

No. 8. Clause 10, Subclause (3).—Delete the words "in a private hospital or," in lines 6 and 7.

Assembly's modification.—Strike out the word "delete" and insert the word "amend," and insert the words "to which this Act applies" after the word "hospital" in line 7.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for amending the Council's amendment is:—"Because it is against the principle of the Bill."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendment made by the Assembly to the Council's amendment be agreed to.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: We have already decided against the principle, so we must negative the Honorary Minister's motion.

Question put and negatived; the Assembly's amendment to the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 9. Clause 10, Subclause 3.—Delete the second paragraph.

No. 10. Clause 10—Delete Subclause 4.

The CHAIRMAN: The Assembly's reason for disagreeing to Nos. 9 and 10 is:—"Consequential on disagreement with No. 8."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the Council's amendments be not insisted on.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendments insisted on.

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

*Sitting suspended from 9.55 to 11.10 p.m.*

#### *Assembly's Request for Conference.*

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting the Council to grant a conference on the amendments insisted upon by the Council, and intimating that the Assembly would be represented by three managers.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That a message be transmitted to the Assembly agreeing to a conference as requested; that the conference be held forthwith in the President's room, and that the Council be represented by the Hon. A. J. H. Saw, the Hon. H. Seddon, and the mover as managers.

Question put and passed.

*Sitting suspended from 11.12 p.m. to 12.35 a.m.*

#### *Conference Managers' Report.*

The HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [12.36]: I have to report that the managers have met and have failed to come to an agreement.

#### **BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT.**

Returned from the Assembly without amendment.

#### **ADJOURNMENT—CLOSE OF SESSION.**

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [12.37]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday, the 18th April.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 12.38 a.m. (Friday).*

## **Legislative Assembly.**

*Thursday, 4th April, 1929.*

	Page
Questions: Agricultural machinery purchases	163
Water Supply, resumptions	164
White City—1, Opinion of Mothers' Union; 2,	
East Perth Progress Association	164
Mental patients, observation	164
Dairying industry	164
Swine fever	165
Migration	165
Bills: Hospital Fund, Council's amendments	165
Workers' Homes Act Amendment, Standing	
Orders suspension, &c.	171
Hospital Fund (Contributions), Council's amend-	
ment	172
Hospital Fund, Council's message	172
Hospital Fund, request for conference	174
Hospital Fund, Conference Managers' report	174
Adjournment; Close of Session	174

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

#### **QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY PURCHASES.**

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Justice: 1, Is he aware of the injustice suffered by those who purchase machinery under hire purchase agreements? 2, Are such

people responsible for the balance of promissory notes unpaid when the machines are re-passed? 3, Have the department still in their possession the copy of the Canadian Act I supplied to them in August, 1920? 4, If so, is it the intention of the Government to bring in an amendment on lines somewhat similar to that Act, and remove the injustice now suffered?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 1, No, not in the purchasing. 2, Yes. 3, Yes. 4, This cannot be determined at present.

### QUESTION—WATER SUPPLY, RESUMPTIONS.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Works: 1, Having in mind the method of providing water for domestic use in various English cities, and other closely settled centres, and the consequent non-requirement of land for the exclusive purpose of water catchment, will he advise, in connection with the extensive waterworks now under consideration and to be carried out, whether it is intended to maintain the policy of resumption of orchard and garden land for watershed purposes? 2, If so, what area of improved land is it anticipated will be resumed, and what expense will be met in connection with the waterworks referred to? 3, Will the present policy, in respect to existing water catchment areas, be reviewed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Resumption is being undertaken only where the purity of the supply cannot otherwise be adequately safeguarded. This is the policy generally followed in other countries. 2, In connection with the present Canning proposals, no further resumption of improved lands is contemplated. 3, Every case will be considered on its merits. (See answer to No. 1.)

### QUESTIONS (2)—WHITE CITY.

#### *Opinion of Mothers' Union.*

Mr. NORTH asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that various branches of the Mothers' Union (incorporated by Royal Charter) have expressed the opinion that White City is becoming an increasing menace to the moral well-being of young people, and should be closed? 2, Does he propose to take any action?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, The matter will be considered.

#### *East Perth Progress Association.*

Hon. G. TAYLOR asked the Premier: 1, Has his attention been drawn to certain correspondence, dated 8th August, 1928, and 15th January, 1929, contained in a pamphlet issued by the Secretary of the East Perth Progress Association. 2, Are the allegations contained in the second letter of the pamphlet substantially correct, particularly that the present Cabinet has been the principal beneficiary from the neglect to administer the law at White City? 3, What action, if any, does he intend to take?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, No. 3, Answered by No. 2.

### QUESTION—MENTAL PATIENTS, OBSERVATION.

Mr. THOMSON asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is it the intention of the Government for the future to see that the stigma of prison is not placed upon patients held in custody under observation regarding their mental condition? 2, Will steps be taken to make available an observation ward separate, and removed from the gaol?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, The stigma of prison is not placed on such persons for the reason that they are not detained in a prison. The public interest requires that persons apparently insane found wandering at large, or charged with offences, occasionally be detained in custody of the police, and for very short periods placed in a police lock-up. This is unavoidable. 2, "Heathcote" was established to provide accommodation for such cases.

### QUESTION—DAIRYING INDUSTRY.

Mr. LATHAM asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Has his attention been drawn to a letter under the heading of "Money in Dairying" which appeared in the "West Australian" of the 2nd inst., wherein the writer states that twelve average cows will return £300 per annum? 2, Will he endeavour to ascertain the identity of the author ("Retired Farmer") and see if his services are suitable and available to assist in the establishment of dairying in the south-west portion of the State?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Yes. 2, No.

### QUESTION—SWINE FEVER.

Mr. LATHAM (without notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is he aware that Mr. Westphal, farmer, of York, claims to have a cure for swine fever? 2, Will he give Mr. Westphal an opportunity to demonstrate his cure at a convenient place at an early date? 3, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, No. 2, I know of nothing to prevent Mr. Westphal's demonstrating his cure if he has one. 3, Answered by No. 2.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It will bring him a fortune if he has discovered a cure.

### QUESTION—MIGRATION.

Mr. TEESDALE (without notice) asked the Premier: Has his attention been called to an editorial in a London paper of last month dealing with emigration to Australia, in which the editor makes the following statement:—

Two years ago we were shown at Australia House a long list of inquirers, all owners of capital ranging from a few hundreds to £10,000, who felt inclined to go to Australia and had gone to the High Commissioner's office to ask what they could do with themselves and their capital if they went to Australia. They were given no information whatever. Australia House knew nothing, and the probability is that Australia secured not a single one of them.

Will the Premier represent this statement to the Prime Minister and ascertain whether this state of affairs still exists?

The PREMIER replied: It is the first I have heard of the matter; I have not seen the editorial, nor have I heard of it. If the hon. member supplies me with a copy of the statement I will consider the question of making representations to the Prime Minister.

### BILL—HOSPITAL FUND.

#### *Council's Amendments.*

Resumed from the previous day. Mr. Lutley in the Chair: the Minister for Health in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Consequentially on the amendments to Nos. 1a and 8, the Minister for Health had moved the insertion of a subclause. Paragraph (ii) of the proposed subclause had been struck out, and the member for Perth had stated his intention to move that the following words be inserted in lieu:—"The Principal Medical Officer may appoint a medical practitioner, who may examine any person admitted to a hospital for treatment under this Act at any time after such person has been admitted. Such examination shall be made in the presence of the medical practitioner attending such patient. If the examination proves the case is not one deserving of treatment he shall not have any claim upon the medical fund."

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I recognise the difficulty confronting the member for Perth to draft an amendment off-hand. I have an alternative amendment that I think will be preferable. I move an amendment—

That the following words be inserted in lieu of the words struck out:—" (ii) The person in control of any recognised private hospital shall within forty-eight hours of the admission of any patient notify the Department thereof in the prescribed form. If the Principal Medical Officer is of the opinion then or subsequently, that the physical condition of any patient, or the disease from which he is suffering, is such as not to warrant hospital care or the continuance of hospital care, then he shall notify the patient and the person in control of the hospital accordingly, and no payment of benefit shall accrue thereafter. Any patient dissatisfied with a notification of the Principal Medical Officer may appeal to the Minister. Such appeal shall be referred by the Minister and determined by a medical practitioner to be agreed upon between the Principal Medical Officer and the medical attendant of the patient concerned, or, in the event of disagreement, to be appointed by the Minister. The decision of any such medical practitioner on such appeal shall be final. If such appeal fails the patient shall be liable to pay to the Department the cost of the appeal or such portion thereof as the Minister may think fit.

Last night nearly every member was of opinion that some safeguard against imposition should be inserted. Under the amendment a patient would enter hospital on the advice of his medical attendant and we would have no control or say in the matter. We should have some say as to whether the patient is a fit and proper person to be there and to remain there for treatment. The amendment will provide for that. I have included the right of appeal. If the appeal is

dismissed, the patient will be liable to pay part or the whole of the cost of the appeal. That is taken from the Health Act under which appeals are made by civil servants on the question of their fitness to continue in their jobs, and the decision of the medical officer is final. There has been no complaint about that provision. We should have some means of preventing the lodging of frivolous appeals.

Mr. Teesdale: Could not you make it a flat rate?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: No, because conditions differ. I do not think there will be many appeals.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: A sick man is a bad thinker.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: A sick man will not lodge the appeal; that will be done by his medical adviser. Some members may take exception to the period of 48 hours stipulated. If it is proved that the notification is posted within 48 hours that is deemed to be sufficient.

Mr. Teesdale: The 48 hours would represent part of the cost?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: No; it is the cost of the referee that I am referring to, not the cost of the hospital treatment received by the patient. There would be no question about the payment to the patient for the time he was in hospital. That would arise only if he were served with notice that he was no longer entitled to the benefit of treatment under the measure. That will not happen very often, particularly if we have this safeguard.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The first two paragraphs of the Minister's amendment are not at all bad, but I do not quite understand the third paragraph. The patient can always appeal.

The Minister for Health: But this sets up an appeal board.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In a case of this sort, the Principal Medical Officer should be allowed to decide, with a right of appeal to the Minister, as is the case in every Government department to-day. If the Principal Medical Officer said a patient should not be in hospital, he would be right in 999 cases out of a thousand. I do not know that the cost of the appeal would be great.

The Minister for Health: Probably not more than two guineas at most.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The first two paragraphs improve the Bill, and will do all that is needed. I suppose there is

some danger of men being kept in hospital longer than they need be.

The Minister for Health: They would have to pay themselves.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am afraid they would not always pay. The Minister would be well advised to let all except the first two paragraphs of the amendment go. He is head of the department, and responsible for the conduct of the department in every detail. I do not see that the remainder of the amendment will give him greater power.

The Minister for Health: No, but it will give greater satisfaction to the patient.

Hon. G. Taylor: The Minister is in a position to call in a medical referee.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister already has power to do all that is provided here.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The second paragraph of the Minister's amendment seems to place the department under an obligation to the hospital. I thought the proposal was to subsidise, to the amount of 6s. per day, the person contributing to the fund.

Mr. Thomson: This only means that the hospital will be notified that the patient will not receive the 6s. per day.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: As public hospitals will not be able to cope with all the cases, the Bill sets up standard private hospitals. Then the measure proposes to allow 6s. per day to the person collected from, but not to allow that amount to a hospital. By adopting the second paragraph of the amendment we shall be placing the Government under an obligation to the hospital.

The Minister for Health: The first paragraph places the Government in the position of having to obtain information from the hospital.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Does the Bill involve the Government in any liability at all to the hospital?

The Minister for Health: No.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The payment goes to the patient, and the patient is responsible to the hospital?

The Minister for Health: Yes.

Mr. MANN: I think the Minister is in error in inserting the second paragraph. It is necessary that he should receive information from someone that a patient has entered a hospital. There the duty of the person in control of the hospital ends. If I go into a hospital, the hospital authorities look to me for, say, four guineas per week;

and they have no right to consider my getting two guineas per week from the fund, since in any event I may not get it. The Minister has claimed all along, and rightly, that the hospital has no call on the fund. Yet he is now committing himself and his officers to the duty of reporting to the hospital that the patient will not be allowed the 6s. per day. I do not think that is right at all. The contract begins and ends with the patient. Last night the Minister said that the patient would not get his refund until he had produced his hospital receipt. Why should the Minister desire to impose on the department the duty of notifying the hospital? That gives a suggestion that the hospital will receive consideration. Surely the Minister wishes to avoid any opposition from that point of view. The paragraph would have been well drafted if it had ended at the words "shall notify the patient." As it stands, the paragraph gives the hospital a kind of call on the fund. Why should those words be there?

The Minister for Health: Because that is only fair and necessary. The Government compel the hospital authorities to notify the Government that the patient is there.

Mr. MANN: Why is it fair and necessary to notify the hospital authorities? They are not relying on the fund for their money. The Minister is imposing an unnecessary extra duty on his officers and giving the hospital an inferred guarantee of two guineas per week.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The objection raised by the Leader of the Opposition to the proposed amendment extending beyond the second paragraph would be unfair to the patient. It would be unfair to place in the hands of a resident medical officer the right to say a man shall not benefit from the hospital fund, and not to allow that man to have the right of appeal against the doctor's decision.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He could always appeal to the Minister.

Mr. KENNEALLY: But if the amendment were agreed to, the law would set out that such a man must receive no benefit from the fund. He certainly should have the right of appeal to a supposedly impartial Minister. The member for Perth suggested there was no need for the hospitals to be notified and contended that notification to the patient was sufficient. If we provide that the hospital

must notify the department regarding patients, is it not logical that, having decided that a patient in the hospital shall receive no benefit from the fund, we shall notify the hospital to that effect?

Amendment put and passed.

No. 10. Clause 10.—Delete Subclause (4.)

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

The Council deleted Subclause (4) because they proposed to get rid of the payment to patients in private hospitals. As we propose to continue those payments, we shall have to reject the amendment.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 11. Clause 11.—Delete the words "or the department" in line 41.

No. 12. Clause 11.—Delete paragraph (b).

No. 13. Clause 11.—Delete the words "by deductions on the pay sheet" in line 4. Delete the words "Subsection (2) or (3) of."

On motions by the Minister for Health, the foregoing amendments made by the Council were agreed to.

No. 14. Clause 12.—Insert a new paragraph as follows:—"Providing intermediate wards or hospitals where necessary, and such provision shall be regarded as a charge on any such surplus."

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That the Council's amendment be amended by inserting after "providing," the words "throughout the State on a basis equal to the amount raised by the local authority or district."

In the country districts the residents contribute half the cost of the erection of hospitals. That principle was laid down by the Mitchell Government and has been adhered to by the present Government. The country people have subscribed liberally by direct donations and other means, or have rated themselves to provide an amount sufficient to pay interest and sinking fund on

half the cost of the construction of their hospitals. In the metropolitan area the buildings are erected by the Government and the local authorities do not pay anything towards the cost of construction. In view of the fact that we are all to be taxed under the Bill, it would be grossly unfair if the present system were to be continued; hence the reason for the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I hope the hon. member will not press his amendment. If the Bill becomes law, conditions will obtain different from those that have existed in the past. The hon. member should read carefully the amendment suggested by the Council. Should his amendment be carried, the Government will be bound absolutely to the pound for pound subsidy system regarding country hospitals.

Mr. Thomson: Not necessarily.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes,

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If the Bill is passed, there will not be any more of the pound for pound subsidy.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I suggest to the member for Katanning that he should recognise that different conditions will prevail in future, and we should have an opportunity to find out how we shall stand under the new regime. In the interests of the country districts and of the smooth working of the Bill, he should not press his amendment. It is one of the main objectives of the department to use the surplus in the direction indicated.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I think the member for Katanning merely desires to have equal treatment for all parts of the State.

Mr. Thomson: That is so.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think the people in the country should be expected to make these contributions in the future and, in fact, I do not think they will do it, seeing that they will have to pay the tax under the Bill. The whole responsibility for dealing with hospital matters in future will fall upon the hospital fund and the Treasury.

The Minister for Health: I want the hospital committees to go on working as at present.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It would be wrong to expect the committees in the country areas to do so. When the Bill be-

comes law we should arrange that its benefits shall apply to every central hospital, and if the fund is not sufficient the cost of that work should be a charge upon the Treasury.

The Minister for Railways: It is easy to see on which side of the Table you happen to be at the minute!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Not at all! The Government will collect over £200,000 by means of the tax.

The Minister for Health: And we will give back at least £86,000.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is a small return from such a tax. It will represent about 6s. 8d. in the pound. Our job is to see how much money can be provided for the object in view. The idea, of course, is to maintain the hospitals at a very high standard. I hope that in common justice to the people who will be contributing to this tax, all hospitals will be placed on precisely the same basis. A considerable sum was contributed locally for the purpose of adding a wing to the Northam hospital. As distinct from this, some hospitals have been built by money one-half of which has been contributed by the Treasury while the other half has been loaned by the Treasury. I do hope that as a result of the Bill all gambling in aid of hospitals will be stopped.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope the Minister will agree to the amendment suggested by the member for Katanning. In the past the country districts have been taxed very heavily in respect of hospital services. Private money has been found with which to do what in the city and the larger towns is done by the Government. Since the country people cannot speak with a united voice, it may be that the proposed intermediate hospitals will be denied to the country.

The Minister for Health: They are to be found in every country district now. You are talking of something you know nothing whatever about.

Mr. SAMPSON: Intermediate hospitals should be established in country districts as opportunity offers and the contributions justify.

The Minister for Health: Tell me of a single country hospital that is not an intermediate hospital at the present time.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister should know these things without asking me for information.

The Minister for Health: You know that what I say is correct.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am surprised at the violence of the Minister. Country people are mindful of the needs of hospitals, many of which are assisted by the private provision of clothing, firewood, eggs and other commodities. I hope the country will receive the consideration contemplated in the amendment proposed by the member for Katanning.

Mr. THOMSON: This provision cannot act prejudicially, because where the Minister deems it necessary that the surplus shall be utilised for the construction of intermediate hospitals, he need not ask the local authority to subscribe. There is no compulsion. We have had sympathetic consideration from the Minister in respect of country hospitals, but on the other hand the Minister has received great consideration from the country people. The erection of the Katanning hospital has been an immense boon to many residents in that district. Credit is due to the present Administration for having made possible in Katanning the construction of a hospital that had been hanging fire for a considerable time. As the result of a personal visit to the district, the Minister for Works was able to say that if we did our share he was authorised by the Government to agree to the erection of the hospital. But we had to find half the cost of erection, and we have no desire to evade that responsibility. All that we want is that when there is a surplus in the fund and it is deemed necessary that intermediate wards should be provided in certain country towns, we shall be entitled to exactly the same consideration as is given to the metropolitan area in the erection of those wards. That is all we ask for.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I will support the amendment. When I hear it said that intermediate wards are to be erected in the metropolitan area free of cost to the people, I feel that the country districts should be placed in the same position. In the past the people of the country districts have loyally supported the local hospitals by the provision of various commodities, but I doubt whether the hospitals will continue to get that support after the tax is imposed. In that regard I subscribe to everything the member for Katanning has said.

Amendment on the Council's amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	11
Noes	..	..	..	24
Majority against				.. 13

**AYES.**

Mr. Barnard	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Brown	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Doney	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Mann
Mr. Latham	(Teller.)

**NOES.**

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Coiller	Mr. North
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. J. M. Smith
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Lamond	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Millington	Mr. Withers
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. Panton
	(Teller.)

Amendment on the Council's amendment thus negatived.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 15. Clause 13.—Delete all words after "to," at the end of line 23, and insert the words "the Crown, and may be sued for and recovered by action in any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the Commissioner of Taxation."

No. 16. Clause 14.—Delete the words "of the Department," in line 31.

On motions by the Minister for Health the foregoing amendments made by the Council were agreed to.

No. 17. Clause 14.—Insert a new sub-clause, to stand as Subclause (3), as follows:—"Every auditor or examiner of accounts who discovers that any paysheet has not been stamped or is insufficiently stamped in accordance with this Act, shall forthwith report the omission to the Commissioner of Taxation. Penalty: £50."

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: This is a monstrous proposal. It embraces private

as well as Government auditors. In effect, we are directing that a section of the people shall become informers upon the rest of the community.

The Minister for Health: It is the job of auditors to inquire into these things.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But this affects private auditing.

The Minister for Health: This refers only to accounts under this Act.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Are we going to direct that every auditor in the State shall become a pimp? The Minister must realise how far-reaching the amendment is. If an auditor fails to discharge this obligation he is to be penalised.

Mr. THOMSON: I engage a firm of auditors to protect my interests. If they discover that some of my wages sheets have not been properly stamped, it is their duty to report to me. The amendment, however, proposes that unless they report some omission to the Commissioner of Taxation, they can be fined up to £50. The whole thing is absurd. It is the duty of Government auditors to attend to these matters, not that of private professional men. As things are, one is obliged to engage private persons to protect one's interests against the officials of the Taxation Department. I know of the case of a man who was requested by the department to put £74 worth of stamps on certain documents, whereas it was shown afterwards that the amount due was only 30s.

Mr. SAMPSON: We should ensure that all the money subscribed is devoted to the purpose for which it is raised. I intend to move an amendment on the Council's amendment to this effect:—"That after the word 'shall' in line 4, the words 'failing the immediate rectification of the deficiency' be inserted." That will give persons who, through carelessness, have failed to do their duty, an opportunity to rectify the error. The greater the care taken with regard to the stamping of accounts, the less likelihood there will be for complaint. If we had an amendment such as that which I have suggested, it would be possible to correct an error. There is a good deal of virtue in the amendment from another place, and I have no hesitation in saying that the Minister and those who will be associated with the operation of the measure will face a good deal of trouble when it comes to collecting the tax. Therefore every reasonable precaution should be taken.

Mr. Thomson: Would you like your auditor to report you because of the mistake of one of your own employees?

Mr. SAMPSON: The object of members of another place is not to impose punishment, but to secure for hospitals all the money which by right belongs to them.

Mr. LATHAM: I desire to move an amendment before that suggested by the member for Swan. I move an amendment—

That before "auditor" in the first line of the subclause, "Government" be inserted.

When we employ auditors, we employ them to protect us. An auditor might say, "I found some of your pay sheets incorrectly stamped," and without giving you the opportunity to rectify the position you are going to be immediately reported to the Commissioner by one of your own officials. If a Government auditor finds an error, then probably there might be justification to make a criminal offence of it. There are not many people in this State who would be so paltry as to try to cheat the Government of 1½d. tax that was being collected from the employees. It is scandalous to make your own officials pimp against the people you employ.

Hon. G. Taylor: I am surprised at you objecting to an amendment made by another place.

Mr. LATHAM: Of course we know the hon. member is the champion of another place. Anyway, I believe the amendment from another place is the result of a misapprehension.

Mr. Sampson: I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to whether the amendment moved by the hon. member is in order. To express in an Act that a Government auditor should do something which he knows it is his duty to do seems to me will make the Bill ridiculous.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is in order.

Mr. SAMPSON: I will not say that I am amazed at the decision of the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: I did not intend to say it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. SAMPSON: I move an amendment—

That after "shall" in line 4 the words "failing the immediate rectification of the deficiency" be inserted.

Amendment put and negatived.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes .. .. .	20
Noes .. .. .	14
<hr/>	
Majority for .. .. .	6
<hr/>	

**BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT  
AMENDMENT.**

*Standing Orders Suspension.*

The PREMIER: I move—

That the Standing Orders be suspended to permit of the passing of this Bill through all its stages forthwith.

Question put and passed.

*Second Reading.*

**THE PREMIER** (Hon P. Collier—Boulder) [6.10] in moving the second reading said: This is a one-clause Bill having for its object the rectifying of a printer's error or a typing error that crept into the amending Act of last session. In Section 16 of that Act there is at the end of Subsection (4) a paragraph that really ought to appear at the end of Subsection (3). By some inadvertence that paragraph became attached to the wrong subsection, and so it becomes necessary to transpose it from Subsection (4) to Subsection (3). I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**MR. THOMSON** (Katanning) [6.13]: I am not raising any objection to the Bill, but I am wondering whether the Premier could inform us as to the position of Commonwealth housing under the Act. One of my electors wishes to purchase a house, but she has received an intimation that at present there is no money available for purchases. When we passed the Bill last session I understood that the intention of the Government was to deal with country homes under the State Act, and with metropolitan homes under the Commonwealth Act. I hope they are not going to stick hard and fast to that rule; because frequently it is in the interests of the people in the country to be able to purchase a house, even if it be of a certain age, instead of building a new house, now that the cost of construction is so very much higher than it was a few years ago. I hope the Premier will see whether he cannot give those people an opportunity to purchase houses. I know what the objection is. But in our desire to find work for the workless we sometimes injure those who cannot afford to build new houses.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

**AYES**

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Millington
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Munale
Mr. Collier	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. J. H. Smith
Miss Holman	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Withers
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Steeman

(Teller.)

**NOES.**

Mr. Brown	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Doney	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Latham	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Mann	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. North

(Teller.)

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 18. Clause 16.—Add at the end of Subclause 1:—“it shall be a defence for a prosecution for an offence against this section if the defendant proves that any such failure, neglect, omission or false statement was due to ignorance or inadvertence or was unintentional.”

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

I propose to accept this amendment; it is merely copied from the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

A committee consisting of the Minister for Health, the Minister for Railways and the Hon. G. Taylor drew up reasons for not agreeing to amendments 9 and 10 made by the Council, and for further amending Nos. 1a, 7 and 8.

Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

*Third Reading.*

Read a third time and *passed*.

*Sitting suspended from 6.19 to 10.30 p.m.*

**BILL—HOSPITAL FUND  
(CONTRIBUTIONS).**

*Council's Amendment.*

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Hospital Fund (Contributions) Bill, subject to a request that the Assembly would make an amendment set forth in the schedule annexed.

**BILL—HOSPITAL FUND.**

*Standing Orders Suspension.*

On motion by the Minister for Health resolved: That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as will permit of the consideration of the Council's messages at the sitting at which they are received.

*Council's Message.*

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to amendments Nos. 7 (ii) and disagreed to Nos. 1a, 7 (i) and 8 made by the Assembly on the Council's amendments to the Hospital Fund Bill; and had insisted upon amendments Nos. 9 and 10 made by the Council, to which the Assembly had disagreed. A schedule showing the amendments disagreed to and insisted upon was annexed.

*In Committee.*

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Minister for Health in charge of the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I move—

That the amendments insisted on by the Council be further disagreed to.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What are they? We have no copy of the schedule.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The first amendment they have disagreed with is that where we put back the words "or

the person in control of a private hospital" and added the words "to which this Bill applies." They have disagreed with that, and insisted upon their own amendment. The next one is where this Committee deleted a paragraph providing for the making of regulations. The Council insist upon that being restored. They have agreed to the deduction of Subclause 4 of Clause 7, dealing with advances by the Agricultural Bank. They insist upon their amendment No. 8, which is to delete the words "in a private hospital." That is virtually the same as the first amendment. No. 9 has to do with Clause 10 Subclause 3, providing for payments to patients in private hospitals. Their amendment No. 10 deleted Subclause 4, which also made provision for payment to patients in private hospitals. They have insisted upon their amendments to wipe out payments to patients in private hospitals altogether. They have not made any alteration, but have simply insisted upon their original amendments, which means that they refuse to admit payments to patients in private hospitals of any description.

Mr. DAVY: I have an idea I am the only member of this House who agrees with the attitude of another place. I took that attitude when the Bill originally came before us—that it was wrong to make payments available to patients in private hospitals. I appreciate that in places where there are no public hospitals a man might have to go into a private hospital and not receive the benefit of his contribution, but any doubts I entertained were finally dispelled by the amendments moved by the Minister last night. His amendments were a most damning indictment of the system of allowing payments to persons entering private hospitals. He suddenly awoke to the immense abuse that might arise from making payments to people entering private hospitals. Apparently, after mature consideration and with the help of the two legal officers of the Crown, he produced a further amendment, half of which was rejected by an overwhelming majority in this House as being hopelessly unworkable and liable to create all sorts of ridiculous hardships. I understand he subsequently moved something supposed to take the place of that and to meet his object without the hardships. It does not seem to have achieved that object. I think the Minister has proved

conclusively that we cannot by any logical process extend this benefit to people entering private hospitals, and another place is perfectly right in refusing to have it done. As a taxpayer, I do not wish to see any money I have to pay wasted on purposes other than the real basic purposes of the measure, which I take to be the provision of proper hospital attention for people who cannot afford to provide it for themselves. The reason for the introduction of this legislation is that our public hospital system has broken down. In the past it has been dependent upon subscriptions collected from the public, supported by a subsidy from the Government.

Mr. Sleeman: You would tax a man for a special purpose and then refuse him any benefit.

Mr. DAVY: What does it matter if we tax people for a special purpose or for the benefit of general revenue? What is the distinction? Every person who pays tax is paying some portion without getting any benefit. What benefit does a bachelor receive from the education system of the State?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He might easily receive some benefit.

Mr. DAVY: I do not think he does. Every man who pays tax has to recognise that he is not necessarily going to receive benefit corresponding to the amount he pays. The first duty of a citizen is to make a contribution to the expenses of the whole of the community commensurate to his income, and he cannot hope to get an equivalent benefit in return. A man in this State with an income of £10,000 a year is probably paying income tax of £1,500 to £2,000 a year. Does he get value in return for it? Of course not. It is said that many people cannot afford to pay for hospital treatment for themselves, their wives and children when they fall sick. They are on the basic wage or their obligations are so great that they cannot afford it, and so we are going to insist on every person contributing in order that this obligation of the whole of the community might be met.

Mr. Kenneally: You did not oppose the principle of every person in the State having to pay when the Bill was before us.

Mr. DAVY: No; but when the Minister said this was not a taxation measure but a measure for compulsory contributions for benefits to be received, I replied that it was a piece of hypocrisy in view of the fact that companies were to be taxed that could

not possibly derive any benefit from it. I would have preferred it had the Minister said this was a straight-out taxation measure for a special purpose, which it really is. Why should we be afraid of it, unless we agree that taxation measures for special purposes are wrong?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We all agree with that.

Mr. DAVY: I suppose we do.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is a pity we cannot get along without any taxation whatever.

Mr. DAVY: If we could it would be lovely, but we should have to go and live in Monaco or some place like that. I am sorry to find myself the only member of this House who agrees with another place, but I do not wish to see one penny of the money I have to contribute dissipated in the manner that will inevitably occur if the Minister insists on payments being made to people entering private hospitals. I submit that the Minister himself last night proved conclusively that the inclusion of private hospitals in the scheme must lead to the most ridiculous abuses which, in the opinion of this House, could not be cured by any safeguards that could be prepared as an afterthought by the Minister, his officers in the Health Department and the Crown Law officers combined. I regret that this Committee refuses to accept the position taken up by another place.

Mr. J. H. SMITH: The Minister for Health has suggested no alternative to his motion. Some compromise should be offered, because the country is crying out for a Bill of this kind. I would rather accept the Council's amendments than see the Bill go by the Board. Perhaps a conference will bring forth some good.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The member for West Perth is entitled to the questionable honour of being the only member of the Chamber who supports the attitude adopted by another place. It is difficult to understand his point of view. If the Council insists upon these amendments, the sooner we decide that it shall not be permitted to direct the affairs of the country, the better will it be for all concerned. We have no right to deny to the individual the choice of hospital to which he elects to go. The hon. member says we should make this a charity tax.

Mr. Davy: Not at all.

Mr. KENNEALLY: It is not a question of relief to indigent persons, but a question

of making provision for subsidising persons who are obliged to go into hospital. The attitude of members of the Council is a mere subterfuge to cover up their real desire to protect the aggregations of wealth they represent.

Mr. Davy: How would it do that?

Mr. KENNEALLY: To protect them from taxation. I hope the Minister's motion will be agreed to.

Question put and passed: the amendments insisted on by the Council further disagreed to.

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

*Request for Conference.*

**THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH** (Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans) [10.57]: I move—

That a conference with the Legislative Council be requested, and that the managers for the Assembly be the Hon. J. C. Willecock, the Hon. G. Taylor, and the mover.

**MR. SLEEMAN** (Fremantle) [10.58]: It is only a waste of time to carry a motion of this kind. The Government are wedded to one attitude, which provides for the payment of the subsidy to patients entering private hospitals, while another place is as consistently opposed to that attitude. Last session the Bill was practically thrown out in another place. Promises were given afterwards that if the Bill was brought up again there was every reason to believe it would go through. We are now going through the same sort of thing that occurred last session. We are wasting time in asking for a conference with the Council. This is a case where there can be no compromise.

Mr. Mann: The Minister may relax his attitude.

The Minister for Works: Let the others relax.

**MR. KENNEALLY** (East Perth) [11.0]: The motion raises the question whether we are to have government by representatives or government by conferences. There has recently been a tendency for another place to insist upon amendments to the last ditch in the hope that when a conference, up to which it always works, takes place, it will get at least some of the amendments upon which it has insisted. I am not favourable to the idea of government by conference,

towards which system we are tending. If the fossilised representatives of bricks and mortar in another place are going to insist upon governing this country, we ought to let the people know that the Council is preventing others from doing the work they are sent here to do. I therefore oppose the motion for a conference.

**THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH** (Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans—in reply) [11.2]: Like the member for East Perth (Mr. Kenneally) I am not altogether enamoured of conferences between the two Houses; but I am so anxious to secure the Bill that I am unwilling to leave any loophole for its defeat. I will not be one to sit here without asking for a conference and thus give another place the opportunity to say, "If a conference had been asked for, we would have been prepared to give way." I want the conference in order to see whether another place will give way. Therefore I hope the House will carry the motion.

Question put and passed.

*Sitting suspended from 11.5 to 11.15 p.m.*

**BILL—HOSPITAL FUND.**

*Council's Further Message.*

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Assembly's request for a conference and had appointed the Hon. A. J. H. Saw, the Hon. H. Seddon, and the Hon. W. H. Kitson as managers, the President's room as the place, and the time forthwith, for the holding of the conference.

*Sitting suspended from 11.18 p.m. to 12.35 a.m.*

*Conference Managers' Report.*

**THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH** (Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans) [12.36]: I have to report that the managers have met and have failed to come to an agreement.

**ADJOURNMENT—CLOSE OF SESSION.**

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [12.37]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday, the 18th April.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 12.38 a.m. (Friday).*

---

By Proclamation published in the *Government Gazette* of 12th April, 1929, Parliament was prorogued to the 30th of May, 1929.