

Bill agreed on by the House upon the second reading; and there is no doubt the principle of this Bill is to repeal the duty on certain articles in the Tariff Act of 1893. I think the hon. member for Albany, in his remarks, has misquoted what I had said previously, in stating that I said a proposed addition to the Bill need not come down as a recommendation from His Excellency the Governor. What I did say was that this House could deal with this Bill exactly as it could deal with any Bill which did not require a recommendation from the Governor.

The Speaker left the chair.

IN COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN said another proposed new Clause had been placed in his hand, to which the same ruling would apply.

MR. LEAKE asked whether the same objection would hold good against a proposal to reduce the tobacco duties.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Preamble:

Agreed to.

Title:

MR. LEAKE asked whether it was competent to alter the title.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, as the substance of the Bill had not been altered, the title could not be altered without an instruction from the House to the Committee being first obtained.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11.22 o'clock, p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 30th July, 1895.

Municipal Institutions Bill: third reading—Depositing Stone, etc., in River at Rocky Bay: Legislative Council's Message; in committee—Medical Act Amendment Bill: second reading—Select Committees: extension of powers—Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill: second reading—Free Use of Telegraphs by Members of Parliament: Notice of Motion discharged—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS BILL.

THIRD READING.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

DEPOSITING OF STONE, &c., IN RIVER AT ROCKY BAY.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S MESSAGE.

IN COMMITTEE.

Consideration of MR. ILLINGWORTH's motion—namely, that the resolution of the Legislative Council, contained in its Message No. 1, be referred to a Select Committee—was resumed.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said that since this matter was under discussion in the previous week he had laid on the table a drawing made to scale, which had been prepared for the information of hon. members, showing exactly the position of the quarry face at Rocky Bay, and the amount of encroachment already made by the tide. Those hon. members who had lately visited the works, or had examined the drawing, would see how very small was the amount of encroachment as compared with the original water line, and how little cause there was for alarm at present. The yellow line on the drawing showed the possible amount of encroachment which might be expected when the two moles in course of construction were completed; and even if the water line should reach the yellow mark as shown on the drawing, the encroachment would still bear such a small proportion to the whole of the river space available for navigation as not to excite any fear of inconvenience resulting to the river traffic. Outside the question of immediate traffic on the river

came a much larger question as to what would be, eventually, the channel of the river. On the drawing would be seen a dark blue line, which was placed there to show clearly what would eventually be the channel of the river, because if the river had to be made navigable for much larger vessels, or even for the present traffic, the channel would have to be made fairly straight. When that straightening was done, an encroachment of even a quarter of a mile on the bend at Rocky Bay, caused by the quarrying, would not interfere with the navigation of the river, nor would the beauty of the scene at the Bay be injured to a greater extent than at present. Of course the beauty of the scene was destroyed when the work began. [MR. RANDALL: You are a lot of vandals.] Yes, that must be admitted, but the utility of the harbor works, in this age of progress, was of more importance to the colony than the beauty of a bit of coast scenery. It would have been impossible for the Engineer-in-Chief to have given to this House the estimate which he did, in reference to the cost of these harbor works, if it had not entered into his calculation to throw the sand and small material from the quarries into the river bend at Rocky Bay; because otherwise he would have had to allow at least 6d. a yard more in the estimated cost of the disposal of the sand and rubbish, as a result of getting the required stone from the quarries. That being so, and the work having been authorised upon that estimate, this House had practically committed itself to this method of disposing of that material. The House again committed itself to the disposition of the material in this way by passing the Act which defined the amount of deviation which should be made; so that, properly and legally, the Works Department was acting within the authority which had been given by Parliament. As to the result of stopping or immediately preventing the present mode of depositing the quarry rubbish in the river at Rocky Bay, as proposed in the Message from the Legislative Council, such interference would be a very serious matter indeed in regard to the progress of the harbor works, inasmuch as, if it were seriously contemplated to cease throwing the stuff into the river bend at Rocky Bay, the harbor works must, for a time, be suspended, and the whole of the men employed on the works—other than those engaged in the excavation of the river bed itself—would have to cease operations until such

time as the Government could obtain sufficient plant for conveying the quarry stuff to another site, instead of throwing it into the river. Trucks would have to be constructed specially for the purpose, and this new plant would run into a considerable sum of money. Of course the Government did not affirm that it would be impossible to dispose of the quarry stuff in another place. The question was one of cost, and an enormous outlay would be caused by such a change as that proposed in the Message, besides the delay resulting from a stoppage of the present works until new plant could be procured. If hon. members had studied the chart, they would see that no material damage had been done to the river, up to the present, and there was no curtailment of the navigable passage, because the only portion of the river interfered with was in the wide part. Supposing again—though he did not anticipate this—that the material deposited in the river was found afterwards to be an impediment to navigation, that material could be removed from the river and taken out of the way, and there was the assurance of the Engineer-in-Chief, whose opinion on the matter was entitled to respect, that the pump dredger could remove the stuff to a place entirely outside the harbor at a cost of about 1d. per cubic yard; whereas now, if carried away from the quarries in trucks, the cost would be at the least 6d. per cubic yard. The wisest plan would be to allow the work to proceed in accordance with the present method. The hon. member (Mr. Illingworth), in moving for a Select Committee, mentioned that this quarry stuff could be made available for reclaiming or levelling a portion of ground which he thought would be suitable for railway workshops, so as to keep them at Fremantle. He (Mr. Veun) thought that project was almost impracticable, because the amount of stuff at the quarries now available for levelling purposes was practically inconsiderable. To spend sixpence a yard in levelling up low land so as to make it useful for any such purpose would be an enormous cost, and it would be better to buy land right out, in some suitable situation elsewhere. The whole amount of material for levelling purposes which could now be obtained in the course of quarrying at Rocky Bay would be so small as to be insignificant, in comparison with the large area which would be required for workshops at Fremantle. As to the suitability of the site for workshops, referred to

by the hon. member, when the levels were taken, the estimated cost of putting that ground into anything like form was found to be so great that he regarded it as altogether out of the question. It was the desire of the Government not to remove the workshops far away, but in respect to the site referred to by the hon. member, the cost of levelling the land would be enormous.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said ten times as much had been spent in filling up the site of the railway workshops at Melbourne.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the question of a site for the railway workshops at Fremantle was not now before the committee, and this question of removing stuff from the quarries did not hinge on the workshops question at all. The green line on the drawing placed before hon. members showed the original water line, and the smallness of the encroachment was thus made evident. He hoped the Committee would not insist upon interfering with the harbor works in the manner proposed in the Message from another place, but would allow these important works to go on in accordance with the plans authorised by Parliament.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said he would refer only to the question of removing the quarry stuff to a site inside the hills not far away, where the land could be levelled up for railway workshops. The distance to carry the stuff to this site was about the same as conveying it to the river. He had lived long enough to have seen ten times the amount of high land—land known as Bateman's Hill—cut down and thrown into the swamp at Melbourne for providing the site on which the railway workshops in that city were built. If that could be done at Melbourne, the same could be done at Fremantle on a smaller scale. An immense amount of waste material was being thrown into the river at Rocky Bay, where it did no good, instead of utilising it by carrying the stuff an equal distance in another direction for levelling up land that could thus be made available for a valuable purpose. The suggested cost must be an exaggeration, because the same trucks and the same length of railgauge could be used for depositing the waste material in a valley within the hills. It would cost no more to deposit the stuff on the opposite side of the quarry hill than to convey it into the river.

THE PREMIER: That is ridiculous—a random statement.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: With all due deference to the superior knowledge of the Premier, it could be done at the same cost.

THE PREMIER: What information have you got to show that? Have you the opinion of any professional man?

MR. ILLINGWORTH said that as to professional opinion, it might be satisfactory to the Government, perhaps, if he were to quote the opinion of Mr. Allison Smith as an expert. When the Select Committee made its report, the opinion of that body should be worth something, even if his own opinion was not; and if the opinion of the Select Committee did not support the suggestion he had made, this House could then settle the matter. Another point was that the present question originated in another place; and, in a matter of this kind, the Council's Message should be treated with some deference by this House. If the resolution in the message had been seriously debated in another place, the result of that debate should be worthy of some consideration from this House. There might be difficulties in the question which hon. members in this and the other House did not understand, but these would be best settled by the appointment of a Select Committee, as proposed in his motion. Therefore he must hold to the conviction that the proper course to take was to submit the whole question to a Select Committee.

MR. A. FORREST asked what would be the probable cost of making a new channel twenty feet deep, to enable steamers to come up the river to Perth. He suggested it would be better to utilise the material that was being thrown into the river by filling up the land between the railway bridge and the present railway line, and so make that land valuable.

THE PREMIER: That is not our land.

MR. A. FORREST said he was referring to the Government land between the present railway line and the new one that was being built. It would be very much better to do that than to have to make a new channel through Rocky Bay; not only because of the expense, but because a natural channel was always the best. To do as he suggested would make that block of land worth from £1,000 to £2,000 an acre.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he wished hon. mem-

bers to understand that the making of a new channel was by no means consequent upon throwing the sand and other material into the river, because the navigable portion of the channel was interfered with very little indeed. He had had the drawing colored, in order to show what would probably be the channel when steamers could come up to Perth. The question raised by the hon. member for West Kimberley had been dealt with by the Engineer-in-Chief, and it was just on that point that the extra cost of sixpence per yard would be necessary. The Engineer-in-Chief had reported as follows:—"An additional and very important fact, which has to be taken into consideration in connection with the question, is the enormous number of additional trains which would be required to convey this sand into the reclamation ground at Fremantle. We have now 14 trains each way per day, carrying rock, making 28 crossings of the public traffic line at North Fremantle; and, assuming that the crossing of trains carrying sand would be four times as many, it would involve 112 additional crossings of the traffic line each day, making in all 140 such crossings." From this report hon. members would see there was a very great element of danger in that.

MR. GEORGE: Not as much as in Perth.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the hon. member for the Murray could not surely realise what it meant to cross a road like that one hundred and forty times a day. He quite agreed that the place suggested by the Mayor of Perth would have been the proper place to put the stuff, if it had not been for the enormous expense attached to that operation.

MR. GEORGE said more information should be given than that which had been supplied by the head of the Department. He (Mr. George) did not agree with the Minister in saying there would not be sufficient material to use for reclamation purposes. If there were four times as much debris as stone, and if there were needed one hundred and forty trains a day to carry that material away, it would be sufficient to reclaim a considerable amount of land. With regard to the proposed new channel, he wanted to know if any boring had been done, or if anything at all had been done to ascertain what the bottom of the river was, whether rock or

sand. It would be much better to put the material where it would be of use, even if that operation cost a little more to do so. He regarded the lack of trucks by the department as being a very lame excuse. The only principle upon which a Government, or a department could exist was that it should exercise some amount of foresight; and even the Minister himself would not accuse the Engineer-in-Chief of being lacking in that. The Minister had said it would cost sixpence a yard extra, and there were four yards of debris to one of stone, which made two shillings a yard as the cost of getting the stone. Either the Minister's statement was wrong or the newspaper statements were wrong, and should be corrected.

MR. JAMES regretted that the present occasion was being used to discuss the question of the removal of the workshops from Fremantle. It was very significant that those who wanted this Rocky Bay question referred to a select committee were those most opposed to the removal of the workshops from Fremantle. When the resolution was first proposed it had his sympathy, because he was grieved that the beauty of Rocky Bay should be destroyed by quarrying operations; but now that the beauty had gone, the question was, what was the best way of utilizing the place. He wished to say then, what he had often said before, that he had a great distrust of engineers, and hon. members needed to watch carefully the expenditure of public money, though after all the matter before them was largely a professional question.

MR. SOLOMON said no other hon. member, except the hon. member for East Perth, would have thought of suggesting that this question was being raised by the advocates for the retention of the workshops at Fremantle. He thought the matter was of the utmost importance, and it would be a pity for the committee to decide what might really be regarded as a national question, without having it thoroughly threshed out. He could not see any better way than by referring it to a select committee, in order that they might take evidence, and find out exactly how the matter stood.

MR. MARMION said he regretted that other engagements kept him from hearing the beginning of the debate. He did not agree with the hon. member for East Perth that that was simply a move on the part of hon. members who supported the retention of the

workshops at Fremantle. He understood the matter was being discussed because a resolution had been carried in another place. He had no doubt but the exposition given by the Hon. the Commissioner of Railways was eminently satisfactory to himself, and, perhaps, to his department; but the Government had always been willing to have as much light thrown upon every subject as they could possibly get, and he believed the best way to get light on that question was to refer it to a Select Committee.

MR. JAMES: For what purpose?

MR. MARMION said it could obtain evidence from the Engineer-in-Chief and others. None of them were infallible. It was, perhaps, not so much a question of engineering as it was one of common sense. It was whether they should utilize the material that was being thrown into the river, or go on as they were doing then, with an idea of pumping it out again some day, if it were necessary. He preferred that the whole question should be referred to a Select Committee, and if he were on that committee he thought he might ask a few questions that would be of service to the committee, as well as to the community. He must say distinctly that if the Government objected to the question being referred to a Select Committee it would suggest there was something behind that they did not wish to disclose. To prevent that idea taking root in hon. members' mind, he hoped the Government would not object to the appointment of a Select Committee.

MR. CLARKSON said if the remarks of certain hon. members were correct, it was very evident to him the Engineer-in-Chief did not know his business. He (Mr. Clarkson) regarded that discussion as being a step in the direction of securing, if possible, the retention of the workshops at Fremantle.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Government had no objection to a Select Committee. It seemed to him that hon. members had some extraordinary views on that matter. The harbor works had been in progress during the last two or three years, and stone had been taken from Rocky Bay, the debris being thrown into the river, and no one had taken any notice of the fact until an hon. member in another place brought forward that resolution, which was hurriedly passed. The hon. member for Nannine was very deferential towards the members of the Legislative Council when it suited him, but

that hon. member had been known to speak differently at other times. He (the Premier) did not wish to see the works at Fremantle delayed. The Government had spent large sums of money there, and were still doing, so, and it would be a very serious matter to hinder the progress of the work. It looked as if the Government were more eager to consult the interests of Fremantle than those hon. members who were specially interested in the place. He should very much regret if any action of this Committee should impede the progress of the harbor works. The Engineer-in-Chief had said: "If the output of sand is considerably retarded, it means of necessity a corresponding retardation of the ocean moles, and in consequence a considerable postponement of the date at which the harbor can be utilised." There would be an extra cost of fourpence a yard to dispose of the material in any other way than that in which they were doing it at that time. He could not help thinking—although the idea was disclaimed—that at the bottom of that little trouble there was the workshops question. He had no doubt about it. He did not believe the two questions were so closely connected, but if they were, then hon. members should deal with them together. He did not see any reason for that action, because the river was not being stopped up, nor was it likely to be, and he had the Engineer-in-Chief's word that to adopt any other system would mean a delay of at least six months. He (the Premier) had himself suggested a new system, but it had not met with approval. He was surprised that the matter had taken the turn it had. He did not know what they wanted a Select Committee for. Did they want to stop the works. [Hon. MEMBERS: No, no.] Then he asked if hon. members were afraid the river would be blocked up between Perth and Fremantle. He had not found them so solicitous on behalf of the river before. If a scheme could be suggested whereby the material could be utilized, he would be glad if they would suggest it. The hon. member for Nannine was asking the committee to turn a complete somersault.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said he was asking nothing of the kind.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that was the hon. member's object. The hon. member for Nannine had said he was opposed to throwing the refuse into the river, and that

it could be disposed of in some other way; but he (the Premier) asked the committee not to interfere at the present time with the work that was proceeding so very satisfactorily. They had been at the work for nearly three years, and he hoped the committee would not cause them to have to start afresh upon any new system.

MR. GEORGE said he would not allow the debate to terminate without contradicting in toto the hon. member for Toodyay, who was styled the seventh Minister of the Cabinet. He (Mr. George) had never attempted to disparage the Engineer-in-Chief, for whom he had the greatest respect. While he had respect for that officer, he supposed it was quite competent for him to differ from Mr. O'Connor without showing disrespect. Whilst he differed from the Premier or the Director of Public Works, he had the greatest respect personally for those gentlemen.

MR. LEAKE said if it had not been for the plans which the Director of Public Works had placed upon the table, the Committee might have been misled into supposing that there was really, after all, nothing in what the Government had done; but for the Hon. the Director of Public Works to say that there had been no contraction of the passage was going too far. It was true, in a sense, that the river was interfered with only at its widest point, but at that point the spit ran right across it, leaving only a very narrow channel of about six chains wide, while the encroachment was not less than three chains. Anyone who knew Rocky Bay would be struck with the idea that the soundings referred to had been taken at winter level. If that were so, considerable allowance would have to be made for the lower levels which prevailed in the summer. In regard to the statement of the Director of Public Works that it was intended to bring shipping up the river, he would ask what guarantee was there that when one passage was blocked up, the other would be opened up? He could not help thinking that there must be some error in the calculations made by the department, when it was stated that the amount of stuff emptied into the river, compared with that used in the moles, was as four to one, because he was certain that if the contents of one of the moles were emptied into the river, let alone four times their quantity, the channel would be blocked. He believed ships would come up that passage, but the time had not arrived when that should

be held out as a sop, in order to obtain the consent of the Committee to the original and existing channel being blocked up.

MR. MOSS said he would support the proposal for a Select Committee. The first hon. member to drag the workshops question into the debate was the Director of Public Works himself.

THE PREMIER No; the hon. member for Nannine was first.

MR. MOSS said the question before the Committee was not that affecting the workshops, but a resolution from the Legislative Council, and as the Premier had said that that body dealt with the matter hurriedly, it was a very strong argument in favor of referring it to a Select Committee. The matter was a very important one, and should be thoroughly investigated by a committee, which should take the professional opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief and others as to how the material should be disposed of.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported to the House.

Report adopted.

The House proceeded to ballot for the members of the Select Committee.

THE SPEAKER said: Mr. Randell, Mr. Marnion, and Mr. Venn have the highest number of votes. There are three other hon. members for whom the voting is equal, viz., Mr. Loton, Mr. Simpson, and Mr. Wood. I have to decide which shall be the fourth member, and I nominate Mr. Loton. These four gentlemen, with the mover (Mr. Illingworth), will be the members of the Select Committee.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I move that the committee have power to call for papers and persons, and sit during any adjournment of the House.

Agreed to.

Ordered, that the committee bring up their report on Tuesday, August 6.

MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

MR. JAMES: Hon. members of this House will remember that last year, when the Medical Act was before us, it was referred to a committee to deal with objections that had been made to the manner in which the second schedule had been framed, and to meet these complaints the schedule as originally drawn was amended. The working of the Act since it was passed has, however, shown that the

amendments then made have not been of good effect, and it is now the desire of the medical profession and others that what is not now working well should be rectified. That is the whole object of this Bill. The more important part of the Bill is in the second clause, and here it is proposed that the tenth paragraph of the second schedule of the Act, which provides that the holder of a degree of any colonial university shall be registered on the presentation of his diploma, shall be amended. The amendment proposed consists of striking out the words "or colonial university," and substituting the words "or legally constituted and recognised Australian, Tasmanian, or New Zealand University." At present it is possible for a person to be registered here on a diploma that would not be recognised either in Great Britain or in any of the other colonies. At present we have here all sorts of people—we have red, yellow, and black people—and under the Act, as it is to-day, any of these may obtain a diploma from some British colony, which possesses a so-called university, and claim to be registered as duly qualified medical practitioners. It is well known that in America there are establishments called universities that even the authorities of the country itself will not recognise, and if one of similar standing to these happens to be in some far-away British colony, the holder of its diploma could claim to be registered here. Under the law, as it stands at present, it would be quite competent for some of the smaller British colonies, such as those of Africa, to establish an institution they would call a university, issue a degree of medicine, and for the holder of that degree to apply to be admitted to practise in this colony under Section 10. The desired amendment will remedy this, for the degrees of the existing Australian universities are recognised, without the danger of degrees of other so-called colonial universities entitling some person who could not speak English to be admitted here.

THE PREMIER: Why name the colonies? Why not use the term "Australasian?"

MR. JAMES: Because there is no definition, except in the Federal Council Act, of what "Australasian" means. There is another injustice British and Australian medical men have to face, and that injustice comes from Canada. There the highest possible medical degree is not recognised as enabling a British subject to be registered. An M.B. of London

would not be allowed to practise his profession in Canada until he had paid a fee of 80 or 100 guineas, and had passed through an examination. Hence, it does seem an injustice, that Canadians should exercise this injustice and yet demand to be admitted into other parts of the British dominions without these restrictions. It is not right that Canada should prevent our medical men going to practise there and yet want her own people freely admitted here.

THE PREMIER: There is no School of Medicine here if you wanted to examine them.

MR. JAMES: No; that is true, but what this Bill seeks to secure is that the holder of the degree of a Canadian university, before practising in this colony, must obtain the degree of a university of Great Britain or of the Australian colonies. It is not right for Canada to raise barriers against the holders of the highest qualifications, and then seek to enter countries on a degree which would not be recognised as sufficient qualification to enable them to practise. The great principle we all desire to see cultivated, I am sure, is that of reciprocity. If the Canadian universities would hold out the right hand of fellowship to the other British universities of recognised standing there would be no difficulty; but, as it is, Canadians must not growl if the same principles they have employed against others are used against themselves. There is nothing whatever to prevent the holder of a Canadian or American degree from also obtaining the qualification of an English university, and this is really what the Canadian people now demand that the holder of an English degree shall do before he practises in that colony. What they demand of others is no hardship to apply to themselves. There would be nothing to prevent the Canadian universities being recognised by those of England if these barriers were removed, and then Canadians would be able to obtain their *ad eundem* degree from the British universities or the Australian universities, just as they desired. Then it is proposed that paragraph 13 of Schedule II. of the existing Act should be repealed. At present it reads "Any person who shall prove to the satisfaction of the Board that he has passed through a regular course of medical study of not less than three years' duration in a British or foreign school of medicine, and has received, after due

examination, from some British or foreign university, college, or body duly recognised for that purpose in the country to which such university, college or other body may belong, a medical diploma or degree certifying to his ability to practise medicine or surgery, as the case may be." There are serious objections to this clause, for it raises all sorts of possibilities. The Medical Board may, at any day, be called upon to register a man wholly unqualified to practise as a medical practitioner. Even if this section is repealed, the foreigner will be far better treated than any one else, for he will be admitted after three years' study, whereas an English or Australian degree demands five or seven years. In fact, we are doing for other people what they will not do for us. At present there is no part of the Continent where a British practitioner is admitted on his English degree. We had a proof of this with Dr. Jameson, who was for some time in Rome. The authorities were so strict there that eventually he was only allowed to practise among the British subjects there. This would not have been done had it not been for the fact that people who had gone to Rome for their health threatened to leave the place. At present the law is a most unjust one in such places as Canada, and what we say here is that the remedy is likely to be provided by insisting that the holder of a Canadian degree shall not practise here until he has also obtained the qualification of either an English or an Australian University. I ask the House to allow this second reading to pass. The amendments are just, and we should do all we can to encourage reciprocity. People who will not accept our degrees should not expect to be admitted here on qualifications much lower than we require our own people to possess. I move that the Bill be read a second time.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I do not wish to oppose the second reading of this Bill in any way, but rather to support it. I do so more with a view of preventing incompetent practitioners coming here, than with any idea of retaliation on Canada or any other country that does not choose to allow a British medical man to practise in their country. I have looked through the clauses of the Act, and it does appear as if incompetent people who are not fully qualified can obtain degrees from universities not recognised by English universities, and upon the strength of those degrees may demand to be licensed to practise

here. The principal object of the Bill is to ensure our having some guarantee that any man registered as a medical practitioner in Western Australia is properly qualified, and that he holds a degree acceptable to English or Australian universities. I support the Bill for this reason, and not with any idea of retaliation. It is news to me that Rome is regarded as a sanatorium for health, and that people who go there must be treated by British doctors to get well.

MR. CLARKSON: I support the Bill, and, in doing so, would like to remind the House that we have already men practising here whose only qualification is that they resided in the colony a certain time before the Medical Act was introduced. I think that when it is a question of the safety of lives being placed in the hands of any person, there should be some guarantee that that person is properly qualified, and I think the hon. member for East Perth deserves the thanks of the community for bringing this matter forward.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I really do not like the Bill in its present shape. It seems to me that we want more information with regard to the countries named by the hon. member for East Perth, and we should know more of the laws in those countries applying to the medical profession. I have no doubt that the hon. member has made himself well acquainted with the laws of the other countries, but at the same time the desire of the House should be to obtain more information than at present we have before us. We should have this before we attempt to exclude persons who may be qualified in other parts of the world from practising and being registered in this colony. I do not much like the idea of denying a man the right of practising his profession here if he has studied, and is fully qualified to practise in the country he comes from. To debar a man because he holds only a German or a Canadian qualification goes against my grain altogether. To my mind, we must approach this matter with a good deal of care, and upon more information than we have at the present time. My idea is that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee, so that we can have all the evidence possible. We would obtain more information, and it would be more satisfactory than if the subject is debated by the whole House. It is a serious matter, and one that might come back upon us, to debar people fol-

lowing their profession who may be well qualified to do so. Some of them may have become naturalised and settled down here. We should be very careful how we act. We are informed that a British medical man cannot practise in Canada without first passing an examination. I think that examination must be a very formal one. Of course I do not know what the practice in Canada may be, but it seems unheard of that the holder of an English degree should be debarred from practising upon it. It is possible the Canadians did this because their degree is not recognised in Great Britain. We should have information whether this is the case. I do not see any reason why we should take up the cudgels for the British medical practitioner. At present we have no school of medicine where the people proposed to be prohibited could be examined, and we should be very careful.

MR. CLARKSON: There are universities where degrees can be purchased for a few pounds.

MR. SIMPSON: Some give them away for a pound of tea.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I am equally desirous with other hon. members to prevent people who are not qualified from practising, but not to debar people who might be qualified. If the matter is referred to a select committee, and the medical men come forward, we should obtain valuable and necessary information to guide us.

MR. JAMES: I think it would be better if, instead of referring the Bill to a Select Committee, we should postpone the second reading debate for three or four days, and in the meantime the medical men might call and explain the position to the Premier and to the Attorney-General.

THE PREMIER: Let it go to a committee.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I just want to say one word. I think the reason for the position taken up by Canada is to be found in its proximity to America, and to some of the American so-called universities. The Premier is very fond of quoting Great Britain, and he tells us that we should take no step here that has not been taken in Great Britain. Now, I want him to apply it to the Bill now before the House, and I would draw the attention of the Premier to the fact that Great Britain itself does not admit German or French medical men to practise there. If they have seen a reason to take up that stand, surely there must be some

good grounds for it. There must be ample cause for this attitude being maintained, or it would not exist now. I recollect a controversy in Victoria on this very point, and there was much bitterness of feeling shown. If Great Britain has for centuries prevented any man from the Continent practising in Great Britain, surely there must be a reason for it. At present the holder of a Continental degree—not recognised in Great Britain—can come to the Medical Board of this colony and demand to be placed on the register. If the Medical Board refused, he could sue them for damages. I believe that is the legal aspect, and we have no right to place the Medical Board in this position. A man might come here with a valueless diploma from America, and demand to be registered, and he would have a right of action against the Medical Board if his application were refused. The hon. member for Gascoyne has placed the matter before the House in a very clear way. When it is a question of life and death we should take good care that the people in whose hands the cases are placed are qualified to deal with them. The preservation of health is a very different matter from anything else. Already telegrams have been received in this colony both from America and the Continent asking whether it is true that medical men can start practising here on their American and Continental diplomas. There may be many of these ready to take advantage of the present flaw in the Act, and we should do all we can with reference to this matter.

Motion put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

SELECT COMMITTEES.

EXTENSION OF POWERS.

Ordered, that the time for bringing up the reports of the Select Committees upon the Arbitration, Partnership, and Criminal Evidence Bills be extended until Tuesday, 6th August, and that such Select Committees have power to sit during any adjournment of the House.

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson): I desire to move the second reading of this Bill. It is a simple one

to regulate the sale of agricultural fertilisers and feeding stuffs and to ensure that they are what they are really pretended to be. The Bill is designed to protect the public against fraud. Many farmers and others spend large sums of money in the purchase of feed stuffs and fertilisers without having sufficient chemical knowledge to ensure their getting what is represented as being sold to them, and that it contains the necessary fertilising qualities to do the work required of it. In many cases he is only made a dupe, and the Bill will be a means of protecting him against fraud.

Motion put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT AND PUBLIC TELEGRAMS.

By leave of the House, Mr. MORAN withdrew his notice of motion, that members of Parliament should during session be allowed to send telegraphic messages for public purposes free of charge.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned 6-35 o'clock, p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 31st July, 1896.

Justices Appointment Bill: second reading; adjourned debate—Married Women's Property Act Amendment Bill: second reading; committee—Mines Regulation Bill: second reading—Licensed Surveyors Bill: second reading; committee—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 4-30 o'clock p.m.

JUSTICES APPOINTMENT BILL.

SECOND READING—ADJOURNED DEBATE.

THE HON. R. G. BURGESS: I think this is a Bill more for the consideration of the legal than for the lay members of the House. My

principal object in moving the adjournment of the debate on the last occasion was that we should have a fuller House, in order that so important a matter as this might have the fullest consideration. I am glad to see that we now have a fuller House. I do not know exactly why this Bill has been brought in, although I was led to believe it had been rendered necessary on account of some case which occurred last year. Under the present law the Government have the same powers that they now wish to take under Clause 5 of this Bill, because they could at any time *Gazette* new commissions, leaving out the names of justices they do not wish to be continued on the roll. Hitherto this has been done in several cases. It has been said that this Bill will degrade people by making them justices for districts only, while others are justices for the whole colony. I can only say, in reply to this, that it is open for anyone when offered the position to decline it. I know if I were offered such a position I should decline it. The Hon. Mr. Parker pointed out that Clause 7 states that no person shall exercise the jurisdiction of a coroner outside his own district, and he has said that such a provision would operate harshly, especially in the gold-fields' districts. I am inclined to agree with him in this respect. It is said that a similar Act is in force in Great Britain, but even there, I believe, it does not give general satisfaction. The clause to which the Hon. Mr. Parker has referred may even be inconvenient to the Government themselves. Then it was pointed out that Clauses 11 and 12 practically do away with the rest of the Bill, but I believe it is not intended that such shall be the case. As I understand Clause 11 it means that an Act done by a justice shall be taken to have been rightly done unless the contrary is shown, and Clause 12 provides that the act of a justice is not to be invalidated merely because he has acted outside his jurisdiction. I admit these clauses are a little difficult to grasp the meaning of, but I hope hon. members will allow the Bill to go into Committee, so that we can make the wording more plain. If we are unable to do so we can then throw the Bill out.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I have gone carefully into the clauses of this Bill. As a layman, so far as the legal points are concerned, I cannot give an opinion. There are five learned members in this House who will, I am sure, see that nothing which is legally