

Legislative Assembly,*Tuesday, 13th September, 1910.*

	PAGE
Oath of Allegiance	695
Questions: Land Settlement, alleged corruption	695
Savings Bank Maximum Deposit	695
Railway Excess Fares	695
Railway Water Supply, Magnet-Sandstone	695
Public Servants and Defence Forces	695
Perth Tramways, Free Passes	696
Land Selection on Pastoral Leases	696
Repurchased Estate, Bowes	696
Bills: Licensing, Com.	718
Health, 2a., Com.	697

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

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

Mr. Hardwick (East Perth) took and subscribed the oath of allegiance to His Majesty King George V.

QUESTION—LAND SETTLEMENT, ALLEGED CORRUPTION.

Mr. ANGWIN (without notice) asked the Minister for Lands: Has the Minister's attention been drawn to a letter appearing in to-day's issue of the *West Australian* newspaper over the name of Henry Moore, vice-president of the Dallowallin Farmers' Progress Association, stating that corruption in regard to land settlement has been revealed to him, embracing, among others, some officials; will the Minister cause an inquiry to be made and report to the House the result of such inquiry with a view to removing the accusation thus made against the officials?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: My attention has been drawn to the letter and it has now been sent on to the Crown Solicitor.

QUESTION—SAVINGS BANK MAXIMUM DEPOSIT.

Mr. BATH asked the Treasurer: In view of the need for increased capital for Agricultural Bank and other purposes, will the restriction on the maximum amount of deposit in the Savings Bank on which interest is given to be waived?

The TREASURER replied: It is not considered necessary, at the present time, to alter the amount upon which interest is paid by the Savings Bank.

QUESTION—RAILWAY EXCESS FARES.

Mr. GILL asked the Minister for Railways: What was the total amount of excess fares collected at the barriers of the Perth railway station during the months of June, July, and August of last year? Also the amount collected during the same three months of the present year?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, £184 2s. 10d.; 2, £119 4s. 5d.

QUESTION — RAILWAY WATER SUPPLY, MAGNET-SANDSTONE.

Mr. BROWN asked the Minister for Works: What is the amount expended on water supply in connection with the Mt. Magnet and Sandstone Railway?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: £12,326 11s. 1d.

QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVANTS AND DEFENCE FORCES.

Mr. TROY asked the Premier: 1, Is the Premier aware that efforts have been made by certain officials in the Prisons Department to compel men under their control to leave the Federal defence forces? 2, What reasons, if any, are given by such officers for their attempt to interfere with State employees serving the Defence Department during their own time? 3, Has any appeal been made to the Government against this official attempt to deprive men of their rights as citizens, and if so, what reply has been made to such appeal? 4, Are the Government in favour of allowing all State employees, in common with other citizens, facilities for serving in the defence forces, provided such service does not interfere with their duty to the department in which they are employed?

The PREMIER replied: 1 and 2, The exigencies of the prison service necessitated the Comptroller General of Prisons requesting the resignation from the Defence Force of two warders employed in the Fremantle prison, as it interfered with their duties as warders. 2, One of the two warders affected by the instructions did make a request for reconsideration of the matter. His request was refused by the Colonial Secretary, after conferring with the State Commandant, who reported that he had no hesitation in granting this, or any other warder, a free discharge, as he could readily see that the nature of the two duties must clash. 4, Yes. The Commonwealth Government, however, have recognised the difficulties attending the disciplinary staff of prisons, and the amending Defence Bill provides, *inter alia*, for the exemption from service of persons employed in the police or prison service, etc.

QUESTION—PERTH TRAMWAYS, FREE PASSES.

Mr. TROY asked the Premier: What members of the public service, viz., the Police Department, the judiciary, and magistracy, in the metropolitan areas hold free passes from the Perth Tramways Company?

The PREMIER replied: The following officers travel free on the lines of the Perth Electric Tramways:—The Police Magistrate, Commissioner of Police, Superintendent of Police, officers of the metropolitan division, members of the force when on duty.

QUESTION—LAND SELECTION ON PASTORAL LEASES.

Mr. TROY asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is the Minister aware that one application for land on Thompson's Flat, north of the Murchison River, has been refused because notice to the pastoral lessees had not been issued? 2, As settlement is rapidly approaching the Murchison River and will soon seek to penetrate the Gascoyne, is it proposed to issue the custom-

ary twelve months' notice to the pastoral lessees whose holdings lie immediately north of the Murchison River? 3, Is the Minister taking any steps to find out the area of land adapted for agricultural settlement north of that river? 4, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, No. 2, Notices of resumption have already been issued to the lessees referred to. 3, Yes. 4, Answered by No. 3.

REPURCHASED ESTATE, BOWES.

Question.

Mr. TROY asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Was any area of land resumed of the Bowes estate at about from eight to 10 years ago for closer settlement purposes? 2, If so, how many acres, and what compensation did the Government pay the owners for the land resumed? 3, How many acres of land first resumed are now included in the last repurchase by the Government? 4, Is the vendor allowed to retain any portion of the estate; if so, how much and what part? 5, Excluding the portion which Mr. Burges has retained, if any, what proportion of the 35,000 acres included in the repurchase was under crop? 6, Is the Minister aware that the aggregation of large estates, with a view to selling them at a large profit to the Government for closer settlement, is being systematically entered upon as a business by certain persons? 7, What steps does the Minister intend to take to put an effective stop to this practice?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Yes, land held under pastoral lease. 2, About 25,000 acres. The sum of £2,113 9s. 8d. was paid for improvements on the land in question. 3, About 5,373 acres. 4, Yes, 5,000 acres around the homestead was not included in the late purchase. 5, About 300 acres. 6, No. 7, Answered by No. 6.

Return.

On motion by Mr. TROY, ordered: "That there be laid on the Table of the House a return showing the names of

those persons under whose names portions of the Bowes estate were held prior to the late repurchase by the Government; how long such land was held, and the acreage under each name; when applied for, and the name of the officials who passed the improvements; also whether the improvements and fencing conditions were carried out."

BILL—HEALTH.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 8th September.

Mr. HEITMANN (Cue): I rise to address myself to this subject with a certain amount of diffidence because I realise that the principles rendering necessary the introduction of the Bill are of the greatest possible importance to the people of the country. Indeed it appears to me the Bill is of far more importance than any we have had or are likely to have this session. At the outset I may say I intend to support the Bill because I believe it is necessary; and I trust it will not meet the fate that has befallen the Health Bill on several occasions—I trust its passage through this and the other Chamber will be facilitated in every possible way. I welcome the Bill because it is giving to the officers in whose hands its administration will be placed the greater powers that, after their experience of many years, they consider necessary. Personally I would be prepared to give almost unlimited powers to a Government when dealing with health matters; but at the same time I would like also to inquire as to who shall be entrusted with the administration of these health matters. I am inclined to think that in the past the officers to whom the health affairs of the State were left have been satisfied with merely sitting in the office and seeing, in a mechanical kind of way, that the various provisions of the Act were complied with. I am afraid that in the past both the Government and the Health Department have failed to fully appreciate the proper functions of such a department. After all, perhaps one cannot blame the officers of the department, for they have carried out their instructions and performed the

work deemed necessary by the Ministerial heads and by Parliament itself. In discussing this question I do not refer to any particular Minister or any particular Government. The conditions which have existed in the past seem to me to have been the result of want of appreciation on the part of various Ministers, Governments, and Parliaments. But while not blaming these officers for what seems to me to be a very loose method of dealing with public health, I certainly think it is a matter for extreme regret that on the part of our Health Department we have had so little initiative in the past. There has been but little effort indeed on the part of the Health Department to get out of the groove—and it is a very old groove indeed which seems to have been worn by lack of knowledge on the part of the administration as to the true functions of a health department, not only on the part of the officers, but, as I have said, on the part of Ministers, Governments, and Parliaments also. In dealing with health generally that degree of importance to which it is entitled has not been accorded to it by members of this Chamber or by members of various Governments. This can be borne out by the fact that the Act under which we are now working is about 20 years old. At all events, while the Act is not 20 years old, when it was passed in 1898 its provisions were, I believe, copied from a Victorian Act which was some 10 years old at the time. I have noticed on more than one occasion that there seems to be very little initiative on the part of the Minister controlling these matters and on the part of the officers themselves; and while perhaps the officers have not been called upon by the Ministers to make any great progress—rather have they been allowed to follow the old lines—I certainly think an enthusiast in health matters could have suggested many useful improvements to the Minister; and I feel sure the Minister, the Government, and Parliament would place no obstacle in the way of carrying out the necessary reforms. The Bill before us contains provisions of all descriptions. It is a Bill of 306 clauses, to say nothing of as many, if not more, subclauses: and one would

imagine that these provisions, so extensive, would provide all the power necessary for an up-to-date Health Department to bring about an ideal state in public health matters. But the provisions in the Bill are by no means new; I think almost every provision before us has been or is being tried by one or other of the Australian States or by New Zealand; but with all the legislation that has been tried in Australia we still have enthusiastic sanitarians, men high up in the medical profession who have made a particular study of sanitary work, who agree that the progress which they anticipated has not been made. They do not complain of the want of assistance on the part of Parliaments; generally speaking they do not want for up-to-date legislation, and they have power to go further if they are so inclined; but still we have these complaints and they are forced to admit we have not made the progress in public health matters which they anticipated. Almost every phase of life which can be misused or abused in any way that will depreciate the value of individuals to the State is being legislated for or is coming under laws of various descriptions, and I am inclined to think at times that all the legislation we have is somewhat in advance of the education of those who have to live under it. I fancy at times we fail to recognise, or rather there is one thing we will have to recognise sooner or later, in dealing with legislation treating with public health or laying down a system to treat with matters pertaining to public health; and that is that no matter how good our legislation may be and no matter how perfect the administration may be, 75 per cent. of the efforts which are necessary in order that we may attain an ideal standard of public health must come from the people themselves. All our laws, particularly those in connection with health matters, are treating with the public side of the individual only; and it appears to me that, after all, the conditions which affect the people mostly are the conditions prevailing in their own homes and in the places where they spend the greater part of their time—that is, speaking of the population generally.

While we are enforcing laws in a public way, forcing people to do certain things, it appears to me useless to endeavour to educate the people by force only. The person who adopts hygienic habits of living because he has been forced to do so is likely to go back upon those hygienic habits when the force is reduced. This appears to me to be the weak spot in legislation and in administration and in the fight generally for public health; and, as I said previously, it has been recognised by medical men who have studied sanitary science that there is something lacking, and that they cannot attain those ends which they set out for. It appears to me that this failure on the part of the powers to recognise the importance of the individual, or the importance of the efforts of the individual which are necessary, is the weak spot in all matters dealing with public health. The real fight must be by the people themselves. It is of no use making laws and bringing in legislation, no matter how drastic it may be, if we cannot at the same time educate the people up to that standard which will enable them to see the necessity for this legislation. Even in the last report of the Medical Department, the Principal Medical Officer has stated that greater efforts would be made by the people. As a matter of fact in all matters dealing with health and hospitals throughout the State, Dr. Hope, backed by the Ministry, has laid down the principle that as much as possible of the responsibility in health matters should be laid upon the people themselves. Only now is under discussion in various parts of the State the decision of the Health Department to endeavour to enforce committees in various parts of the country—all through the country as a matter of fact—to take over the management and a good share of the financial responsibility of our hospitals. In dealing with infectious diseases, for instance, Dr. Hope admits that it is almost useless or impossible to make a great amount of progress unless the people themselves are prepared to join in. I will admit that at once, because, as I stated, I think the greatest effort has to come from the people them-

selves; but how is it possible to even expect from the population of this country something about which they know very little? It appears to me one could set up the same standard in regard to education. We might issue regulations requiring that at the age of 10 every boy and girl in the State should pass a certain examination or be of a certain standard of education, while at the same time not providing teachers or schools to bring about that result. Just in the same way we are expecting—and we know it must come—a certain amount of effort from the people in health matters, and we have not even given them the knowledge which is necessary for them to perform these functions. There is not the slightest doubt that in regard to hygienic matters the people generally are very ignorant. One has not even to go to the average person to find this out; because medical sanitarians who have taken a vast interest in this business and who have made public health a life study, even they tell us that medical men are paying very little attention to hygiene, that is, preventive medicines. It is, indeed, most interesting to read the remarks of one of the ablest sanitarians in New Zealand—I think he is the best in New Zealand and one of the ablest in the Commonwealth—and he points out very clearly that medical men, to whom after all we must look for this education, seem to have more thought for performing—in the case of a surgeon—some delicate operation than for the question of preventing the necessity for the operation. As I say, it is interesting to read the remarks of the head of the New Zealand Health Department upon this particular question in a paper read before a conference of medical men which sat in Melbourne two years ago. I understand that the leading medical men from all parts of Australia were present. The paper is entitled "Side lights on the work of a health officer." Among other things it says—

One of the first things that strikes an apostle of sanitation is this, that the medical profession, no less than the public, has altered front

in a most remarkable fashion during these latter years. A surgeon, while he agrees that prevention is always far better even than his cure, is more interested in removing your appendix, which has become irritated because of a piece of enamel from a pie-dish, than in seeing that pie-dishes are enamelled in a manner that will permit of some security of tenure of the enamel. He will study how to remove your gall bladder in the most approved manner with greater zest than he will to prevent the necessity of the operation. I have no fault to find with my brethren on the surgical side but, after all, you and I would rather conserve our gall bladder, if at the same time we could keep our health, than give these expert surgeons an opportunity of showing their skill in removing offending oddments.

This was written by a man high up in the profession, and occupying a prominent position in the medical world generally. When we see this and find that the medical men themselves are not giving the subject of preventive medicine that degree of consideration that is necessary we can ask ourselves how is it possible for the community in general, for the people themselves, to appreciate hygiene and the methods of healthy living. As well as bringing forward legislation, as well as giving greater powers to our medical officers to do a lot more in the matter of educating the people, we should take steps to bring about a better state of affairs. On this particular phase of the question we have done but very little. It has been said that the medical men have done a great deal. It is true that some have done a good deal, but when one considers that the medical men are practically the only ones with the necessary knowledge, it can be understood that the proportion of ability falling to the people themselves must necessarily be very small. In the study of public health we fail to recognise that, I believe, 95 per cent. of bad health is the result of bad habits. If this is so, if most of our evils can be prevented, why then cannot we, as a Parliament, introduce measures

and take steps which will give to the people that education which is so necessary for the prevention of illness? Civilisation appears to have brought with it a good deal of ignorance in regard to health matters. As an example of this take the houses in which the people live; take this Chamber itself. Why, even here the building is built so that there is neither ventilation nor proper light, and we have to adopt artificial means of lighting the Chamber, even when the sun is shining. When we consider that the vast majority of people live in homes which are badly ventilated, and very many of which are bad from a sanitary standpoint, it can easily be understood that, until the time comes when we can educate the people as to the proper methods of living, it will be almost impossible to get them to assist in bringing about an ideal state of public health. The Bill includes many provisions, and it would be almost impossible for one to deal with the various and extensive divisions of it. There are 306 clauses, and as many, if not more, subclauses. I have endeavoured to show that, notwithstanding the 306 clauses and the many subclauses, unless the Government, through the Health Department, adopt a different attitude they will find a comparatively small advance in the direction of public health. One matter dealt with is that of the sale of drugs, while another is the registration of nurses. Again, we have clauses dealing with the distribution and sale of milk, and others controlling the examination of food. There is very short reference to the health of school children. There are provisions dealing also with the various trades of the State. A remark which fell from the member for Brown Hill interested me greatly, and made me realise that the time has arrived for members of this Chamber to take it upon themselves to discuss what are sometimes termed delicate questions. The hon. member mentioned the reluctance upon the part of certain people, and undoubtedly there are hundreds and thousands of them in Australia, to take upon themselves the responsibilities following upon married life. I did intend

to deal with the various stages of life from birth upwards, but it seems to me that it is necessary for one to go back even further than that. There are certain provisions in the Bill dealing with drugs. In connection with this conduct on the part of very many people in refusing to accept the responsibilities following upon married life, I regret to say that they are encouraged to take such means to avoid those responsibilities by the advertisements in the most respectable newspapers of the State, in which mention is made of various means which may be used to avoid them. It is necessary that the members of this Assembly should throw off, as far as possible, a good deal of mock modesty which has been shown at times, and discuss this question as man to man. It is a well-known fact that this state of things does exist to a great extent, and what are the results? Married people discover that, either through their love of pleasure or for other reasons, they have no desire to accept the responsibilities which have been provided for them, and which are intended, by nature, and they adopt means of prevention. The result is that hundreds and thousands of cases—as medical men can tell us—occur where suffering has been enforced upon the people to a very great extent in after life. As a matter of fact it often results in many women becoming confirmed invalids for the rest of their lives, and if it does not go that far the effects of the adoption of prevention are shown on either the person herself or possibly, and very probably, upon the offspring of later years. That is one stage. Then one can go further and find that other steps are taken, and these also are advertised very freely in respectable newspapers right through the States. It has been frequently found by those pleasure-loving people that at times it is necessary not to prevent but to cure, and in many cases it is nothing more nor less than straight-out murder. There are men who seem to be like ulcers upon the earth, men who are ready to trade upon the want of knowledge of the consequences upon the part of these

people, and who for a few paltry pounds are ready to lend themselves to assisting these persons to carry out their intentions. So it goes on and the same results accrue. Medical men could tell us of hundreds of cases of women in Perth who are suffering to-day from what they have done in the past in this particular direction.

Mr. George: Do not some medical men assist in these practices.

Mr. HEITMANN: I would not say that, although it has been discovered on rare occasions that there are medical men who engage in these practices; but, generally speaking, in this particular direction, the medical men have a high standard of honour. The evil exists, and occasionally we find medical men assisting in it. That does not lessen the crime either on the part of the principals or on the part of the medical men or others who assist. The results are dreadful. The organs of women become injured to an extent that their lives afterwards are made one long day of pain and injury to themselves, their husbands, and those in close touch with them, and often, possibly, in fact probably, the child which has escaped will suffer in after life from the effects of this inhuman treatment. It is to be hoped that in this portion of the Bill stringent measures will be adopted and the Government will recognise that in discouraging matters of this kind they cannot go too far. All members will support them to prevent the evil which is going on daily in our midst, and which many people in power and in high public positions are thoroughly aware of. It would be interesting indeed for this Chamber to have read to them the report of the gentleman commissioned by the Federal Government to inquire into this very question, and it is a great pity that, even although the report might be deemed to be so strong or so bristling with crime as to make it inadvisable to send it out to the general public, the various Parliaments in Australia should not have been supplied with copies of it, as members would have benefited considerably by considering it when deliberating upon health matters. Then we

come along to the provision for the saving of life. There is provision contained in the Bill for the registration of midwives, and this is undoubtedly something which is very necessary indeed in Western Australia. After one has travelled about the country, and particularly in the back blocks of Western Australia, and not exempting even Perth itself, one is not surprised to find the high rate of mortality among women during the period of confinement. Personally, I am surprised that it is not even greater. We are providing that midwives shall be registered, but I trust that the Government will alter this provision somewhat so that the Bill will raise the standard of the nursing profession. In providing for only six months' training, the Government are going in a direction which is entirely opposite to that followed in the Eastern States and New Zealand. The latter country is supposed to be right up-to-date in regard to these matters, and, as we are copying so much of the Bill from the New Zealand legislation, it might be beneficial to copy that portion also which will have the effect of raising the standard of nursing rather than lowering it. I have been informed within the last day or two that the scheme which is being put forward by Lady Dudley provides for the very highest standard of nursing, and I find that it is the standard adopted by the A.T.N.A., which I am led to believe is one of the highest in the world. At the present time on account of our interest in these matters, we have gone along without taking action of any kind. We appear to have thought that as long as the population was increasing at a fair rate, that ought to be sufficient. As a matter of fact we in Western Australia at the present time, with all the booming we are giving the country, are far behind many other places in the world in connection with maternity matters. Viewing the great disadvantages under which the female portion of our population labour, it is just about time that we took into consideration the equipping of a thoroughly up-to-date Government maternity home. This is a matter which is receiv-

ing some little attention just now, but I am sorry to say that the Government are not, to my way of thinking, doing their duty, but are leaving it to a few outside individuals to carry on this work. It appeals to me as a work which is essential, and which belongs to the Government, and I sincerely hope that before long the many disadvantages under which our women folk labour will be removed, and that in Perth we shall have an up-to-date maternity hospital. It would surprise members of this Chamber to learn the great difference there is between the rate of mortality in this State and in other parts of the world. This, in itself, proves how necessary it is that there should be a maternity hospital. Not only would this give accommodation to the poor people and to those people who very often cannot afford to pay the high fees asked at some of the institutions, but it would be the means of educating the mother of the child and providing the necessary education for the midwives. Unless we have some scheme of this description it will be impossible to attain that high standard in the nursing profession, among the midwifery section at all events, which is desired. In New Zealand they found that it was necessary—and there, as I have stated, they have some of the finest sanatoria in Australasia—to build maternity homes, and at the present time one exists in each of the principal cities, and the latest reports show that some 1,222 mothers have been accommodated there, and that the results have been highly satisfactory, together with the fact that the mortality rate since their establishment has been lower than it was before when the patients were treated outside. Next comes the question in connection with which there is some provision in this Bill, that of the milk supply. Here again this affects the individual very much indeed. We very often find a great reluctance on the part of a mother to give the child its natural food, and I regret to say in Western Australia, as much as in every other part of the world, this reluctance appears to be on the increase. Here again is an indication of the ignorance of the people with regard to health matters,

and I must confess it is an ignorance which is due to the fact that there are so many women who decline to take upon themselves their responsibilities on account of their love of pleasure. Thus owing to their inability to accept the position as they find it, these mothers are forced to give their children artificial food. Then comes the question of adulteration, which is being dealt with by the State. I am led to believe that infantile mortality in this State is largely due to these adulterated foods, and foods which are far from being of the highest standard. As we know, the most common food used is cows' milk, and, as everyone knows, in administering it to infants the greatest possible care should be taken. It is not only necessary that we should provide the power to inspect dairies, but we should also have officers who should be enthusiastic with regard to health matters, and willing to carry out their duties in the best possible way. Up to the present time I am afraid we have paid but little attention indeed to the question of the inspection of milk and dairies: It is not so long ago—two years I think—since the only officer who was in charge of this particular branch of the Health Department was transferred from the Health Department to the Stock Department, and now we have it that while one branch of the department is being administered by the health authorities, another branch, the inspection of stock, is being dealt by another department altogether. I find in this Bill that the local bodies in various parts of the State are allowed to make their own by-laws, and it appears to me that the Government should see that the department in charge of health matters should make the rules and regulations for the inspection and control of dairies, and the distribution of milk generally throughout the State. This is a matter which we cannot leave to any Tom, Dick, or Harry who may happen to be appointed a health officer by a local body, and whose qualifications for the position of inspector may be simply that he may have a friend on that local body. As far as my knowledge goes in the back part of this State, I refer to my particular district the Murchison, very

little attention has been paid to the question of the milk supply and there exists there ample opportunity to those vending the milk to adulterate it in any way that they may desire. In a matter of this kind we should see that the best inspection possible is made and there should be the greatest control over the distribution of the milk in order to do away with one of the causes responsible for the high rate of infantile mortality. Then we come to another provision in the Bill dealing with the inspection of State school children. All I can see in the measure in this respect is the one clause which provides that a medical man or an officer of the health department may examine State school children. This is a matter which has received a lot of attention in other parts of the world. In Tasmania they have a thoroughly up-to-date inspection and examination of school children. They have a medical branch of the Education Department which appeals to me as being most necessary. It is true that in this State we have made spasmodic examinations of State school children, but, as Dr. Hope points out in his report, that owing to their being so much work in the laboratory of the department at some period of the last year covered by his report it was found impossible to continue this work as desired. This is a question that should receive far more consideration at the hands of the Government. Although recognising that a great deal of good can be done by the inspection of school children, we allow it to go and say, "Oh, it will be found out in later life, or if it is not found out it will not matter a great deal." Not only is the child when he starts to go to school a victim of the ignorance of his own parents, but he is subject also to the ignorance of the parents of many hundreds of children attending the same school. Among the various matters that require attention in connection with the inspection of school children, the most important is the testing of sight and hearing, and, not only should inspectors examine thoroughly every school child who can be got at in the State, but he should see when he detects that something is wrong with any particular child, that not only the parents of the child

were notified but he should see also that the child was treated for what illness it might be suffering from. At present on the detection of an ailment we simply send a note stating that such and such a thing is wrong. I think it is time the Government considered the question of providing for a medical branch of the Education Department. And not only should they go this far, but in order that the children might be treated for and cured of their various ailments we should also provide hospitals for such purposes. Seeing that the sight and the hearing are two great contributing causes to the disabilities of children, I do not think it would be out of the way to expect that facilities should be provided for the special treatment of eyes and ears at the Children's Hospital or the Perth Public Hospital. When a boy leaves school he goes into one of the various avenues of employment. Perhaps he enters a factory. As we know, the conditions obtaining in some factories in this country are anything but good. Dr. Hope, in his brief report, states that the factories in Perth have been inspected at least once in every three months. In my opinion that is altogether too long a period to be allowed to elapse between the inspections. These places are unhealthy, some of them are badly ventilated, and in many the conditions do not tend to the health of those working therein. Possibly the boy might go into an office, where almost the same thing applies. Owing to want of knowledge youths are enclosed in offices under conditions anything but hygienic, offices badly ventilated, badly lighted and constituting a menace to the health of the clerks. If a boy goes into one of our mines the same conditions apply, perhaps even in a much higher degree. Our mines are unhealthy, and, as I know, we have many hundreds in the State who are suffering from the effects of having followed that employment. If the boy goes into that most respectable of callings, bank clerking, he finds himself encumbered by regulations such as should not be allowed in any self-respecting community; one in particular

which forces him to lead a life of celibacy during the greater portion of his time on earth. In many cases we find this is so. While we deal with legislation only and forget that owing to their want of knowledge the people themselves are not in a position to assist the officers of the department I think we shall never gain that degree of efficiency, that high standard of health, which is desired. It is a well known fact that the knowledge of health matters which exists amongst the people is of a very low standard indeed. In the Bill itself one principle seems to overshadow all the rest. I refer to the administration of the measure. Just now I will only briefly touch upon it, because I will have an opportunity when in Committee of further dealing with the question of whether the measure shall be administered by a board or by a Department of Public Health having at its head a Minister of the Crown. After considering all phases of the question I have come to the conclusion that, owing to the fact that the Central Board of Health has been to a great extent separated from direct control of a Minister, and also from Parliament itself, we have not had that degree of efficiency in the administration of various matters which one would like to see. On looking up the Health Acts of the various States I find that in New Zealand they have a Department of Health. There is no board there to deal with. From the New Zealand Act, which is administered by a chief medical officer directly under a Minister, we have copied a great many clauses of the Bill, and I think it would be wise if the Government went further and adopted the New Zealand system of administration. In Queensland also, they have a Department of Health, the official head being the commissioner of health. In New South Wales there is found almost precisely the same system; for while they have a chief medical officer and a board, it appears to me the board is an advisory board only with very little powers. In Tasmania, which has but recently founded a Health Department, or at all events a live one, that department comes directly under a Ministerial head. Instead of having

what we have had in the past, namely a lukewarm interest displayed by the Minister and the Government generally, I think it would be advisable if an amendment were moved providing for the establishment of a department of Health. At the same time I hope the Government will in the near future see the wisdom of appointing a Minister for Health. I feel sure that, being a lover of his country, trying to get the best he could for the people, endeavouring to obtain the highest possible standard of public health, such a Minister would find any amount to do in that new department. An alteration sadly needed in the Bill would be effected by striking out the words "Central Board of Health" and substituting "Department of Public Health." In conclusion I would say there are contained in the Bill many details which are new to us although not new in other parts of the world. We will have an opportunity of discussing these when in Committee, and I trust the Government will see that the measure becomes law this session, and will not be again condemned to the scrap-heap, as it has been for the last five or six years.

Mr. WALKER (Kanowna): I desire to emphasise the concluding remarks of the last speaker. The chief feature of an objectionable nature occurring in the Bill is the extensive power to be centred in the central board, apparently without responsibility. The board has power to destroy our houses, to enter unbidden and at all times into our dwellings, to interfere with almost every building in the State, to deal with our streets and highways, to go to the remotest parts of the State and act with uncontrolled, unrevisable authority, to over-ride any local board, to insist on local boards raising rates upon the property in their districts, to cancel the resolutions of the local boards, to appoint officers upon those local boards, to dismiss officers, and in fact to countermand whatever orders a local board may issue, or to impose any orders of the central board itself upon the local boards; and that apparently without any Ministerial responsibility. I will frankly admit it is necessary, if you

are to deal with health matters as these matters should be dealt with, that the board or the department should have extensive authority. But in order that we may see that these powers are not abused we must have responsibility somewhere; we must be able from our places in the House to fix upon those who should bear it the penalty of any excess or any indiscretion in the exercise of the powers conferred by this measure. And we should go further, especially when we are putting into the hands of this central board all the local boards of the State. We should make the central body more explicit in its interferences. I will quote a few samples—not the only ones which occur in the Bill—of that indefiniteness which in itself seriously suggests irresponsibility. Clause 176 reads—

Any person who (1) sells, offers, or delivers for sale, keeps or has in his possession for sale, or supplies to any person—(a) impure or unwholesome milk . . . ; (b) milk drawn from animals within 30 days before or five days after parturition; or (2) uses any such milk for human consumption, . . . — and (5)—and this is the point I wish to draw attention to—allows any person suffering from any infectious or contagious disease to (a) milk any animal, . . .

Now who is to decide whether a person is suffering from an infectious or contagious disease?

The Minister for Mines: Read the last paragraph in the same clause.

Mr. WALKER: You mean this—

It shall be no defence to any prosecution under this section that the owner did not know that the animal was diseased, or that the person was suffering from an infectious disease, unless he shall also show that it was not practicable to discover the fact by the exercise of reasonable diligence.

Who is going to take that responsibility? It is not alone infectious diseases; but contagious diseases are brought into the category. We have no means of getting at the fact. There should be some officer who is responsible for the ascertainment that the person employed by

a dairy-keeper is suffering from some infectious disease. Who among laymen will undertake that responsibility? I do not think the Minister would like to shoulder a responsibility of that kind. What I am objecting to is that these provisions—there are more than one in the Act—are likely to render the Act a dead-letter. We are filling our statute-book with laws that are useless. As a matter of fact, to illustrate what I am saying, we have already upon our statute-book Acts of Parliament which cover in a very large measure all we are providing for here; but they have never been put into operation, no good has come of having these Acts on our statute-book, we have never been able to apply them, and so we are likely to have these clauses absolutely useless so far as any benefit to the public is concerned.

The Minister for Mines: This has been on the statute-book for a long time.

Mr. WALKER: That is what I say; it is a dead-letter; and that is the objectionable feature. If we are to improve our law, make it practicable. What is the good of repeating what the Minister now admits has been a dead-letter?

The Minister for Mines: I did not say so; I simply said it has been on the statute-book.

Mr. WALKER: Exactly; and it has been a dead-letter; it has never been enforced—the hon. member cannot give me an instance of it—and is, I repeat, filling our statute-book with what is of no utility as far as public benefit is concerned.

The Minister for Mines: I do not think you would move to strike out that provision at any rate.

Mr. WALKER: We want some amendment to make someone responsible for taking the step of deciding who is suffering from infectious or contagious diseases. The same difficulty occurs in Clause 191. No person who is suffering from any contagious or infectious disease shall engage or be employed in the manufacture, manipulation, preparation, handling, storing, or sale of food or drugs; and then in Subclause 2 it says, "the medical officer may examine any person so employed who is supposed to

be suffering from any infectious or contagious disease." Now, I have no hesitation in saying that if this be left to the medical officer of the local board it will never be done. The responsibility should be on the Government medical officer.

The Minister for Mines: That is the medical officer under the Bill. The inspector would report, the medical officer would examine, and if the man was found to be suffering from this disease he would be removed.

Mr. WALKER: There is a distinction between the Government medical officer and the medical officers of the local boards, and we want to fix the responsibility on the right head. However, it is true these are not matters that cannot be amended in Committee; but by these illustrations I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we want to be exceedingly careful in making this measure a practicable measure so that we can carry it out, and we want above all things to make the administration of this Act come within the sphere of ministerial responsibility. Under this Bill the Minister is almost eliminated. True, there are some powers given to him; true he can at times override the central board and at times even co-operate with them; and some duties are imposed upon him in connection with the administration of the Act; but the board is practically independent of ministerial supervision, it practically is a board altogether outside the sphere of government. This is the delegated style of administration to which I have repeatedly taken objection in this Chamber and to which I intend to object when the Bill enters upon the Committee stage. We have in our previous Health Acts, in our previous legislation upon foods and adulteration, and in our medical acts, etcetera, nearly all, practically, that we find in this Bill; but we are met at this stage with the necessity for re-enactment—why? Because we have not had ministerial activity enough supervising the Health Department of this State. We have not really had a Health Department in this State. What we require is

not so much all these sections put upon paper and printed, as activity in administration, impartial administration of our health laws, a vitality in attention to duties in these particulars. That is really what we require; and for the purpose, therefore, of making this a practical Act and of fixing responsibility for its administration in a proper quarter, I trust we shall amend the Bill in Committee, so as to make this not an independent board of health—I mean, independent of ministerial responsibility—but a ministerial department presided over by the Minister, making the Minister responsible for its complete, active and just administration.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret): I must admit I have not gone through this voluminous Bill with the care that is necessary to enable one to make himself acquainted with its various stages. I notice that provisions have been taken from Health Acts of most of the States of the Commonwealth and from the Health Act of the Dominion of New Zealand. There are 136 clauses containing provisions already in operation in other portions of the Commonwealth and in New Zealand. There are 10 clauses taken holubolus from the New South Wales Act of 1902; there are 11 clauses taken from the South Australian Act of 1899; there are 41 clauses copied from the New Zealand Act of 1900; and there are 74 clauses taken from the Queensland Act of 1900; making in all 136 clauses copied from various Acts in the Commonwealth and New Zealand. I hope the Minister in charge of the Bill will be able to tell us how these clauses will apply in Western Australia and suit our conditions. I daresay he has gone into that phase of the question. There are 306 clauses in the Bill and some clauses have up to 20 subclauses, so that the measure is indeed far-reaching. It reaches nearly every person, irrespective of where he or she lives, or irrespective of avocations. I hope the House will deal with this measure liberally, more so than was done to the Health Bill brought down four or five years ago. To show the irony of fate, the Minister now in charge of this Bill was

one of those who sat in Opposition when a Bill of a similar character dealing with public health was brought down; and it would be interesting to see the *Hansard* record of the attitude the present Minister took up towards that measure. It was indeed hostile from the start, and the member who represents Menzies had a select committee on the Bill. It must be refreshing to the hon. member that the Opposition have not adopted that plan towards this Bill, have not adopted the plan of party politics on a public health matter.

The Minister for Mines: It has been to a select committee two or three times since.

Mr. TAYLOR: And there is no reason why it should not go through another—for party purposes; but the Opposition are not taking that view of the case so far as I know. No member of the Opposition who has spoken to the second reading has indicated anything of that character, showing that there is a genuine desire on the part of the Opposition that the public health laws should be put in some sort of shape suitable to the State. I hope when we are in Committee the Minister will be able to give the information that will enable us to deal with the subjects on their merits, so that we can make a workable measure of the Bill. I have certain faults to find with it. I believe it has no right to include general nursing. I think that is a matter for a Bill by itself. I fail to see how on earth the general nursing system of any State has much to do with public health. I dare say there is some justification for that portion of the Bill dealing with midwifery, though I am not clear upon that point; but so far as general nursing is concerned, I believe it should not be dealt with, or at any rate in the manner in which this Bill deals with it.

Mr. Angwin: That part is copied from the English Act.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not aware of that, but apparently the Bill is largely copied. When in Committee I will move to strike out Clause 256, and insert in place thereof a clause more equitable to nurses. I have been approached with

regard to this matter by nurses who have pointed out the injustice of the clause so far as they are concerned. They desire to have representation on the Nurses' Registration Board.

Mr. Heitmann: That has been promised.

Mr. TAYLOR: At the time they spoke to me no promise had been made. They desire that the board should consist of two matrons, an honorary practitioner from the hospital training school, the president of the Central Board of Health, and one medical man appointed by the Minister, as proposed in the Bill. Under the clause it is suggested that the board shall consist of three members, the president of the Central Board of Health, to be the chairman of the board, and two medical practitioners to be appointed by the Governor for a term not to exceed three years, and to be eligible for re-appointment. When one remembers that this board has to set up a standard of nursing, it must surely be admitted that there should be nurses upon it for they are the most capable to set up that standard. I hope the Minister will not object to give the nurses representation on the board.

The Minister for Mines: The Minister controlling the department proposes to agree to an amendment in that direction.

Mr. TAYLOR: That is very satisfactory. It will be necessary for us, therefore, to alter Clause 256 in Committee. So far as the nurses are concerned the question of examination is not nearly so important as that of the personnel of the board which will set up the standard. Once the standard is set up the examination does not matter so much to the profession. Medical men cannot know the standard that should be set up for nursing or at all events not nearly so well as trained nurses, who have reached the highest positions in the profession, such as hospital matrons of years standing. I hope the Minister will let us know the nature of his amendment so that, if it does not go far enough, I shall be able to place a proposed further amendment on the Notice Paper. I always think that all amendments should, where possible, be

placed on the Notice Paper, so that members might know what is coming forward. There are other matters relating to the welfare of the nurses which I will deal with when the Bill is in Committee. It would be wise for the Minister to drop all that portion of the measure dealing with the nurses, and bring it in as a separate Bill. By this means the provisions would be made much more effective. The Minister might consult with his colleague, the Colonial Secretary, regarding the suggestion. There are many and varied matters dealt with in the Bill, but I will not deal with them in anything like detail now. I have gone sufficiently far through the measure to realise that it is desired to glorify the Central Board of Health and remove the responsibility from the Minister to that body. I am strongly opposed to that. I do not think the local boards have in the past done their work as they should have done, and there should be given to the Minister authority to compel them to perform their duties properly. It is not right that this power should be given wholly to the central board. Under the Bill it is provided that before a local body can raise a loan or dismiss an officer, or, in fact, take any step whatever, they must obtain the authority of the Central Board of Health. Take the case of a local board at Peak Hill, Wiluna, or Nullagine, desiring to dismiss an officer, or to raise a loan. They would know all the conditions pertaining to their district, and yet would have to receive the consent of the Central Board of Health, none of whose officers had, perhaps, been within hundreds of miles of the place. The Minister would be placed in a very different position. There are Government officers, in one department or another, at every town, who could keep him posted with all information, and he would, therefore, be able to give an opinion as to whether the course proposed to be adopted by the local board was right or not. I want to remove many of the powers proposed to be given to the Central Board of Health, and substitute the Minister controlling the measure. The position I take is this, that I would prefer to sacrifice the Bill than to sacrifice control by the Minister.

I hope to be able to remove central board control and substitute that of the Minister, who should be the responsible person.

The Minister for Mines: Do you want to abolish the Central Board of Health?

Mr. TAYLOR: No.

Mr. Heitmann: I do.

Mr. TAYLOR: I greatly object to glorify the Central Board of Health and place upon them the responsibilities suggested in the Bill. If the Minister has control, as he should have, he will then be able to see that the Central Board of Health and the local boards do their duty properly.

Mr. Angwin: Do you not think the local boards will be careful about issuing instructions when they know the central board might upset them?

Mr. TAYLOR: They might use greater care through their knowledge that the august body might come down on them like a clap of thunder. My experience is that neither the Central Board of Health nor the local bodies have done their duty. To realise this one has only to take into consideration the state of affairs in Perth. It is anything but satisfactory from a sanitary point of view, at all events unless matters have been considerably changed from what they were 18 months or two years ago. One can realise where the trouble comes in on looking at the constitution of the local governing bodies. Almost invariably the mayors and councillors form the local boards of health, and it is those very men who own a number of buildings and structures. The result is that the health inspectors have to issue instructions for the removal at times of something objectionable on premises owned by their bosses, namely, the mayors and councillors, with the result that in many cases the evil is not removed.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. TAYLOR: I was explaining that I intended to oppose the principle in so far as giving the central board the responsibility and removing it from the Minister. I also pointed out that the central board is elected in Perth, and

practically all their officers are in the City, and the difficulty that the board experienced in connection with local conditions would, in my opinion, militate against the working of the department. I hope, therefore, that the House will alter the principle of the measure in the direction I have indicated and give the Minister control instead of giving it to the central board. The member for East Fremantle interjected when I was speaking that the central board had full power to veto the decisions of the local governing bodies. I am sure the member for East Fremantle, who has had a lot of experience with local governing bodies, has suffered in the past through the power given to the central board, and perhaps through their want of knowledge with regard to local requirements. I hope the Minister will accept the suggestion that I have made. I have no desire to offer any opposition to the second reading, but I have indicated the attitude I intend to take when the measure is in Committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): In discussing this measure it may perhaps be worth while saying that from the point of view of draftsmanship it is a luxury in comparison with the Roads Bill. At the same time, we find even in this Bill one or two rather extraordinary definitions. For instance, we are informed in this Bill that land means water, and as we are informed in the Roads Bill that an electric wire means ratable land, we are certainly getting some wonderful things in the way of definitions. Again, we are informed in the Roads Bill that a road means an outhouse, and in this Bill we are informed that a house means a ship. We are told, and correctly so, that the English language has developed very considerably since Shakespeare wrote his plays, and I am game to say, if we continue in this system of draftsmanship, we will have some wonderful developments in the very near future. However, otherwise than those small extraordinary statements the Bill is, as I said before, a luxury of draftsmanship in comparison with the ordinary measures

presented by the Government. Discussing the measure itself I have no intention to go over the ground which has been traversed by various members who have spoken on the second reading. There are, however, one or two matters that it is necessary attention should be drawn to, and they are as much the things which have been left out as those which are included in the Bill. We find in the Bill that many things are included which, in my opinion, should be included in a Bill for the punishment of fraudulent traders; yet we find they are in a Health Bill instead of being placed in charge of the Criminal Investigation Department.

The Minister for Mines: We have not the machinery.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: But I hold that we have plenty of time, if not intelligence, to produce that machinery.

The Minister for Mines: I mean the officers.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: They are the same. For instance, in this Bill we find that the health authorities have power to prosecute any person for offering any package that is not the weight specified on the outside of the package. Any person selling stuff which is of light weight, in my opinion is a criminal, and should be attended to not by the health authorities but by the Criminal Investigation Department. I want to say that the sooner we recognise this selling of stuff or cheating people with regard to the weight, or with regard to the adulteration of food stuffs, as a criminal offence the sooner will it disappear from trade in Western Australia. We find in this Bill that a vendor of milk is liable to a fine. I hold that a man who robs me by false pretences, or by selling me water instead of milk, is equally as bad as the man who would rob me by means of a valueless cheque, and I think it should be dealt with in the same manner; and a man who would jeopardise the health of my child by supplying adulterated milk which would be injurious to the health of that child is equal to a garrotter, or a

person guilty of robbery with violence, and certainly should be treated in the same category as the garrotter or the man who is tried for robbery with violence. Let us look at it in this light; if a man comes into my back yard and steals a hundredweight of coal, that man will get six months imprisonment without the option of a fine, and possibly he will get a couple of years; on the other hand, if my wood merchant supplies me with nine hundredweight of coal and charges me for half a ton, then the utmost the law provides is a fine. That man is equally as bad as the man who comes into my yard and steals the coal; he is worse, for after all, a man who would go into a back yard and take your coal would most probably want it to keep himself warm, whereas the coal merchant could not plead that kind of excuse. As I stated the sooner we recognise these offences as criminal offences the sooner we will prevent their repetition in Western Australia. I want to say again that the placing of such offences under the control of the Health Department is placing them where they will not be properly and efficiently attended to, and I hold that all those clauses referring to adulteration, light weight, and falsification of marks, or trade marks, should be taken out of this Bill and put into a Bill under the title of a Bill to prevent fraudulent trading. When we have such a Bill then we will be likely to prevent these offences, and I hold that putting these things into the Bill before us is worse than useless; it is waste of effort, waste of paper, and waste of ink, not to say, to an extent, that it will be a waste with regard to administration. There are one or two other matters not included in the Bill which should be included. Various hon. members who have spoken have advocated that we should have a Bill for the registration of nurses. With that proposition I fully agree, and I also hold that there are many practitioners, professional people in connection with health matters, who should be registered, and I am of opinion that we should have a Bill which would include the registration of the whole of these, not only the

nurses but medical practitioners, dentists, chemists, and above all, opticians. One of the greatest robbers is the optician, whom we have not only in this State but throughout the whole of the world to-day. It is an old system of robbery which has come down to us for many years. We can read of it in Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield*, where the young fellow went to the fair and was taken down by a spectacle dealer. The spectacle dealer has come down to us right through the centuries, and I contend it is the duty of the Government to deal with opticians, and in taking measures for registering nurses we should certainly not neglect the opportunity to register opticians. I have been given many instances of absolute injury to people's eyesight through nefarious practices on the part of a number of these gentlemen who style themselves opticians. Not only do they deliberately and in broad daylight rob the people of their money, but in many instances they are the cause of the loss of eyesight. I am making this statement after having thoroughly thought it out, and on good evidence. I contend that if the Minister has any desire to promote the health of the citizens, it behoves him to do something to prevent the continuance of the immense injury being done by various opticians to the eyesight of the people. There is another important point upon which I would like to say a few words, namely, in reference to resident medical officers. In dealing with a Health Bill one would naturally expect to find something referring to the duties, privileges and appointments of resident medical officers, of whom we have a large number in the State, and to whom the Government are paying a considerable sum of money. Yet we find nothing whatever in the Bill referring to the appointment or control of these officers. Further than that, on making inquiries at the Medical Department and other places in Perth, I find there is not to be had a spare copy of the regulations under which these officers are appointed and work. I hold that in a department of

such importance every member of Parliament should be able to obtain the regulations and conditions under which these officers are appointed. But our inquiries are met with the apologetic explanation that the regulations are just out of print, that some more may be printed at some future date, but that for the time being they are unobtainable. I have some serious complaints to make in regard to the resident medical officers, complaints that amount practically to the charge that these officers, who are well paid by the Government, have allowed men to die from sheer neglect. I want to tell the Premier who, I presume, will be representing the Colonial Secretary when we come to the latter's Estimates, that I will make serious charges against these resident medical officers. I hold that such cases should be provided for under the Bill. These officers constitute one of the most important factors in regard to the health of the people of the State. In order to give the Minister a fair chance, I want to say that four deaths have occurred in the Pilbara electorate which, in my opinion, were directly or indirectly attributable to the neglect of resident medical officers. When we pay a resident medical officer I think we should see he does not allow the people of the district, whom he is paid to attend, to die for want of medical treatment. These are serious charges, and I intend to fully substantiate them when we come to the Estimates dealing with the Medical Department. This question of the appointment and control of medical officers is, I contend, of the utmost importance and certainly should be dealt with in a Bill of this sort. I have been forced to the conclusion that the system in existence is absolutely bad; in fact with these doctors the whole system appears to lie in the question of how much they can obtain; not what they can do to relieve sickness or save life, but how much money they can obtain. The resident medical officer is the only member of the public service privileged to allow his private practice to interfere with the work he is paid by the Government to perform. As I have said, I know of four deaths that have occurred

in the Pilbara electorate—one at Port Hedland, one at Nullagine, and two at Marble Bar—which were attributable directly or indirectly to the neglect of these medical officers. The neglect comes about in this way: notwithstanding that the medical officer receives £200 or £300 a year from the Government, when a patient is brought to him he always considers whether it is possible to make that patient pay.

The Minister for Mines: What did the department say when you made this complaint about the resident medical officer?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The department said nothing, or, rather, I was referred to the doctor. The complaints were made, and the department wrote to the doctor, asking if the complaints were true. Of course the doctor said "no." One man in particular was brought in to Marble Bar on the order of the warden. The police had gone out and brought the man in for medical treatment. He lay in Marble Bar for four or five days, the doctor refusing to give him any medical attention whatever. Constable Strapp gave the man food, and washed him; but, so far as medicine or medical attention from the doctor was concerned, that man had nothing whatever for four or five days. While the doctor, the Medical Department in Perth, and the progress association at Marble Bar were exchanging telegrams on the question of whether the man was a Government patient or a private practice patient, the man languished for attention. When these authorities had settled that the man should be attended as a Government patient the only care he required was from an undertaker—and the Government had to supply the undertaker. I say again that no Health Bill is complete which does not deal with these resident medical officers. We must have a measure brought before the House which will deal pretty plainly with the appointment, control, and duties of all medical officers, and no Health Bill can be satisfactory without that provision.

Mr. BOLTON (North Fremantle): Whilst I recognise the urgent necessity for certain reforms in the law relating

to public health, I do not think the Government have taken the right steps to secure the support of this side of the House in effecting those reforms. For many years past there has been intense friction between the Central Board of Health and the local boards, and the action of the central board has added to that friction. I do not see how, under the provisions of the Bill, that friction will be avoided; in fact I am led to expect that it will be greater in the future than in the past. From the beginning to the end of this Bill of over 300 clauses it will be found that the clauses start in this fashion, "The local board may, and shall if required by the central board." So far as the local governing bodies are concerned each and every clause is made mandatory according to the decision of the central board. I am of opinion that, owing to so much friction in the past between the central board and the local boards, it would have been wiser had the Government taken a little power from the central board rather than seek to add to that power. In fact one might as well declare straight-out that direct Ministerial control is the only possible solution of the difficulty. I admit the necessity of these reforms, and also that the central board must have certain powers, but I cannot see how it is possible for the local boards to work harmoniously with the central board under a Bill like this. It will even be impossible to raise a loan without the authority of the central board. We are told the Bill provides for the using of municipal funds for health purposes; yet it will be necessary to apply to the central board for permission to raise a loan. It seems to me we might as well make the central board the Government—do away with this House and all local bodies, and put everything into the hands of the central board. I say it is a mistake to increase the powers of the central board, seeing that they have not been able to work harmoniously with the local boards in the past. I object also to the provision under which the local boards shall have the right to distrain upon the goods of the tenant for the recovery of rates. I trust the House will see the necessity of knocking out that provision. The owner of the property is the man who should be

proceeded against for the recovery of those rates, and the goods and chattels of the tenant should not be attached. I am hopeful the good sense of members will be brought to bear, and that the provision will be struck out. There are two clauses to which I have very strong objection. The first is Clause 46. This clause deals with rating. It is a similar provision to Section 178 of the parent Act. It deals with the sanitary rate, and it only perpetuates the trouble the local boards have had for a good many years past. To put it plainly, those having tenements erected on land can be rated a sanitary rate or a pan rate, and those having vacant land will not be rated at all if a pan rate is struck. It necessarily follows in connection with health work that there is street sweeping and watering and scavenging, and there are depots and plants to be kept up, but with a pan rate no rate can be received from unimproved property towards this work. The local governing bodies have applied many times for assistance in this direction. The North Fremantle local board went so far as to ask the Solicitor General for a decision in this particular direction. Counsel's opinion outside the Solicitor General was conflicting, and the board were unable to get a ruling from the Solicitor General; yet the same old provision is contained in Clause 46 of this Bill, that there shall be a rate of 6d. in the pound on the annual assessment or 3d. in the pound on the capital unimproved value of the land held in fee simple. Take a case in point, where a local governing body has a rating power of £26,000. The income at 1d. in the pound would mean £83. At 6d. on the annual value, as provided in this Bill, they would roughly get about £500. The administration of health at North Fremantle last year cost £1,041, and in addition there were £615 for street watering, scavenging, plant, firewood, etcetera. and £170 also made up of different items, whereas the sum it would be possible to raise under the Bill is £1,250. So taking this one instance there will be a deficiency of about £600 for this board even if this Bill goes through, because of the inability of the local board to rate unimproved property. Surely it is not the intention

of the Government in introducing this Bill that only those having tenements should be rated and should pay for the upkeep of the plant that is necessary for the whole town and not only for those who have tenements. Of course I shall be reminded that there is in Clause 92 an alternate rate. The clause says—

The local authority may in lieu of a sanitary rate, provide for the disposal of nightsoil or other refuse, whether within the district or not, by making an annual charge, payable by equal monthly or other instalments in advance, for the removal thereof, in respect of every house or place from whence the receptacles for nightsoil or other refuse have to be removed.

This being an alternate charge where they can strike a pan rate instead of a health rate, an annual charge instead of, as provided in Clause 46, the annual rate, it is clear that under this system where a pan rate is struck it is not possible in any way to rate vacant land, though the scavenging and watering and upkeep of plant at the different local board depots are as necessary to the owners of the vacant land as they are to those to whom the board charge the pan rate. The board at North Fremantle have appealed several times for assistance over this particular ambiguity, but have not been able to remove it so far. I propose to move one or two amendments in this particular direction, and I trust hon. members will support me. If members who represent local boards of health will speak with the voice of these boards, this Bill will get a rather warm passage through the House.

Mr. Heitmann: Perhaps the local boards of health are sometimes entitled to a warm passage.

Mr. BOLTON: Very often they are, but two wrongs do not make a right; and as there has been friction for so long between the local boards and the central board, I am quite sure members of the House have been reminded by local boards in their electorates that it will be necessary, while additional responsibility is placed on the local boards, they shall at least have the right to put on extra

taxation, not necessarily higher taxation, but extra taxation, so that it will be more equal and will not be paid only by those people who have tenements. As regards the clause dealing with the admission of patients to hospitals under regulation—

Mr. Underwood: There is nothing in the Bill about it.

Mr. BOLTON: I think there is. If the hon. member has not read the Bill I would refer him to Clause 252 which says—

Any expenses incurred by a local authority in or about the treatment and maintenance of a patient in a hospital or in a temporary place for the reception of the sick shall be a debt due from such patient and also, if such patient is an infant, from the parent or other person liable for the maintenance of such infant, to a local authority, and may be recovered from him, or, in the event of his death, from his legal representative, or in the case of an infant, from such parent or other person, by action in any court of competent jurisdiction.

I think the Minister will see the necessity for accepting some amendment. The peculiar feature is that patients are sent from different districts to the hospitals without the knowledge of the local authorities. I have in my mind the case of a young woman who was living at Cottesloe. She was maid at the residence of an hon. member of another place, so there can be no question as to where she was living, but she was visiting at North Fremantle for three days and was taken ill and was taken to the hospital. After six weeks' illness she recovered and the local board of health at North Fremantle were notified that they would have to pay the fees. The young person had disappeared and the board did not know she was in the hospital. They did not have to supply a certificate for her admittance. They are never consulted by the Fremantle hospital. Any patient can go into that hospital from any district without the knowledge of the particular board, and that is not a fair thing. As a matter of fact it is doubtful whether

the charge belonged to that particular board, as this person was a resident in another district; but even if it were the case because she was taken ill in the district, having left her service on account of sickness, surely it should be necessary for the patient to get the approval of someone before entering the hospital.

The Minister for Mines: That might take time and it would be rather dangerous.

Mr. BOLTON: The hon. member does not know the position in Perth. I have a copy of a certificate a person has to get before gaining admission to the Perth hospital. Why cannot it be done at Fremantle? If it does not take time in Perth—and evidently it does not—why should it take time at Fremantle? Here is a notification from the superintendent of the Perth hospital to the North Fremantle local board of health. It is—

Will you kindly advise me of the names and addresses of the officers authorised to sign, on behalf of your board, orders for admission of infectious cases to the hospital; also please state telephone numbers. The medical practitioners in the metropolitan area were advised, at the same time as you were, to the effect "that all patients suffering from infectious disease must be provided with an order from the local board of health concerned before they will be admitted."

A book was sent down containing orders which have to be signed by those authorised to sign them. These orders read—

Please admit....., of suffering from and this board holds itself responsible for the maintenance of the case while under your care at the rate of 6s. per day.

The unfairness is this, that the patients are admitted to the Fremantle hospital without the knowledge of the local boards, and the local boards are only notified when the patients leave the institution. They are notified that such and such a person from a particular district has been an inmate for so many weeks, and a bill is presented, but in many in-

stances it is impossible for the local authority to trace the party. In this instance I have mentioned they have not been able to recover, and ratepayers' money is being spent where it should not be spent. I question very much whether the local board had any right to pay the fees in this case, as the person was a resident of Cottesloe. However, I think that this is a case that should be provided against.

The Minister for Mines: It is a matter of detail to be fixed up by regulations.

Mr. BOLTON: That is the trouble. These confounded regulations have been the stumbling block to reform all through. Repeated applications have been made to have these regulations amended, but it cannot be done, and unless we have it in the Act we cannot get reform. Regulations are always the stumbling block of reform. It is a difficult matter to get any reform or alteration to a regulation; and unless we are prepared to fight to have reforms put in to the Bill itself, we are never sure we are going to get the reforms. I have quoted a specific case; and if it does not appeal to the Minister when we come to that clause in Committee, if he is not prepared to amend it in the way I suggest, I hope he will make a statement—and I will accept it—that the regulation will be altered accordingly. If the local board have to pay the fees necessary for the admission and treatment of patients they should at least have the right to give the orders holding themselves responsible. That will at least give them a better opportunity to recover from the patient. During the Committee stage I shall have the pleasure of introducing one or two amendments which I hope the members will adopt, more especially those regarding the rating of unimproved land for health purposes, and requiring an order from the local board for the admission of patients to hospitals.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (in reply): If no other member wishes to address the House I shall make one or two remarks before we go into Committee on this measure. There have been many matters brought before the Cham-

ber in connection with this Bill, and in a Bill of over 300 clauses one must expect that there will be difference of opinion in regard to many of the particulars in the provisions framed. At the same time I think the member for North Fremantle will admit there is a large amount of detail that must necessarily be left out of the Bill and which can always be provided for by regulations. There are regulations which may suit one local authority in one district that may be altogether impossible for administration in another district. I am sure no one desires to have too much detail in the measure, details which can be fixed up much better by regulation. Once enacted there is no chance of altering them except by an amending Bill. On the other hand, if regulations are found to work oppressively in any one district they can be amended either by the local authority or by the Minister. The member for Pilbara drew attention to the very broad definition of some of the words which appeared in the measure. This is a very wise proceeding in the drafting of the Bill. It is a very wise proceeding in the drafting of the Bill to make the definition clause as broad as possible, and when we talk of "land" including "water" and of a "house" including "ship" we provide that if a breach of the law occurs upon a ship the definition of "house" covers this and we shall be able to prosecute without having so much verbiage in the Bill, so many words right through the whole of the measure. I congratulate the draftsman on giving a broad definition of those words. Members have complained of the maladministration of certain medical officers and I hope the member for Pilbara has placed the facts he mentioned before the Minister controlling the department.

Mr. Underwood: They have been placed before the Minister and before you also.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I cannot understand that, for there would be no reason to bring the matter before me.

Mr. Underwood: A camp was burned down; that was in your department.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If the matter were brought before the Minister, every inquiry would be made. The main feature of the Bill is in connection with the administration clauses—whether we are to have control by Minister only, to have a Ministerial Department, or whether we are to have a Central Board of Health such as existed in the past. Members must not forget that under the Bill the Minister is really given absolute control. If they read the clause carefully they will see that all the powers, rights and authorities vested with the Central Board of Health or with any local authority, shall be exercised by the Minister whenever he thinks fit. There is Ministerial control to that extent. What can members offer in place of it? They say they want to get rid of the board. When asked whether they want to get rid of it altogether, some Opposition members say "yes," and others "no." What are we to have in place of the board, and who will advise the Minister as to what action he should take in administering the measure?

Mr. Bath: A staff of competent officers.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: With an under secretary, I presume, or a commissioner.

Mr. Bath: Not necessarily.

Mr. Walker: A clerk if you like.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Minister now controlling the department has no special knowledge of health matters, and I suppose the next Colonial Secretary will be in the same position. Of course if it should be the member for Pilbara I suppose he will be well versed in all these matters.

Mr. Scaddan: What knowledge did you have of mining when you took control of the Mines Department?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: A great deal more than the hon. member has.

Mr. Scaddan: In your own mind.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am pointing out that a Minister may be appointed Colonial Secretary who has no knowledge of sanitation or health matters

generally. If there were a commissioner, which some members say there should not be, he would be supreme, for in most cases the Minister would take his advice. The Central Board of Health would have no greater powers than would be given to a commissioner. Taking all things into consideration I think it would be far wiser and better to have a board consisting of technical advisers to the Minister, with the Principal Medical Officer as a permanent head. There would also be two other technical gentlemen appointed with him, and, so that the local authorities might be represented, we would allow them to nominate two members. If the board becomes established these latter gentlemen will be able to place before the central board the desires of the local authorities, and thus friction will be prevented. There was friction some time ago between one of the local bodies and the central board, but at that time we were justified in taking drastic means to cope with the outbreak of plague, and it was essential that a deal of work which might have been neglected by the local board should be taken in hand by the Central Board of Health. Large powers are given to the central board, not that they should be used on all and every occasion, but in particular cases which are sure to arise. Stringent powers must be given to some central authority so that any disease, such as an outbreak of plague, that might arise can be properly dealt with. There is a new clause which provides that any local board has the right to appeal to the Minister, and the fullest power is given to the Minister to say, if he thinks fit, that work authorised by the Central Board of Health shall be resisted, and he is given authority to act as he thinks best. There is the fullest Ministerial power, and I ask members, when considering this question either of dispensing with the Central Board of Health or of merely making them an advisory board, to ask themselves what they shall give in place of it. I am sure those who take a deep interest in health matters must see that it is far wiser to have a permanent board representing, not only medical science and sanitation, but also the local authorities, than

to have health matters placed wholly under political influence.

Mr. Walker: Not political but responsible; there is the difference.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If greater responsibility is placed on the Minister than is provided in the Bill it will be doing something unfair to the gentleman holding that position. The clause in the measure giving the fullest political power is very clear, but I will deal with it more fully in Committee. So far as general administration is concerned that will be in the hands of a technical board, aided by the nominees of the local authorities. I propose to go into Committee at once on this measure.

Mr. Scaddan: Surely not.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We can get on a little way, and as soon as we reach a contentious clause I will report progress. We want to get on with the Bill. I think all members are seized with the fact that the Health Bill is very necessary. It is necessary to get on, as we want something to send on to the other Chamber.

Mr. Scaddan: You are putting off the other measure.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We want to try and get the Bill passed this year.

Mr. Scaddan: Why did you not start at the commencement of the session and give it a chance?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Let us get on with it now. As I said before, when we reach a contentious clause and members want time for consideration, I will report progress.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

The MINISTER FOR MINES moved an amendment—

That in the definition of "Analyst," after the word "appointed," the words "or registered as" be inserted.

Amendment passed.

The MINISTER FOR MINES moved a further amendment—

That in the definition of "Boarding-house" the words "the licensed premises of a licensed victualler" be struck out and "premises licensed under a publican's general, wayside house, or hotel license" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed.

Mr. BATH: The definition of "dairy" provided for the inclusion of all buildings, yards and premises. Later on there was a clause dealing with dairies, but there was absolutely no provision for keeping milk carts in proper order. It was a grave omission from the Bill, and no matter what provision might be insisted upon regarding a dairy and its appliances, if a milkman sent milk out in a dirty cart then the whole of the other provisions would be useless. He moved an amendment—

That in the definition of "dairy," after "yards," the words "vehicles, utensils" be inserted.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It was hard to know how a vehicle could be regarded as portion of a dairy. It would be possible to make the alteration the hon. member desired in Clause 182, which provided for by-laws as to dairies. If that were done there would be no need to include a vehicle as a part of a dairy. There would be no objection to the word "utensil" being added to the definition.

Mr. WALKER: The member for Brown Hill should insist on his amendment. A vehicle was incidental to the existence of a dairy. The word "dairy" was only a covering word, and was not a synonym. Part of the business of a dairyman was to see that everything in connection with the dairy was kept in order and clean.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There was power to make by-laws prescribing precaution to be taken to protect milk from infection or contamination. Did the hon. member desire to make a vehicle which would carry milk about the streets a part of a dairy?

Mr. Walker: Then it is absurd to call a cart a dairy.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If the member for Brown Hill pressed his

amendment the sense of the definition would be destroyed.

Mr. BATH: If the Minister's argument held good it would also apply to the amendment of the clause, because under it the interpretation of it would include a place for the storage of dairy produce, and that place might be some distance from where the butter was produced. When the Committee reached Clause 182 it was his intention to endeavour to secure provision for this to be explicitly stated. More than that, it was his desire to have it in the interpretation of the word "dairy." He had had ocular demonstration that in this particular public health was not regarded, and it was with that object in view that the amendment was moved.

Mr. BOLTON: The Central Board of Health would direct the local board to take action against a milk vendor for not having his vehicle clean, and it would be as well to have the provision in the Bill rather than leave it to the confounded regulations. There was too much left to regulations. If the word "vehicle" annoyed the Minister the words "milk cart" could be inserted.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	20
Majority against				1

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Bath	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Heltmann	Mr. Troy
Mr. Holman	Mr. Walker
Mr. Horan	Mr. A. A. Willson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnson	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Monger
Mr. Carson	Sir N. J. Moore
Mr. Draper	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. George	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Harper	Mr. F. Willson
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Layman	(Teller).
Mr. Male	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause as amended put and passed.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clause 5—Savings:

Mr. WALKER moved an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subclause 3 after "authority" the words "with the approval of the Minister be inserted."

The object was to have the Bill administered Ministerially. The Minister must accept responsibility. The object was to provide for the approval of the Minister before taking the matter to a higher court.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 6—Power to suspend operation of the Act:

The MINISTER FOR MINES moved an amendment—

That the following words be inserted at the end of Subclause 1:—"Provided that notice of the intention to issue such proclamation shall be given in the Government Gazette at least one month prior to such proclamation being made."

The Government did not desire to take any drastic action without due notification. If the amendment were carried at least one month's notice of such action would be required. The Crown Law authorities considered it reasonable that such notice should be given.

Mr. ANGWIN: The Minister should afford some more definite reasons in support of his amendment. Surely the Governor would not make any such proclamation as was provided for under the clause without the necessity for its being put into operation at once.

Mr. BATH: The Committee should have some reason for the insertion of the clause itself. The Minister should be able to inform members what circumstances were likely to arise which would render necessary either such a clause or such an amendment. There must have been something to suggest the provision to the health authorities, and whatever it was the Minister should give it to the House.

Mr. WALKER: The very object of a proclamation was the immediate doing of something without any precedent notification, something that was necessary there and then on the spot. What would the notification be but the proclamation itself? The amendment was absurd, for the terms of the proclamation could be whatever the Governor chose to make them, and they could include one month's notice.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The select committee that had dealt with the Bill when in another place had thought it wise that such a proviso should be inserted. Inadvertently it had been omitted when the Bill was being printed. As for the necessity for the clause, in a State so vast, comprising climatic conditions so widely varied, what might do very well in Perth might not be found to be applicable in a place like Broome; hence the necessity for giving the Governor power to suspend the operations of the Bill in any particular district. The provision had been taken from the Queensland Act. At the same time he did not think such power should be taken without a qualification in respect to due notice. However he would not press the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Progress reported.

BILL—LICENSING.

In Committee.

Resumed from 8th September; Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clause 31—Australian wine license:

On motion by the Attorney General Subclause 1 was amended in line 7 by striking out "forty" before "per centum" and inserting "thirty-five" in lieu.

Mr. WALKER moved a further amendment—

That the following stand as Subclause 5:—No person being the holder of an Australian wine license shall carry on any business other than the sale of wine on the licensed premises.

The object of the amendment was to do away with the sale of wine in fruit or such like shops. It was not necessary to speak at length on the matter as the evil was well known. There was no greater danger, especially to the frailer sex of the community, than the taking of wine on these premises, particularly when the wine contained 35 per cent. of alcohol. If this was the price, the danger to the community, to pay for our vine cultivation the industry was not worth it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD opposed the amendment. It was those who never drank wine who imagined all these terrors, these evils, this gloom, and those early graves brought about through the first drink of the little child toddling into a fruit shop for an orange and getting a drink of wine. No obstacle should be put in the way of selling Australian wines. The statement of the member for Kanowna had no foundation in fact, and only existed in the minds of life-long teetotallers, secretaries of temperance alliances, and, possibly, Jessie Ackerman. The system of opposing everything must not be carried too far. One fact that should secure support for the clause was the opposition displayed by licensed victuallers towards wine licenses. These Australian wine licenses did not encourage drinking nor lead to drunkenness, nor did they encourage the toddling infant or the mother of the toddling infant to drink.

Mr. GILL: The hon. member did not clearly understand the amendment. It did not prevent the sale of Australian wines but simply confined the sale of those wines to wine shops. The objection was to the sale of Australian wines under disguise. A walk through Perth would show the evils in existence, evils which it was the duty of hon. members to remove and which could be removed by doing away with the sale of wines in fruit and fish shops. The sale of intoxicants should be confined to certain premises over which the police would have better control.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Australian wine and beer licenses had been struck out on the ground that wine and

beer houses were kept purely for the purpose of drinking, yet now the member for Kanowna wished to so amend Australian wine licenses that Australian wines could only be sold on premises where nothing but drinking could be done. Hon. members scarcely seemed to realise that in their attempt to make a monopoly for the publican or to carry temperance principles to an extreme they were seriously jeopardising the Bill. There was a possibility, so to speak, of sitting down on the safety valve. Surely the members could see the inconsistency of abolishing the wine and beer licenses because they made places purely drinking shops and next preventing wine shops from selling fruit or any form of refreshment except wines. There was a large school of temperance reformers urging that reform of public houses should proceed upon the lines of providing something more than drink for the person going to those places, that public houses should be places to which a man could take his wife and children, places something on the lines of the Continental cafes. Any reform on the question of selling wines should be on these lines rather than by making the wine shop a place that would shortly become of such bad repute that members would move for the abolition of wine licenses altogether, because premises hiding those licenses were places to which people could only go for drink which the Legislature prevented them from getting in any other place. There was also the further question of the interest of the viticultural industry, which with a reasonable amount of encouragement would become considerably larger in this State. It was doubtful whether it would pay a person to take up a wine license if he were prevented from combining the sale of wine with the sale of fruit and other refreshments; and if it did pay it was certainly very doubtful if a license of that description would be in the public interests. The mere fact that fruit and other refreshments were sold and that persons went into the shops with no desire to obtain drink, compelled the keepers of those shops to keep them in a fairly decent manner. If these places were used only for drinking purposes, the last stage

of the shop holding a wine license would be a great deal worse than the first.

Mr. BATH: If the member for Pilbara wanted to be practical he should be able to give, what was impossible now, an assurance that the wine was wholesome and Australian, and was sold in decent premises. Let him remember a raid made on this type of fruit shop in South Australia some time ago, and that the analysis of the stuff sold therein showed that it was manufactured from anything but the juice of the grape. The people who bought it thought they were paying for Australian wine. If people thought it essential to have alcoholic liquors he would much sooner see them consume wholesome Australian wines than beer or whisky, and a good many patent medicines; but, unfortunately, we could not get an assurance that it was decent Australian wine. It was only necessary for anyone who wanted to investigate the question to see the places where the wine was sold, for he would find some of the frowsiest dens one could possibly imagine. If we were to have Australian wines sold let us impose the same restrictions as on licensed premises; let us see that the premises were decent.

Mr. Underwood: Move an amendment to that effect.

Mr. BATH: Let the member say how he would ensure that Australian wine was sold and not some vile concoction. It seemed impossible to prevent the association of the wine trade with a very low form of industry? In the *Lone Hand* some three months ago there was recorded the result of a personal investigation of a number of these premises in Sydney, and the character of those who were carrying on the business. The condition of affairs as revealed was most undesirable, and, unfortunately, that condition of affairs existed throughout all the towns of Australia where the wine business was encouraged. If there were not some assurance given as to the premises the provision of the member for Kanowna commended itself as a very wise one.

Mr. JACOBY: If the statements of the members who had criticised the wine shops in the State were true there would be an excellent argument for the abolition

of the licenses. The wine-growers themselves had frequently, in view of the difficulty in getting licenses granted, taken care only to support applications from reputable people, for they recognised that it was in their interests to see that no stigma attached to any of the premises in which Western Australian wine was sold. Perhaps, occasionally it had occurred—he had no knowledge of it—that licenses had been granted to the wrong class of people? Surely that was a matter for police administration. The bench had power to refuse renewals of these licenses, and if the premises were undesirable surely the police knew it and could report to that effect. Because in some instances wine was sold in places of an undesirable character that should not justify Parliament in giving no opportunity for the sale of wine. Reference had been made to the fact that in some of the States adulterated wine had been sold, but no instance had been quoted of that existing here. If it did exist there was power under another Act to deal with the question. Because by laxity in administration a certain amount of adulterated wine was sold that was no justification for Parliament saying that no wine whatever should be sold. With regard to the question of opportunities provided for the sale of wine, members had already decided to abolish wine and beer licenses. Those licenses and colonial and gallon licenses were practically the only avenues open to the wine-growers of the State. It had been suggested that if wine were to be sold it should be sold only in wine shops. It would be a good thing if that could be brought about, but the profits made by the sale of wine were so small that they did not justify anyone in starting the business unless it were associated with the sale of some other product. Attempts had been made in this direction, but none had been successful, as there was not sufficient demand for local wine to start even one purely wine shop in Perth. There was a capital of something like £130,000 invested in wine-growing ventures in the State, ventures started at the invitation of the Government. People had urged that this was the best wine-making country in Australia, with the

result that many had invested capital, some with unfortunate results. If members would look at the figures in the *Statistical Abstract* they would find that whereas the quantity of wine made in Western Australia in 1906 was 208,911 gallons, in 1909 it was 132,000 gallons. That decrease was brought about because after Federation became an actual fact not more than five firms in the State, who had entered into the business, were on a sufficiently large scale to withstand competition; the small men were going out of the business. The opportunities for the sale of wine were firstly, private trade, secondly through the wine shops, thirdly, colonial licenses, fourthly, wine and beer licenses, and fifthly, hotels. Unfortunately, hotel-keepers did not understand wine, for the only wines they could handle were highly fortified, very strong, wine of the port and sherry type, but when it came to the lighter wines such as claret and chablis the hotel-keepers handled them so badly as to lose money on them. In addition they gave unsatisfactory service to their customers. Therefore, they did not encourage the sale of wine. They could make 400 or 500 per cent. by the sale of other liquids but could not do it out of wine. Ninety-nine out of one hundred hotel-keepers did not know the difference between light or sweet wine and wines of the full-bodied variety. The growers also had to fight very severely the competition of the wine grower in the other States. We could look at the hotel people as supplying very little opportunity for the sale of local wine. Wine and beer licenses were not to be issued, and gallon licenses had also been struck out; therefore, practically all that was left was private trade and the wine shop. The latter was now under consideration. Of the wine sold in the State 60 or 70 per cent. was disposed of under some form of colonial wine license. If the amendment were carried what would be the position of the vineyard owner?

Mr. Collier: Is there no other point of view except that of the grower?

Mr. JACOBY: The point of view of the grower was the one he was putting

now; surely that required consideration. If the Committee decided that the growers' case was not strong enough, what was the position? It was said that compensation would be granted to the hotel people, but what compensation was to be offered to the wine grower? The whole industry would be practically destroyed if the amendment were carried. Already serious injury had been done by carrying other amendments, but this would be the last straw. What about the man who had cultivated the soil, engaged in a legitimate business, and become established under the laws of the country, highly suitable for the growth of grapes, if he were refused facilities for the sale of his goods? Members should hesitate before still further restricting the opportunities for the sale of wine. Another matter was this, the time would soon arrive when there would be a large surplus of apples in the State, fruit that could not be utilised. There were two directions in which that fruit could be turned to account, one by drying and the other by making cider. Only a certain percentage would be suitable for drying and the balance must be turned into cider. Many orchardists had already found they must do something in the matter, for some of them had each season 10 or 15 tons of waste apples suitable only for making into cider, and they were now ordering cider plants. The manufacture of the drink would soon become an important industry. The only opportunity for the sale of cider would be through the wine shops. With every member he desired to see the trade properly conducted. There was no objection to any reasonable proposal to safeguard the people who dealt in wines, and to see that it was sold in reputable places.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The member for Brown Hill told the Committee that the fact of these shopkeepers being debarred from selling apples or cabbages in their wine shops would be the cause of making those shops reputable buildings. That was a most extraordinary argument and worthy of a teetotaler.

Mr. Bath: That is your argument.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member's proposition was that the present shops were disreputable, and to remedy that state of affairs he proposed that apples should not be sold in them. With regard to South Australia neither the member for Brown Hill nor the member for Forrest was acquainted with the conditions under which wine was sold there. Again, practical experience came to his (Mr. Underwood's) assistance. He had taken wine in Adelaide, and a good quantity of it, and that was more than the hon. members referred to had done. If they had consumed wine they would know that almost invariably the wine shops in Adelaide were wine shops only, and not fruit shops.

Mr. George: You can get wine at a restaurant there.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The places where "pinkie" was sold were wine shops, and they were established for the sale of wine only. Another argument used by the member for Brown Hill was that because wine had been adulterated by someone we should not allow it, or pure wine, to be sold. The Bill, however, contained provision for cases where liquor was adulterated. The hon. member might just as well advocate the non-use of milk because someone put water into it. The fact that we got adulterated wine had nothing to do with the case, and it was no argument against the clause as it stood. The amendment had nothing to do with the case, because if they sold adulterated wine in a shop where they sold apples they would sell it in a shop where they did not sell apples. The amendment was not likely to have any benefit; it could only act as a deterrent to the sale of Australian wines.

Mr. ANGWIN: The whole tendency of the Bill was to try, if possible, to bring about a decrease in drinking habits as far as intoxicants were concerned. The member for Kanowna in moving the amendment no doubt realised that a very large number of these fruit shops were decoy shops for the express purpose of luring in young boys and girls and starting them in the habit of taking intoxi-

cating drink. Since the Bill was last before the Committee the opportunity had been given him of accompanying a gentleman who knew something about the wine shops, around the city of Perth, and he had seen more women in these wine shops of Perth during the past week than he had ever seen in his life previously. There was not the least doubt that if these wine shops had not been fruit shops those women would not have been there at the time. The Committee should try, if possible, to bring about what was no doubt the desire of the Minister, the reduction of the sale of intoxicating liquors. If anything could be done which would have that tendency and which would prevent the youth of the State becoming addicted to drinking these intoxicating liquors the Minister should be the first one to support the proposition. There was no doubt that the member for Kanowna had that in view when he moved the amendment. He (Mr. Angwin) hoped that the time was not far distant when the sale of intoxicating liquors would be regulated by officials of the State, and until that was done we could not expect to have good liquors served to the public. The member for Swan had pointed out that there was not sufficient trade in Perth to justify the existence of wine shops solely, but one could not pass many doors of these places where wine was to be bought without realising that the greatest stock in trade in these shops was wine, and if those people could make their businesses pay there should be a handsome profit in wine shops alone.

Mr. KEENAN: It was to be hoped that the member for Kanowna would not press the amendment, and if he did that the House would not accept it. The facts brought before the Committee were perfectly apparent, but if the amendment were agreed to we would place in the path of the winegrowers of the State an obstacle which would lead almost to the extinction of the industry. Were the Committee prepared to do that? Had the drinking of wine ever led to drunkenness?

Mr. Walker: Yes.

Mr. KEENAN: The member for Kanowna might think so, but was it not a fact that wine-drinking countries boasted of sober citizens? If one went to a country where alcohol was not drunk but where wine was consumed one never saw a drunken man.

Mr. Walker: The Australian wine contains from 35 to 40 per cent. of alcohol.

Mr. KEENAN: The alcohol was added for the preservation of the wine, but the percentage was infinitesimal compared to that which was contained in whisky. Perhaps the member for Kanowna knew more about the subject.

Mr. Walker: I do.

Mr. KEENAN: Then the hon. member must know that in a wine drinking country drunken men were never seen.

Mr. Walker: But they do not drink Australian wine.

Mr. KEENAN: Was Australian wine an inferior production?

Mr. Walker: Absolutely.

Mr. KEENAN: He had always been told that Australian wine, though not as old or matured as the foreign wines, was just as good as the wine produced in Europe. The member for Kanowna should not persist in his amendment which was not in the interests of temperance, because it would not lead to any reduction in drink, and was certainly not in the interests of the industry, which was a struggling one, in this State.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: As far as the Australians were concerned they would never be a wine drinking community. The blame for the inferior quality of wine was due to the growers themselves. He had received complaints from various parts of the State where growers retailed wine of inferior quality, and the result was that when men partook of this half matured production the effect was injurious. He (Mr. O'Loghlen) had had as much experience of wine making in South Australia as the member for Pilbarra, although perhaps not so much experience of the drinking of it, and he knew that the commodity known as "pinky," which had occasioned so much comment, was absolutely the greatest curse of the out-back

districts of that State; and when it was hawked about to the different camps in the country districts of Western Australia it was a fair criterion that a similar article was being retailed in Perth. Certainly the position of the grower should be considered. But the grower would be amply protected under the amendment; because the supporters of the amendment were not trying to abolish the wine industry, but were merely asking that where wine was sold nothing else should be sold. He would support the amendment because he recognised the evils of the production of bad wine.

Mr. TROY: The reformers supporting the amendment were desirous of preventing, or curtailing, the drinking habit, while the opponements of the amendment had in view the extension and encouragement of a West Australian industry. He entirely disagreed with those who declared that the owners of fruit shops sold fruit merely as a decoy in respect to the sale of wine. Certainly the decoy was not a very successful one, for far more wine was sold in the exclusive wine shops than in the fruit and wine shops.

Mr. Scaddan: Would you agree to the selling of fruit to children over the bar of a public house?

Mr. TROY: The cases were in no way analagous. If people wanted to get drink they would go where they could get it, whether to a public house, a wine shop, or a fruit shop. Not all the restrictions that could be made would prevent the sale of drink.

Mr. Walker: I merely want to lessen the opportunities for supplying drink to children.

Mr. TROY: The hon. member was anticipating something not likely to happen.

Member: It happens every day.

Mr. TROY: If there was drinking in these fruit shops, it was because people went there to get drink, and not to get fruit. Surely those people were better there than in some worse place. The sale of liquor would never be stamped out by restricting the sale to certain depots, but only by inculcating in the people the quality of self respect, by teaching them

that to get drunk was to degrade themselves. He saw no reason why people should not be able to get a glass of wine in a fruit shop.

Mr. SCADDAN: The object of the amendment was not to prohibit the sale of Australian wine, but to restrict the sale of that wine to certain premises. If the member for Mount Magnet had been logical he would have gone on to say there ought to be no restriction on what should be sold under a general publican's license or as to whom it should be sold to. If one could purchase wine in a fruit shop, why then should one not be able to purchase fruit in a public house?

The Attorney General: You can.

Mr. SCADDAN: You would not permit children to go into a public house bar to obtain fruit?

The Attorney General: I misunderstood you.

Mr. SCADDAN: Why should the holders of these wine licenses be allowed to sell fruit and confectionery in the same shop? If he wished to do so the member for Murray could easily discover in Perth where children and girls of tender years obtained wine at these fruit shops.

Mr. Jacoby: Why not tell the police?

Mr. SCADDAN: On a former occasion the Minister for Mines had declared in the House his knowledge of the existence of sly-grog shops close to the Gwalia Hotel; yet nothing had been done by the police in respect to those grog shops. Of what use, then, would it be for him (Mr. Scaddan) to complain to the police about these wine shops if a Minister of the Crown could not bestir them?

The Premier: West Australian wine is not an intoxicating liquor.

Mr. SCADDAN: Men in the trade, even the member for Swan, would not deny that some local growers imported brandy with which to fortify their wines. Perhaps this brandy was a non-intoxicant. However, the object of the mover was merely to restrict the sale of intoxicating liquors to premises where children could not obtain them. In connection with the threat made by the Attorney General that if members were not careful they would sit too long on the safety valve—

The Attorney General: Not a threat; a warning merely.

Mr. SCADDAN: In view of the statement made by the Attorney General, it would seem that the article in that day's *West Australian* had been inspired, notwithstanding which he hoped the Committee would shape the Bill in accordance with their desires irrespective of any threats by the Attorney General.

Mr. SWAN: On general principles drink should not be sold on any premises except on publicans' licensed premises; but as this would be a restriction on an Australian industry, we should allow wine licenses; but they should stand by themselves. We could not make people sober by Act of Parliament, nor could we make them drink wines by Act of Parliament, and it would take a very strong Act of Parliament to make him drink some of the Australian wines sold in Perth. Some of the stuff sold as Western Australian wine was undoubtedly intoxicating and young people became intoxicated through drinking it, as could be seen at any time in Perth, particularly on a Saturday night. People went into these shops ostensibly to purchase fruit or pastry but really to purchase wine, and the names of women who had become confirmed drunkards through getting wine at some of these shops could be given. A lot of the stuff was unfit for human consumption and was making drunkards of a large number of our young people. This could be proved. It would remove some of the evils if we could restrict the sale of wine to wine shops. Proper supervision would remove some of the evils, but carrying the amendment would very much simplify proper supervision. The main object was to remove the possibility of young people going to these shops and drinking wine under the pretence of buying confectionery.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: People of wine-drinking countries were a more sober class than people who went in for drinking spirits and beer. We should discuss the matter from a wide standpoint. No one wished to injure the wine industry of the State as far as it was legitimately carried on. It was

known in many cases that adulterated or immature local wine, and more especially wine fortified by stuff bearing the name of brandy, was sold on some of the timber stations with disastrous results; but in the backblocks very bad stuff was sold under the name of whisky, which was more harmful. Everywhere advantage was taken of the opportunity to sell something which was assumed to be something it was not and was deleterious to the health of the people who consumed it. If we desired to lessen the number of places where the sale of this wine went on we had the local option polls for the purpose, and we ought to depend upon them for the reduction of the number of places in which Australian wines could be sold. Further, we ought to take into consideration the industry. According to Mr. Hans Irvine, Western Australia was second to no country in the world for producing wine grapes; and we should hesitate before rashly doing something that would prove an obstacle in the expansion of an industry which was good for the State by producing employment and bringing revenue into the Treasury and by providing a field for the investment of capital. The climate of Western Australia was eminently adapted for wine drinking, and we would do much better to restrict the consumption of spirituous liquors and beer and turn our attention to the drinking of wines. It was wrong to assume that Western Australia turned out nothing but bad local wines.

Mr. O'Loughlen: We do not say that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It seemed to be the impression of some hon. members. It was wrong. Excellent wine was produced in Western Australia. The member for Swan (Mr. Jacoby) had put the case admirably and clearly from the producers' point of view. Adopting the amendment would certainly be aiming a blow at first-class restaurants and cafes in the towns of this State. We had in the State one of the most up-to-date cafes in Australia, and it would be a hardship if the proprietor of that cafe could not sell Australian wines in connection with his dining-rooms and it would be a great inconvenience to his customers.

Mr. Angwin: They can get it for the customers if they have an eating-house license.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They could get it by going outside and paying the full price. He did not care what restrictions were put on the sale of colonial wines, but if places were established for the sole purpose of selling wine there would be the same trouble in supervision as existed now where shops sold light refreshments as well as wine. In fact, there would be more trouble, for then the wine shop would have to depend solely on what they sold, and if they sold at the present retail prices of colonial wine they would not make a great profit out of it. The result would be that sly-grog shops would crop up, and there would be more disreputable places than now under the system of fruit shops. Where there was one fruit shop which, perhaps, did not bear a very good character, there would be a score of places which would be the resort of people of bad character, who would obtain there not only the wine allowed to be sold under the license, but also other intoxicating liquors.

Mr. Scaddan: Such people can frequent shops where fruit is sold.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Not with the same facility as places where wine only was sold.

Mr. Scaddan: Children would not go there.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It had been suggested that children could not go in hotels, but they could do so. Certainly they could not obtain liquor there nor could they in the fruit shops. There was not much chance of wine being supplied to children in the fruit shops because the profit the owner of the shop would make would nothing like compensate for the risk he would run. Perhaps more careful supervision was necessary on the part of the police and the liquor department. If the clause were passed as printed it would be best in the interests of the industry.

Mr. GORDON: Stricter supervision might be maintained, but he certainly objected to the amendment. Many ladies preferred wine to tea, which latter bev-

erage was just as harmful as bad wine. Why should not ladies be able to go into respectable fruit shops and get a glass of wine if they wanted it? Should they not have some of the luxuries of life? If they preferred a glass of wine to a cup of tea, let them have it. The more these matters were made secret the more difficult would it be to keep the trade in proper order.

Mr. WALKER: The only solid argument against the amendment was that of the member for Swan to the effect that if the amendment were carried wine-growers would not sell their wine. Was it wise that wine should be sold at the cost of the ruination of the young people of the community? Should temptations be put in the way of young people and women so that the wine could be sold? That was what it amounted to.

The Minister for Works: Why not abolish licenses altogether?

Mr. WALKER: That was not possible, although he would do it if he could. The difficulty with regard to colonial wine was that there had to be a label outside—the sale of fruit and other things was the decoy. One could pretend to go into the shop for oranges, not for wine. Thus women were able to go into shops and get wine. There were some respectable places, but many were not of a character that should be tolerated in a clean community. Women and girls went in there and drank wine, and escaped suspicion because of the fruit shop screen. They got their poison, for some of the wines sold there was poison, and were at times poisoned for the rest of their lives. What homes were being ruined, what lives were being blighted, apparently did not matter so long as the wine was sold. So long as we sold the wine, what matter who fell, what matter what ruination followed? Was not that the argument? If wine were sold behind the cloak of oranges, why not sell beer and whisky there also? It was too great a price to pay for the wine industry, to keep the licenses perpetuated under the present conditions. If the wine could not be sold on its own merits, without having the excuse of the sale of fruit, there was not much in the

industry; it was not worth encouraging. Mention had been made of the fact that the people of France, Spain, and Italy were wine drinkers, but the wines of those countries were not to be compared with the wines of Western Australia. There was no more intoxicating drink than the fortified wine of Western Australia.

Mr. Underwood: Have you ever tried it?

Mr. WALKER: Yes. The hon. member for Pilbara did not have all the experience, and the only difficulty about the hon. member was that he had not profited by his experience.

Mr. Jacoby: Nearly all the wines consumed by the people of Italy and Spain are new, and not fortified; the dry wines are never fortified.

Mr. WALKER: But there were wines which were fortified, and in these shops fortified wines were sold, and he had seen women in a state of intoxication in the fruit shops where they had been able to obtain wine. If we were to have the sale of these intoxicants we should have the shops at which they were sold under strict supervision; then we would know what kind of wines were being disposed of. Whisky drinking and wine drinking were evils. The good wine-drinking did in encouraging a few growers was infinitesimal compared with the harm that was done to the community generally.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	23
Majority against				7

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Bath	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Swan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gill	Mr. Walker
Mr. Heltmann	Mr. A. A. Willson
Mr. Horan	Mr. Brown
Mr. Johnson	(Teller).
Mr. Murphy	

NOMES.

Mr. Butcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Draper	Mr. Monger
Mr. George	Sir N. J. Moore
Mr. Gordon	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Harper	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Holman	Mr. Price
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Male	(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause as previously amended put and passed.

Clause 32—Packet license:

Mr. MURPHY moved an amendment—

That in lines 6 and 7 the words "provided that Section 111 of this Act shall not apply to a packet license" be struck out.

It was not necessary to say much why this special concession to packets should not be conceded by the Committee. It was the law of the State that no holder of a license should sell liquor on Sunday, Christmas Day, or Good Friday, and why certain exemptions should be given to packets was hard to understand. The proposed concession was simply for the sale of liquor on the Swan on the days mentioned. The large majority of the passengers on these boats did not make use of the facilities provided. However, his objection was that amongst the passengers would be found some 20 or 30 who made the fullest use of the opportunity for consuming spirits, and these people, even when they had become a nuisance to the others, could not be got rid of until the boat returned to the wharf. He saw no reason why this exemption should be granted to packet licenses.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Only last year the House had passed an amending Bill which provided for these facilities being given to the steamers. The hon. member might have shown that it had had some bad results. The position was that the steamers on the Swan River provided a great deal of healthful and innocent amusement for a large

number of people on Sundays and holidays; and he was assured that if this form of license were curtailed in the direction desired by the hon. member, if the steamers were deprived of this source of revenue, they would no longer be run at a profit, and would probably be withdrawn altogether. If the amendment were agreed to the attitude of the Committee would be highly inconsistent, seeing that it was less than 12 months since these facilities had been provided, and no reasonable excuse had been forthcoming for the revoking of such facilities. No complaint had been made of any abuse of the facilities provided on these steamers. Some members seemed to think all drink an evil, while others held that people should deal with the publicans and the publicans only. Between the two the convenience of the general public was likely to be entirely disregarded. Unless it could be shown that the general public was opposed to this particular privilege, or that it had been abused, he thought the law should remain as it was to-day.

Mr. ANGWIN: The Attorney General seldom rose to speak on this Bill without pointing out that there were two sections in the Committee, and that he himself was the only member having any regard for the public. The only section of the public that was being considered in respect to these particular licenses was that section which had been whipping the Committee all the evening, which received the benefit of the licenses. Last year he had opposed this provision, and he would oppose it again. It had been stated that there had been no abuse of the privilege. He himself had seen a man fall into the river from one of the steamers. There was no necessity for the privileges enjoyed by these steamers.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.49 p.m.