Hon. P. COLLIER: I am not surprised at the absence of members, because the lateness of the hour is a reasonable explanation of their absence. If it is not considered to be out of order, I would remind the Minister that ever since the session opened, I have assisted the Government to push on with the business. I have met the Premier on every possible occasion by sitting late or otherwise as occasion demanded, and generally I have worked in harmony with him to assist to get through the business of the session as expeditiously as possible. It during the absence of the Premier we are not to be allowed to adjourn at the usual hour, and business is to be bludgeoned through, I shall have to reconsider my attitude. If there is going to be a trial of endurance I can promise the Minister for Works that he will not make so much progress next week or the week after as has been done hitherto. We are not going to be bludgeoned into sitting here at all hours.

The Minister for Works: Why should there be any necessity to threaten?

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is not a threat. If I am not to receive any consideration on the rare occasions when I ask for it I am not going to be so indulgent as to assist the Government every night to put their business through. I hope we shall now be able exhaustively to examine the position of the water supply before we adjourn, and possibly later in the sitting metropolitan members will have resumed their seats and will be able to join in the debate. Unfortunately, we have not yet received the report of the Water Supply Department. It is true a type-written copy was laid on the Table.

The Minister for Works: This is all I have on the subject. It has been on the Table for a week.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I shall be glad to have the use of the Minister's copy, but as it is rather difficult to grasp the contents of such a document while one is making a speech I shall have to postpone the matter for the time being and peruse the report more at my leisure.

Progress reported.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION.

Received from the Council and read a first time.

House adjourned at 11.47 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 16th November, 1920.

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

QUESTION—MINING, ELECTION OF WORKMEN'S INSPECTORS.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Minister for Education: 1, (a) Do the regulations framed under the Mines Regulation Act Amendment Act, 1915, setting out the method of election of workmen's inspectors provide that a voter, when exercising a vote, shall record a full preference for the whole of the candidates shown on the ballot paper? (b) If not, what are the reasons for departing from the statutory method of voting at a Parliamentary election? 2, Who framed the poster relating to the recent election of workmen's inspectors in the Kalgoorlie and Boulder districts, which states, inter alia: "The voter shall mark the papers by putting the numbers 1, 2, and 3, and so on, opposite the names of the candidates in the order of preference," and "Voters *may* vote for any number of the names on the paper provided they are marked in the order of preference"? 3, Is the Minister aware that the application of the words "shall" and "may" on the poster caused much confusion amongst voters as to whether or not it was necessary to exercise a full preference in respect of all candidates whose names appeared on the ballot paper? 4, Is the Minister aware that instructions were given to deputy returning officers that unless a voter exercised a full preference his ballot paper would be declared informal, and that such instructions were promulgated amongst voters? 5, Is the Minister aware that (a) the two retiring inspectors—who were both candidates—and their supporters actively canvassed voters and advised that it was not necessary to exercise a full preference vote, and that (b) the returning officer disallowed no ballot paper by reason merely that the voter had failed to exercise a full preference? 6, By what system or process of counting did the returning officer ascertainn the result of the ballot? 7, Will the Minister lay upon the Table of the House all papers and counting sheets used by the returning officer which record the distributions of all formal first preference votes, and which record the various transfers of the remaining preferences?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, (a) Yes; but discretionary power is given to the Minister to alter in detail. (b) The reasons for departing from compulsory full preference voting was the abnormal number of candidates nominated (27 in 1916, 14 in 1918, and 9 in 1920), which would make the marking of conscientious preferences throughout the voting paper impracticable. 2, The instructions to voters as to method of marking ballot paper set out on the poster were not specially framed for the recent election, but are the same as those used in the elections of 1916 and 1918. 3, No. 4, Yes; in doing so the returning officer overlooked the option that the poster allowed. 5, (a) No; (b) yes. 6, The first candidate was elected on the system prescribed in the State Electoral Act, and the second candidate on the system of electing the second candidate for the Federal Senate, as there are no provisions in the State Electoral Act for election of a second candidate. 7, Yes. Papers herewith.

DETAILED RESULT OF ELECTION OF TWO WORKMEN'S INSPECTORS OF MINES HELD AT KALGOORLIE ON THE 30TH OCTOBER, 1920.

—	1. Bailey.	2. Boardley.	3. Bursill.	4. Crocker.	5. Darcey.	6. Healey.	7. Howell.	8. Johnston.	9. Reed.	Exhausted.	Total.
A.—Election of First Inspector.											
First count ...	111	35	247	927	496	(20)	126	160	44	...	2,166
First distribution ...	3	...	1	4	3	...	5	4	...	...	(20)
Second count ...	114	(35)	248	931	499	...	131	164	44	...	2,166
Second distribution	3	...	10	9	5	...	2	3	2	1	35
Third count ...	117	...	258	940	504	...	133	167	(46)	1	2,166
Third distribution ...	4	...	8	6	6	...	5	17	...	...	46
Fourth count ...	(121)	...	266	946	510	...	138	184	...	1	2,166
Fourth distribution	...	...	45	29	18	...	19	9	...	1	121
Fifth count ...	...	...	311	975	528	...	(157)	193	...	2	2,166
Fifth distribution ...	...	...	32	6	5	...	...	111	...	3	157
Sixth count ...	...	...	343	981	533	...	...	(304)	...	5	2,166
Sixth distribution ...	...	...	256	16	22	...	...	...	...	10	304
Seventh count ...	...	...	599	997	(555)	...	...	...	...	15	2,166
Seventh distribution	...	...	42	503	...	...	...	...	...	10	555
Final count ...	...	...	641	1,500	...	...	...	...	...	25	2,166
B.—Election of Second Inspector.											
First and Final Count	123	47	261	...	1,375	21	127	162	50	...	2,166

QUESTION—GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY, NUMBERED SEATS.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (for Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom) asked the Minister for Education: Whether the Government will take steps to arrange with the Federal Commissioner of Railways that numbered chairs be allotted to passengers at changes on the Great Western Railway caused by the break of gauge?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: The break of gauge referred to occurs between Port Augusta and Adelaide, and the question of allotting numbered chairs for trans-Australian passengers is a matter which concerns the South Australian Railway authorities. Representations will be made on the matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by the Minister for Education, leave of absence granted to the Hon. G. J. G. W. Miles (North) for twelve consecutive sittings of the House on the ground of ill-health.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH ENDOWMENT LANDS.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous sitting; Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair, the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

New Clause—Roads and footpaths to public buildings (partly considered):

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dodd has moved a new clause, to stand as No. 41, reading—

If any public building is erected on land acquired by the Crown within the boundaries of the said lands, it shall be the duty of the council to provide, make, maintain, and keep in repair such roads and footpaths as may be necessary to give proper access to such building.

New clause put and passed.

Postponed Clause 47—Current supplied for council tramways:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That the words "charge made for the time being for current supplied to the Government tramways" be struck out, and "cost price thereof" inserted in lieu.

I fear that if the clause passes in its present form, the money required for the construction of the tramways will not be forthcoming. No one would subscribe towards the capital needed, if the new system must take its supply of electric current from the Government at a price which is indefinite. We may have in the future, as we have had in the past, a Government in power which is not altogether too scrupulous, and such a Government might say, "Here we are with two pockets, one as regards our trams, the other as regards our power station. We can charge a high price for current to our trams, because by doing so we get a high price from the Perth City Council's trams; and although we shall be making a loss on our own trams, we shall benefit the power station to an equal extent, and moreover shall benefit the power station by the increased price which we shall get from the Perth City Council's trams." Under the 1913 agreement power is to be supplied to the city of Perth for 50 years at cost price, subject to that cost price not exceeding three farthings per unit. The returns before us show that just now the Perth City Council are getting a considerable advantage in this respect, since the present cost of producing the current is 1d. per unit. However, that position will not obtain for long, if the proviso which I shall presently move is carried. I do not propose that this clause should go as far as the existing agreement goes.

Hon. J. Duffell: Would you allow in the cost price anything for interest and sinking fund?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Interest and obsolescence and operating charges are included in the cost price under the agreement. The returns show that the total loss on three years' working of the power house has been £25,000. However, the Perth City Council should have some definite price to work upon, and not be subject to possible exploitation at the hands of some future Government.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There are two points which the hon. member appears to have lost sight of. Firstly, people will not be asked to lend money on the security of the proposed tramways, or to take shares in those tramways. The money borrowed by the municipality to construct the tramways will be borrowed on the general credit of the city of Perth. The second point is that the amendment would not have any effect. In the absence of this clause the Perth City Council would be entitled to call upon the Government to supply them with whatever current they required for tramway purposes, in accordance with the agreement of 1913. This clause does not in any way take away that power from the council. The whole of the 1913 agreement stands in respect of these endowment lands as in respect of the municipality generally. All the clause does is to say that the proviso in the agreement, limiting the price to three farthings per unit, shall not apply in respect of the proposed tramways, but that there shall be another limit. The whole of Clause 6 of the agreement of 1913, with the exception only of the proviso, still applies under this measure. It is only the proviso as to the three farthings maximum price that is taken out by this clause. Reading this clause in conjunction with Clause 6 of the agreement, as I contend one must do, the amendment would have the effect of providing that in determining the price the cost price shall apply, and that it shall not exceed the cost price.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is what you say by your clause in this Bill.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member has not grasped my meaning. The Bill proposes that the price charged shall be the cost price; but instead of the proviso in the agreement of 1912, which says the price shall not exceed three farthings per unit, there is now a proviso that it shall not exceed the charge made to the Government tramways. The hon. member suggests that an unscrupulous Government might charge the Government tramways an unduly big price in order that a similar price might be charged to the council's tramways. I suggest that nothing of the sort could possibly happen in view of Clause 6 of the agreement. The amendment means that the price charged shall be the cost price, which shall not exceed the cost price. Surely the hon. member does not want that!

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes, I do, in another way. I agree that the price to be paid shall be the cost price to the Government. The Minister says that we are getting rid of the proviso to Clause 6 of the agreement and allowing the rest of that clause to stand. I want that. But we are not doing that, for, under the Bill the price charged shall not exceed the charge made for the time being for current supplied to the Government tramways—which may be anything; it will depend on the mood of the Government. The Minister suggests that we could not have an unscrupulous Government.

The Minister for Education: No, I said that even an unscrupulous Government could not do what you suggest.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: What is there in the clause to prevent the Government fixing the price of current to their own tramways at 3d. or even 3s. per unit? Their own tramways would make a loss, but their power scheme would make a corresponding profit, and the city council's tramways would also have to pay the 3s.

The Minister for Education: Not at all.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Well, I cannot read the clause. The clause says nothing whatever about cost price.

Hon. A. H. Panton: If a man goes mad once, that is no reason why he should perpetuate that condition.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The clause strikes out the price limitation and substitutes "the charge made to the Government tramways." I want to get back to the agreement of 1913, minus the proviso.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The amendment would certainly prejudice the council; it could not possibly prejudice the Government. Under the agreement the council has the right to current at cost price, a right not taken away by Clause 47, which only removes the proviso to Clause 6 of the agreement. If the Government were to charge the Government tramways 3s. per unit, as the hon. member suggests, the city council would still have all the privileges under Clause 6 of the agreement. If the proviso were left out, the city council would still have to pay the cost price, notwithstanding that the Government tramways might be getting current at less than cost price. The hon. member argues as though Clause 47 repealed Clause 6 of the agreement. It does nothing of the kind, but repeals only the proviso to Clause 6, which limits the cost price to three farthings per unit. We have not altered the provision for arriving at the cost price; we have not altered the right of the council to get the current at cost price but, instead of limiting the cost price to three farthings per unit, we say that if the Government supply their own tramways at less than cost price, the council shall have it at the same price. It is a protection, not to the Government, but to the city council.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In view of the explanation given by the Minister, I am bound to support him. Clause 6 of the agreement provides that the council shall receive its current at cost price, and there is a proviso that the cost price shall not exceed three farthings per unit. The hon. member's amendment would only create confusion. I appreciate the hon. member's desire to secure the position of the city council; but, having regard to the fact that the council is entitled to receive its current at cost price, as provided in the agreement, the mere alteration made by the proviso to Clause 47 of the Bill will not interfere with the right of the council to demand its current at cost price, but the maximum price which it can be charged will be the price charged by the Government to the Government tramways. The alteration made by the proviso is merely to save the Government from supplying current at less than cost price.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I will support the clause as it stands. The Minister has made the position very clear. Moreover, the city council is fully aware of the wording of this clause.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The city council does not want this clause.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: It is one thing for the hon. member to say that, and quite another to remember that the city council has not approached us for any amendment to the clause; therefore, we should not be justified in amending the clause in the manner proposed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I was told by the Town Clerk, and Mr. Crocker that this was not one of their clauses, and that it had been put in by the Government.

The Minister for Education: That is so, but they agreed to it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: There is no definite price set down at which the Government will supply electricity for tramway purposes, and without some limitation the city council will not know what the cost of it is to be. There should be some limitation of this sort. Time will tell whether I am right or wrong.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

> That the following proviso be added:—"Provided that this section shall not operate against the right of the council to generate and transmit electric current within the said lands."

Without a proviso of this nature the council would, under the agreement, be bound to the Government's scheme for a period of 50 years. In view of the great developments in electricity that are constantly being brought forward, it would be inadvisable that the council should be restricted in this way. The object of my amendment is to give the city of Perth an opportunity of making at least a portion of the 3,500 acres involved in this new territory an industrial centre. I have just been through the Dominion of Canada. In practically every township and hamlet there is what is known as a Canadian club, and every member is supposed to bring five new members into it every twelve months—members are required to do all they can to establish new industries in their particular centres. The basis for these manufacturing industries in an abundant supply of cheap eelctric power and water, and these towns advertise their claims for support in this direction. I had occasion to travel by steamer from Liverpool to Newfoundland. This steamer was fitted up with wireless telephony apparatus. Last July we heard through the wireless telephone a concert which was going on in England 2,754 miles away. We were speaking to the other shore 1,750 miles away, and were in daily communication with ships from

400 to 500 miles distant. The old type of wireless had been done away with on that vessel. We were off the coast of Newfoundland for 11 hours in a dense fog, and every hour we were given our position from the shore. The Marconi people on board told us that electrical science was only in its infancy, and that in future we would have, instead of 100,000 volt transmission schemes, 500,000 volt transmissions. Only a few years ago the board of trade limit was 3,000 volts. In Winnipeg there is one transmission scheme of 65,000 volts and another of 110,000 volts. In this place cheap current is provided for manufacturing purposes and also for domestic use. It is generated by water. It is also known that current can be generated from coal at the pit's mouth as cheaply as it can be done by water. There is a huge dam across the Red River some distance from Winnipeg, and the cost of constructing the hydro-electric scheme was enormous. If coal can be obtained within a reasonable distance of the industrial centre concerned, electric power can be transmitted practically as cheaply as by any other means. I mention these developments in electricity to emphasise the fact that if the city of Perth is prevented from taking advantage of them, it will be losing great opportunities for advancement. I want to afford the city an opportunity, through this amendment, to secure cheap power for the purposes covered by the Bill, and to take advantage within the next 50 years of all the latest developments in the electrical world. It is impossible to run factories with power at .75d. per unit. Throughout America and Canada much smaller prices rule for factories, and I had an opportunity of securing particulars of quite a number of instances showing how development has taken place in those countries. I have many pamphlets and booklets which I can make available to members should they desire to have them. There are quite a number of things which might be done under the powers contained in the Bill, judging by my experience while away from the State. In some towns I visited in Canada the people invite manufacturers to establish their works on sites provided at a peppercorn rental, extending over a long period of years, free from municipal taxation except the improvement tax, which is levied on money spent on improvements to building sites.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I believe that they pay these industrial concerns to come into their district.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not know that, and I am speaking of what I saw myself. Many towns, I believe, have offered their sites to start with free. At such places there is abundant cheap power and cheap water. Where such instances have occurred, enormous progress has been made within a short period. It is not uncommon for towns with a population of 2,000 inhabitants to run up to a population of 100,000 within 10 or 11 years. I desire to give Perth an opportunity to encourage manufacturers.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should not make a second reading speech on his amendment. I have given the hon. member great latitude.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I only want to show the possibilities industrially.

Hon. J. Duffell: We are all seized with the importance of it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If members are satisfied I do not desire to detain them. I simply wish to point out one or two industries that are quite possible in Perth, if we go the right way about it. The powers under this Bill, however, are limited, and would not provide the Perth City Council with reasonable opportunities during the next 50 years. I do not want to repudiate the present agreement, but I desire to see that the Perth City Council shall be in a position to take advantage of the latest electrical developments and provide power which will enable manufacturing to be carried on successfully.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I desire to express my appreciation of the latitude extended to Mr. Lovekin, thus enabling him to give interesting details of his experiences while on his travels. We are very much interested in the matter, and I for one should be glad of an opportunity of perusing the pamphlets he has referred to. While I realise that Mr. Lovekin is in earnest regarding the proviso he has proposed, I am astonished that it should emanate from that hon. gentleman, who is one of the representatives of the metropolitan province, bearing in mind that the agreement which is in existence at present, provides that the Government shall supply the city council with current at .75d. per unit, and is therefore an excellent one for the citizens of Perth. Mr. Lovekin said that the proviso would enable the city council to establish new industries. If he means by that that the Perth City Council or their executive officers are wiser in their day and generation than those who enabled that body to obtain current at so low a rate as that mentioned, and having regard to the fact that the Government have not sought, in view of circumstances which have existed since the agreement was made, to repudiate it, it is astonishing that such a proviso should be presented to the Committee. I have only to remind hon. members of what is proceeding at the present time. Eight years ago, when the agreement was entered into, a big effort was made to force the hands of the Subiaco municipality. At that time they had an electric light plant running, which was giving every satisfaction then, and it has continued to give satisfaction ever since. So much was that so, that notwithstanding the fact that the Perth City Council were obtaining current at .75d. per unit when it was costing the Subiaco municipal council .90d. per unit to manufacture, the Subiaco municipality were

still able to sell current to their consumers at less than was paid to the Perth City Council by the ratepayers. However, at the present time the Subiaco council, with their efficient staff and up-to-date plant, realise that they cannot compete successfully with the present high cost of fuel, wages and so on, and they have been induced to consider favourably the advantage to be derived from taking current from the Perth City Council.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The output was so small.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: It was not a question of output, for they were working to their full capacity, including storage as well. Notwithstanding that, the Perth City Council have made conditions so favourable that the Subiaco council are at present giving favourable consideration to scrapping their plant and taking their current from the city council. It may be that Mr. Lovekin can see ahead and can see the city council taking over the Subiaco plant and setting it up for use again.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Oh, no!

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I do not say that that will be so. I have listened to Mr. Lovekin's remarks regarding what has been done with water power. He did not tell us what has been done in other parts of the world, where they have been utilising air for the purpose of generating electric current.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What about sea power?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: In addition to wave power there are many other ways of generating power, but the fact remains that the agreement I have referred to is still in existence.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I do not want to repudiate it.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: It is not fair or reasonable to expect that that agreement shall be departed from, and say that, notwithstanding that agreement, we are prepared to give the city council an opportunity to enter into competition with the Government. If the Perth City Council should be given power under the Bill in connection with the garden city development to proceed along the lines suggested by Mr. Lovekin, the Government would not be able to secure any of that benefit for the power house and the machinery they have provided, which they might reasonably expect. I cannot support the proviso as moved by Mr. Lovekin.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am entirely in sympathy with the motive of Mr. Lovekin. The House is indebted to him for the information he has given. What we want more than anything else is cheaper power for manufacturing purposes. His aim will not be achieved by the amendment he proposes, for it says that the Bill shall not do what the Bill does not provide for under this clause. The proviso sets out that this clause shall not operate against the rights of the council to generate and transmit current within the city lands. The clause does not purport to give those rights to the council. It does not affect the rights of the council in any way. Something else affects the rights of the council, and if the hon. member desires to achieve his object, it will be necessary to amend some other clause, but not this clause. I understand that it is the hon. member's intention to move an amendment to Clause 40 of the Bill to give the council certain powers. I wish to make clear the points which will be involved. Under Section 438 of the Municipal Corporations Act the municipalities have power to borrow money for the construction or purchase of gas works, electric light plant, or any other works for lighting the municipal district, and under the Act passed in 1912 for the supply of gas or electric light or power for consumption or use by any person, company, or public or local authority. That right is limited in this way, provided that in respect of matters contained in Subsections 5, 6 and 7—it is Subsection 6 which gives the right with regard to electric light works—the consent of the Governor shall first be obtained. If the amendment is passed, together with the consequential amendment to Clause 40, the Perth City Council will have not only the ordinary right of a municipality to construct or purchase electric light works, but will have the right to do so unquestioned and without the authority which other municipalities would have to obtain. Every other municipality is bound as to the amount it can borrow. The amount is set out in Section 436 of the Municipal Corporations Act and is ten times the average ordinary revenue. If this power is given under Clause 40 Perth municipality will be free from that obligation. Thus in two respects the Perth City Council will stand in a better position than any other municipality. I see no reason why Perth should be given powers and privileges not enjoyed by any other municipality in the State, and there is a very strong reason why they should not be granted these powers. The agreement of 1913, which was for 50 years, and terminable then only on three years' notice so that it still has 46 years to run, provides—

> Subject to the proviso hereto, nothing in this agreement shall derogate from, or be construed to derogate from, the rights, powers, and privileges vested in the corporation under and by virtue of the Perth Municipal Gas and Electric Lighting Act, 1911. Provided that during the currency of this agreement and so long as the Government shall supply current to the corporation to the full extent of its requirements, the corporation will not itself generate current.

If the hon. member wishes to alter that condition of affairs, it will be necessary for him to make paragraph 9 of the agreement of 1913 inoperative in respect to this measure.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I only want it to apply to the new area.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: But the amendment will not have that effect. It will not remove paragraph 9 of the agreement.

Hon. A. Lovekin: With the consequential amendment I think we can make it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This amendment will not have that effect. The hon. member's only opportunity would be to insert in this Bill a clause to the effect that paragraph 9 of the agreement of 1913 shall not apply to these lands. If he did this, we should have to ask ourselves whether it would be fair and reasonable that the rest of the agreement should apply to these lands, and that the Government should be bound by the agreement. The agreement of 1913 is undoubtedly favourable to the Perth City Council and unfavourable to the Government. If the Council wished to get out to-morrow, the Government would cancel the agreement readily and willingly. Current is costing about .84d. and we are selling it at .75d. The increases in the cost of coal and in wages seem to be going on and the position is not likely to improve. The Government would be glad to get out of the agreement. The agreement not only binds the Government on the points mentioned, but also binds the Government to supply the present and future requirements of the city. Do the Perth City Council wish to be relieved of the agreement so far as these lands are concerned? I do not think so.

Hon. A. Lovekin: No, they do not and I do not want them to be, either.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Then, would it be fair to take out the only provision which can be construed as being favourable to the Government? Does the hon. member suggest that the Perth City Council should have all the advantages of the agreement and be relieved of the single obligation which is imposed upon them? That would not be a fair proposition. The hon. member's object could only be attained by amending the agreement of 1913 in a manner equitable to both parties.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Minister asks whether it is fair to take from the agreement the only provision which is advantageous to the Government. That is a very narrow view. Would not there be a much greater advantage to the Government as the result of the establishment of industries in this State? The Minister said this is not the place or the form in which to make the provision. I put an amendment on the Notice Paper and suggested that, to facilitate the passage of the Bill, we could test the principle on Clause 47, and the Minister assented to the adoption of this course. I do not care whether this is the right form or the right place, or whether it will be advantageous to the Government. I am striving to keep the rope from the neck of the Perth City Council during the next 50 years, whereby Perth is prevented from establishing industries within this new area. I do not wish to repudiate one provision of the agreement. If it is a bad agreement for the city, the council must stand to it because they entered into it with their eyes open, but there is no obligation on the city with respect to this new area. The opening up of these lands was not contemplated when the Act was passed. I suggest that we should enable the council to establish industries in the new area and not insist upon the council being bound by the agreement, which must for all time prevent the establishment of industries, because it has been shown over and over again that it is impossible to carry on industries when power is costing anything like .75d. The Minister suggests that when the time comes and these developments can be made, the agreement might be revised. We do not expect to get passengers for a railway until the railway has first been constructed. If we want people to start industries here, we must be able to show that cheap power and cheap water in abundance are obtainable. If we can provide these essentials industries will be established, and we shall be able to make something like a State of Western Australia, and it will no longer continue to be a State of primary production alone.

Hon. J. Cornell: The water to-day is not good, cheap, or plentiful.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Years ago, with a very small plant, we pumped water to a height of 240 feet to King's Park, and paid the extravagant rate of 3½d. for current. Even then we were able to pump the water for 4½d. per thousand gallons. It was good water and it kept the grass green and the plants alive. On the Lime Kilns Estate there is an abundance of water obtainable with a small lift, ample to supply any industry which might be started there. I am interested in trying to manufacture paper in this State. Sixty-three thousand tons of paper are used in Australia every year, which would represent the output of one factory having a couple of machines. To produce each ton of paper requires the product of a ton of coal, but no one would agree to transport 63,000 tons of coal from Collie. The product of the coal would be transmitted in the form of energy.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine himself to the question before the Committee.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I was trying to impress upon members the necessity for passing an amendment which would give Perth an opportunity to get cheaper power in future. If I am out of order I shall resume my seat.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—OPTICIANS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 10th November.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.45]: I intend to oppose the second

reading of the Bill, and I do so on the ground that it is against the public interests. Even those primarily concerned, the opticians themselves are, I believe, divided as to the merits of the Bill. It is even unlike the curate's egg, which we are told on good authority was good in parts. So far as I can see, there is nothing in the Bill which makes it fitting as food for public consumption. Even the definition of "optician" seems to me to be an outrage on the English language. If hon. members will look at Clause 2, they will see that "optician" is defined as a person who practices the art of optometry. If they turn to the dictionary they will find that an optician is a person who makes or deals with optical instruments or eye glasses, and so far as I can see, if the Bill becomes law there will be nothing to prevent an optician sitting in his office and becoming a pure sight-tester, and not supplying the public with glasses at all; that is to say, he will fail to carry out one of the primary duties of the optician. Then again, no one who is not a sight-tester—and I am going to use the name "sight-tester" in preference to "optician" —will be allowed to advertise himself as an optician, and the result will be that if such world renowned firms as Zeiss and Watson wished to come here to start in business, they would be precluded from advertising themselves as opticians because they would not be sight-testers. Again, it is the practice in most large towns for men to set up in business as makers and fitters of glasses from oculists prescriptions, but so far as I can see, under the Bill, if a man wished to carry on that line of business exclusively, without being a sight-tester himself, he would be unable to do so. It is true there is a clause which protects craftsmen and those who actually make or alter lenses, but that is not the function of the ordinary optician who makes up an oculist's prescription; he employs craftsmen to do that work, and he himself adapts and fixes the lenses and the frames, and centres the lenses. So that it seems to me there are many of what I would call minor defects in the Bill. But I am not going to oppose the Bill so much on those grounds as on account of what I consider to be the wrong principles in the Bill, and I cannot do better than quote the words of the introducer when he referred to the disorders of the sight being treated by some unskilled person, leading to dire results. I think on one occasion exception was taken in this House to the use of the epithet "Jew." I hope the hon. member will pardon me if I paraphrase the lines of Gratiano to Shylock, "I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me those words 'dire results.'" In the event of an explanation being needed, I may state at once that I am aware the hon. member is not a Jew. These dire results are exactly what were feared by the members of the medical fraternity assembled in congress recently at Brisbane. That congress passed certain resolutions dealing with the matter. They were as follows—

1. It is dangerous to the welfare of the public that opticians, however, highly qualified as such, should be registered as sight-testing opticians.

2. The testing of errors of refractions (such as long sight, short sight, astigmatism, etc.) and the treatment thereof by spectacles or otherwise cannot be safely carried out by other than fully qualified medical practitioners specially trained for this work.

The reasons for these opinions are (a) That the eye is a part of the human body and not merely an optical instrument. (b) That a full knowledge of the various sciences considered necessary for graduation in medicine is as essential for the proper treatment of diseases of the eye as it is for the proper treatment of diseases of any other organ of the body.

In the first place, dealing with the functions of the optician in so far as he is concerned, in correcting errors of refraction, it is always—when I say "always" I mean during modern times, going back even to 40 or 50 years ago—it has always been known to oculists that in testing the sight of children and young people it is impossible to do so without using the drug known as a cycloplegic. Under the Bill the use of such a drug is expressly forbidden to the optician.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Which is quite right.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Undoubtedly, because the use of the drug in certain conditions of the eye is dangerous. It therefore should not be used by anybody but a medical man. The oculist says there are certain errors of refraction which it is impossible to correctly estimate without the use of this drug. In all cases of errors of refraction occurring in young people, especially in children, it is necessary that the drug should be used. It is also considered necessary to use it in the case of older people when they have errors or refraction known as astigmatism. That was the current medical opinion when I had the privilege of undergoing my training, and that opinion prevails to-day. I have here the "British Journal of Ophthalmology," and in an article by George M. Gould, who delivered the opening address at the Oxford Opthalmological Congress held in July, 1917, in which address he introduced a discussion upon errors of refraction, he said—

> First and absolute, is the exceptionless rule that up to 45, and sometimes up to 50 years of age—largely depending upon the art and skill and experience of the oculist—there can be no accurate diagnosis of the ametropic errors without cycloplegia.

Ernest Clarke in the same journal is reported to have said—

> There are perhaps few, if any, living who belong to the "old school" which taught that no astigmatism under 1D,

need be corrected; that cycloplegics were hardly ever necessary in refraction work.

He maintains that up to the age of 30 and occasionally over, it is invariably necessary and he concludes by saying—

> I have found that there are a few patients where the cycloplegic does not reveal anything new, but the large majority do; and I feel that it is better to put a few to inconvenience rather than make a wrong diagnosis in the many.

Here is a quotation from a work by Webster Fox, Professor of Ophthalmology at the University of Pennsylvania. The date of this work is 1920—

> A mydriatic should then be prescribed, if the patient is not over 45 years of ago, to place the eye at rest in order that latent errors may be more easily detected.

Here is another work by Fuchs, Professor of Ophthalmology in the University of Vienna, translated into the English by Duane, Professor at the Knapp Memorial Hospital, New York. He says—

> The translator's own practice is to use homatropine whenever practicable, especially insisting upon its employment in children and where there is a suspicion of spasm of accommodation (difference between subjective and objective tests), or where there are evidences of convergence—excess. Contrary to the statements generally expressed he has found it advantageous to paralyse the accommodation in patients between 40 and 50.

It will be seen therefore that the highest medical opinion is that in a very large majority of cases of erors of refraction, it is necessary in order to get a correct estimate of the error to use cycloplegic. I can give the House a little personal experience. I, unfortunately, have to wear glasses and some 18 years ago I noticed that my sight was not as good as it formerly was. At that time the only man who was practising as an oculist in Perth happened to be out of town, and I went to an optician. He examined my sight in the usual way and said I had short-sighted astigmatism. He fitted me with concave cylinders, but I found on wearing them that the condition of my eyes became worse. Shortly afterwards when I happened to be in London I consulted an oculist there, and he used a cycloplegic and determined that the error of refraction was long sighted astigmatism and that I required convex cylinders. He said that the glasses I was wearing were adding to my troubles. The great objection I see to the Bill now before the House is that it will set up a class of practitioner who will be considered by the public as an authority on defective sight. Instances are already not uncommon for loss of sight to take place in consequence of people consulting opticians and getting fitted up with spectacles when they are really suffering from diseases of the eye-ball, and which sometimes are made worse by the glasses, and in no case is relief afforded. On the other hand, valuable time is wasted because an oculist has not been consulted on account of the assurance given by the optician that all that is required is glasses. The worst offenders in this respect are not hawkers who go about selling glasses, but those people who set up as authorities on, defective sight. In the language of the introducer, if the Bill became law, one would be able to go to an institution and find out what was the matter with one's sight. These people set up as being authorities on eyesight, and they entirely overlook the fact that failure of eyesight may be due not only to errors of refraction, but very often to disease of the eye.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Can they not tell that?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: They often do not. Instead of a person being able to go into an institution and find out what is the matter with his eyesight, what he is able to do is to go into an institution and get fitted with glasses by an eye-tester. In introducing the Bill Mr. Nicholson said it contained nothing to prevent people from going into a shop and buying spectacles, which he stated he thought was quite a proper thing to do.

Hon. J. Nicholson: To buy them as merchandise.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Mr. Nicholson said there was nothing in the Bill to prevent people going to a shop and fitting themselves with spectacles at their own risk. That is exactly the position which the medical profession take up with regard to the optician. Just as the medical profession say there should be nothing to compel any person suffering from cancer to get medical advice, so they say there should be nothing to compel a patient with an error of refraction to go to an oculist if he prefers to go to an optician. The medical profession do not want to restrict the public's choice. If the public wish to go to an optician, by all means let them do so; but let them know that they are doing so at their own risk. The medical profession contend that it would be wrong for the State to give the hall-mark of registration for testing sight to people who are not fully qualified to perform that work. Various other countries have been quoted—America, Queensland, Tasmania—as having legislation similar to this Bill. I am not very much concerned with the legislation of the United States. I would suggest that we are less likely to find crank legislation in the United Kingdom than in the United States, and the United Kingdom has no such law as this. Nor am I very much concerned with Queensland legislation. I do not think members of this House are likely to look to Queensland for examples of legislation; and I am certainly not going to look to Tasmania in a matter of this sort, for at this very moment the Tasmanian Legislature is passing a Bill to render qualified as a medical practitioner

a man who has merely a bogus medical qualification. I can see that if this Bill should become law, next session we shall have Mr. Nicholson introducing a Bill on behalf of the hairdressers. At one time the hairdressers were mixed up with the surgeons; whence, I believe, the red and blue pole of the barber to-day. Those of us who go to the hairdresser and have the misfortune to be a little thin on the top, usually are offered a lotion which is said to be most conducive to the growth of hair. Many barbers have posted up a certificate stating that the holder is a qualified trichologist of some unknown college or institution. Next year we may see a Bill compelling every hairdresser to become a trichologist, and nobody will be able either to cut hair or sell hair lotion unless he is a registered trichologist. It is true that for the last six centuries the opticians have been engaged in supplying glasses to mankind. Nobody wants to prevent them from doing so. You, Mr. President, may remember this entry in Pepys' diary under date of the 7th October, 1664—

> There came Mr. Cocker, and brought me a globe of glasses and a frame of oyled paper as I desired, to show me the manner of his gaining light to grave by and to lessen the glaringnesse of it at pleasure by an oyled paper. This I bought of him, giving him a crowne for it, and so well satisfied he went away, and I to my business again, and so home to supper, prayers, and bed.

It is quite obvious that the opticians have been engaged in supplying glasses to the public for many centuries. But the science of optics has made very great strides meantime. It is only since the second half of the nineteenth century that the nature, extent, and causes of the difference in the refraction of the eye have become known. All the advances that have been made in this science have been made as the result of the combined labours of the physicist and the oculist. I believe the optician who would come under this Bill has had practically no share in the progress of the science. The Bill is so wide-sweeping that I believe it will sweep even the University into its net. I have had a communication from the professorial board of the University stating that if a certain clause of the Bill goes through, their work will be hampered.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I have given an undertaking in that respect.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: That, unfortunately, has not yet been mentioned.

Hon. J. Nicholson: But it will be.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: There is no clause in this Bill that I can regard as good, but it contains very many which I regard as harmful.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [6.8]: I have sat patiently listening to our learned colleague in the hope that he, speaking on behalf of the medical profession, would give us something tangible and reasonable on which we, as laymen, could make up our minds regarding this Bill. But all Dr. Saw did was to endeavour to ridicule the Bill. Though ridicule may be a powerful weapon on the hustings and elsewhere, I for one have learnt that it is of very little utility in this House. All that Dr. Saw said, after quoting the views of the medical profession, boils itself down to this, that the medical profession are satisfied to leave things as they are, that persons suffering from defective sight, either real or imagined, shall be allowed to consult either a medical man or an optician. Mr. Nicholson desires by this Bill to give the public some protection, to give them some guarantee that opticians who are not qualified medical men possess a proper degree of competency. I have read the Bill from end to end, and find it liberal in all its phases. It could be further liberalised in Committee. If the medical profession are prepared to stand still and to allow the man or woman or child suffering from defective sight to choose between the most highly qualified opticians in the State and the biggest impostors hawking glasses, I am not so prepared. I will, if I can, alter the law so as to require in opticians some standard of competency. I would have supported Dr. Saw if he had proposed to introduce a Bill making it an offence for any person other than a duly qualified medical practitioner to practise sight-testing or to tinker with the eye. That would be logical and reasonable. Dr. Saw has referred to a personal experience he had with sight-testers. Mr. Dodd will bear me out when I say that I had many consultations with so-called eye specialists holding diplomas in this State. After that, I had the pleasure of being attended by one of Australia's greatest oculists, a man equally renowned for skill and benevolence, one whom the humblest in the land could consult freely—the late Dr. T. K. Hamilton, of Adelaide. Before I consulted Dr. Hamilton I had had, not the pleasure, but the very reverse, of consulting eye specialists in this State for a period of 18 months. While there may be many medical men calling themselves oculists or eye specialists, there are very few who, in the final analysis, are qualified to treat eye cases. I know of hundreds of cases that came to Dr. T. K. Hamilton after having been unsuccessfully treated for years by oculists in this and other States. Let me point out that the charges of oculists are extortionate. I venture to say that not one of the leading oculists in Perth to-day would test a person's eyesight for a fee of less than two guineas. That is the chief reason why people turn to other quarters. Reverting to Dr. Hamilton, I may say that he gave me a pair of glasses and that he cured my eyes of trachoma. I did not wait sufficiently long for the after effects to wear off, but rushed to another Adelaide eye specialist, Dr. Bennett. Having obtained from Dr. Hamilton reading glasses,

I was supplied by Dr. Bennett with what he said I needed, namely long-distance glasses. Eventually I got an entirely suitable pair of glasses from a man who was not a medical practitioner; and I wore those glasses until I lost them when the ship in which I was travelling was torpedoed in the Bay of Biscay. Such has been my experience of medical men in connection with the treatment of eyesight. A cardinal principle of the late Dr. T. K. Hamilton was to save an eye wherever he could even though it might be permanently ruined. He used to say that any sort of an eye was better than a glass eye. In all our lifetime we get only two eyes, and very often we see out of only one. I support this Bill because its enactment will afford a certain amount of protection to the public, and will effect the removal of a certain amount of imposture existing in our midst. In the general interests of the public this Bill should be supported.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. Nicholson: May I be permitted to make a personal explanation? In moving the second reading I mentioned, on information which I had received and which I believed, that a similar Bill had been passed in, among other States, South Australia. I have learned, however, that the Bill has not yet passed in South Australia, although it is the law in the other States I mentioned.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [7.31]: The Bill seems to be one of those measures of secondary importance, which nevertheless demands very careful consideration at our hands. We can safely say, on this occasion at any rate, that we are all most anxious to do the right thing, but through no fault of our own, and with no reflection on ourselves, the majority of us know very little about the Bill. Therefore in respect of this kind of measure there is the greater responsibility that those who introduce them should be particularly careful to place the case fairly and fully before the House. We have heard the explanation from the hon. member, and the only reason I am going to criticise him, rather than the people he represents, is because he is here to answer me. He can go and complain to his opticians that they have not posted him in his work; but we can leave them out of it altogether. They have not the right to speak here, whereas the hon. member has. Therefore I say that, *in spite of his explanation*, we have just grounds for complaint at his introducing a measure of this nature, and not deliberately—it is absurd to say deliberately misleading us, for in such a case we could defend ourselves; but worse than that, misleading us unwittingly, the blind leading the blind, and we both fall into the ditch.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member is scarcely in order in accusing another hon. member of misleading him.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: On that point I will leave it to the personal explanation we have just heard; I do not wish to say anything more. Possibly one ought to blame the principals in the case, but I always object to attacking people who are not in a position to defend themselves. Therefore all my remarks are directed to the hon. member, who will have the right to reply. We have heard two expert authorities for and against the Bill. I regret that Dr. Saw is not here. I think his case against the Bill was worse than that of the hon. member who moved the second reading. I have looked into this matter myself, and I say that these people who are the prime movers have put me, and probably others, to a great deal of unnecessary extra work because they have not had the interest or the knowledge to let us know exactly what we are asked to do. It will be remembered that a short time ago we had a new system introduced in this Chamber which added a fly leaf to each Bill, a leaf on which was printed a brief summary of the provisions of the Bill, together with references. If that had been done in the case of this Bill it would have assisted us greatly. This Bill has no memorandum, no references to other Acts in different States, and therefore our work is made so much the harder. I ask Mr. Nicholson to make a special note of this. As to the information we are entitled to have before we can come to a sound conclusion on this matter, I am going to take the Tasmanian Act, which has been in force for six or seven years. If an Act of this kind has been in force for so long in Tasmania, a report from anybody over there, the medical people, the opticians or the politicians, would be of material assistance to us. In regard to Queensland, the hon. member referred to the report of a committee of inquiry. There, again, it is of no use just putting a lengthy paper on the Table of the House. Surely we are entitled to ask of the opticians in this State, or their spokesmen here, that we should have some summary, printed preferably, because there are in the Bill a great many words which I have never before seen, which I cannot spell and with whose meaning I am totally unacquainted. Such a summary would be of great assistance to us, would by its references tell us what is from Tasmania, what from Queensland, and what is new. It is to be regretted that this South Australian reference should have been brought in, because I should imagine that the Bill in South Australia, which was introduced in October, was largely used in the Bill before us. If hon. members will look at the South Australian "Hansard" they will find that while the Bill there was introduced on the 2nd October, 1919, it was dropped at the end of the session. They have over there a method, which several

Parliaments have in varying forms, of reintroducing a Bill without going through all the necessary stages of its first introduction, and therefore it has come on again this session. If hon. members will look at Nos. 5, 7, 10, 13, and 14 of the South Australian "Hansard" they will find that very drastic steps were taken in Committee in striking out various clauses. Another point which I would ask Mr. Nicholson to make a note of is in reference to the question of whether medical men should be on this board. In South Australia the matter was debated at some length, and I think they decided to strike them off the board. I should also like to know from Dr. Saw whether, if we provide for medical men being on the board, any of them would go on the board.

Hon. R. J. Lynn: It would depend on the remuneration.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Doctors, after all, are not guided primarily by a desire for remuneration, although they have to live like the rest of us. The three parties interested in the Bill are the medical fraternity, the opticians, and the public. If I can do anything to advance any section of the community in regard to their status or position, so long as no injury is done to the public I am certainly in favour of doing it. To that extent I shall support the second reading. I am prepared to give the Bill most full and careful consideration. I should like to point out, however, that if they get the second reading through, they will be well advised to drop the Bill for this session and go back and do their work properly. I hope we shall carry the second reading, because it will give them some encouragement to go and do their work well. But to say there is any reasonable chance of getting the Bill through this session, at this hour, well I ask hon. members whether any of them would be prepared to say there is any hope of getting the Bill through both Houses? If we are to do the work well it means considerable trouble to ourselves which will be entirely thrown away unless the Bill is going through in the ordinary course. To expect, in the middle of November, with the many measures of public importance coming on, that we should get the Bill through both Houses this session seems to me out of the question. I do not propose to give my personal experiences, either with opticians or with oculists. That is not going to assist us very much, although Dr. Saw seemed to think it would. It was certainly an astonishing piece of evidence that he went to an oculist and, because that oculist did not put everything right, that therefore we should hand ourselves over body and soul to the doctors —as if they never made any mistake in their work! If we were all going to give our personal experiences of opticians and medical people, I should think the opticians would come very well out of the receital of those personal experiences. If these opticians wish their case to be an appeal to the public, I venture to proffer them the suggestion that they should give the public the benefit of their opinion in regard to the testing of children's eyesight in our schools. As a matter of fact, when one gets over 50 it does not matter so much; but considering what it means to children at school, how essential it is that they should have good eyesight, and how at the beginning these diseases can be treated very much more effectually than after delay, I trust a good case will be made out for the opticians being allowed to test the eyes of the children in our public schools. I have had a paper from a private firm of opticians handed to me with regard to a report on the eyesight of children in the metropolitan schools. The report apparently was made 20 years ago. No one will deny that the ideal system would be to have a first class oculist who would test and examine the eye, and then to have a first class optician who would fix the apparatus and provide the glasses. It goes without saying that the opticians, the medical men, and the public would grant that such would be the ideal and proper system. The difficulty in this country, as we know from our circumstances, is that this, for all practical purposes, cannot really be obtained. The number of first class oculists in this country, who would stand up to the test outside this country, must necessarily be comparatively few. This means that the sight of people in Western Australia will be handed over to men who, on their own showing, will not be experts. If the doctors were to say that they were anxious to protect our eyesight—and it is important that the sight of the people of the country should be protected—by prohibiting anyone except a duly qualified medical man from testing the sight, I could understand their attitude. As Mr. Cornell has pointed out, opticians have been testing sight in this State and have apparently given satisfaction to many people. The fact that Dr. Saw went to an optician is some indication, at any rate, that he did not think he was running any considerable risk as to his eyesight. Are we going to put these opticians in a position where they will simply be looking after their own interests, or shall we be protecting the interests of the public by putting these opticians into a separate class, with special rules and regulations and a special system of testing their own qualifications, and having special educational tests applied to them? Under this Bill the board will be created by the opticians. In South Australia it was proposed that two medical men should sit on the board. Clause 21 raises the question of nationality. It says—

> Subject to this Act, any person of or over the age of 21 years, being a natural born or naturalised British subject.

Why put that into the Bill? Eyes are the same all the world over. What does it matter whether a man is a Dane, a Frenchman,

or an Italian, if he understands his work? If such a man is qualified, and there is no other objection to him, why say that, because he is an alien, we object to his resignation?

Hon. J. Duffell: We do not call a Frenchman an alien.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Does the hon. member not know what an alien is? Clause 24 says—

> No registered optician shall solicit business or engage in the hawking of spectacles.

That is an astonishing thing. If these men are qualified to test the eyesight, the more they push the business and advertise it the better. This particular clause was struck out of the South Australian Act. I presume it was taken from the Tasmanian Act. Clause 27 says that no registered optician shall practise who has not an established place of business within the State of Western Australia. If a man came from South Australia, where they have registered opticians, why should he not practise in Kalgoorlie, or Forrest, or some other place along the Trans-Australian line?

Hon. J. Nicholson: He will not practise otherwise than in his own name. You remember some medical men who practised by advertisement here.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The question of medical men is not under discussion. They have their own organisation and traditions. We are establishing something new here. I do not see why opticians should not advertise. Clause 29 says—

> The board shall hold examinations of persons desiring to qualify for registration under this Act, and fix the places where, and the times when, the examinations shall be held.

That ought to be carefully considered. I am not prepared to say offhand that it ought not to go in. If people wish to be examined at Broome, or some other place in the North, are they going to be dragged down here for examination, or is a special examiner to be sent up there to put them through their paces? We ought to remember what a huge territory this is. I was distressed to hear Dr. Saw talk as he did about Tasmania and Queensland. I think he said he did not take any interest in what was being done in either of those States.

Hon. A. H. Panton: The reason is obvious.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: It struck me in a most painful manner that a gentleman who enjoys the position, reputation and standing in the community, such as Dr. Saw does, should speak like that about our neighbouring States, especially on a question of the eye. I should have thought the eye in Queensland and Tasmania was very much like our eyes in this State. It is time we recognised that what goes on in the other States is of great importance, and may be of great assistance to us. I am going to vote with some hesitation for the second reading of the Bill. Before we get into Committee we should have a great deal more information before us. Nothing that Dr. Saw has said has influenced me against the Bill. I should like to refer Mr. Nicholson to the letter, a copy of which he has probably received. This is in connection with the members of the particular firm being registered under the Bill. I hope the opticians themselves will also consider that letter. It was with no animosity against Mr. Nicholson that I made the remarks I did at the beginning of my speech. I only made them so that he should realise that there is some ground for complaint, and that it is a good deal easier for him to reply when an attack is made upon him than for the people he represents, who are not able to speak for themselves here.

Hon. A. H. PANTON (West) [7.55]: I will not attempt to discuss the technicalities of this Bill. During the last few days I have been endeavouring to obtain some information as to what it means. The more I have endeavoured to find out, the more befogged have I become. I was somewhat disappointed in the speech made by Dr. Saw, for I expected to get some information from him. I can only deal with this Bill from the common-sense point of view. The first question we should ask ourselves is, how far are we proposing to go in protecting the public? We have been putting through a great many Bills which have tended to create a close preserve with regard to some profession or other. The Bill contains some remarkable clauses. Clause 4 gives the Government power to appoint six members of the board, who would, in turn, have power to examine other opticians and determine whether they were entitled to be registered or not. I should like some information from Mr. Nicholson as to whether these six gentlemen will come from the metropolitan area only, or whether they will be chosen to represent various parts of the State and whether they will possess special qualifications which will give them the right to prevent anyone from being registered. If a board is to be created, we should follow much the same lines we pursued in regard to the Nurses' Registration Bill. There should be two or three qualified people—medical men if they are preferred—to conduct examinations and pass the registration of those who are entitled to be registered. Such registered opticians could then, if they wished, form their own board. I am averse to giving any such men, whoever they may be, the right to say who should be registered and who should not be registered. I have yet to be convinced that such men would stand head and shoulders above any other opticians in Western Australia. Clause 8 does not appeal to me. It provides that any person who is an undischarged bankrupt or of unsound mind shall be incapable of being elected or acting as a member of the board. If a man is of unsound mind, naturally we do not want him to be concerned with eye

testing. I do not understand, however, why an undischarged bankrupt should not act on the board. Even the highest qualified optician in the world might experience sufficient bad luck in business to become bankrupt and undischarged. Is that sufficient reason why we should debar him from practising the testing of eyesight? If so, it seems to be a most flimsy reason.

Hon. J. Cornell: He would become eligible again as soon as he got his certificate of discharge.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: What difference does it make to the board if such a qualified optician is an undischarged bankrupt or not? Is that a crime?

Hon. J. Nicholson: What difference does it make so far as a member of Parliament is concerned? An undischarged bankrupt cannot become a member of the House.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: Are we going to put an optician on the same plane as a member of Parliament. If it is simply a matter of election and if the only reason in support is that an undischarged bankrupt cannot become a member of Parliament, then I think this clause should be amended. Clause 21 is one about which I am not so much concerned as Mr. Sanderson so far as it relates to naturalised British subjects, but I am concerned with paragraph (a) which refers to membership of the Western Australian Optical Association Incorporated. My advice is that there are two associations in Western Australia. One is the Western Australian Optical Association, and the other, I think, the Optical Society of Western Australia.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The Society of Opticians is the other.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I know that the medical fraternity also have some objection to this Bill. As a layman, I have to look at the measure from the points of view of the two societies and of the medical fraternity.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They will probably amalgamate after the Bill is passed.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I would sooner they amalgamated before and then we would know where we are. I would like to know why this paragraph confines the operations of the clause to the members of the Western Australian Optical Association, Incorporated. Is it that only the members of that body are qualified opticians? My advice—I have been in the country and have talked with those opticians with whom I have come in contact—is that all the brains are not in the one or the other association. It would be interesting to know why this clause confines registration to members of one organisation. In conversation with one optician in the country he suggested to me that there was "a nigger in the wood pile." Dr. Saw referred to the definition of an optician. I want to know before I vote for the second reading of the Bill how it will affect an optician in the country who has had 30 years experience and who does not grind his own lenses. I understand that it does not pay country opticians to instal machines for the grinding of lenses, and they get them ground in the city. Does the definition include the grinding of lenses? I have had some experience with another board of examiners which wanted to make a close preserve of their particular occupation, and who asked questions it was practically impossible to answer.

Hon. J. Cornell: The engine drivers, to wit.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: Yes. It is easy for a board constituted as the opticians' board is proposed to be constituted, to put up some question such as that affecting the grinding of lenses which a country optician would not be able to answer, and this would result in a refusal to register him. Once opticians become registered, although if they solicit business they will not be allowed to advertise it, we will find that the registered man will be in a better position than the unregistered optician. In fact, if the Bill becomes an Act the unregistered man will be set aside, because he will not be able to practise. I am concerned with what will happen in the country and the country opticians are also concerned. They believe that the metropolitan opticians are looking forward to securing country business, and I would like a definite assurance from Mr. Nicholson on that score. Clause 24 says that no registered optician shall solicit business or engage in the hawking of spectacles. I have seen some of the opticians' premises and have noticed their advertisements. If they do not constitute soliciting business, I do not know what that phrase means. To solicit is a comprehensive phrase and if we are not careful we will have sign writers deprived of a lot of work so far as the opticians are concerned, if this word is left in the Bill. In fact, the word will cause a great deal of trouble unless it is deleted. Respecting Clause 27, Mr. Sanderson asked a most pertinent question. It seems to me that if a firm, who are not opticians themselves, propose to set up an optician's business within their own business and engage the most expert man it is possible to get they will be prevented from carrying on business unless the optician's business is under the direct management of the owner. If I were in business of some sort and proposed to start in business as an optician I would not be competent to carry on the business, but would secure the most expert optician possible to deal with it. The clause as it stands could be easily amended so as to make provision for any firm which proposed to adopt the course I suggest. These are a few of the clauses I wish to deal with. It is very difficult to get much information about the matter at all. There seems to be a great division of opinion between the opticians themselves and the medical fraternity, and it is hard from a layman's standpoint to decide what we

should do. I asked an optician in the country last Friday some questions regarding the testing of eyesight. He told me that I could go to any doctor I liked and he would undertake that his statements would be verified. He said that the pinhole test was sufficient to indicate whether the fault in the eye was due to accommodation or organic. I asked a doctor about it to-day and he said, "That is no good to us." That is as far as I got. That was what the two experts said, and where do I stand? It is difficult to know from a layman's standpoint where all this will land us. Consequently I hope that Mr. Nicholson will give us more information than we have had to date. I am anxious to see the Bill knocked into shape but I am not prepared to see it go through as it is, unless I am convinced that some of the clauses do not mean what their reading would suggest.

On motion by Hon. J. W. Hickey, debate adjourned.

BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD.

Assembly's Message.

Message received from the Assembly notifying that it had agreed to make Council's amendments Nos. 1 to 7 and 9 but had declined to make amendment No. 8.

BILL—GUARDIANSHIP OF INFANTS.

Second Reading.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.14]: I moved for the adjournment of the debate on this Bill as I was anxious to make inquiries from various sources regarding the effect it would have on established institutions, notably upon the W.A. Trustee, Executor, and Agency Co., Ltd. As the result of these inquiries I am led to the conclusion that the Bill fulfils all that it stands for, and is very highly approved by the institution I was more concerned about. In the circumstances I do not intend to occupy any more time of the House on the second reading, beyond expressing my entire accord with the measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; Hon. J. Cunningham in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 12—agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 11: (1) If any person (hereinafter called the testator) dying or having died after the 1st day of January, 1921, disposes of his or her property either wholly or partly by will in such manner that the widow, husband, or children of such person or any or all of them are left without adequate provision for their proper maintenance, education, or advancement in life, as the case may be, the court may at its discretion and taking into consideration all the circumstances of the case, on application by or on behalf of such wife, husband, or children, or any of them, order that such provision for such maintenance, education, and advancement as the court thinks fit shall be made out of the estate of the testator for such wife, husband, or children, or any or all of them, and may attach such conditions to the order as it thinks fit: provided that the court may refuse to make an order in favour of any person whose character or conduct is such as to disentitle him to the benefit of such order. (2) Every such order shall operate and take effect as if the same had been made by a codicil to the will of the deceased person executed immediately before his or her death.

This is the new clause of which notice was given by Mr. Dodd.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

MOTION—RETURNED SOLDIERS AND RAILWAY PASSES.

Debate resumed from the 11th November on the following motion by the Hon. A. H. Panton:—

That in the opinion of this House returned soldiers who are attending the Base Hospital, Fremantle, or the vocational training schools in Perth, should be carried over the railways free of charge.

To which the Hon. J. Cornell had moved an amendment—

That all the words after "House" be struck out and the following inserted in lieu: "the Government should (1) grant free transit over the State tramways to ex-members of the A.I.F. who are blinded or totally and permanently incapacitated, or eligible for full membership in the Maimed and Limbless Men's Association; (2) and in the event of the request made by the Federal Executive of the Returned Soldiers' League to the Federal Government being definitely refused, grant to ex-members of the A.I.F. free railway transit, provided that they are (a) blinded or totally and permanently incapacitated; (b) inmates of or attending for treatment at military hospitals, sanatoria, convalescent homes, and hostels; (c) eligible for full membership in the Maimed and Limbless Men's Association."

Hon. A. H. PANTON (West—on amendment) [8.21]: If I address the House at this stage, shall I close the debate?

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member moved the motion, but has not yet spoken to the amendment.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: That is so. I propose to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member may speak to the amendment, and may speak in reply afterwards if he so wishes.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I propose to accept the amendment. It is some considerable time since I introduced the motion, in which were included the trainees in the vocational training schools, and meanwhile the Federal Government have granted vocational trainees 4s. 6d. per week for train fares. Although this does not cover the cost to those living at Fremantle and Midland Junction, the lads in the school have adopted a system of pooling the amounts and buying the tickets, so that practically these men do get their tickets from the Federal Government. Consequently there is no occasion to provide for them in the motion. The Returned Soldiers' League have advised me that they propose to fight the question of getting increased payments for vocational trainees instead of fares; consequently I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Hon. T. MOORE (Central—on amendment) [8.22]: As the seconder of the motion, I favour the acceptance of the amendment, but we are not dealing with this subject at all fully. I am surprised that more members have not been anxious to air their views regarding what they think ought to be done. If we pass the amendment and if the Government give effect to it by granting to these men the right to be carried over the railways and tramways, we shall not have done much, because in time this privilege may be cut out. I do not think we are dealing with the returned soldiers fairly. This is a Federal responsibility purely and simply, and while the State Government are prepared to carry on for a certain time and give the returned soldiers certain privileges, this is no lasting benefit. Instead of dealing with the returned soldiers in this tardy manner, the whole of the people of the State should ask themselves whether they are satisfied with what is being done. Are they satisfied that the returned soldier is getting a fair deal? I am surprised that patriotic men, or men who in the past said they were patriotic and were prepared to do everything possible for our returned soldiers who were disabled, are not now attempting to get anything like the right thing done for these men. I believe that the responsibility of looking after the returned soldiers rests with the generation who are alive to-day. The sacrifices made by our soldiers will be forgotten in the very near future. Every member knows that there is a tendency on the part of a great number of citizens to-day to shirk their responsibilities, and I do not intend to remain silent if the returned soldiers are not getting a fair deal. The memories of the public are very short. The very fact to which Mr. Cornell directed attention, that men who suffered in the South African war are to be treated differently from the men who suffered in the recent war, shows how soon the memories of the public fail them. The man who lost a limb in the South African war was just as patriotic as the man who lost a limb in this war. Why should any differentiation be made on that account? Yet this point has been raised during the discussion of controversial matters between the States. The very fact that the question before the House is being allowed to pass without comment shows how we are drifting. What happened to the South African men will happen to these men unless the people who are alive to-day take the matter up and deal with our returned soldiers fairly and honestly. Every member will realise that the proposals now before the House are only tinkering with the returned soldier question. Instead of having extended to them this privilege giving them the right to travel on our trains and trams, more generous treatment should be meted out to them. Something which would be more lasting in its effects should be given them. When men have been disabled they should receive a pension sufficient to enable them to pay their way as citizens of the State, as they would do if they had not been disabled. Why do not we regard the matter in this light? Why are we satisfied to pass this proposal without much comment and let the returned soldiers crippled and disabled drift along in this way from year to year, when we are quite aware from previous experience that in a few years these crippled and disabled men will be entirely forgotten? I hope that the Government will give effect to this proposal by carrying these crippled men over our tramways and railways free of cost, but I hope that the very fact that we have brought this question under the notice of the people will cause them to rise to a sense of their responsibilities. I hope that the Press will take notice of this matter, the Press who were so patriotic practically just a few days ago, that they will take the matter up and be patriotic for just a little while longer, so that we shall get some lasting benefit for our returned men, instead of merely extending to them a privilege which, if brought into effect, will last for only a year or two.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.28]: I did not intend to speak on this subject because I took it that the sense of the House was entirely favourable to the motion and amendment as submitted. The wide issues which Mr. Moore has raised do not seem to be matters with which this House can deal. They are entirely of Federal concern.

Hon. T. Moore: Should we keep silent?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: We should address ourselves entirely to the questions raised on this issue——

Hon. T. Moore: I say we are tinkering with the question.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Namely, the treatment of blind and crippled soldiers, and those who are in sympathy with it—I for one am, and I believe every member of the House is in sympathy with the proposal—do not consider it necessary to get up and indulge in heroics a this stage.

Hon. J. Duffell: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I have as great an admiration for the men who went to the war, and am as willing to do as much for them as is any member of this House.

Hon. T. Moore: Are you satisfied it is being done? That is the question.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I certainly do not wish to indulge in heroics. There is another aspect of the question affecting men who are not absolutely crippled. I believe that 95 per cent. of the men of this State who have to work for their living know that the greatest benefit a man can enjoy is the ability to work and earn his living, and whether crippled or not the greatest satisfaction to him will be to do such work as lies in his power. I do not reproach either the State or the Commonwealth Government for ingratitude to our returned men, and I believe this is the feeling of the bulk of the returned soldiers.

Hon. T. Moore: I am perfectly satisfied that you do not go amongst them as much as I do.

On motion by Hon. R. J. Lynn, debate adjourned.

MOTION—FEDERAL CONSTITUTION, CONVENTION.

Debate resumed from the 9th November on the following motion by Hon. A. Sanderson—

> "That in the opinion of this House a Federal Convention, with equal State representation should be appointed by the electors of each State on the basis of proportional representation to make recommendations with a view to revising the Federal Constitution, and that the Government of Western Australia be requested to urge this opinion upon the Commonwealth Government."

Hon. A. H. PANTON (West) [8.30]: The motion is one that demands the fullest consideration; in fact, it deserves a great deal more consideration than it will probably receive in this House this session. I also venture to say that it should have had more consideration than it actually received at the hands of Mr. Sanderson who moved it. The question of revising the Federal Constitution is certainly a big one. It is also a burning one at the present time, but I am not quite sure what Mr. Sanderson means, whether he means that a convention is to be elected with equal representation for the States, and that the findings of the convention are to be submitted direct to the people, or whether the convention is to act purely as a kind of advisory committee to the Federal Parliament. Mr. Sanderson did not express himself definitely on this point. It seems to me that if the proposed convention is to be purely an advisory committee for the Federal Parliament, it will be a huge waste of time and money, because no good will result. If we are to leave the Federal Parliament to be the final arbiter as to what is to be submitted to the people, that Parliament should accept the responsibility of its position and prepare a set of amendments for submission to the people, for the people's endorsement or otherwise. On the other hand, if the convention suggested by Mr. Sanderson is to have full power to draft what they consider necessary amendments, and submit them direct to the people, it will be a different question altogether; but to ask the Eastern States with their big population as against ours which is so much smaller, to agree to all the States having equal representation and equal voting power in connection with the drawing up of a set of amendments, I am very much afraid that Mr. Sanderson on this question is much more optimistic than I am, if he considers that they will agree to such a proposal. I am convinced that the convention will not do very much good. I am convinced also that the Federal Parliament should discharge the obligation imposed upon it under the Constitution and should frame proposals for submission to the people. I do not agree with Mr. Sanderson when he states that those outside know or should know more than the members of the Federal House in regard to the disabilities under which we are working. It is not much good Mr. Sanderson railing at the members who represent Western Australia, because after all those representatives are the chosen of the people, and with the democratic vote which exists, I do not see how Mr. Sanderson or anyone else can take exception to the representatives of this or any other State once the electors have declared their choice through the ballot box. Mr. Sanderson made reference to unification. It seems to be an established fact amongst many people, and amongst some members of this House, that the Labour party stand for unification. I am prepared to admit that the Labour party of Australia to-day do stand for some system of unification, and I am in accord with them to the extent that a drastic alteration of the present method of government, both Federal and State, is needed. The time has arrived when members of Parliament in each of the Houses, Federal and State, as well as the people who think for themselves, should realise that Australia is over-governed. It is not the intention of the Labour party to bring about a system of unification which will have the effect of handing over Western Australia, or any other part of Australia, to the Federal control. There is a decided division amongst the members of the Labour party who take an interest in this matter as to what system should be followed. My opinion is that a

drastic alteration in our present method of government is badly needed, and I go further and say that we require an alteration of our State boundaries. When we talk about unification, and the centralisation of everything in Melbourne, I venture to express the opinion that there is no more centralisation in Melbourne than there is in Perth so far as the North-West is concerned. That, in my opinion, is sufficient to warrant the re-allocation of the boundaries of the States, and the functions of the various Parliaments, and, if necessary, we should abolish State Parliaments and introduce provincial councils, which would be a better solution of the difficulty existing to-day. I am sorry that Mr. Sanderson did not elaborate his motion a great deal more. Had he chosen to do so, he could have given the House valuable information. I do not propose to vote for the motion as it stands, because I am satisfied in the first place that it is not democratic to ask the Eastern States, with a bigger population than we possess, to consent to each State having equal representation. Secondly, I do not know whether Mr. Sanderson is prepared to alter the motion or to give us some assurance that he does not mean that the Convention will be only an advisory committee. I have no desire to support a motion which will merely involve a huge waste of time and money. After all, conventions of this sort, elected on the basis of proportional representation, mean that every section of the State will have the right to nominate a candidate.

Hon. J. Duffell: That is desirable.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: It is quite desirable; I agree with the idea, but it will cost a lot of money for such an election, and once the election is decided and the representatives are chosen, they will go over to the Eastern States at the expense of the country, they will be there for probably many weeks or months, discussing proposals, and then if those proposals are to be referred to the Federal Parliament, that body in turn will require a good deal of time to debate the decisions of the Convention and the end will be that the results of the Convention's deliberations will find their way into a pigeon-hole or the waste paper basket. After the able arguments Mr. Sanderson has advanced in this Chamber on the question of the financial position of the State, I am sure he has no wish to further burden Western Australia or any other part of the Commonwealth with an undertaking that will not do any good. Mr. Sanderson must also appreciate this fact, that if the members of the Federal Parliament as constituted at present are not prepared to frame proposals to submit to the people for the alteration of the Constitution, they are certainly not going to take proposals from any convention, and I have also to learn that the Federal Constitution gives power to a convention to frame proposals which may be submitted direct to the people. That is the obligation of the Parliament we have created, and until the Constitution is amended in that direction, we shall only be wasting time. I do not propose to vote for the motion.

On motion by the Minister for Education, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.40 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 16th November, 1920.

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

QUESTION—WHEAT BOARD, MEMBERS' STATUS.

Hon. P. COLLIER asked the Premier: Can he inform the House of the names of the members of the Australian Wheat Board who last week fixed the price of wheat for local requirements at 9s. per bushel, and also the status of each, whether representative of their respective Governments or of the wheat growers?

The PREMIER replied: The Premiers in conference—the Hons. J. Storey, H. S. W. Lawson, and H. N. Barwell—fixed the price. This was recommended by the Hons. Dunn, Oman, and J. G. Bice, and the farmers' representatives—Messrs. Drummond, Hill, and O'Loughlin—who form the Australia Wheat Board, together with our representatives.

Hon. P. Collier: That is not what I wanted.

The PREMIER: I will supply any information that the hon. gentleman desires concerning this matter if he will indicate what he requires.