Bureau or to the advertisement columns of the Press or to the employment broker. The Labour Bureau is conducted by the Government at a loss, therefore every privilege is given them. One wonders, even on the explanation of the Colonial Secretary, that if the charge is excessive, why do not employees avail themselves of the Labour Bureau when they have the opportunity? The argument put forward as to the employer paying half the cost seems absurd. If a man has 25 employees it would only cost him £5 a year, therefore the whole thing seems unnecessary. As to the making of regulations, once that is embodied in an Act, goodbye to employment brokers because we shall have the Government some day gazetting such regulations that brokers will not be able to live. Because if the Government study themselves they will gazette regulations that brokers will not be able to exist under, for the Government have heir own bureau to consider. I do not see any argument put forward to show the necessity for the Bill. There cannot be any injustice existing and if the clause enabling the Government to make regulations is passed, it will give the Government, who are interested in this matter, an unfair advantage. For these reasons I feel compelled—and I apologise to Mr. Dodd for being so compelled —to oppose the second reading.

On motion by Hon. A. Sanderson debate adjourned.

BILL—VERMIN BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter (Honorary Minister) Bill recommitted for reconsideration of Clause 13 and the consideration of a new clause.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; Hon. C. F. Baxter (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 13—Insertion of new section in Part 5:

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move an amendment—

"That in line 2 of the proposed new Section 46A after "occupier" the following be inserted:—'within the meaning of this Act or the Rabbit Act of 1902.'"

This is necessary as Part 5 of the Rabbit Act is incorporated in this Bill. The definition of "owner" is different in the Vermin and Rabbit Acts and "occupier" is not defined at all.

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

New clause:

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move—

"That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 5:—'Section 13 of the principal Act is hereby amended as follows:—(a) By inserting after the word 'scale' the following words:—'in respect of pastoral holdings'; (b) By adding to the section the following words:—'in respect of other holdings the same number of votes as he would have for such holdings at an election of members of a roads board under the Roads Act of 1911.'"

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Would it not be better to place in this Bill the exact wording of the section of the Roads Act?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The clause now proposed makes the provision absolutely clear. The number of votes is set out in the parent Act applying to pastoral holdings and, as far as the other holdings are concerned, the number of votes is prescribed in the Roads Act.

New clause put and passed.

[The President resumed the Chair.]

Bill again reported with further amendments.

House adjourned at 6.13 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 4th April, 1918.

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

[For "Questions on Notice" and "Papers Presented" see "Votes and Proceedings."]

BILL—GRAIN ELEVATORS AGREEMENT.

Message.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending the Bill.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL AND MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIES (Hon. R. T. Robinson—Canning) [4.38] in moving the second reading said: The object of the Bill is to confirm an agreement that has been entered into by the Minister in charge of the wheat scheme (Hon. C. F. Baxter) with John S. Metcalf Company, Ltd., of Canada, relating to the preparation of plans, specifications, and estimates for bulk-handling grain elevators; for separate drawings, plans, specifications and estimates for storage bins for the construction of same in advance of the main scheme; for plans, drawings, specifications and estimates for temporary machinery and plant to work same pending the completion of each elevator as a whole; and for the supervision of such work as may be utimately carried out in connection with the said plans and specifications during the period of five years computed from the date of approval of Parliament. The construction of such storage bins as I have indicated is an integral part of a complete bulk-handling scheme. It is desirable to provide storage bins now, and it is equally desirable that those storage bins

should be capable of being used at a later stage as part and parcel of a bulk handling of wheat system. Before, however, such a system can be adopted, a machinery measure dealing with the whole of the necessary proposals, such as engineering, marketing, administrative, and financial, will have to be submitted to and be passed by Parliament. A considerable quantity of the 1916-17 wheat is still on hand, and the 1917-18 crop remains almost entirely undisposed of. Under these circumstances it is considered that the 1918-19 crop will be on hand in Western Australia for two or three years, and perhaps longer. It is the desire of the scheme that as much of that crop as is possible should be stored in silos for the extended period that it is likely to be kept before it can be sold overseas and shipped, in order that it may be protected from weevil, mice, and other pests. And from a Government point of view, as well as from a wheat scheme point of view, it is essential that the necessary storage bins to accommodate the wheat should be started right away, if they are to be ready in time for the next harvest. I wish to emphasise the point that for any loss through inadequate storage for the coming harvest, the responsibility does not rest entirely on the farmers delivering to the pool, because they are assured at any rate, of 4s. per bushel f.o.b. The liability up to this amount is with the Governments that have made the necessary financial guarantee. In this connection the State Government are fully responsible for the first 3s. per bushel, and any loss between 3s. and 4s. per bushel f.o.b. is shared equally by that Government with the Commonwealth Government.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What powers have you got to control it?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I will explain in a moment. In view of the Australian general scheme for marketing the wheat harvest, the Commonwealth Government passed the Wheat Storage Act last year. Provision is made thereunder for the Commonwealth Government to finance the States to enable bulk storage to be instituted for the protection of the various harvests pending sale and shipment. By that arrangement it is anticipated some £285,000 will be made available to this State for construction of silos, provided they are built to the satisfaction of the Wheat Storage Commission appointed under that Act. Consistent with the Commission's requirements, that amount, £285,000, must be used to the best advantage of the scheme in order to provide the maximum amount of storage for a minimum amount of expenditure. The £285,000 will provide storage for five million bushels in bulk, costing therefore one shilling and twopence per bushel. At the same time, it is the desire of the Government that such bulk storage for the scheme shall be of such a nature, and in such positions, as will fit in with any suitable general system of bulk handling of grain that might be ultimately decided upon for this State. If the storage bins are to be designed as part of the ultimate scheme, it is necessary that the plans of each elevator as a whole should be prepared. It is not practicable, the Government are advised, to design the storage bins and elevators to be constructed in advance of the main scheme, apart from the design of each elevator completed as a whole. In the circumstances, it is necessary that the best bulk-handling advice which can be obtained in the world should be received in connection with the plans, specifications, and construction of the preliminary silos or storage bins. Further, so that there should be co-operation of interests, it was recently considered advisable to amalgamate, in one board, representatives of the Bulk Handling Advisory Board, and representatives of the State Wheat Marketing Committee. The result was the formation of a composite board, known as the Wheat Marketing and Bulk Handling Advisory Board. Now, the question of bulk handling for Western Australia is not new. In June of 1913 the then Government, in which Mr. T. H. Bath was Minister for Agriculture, appointed a board to inquire into the question, and as to whether a system of handling grain in bulk was suitable for Western Australia. As a result of the inquiries of this board, and after negotiations with the Metcalf Co., Ltd., by the then Government, an agreement was drawn up and approved by the Cabinet on the 10th day of April of 1916.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Subject to conditions.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That agreement, however, contained certain clauses which did not meet with the approval of the Metcalf Co, Ltd.; and after further negotiations an amended agreement was drawn up, and this was also approved by the Labour Cabinet on the 24th July of the same year.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I say, no. It was never considered by the Labour Cabinet.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I will show it to you. The Premier, Mr. Scaddan, however, in view of political affairs being unsettled at the time, allowed the actual signing of the agreement to stand over until the political atmosphere was clearer.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I say the agreement was never considered by the Labour Cabinet after it came back from Sydney.

Hon. P. Collier: I confirm that statement.

Hon. T. Walker: I never saw the agreement.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. gentlemen interjecting may have forgotten.

Hon. P. Collier: The matter was a one man job.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: In due course I shall give the House proof of the statements I am making. Later on, the new Government, in which Mr. Mitchell was Minister for Industries, negotiated again with the Metcalf Co., Ltd., after the Minister in question had satisfied himself as to the reputation and bona fides of the company, for a modification of the draft agreement which had been approved of previously. Notwithstanding this consensus of opinion of all parties regarding the desirability of having some measure of bulk handling in this State, there is no doubt that in the present conditions of straitened finance——

Hon. J. Mitchell: And in view of the high cost.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: And in view of the high cost, the idea of introducing bulk

handling because of its own intrinsic merits would have been impracticable for Western Australia, were it not for the assistance of the Federal Government under their Wheat Storage Act, to which I have referred.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What are you going to do about the poor devil who cannot put his wheat into storage?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: By that Act the proposed bulk storage, for which the Commonwealth is providing the funds, will, if this Parliament agrees, form the substantial nucleus of a permanent bulk handling system for Western Australia. The agreement which hon. members are now asked to consider and to confirm is a considerable improvement on any agreement that has been previously approved of by the respective Governments; and it is submitted to this House with full confidence that it will meet with the approval of every hon. member.

Hon. P. Collier: That, it will not.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: How does the leader of the Opposition know that?

Hon. P. Collier: I for one will not approve of it. I did not, either, as a member of Cabinet, notwithstanding all the declarations.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I, for another, did not approve of it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The improvements in the agreement have been mainly effected in providing that plans and specifications shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the Minister or the Engineer-in-Chief, that they are in fact warranted to carry out the purpose for which they are prepared. The details of that provision will be found in Clause 6. That all duties and services to be carried out and rendered by the company under the agreement, shall be by fully qualified and competent persons to be approved of by the Engineer-in-Chief, who shall have power to inquire into each appointment and, if necessary, cancel.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is only as regards inspection and supervision.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Clause 4, dealing with that matter, is entirely new. That if the duties are not being carried out to the satisfaction of the Engineer-in-Chief, as to which he is sole judge, the agreement may be determined at a month's notice, subject only to arbitration in the case of works actually under order. The details of this will be found in Clause 13. The agreement retains the company as consulting and designing engineer for a term of five years, with an option of renewal on the part of the Government. The agreement does not commit the Government to the construction of works; but, so far as the Government determine to undertake works within the scope of the agreement, the company will be the consulting, designing, and supervising engineers, and will receive the prescribed remuneration set out in the agreement, which remuneration is based on the fees ordinarily paid to engineers. This customary remuneration, as recognised by the Institute of Civil Engineers, for the design and supervision of construction is five per cent. on cost, or three per cent. for designs and two per cent. for supervision.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That was denied here in 1915.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I shall be glad to satisfy the House on the point.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You are right; but it was denied as I say.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Engineer-in-Chief advises that £9,000 for the designs, as provided for in Clause 9, compares favourably with three per cent. on cost, particularly in view of the additional work involved in preparing separate drawings, separate specifications, and separate estimates for the storage bins and temporary machinery and plant to be erected in advance of the main scheme. For this fee of £9,000 the drawings, specifications and estimates of the terminal elevator at Fremantle of from one million to one million and a half bushels and for four country elevators of capacities of 30,000, 40,000, 50,000 and 100,000 bushels will be prepared, and separate drawings for the storage bins and machinery immediately required. These storage bins are the only work of construction that will be undertaken without further parliamentary authority.

Mr. Maley: You will not build all these out of the £285,000.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: In the construction of these works tenders will be called for in the ordinary way. For the supervision of work under construction, but only of such works as the Government in its discretion may think fit to undertake, the ordinary remuneration of two per cent. is payable.

Hon. P. Collier: Which Government, Federal or State?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The State Government. So far as the suitability of the appointment of John S. Metcalf Co., Ltd., to act as expert advisers to the Government is concerned, I should have thought there would be no question inasmuch as this is the company who have been approved by previous Governments.

Hon. P. Collier: The Commonwealth Government instructed you about it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: However, in order that there may be no doubt on the matter, and that hon. members may be completely satisfied, I would point out that there is on record at the wheat scheme offices a comprehensive list of works which this company have either designed, supervised, or built. I shall be glad to produce to hon. members this list or any other information in the possession of the Government relating to the Metcalf Co., Ltd., which hon. members may desire to have. I might, however, mention with advantage one or two of the more principal works of similar nature to those now contemplated. In 1897 this company designed the first elevator erected by the Manchester Ship Canal. In 1915 the Manchester Ship Canal decided to erect another elevator, and although they then had a staff of their own who since 1897 must have been familiar with the working of elevator machinery, they decided to engage John S. Metcalf Co., Ltd., the company who designed their first elevator. This company were also engaged as designing engineers by the Canadian Grain Commissioners, and they de-

signed the Montreal bulk handling installation.

Hon. P. Collier: Are the credentials supplied by the firm genuine?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: A good deal of the information supplied has been checked by the Engineer-in-Chief.

Hon. P. Collier: I am sceptical about the credentials of these firms; they are mostly supplied by themselves.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This firm also erected the elevator at St. John for the Great Canadian Pacific Railway. It is a happy coincidence, too, that this company have been engaged by each of the other wheat exporting States as advisers and designers in connection with the introduction of bulk handling. At the present time this company are engaged in designing and supervising the preliminary work in connection with the installation of the bulk handling system in New South Wales. I am advised by my colleague, Mr. Baxter, that when he was recently in the Eastern States, the Minister for Agriculture for New South Wales informed him that by reason of inquiries which his officers had made in the United States of America, they were convinced that this company as bulk handling specialists were unexcelled. It may be asked why it is necessary to engage an outside firm to do this work seeing that the principles connected with bulk handling are extremely simple and that we have a competent staff of engineers connected with our Government departments? The work of bulk handling is done by machinery and the control of the machinery is simplicity itself. To obtain this it is necessary to devise complicated systems of power transmission. The need of this has been one of the causes of establishing a new branch of the engineering profession in Canada and the United States, and these men are called "Grain lifting engineers" It is true that any engineer connected with bulk construction and power transmission could design elevators and machinery which would handle grain in bulk, but it is equally true that the best can be designed only by an engineer who has made a specialty of this department in engineering science, and who has worked out again and again the many problems presented in handling grain, who also knows by experience their comparative values and is familiar with the latest devices and their application as an economical part of a grain elevator plant. It is only such experience that can devise for each new location a new set of conditions and combination of machinery and a general plant which will accomplish the handling desired with the greatest economy of space and power combined. Our own engineers consider that in these experts we shall have available such knowledge and experience.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I have the report here. It advises that tenders should be called.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Furthermore our Engineer-in-Chief considers that no matter how competent to design and supervise the construction of silos departmental officers may be, it is obvious that they have had neither the experience nor the specialised training—more especially in details making for efficiency—possessed by Metcalf Co., Ltd., a company who have devoted themselves to this class of work. He is of the opinion that departmental officers could not prepare plans, or supervise construction, more cheaply than Metcalf's because, even if our officers had the knowledge, the actual routine cost would be much the same. The Engineer-in-Chief thinks that Government officers might do the actual supervising work as cheaply as the company but, unfortunately, the company will not provide plans unless they get the job of supervising as well, a course quite usual with an architect or designing engineer. The storage bins will be ultimately charged to the bulk-handling system as a whole when adopted, either on an equitable basis of valuation or cost, less depreciation (if any) according as the silos exceed, or meet the exact requirements of the system. Until that time comes the wheat-marketing scheme will be charged with interest and sinking fund. I move—

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

On motion by Hon. P. Collier debate adjourned.

BILL—HEATH ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister) [5.10] in moving the second reading said: In introducing this Bill I think very little need be said. It is not a Bill that requires very great consideration.

Hon. P. Collier: It is not controversial you mean.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The principle has been confirmed by legislation not only in Western Australia, but in all Australia. The Bill consists almost entirely of details, and those details of course can best be considered in Committee. I desire however to refer to one or two points in regard to matters which are dealt with in the measure. It will be remembered that the Health Act was passed in 1911 and at that time it was one of the most advanced Acts of this description not only in Australia, but in the English-speaking world. The drafting of the Act in force was very good indeed, but it has been found in working that certain amendments were required. The Bill which is now before the House should have been introduced two or three years ago. As a matter of fact it was prepared by the Medical Department in 1915, but the stress of circumstances and the pressure of time prevented Parliament or the Government from going on with it. However, the time has now arrived when we must give attention to the health of our people and as we have a Medical Department which spends a great deal of money we should give that department good sound legislation to work on. The Bill deals with such questions as lodging-houses. There is an amendment to provide that if a person has one lodger, that person is keeping a lodging-house. The existing Act says that three or more lodgers shall constitute a lodging-house. Again, where the Bill deals with water sup-

plies, in connection with polluted water the department at present has to prove that the polluted water is being used. It is not possible, however, to keep an inspector on premises all the time to see that the water is not used. The Bill provides that where wells contain polluted water, they shall be filled.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Then they will not be able to get water for their gardens.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The hon. member will have an opportunity for stating his reasons for opposing the Bill later on. I think I ought, however, to apologise to the hon. member for introducing this Bill because he is the recognised medical authority of the House.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Where there are wells, those wells are used where there is no Government supply.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The Bill also deals with frozen meat. Things, we find, have altered a little. By the existing Act frozen meat is defined as any meat which has been chilled. Now, as a fact, practically all meat coming into our butchers' shops to-day has been chilled although it has not all been what may be termed frozen. We wish to obtain a common-sense definition on that point. Again, with regard to foodstuffs we experience certain difficulties. When the Health Department inspectors on their rounds find foodstuff that is unfit for human consumption, we have to prove that the stuff was in the place for sale. Under this amending Bill we wish to provide that in the case of anyone dealing with or using foodstuffs, if foodstuff unfit for human consumption is found on his premises, it shall be prima facie evidence that it was there for sale. An amendment is desired in that direction. The Bill contains quite a number of clauses of the same description. Take, for instance, the milk supply. In our endeavours to compel milk vendors to cease supplying impure or adulterated milk, we have found that certain sections of the principal Act must be altered if we are to be enabled to obtain convictions. We want convictions only where there have been offences in regard to the supply of milk. I may point out that scores of persons do drink milk, though I personally do not. Those who drink it are entitled to have it pure if that can possibly be secured.

Mr. Munsie: The germs in the milk will not affect you personally?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): No. This Bill also deals with the matter of lying-in homes. These have been and are now under the control of the State Children Department. It seems only ordinary common sense that they should be controlled by the Medical Department.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You are right there; I agree with you there.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): We will carry the second reading, then, just to get that reform.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No, you will not.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The position to-day is that in regard to the maternity and lying-in homes the Medical Department have inspectresses who visit various places. Then the State Children Department have more inspectresses who are working over the same ground. The inspection of maternity and lying-in homes should, in my opinion, be handled by the Medical Department. That is the proper department to look after them. Next I come to what is rather an important question, that of midwives. Various important amendments which are possibly debatable are proposed on that subject. The object of the department is to secure the best possible treatment for women in their time of trial. I think every member of this House knows that lives are being lost through lack of knowledge on the part of midwives; and this refers not only to the children but also to the mothers. I shall not deal with the details of these amendments; that will be done in Committee.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If the same care had been taken of our forefathers as you propose to take of us, none of us would have been here.

Hon. P. Collier: It is a wonder the race ever survived without all these precautions.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): With regard to the practice of mid-wifery there are certain phases in which a woman of ordinary reasonable knowledge would know that it was necessary to call in a doctor. Those midwives who cannot pass an examination to prove that they know when it is necessary to call in a doctor will, if this Bill passes, not be allowed to practice as midwives except in conjunction with a doctor. Another important and possibly debatable amendment is that which empowers the midwifery board to deal with breaches of duty on the part of registered midwives. It is proposed that the board shall have power to fine in such cases. Under the existing Act midwives can be brought before a magistrate. This Bill vests the power to fine in the board, but at the same time gives a right of appeal by the person fined to a judge in Chambers. Those are points which are debatable. But in my opinion the amendments are necessary. One other small matter with which this Bill deals is an amendment of the 1915 Act relative to venereal disease.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A small matter, do you call it?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): It is a small matter indeed compared with the measure which we passed in 1915.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If we did that then, we are not going to do it again. Make no mistake about that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Let me say that it is the majority of this House that is going to decide what shall be done. I believe the member for North-East Fremantle is sufficient of a democrat to bow to the will of the majority.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No; we will not. We will get the people at it. It is not the majority of the House, but a majority of the people.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): With regard to venereal dis-

ease, we have found that the time allowed within which treatment must be continued is too long. The existing Act provides that a sufferer from venereal disease must attend a medical practitioner at least once in four weeks. Moreover, the sufferer is allowed 14 days' grace, which makes a total period of six weeks during which treatment may possibly not be continued. Beyond all shadow of doubt that period of time has been found to be too long. The amendment proposed is that sufferers from the disease must attend oftener for treatment. Again, we ask under this Bill power to examine children brought before the children's court.

Hon. P. Collier: Will you guarantee that Lovekin will not publish reports of such examinations in the "Daily News"?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): I will guarantee that Lovekin will not be there.

Hon. P. Collier: In that case you will have a better chance of getting your Bill through.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): When one comes to the case of a venereally diseased child, there is something more than Lovekin or party politics to be considered.

Hon. P. Collier: There are cases of diseased mind, too.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The evidence we have shows that unfortunately many children coming before the Children's Court suffer from venereal disease.

Hon. P. Collier: You can read it in their eyes, can't you? So Lovekin says.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Yes, so Lovekin says. But I want to say that a man who will laugh at, or try to make political capital out of, a venereally diseased child is not thinking what he is doing.

Hon. P. Collier: Who is trying to do that?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Oh, Lovekin, I suppose.

Hon. P. Collier: Why insinuate?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): With regard to Clause 46, I wish to say that that clause gives scope to discuss practically the whole of the ramifications of venereal disease. It has, however, been found that the amendment inserted in the original Bill by the Legislative Council, requiring a signed statement before the Commissioner of Public Health can take action, has considerably and most materially hampered the department's efforts to clean up venereal disease. After all, I do not think there is one single man in this House who will say that it is not absolutely desirable, and even essential, to wipe venereal disease out of our midst if we possibly can. The department have found that the provision as to a signed statement does very materially interfere with their efforts in that direction. I just wish to say—I am not speaking lengthily—that a great deal yet remains to be done in regard to venereal disease. Most particularly is there urgent necessity to provide some place to which women affected with venereal disease may retire until they are cured. In this respect a man does not matter so much; he can get a room and look after himself and still follow up his work. But a woman cannot do those things. It is not right that a woman so affected should be employed handling food or should be employed as a nurse girl looking after infants. It is not right that women in this state should follow various other occupations. Seeing that we want to cure those women, we must provide some place to which they can retire until cured. There has been a great deal of agitation in regard to this matter. Many very sincere ladies have held public meetings on the subject of this amendment. There is one thing that those ladies can do to assist the Government, and to assist the Medical Department, and that is to furnish us with some scheme whereby we can pick up those poor unfortunate women and keep them until they have been cured. Now this is going to cost money, but I am sure Parliament will grant the money. But why spend money unless we are going to do the thing well? To leave those depraved people who want to keep venereal disease on them, who want to go about disseminating venereal disease, while we seek to eradicate the disease in other directions, is like trying to bale a well with a leaky bucket. I do not know any question, I cannot call to mind any question, on which the change of opinion has been so great. And there has been not only a change of opinion but also a change in habits of thought on this question of venereal disease. Two and a half years ago, when the original Bill was introduced into this Parliament, it was practically the first measure of its kind in English-speaking countries. At that time the military authorities had a barbed wire compound in the centre of Blackboy camp, and a guard with fixed bayonets walking round that compound. One could see that awful and miserable compound from the train as one passed through the cutting. We had the spectacle of men returned from Egypt suffering from venereal disease, and the Minister for Defence turning them out of the A.I.F. and publishing their names. The position to-day is that the military people have realised the danger to the community and to the soldiers themselves. They have, however, done away with the barbed wire entanglement. Mr. Justice Rich who was appointed a Royal Commission to inquire why soldiers escaped in New South Wales, suggested that the wires should be electrified so that the soldiers, if they attempted to escape would be electrocuted. To-day we in Western Australia have provided a hospital at Rockingham where cases of venereal disease amongst soldiers may be treated. The military authorities were recently complimented by the Commission on what had been done at Langwarren and at other camps. Until comparatively recently it was almost impossible to discuss the question of venereal disease in mixed audiences; to-day it is being discussed freely by everybody. We were told that the medical profession were opposed to curing the disease because if that were done many members of the profession would lose a considerable portion of their practice. Personally, I do not think that that is the case. Experience in Western Australia shows that the medical profes-

sion here almost without exception, have done their utmost to assist the Medical Department in carrying out the provisions of the Health Act. Depots have been established to take the place of the wired in compounds and preventive measures are adopted. We find also that a patriotic woman named Miss Rout has devoted her time and energy and what money she has to introducing preventive measures amongst the Australian and New Zealand soldiers in England, and yet members will say that we here should stand still.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What has all that to do with the Bill?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): Nothing of course.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Do you want to make the Commissioner of Health a Czar?

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The past few years have wrought many changes. In 1917 we find that in 18 States of America legislation was passed concerning venereal disease. I am not going to weary the House by reading an abundance of evidence which I have before me on the subject of what is done in America, but I may be permitted later on to quote some paragraphs from bulletins in my possession In a good many instances the West Australian Act has been followed. There is not in America what is termed here the law of the suspect; they simply provide treatment, isolation, and quarantine, under the same regulations which control typhoid fever, measles, bubonic plague, and other diseases. There are some peculiar laws in force in the United States, but California follows more closely than any other place the law of Western Australia. There are two things, however, in which they have not followed us. One is the prohibiting of other than medical practitioners treating the disease, and the other is with regard to signed statements. There are one or two American laws which might possibly be adopted in Western Australia with advantage. In California it is worthy of notice that in connection with all cases of ophthalmia whether the infecting agent was gonorrhoea or not, those cases must be reported. This disease is the cause of blindness in babies to the extent possibly of 50 per cent., and if preventive measures can save the sight of those babies they should certainly be adopted by our medical practitioners and midwives, who should be supplied with the prophylaxis. There are peculiar laws in some of the States of America. In Iowa, for instance, there is no compulsion in regard to curing, that is to say they cannot compel a person there to undergo treatment. But they have the right to placard a house in the event of a person living in that house suffering from venereal disease, and refusing to undergo treatment. This placard is in red with black letters, 4½ inches high, setting out "Venereal disease here; keep out." Of course there is no compulsion, but hon. members will admit that a placard like that is more effective than many other means.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We would require to see the whole of their Act to understand to what that placard applied.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The hon. member will surely allow that I have given some time and study to this question.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No, I will not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): When I quote to the House I quote correctly. In the State of Kansas we find that contacts are prohibited from using baths or being served in barbers' shops. They have the right of examination. In Louisiana infected persons are not allowed to use any swimming pool or tank. Then in many States the question of marriage between infected people is dealt with. New Jersey, for instance, lays it down that any person who desires to enter the marriage state must first of all present a clean certificate of health, a certificate which shows that he or she is free from venereal disease. New York has a similar law, and so emphatic is it there that every person applying to be married must first of all make this avowal—

> I have not to my knowledge been infected with venereal disease, or have not been infected with it for five years. I have had a laboratory test within the period which shows that I am now free from this disease.

That is a statement which has to be made in New York by both males and females before they can be married. It only shows what the great republic thinks of this important question. I will quote from a recent public health report, the date of which is 18th January of the present year, to show further how New York treats persons affected with infectious or venereal disease. This is the regulation of the Department of Health of New York—

> No person who is affected with any infectious disease, or with any venereal disease in a communicable form, shall work or be permitted to work in any place where food or drink is prepared, cooked, mixed, baked, exposed, bottled, packed, handled, stored, manufactured, offered for sale or sold. Whenever required by medical inspector or other duly authorised physician of the Department of Health, or by an order of the sanitary superintendent, the director of the bureau of food and drugs, or the director of the bureau of preventable diseases of the said department, any person employed in any such place shall submit to a physical examination by a physician in the employ of the said department. Such persons, however, may, in their discretion, be examined by their own private physician, provided such examinations are performed in accordance with the regulations of the board of health. No person who refuses to submit to such examination shall work or be permitted to work in any such place.

And people talk about the Czar of the Health Department of Western Australia! That is the kind of thing that has been found necessary in New York, a place where they know something about this disease. Let me read a little more in regard to America. What I have already quoted referred to the year 1917. On the 2nd January, 1918, this current year, the

following telegram was sent by the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service to every health officer in the United States—

> Control venereal infections in connection prosecution of the war constitutes most important sanitary problem now confronting public health authorities of United States. Plan of control mailed you to-day. Request your co-operation forceful enforcement same. Venereal infections should be made reportable and quarantinable. Means of diagnosis and cure should be provided. Campaign wisely conducted publicity should be launched. Please inform me your action in premises.

The confirming letter from the Surgeon General stated—

> It is evident that the prevention of venereal infections in the military population is largely dependent on the degree with which these infections are prevented in the civil community.

That is where we come in.

> This imposes upon the civil health authorities the duty of forcefully attacking the venereal problem upon the basis of the control of communicable disease.

Let hon. members bear in mind the term "communicable disease." Typhoid fever, measles, and scarlatina are also communicable diseases.

> There is forwarded you herewith an outline upon which it is proposed to make this attack. Manifestly, no plan which can be set forth at the present time can be complete in all its details, nor can a plan be devised which in all its phases fits the requirements of each State exactly. Therefore in the plan which I am sending you, only the basic necessities have been stressed. Your co-operation in putting this plan in force is requested. The public health service, in co-operation with the Red Cross and the Medical Department of the Army, is establishing venereal clinics in cities in immediate contiguity to the Army cantonments. There is even greater need for the beginning of an active anti-venereal campaign in those cities which are outside of the military zones, but into which soldiers go in search of recreation. Most important of all, perhaps, is the thorough education of the general public to the end that this disease group will be considered in the same light as are the other communicable infections. This will permit the free and frank discussion of this important question without offence to modesty. I shall be pleased to have your views and suggestions as to the prosecution of further work along these lines. Whatever is to be done must be initiated promptly if we are to prevent the next increment of the draft from having the high venereal rate of the last.

That is what has been found in the United States.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Education.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): We need education, and treatment, and also the right to treat those who are too weak-minded or too poor in spirit to get treated of their own initiative. One other point of this subject I hold to be well worthy of consideration. We have at Rockingham, in that camp there, something like 300 patients. Let non. members note the ages of some of those patients. Sixteen per cent. are between 18 and 20 years of age; 21 per cent. between 20 and 23 years of age; 14 per cent. between 23 and 25 years of age. Those are boys of whom a great number, were it not for the treatment we have absolutely enforced, would be total physical ruins. And many of them are, so to speak, kiddies who have just left their mothers.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is a military matter. It has nothing to do with the Bill.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): The figures I have given show how the disease is being spread.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not while those patients are in the camp.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): In connection with this Bill we have heard a great deal about the probable case, and the possible case.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The select committee's report is full of such cases.

Hon. R. H. UNDERWOOD (Honorary Minister): We have heard a lot about some innocent young woman who will be subjected to the indignity of examination if this Bill passes. I have no desire whatever to force indignity upon any woman, or anyone. But I ask hon. members, when they think of this possible or probable woman, to think also of those boys. Those boys at Rockingham are good boys, and the fault is not theirs. Where there is a woman, or a man, spreading venereal disease, who is not to be got hold of by the ordinary methods of the Medical Department, we should have the police after that man or woman. I know of no greater crime than the infection of a girl or a boy with a disease of this description. Those who defend people guilty of such conduct—well, I cannot make out such defenders. Let me read just another extract. This is a quotation from an article in the "Nineteenth Century," entitled "The Fight against Venereal Infection," by Sir Bryan Donkin, M.D. In that article reference is made to the use of preventives against venereal disease. In a postscript the writer quotes from a letter addressed to him by Miss E. A. Rout, the New Zealand girl who is doing special work in England; and the quotation reads as follows:—

> The evidence in my possession, official and unofficial, is overwhelming proof of the urgent necessity of prophylaxis as the only mode of preventive treatment which is unlimited by questions of time and place. I have placed this evidence confidentially before the highest military and medical authorities in Egypt and in England, and have transmitted it to the Colonies; and in no case have the conclusions to which I have been guided by my own intelligence and the expert counsel of trained men and women been seriously questioned, quite the contrary. From all parts of our Empire a million men have come overseas. Over one-third of that million becomes infected with venereal diseases every twelve months, and many thousands are constantly sick in venereal disease hospitals.

Never has a question of greater importance than this question come before this House. There has never been a question to which hon. members were more urgently required to give their best possible thought. There should be no attempt to shirk this question, or to burke it. I do not for an instant assert that the proposals in this Bill are the best conceivable; but I want, and ask for, the best intelligence of members of this House to assist the Government in coping with venereal disease. I move—

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

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move—

"That the debate be adjourned."

Motion (adjournment) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	.. .. ..	14
Noes	.. .. ..	24
Majority against	..	10

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Collier	Mr. Rocke
Mr. Green	Mr. Walker
Mr Jones	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lambert	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Lutey	(*Teller.*)
Mr. Munsie	

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Money
Mr. Broun	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Brown	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Davies	Mr. H. Robinson
Mr. Draper	Mr. R. T. Robinson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Foley	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Thomson
Mr. George	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Lefroy	(*Teller.*)
Mr. Maley	

Motion thus negatived.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.59]: I am very much surprised indeed at the action of hon. members opposite in refusing the adjournment of the debate after hearing the Honorary Minister speak for about an hour on a Bill which, it is contended, requires no discussion at the second reading stage.

Hon. P. Collier: The adjournment of the debate has in such circumstances never been refused in this House before.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier made a distinct and definite promise, when he asked for the suspension of the Standing Orders, that he would not attempt to rush through Bills of this description.

Hon. P. Collier: We have learnt that his promise cannot be relied on.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier stated most positively that it was not his intention to take hon. members by surprise, and that after the second reading of a Bill——

The Minister for Mines interjected.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Let the Minister for Mines keep his mouth shut.

The Minister for Mines: You keep yours shut!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I keep my mouth closed at the proper time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is a distinct breach of the promise made by the Premier, and it is not the first time he has offended.

Hon. P. Collier: We cannot rely on his word any longer.

The Premier: What promise was made?

Hon. P. Collier: You said distinctly you would not push through any Bills which were important.

The Premier: The member for North-East Fremantle threatened that he was going to stonewall the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am going to stonewall the Bill if the Speaker will allow me to do so. I am going to speak against every word of the Bill. The Honorary Minister, who admits that he is under the influence of the medical profession, quoted extracts from legislation which is supposed to be in force in America. We have not had the opportunity of verifying the statements which he has made; we have not had the opportunity of looking them up, nor have we had the opportunity of seeing whether, in his quotations, he has taken out merely passages to suit himself or to mislead the Chamber. We shall have no opportunity of looking into things properly owing to the action of the Government in refusing to allow the debate to be adjourned. The Honorary Minister in introducing the Bill gave the whole case away. We have been told repeatedly by the Medical Department, before the appointment of the select committee to make investigations in regard to the Bill, that the Bill was brought in for the express purpose of treating all alike. The Honorary Minister to-night is the mouthpiece of the Medical Department, and he said "We want to place the women." It does not matter at all about the men. The Honorary Minister let the cat out of the bag, clearly and distinctly showing that the Bill was brought in specially to attack the women.

The Minister for Works: Nothing of the kind.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Honorary Minister declared that the Bill was brought in to attack women.

The Minister for Works: Certainly not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Honorary Minister is the mouthpiece of the Medical Department, and he has shown that the belief that the Bill is to apply to all sections alike is a sham. In effect the Minister states, "We want to keep the women isolated; we want places where we can keep them; it does not matter so much about the men," The difference between the Minister and myself in regard to this matter is that I look at the man as the culprit; the Minister looks at the man as the victim. I look on the woman as the victim and he looks on the woman as the culprit. That is the only difference between the Minister and myself. The whole intention of the Bill so far as venereal cases are concerned

is to deal with women. The Legislative Council passed the Bill under the belief that it was intended that all should be treated alike, that all should be under the same supervision so far as the Medical Department was concerned. If the information which has now been placed before us had been given to the Legislative Council when that Chamber was considering the Bill, I am loath to believe that they would have passed it. In my opinion the Council passed the Bill solely on the information given to them by the Medical Department through the select committee, that the object of the Bill was not solely to deal with women. I am not going to quote what takes place in America.

Hon. P. Collier: What time have we had to verify the authorities the Minister quoted or to look up the evidence he submitted.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not going to quote from pamphlets although I have quite a few giving the opinions of the medical profession, as to whether it is advisable or not to make this a notifiable disease. There is strong evidence from high medical authorities that by making this a notifiable disease there is a tendency in a large number of instances to prevent persons getting medical treatment. That can be borne out by medical authorities, as high as any we have in this State. I admit we have some capable medical men here, but there is no occasion for me to quote authorities. I am going to deal with the Bill merely as it affects Western Australia. The Honorary Minister pointed out that there are other clauses in the Bill besides those which deal with venereal disease, and which should be amended. One clause deals with the alteration of the definition of the words "lodging-house." This amendment will mean that if an hon. member receives a visitor who may be a relative of the family, and who may desire to stay the night, the Medical Department want power to make that visitor prove that he really was a visitor and not a lodger. That is one of the ridiculous provisions it is desired to pass. There is another which is equally ridiculous but the Honorary Minister did not speak about it. It is generally known that the Crown cannot take action against itself. It is impossible for one servant of the Crown, acting as a servant of the Crown, to enforce the provisions of an Act against another servant of the Crown. Yet we have a provision in the Bill which asks us to legislate so that a public health officer could, if he so desired, enforce the provisions of the Health Act against, say, the Crown Law Department. The Solicitor General has advised that it is not possible for one department to take action against another, in other words it is not possible for the Crown to sue itself. Yet the Bill asks us to legislate in that direction. This shows, too, that the Commissioner of Health wants to be made a Czar; he wants to be able to say, "We rule this country and every man, woman and child in it is at our mercy."

Hon. P. Collier: Another inquisition.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have no doubt that the Commissioner and his officers have been brought into this way of thinking on account of the various regulations which have been made under the War Precautions Act. Seeing that power has been given to one man to practically run this country, to stop persons from almost going outside their own doors at night time, especially if they want to go in a wrong direction, the Commissioner wants to be able to do likewise. He will never get that power if my vote can prevent it. There is another matter in connection with the Bill which has been lost sight of and which has not appeared in the Statutes of this State previously, and it is the power which the Commissioner desires to compel a local authority to adopt any by-law he may make.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Before tea I was pointing out that there is in the Bill a provision giving power to the Commissioner of Public Health to compel local authorities to make any by-laws he may desire. Some four years ago I placed on the Table a copy of what was called "model by-laws," drawn up for the purpose of giving the local authorities a guide for the making of health by-laws. It was left to the discretion of the local authorities to adopt the whole, or any, of those model by-laws. The Commissioner now desires to revoke those discretionary powers and to take unto himself power to compel the local authority to adopt the whole of those model by-laws, many of which, having been taken from the London by-laws, are not applicable to this State. After careful perusal I hesitated for 12 months before placing some of them on the Table of the House, realising as I did that in a State like this it was virtually impossible to get the local authorities to adopt them. I particularly remember one, dealing with hairdressers. If that by-law had been adopted and enforced, it would have been impossible for any hairdresser to shave a man for less than half a crown. Many of the by-laws were so drastic that I felt confident that if enforced they would be utterly detrimental to the community, that indeed it would be impossible for the local authority to enforce them.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): We can discuss all this in Committee.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: And on the second reading, too.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): But it means repetition.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That does not matter. The suggestion that we should give the Commissioner power to compel local authorities to adopt by-laws so drastic that they could not be put into effect, shows the despotic power the Commissioner is aiming at. The Commissioner also requires special powers enabling him to raid mining camps.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): That is not in the Bill yet. It has to be moved as a new clause.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is there for us to consider. The Commissioner desires these special powers; the powers given under the Roads Act are not sufficient for him. Then

he requires power also to validate all rates that have been wrongfully struck in the past. There is in the State a very large area for which the authority is the central office. In other words, there are no local authorities in that area. This is one of the reasons for maintaining a large inspectorial staff. The central office controls a very large area, and if any of the rates struck have been wrongfully struck, the Commissioner is to have power to validate those rates. He is not satisfied with the exercise of the powers given under the Roads Act and the Municipalitis Act, but he wants special powers in addition.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Only in regard to health.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: On many occasions I have impressed upon the department the necessity for forming local boards, believing as I do that local government is the best for local affairs. On every occasion I was told that it was impossible to form a local board. In consequence of this the inspectors have been growing in number year by year, until they are more numerous to-day than ever before. Four of them, including the inspector of factories and shops, have gone to the Front. To those who enlisted a definite promise was made by the Government that their places should be kept open for them. I hope that promise will be fulfilled; but the Public Health Department is increasing the inspectorial staff, and to-day we have two more than ever before. The reason is found in the desire of the department to have full control under the Health Act of as much of the State as possible.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Are not they the best people to control it?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am doubtful of that.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): To whom would you give the power?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: To the local authorities. To-day the department are controlling large areas from Perth, sending out inspectors and providing even a medical officer from the central office. It would mean materially reduced cost if the work were handed over to the local authority. That is the reason why the Commissioner desires power to increase the rates in those localities, and power to validate rates wrongfully struck. Special attention should be given to this provision in the Bill, because it means a large increase in expenditure. If it is the policy of the Government to hand over all control of public health to the central office, it should be done in a proper manner and not piecemeal, bit by bit. The powers prescribed under the Health Act should be conferred on the local authorities.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): If the local people will not act, we act.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They should have the first chance.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): They have it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, because the central office is anxious to get the control. This is one direction in which economy could be exercised, namely, by handing over the control to the local authorities. Again, the Commissioner desires to take control of all public buildings in the State.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): So he should.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He desires that no entertainments or lectures should be given in any public building until it shall have been licensed by the department.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Why should not that be so?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Commissioner proposes that on buildings where public entertainments are to be held a license fee not exceeding £10 per annum should be imposed. Where the building is merely to use for lectures and so forth, he suggests a license fee of £5 per annum. These things represent a further encroachment on the powers of local authorities. To-day the local authorities have power over such buildings. It is true they have not power to license the buildings, but they have power to see that the buildings are maintained in proper condition and that the surroundings of the buildings are so maintained that the health of the community is not endangered. The Commissioner proposes that in future the local authority shall still exercise these functions, but that his department shall receive the license fees. Before a building can be used for public entertainment, the plans have to be approved by the central government offices, principally the Works Department, which is the only department knowing anything of the subject. But once approval is given, the building is under the control of the local authority. Just fancy a little building being put up in Subiaco for the purpose of holding public meetings—not for picture shows or other entertainments—and a license fee of £5 per annum being immediately imposed on it. The same thing applies to the agricultural halls, which are scattered all over Western Australia, and which are used for public meetings, political and otherwise. In such cases the agricultural hall would pay an annual license fee of £5 under this Bill but once a picture show is held in the hall the license fee jumps to £10 per annum. Such are some of the provisions of a Bill which shelters itself behind the pretence of dealing with venereal disease. By that pretence those provisions have been concealed from the public. Hon. members have not given the Bill sufficient attention to recognise what it really is. They have looked at it from only one point of view. I venture to say that when the measure reaches Committee members generally will see that these provisions are deleted. Moreover, under this Bill the Commissioner seeks power to decide in what areas offensive trades may be carried on. Of course he is in a better position to know that than are the local authorities. Apparently he has failed to realise, however, that the local authority is served by a medical officer and a health inspector. Probably the Commissioner thinks these men can have no knowledge of anything. Therefore he proposes to come along and tell the local authority, "You must have the offensive trade

in this particular position." He seeks power to do that in defiance of the medical officer and the health inspector of the district. That is another provision which is covered by the pretence that the Bill deals with venereal disease. One point which the Honorary Minister strongly emphasised in his second reading speech was that it had been found the principal Act needed amendment in many minor respects. One of those respects was the sections dealing with food. Under the principal Act, any person having unwholesome food on his premises for sale, can be prosecuted. I admit there has in the past been some difficulty in ascertaining whether the unwholesome food was or was not for sale. Consequently, the Commissioner desires by this Bill to secure the deletion of those words "for sale" from the particular provision in the Act. But he overlooked this feature, that the fact of a person having unwholesome food in his possession does no injury to anyone so long as he keeps it in his possession.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Yes: as long as it is not sold in the presence of an inspector. Why would the person want to keep unwholesome food in his possession?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When the person gives or sells the unwholesome food to any other person, he is doing something that might result in detriment to human beings or animals. But as long as he keeps the unwholesome food in his possession he is doing no harm.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): That is what he does not do, though.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have here now a sample of unwholesome wheat, wheat sold by a representative of the Government to an hon. member of another place, who paid for it before he got delivery. Under this Bill that gentleman could be prosecuted for having this wheat in his possession. I could be prosecuted, under this Bill, for having this unwholesome wheat here now. Hon. members will recognise the nature of the powers the Commissioner desires in this matter. When the purchaser of this wheat distributed it to his turkeys, the result was that they were dead the next morning. Yet the Commissioner proposes to go along to that purchaser and say to him, "You have unwholesome food in your possession; you have no right to have it in your possession. I will prosecute you; you will lose not only your turkeys, but you will be fined as well."

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Why should he have the unwholesome wheat in his possession?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But the Government sold him that wheat.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): They were wrong in doing so, and that ends that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This Bill contains so many minor amendments all covered up by one salient feature with the object of drawing off the attention of the local authorities and of the people generally. I have tried in a few words to show hon. members that this Bill is not so innocent as it looks. With the main question of the Bill I have not yet dealt. More power is being asked by this Bill than hon. members, if they gave the matter any thought, would be disposed to grant. This Bill proposes to grant to the Commissioner powers which, in my opinion, should not be entrusted to him. Especially should powers not be taken from the local authorities and transferred to the Commissioner, because if there is one thing that this country should do in these times of stress, in these times when economy is the watch-word, it is to try and encourage local authorities to handle local affairs, to try and reduce expenditure in the central offices, to try and encourage the people who are willing to give their time gratis in the conduct of local affairs. The object of this Bill apparently is to discourage such people, to take away the powers of local bodies, and to build up huge staffs of vast importance in the central offices. The Honorary Minister urged, in support of this Bill, that it is necessary to exercise greater care in the matter of midwifery. He said that many a woman had lost her life, and that many a child had lost its life, owing to the nurse not being competent to carry out her duties. We know that is true. We know that has happened on many occasions. But there have also been many cases where both mother and child have lost their lives because a nurse was not obtainable at all.

Mr. Pickering: That is true in the country districts, at any rate.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Many a woman has lost her life, and many a child has been stillborn, because the services of a nurse were not available in the time of need. The late Commissioner of Public Health, Dr. Hope, made it one of his principal objects to ensure that as many women as could show their competency in this direction should be registered as midwifery nurses, especially in country districts.

Mr. Pickering: Hear, hear!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: On two or three occasions, if I mistake not, the late Commissioner of Public Health requested the Government to ask Parliament to modify the law as it now stands in regard to women practising midwifery. Unfortunately, however, Parliament made the law more stringent than the late Commissioner desired. Dr. Hope was a man who had spent many years in Western Australia, and who had passed over 40 years in the services of this State, and knew the troubles and trials of our country residents. Indeed, for a number of years he was stationed in country districts. Thus he was able to realise the extreme difficulty which occurs at times when women are in need of assistance. Accordingly he endeavoured to make the registration of nurses as easy as possible consistently with competency. But things have changed. The Medical Department now have not the benefit of counsel from one who knows the difficulties of country life in Western Australia. The department have not advice at this time from men who have spent many years in the inland towns of Western Australia. Every attempt has been made to discourage persons as far as possible from being trained for attending midwifery cases. I admit that if persons can afford to have a trained general nurse at these times it would be better and safer, but members must realise that an ordin-

ary working man cannot afford to pay for the services of a general trained nurse and a midwifery nurse, as well as obtaining other assistance. A working man cannot afford to pay the fees at accouchement times, and therefore the woman has to run a greater risk. It is the duty of the House to carry out the law which was previously placed on the statute-book. A contract was entered into in all good faith. Many times I have assisted in drafting clauses in regard to the Licensing Act of the State. I have pointed out that we have entered into a contract and nothing should be done as far as local option was concerned until the year 1921. I felt that from that time to the present it was the duty of members to keep that contract. When Parliament has laid down certain conditions those conditions should be adhered to. But it is not so in connection with midwives. When the Act was passed dealing with engine-drivers' certificates, it was provided that every engine-driver who had been working for a certain number of years, and showed that he was competent, was granted a certificate to enable him to earn a livelihood without undergoing further examination. The other day, when dealing with the question of dentists, it was pointed out that when the Dental Act came into force every person practising as a dentist in Western Australia was allowed to register as a dentist and practise for all time. Take the Veterinary Act; the same thing applied there. Everyone who was practising and following that profession, earning a livelihood by it, was registered as a veterinary surgeon and remained one for all time. But when the Health Act was passed, those who had been practising as midwives for years had to register before a certain date. They were to have their names placed on a register. Now this Bill comes along and says, "It is true Parliament agreed to register you, but we are going to ask Parliament to alter the conditions under which you were registered, and to provide for an examination as far as you are concerned. We are going to vary the conditions under which you were registered; we ask Parliament to wipe out the conditions previously existing." Should not the same thing apply as in the case of engine-drivers and dentists?

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): It does in regard to engine-drivers.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It does not in regard to stationary engine-drivers, and the Act only dealt with stationary engine-drivers and not locomotives. The drivers of locomotives get their certificates from the Railway Department. I think I am safe in saying that once a medical officer passes his examination and obtains his certificate, he does not pay so much a year for registration afterwards. I was going to say he pleases himself whether he joins the medical association, but I think he is obliged to. I do not think a medical officer pays to the State an annual fee for keeping up his registration. But what do we find? Every year a midwifery nurse has to send in her name for registration and she has to send also a fee of 5s. to pay for that registration. That is contained in this Bill; it was not in the Act. If a midwifery nurse fails to send in her name for registration she is fined 10s. for not doing so. That is also in the Bill. On a second occasion, in all probability, she will be struck off the roll. Why this differential treatment as far as these women are concerned? Why is it necessary to impose fees and fines on women and not apply them to officers of the department? There is no provision that health officers have to pay a fee to register, or pay a fine if they do not register. There is no provision in that direction in regard to medical officers. These are clauses which members have not looked at. It is true that the State established a hospital for the training of midwifery nurses, but I am safe in saying that scarcely anyone is trained unless they are members of a certain association. The institution is not carried on as it was intended, and the institution is not training the women that it was intended should be trained there. I have had on occasion to bring before the House the question of the wives of deceased soldiers, and I have asked why they are not allowed to be trained in the institution at Subiaco.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Because it is full.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Why is it full?

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Because there are so many applicants.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, but because trained nurses are going there all the time. The institution is not being used for the women it was intended for.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Who did the intending? You did not intend to build it at all.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I would never have built the institution at Subiaco because I was convinced that it should be built within the grounds of the Perth hospital. That would have saved the country some thousands of pounds. And when I am convinced of certain things, it takes a good deal to alter my opinion. I was convinced also, on the advice of the then principal medical officer, that the hospital would have been better in the grounds of the Perth hospital, where there would be one management and the medical attendants would have full control. The Minister wanted to know who "intended" that these women should be trained. I say that the Honorary Minister did. One of the strongest objections lodged against the erection of this building within the Perth hospital grounds was that it was feared the trained nurses would take control, and that there would be little opportunity for women, who wanted to take up midwifery cases, to get an opportunity to be trained. They would not have the same opportunity unless the hospital were built elsewhere. Those were the conditions that had a great deal to do with the erection of the hospital away from the Perth hospital grounds, and the Minister asks who intended.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not discussing the erection of maternity homes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We are discussing midwives.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine himself to that discussion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is almost impossible to have efficient midwifery nurses, competent persons to look after our women in country districts, unless there was some place to properly train these persons. I was trying to show that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill does not provide for the erection of homes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know I am not allowed to deal with the clauses of the Bill, or to read them, but if you, Mr. Speaker, will look through the Bill you will find that it provides that a nurse should go through a certain examination to find out whether she is competent to attend women without the aid of a doctor, and whether she is able to understand when a nurse should call in a doctor.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the hon. member is discussing the training schools, and whether the qualifications are not too high. The hon. member is not in order in discussing maternity homes as training schools for midwifery nurses. There is no provision in the Bill dealing with that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: How is it possible for a woman who has not attended midwifery cases to pass an examination before she can be registered as a midwifery nurse? She has to go before a board, and how is it possible she can pass an examination when she can only train in an institution where she is not admitted? The Bill makes provision for passing an examination.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can discuss the standard of the examination but he must not discuss training schools for maternity cases.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I cannot see that, Mr. Speaker, but of course I bow to your ruling. The Bill provides definitely that the nurses must go up for a further examination, and how is it possible therefore for a nurse to do that without going through a training school.

Mr. SPEAKER: The training school is not under review. The hon. member can discuss the standard of the examination.

Point of Order.

Hon. T. Walker: On a point of order, I think the hon. member is perfectly right. He is dealing with the examination of nurses, and he is dealing with what is antecedent to, necessary to, and connected with those examinations. The original Act dealt with training schools for nurses, and incidental to the provisions for nurses were the schools. The Bill before us is to be read as one with the other, and therefore all the principles contained in the other are open for comparison and discussion now. Therefore, everything incidental to the examination is relative, and what is relative to that discussion is in order.

Mr. Speaker: The Bill, so far as I have read it, does not amend the training schools for midwifery. It makes provision for a certain examination which is already in existence in the parent Act, but perhaps it is a higher or a more rigid examination. The member for North-East Fremantle has been discussing training schools and the necessity for them, and pointing out that a certain training school for midwifery is not fulfilling its functions. The Bill before the House does not amend that portion of the parent Act. It only deals with the standard of midwifery.

Hon. T. Walker: If the Bill before us prescribes a new examination it pre-supposes training.

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing in the Bill dealing with training.

Hon. T. Walker: But the natural logic is that if one has to pass an examination, it is necessary to prepare for it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is quite wrong. The provision which the member for North-East Fremantle has been discussing is that provision dealing with the registration of midwifery nurses who have had no training other than that gained by following their profession for a certain period, and his complaint is that now they are called upon to submit themselves for another examination, and to support that argument he is attacking the training schools.

Hon. T. Walker: They were registered and became midwives and are entitled to practice. The new Bill proposes that they shall not be able to practice unless they submit themselves for fresh examination.

Mr. Speaker: And this Bill makes no provision for training.

Hon. T. Walker: The Bill retains the old training schools inasmuch as it has to be read as one with the original Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not in order in discussing training schools under the Bill before us. He can discuss the standard of the examination.

Debate resumed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I contend that once the midwives have been registered, the registration should hold good. We are now asking Parliament to violate a contract which was entered into with these women by calling upon them to submit themselves for another examination, and an examination which in all probability would be of so high a standard that these women will not be able to pass it. Moreover, it must be remembered that most of the midwives are women of mature age and it will be exceedingly difficult for them at their time of life to prepare for a difficult examination. I regard this as only an attempt to reduce the number of midwifery nurses in the State. We are playing entirely into the hands of a few. The cry throughout the State has been for more midwives. On more than one occasion Dr. Hope endeavoured to provide that a woman to become a midwife should qualify for examination in six months. Unfortunately, influence was brought to bear on members, and they refused to accede to the request of the Commissioner. Parliament made the period 12 months, but through some defect in the Act the intention of Parliament has been flouted so far as general nurses are concerned. The women who are likely to be affected by the proposal in the Bill have all been registered and have qualified by actual experience. There was no place in which they could pursue a course of training. It is not fair now that we should ask these women

to submit themselves for examination, when we told them definitely that if they practised for a certain period they would be registered on the passing of the Act. Now we are asked to break faith with these women. I hope that when in Committee hon. members will assist me in an endeavour to preserve to those women the rights Parliament previously granted them. They are wanted in the towns, and even more are they wanted in the country. It is impossible to get trained nurses to go into the country; yet it is now proposed to prevent the midwifery nurses from practising in remote districts. Coming to the venereal clauses, let me assure hon. members that the statement made by the Honorary Minister (Hon. R. H. Underwood) in moving the second reading that those opposed to the venereal clauses are opposed to anything being done, is not correct. They have no desire that disease should run rampant throughout the State. They want as far as possible to protect the young women the Honorary Minister wishes to reach. They want to protect the liberty of the subject. They want to see that every woman in Western Australia shall have the same freedom as the women of any other part of Australasia. In Queensland prostitutes were registered for a number of years, but last year the system was knocked out. We want merely to protect the young people of the State, particularly the girls. It is all very well for the Commissioner of Public Health to tell us that he does not intend to put the law into force, to exercise the powers we are to give him. If that is so, why is the power asked for? If the Commissioner has no intention of grabbing someone by the neck and putting him or her into the detention hospital, whether suffering from disease or not, why should we give him the power to do so?

Mr. Teesdale: Did he say that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He said in his evidence that he did not intend to use the power, that he would not take notice of anonymous letters. Why, then, should we give him the power asked for? The creature who makes a statement that any young girl is suffering from disease, and refused to sign the statement, is not a man at all; and the man who would take any notice of such a person is nearly as bad as the other fellow. I regret very much that members of another place did not take much notice of the provisions of the Bill as it went through. They were led astray by the select committee, which was biassed. The very chairman of that select committee was the man who tried to stop the Public Health Department from protecting the people from fraud and nostrums which were being sold. In this regard only one witness gave evidence before the select committee. He was a man personally interested. He has built up his fortune by frauds on the people, by selling quack medicines which the Treasurer the other day advised him to take. The pity is he did not take them, for they might have choked him. But the select committee took his word, and although a duly qualified chemist afterwards gave evidence in regard to another matter, the select committee asked him no questions about these patent nostrums, preferring to take the word of the imposter to whom I have referred. Patent medicines have done far more harm in this State than have venereal diseases. Clauses put into the Bill for the protection of the public have been struck out by the select committee. The Minister said he wanted a place for the women, that a man does not matter. When it comes to the women the law is made as severe as it possibly can. The character of a pure, innocent girl is of no importance at all. The girl who tries to live honestly and purely has no consideration shown her. Archbishop Riley gave evidence before the select committee. I remember that he took an active interest in fighting the Contagious Diseases Act in England. I was only young at the time. I was taking part in an election campaign in the north of England in 1886 when a gentleman was a candidate fighting very hard against the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Act. I remember the outcry made in England at the time, when young girls had been run in as prostitutes because they would not give way to the desires of some of those administering the Act. Eventually the Act was repealed, and from that day to this no one has ever dared to introduce in England an Act of a similar nature. I say without fear of contradiction that the Bill before us is far more drastic, is more dangerous to the liberty of the people than was the Contagious Diseases Act of England. The Contagious Diseases Act was administered by the police, while the Bill before us is to be administered by the Commissioner of Public Health with the aid of the police. That is the only difference. It is true that the Contagious Diseases Act of England was devised to deal chiefly with prostitutes. But the main principle of the Act was venereal disease. It is all very well for the Commissioner of Public Health to say there is no connection between the Bill and a Contagious Diseases Act. The principle is exactly the same. The Contagious Diseases Act of 1869, which was repealed in 1886, contained the same principle. It did not apply all over England, but only to certain localities, chiefly where soldiers and sailors were situated. Its object was to stop the spread of venereal disease among the men of the army and of the navy. What is the difference between the Contagious Diseases Act and the Bill?

Mr. Green: One is to make vice safe, the other to abolish rotten disease.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No. There is no difference. They are exactly the same. The hon. member has not read the Contagious Diseases Act of England. In England, if the superintendent of police had reason to believe that a woman was a common prostitute, he could go before a magistrate and on oath lay an information against her. The magistrate, if he saw fit, could issue an order asking the woman to appear before him either in person or by representative. If she failed to appear, the superintendent of police had to declare on oath that he had served the notice on her in sufficient time to enable her to appear. He then had to substantiate on oath

the information previously sworn, before the magistrate could take further action. Then the magistrate, if he deemed fit, could issue an order directing the woman to appear before a surgeon for examination.

Mr. Green: Was no penalty attached?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, just the same as here. That is to say, the offender could be put into gaol. What is the difference between the two measures? Under the Contagious Diseases Act the superintendent of police had to make oath three times before action could be taken. What is the difference? If I had some kind of malice against the Premier, if I wanted to get at the Premier, then, if this Bill became law, and if the hon. gentleman had a daughter, I could get at him by sending to the Commissioner of Public Health a communication accusing her of suffering from venereal disease. And then the Commissioner could, if he thought fit, issue an order requiring—but, by the by, I am supposing the case of a female. Under this Bill the Commissioner would, in the case of a female, have to summon a board, of which he is to be the chairman and the other members of which are to be a lady doctor, another lady, and a layman. The Commissioner, as chairman, would lay the accusation against this lady before the board. Then the Premier's daughter—I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has a daughter or not——

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think it is in very nice taste to select a member for illustration. You can put up a supposititious case.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I would not have minded it if I myself had been selected to afford the illustration. I would not have minded at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be much better to take a supposititious case.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Very well, Sir. Let me say that some young woman has had an information of this nature lodged against her, and knows nothing whatever about it. She is not summoned; she is not asked to attend the meeting of the committee in order that they may find out whether the accusation is true or false. Here are four people sitting in conclave to try her as a suspect. No oath is administered in any shape or form. But here are four people who know that she is suspected of venereal disease, to start with. Then there are two or three in the office who know that she is suspected. Thus there would be six or eight people aware of the fact that this young woman is suspected. She has no chance whatever of answering the charge, so far as the committee are concerned. If the committee, on the information gathered by the Commissioner of Public Health, are induced to say, "We think there might be something in this; we think we had better have an order sent to her to go before a medical practitioner," then such an order would go forward. And, let hon. members note, no oath is administered. In England, under the old Contagious Diseases Act, an oath had to be taken three times before anything of that nature could be done. Here, the Commissioner can send the young woman an order to go before a medical practitioner, her own medical practitioner if she chooses. If she does not obey that order within a reasonable period, the Commissioner of Public Health can call upon the police to enforce compliance on her part.

Mr. Teesdale: Nothing of the kind. The police have nothing to do with the measure. Read the evidence. Read what the Commissioner says.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not care a hang what the Commissioner says. I say that the police have to do with this Bill. Let the member for Roebourne read Clause 38 of the Bill.

Mr. Teesdale: I am reading the Commissioner's evidence.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not care a hang about the Commissioner's evidence. I will deal with his evidence directly. I am dealing with the Bill now. Clause 38 provides—

> The Commissioner and any public health official may do and cause to be done all such acts, matters, and things as may be necessary or reasonably deemed to be necessary to specifically enforce and carry into effect any order lawfully made by him under Section 205 of this Act, and in particular (without limiting the generality of the foregoing provisions) may by warrant under his hand require any officer of police or any inspector to apprehend any person whom he has ordered to be quarantined or isolated.

Mr. Teesdale: But how will the Commissioner of Public Health interpret that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is the law. We are making the law here; we are not interpreting the law. If the power is not to be enforced, why give it? If the Commissioner does not want that power, why does it appear in this Bill?

[Owing to the electric lights failing, the sitting was suspended from 8·55 to 9·25.]

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When we got into darkness I was trying to point out the difference between the present Bill and the old Contagious Diseases Act of England, and I was endeavouring to show that the Bill we now have before us is more severe than that Contagious Diseases Act which we have heard so much about. The fact that the lights went out should be a warning to the Government. It shows, to my mind, what darkness there will be in the life of our womenkind in future years if this Bill becomes law. For three years I refused to bring in a Bill to satisfy the Commissioner of Public Health. It was a Bill similar to this one, and that was in 1912.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): The Commissioner you had did not have sufficient brains to bring in such a Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He was respected in this State for 40 years.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): He was 40 years too old.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He carried out his duties faithfully and well and no one could point the finger of scorn at him. He left this country and went on the battlefields of Flanders to attend to the suffering there.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): He had not the brains to bring in a Bill of this description.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: To overcome the difficulty, I asked the hospital board to give free treatment for venereal disease in 1912, before the

hon. member (Mr. Underwood) had anything to do with the question. I recognised that if anything was to be done it must be voluntary. Under this Bill a woman could be charged as suffering from venereal disease and be ordered by the Commissioner of Public Health to go up for medical examination without giving her an opportunity in the first instance to put up a defence. The first she would hear about it would be when the order was given.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): If a woman is suffering she must be cured.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There are many women who would rather commit suicide than undergo treatment in the manner this Bill proposes that they shall be dealt with. Does the honorary Minister realise that under the Bill it will be possible for many innocent women to be accused of suffering from the disease?

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): How did all those boys get down to Rockingham?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Well I do.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Contagious Diseases Act of England provides that an oath has to be taken three times before a woman can be ordered to undergo medical examination. If this Bill becomes law it will be possible for a woman to be examined merely on the statement of any person, and that person need not even sign his or her name. If I desire to lay an information against a person for the simplest of offences, or even for committing a breach of the peace, it is necessary for me under the Justices Act to make a sworn statement. The Honorary Minister asks us to approve of a proposal which will enable anyone to make a charge against a woman or girl without taking an oath or without even giving his or her name.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): I am only asking you to do what you did 2½ years ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: This cross firing must cease. The Honorary Minister has addressed himself to the subject already this afternoon, and he will have an opportunity of replying. I hope he will let the member for North-East Fremantle proceed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have been told by the Commissioner of Health in the evidence he gave before the Select Committee that there are any number of girls in this State under the age of 16 years suffering from venereal disease. That implies that there are a large number, and we have had an Act in force to deal with this disease for about two years. Clinics however were not opened in Perth until October last, while I do not know whether the hospital at Subiaco is opened yet. Very little provision was made for attending to cases which came under the notice of the authorities, but in face of that the numbers quoted by the Commissioner of Health show that the Act has had a beneficial effect. I had better quote from the evidence given by the Commissioner. In question number 100 the Commissioner stated—

> There are any number of girls under 16 suffering from venereal disease and it is very difficult to deal with them. Some of them are filthy.

Then we find in answer to question 25 the Commissioner stated—

> Between the ages of 10 and 20 there were 117 cases amongst the males and 48 amongst females. The figure of 117 would consist mainly of young men between the ages of 16 and 20.

Seeing that the medical fraternity were not compelled before the passing of the existing Act to report cases of venereal disease, seeing also that there are many people suffering who would immediately try and get medical attention, seeing further that many people receive attention in hospitals and gaols, and also that between the ages of 10 and 20, according to the Commissioner himself, there were only 48 cases amongst females, I contend that the Commissioner had no right to make a sweeping statement to the effect that there were any number of girls suffering from venereal disease. His own figures condemn him. They were an exaggeration. Why were they used? Simply to frighten the people of the State.

Mr. Teesdale: Pure assumption.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is assumption by the Commissioner. I admit there may be a few young girls discovered in the children's court.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Well, would not you try to cure them?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Of course.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Well why do not you come along and help us?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The existing Act already provides for that. A lot has been made of the position in regard to the signed statement. The Commissioner says it is useless, that they will not sign a statement. The chairman of the select committee asked him, "How many have you had?" and the Commissioner replied, "We may have received two or three altogether."

Mr. Draper: Did he not say on another occasion eight or nine?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I will come to that. Later on we find these questions and answers—

> By the Chairman: Will you go so far as to say that the intention of the Act is defeated in the absence of this power?—I feel that that section of the Act is practically useless and might just as well be deleted altogether. As I have said, I have had about two signed statements.
>
> Have you ever seen any trace of malice in the accusations made or the statements received by you?—I only remember one case which was considered to have been brought by malice, and that was in the case of a prostitute.

Of two or three signed statements, one was ascribed to malice. It is a pretty high percentage, yet we are asked to allow persons to accuse others of suffering from disease, without necessity for making any signed statement at all.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): The Commissioner is a villain.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: His evidence is here and I am going to prove from it that the Bill is unnecessary. One of the principal objections to the Bill is the proposed abolition of the signed statement. It is held that if the signed statement is abolished no person will be safe. In his evidence the Commissioner admits that out of two or three signed statements one was ascribable to malice. How many malicious accusations will there be when no signed statement is required?

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Did he act on that one which was ascribable to malice?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not know. The Minister is not asking us what the Commissioner shall do. He is asking for power for the Commissioner, which is an entirely different matter. The Minister knows that not long ago an inquiry was held arising out of the action of a medical

officer in examining without authority certain women in Perth. The Minister remembers the outcry in regard to that.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Have you any case against the Commissioner?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, I am dealing with the Bill.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): You are not, you are dealing with the Commissioner.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am using the Commissioner's evidence given before the select committee. That evidence shows there is no necessity for the Bill. Is it not possible that the Commissioner will get many malicious accusations when the signed statement is no longer required?

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Is it not possible that he will not act on them?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have nothing to do with that. When the War Precautions Bill was introduced in the Federal Parliament Sir William Irvine pointed out the dangers underlying the Bill. But the Government replied, "We do not intend to act on it; we only require the power to deal with any matter that may arise." The power was given. Has it not been abused since? The position is the same here. We are not asked by the Minister for certain powers which the Commissioner will exercise; we are asked for power to enable the Commissioner to do certain things if he so desires. The member for West Perth (Mr. Draper) by interjection asked, "Did he not say he received eight or nine?" I ask the hon. member to refer to Inspector O'Halloran's evidence on page 22. Let me remind hon. members that the police have nothing to do with the Act. They have no right under the Act to interfere, to ask any person whether he or she is suffering from a disease.

Mr. Draper: Question 1038 is the one I referred to. The answer is 13 or 14.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: You are referring to the Commissioner's second lot of evidence. Here is some evidence by Inspector O'Halloran—

> By Hon. J. Duffell: In cases where you have reason to believe, or where it has been reported to you that certain persons are supposed to be suffering from venereal disease what action do you take?—If we receive a report to that effect, we get a signed statement from the person concerned setting forth the grounds for making the charge. That signed statement is sent on to the Commissioner for Health.

So it is seen that the police did take some action under the Act, although they had no right to do so. Here is some more evidence from the same witness—

> Do you get many signed statements?—No. How many have you had during the past 12 months?—Perhaps eight or nine.

The Commissioner said he had two or three. Inspector O'Halloran had eight or nine, and they were sent on to the Commissioner. Later on the Commissioner was again called before the select committee to comment on the evidence given by other witnesses—a course absolutely without precedent. I guarantee the Commissioner's evidence was not given to the other witnesses to peruse. However, here is some more of Inspector O'Halloran's evidence—

> If you had reason to believe from information received that a person was actually suffering from and had conveyed disease to others, what action would you take?—That would depend on the circumstances. If the person was a reputed prostitute the constable at once ascertains whether a charge of being idle and disorderly could be established against her. If so she would be immediately arrested. If she was imprisoned she would be sent to Fremantle, and I suppose, attended to there. [If she was the daughter of some reputable person, what action would you take?—We would take action in the same way. If a person reported to me that a girl of 18 or 19 was suffering from venereal disease, I would first have inquiries made as to what led that person to believe such a thing. I would get down to bed-rock before any action was taken, or the Commissioner notified.

Mr. Teesdale: There are precautions for you!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: A little while ago the hon. member declared that the police did not take any action at all under the Act, yet here we have the evidence of an inspector of police that he would take action.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): He did not take action.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: How did he get the signed statement?

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): Why not get down to bedrock? Have you seen the boys at Rockingham? Get down to that. Do you want the disease kept here or not?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: On one or two occasions, when the Honorary Minister was introducing the Bill, I was guilty of interruption. You, Mr. Speaker, called me to order; and I obeyed your direction. I regret the Honorary Minister does not follow my example in that respect. He must realise that he has had ample opportunity: he has spoken as long as he chose to speak. However, his case was a very weak one. The evidence placed before the select committee was quite unconvincing. Consequently, the Honorary Minister is trying to bamboozle me as regards the analysis I intend to make of the evidence. It will be allowed, I think, that I have a right to make that analysis in my own way; and this I intend to do. All through the evidence which has been submitted there has been actual proof that the police do take part in the administration of the measure. In other words, it is impossible for the Commissioner of Public Health to administer the measure without the help of the police. No Act in which there are penalties, and which may involve imprisonment for contempt of court, can be administered without the assistance of the police. The Honorary Minister would endeavour to blind the people into the belief that this Bill would be wholly administered by the Commissioner himself, and his secretary and typist. That statement, I say, is false and incorrect. The police must assist in the administration of this measure; the police must enforce its provisions: they must take action, on behalf of the Commissioner of Public Health, to make compulsory examinations with a view to ascertaining whether venereal disease exists or not. If we cannot have the proper position relative to a measure placed before us in a just and honest way, without any bamboozling, better let the measure go altogether. Rather let us tell the people openly "We intend to treat every one of you as a suspect." What is the evidence of Inspector O'Halloran in this connection? He is asked what he would do if an offending girl were the daughter of some well-to-do or reputable citizen. His reply is that he would take action in the same way. From his previous answer, it appears that this means that the police would arrest the girl for loitering or something of that kind. And yet we are told that the police are to take no action

under this Bill. The Bill is a disgrace to a British community.

Hon. R. H. Underwood (Honorary Minister): I wonder you helped to pass the principal Act.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am glad to have the opportunity of rectifying my error. The Commissioner of Public Health had an opportunity of perusing the evidence of other witnesses. It was submitted to him in order that he might be enabled to criticise their statements. He was again questioned on the subject of signed statements—

> 1038. You were doubtful as to the number of signed statements which you received. Have you looked that matter up?—I looked it up and sent it to you. I think it was about 13 or 14, half of which were not in order. They were no use to us.

Mr. Draper: Yes; but 13 or 14 were received. It does not matter whether they were in order or not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Dr. Atkinson's answer continues—

> I have only received six effective signed statements which were of any use. They say, as a rule, "a girl calling herself Chloe, whose address is King's park"; one was a girl with red hair who hangs around Midland Junction.

I quote this evidence merely to show that the position was brought about for the express purpose of proving that signed statements were useless. The Commissioner went on to point out that even if persons admitted to him that they were suffering from venereal disease he would have no power to take any action. That is as great a piece of bunkum as ever a man uttered. Anyhow, I propose, if hon. members give me the opportunity, though I really do not think there is any necessity for it, to amend the clause in Committee, so as to provide that the Commissioner shall have power to deal with persons who admit to him that they are suffering from venereal disease. If you, Mr. Speaker, were Commissioner of Public Health, and I was one of your inspectors, and you, as Commissioner, informed me that some person had admitted to you that he was suffering from venereal disease, I, as your inspector, would not hesitate for a moment to sign a statement. Any assertion by the Commissioner that he could not take action in such a case I characterise as mere exaggeration for the purpose of endeavouring to secure a law here that does not exist in any portion of the British Empire, a law to do away with the signed statement. That law would abolish the right of an innocent person to claim damages for a slur cast on his or her character. That is one of the greatest safeguards, and in a sense the only complete protection, a woman has for her good name. I believe that the law of libel—the member for West Perth (Mr. Draper) will correct me if I am wrong—regards nothing as more serious than an unfounded accusation against a woman that she suffers from disease of this kind. Every Act of Parliament that has been passed throughout the Commonwealth on this subject requires a signed statement. Do not the people of the other Australian States possess as much knowledge and intelligence as we in Western Australia have? If it is necessary in a little place like Perth to provide for the unsigned statement, should it not be necessary in the city of Melbourne, with its million inhabitants, and with its thousands of soldiers returned from the front? If such a law is necessary here, is it not necessary in the large Eastern States? But the Legislatures and the medical authorities of the Eastern States say the power is not necessary. Victoria passed an Act on this subject in 1916; it was assented to on the 28th December, 1916. Section 13 of the Victorian Act reads—

> When the medical inspector is satisfied by the certificate of a medical practitioner, or by statutory declaration, that there is reasonable ground to believe that any person is suffering from venereal disease and is not under treatment by any medical practitioner, he may issue an order in writing requiring such person to place himself forthwith under the care of a medical practitioner.

That is the law of Victoria to-day. Victoria would not permit its daughters to be subjected to the indignity which is here proposed for the daughters of Western Australia. And the work of the Victorian Health Department is far greater than that of our Health Department. Yet the Victorian authorities, for the protection of Victorian womanhood, insist on a signed statement and on a declaration on oath. Let us take Tasmania, a State in point of population closer to ours than Victoria is. The Tasmanian Act on this subject was assented to on the 23rd February, 1917, and Section 41k of it reads—

> Whenever the Chief Health Officer is satisfied (1) by the certificate of a medical practitioner, or (2) by signed statement in which shall be set forth the full name and address of the informant, that any person is suffering from venereal disease and is not under treatment by any medical practitioner, he may issue an order in writing requiring such person to place himself forthwith under the care of a medical practitioner.

That is the law of Tasmania passed in 1917. Surely they are as wise in Tasmania as we are here. They realise the necessity for protection. The minds of the Tasmanian medical officers run in the same direction as Dr. Saw's did when he assisted to frame our present Health Act. I ask hon. members, before they vote on this Bill, to read the speech Dr. Saw made in the Legislative Council during the passage of the present Act. It is useless to say now that Dr. Saw would have preferred a more stringent measure, and that he took what he thought was obtainable. I consider Dr. Saw's action relative to the original Health Bill was one of the wisest political actions ever taken.

Mr. O'Loghlen: But doctors are like lawyers: they differ very much.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That may be. But Dr. Saw is a highly esteemed physician, a man well liked, well known, and of recognised great ability; and Dr. Saw considered the signed statement a necessity. Again, let us take the case of Queensland. When legislation of this character was previously under discussion here, I heard Queensland held up as a model State, as the only State in Australia that dealt legally and effectively with prostitution, as the only State in Australia that provided for medical examination of prostitutes. I have heard statements of that kind made in this Chamber repeatedly. One would have thought that Queensland, which had adopted a measure of legalisation of this traffic longer than any other State of Australia, and later than Great Britain, would not have found it necessary only a few years ago to relinquish its legislation in regard to that matter. They have also found it necessary in Queensland, on account no doubt of the war, to do something to try and alleviate the suffering due to venereal disease, and in their

Health Act of 1916-17—since ours was passed—Section 161 provides that whenever a Commissioner has received a statement signed by a medical practitioner or other person in which shall be set forth the full name and address of the informant, that a person is suffering from venereal disease, and the Commissioner has reason to believe, from the evidence disclosed in the said statement, that the person named therein is suffering from such disease, he may give notice in writing to such person that such person shall consult a medical practitioner. This is a section of the Act of Queensland, a country that has been dealing with this question for years. They find it necessary to look after the young girls and women of their State, yet we are told that in Western Australia the right of the individual is nothing. We are told there is no necessity for a signed statement. Do hon. members realise the effect that an unjust accusation, without a signed statement, will have? There is no remedy. Do members realise the power we are placing in the hands of some people—power to some malicious person to ruin for all time the character and future prospects of any young woman in this State? I have been told on one or two occasions, "They will never do that; they will never take that action; they will never endeavour to force some person who is innocent to the indignity of being medically examined." They might not do it, but they are asking for the power: and we as members have only to consider the power we are giving, what we are conferring on persons if they desire to use the power. We have not to consider whether the Commissioner of Public Health will take certain action or not. We have not to consider whether he will take Bill Angwin by the scruff of the neck and send him to the detention hospital at Fremantle and keep him there for medical treatment or not. We have to consider the power we are giving persons to do this, and I am objecting to give that power. If the Commissioner will not exercise that power, he does not need it. We are told that the disease is rampant in Western Australia and the Commissioner was asked to quote certain cases. He gave evidence of one young girl at Midland Junction—Blackboy—who had infected six soldiers in one night. I dealt with that case just now; I do not intend to repeat it. The Commissioner was asked if he knew of more cases and he was able to find another one. Another young girl, of a decent family, whom it was thought was suffering from the disease. The Commissioner managed to get two out of the population of Western Australia. I want to draw members' attention to the fact of how statements of this kind, on repetition, are exaggerated. The Commissioner referred to this young girl at Midland Junction and also to a young woman who got married. They say it is necessary to get the Bill through, therefore they must frighten the people and make out the disease is worse than it really is, but I want to show members the exaggeration. Mrs. Cowan gave evidence before the Committee and she presumed, like others, to frighten the people into what I call a scandalous Act. This is the examination—

> In your capacity as justice of the children's court, you come across a good many cases of juvenile depravity on the part of girls?—Unquestionably, and of boys too.
>
> And in some cases I presume, there is evidence that those boys and girls are suffering from diseases?—We cannot prove it but we know they are.

What does Mrs. Cowan know about it? There was the evidence of Mr. Lovekin: he has proof in one case. But Mrs. Cowan said, "We cannot prove it but we know they are." One is inclined to say, "How the devil does she know?"

Mr. Munsie: Mr. Lovekin said he could tell by their eyes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have heard enough of that. That is the class of evidence we are asked to pass the Bill on. On a close perusal of the evidence it will be noticed that the ladies and gentleman who gave evidence against the Bill were subject to a great deal of cross-firing; it was more like a debate of three to one. This lady, Mrs. Cowan, whom I know very well, was in favour of the Bill; she was also in favour of a committee being appointed. She was very anxious that someone else should have a finger in the pie, and when she was questioned in regard to the Bill, and the Commissioner having power to act on his own, she said "No one will have any confidence in one man having such power." As far as I am personally concerned, I have more confidence even in the Commissioner, although I do not agree with his action, having the power, than that other persons should be placed on the board. They thought they would like to know what is going on. Some people are very anxious to go on the board. I come to the question of frightening people about something which does not exist. Here is some examination—

> The Commissioner has told us about one girl who is the centre of infection, who has infected scores of people, and who has admitted her state to the Commissioner.

It has gone from six to scores.

The Minister for Works: Very probably it would grow.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not say it is not probable but I defy anyone to say that the Commissioner made such a statement. No one can find it. He said there were six cases; now it has grown to scores, and very soon it would have got to thousands.

The Minister for Works: If she remained unchecked, it would soon get to thousands.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the Commissioner had done his duty he could have checked that case It is necessary to exaggerate to frighten people Who are the class of people suffering from this disease? As far as possible the Commissioner endeavoured to find out. Who are those who are spreading the disease? It would not be persons in society; that would be a matter of impossibility. It must be those who are working for their livelihood. One medical gentleman says—

> The professional prostitute has a reputation to conserve, a reputation for cleanliness and freedom from disease. The amateur prostitute, the street loiterer, the shop girl from 15 to 18 have not that feeling in mind at all.

Another slur cast on the shop girls, the working community. So far as the workers are concerned they are as innocent as any other section of the community.

Mr. Teesdale: It has all been explained.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: A person is condemned first and an explanation is made afterwards.

The Minister for Works: This disease does not respect classes.

Mr. Munsie: Why bring in classes at all.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Evidence was also given before the select committee by Mrs. Dugdale, a registered nurse, and if any person reads her evidence carefully, only one conclusion can

be arrived at, and it is that with a little tact no difficulty will be experienced in getting people suffering from venereal disease to seek medical attendance. Surely that should be sufficient. The whole trend of her evidence shows clearly that in every instance the infected girls with whom she came into contact agreed to seek medical advice. We are told that sometimes these people seek medical attendance but do not follow it up. It is necessary that we should have more drastic action to compel people to undergo treatment until cured. Dr. Officer also gave evidence. He is a well known medical practitioner in this State and he stated that he had found the Act to work satisfactorily and that he had had no trouble in inducing sufferers to continue treatment.

Mr. Teesdale: Those with whom he came into contact.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Is it not strange that Dr. Officer should be the only man to come into contact with those who want to continue treatment. Those people too must have paid for their own treatment. That shows clearly that there is no need for an alteration in the Act in that direction.

The Attorney General: Further along Dr. Officer states that it is difficult to get at these people without compulsory measures.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am giving the evidence as it appealed to Dr. Officer. Throughout this evidence if hon. members will read it, they will see that the questions which were put by the Chairman were all biassed.

Mr. Teesdale: It is unfair to accuse him of bias.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Reading the evidence through proves it. The Chairman asked Dr. Officer this question,—

> What class of people have you been dealing with; we are led to believe that the principal difficulty is not so much with the prostitute as with the amateur.

There were a lot of leading questions like that asked by the Chairman.

The Attorney General: All the questions were leading.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, leading and biassed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in accusing a select committee appointed by another place of bias.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Dr. Officer stated that the Act had worked satisfactorily. Hon. members fail to realise that we already have an Act in force which provides for compulsory measures, and Dr. Officer said of that Act that it had worked satisfactorily. The Bill before the House provides that signed statements need not be made.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is repeating himself with regard to signed statements.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have not yet dealt with the compulsory clauses. I merely wish to point out that Dr. Officer realised it was necessary to have some compulsory clauses in order to make the Act a success. These compulsory clauses are already in force and according to Dr. Officer, have worked satisfactorily.

Mr. Draper: He was simply referring to treatment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is compulsory treatment that we have at the present time. Compulsory clauses are necessary. If a man, after having been examined, fails to return for treatment, the doctor can report him, though not by name, to the Commissioner, and if he then fails to attend, the Commissioner can put the compulsory clauses into operation. As the Minister stated in introducing the Bill, it is a measure of great importance. I could keep hon. members as here until 7 o'clock in the morning dilating on the importance of the Bill. I only want to plead with hon. members to remove the danger from the innocent. That is all we want. Anyone making a complaint should have the courage to sign his name, and not leave the Commissioner of Public Health to bring accusations which he could not prove. The suspect should not be under liability to arrest for examination, should not be put to the indignity of having a slur cast upon him or her as the result of possible arrest. It is all very well to say that everything is done in darkness. From our experience to-night we know that very little can be done in the darkness. We ourselves had to adjourn. Immediately the police are called in to enforce the provisions of the Act, everyone in the district knows there is something wrong. The Commissioner said he sometimes has difficulty in ascertaining the addresses of certain persons whom he wishes to compulsorily examine owing to their failure to attend for treatment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is repeating himself.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have not previously referred to this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has been repeating himself for the last hour. I have allowed him a lot of latitude, but there is a limit.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have not previously spoken on this point. The Commissioner said he had difficulty in tracing a person who had been under medical attention and had failed to carry on the treatment. The police say they can always find such a man if required. It was pointed out that all that was done was merely to send out a notice, just as a notice is sent out to a person who has failed to pay his account to the public hospital. It was said that this was the only intimation any policeman would have. But the accounts sent out in connection with the public hospital go through a different office. There are two entirely separate departments; one is administered under the Public Health Commissioner by Mr. Milner, secretary to the Medical Department, while the other, which will deal with the Bill, is administered under the Commissioner by Mr. Huelin, secretary to the Health Department. They are two separate departments. Immediately a notice is sent out from the Health Department to the Police Department, it must be known. In any case the police would probably arrest the girl against whom the information was given, although perhaps on a false accusation.

The Attorney General: Did you say that the police would make a false accusation against her?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No. I say that the police might be acting on a false accusation. As soon as the message goes out from the Health Department asking for the address of some woman, the police know immediately what the matter is, what the person is wanted for; and if it be a young girl to be seen in the street talking to a soldier, and some person puts in a false accusation against her, in all probability the police would arrest her and charge her with loitering. They say they would not arrest without some knowledge. Well, there would be the knowledge straightaway. I beseech hon. members to give this matter full consideration. I ask them to realise the difficulties to be contended with. I realise that this is a disease which has been handed down for ages, that it is a terrible scourge affecting mankind all the world over, and I agree that we must do all we can in reason to combat it; but above all let us try our present Act with its compulsory clauses

just starting to provide free medical attention with a view to decreasing the ravages of the disease. I say let us give it a fair trial before we branch out along lines never yet tried in any part of the British Empire. I leave it to hon. members to consider the matter carefully. It is more serious than they realise. The difficulties are such that we have to watch carefully. I for one will never vote to cast upon a woman such a slur as will be cast upon many if the Bill becomes an Act. I ask hon. members to consider their votes carefully.

On motion by the Minister for Works debate adjourned.

House adjourned 10·53 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 9th April, 1918.

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

[For "Questions on Notice" and "Papers Presented" see "Minutes of Proceedings"]

BILL—VERMIN BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of committee adopted.

BILL—RABBIT ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; Hon. C. F. Baxter (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment to Section 21 of the principal Act:

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move an amendment—

"That all the words after 'twenty-one' in the first line be struck out and the following be inserted in lieu: "and Section 32 of the principal Act are hereby amended by substituting the words, "at the prescribed rate of £4 per centum per annum" in the former section, and for the words "at the rate of £5 per centum per annum" in the latter section."

The reason for the amendment is because of the alteration in the financial position. When the Act was framed five per cent. was considered a fair rate of interest, but at present the rate is much higher. I do not think it would be safe to prescribe any rate as we do not know what money will cost us in the future.

The CHAIRMAN: This, undoubtedly, should form the subject of a new clause. The amending Bill will have Clause 2 dealing with Section 32 of the Act and Clause 3 of the Bill dealing with Section 27 of the Act, a most unusual course. The amendment, however, is in order and as such I accept it.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I should like to know why Section 32 is referred to when the Bill we have before us refers to Section 21.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think that with very little trouble the suggestion offered by you, Sir, might be adopted, namely, to substitute a new clause. I am sure that this will meet with the wishes of the Honorary Minister. In that case all that will be necessary will be to amend Section 2 by inserting in lieu of the words "Six pounds per centum" the words "at the prescribed rate." A new clause could then be inserted to make a similar amendment to Section 32 of the principal Act. Section 21 provides for the rate of interest to be charged in connection with the purchase of wire netting, and Section 32 provides for a rate of interest of five per centum on debts incurred by the holder for work done in the extermination of the rabbits.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I suggest that the clause should be postponed and the Bill recommitted. Between now and that time a new clause could be drafted.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I desire to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I move an amendment—

"That in line 2 the words 'Six pounds per centum' be struck out and 'at the prescribed rate' inserted in lieu."

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Will that read with the original Clause 2?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 31:

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: According to the parent Act an owner can be reported to the Minister, and the Minister can demand that that person should appear before him and give his reasons for not carrying out the instructions issued by the inspector. The amendment does away with any opportunity the owner may have. An inspector will be able to give various instructions which it may not be possible to carry out. The owner will have no redress except by way of appeal to the same inspector. The original Act provides for the right of appeal to the Minister, and it is dangerous that we should take away that right.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Under the existing Act it is necessary when a person is summoned for that person to proceed all the way to Perth. The amendment will do away with that necessity. There is nothing in the amendment which will prevent an appeal being made to the Minister. It will be possible to make such an appeal. The only object of the amendment is to enable the Minister to proceed without dragging a person to the City.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: There is some force in the remarks of Mr. Hamersley, but if he looks carefully at the clause he will