of keeping himself in the field as a prospector.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I sympathise with the Premier in the position that confronts him. It has always been so. Something happens and then the Premier is expected to undertake something to provide against the extra cost to the getter. I do not know how the Premier will do it. If we are to preserve our industry at present prices we shall have to hold off for some time. I suppose it is the sandalwood from South Australia that has hit us so hard.

The Premier: That and the position in China.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: China can take about 6,000 tons only a year.

The Premier: I am not pressing for the royalty for the time being.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope we shall be able to retain the trade because it is invaluable to the prospectors in the back country. It is the one legitimate direction in which we could hold the trade against a decent price. For 50 years we have allowed them to get the timber at a low figure before we secured an increase.

The Premier: It is so important that South Australia does not want to compete with us.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We do not want to lose the trade. I hope the Government will do all they can to keep it going but we cannot be expected to hold timber on the wharf for an unlimited time.

Mr. Corboy: No one would expect that.

Mr. LAMBERT: No reference is made in the Estimates to the work carried on at the University in connection with tanning products.

The Premier: That does not come under this Vote.

Mr. LAMBERT: Can the Premier indicate under which Vote it comes?

The Premier: I cannot say offhand.

Mr. LAMBERT: I want to discuss one phase that is of all-importance to the State.

The CHAIRMAN: You cannot discuss it under this Vote.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.7 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 26th October, 1927.

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

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Assembly now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; Hon. A. Lovekin in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2.—Strike out all the words after "by," in the second line, and insert in lieu thereof "inserting after the word 'area,' in line seven of paragraph (c) of Subsection (2) thereof, the words 'and the Board controlling Reserve A1720 (the King's Park).'"

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The amendment suggested by the Legislative Assembly brings the Bill into line with the original intention. It was framed in the way suggested by the Assembly at the outset but, as the President knows, in deference to the views of the Speaker, the Bill was altered to omit the words, "King's Park Board" in lieu of which "Reserve A1720"—which is King's Park—was inserted. The contention of the Speaker was that the inclusion of the name of the park in the Bill created another authority and it followed there must be an appropriation of revenue, in which event, he contended, the Bill could not originate in the Legislative Council. The Speaker was quite wrong, because the provisions of the Traffic Act specifically set out that the fees to be collected shall be placed to the credit of a trust account, so that the money does not go into Consolidated Revenue at all. Wiser counsels have prevailed apparently, because the same gentleman was in the Chair when the Assembly passed the third reading of the Bill in its amended form, and in the form we originally intended. Had the Bill been

amended in accordance with the attitude adopted by the Speaker, it would have meant that the Minister for Works would have had to construct the roads in King's Park. The Minister for Works objects to that and prefers to make a grant to the board to enable it to carry out the necessary work. He therefore proposes, by way of the amendment passed by the Assembly, to make an addition to paragraph (c) of Sec. 13 of the principal Act. It makes no difference at all to the board, because under paragraph (b), which the Bill sought to amend in deference to the views of the Speaker, the Minister for Works constructs the road and takes the cost out of his moiety. If he does not, he has a surplus which, under paragraph (c), is transferred into the second moiety and that is the one from which road boards, municipalities and others secure their appropriation. Hon. members will see therefore that it makes no difference at all to road boards or municipalities under which paragraph the provision regarding King's Park is made. The Minister desires that the park authorities shall have the grant and carry out the work, rather than that he, as Minister, shall do the work through his department. The members of the King's Park Board are glad to have the matter adjusted in this way. We thought we could not get it in this way at the outset in view of the contention raised by the Speaker, and therefore we endeavoured to secure our ends in another way. Now the Minister himself has put it right. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 15 (Inspection of Rolls).

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Section 33 of the principal Act fixes the price for rolls. Can the Chief Secretary indicate what fees will be charged if the clause be agreed to? If the clause is passed, the parent Act will prescribe fees for the Council rolls and supplementary rolls, but the fees chargeable for Assembly rolls will be as prescribed. It is intended that there shall be the same rates chargeable as for the Commonwealth rolls?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The price will be 6d. as in the past, for each subdivisional roll.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: If that is the position, then no purpose is served by the clause seeing that we will merely pursue the same course as is outlined in the principal Act.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The fees will be prescribed by regulation and the price will be 6d. for each roll, no matter how small it may be. The regulations under the Electoral Act, 1907, set out the prices that are to be charged for the different rolls. I daresay new regulations will be necessary if the Bill is passed, but I do not think the purchase prices will be in excess of those set out in the existing regulations.

Hon. E. H. Harris: If the rates are to be the same, Clause 15 is merely so much verbiage, seeing that the provisions of the Act itself will stand.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The price will be prescribed by regulation. I cannot say what it will be, but I can say definitely that the minimum will be 6d. per subdivisional roll.

Hon. E. H. Harris: If you made it uniform with the Commonwealth it would be 3d.

Hon. A. BURVILL: Fifteen electorates, some having two and some three rolls each, will have 33 rolls in all. If an electorate has three rolls, will the charge be 1s. 6d.? Such an arrangement is likely to lead to great confusion.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The number of extra rolls is not 15 but 17. The 67 rolls will be prepared beforehand, but certain ones will be amalgamated previous to the election so that there will be 50 rolls altogether, or one for each Assembly district.

Hon. A. BURVILL: If the rolls are to be amalgamated just before an election, inconvenience may result. It may be considered advisable to begin the checking of rolls a considerable time beforehand and the rolls for some districts would be in three fragments. Would the charge be 6d. for each one?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Ample time would be allowed for such work as checking. I do not wish it to be inferred that the consolidation of the rolls would take

place a fortnight before an election, but the question of the actual time may well be left to the Chief Electoral Officer.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 16, 17—agreed to.

Clause 18—Claims for enrolment or transfer of enrolment:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Subclause 1 provides that any qualified person "who lives in a district, or if the district is divided into subdivisions, in a subdivision and has so lived for one month" shall be entitled to enrolment. If a district had been subdivided and an elector had lived portion of the month in two or more subdivisions but not a month in any one of them, what would be his position? No one could witness his declaration that he had lived in the subdivision for a month. Subclause 2 deals in the same way with transfers. If a district had been divided into two or three parts, unless the elector had lived in a particular part for a month, he would not be eligible for enrolment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If an elector had lived in any subdivisions of a district he would have lived in the district, because a subdivision is merely part of a district. He would be entitled to enrolment so long as he had lived in the district for a month.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: On the wording of the clause the Minister is wrong. If an elector had lived for a month in more than one subdivision, although he had been in the district for a month, he would not be entitled to enrolment. The clause should be redrafted.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Make it read "one or more subdivisions"

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: On the drafting of the clause there is a good deal in Mr. Harris's contention. The wording could be made much clearer.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I emphasise that if an elector lives in a subdivision, it is portion of an Assembly district, and therefore he must be living in the district.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You must recognise the alternative "or."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Chief Electoral Officer directed the Solicitor General's attention to the clause and he was satisfied that it provided all that was necessary.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It does not satisfy me.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Minister is not attaching any meaning to the word "or."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am, but it may be well to postpone the clause for further consideration. I move—

That the further consideration of Clause 18 be postponed.

Motion put and passed.

Clause 19—Compulsory enrolment:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Subclause 4 provides that electors following certain occupations shall be entitled to have their names retained on the roll although they may change their address The enrolment of such electors will be undertaken by the Commonwealth officials who already enrol men following about 14 different vocations. As I remarked previously, the only vocation omitted is that of a bushranger. On the envelopes sent out by the Commonwealth Department there is this note—

An elector who is only temporarily absent from his or her place of living, although such absence may exceed one month, is not thereby deemed to have changed his or her place of living for the purpose of transfer of enrolment.

As the department has already enrolled those who are following the avocations mentioned in the subclause and retained the names on the roll, I fail to see the necessity for the subclause. The Commonwealth have inserted a provision to ensure that the names of those men are retained on the roll, and if we have one card, that should satisfy both the State and the Commonwealth. I would like to hear further reasons from the Chief Secretary for retaining the subclause.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This does not mean, as some members may think, that a person living in a particular district should retain his vote for that district. A station hand or a drover, still within the district, though he may have changed his address, need not put in a card to notify that he has changed his address. Under the existing law an elector is supposed, in such circumstances, to make a fresh application, but under the Bill it will not be necessary for him to do so while he remains in the electorate.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Reference is made to able-bodied seamen, but there is no provision for an engineer or the skipper of a ship.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Are not engineers and skippers of ships, seamen?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I submit that a dingo trapper, a camel driver and others following somewhat similar occupations are equally entitled to be included in the list. What about an insurance agent who is running around various districts? I do not think the subclause is necessary, and therefore, I move an amendment—

That Subclause 4 be struck out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: When joint rolls are being prepared the utmost vigilance will be exercised by the Commonwealth administration. If anyone leaves his address, notification will be immediately made and the name removed from the roll.

Hon. J. Nicholson: There is not a similar clause in the Commonwealth Act.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, but the conditions in Western Australia necessitate legislation of this character to enable a fair number of men, say those who are prospecting or droving or engaged in station work, and who have no fixed address, to retain the franchise whilst they are still resident in a particular district.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Perhaps the Minister will look into this clause as well. Here, too, the words "district or subdivision" are used in a connection that shows they are intended to be two distinct and separate things.

Hon. A. BURVILL: I think the subclause should be deleted because it will lead to a good deal of confusion. In any case, I do not see the necessity for it.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	7
Majority for	5

Ayes.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. A. Lovekin	(*Teller.*)
Hon. J. Nicholson	

Noes.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. J. R. Brown
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(*Teller.*)

Amendment thus passed: the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 20 and 21—agreed to.

Clause 22—Time for altering rolls:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The clause provides for quite a different application for enrolment from that set out in the parent Act that we are asked to amend. For the information of members, I would draw attention to the fact that under the parent Act claims received not less than 14 days before the issue of a writ for an election may be enrolled after the issue of the writ, and alterations of the rolls before the issue of the writ for an election may be made after the issue of the writ. Under the present system a claim card remains such until the expiration of 14 clear days after it has reached the registrar. On the 15th day, if it has not been objected to, the name of the person on the card is enrolled by the registrar, which means that an elector's name is placed on the roll. Under the provisions of the Bill, which is a copy of the Federal Act, the registrar, on receipt of a claim immediately enrols the name of the applicant. The elimination of the State procedure of having a claim lying in abeyance for 14 days has in my opinion an entirely different effect. The Commonwealth electorates have 30,000 to 40,000 on a roll, so even if a dozen or two are dropped in at the last moment it makes but little difference. However, it makes a lot of difference in some of our electorates, having but a small number of enrolments. If I were a candidate for an electorate where there was likely to be a very narrow margin, I would look askance on this proposal. Under it many people will stack up the claim cards and not lodge them till the last moment, so that nobody else can inspect them. Under the present method we have 14 days in which to object to claim cards. Consider what occurred at Southern Cross. The Assembly member for the district admitted in court that he had witnessed claim cards of persons who had not resided in the district for one month. They arrived in the district on the 7th January, and when he put in their cards on the 5th February he declared they had been there a month. Subsequently he admitted in court that they had not been there for the specified period. Under the proposal in the clause, the moment a claim card is put in, the elector is duly enrolled and his vote cannot be challenged. The method will not work satisfactorily in State electorates, particularly those having but small enrolments. Under this, what has happened before will happen with impunity.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Every facility should be given for enrolment.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I want every facility for objecting to an improper claim card. Under this, no objection can be taken, even if the person whose name appears on the claim card has not been in the district for one month. If we pass this, it will not be long before we are asked to make it uniform for the Council.

Hon. E. H. Gray: A good idea, too.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: This is even more important in relation to Council enrolment, where we have a different qualification, and where it is necessary to closely scrutinise claim cards. The Chief Secretary probably will tell us that if we do not pass this as drafted, we shall be putting the Commonwealth electoral people into an impossible position. But it will be possible for them to accept a claim card, enrol the applicant for the Commonwealth electorate, but, in respect of the State electorate star the card and hold it in abeyance for 14 days. Let me give a further illustration. In the Greenough electorate 283 electors were enrolled, and 80 per cent. of the cards put in were witnessed by the member for the district.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Is there anything wrong with that?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Not if that were as far as it went. The cards did not disclose the electorates for which those men, the majority of whom were road makers, had been previously enrolled.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is not essential that the information should be given.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: No, it is not essential, and so the space was left blank. Over 100 of those cards, dated the 5th February, were witnessed by the member for the district. There is no record of any aeroplane having taken any person to and from the various points where those cards were witnessed. They were put in from Greenough, from Geraldton, from Ajana and from Mullewa, all on three consecutive days, and witnessed by the same person. Yet it takes 32 hours to travel from Greenough to Geraldton, and 58 hours to Ajana.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is stretching the discussion very far from the clause. The clause deals with the time when the claim shall be received. I hope the member will connect his remarks with the clause.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am not stretching the discussion at all. I am quoting the mileage round about the district. By the shortest route it meant 204 miles over a particularly bad road, and it is doubtful whether anybody travelled over the whole area within three days. It is far easier to sit down and fill in the dates afterwards. I mention that to show how necessary it is to take every precaution to see that when claims are put in there shall be 14 days for the lodging of objections.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is not very creditable to the Chamber when a member makes innuendoes and casts aspersions on members of another place. I know for a fact that what the hon. member has said is not correct. It may be that some person witnessed the claim cards of a number of people in the Greenough electorate but, on the other hand, a paid agent of the United Party enrolled considerably more than 283 persons at Geraldton. The whole district was canvassed by that paid agent, who was very successful in placing a considerable number of persons on the roll. As to the insinuation that men working on the roads were not qualified, as the result of the closing down of certain works prior to the general elections about 50 men were put to work in Greenough. For the time being they were permanent residents and, no doubt, were placed on the roll. The hon. member insinuates that it was a shady transaction.

Hon. E. H. Harris: I did not say "shady."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: What is the object of bringing this forward?

Hon. E. H. Harris: To show how necessary it is that we should have 14 days for the lodging of objections.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This is a vital clause, and without it the Bill will be of no use. Our principal Act provides for the receipt of election claims at any time 14 clear days prior to the issue of the writ. Under the proposed clause, which is in conformity with the Commonwealth law and is necessary if we are to have joint rolls, claims will be receivable up to 6 p.m. on the date of the issue of the writ. I have no desire to disguise the position from members. That means that people can become enrolled almost up to the moment of the issue of the writ.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is there no chance of objecting that people are not entitled to be on the roll?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If we retained our present law and made provision for the 14 days notice, it would be almost impossible to have joint rolls, unless the Commonwealth Government amended their Act in accordance with ours. The whole thing is impracticable. One set of persons could be enrolled only after the expiration of 14 days, and another set could be enrolled immediately prior to the issue of the writ. If this clause is not acceptable, the Bill is not acceptable. The object of drafting the measure on these lines is to make it harmonise with the Federal law. It would be useless to pass the Bill unless this were agreed to.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Is it not quite useless to endeavour to fit the Federal coat upon the State body? A few fictitious electors upon a large Federal roll would not perhaps have much effect upon an election, but the same number enrolled at the eleventh hour in some pocket borough might change the whole aspect of affairs with consequent disaster to the State. We cannot have something that is equally good for the Commonwealth and for the State in this respect. I should be sorry to see the clause passed, for it seems to me to open the door to gross corruption. I shall vote against it.

HON. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM: When I was talking yesterday I said it would be better to amend the Electoral Act altogether. Any clause that permits of an evasion of the intentions of the Act, in the way that has been illustrated by Mr. Harris, by the interjections of Mr. Gray, and the admissions of the Chief Secretary as to what the opposite side have done, is a bad clause. The intention of the Act is that when a man puts his name down and applies for enrolment, 14 days shall elapse in which objection may be lodged against him. Anything that does away with that should never be permitted. We have been told that hundreds of votes have been rushed in under circumstances that rendered it impossible to make any inspection of the claims or lodge any objection. Therefore members would do well to consider whether such a state of things should be tolerated. I am sure people do not desire to get on the roll unlawfully, and that they would be glad to be placed in the position of being prevented from doing these things. We should maintain the 14 days provision.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: After the remarks of the Chief Secretary about the Greenough enrolments, I should like to make the position clear regarding another district, on the admission of a man who witnessed the claim cards. It was admitted in the court that a man named Corboy——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed members a great deal of laritude. I understand the man referred to by the hon. member is an hon. member of another place I hope, therefore, Mr. Harris will not pursue the line of action he is contemplating.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I will not mention names. It was admitted in the case before the court that the men arrived on the 7th of the month, were put on the roll, and their claim cards witnessed by a qualified witness on the 5th of the next month. But for the section we are now discussing no opportunity would have been afforded to anyone to object to the claims. These names would all have been put on the roll, and the persons would have been entitled to record their vote.

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

Ayes	.. ..	5
Noes	.. ..	15
	Majority against ..	10

Ayes	
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. J. R. Brown
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(*Teller.*)

Noes	
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. G. W. Miles	(*Teller.*)

Clause thus negatived.

Clause 23—Penalty on officer neglecting to enrol candidates:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I should like to know what justification there is for this clause. It says that any officer, which means a registrar, who fails to do his duty when receiving claims, is liable to be fined £10. In the principal Act the penalty is £200 or imprisonment for one year. This clause will create an anomaly between the Legis-

lative Council and the Legislative Assembly. If the officer fails to do his duty in the case of the Council he will be liable to a fine of £200 or imprisonment. If he fails to do his duty in the case of the Legislative Assembly he will, under this clause, be fined no more than £10. The Chief Secretary said the principal Act would still apply as regards penalties for making false statements in a claim, and would be enforced by the State. I submit that the Chief Secretary when making that statement was dealing with an entirely different clause. The Chief Electoral Officer has no power to impose any penalty, for that is a matter for the courts. There is no justification for departing from the parent Act and setting up an anomalous position between the two Houses. If, as the Chief Secretary says, the principal Act will still apply, why have two separate penalties?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have no further explanation to offer. The penalty for neglect in this case is £10. Under the principal Act the penalty for a breach or neglect by an officer is £200 or imprisonment not exceeding one year. This provision is embodied in the Bill to conform with the Commonwealth law.

Hon. E. H. Harris: And to create an anomaly with respect to the Council.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We must have uniformity in order to secure joint rolls. The Solicitor General states that the Chief Electoral Registrar can take advantage of the provisions contained in Section 178 of the Electoral Act, under which it will be possible severely to punish an offender to the extent of fining him £200, or imprisoning him for a period not exceeding one year. I have no other explanation to offer, and cannot change my ground in order to suit the occasion.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: When the same registrar is dealing with the Assembly rolls, why fine him £10, when if he commits an offence with respect to the Council rolls, he may be fined £200 or sent to gaol?

Hon. H. Stewart: He is not the same man.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, he is. The State registrar will conduct the Council enrolments; the Commonwealth officer will not. The latter should be in exactly the same position as the former.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Chief Secretary said the object was to secure uniformity between the rolls; the penalty, however, will not affect the compilation of the rolls. The rolls can be compiled as proposed in the Bill, and the penalty can be in accordance with existing legislation.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the amendment were made, we would have the Commonwealth regarding the offence as meriting a fine of not more than £10 and the State declaring that the fine should be up to £200. If action were taken by the Federal Government, the fine could not exceed £10, whereas if the State took action, the penalty might be up to £200; and that is a ridiculous position if a partnership in electoral rolls is entered into.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 24 to 29—agreed to.

Clause 30—Names on roll may be objected to:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Why is the objection fee in this instance 5s.? Is the aim to attain conformity with the Commonwealth? If so, a State anomaly will be created. The fee for objecting to a name on the Council roll is 2s. 6d., while the corresponding fee for the Assembly is 5s.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 31, 32—agreed to.

Clause 33—Notice of objection:

Hon. A. BURVILL: I move an amendment—

That in the last line of Subclause 4, "calendar" be inserted between "one" and "month."

Clause 36, dealing with appeals, speaks of action being taken "at any time within one calendar month after the receipt of notice." If "calendar" is used in one case, it should be used in the other.

The Chief Secretary: Under the Interpretation Act "month" means calendar month.

Hon. A. BURVILL: If that is so, why is "calendar" used in Clause 36?

Hon. J. Nicholson: A little license on the part of the draftsman.

The CHAIRMAN: On page 151 of the Standing Orders appears the definition, in the Interpretation Act, of "month" as calendar month.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Clause 33 has been copied from the Commonwealth Electoral Act, and the word "calendar," though unnecessary, has been included.

Hon. A. Burvill: Why not let us have uniformity?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will have his remedy when Clause 36 is reached.

He can then move the deletion of the word "calendar." Has the hon. member the Committee's leave to withdraw his amendment?

Hon. A. BURVILL: I object to withdrawing my amendment. The necessary correction may as well be made now.

The CHAIRMAN: I have drawn the hon. member's attention to the definition of "month" in the Interpretation Act, and I have suggested that he should not move to amend this clause, but that when Clause 36 is reached he should move the deletion of "calendar." Does the hon. member persist in his amendment?

Hon. A. BURVILL: As a rule people who refer to an Act such as this do not also refer to the Interpretation Act. Therefore, with a view to avoiding the possibility of confusion, it would be advisable to have "calendar" inserted here.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	13
Noes	.. .. ..	6
Majority for	..	7

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. J. Nicholson	*(Teller.)*

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. J. W. Hickey	*(Teller.)*
Hon. W. H. Kitson	

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 34, 35—agreed to.

Clause 36—Appeal to courts of summary jurisdiction:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I wish to draw attention to the appearance of the word "calendar" in Subclause 1 and to point out to the Committee that it is unnecessary to use that word. I wish also to direct the attention of members to the provisions of the Interpretation Act, because many Bills that come before us entirely ignore that Act. From time to time we find clauses included in Bills providing that the Government shall have power to make regulations, which shall lie on the Table of the House and so on. That is merely re-enacting existing provisions of the Interpretation Act. There are a dozen other instances in which the same sort of thing occurs. I wish to bring this matter under the notice of the Minister and to inform him that there is an Interpretation Act in existence. If he were to mention the fact to the Parliamentary draftsman or whoever was responsible, we would have much better legislation if regard were had to the Act, than we do get with the provisions of that measure passed over.

The CHAIRMAN: When the previous clause in which this matter cropped up was before the Committee, I tried to convey to members the fact that there was no need for the inclusion of the word "calendar" in view of the provisions of the Interpretation Act, but the Committee were dead against me.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think the Parliamentary draftsman can be absolved because a majority of the members of the Committee of this House, not including Mr. Lovekin, decided that it was necessary to insert the word "calendar."

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I understand that but I also understand that it was not the Committee of this House that passed the provision I referred to in the Interpretation Act. Two Houses of Parliament did that and the measure was assented to by the Governor. That Act sets out that when the word "month" appears in an Act of Parliament it means a calendar month.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 37—agreed to.

Clause 38—Consequential amendments of principal Act:

Hon. A. BURVILL: Subclause 2 provides that the word "Western" in paragraph (b) of Section 17, Subsection 1, shall be deleted. I ask for a ruling as to whether the amendment is within the scope of the Title of the Bill. Why should the word be deleted?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: With the amendment the section will provide for continuous residence for six months in Australia instead of Western Australia. That is for the purposes of the joint roll. That is the foundation of the qualification, but not the whole of it.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. The Act reads, "has lived in Western Australia for six months continuously." Subclause 2

of the Bill seeks to amend that so that it will be necessary for a person to live for six months in Australia and one month in Western Australia before he can be enrolled. I would draw attention to what has been done in Victoria and South Australia.

Hon. E. H. Gray: What have they got to do with this?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The Victorian and South Australian Governments provided in their Acts that an elector must live for three months in their respective States before he can be enrolled. I think we should have six months' residential qualification in Western Australia. I move an amendment—

That Subclause 2 be struck out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The subclause has been inserted for the sake of uniformity so that the qualification will be six months' residence in Australia and one month in any subdivision.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you believe in that yourself?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Certainly.

Hon. H. STEWART: This is not the first Federal agreement or arrangement that we have had to deal with. On other occasions we have heard this plea for uniformity, notably in connection with the legislation to provide one authority to collect taxation. There have been advantages in connection with that particular scheme, but there have been decided disadvantages. So far from Parliament securing uniformity when they agreed to that and other similar legislation, there have been wider differences than previously; yet despite those variations the legislation concerned has been administered satisfactorily. In such matters I believe that if we have some provision that is better than that contained in the Commonwealth Act, we should adhere to our legislation and the Commonwealth will probably follow our lead. In common with Mr. Harris, I think it desirable to delete Subclause 2. I believe that a residence of six months in Western Australia should be the minimum qualification entitling a person to exercise the franchise reasonably and intelligently. That is in the best interests of the proper government of Western Australia.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am surprised at the narrow view adopted by members opposing the subclause. Where is the Federal spirit that we should display? What about "one people, one destiny"? There is only one possible flaw and that is that persons opposed to Labour have enormous funds at their disposal and they might arrange huge picnics in the Eastern States in order to defeat Labour. I do not think, however, that the people would agree to such a course. Why not give evidence of a Federal spirit on this occasion? If a person from the Eastern States were to come here and buy land, he could have his name placed on the municipal rolls straight away. Why should we differentiate?

Hon. E. H. Harris: He could not do that.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Yes, after seven days.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But if a man buys a block of land, it is evidence that he has come to stay.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Why continue the old Groper "totherside" attitude. Why not welcome people from the Eastern States and encourage them to come here as quickly as possible? I believe in adopting a broad view in respect of these questions.

Hon. H. SEDDON: We are beginning to see the nigger in the woodpile at last! The Minister was insistent upon the desire to secure uniformity, but Mr. Gray has pointed out that it is possible for people to come here and become enrolled quickly as electors for this State. If the subclause be agreed to, I can visualise what may happen in the future.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is your party that has all the money to spend at election time.

Hon. H. SEDDON: If the hon member desires to talk about that, I can tell him that I saw more money splashed about during the last election by the Labour Party than ever before.

Hon. E. H. Gray: For every £1 we spent, the others spent £5.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I can realise the object behind the subclause. It might be possible to organise an immense army of "shock troops" to travel from one State to another electing Labour Governments in the various States throughout the Commonwealth! I do not know how Mr. Gray can reconcile his statements with the provisions of the Bill placed before us in 1925 because that measure, which was introduced by the present Government, provided for a residence of three months instead of six months. Possibly, however, they have realised the advantage of one month's residence rather than the period of three months. The Victorian Act makes provision for a voter having to be a resident of Australia for six months and

at least three months in any subdivision of Victoria.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Is that the amended Act?

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes.

Hon. E. H. Harris: And the elector must live in a subdivision in Victoria for that period.

Hon. H. SEDDON: In the circumstances I think we should leave matters as they are.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: What is the underlying object of the subclause? The purpose of the residential qualification in the Act is that a person shall be resident for a period long enough to enable him to know something about the country in which he desires to exercise the franchise. No one can know much about any country even after a residence of six months. I think that period is short enough.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	14
Noes	.. .. ..	5
Majority for	..	9

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. J. Nicholson (*Teller.*)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson (*Teller.*)
Hon. E. H. Gray	

Amendment thus passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to Subclause 3:—"and the following words are added to paragraph (d) thereof, namely, 'unless he is a native of British India, or he is a person to whom a certificate of naturalisation has been issued under a law of the Commonwealth or of the State, and that certificate is still in force, or is a person who has obtained British nationality by virtue of the issue of any such certificate.'"

Under the Constitution Act persons, though Asiatics, if possessed of the freehold qualification are entitled to vote for the Council, but they are excluded under Section 18 the Electoral Act from voting for the A sembly. That section expressly excludes aboriginal native of Australia, Asia, Afr or the islands of the Pacific or a pers of the half-blood. The exclusion almost identical with that which w contained in the principal Act of t Commonwealth. In 1925 the Commo wealth Parliament passed an amendment, t effect of which I have embodied in my amen ment, so that my proposal will assist to bri the two laws more into uniformity than th otherwise would be, and will prevent co fusion that otherwise would arise.

The CHAIRMAN: Since the amendme was placed on the Notice Paper I have giv some consideration to its relevancy. The B provides for the preparation and use joint rolls for the State and Commonweal elections. In no portion of the Bill is a attempt made to alter the basic provisions the Act that prescribes who may be enroll as electors for the Assembly. The amendme disturbs the present position inasmuch as seeks to enfranchise individuals who to-d are expressly barred through being abo iginal natives of Australia, Asia, Africa the islands of the Pacific, or persons of t half-blood. In no circumstances may su persons be enrolled as electors under the e isting Act. Mr. Nicholson's amendme seeks to give them the status of enrolmen and as the Bill does not disturb the bas qualification for an elector, I rule that t amendment is not relevant to the subje matter of the Bill and is out of order.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I was going t object to the amendment on constitution grounds, because I consider it goes beyon the Constitution in creating a new electo In another place the measure, whic amends the Constitution, was not carrie by the statutory majority. Whether th Royal assent would cure that defect, cannot say. It is not advisable for thi House to legislate for the electoral qualifi cations of another place. We have quit enough to do to look after ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN: If no objection i taken to my ruling I shall put the question

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: May I point ou that Clause 17 and subsequent clauses dea with enrolment?

The CHAIRMAN: The Bill does no seek to alter the enrolment qualificatio for the Assembly but the amendment does and on that ground I have ruled it out o order.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I move an amendment—

That Subclause 3 be struck out.

Subclause 3 deals with paragraphs (b) and (c) of Section 18. Those paragraphs read—

Every person, nevertheless, shall be disqualified from being enrolled as an elector or, if enrolled, from voting at any election, who . . . . . (b) is wholly dependent on relief from the State or from any charitable institution subsidised by the State, except as a patient under treatment for accident or disease in a hospital; or (c) has been attainted of treason or has been convicted and is under sentence, or subject to be sentenced for any offence punishable under the law of any part of the King's dominions for one year or longer.

It is proposed to delete paragraph (b), and to strike out of paragraph (c) the words "or subject to be sentenced." I cannot understand why these people should be given exemption.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I would like to ask why there is such a desire to give these people a vote?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The reason is similar to a dozen others that I have already given to the Committee and it is the desire to bring it into line with the provisions of the Commonwealth Act.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	3
Majority for	10

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. A. Burvil	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. Sir W. Lathlain
Hon. G. W. Miles	*(Teller.)*

NOES.

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. J. W. Hickey	*(Teller.)*

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Subclause 4 is another instance of the futile attempt to get uniformity. The Commonwealth keeps everything that is profitable and permits the State to retain everything that involves a loss. Where the charities are concerned, the State can keep them. The Commonwealth has no charitable institutions and therefore employs no superintendents of charities, and because of that they propose that we shall strike out the reference to the superintendent in our legislation. Under the Electoral Act the superintendent of the Hospital for the Insane has to report to the registrar all particulars about the insane in that home, and the registrar then rectifies the roll. Further, the superintendent of charities has always notified the registrar about the unfortunate imbeciles who are in the Old Men's Home. We are going to do away with the obligations on the part of the superintendent to report to the registrar that fact, and therefore imbeciles will be permitted to remain on the roll and will be able to vote when they ought not to have a vote. I move an amendment—

That Subclause 4 be struck out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Only a comparatively few of the inmates of the Old Men's Home and Old Women's Home are, under our present Act, disqualified from voting. They cannot be disqualified unless they are wholly dependent on the State for relief, but over two-thirds receive the old age pension.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That does not give them mentality.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is a large number of people outside those institutions whose mentality is lower than that of some of the inmates of the home. I have been to the home and have come across some very intelligent men. It is most improper for any hon. member to reflect on the inmates of those homes.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I only mentioned some of them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Is it worth while then to disfranchise the remainder?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Under the existing law the superintendent has to report to the registrar whether there are any inmates in the home who are not of good mentality. Why should we alter that? There cannot be uniformity in this case because the Commonwealth have no such institutions.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: If I understand the amendment it will mean that those people in the homes will be disfranchised.

Members: No.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Why should there be a special provision to disfranchise them?

Hon. E. H. Harris: Nothing of the sort. But what about the scandal down there when votes were got with a keg of beer?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: When was that?

Hon. E. H. Harris: At the 1924 election.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I do not believe it, and moreover it is a reflection on the superintendent of the home.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It had nothing to do with him. It was ventilated in the Press.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No one can take postal votes at the Old Men's Home without first meeting the superintendent. I object to the hon. member's statement. Why should an attempt be made to deprive people who are unfortunate enough to be inmates of such a home, from exercising the franchise.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is not the point.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Why not stick to the Commonwealth Act and make the position clear?

Hon. A. Lovekin: Because they have no superintendent of charities.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: There has been a good deal of stir about nothing. In the past the superintendent of public charities has reported whether these people were or were not fit to vote and the system has worked well. The Chief Secretary has assured us that the mentality of the people in the Old Men's Home is higher than that of the voters outside. That is the Chief Secretary told us.

The Chief Secretary: I did not.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Yes, you did. In those circumstances we need not be in the least alarmed. If the mentality of those people is as good as that of the people who are outside, then there is nothing to fear.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The whole question seems to centre around mentality. I did not say that the mentality of the inmates was higher than that of many people who were outside the institution. What I said was that the mentality of many people outside was lower than that of some of the inmates of the home. Mentality, however, has nothing to do with the question. At the present time the inmates exercise the franchise at State and Commonwealth elections and the deletion of the subclause will mean that one-third of the inmates will be disfranchised.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But why are those words in the principal Act?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They were inserted in the ancient days, when there were no old age pensions to influence the position.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: A little while ago the Chief Secretary told us very few people would be affected by the clause. Now he tells us that one-third of the inmates of the home will be affected. I understand there are 600 odd men there, so it seems that 200 of them will not be entitled to the franchise, if the superintendent sends to the registrar a list of those who from time to time appear to be disqualified. If the words are not deleted the superintendent will send his return along in the ordinary way. The registrar will investigate individual cases, and those who are ineligible will automatically come off the roll.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It seems to me that if this is not carried there will be disfranchised for Federal elections certain people who are not disfranchised now.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not follow that. If there is any reason outside of conformity with the Federal roll, it must be that the superintendent has not done his duty.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The provision is obsolete. It has not been used for years past.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Well, why not strike out the words and insert "Controller General of Prisons"? I take it the Superintendent of Public Charities has supplied the names of those claiming to be enrolled, and I cannot understand why that should not continue, since it seems to have worked well in the past.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: As I understand it, some of the men in that institution are not entirely destitute, but are living in separate detached buildings. Probably if we pass the amendment to the Constitution that we now have before us, some of them will be entitled to vote for the Council It will be necessary for the Superintendent to report it to the registrar. I think the provision in the Act is better than that in the Bill.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	4
Majority for ..	9

Ayes.	
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. G. W. Miles	*(Teller.)*

Noes.	
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. E. H. Harris
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Progress reported.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Assembly's Message.

Message received from the Assembly notifying that it declined to make the amendment requested by the Council.

BILL—LOAN AND INSCRIBED STOCK (SINKING FUND).

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—STATE CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. J. W. Hickey—Central) [8.11 in moving the second reading said: After all, there is not really much in the Bill. It seeks to change the title of the State Children Act and also of the State Children Department. If the Bill be passed, the Act in future will be known as the Child Welfare Act, while the department will be known as the Child Welfare Department. The title, "State Children Department" is somewhat of a misnomer and does not cover all the activities of the department. Prior to 1917 we had really two departments under one head, namely, the State Children Department and the Public Charities Department; but from 1917 onwards the activities of the last-named department, including charitable relief to women on whom children were dependent, and outdoor relief, were carried on under the State Children Department. Those in authority at the time had in mind certain reforms, and desired to eliminate the somewhat harsh term "State child" by changing the name both of the Act and of the department. I do not think there can be any very strong opposition offered to the proposed change. New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia have all adopted a similar course, and in those States to-day the respective departments are entitled Child Welfare Department. Undoubtedly the department, as it exists in Western Australia, is for the welfare of the children generally. The new name is more suitable in every respect. Under it no stigma is left for the child to carry in after life. Many of those whom in the past we have termed State children, but who in future will be known as wards of the State, have risen to high positions of responsibility and have been a credit to themselves and to the institution under whose protection they spent their early years. In order to obviate any stigma that may follow the children in after life, it has been decided to amend the Act, and that the children should in future be known as wards of the State. The Bill also provides for the repeal of Section 15 which declares the Government Industrial School at Subiaco to be a Government institution under the Act. The receiving depot at Subiaco was transferred some years ago. It is now in Walcott-street, Mt. Lawley, and has been gazetted as a receiving depot under the Act. It is also proposed under the Bill that the department should have power to release a delinquent child committed to an industrial school before his or her term of detention expires. At present there is no such power. In the absence of expressed authority, the department has taken a common-sense view, and has released such children on trial when it appeared that that could reasonably be done. The Minister controlling the department, and the members of the Children's Court, have concurred in such early releases. As the result of their deliberations they decided to take that responsibility.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I do not think that is quite correct.

The HONORARY MINISTER: They concurred in making these early releases from the industrial school in certain cases. I happen to have been dealing with one of these cases, although I am aware that the hon. member has more experience than most people have of the Children's Court. At any rate I feel sure that the Minister for Health and the members of the Children's

Court have conferred and concurred regarding these early releases, with great benefit to all concerned. Another feature of the Bill is that provision is made for Section 76, relating to the attachment of moneys, property, etc., in connection with maintenance defaulters, to apply to those who offend under Sections 128 and 129. The section as it stands is not of much value to the department, as it is most unusual and in most cases unnecessary to ask for an attachment order, when an order against a near relative is being obtained upon complaint made under Section 69. The inclusion of the two sections referred to permits the department to secure attachment orders against defaulters where it is known that they have money coming to them, or where they have any property, etc. Section 76 does not permit of this, and some defaulters, although in possession of property can to all intents and purposes defy the department. A much-needed amendment is that proposed to Section 78. This provides for security where forfeited to be paid to the department, which has incurred considerable expense in the maintenance of a defaulter's children. When the money has been refunded, the department which has incurred the obligation should derive the benefit. I understand that all moneys that are recovered in this way go either to the Attorney General's Department or the Crown Law Department. This amendment will have the effect of providing that any moneys recovered in this way will go to the department which has incurred the expense. Provision is also made for the prosecution of persons who remove State children out of Western Australia. At present Section 103 protects only those children placed by order of the court in the care of private persons or societies. That the amendment now sought was not made in the past must, it is thought, have been due to an oversight when the principal Act was framed. The last matter dealt with in the Bill relates to proceedings taken against persons having wards of the department illegally in their care. Instances in the past have occurred, when it has been difficult to institute proceedings against such persons. It is felt that the department should have more power under the Act. The Bill provides principally for the changes of names that I have indicated and the other few improvements that are deemed necessary to the Act. Mr. Lovekin has supplied members with a copy of a memorandum of his ideas upon the Bill. In Committee I shall have something to say concerning the amendments outlined by him. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan [8.23]: I will support the Bill. It is better to regard these children as wards of the State than as State children. In after life they may be looked down upon as State children, for a certain stigma may attach to them. The use of the term "ward" is better than that of State children, and it is one that is generally used elsewhere. To the first clause relating to the change of name from State children to wards of the State there can be no objection. Clause 5 deals with the Subiaco Industrial School, which has gone out of existence. There is no need for the section to remain in the Act. With regard to Clause 6 I think the Honorary Minister must have been misinformed as to securing the approval of members of the Children's Court. This clause as it stands really undermines the functions of the court. Under Section 33 of the Act, if a child is found guilty of an offence which is punishable by imprisonment the court in lieu of imprisoning that child may send it to an industrial school, or may allow a near relative to punish the child, or may release it on probation on such conditions as the court may order, and in such case the child shall be subject to the supervision of the department until it attains the age of 18 years or during as short a period as the court may order. The court exercises that function pretty freely. Under Clause 6 as it stands, when the court has given instructions that a child shall be treated in a certain way, the department may cause the child to be released on probation under the supervision of an officer of the department or a probation officer. The decision of the court would go by the board. It will be a farce to sit on the bench and commit children if a departmental officer, who knows nothing about the case or the circumstances or the grounds upon which the court committed the child, and who heard none of the evidence, can cancel the sentence, do what he likes, and place the child under some irresponsible departmental official.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He is an expert. The child would be under him all the time. He would have more knowledge of the child than the court could have after seeing it only once. The child may come before the court for one day, but it is under the control of the probation officer all the time.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The court commits the child to that probation officer, who works under the direction of the Court. The department, under this clause, wants to be able to give it to some other officer of the department. There are only four inspectresses. What is the good of an inspectress when it comes to a case of looking after unruly boys? That clause should be deleted. Clause 7 would not be necessary if the consequential amendments had been made when the Act was consolidated. Clause 8 is not objectionable, but really does not make much difference to the position. At present a man is ordered to find security, and when the security is forfeited, the Attorney-General's Department takes the money. The Charities Department has paid out the money, but does not get it; but revenue gets it just the same, whether it goes to one department or the other. It does not make any difference, but it may be better if the security that is forfeited goes to the department that has advanced the money.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There is not much of the Bill left.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: True, there is very little in it. As regards Clause 9, I am a member of the Children's Court, and I have not had any consultation with other members of that court about the Bill. I was surprised when I saw the Bill. I suppose somebody has consulted other members of the Children's Court regarding the measure. Section 103 of the principal Act, referred to in that clause, is to be amended by deletion of the words "this Part of." If those words are struck out, it will make no difference to the section, which reads—

> No person who, whether as manager of any society or otherwise, is guardian of the person of any child by virtue of any order under this Part of this Act, shall remove such child or suffer such child to be removed out of Western Australia without the consent of the Minister being first obtained.

Clause 10 is perhaps necessary, because it declares that any person who, having a ward in his or her care, neglects or refuses, on demand, to hand such child over to an authorised officer of the department or a police officer authorised to receive the child commits an offence. There can be no objection to that. There are, however, two or three amendments I desire to see made in Committee: and to save time I have prepared a statement, copies of which have been furnished to members so that I will not need to labour the subject during the next stage. The first amendment refers to the objective of getting a woman probation officer as well as a male probation officer. I have given my reasons in that memorandum. The department have always opposed the proposal. The 15 members of the Children's Court, some of whom have been there for 20 years and some for 12, have always been unanimous that there is as much delinquency among young girls as among young boys, if not more, and that there is no means by which the court can function. The cases are not taken to the department, but to members of the court. Sunday after Sunday and Saturday after Saturday I have had parents coming to see me about their children, asking for advice as to how to act. If there were a lady probation officer to look after delinquent young girls, one could handle such cases; but men really cannot handle the cases of girls, and there is nowhere to send the girls. All the department have is four inspectresses who visit the foster mothers and look after the children, going about once a month or once in six weeks to visit a child, which is not often enough. Those inspectresses cannot do probation work. So satisfied was I two or three years ago, when the present Government came into office, of the necessity for a lady probation officer that I offered to pay her salary—I forget whether for two years or three—to give the system a trial. An officer of the department, upon my suggesting a salary of £300 a year because I wanted to get the right type of woman for the job, told me unofficially that if the department appointed a woman probation officer at such a salary as that, it would cause dissatisfaction amongst the other inspectresses. Therefore the offer was turned down. As I point out in the memorandum, the secretary in his last report states that only four girls were placed on probation during the year. That is because the women police have been told not to bring girls to the court, the magistrates being unwilling to sully girls by sending them to institutions for a little laxity here and there. We want to direct them into the right track. Mrs. Dugdale, one of the women police, is doing a great deal of this probation work. Dozens of such cases never come to the court at all. This good woman ought to be promoted in the ranks of the police force,

because she takes such girls to her own home and tries to get them on the right track and to put them out somewhere where they will be looked after. All that is going on, and the department know nothing about it, but the secretary writes that during the year only four girls were placed on probation. There would have been 50 cases if all the girls concerned had been brought before the court. That is one amendment I wish to secure in Committee, and another is that under the Act as it stands the limit of the order which the court can make for the maintenance of a child is 12s. 6d. per week, whereas the limit should be considerably higher. In the case of quite a number of babies the State gets the maximum order for 12s. 6d. per week, and immediately begins to pay out 15s. per week to the foster mother. If the child is at all sick, the Government pay up to £1 per week, getting a return from a man, possibly well able to pay, of only 12s. 6d. per week. The State is penalised quite sufficiently by having to keep a number of children whom it ought not to have to keep, and those who can afford to pay ought to bear the full cost of the keep. A third amendment I shall suggest in Committee is to prevent young children from being engaged in connection with the tin hare business. Under the Act children under 14 years of age are not allowed to be engaged in services of that sort, and I do not think they ought to be allowed to be engaged in the racing or running of tin hares. So I propose to substitute the word "races" for the word "horses." With those few remarks I support the second reading. Perhaps the Minister will be good enough to postpone the Committee stage to the next sitting.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [8.38]: I support the second reading, and wish to express my admiration of the splendid work done by the Children's Court magistrates. I have no desire to go over ground already traversed. The only clause I am about to criticise is the one referred to by Mr. Lovekin, giving the department power to release children committed to industrial schools. It might well be that the word "Minister" should be substituted for "department," but the principle involved is good. The magistrates hear the case, taking evidence for and against; and when a child is committed to an industrial school it comes under the permanent control and supervision of officers. Thus the same argument applies to the clause in question as to the legislation now in existence. It is wonderful what an incentive it is to prisoners, and must be to children, to see something ahead of them. A child may be sent to an institution for two years, and to some types of children that period will seem slavery. If they have the incentive of knowing that good behaviour, hard work and looking after themselves may lead to their release on probation, to their being given another trial in the open spaces of ordinary childhood——

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is done now by the probation officer, who comes back to the court and tells the story.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: But this may be an easier way out.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That may be the opinion of people who know nothing about it.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It appears to me that something of the kind should be done in order to deal with certain types of children. Undoubtedly children, just like adults, if they see some reward for work done, produce better results. If, as Mr. Lovekin says, exactly the same thing is done now, why is the clause inserted? Anything to improve the lot of children has my cordial support, and I have much pleasure, therefore, in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—HOSPITALS.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 19th October; Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair, the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill

Clause 38—Regulations (partly considered):

Clause put and passed.

Postponed Clause 27—Power of local authorities to expend revenues on public hospitals:

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: This clause diverts the incidence of taxation from the Government to the local authorities, and therefore should be deleted. Recently the

secretary of the Health Department placed before a conference of hospital authorities a proposal that 1½d in the pound should be levied on all incomes, from the highest to the lowest, to meet hospital expenditure, and the secretary stated that this would result in the raising of a sum of £217,762. That sum is about equal to the amount paid by subscribers to various medical funds at the rate of 6d. per head per week. I rather regret that the Government have rejected so broad a proposal in favour of that contained in this clause. I have taken the trouble to ascertain how the clause will affect the local governing bodies in my province. There are 27 different road boards, whose general revenue averages a little over £2,000. That would provide a total of £55,286, to say nothing of what would be the revenue of municipalities within the province. A contribution of 10 per cent. of the general revenue would mean that the local authorities in the province would contribute £5,528, which should be raised by means of direct taxation. The taxable revenue of the whole of the road boards throughout the State amounts to £193,715, making a total possible charge under the Bill against the local authorities of £19,371. That means that the Government are side-stepping their duty of imposing taxation amounting to, roughly, £20,000. The figures I have quoted refer to 1925, the latest obtainable. Since then there has been a re-assessment of the land in many of the road board areas so that the amount to be raised would probably be nearer £30,000 than £20,000. In such circumstances it is only to be expected that throughout the agricultural areas there is strong exception taken to this method of taxing the people. It means that the nomad who goes into the country areas and is taken ill, has to be looked after by the local authorities, whereas it should be the duty of the State to undertake that task. This means removing the responsibility for maintaining hospitals from the Government to the local authorities and really placing that responsibility on the shoulders of the producers themselves. The clause will mean that the taxpayer who is already heavily taxed, will have to shoulder the extra financial burden, and the individual who does not contribute a penny towards the hospital will receive the benefit. The Government will be relieved of the odium of imposing the necessary tax, and I hope the Committee will agree to strike the clause out.

Hon. J. EWING: I hope the Honorary Minister will explain what the position will be regarding the Collie and Katanning hospitals if the clause be struck out. Those hospitals were erected by the Government and, while I do not know exactly what the position is regarding the Katanning hospital, the miners at Collie contribute from their wages to maintain the local hospital. In addition to that the subscriptions from the local people are very satisfactory indeed. Those hospitals were erected at a cost of between £2,000 and £3,000.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The contributions you refer to at Collie are voluntary.

Hon. J. EWING: That is so, but the Bill provides for a contribution of 10 per cent. of the general revenue of the local authorities to be applied towards the hospitals The clause includes a provision validating loans in connection with those hospitals.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Why not retain that subclause in the Bill

Hon. J. EWING: The general opinion seems to be that the clause as a whole should be struck out and provision made to meet the position by an amendment of the Municipalities Act. Should the whole clause be struck out, that will eliminate the subclause dealing with the contributions to the Collie and the Katanning hospitals. I want to know what the position will be then.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Mr. Yelland has placed the position clearly before hon. members. He has pointed out that it is not reasonable that the hospitals shall be maintained in this way. Even if the proposal for a 10 per cent. levy were acceptable, it is very dangerous to provide that the members of a road board shall be able to bind the board for a period of years by agreeing to make contributions over a given period. That seems altogether too much power to place in the hands of a local authority. It means giving road board members for one year unlimited power to hamper those who will follow them for years to come.

Hon. J. Ewing: It is a good clause and I think it should be retained in the Bill.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Then the hon. member and I disagree.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Yelland has made an estimate of what it will cost the road boards in his province, but as a matter of fact those local authorities have this power to-day, so that they are not affected at all by the clause.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Then why include it in the Bill?

The HONORARY MINISTER: All that is asked is that the municipalities shall have the same power as the road boards already possess. It must not be lost sight of that it is purely voluntary on the part of the boards or municipalities as to whether they shall exercise the power.

Hon. J. Ewing: The municipalities are contributing to-day.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is so.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: And can the local authorities pledge their board over a number of years?

The HONORARY MINISTER: No.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: That is what you are providing in the clause.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In view of our experience of road boards and municipalities, is it likely that any local governing body, bearing in mind the periodical elections, would do something that was out of step with the opinion of the ratepayers?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But if they did, their action could not be rectified.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not read that into the clause. It is merely in the interests of the hospitals and the people who are concerned.

Hon. J. Ewing: Why should not the municipalities have the same powers that the road boards have to-day?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Exactly. Is there anything wrong in a municipality being permitted should it so desire, to contribute towards the upkeep of a hospital? If a hospital committee were established, would it not be reasonable for them to expect to have the promise of assistance over a period of two or three years so that they should know what their prospects were? I think the clause is essential.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I cannot agree that the clause is necessary. The revenue of the City of Perth amounts to £120,583 and that of Fremantle to £17,092. The City Council might decide to contribute 10 per cent. of the revenue towards the upkeep of the Perth Hospital and the Fremantle council might decide to do the same in connection with the hospital at the port. Bearing in mind that the scheme is a voluntary one, the municipalities between Perth and Fremantle might not contribute a penny towards those institutions. There are no hospitals between Perth and Fremantle, so that the ratepayers from those intervening municipalities would use one or other of the two public hospitals I refer to. It does not seem equitable that such a position should arise. Some people contribute voluntarily, but others who should contribute fail to do so. The proposed distribution is inequitable. The Perth City Council might decide to contribute, and though the people of Subiaco would use the Perth hospital, the Subiaco municipality might decline to contribute. Similarly in the country, some of the local authorities would cheerfully support hospitals, but others would not. The measure will involve a direct tax on the already heavily burdened taxpayer. As Mr. Yelland pointed out, the people who use the hospitals are not paying their fair quota towards the upkeep. The public generally are willing to pay for patients in indigent circumstances, but a voluntary proposal of this kind is inequitable.

Hon. A. Burvill: What remedy would you suggest?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Some definite scheme is required for the whole of the charities. A tax on wages has been suggested, but many of the people in receipt of high salaries would then be paying for hospitals from which they derived no benefit. The existing position in Perth is a disgrace.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Why are there so many sick people in Perth.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I am not aware that there are more sick people in Perth than anywhere else.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I support the clause, though there is much in what Sir William Lathlain has said. The Fremantle Council might call a conference of local authorities from Cottesloe Beach to Jandakot and offer to contribute a certain percentage provided the others contributed proportionately. It would be advantageous to have power to do that.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Under that scheme you would not get the man who does not contribute at all.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We would; if he was a worker he would be paying rent.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: I have heard that tale before.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Under the Bill the burden on the ratepayers would be lessened because they would be contributing through the rates.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: How would you get hold of the man who was not a ratepayer?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Under this scheme a bigger percentage would contribute than are contributing at present. My experience of the country is that people there are approached and told they are expected to contribute so much.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: What do the men who use the hospitals give?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The men who work on farms give generously if they are approached properly. I lived in the country for nearly 10 years and the receipts from the young fellows on the farms were wonderful. The scheme will assist the generous farmer or employee.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you believe in this method by which the Government will pass on their responsibility to the local authorities?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Whether the Government or the local authorities provide the money, the same people have to pay. If we cannot get a better scheme, let us adopt this one.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Let us have a better scheme.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: If Mr. Gray can suggest a better scheme we would be glad to hear it. The Honorary Minister said it would be optional whether a road board made the contribution. We must consider not only what is probable, but what is possible under the measure. The Government have only to withdraw their hospital subsidies and the road boards would be compelled to resort to this method of raising funds. Mr. Gray overlooked the fact that if the road boards are called upon to pay 10 per cent. of the their revenue to hospitals their income will be depleted to that extent and their rates will have to be increased to meet expenses.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: And then they would not get at the man who uses the hospital and does not pay.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: That is so, and that is the great object in view. The man who uses a hospital should pay according to his means. Some people cannot pay and it is the duty of the community to provide for indigent sick, but why should we inflict this taxation upon people who are already heavily burdened?

Hon. E. H. Gray: You would lessen the burden on the generous man.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Under Clauses 27 and 28, it would be possible to put the screw on local authorities. The Governor may declare that it is expedient to construct a hospital for a district of two or more local authorities and may authorise its construction and declare the districts to be served by it. The proposal will be binding if two-thirds of the local authorities agree to it. We have been told that it is optional, and yet it is possible to compel the local authorities to contribute. I cannot understand why the Government have not adopted the suggestion to impose on all incomes a tax for hospital purposes. I understand that the workers at a conference agreed to it and yet the present Government have made a definite attack upon those who are carrying the burden of taxation.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: There is no doubt that Mr. Gray is correct in saying that to a large extent if this proposal is carried the generous man will decline to render further assistance.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In connection with any system, not alone the conduct of hospitals, but in every walk of life, we find people who are ready to side-step their obligations. Mr. Yelland returned to the argument that the Government should introduce legislation for the upkeep of hospitals. With all that has been said I agree and nobody can sound a jarring note on the subject of the proposals that have been advanced. The clause, however, merely gives to a municipality the power that is already held by a road board under the Road Districts Act.

Hon. H. STEWART: If road boards have this power, why is it necessary in Subclause 3 to validate the action of the Katanning Road Board in raising a loan for the erection of their hospital?

Hon. J. EWING: I asked the Minister a similar question. It is a fact that in the building of the Collie Hospital financial assistance was given by the municipal council. Seeing that road boards have the power to do this and the municipalities have not, will the Minister consider the advisability of amending the Municipalities Act? There is no doubt that a hospital was badly needed at Collie and the Government acted liberally. It is to the credit of the municipality of Collie that they rendered the help they gave. We should certainly give municipalities the voluntary power to assist in this direction, a power similar to that enjoyed by road boards. The miners at Collie pay very well towards the support of their institution.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They can afford to do so.

The HONORARY MINISTER: We know that Collie is a municipality and the clause has for its object the validating of the action taken by the Council. In regard to Katanning, evidently some action was taken by the road board. They may have received assistance, or something of the kind, that requires to be validated. I can give no guarantee that there will be an amendment to the Municipalities Act to legalise actions such as those that have been referred to. Objection is being taken to the clause and a similar objection possibly would be taken to such a clause if it were inserted in the Municipalities Act. All that the Bill before us seeks to do is to give to municipalties the power that is to-day enjoyed by road boards.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: To make the position clear I will move an amendment—

That Subclauses 1 and 2 be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN: I remind the Committee that if those two subclauses are struck out, Subclause 3 will be meaningless.

Hon. H. STEWART: The clause is purely optional but I look upon the next one as dangerous. It has been anything but a benefit to road boards. They have had that power and it has enabled them to contribute towards the erection of hospitals. There is a road board in Narrogin as well as a municipality. At Katanning there is a road board without a municipality. At Albany there is a municipality and a road board. Wagin has a municipality and a road board, and Pingelly has a road board but no municipality. It is not right that we should find that a road board in an important centre has the power to contribute a portion of its funds towards hospital purposes while the municipality should be debarred from doing so by reason of the fact that the Municipalities Act contains no provision to enable it to do so. I should prefer to have an undertaking from the Government that they would make the amendment in the Municipalities Act, which is the proper place for it, but failing that I could not vote for the amendment.

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

Ayes	9
Noes	8
Majority for	1

AYES.

Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoo
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. W. Miles	(*Tell*

NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. E. Rose
	(*Tell*

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I suggest that might postpone this clause now and m what remains of it readable by incorpo ing in it some of what we have struck

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 26th October, 1927.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, LAKE GRACE-EAST JILAKIN-KALGARIN.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: 1, Has the report of the special committee on the proposed Lake Grace-East Jilakin-Kalgarin railway been received by the Government? 2, If not, when will it be available? 3, If so, is it his intention to lay the report on the Table of the House?