

# Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 21st December, 1920.

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Questions: Potato Crop, Glut   | 2647 |
| Wheat Handling Charges   | 2647 |
| Police, (1) Helmets; (2) Point Duty Discomforts                      | 2647 |
| Narrogin Flour Mill  | 2647 |
| Bills: Land Tax and Income Tax, Council's Amendment                  | 2647 |
| Dividend Duties Act Amendment, Council's requested Amendment         | 2648 |
| Industries Assistance Act Continuance, Council's requested Amendment | 2648 |
| Railway Classification Board, Council's requested Amendment          | 2649 |
| Dentists, Com., etc.   | 2650 |
| Divorce Act Amendment, Council's Amendments                          | 2661 |
| Workers Compensation Act Amendment, Council's Amendments             | 2661 |
| Stamp Act Amendment, Council's requested Amendments                  | 2661 |
| Coroners, Council's Message  | 2661 |
| Lunacy Act Amendment, Council's requested Amendments                 | 2661 |
| Permanent Reserves, returned   | 2661 |
| Narrogin Recreation Reserve, returned                                | 2661 |
| Navigation Act Amendment, returned                                   | 2661 |
| Justices Act Amendment, returned                                     | 2661 |
| Baywater Drainage Works, returned                                    | 2661 |
| Transfer of Land Act Amendment, returned                             | 2661 |
| Grain Elevators (No. 2), 2A., Com., etc.                             | 2661 |
| Factories and Shops, Council's Amendments                            | 2674 |
| Resolution: Returned Soldiers and Railway Passes, Council's Message  | 2678 |

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

## QUESTION—POTATO CROP, GLUT.

Mr. PICKERING asked the Premier: 1, What action are the Government taking with regard to the present glut of potatoes and the grave possibility of considerable loss through the fly, which loss will result in scarcity and high prices between crops? 2, Do the Government contemplate definite action towards making provision for the next and ensuing general crops, seeing that the trouble will be a recurring one?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The Government will seriously consider any proposals made by the Potato Growers' Association. 2, A Potato Growers' Association has been formed embracing the whole of the growers of the State, and presumably any necessary action will be taken by it.

## QUESTION—WHEAT HANDLING CHARGES.

Mr. JOHNSTON (for Mr. Griffiths) asked the Premier: 1, What are the various handling, shipping, and other charges upon wheat from siding to British ports? 2, Is he aware that reports are freely circulating that under the pooling system costs referred to are greatly inflated? 3, Has he any information to show whether pooling costs are excessive as compared with the old method? 4, If so, will he make it public?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Not known owing to the variation in freights. 2, No. 3, No, but the General Manager of the Wheat Scheme

personally advises that the costs under the present system are in Western Australia undoubtedly much lower than under the old method. 4, See No. 3.

## QUESTIONS (2)—POLICE.

### Helmets.

Mr. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Has his attention been called to the inferior quality of helmet supplied to the members of the police force, more especially in regard to the thickness of the cork at the top, in comparison with those supplied to members of the force in South Australia? 2, If so, will he cause action to be taken to correct this defect and bring the helmets supplied to our force more into line with those supplied to members of the South Australian force?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (for the Minister for Mines) replied: 1, No. 2, Inquiries will be made, but it is doubtful whether the Adelaide helmet affords the same protection from the sun as the local article.

### Point Duty Discomforts.

Mr. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Has his attention been called to the great discomfort suffered by the policemen on point duty in the City through having to stand for a long time on hard blocks and hot tar and exposed to the heat of the sun without any form of shelter? 2, If so, will he see that thick coir mats and shelter are provided for these men in hot weather?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (for the Minister for Mines) replied: 1, No. 2, Open work coir mats will be supplied, but it is not possible to arrange for shelter owing to the narrowness of the streets and the fact that the clearance between tram lines will not permit of the erection of even temporary shelter.

## QUESTION—NARROGIN FLOUR MILL.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: 1, With reference to his statement that the reason for the stoppage of the Narrogin flour Mill was that there was so much flour in hand at the mill, are the Government aware that the mill is now bare of flour, bran, and pollard stock? 2, In the interests of the residents of the Narrogin districts, will the Government supply the mill with further wheat at once, in order that gristing may be resumed there and local supplies of wheat and offal made available? 3, If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Wheat has already been ordered on to the Mill and will be available for gristing at the beginning of the year. 3, Answered by No. 2.

## BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Council's Requested Amendment.

Amendment requested by the Council now considered.

## In Committee.

• Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Add a new clause, to stand as Clause 7, as follows:—*Deduction in respect of charitable gifts, etc.*—Every taxpayer shall be entitled to a deduction under Section 30 of the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act, 1907, from the taxable amount of his income, of any payment made by him to the board or trustees of any charitable institution, incorporated or otherwise, or of a public park or reserve, or of a university or public school, or of a library, art gallery, museum, or other institution for public education, recreation, or enjoyment, subsidised by the Government: provided that such payment is applied solely to such charitable or other public purpose.

THE PREMIER: I have no objection to the amendment. A similar provision was made in Commonwealth legislation some time ago. People may be encouraged to make gifts, but I do not suppose we shall lose much income taxation as a result. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Bill we are dealing with is one to impose a land tax and an income tax, but the new clause requested by the Council seeks to amend the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act. I ask whether the new clause is in order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Subclause 2 of Clause 3 states that where the income chargeable from all sources of a taxpayer, who is married or has a dependant, amounts to £157 and no more, the tax payable by him shall not exceed a certain amount. Has not the Council's amendment a bearing on the Bill just as that subclause has? I am willing to hear argument on the point.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am only dealing with the proposed new clause. The new clause seeks to amend the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act and I ask whether this can be done under a Bill to impose a land tax and an income tax.

THE CHAIRMAN: I must uphold the objection raised by the hon. member and report to the House.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

THE CHAIRMAN: I have to report that the Committee have considered the amendment requested by the Council and, on a point of order raised by the member for North-East Fremantle that the amendment was not the subject matter of the Bill, I have upheld his contention and ruled the Council's amendment out of order.

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

# BILL—DIVIDEND DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's requested amendment.

Amendment requested by the Council now considered.

## In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 3, as follows:—(3.) In assessing the profits made by a company on the returns forwarded under Section 7 of the principal Act, the Minister shall allow as a deduction therefrom any payment made by the company to the board or trustees of any charitable institution, incorporated or otherwise, or of a public park or reserve, or of a university or public school, or of a library, art gallery, museum, or other institution for public education, recreation, or enjoyment subsidised by the Government, provided that such payment is applied solely to such charitable or other public purpose.

THE PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

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

# BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE ACT CONTINUANCE.

Council's requested amendments.

Schedule of two amendments requested by the Council now considered.

## In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; The Premier in charge of the Bill.

No 1—Clause 2—Strike out in line 2 the figures "1915" and insert "1917":

THE PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be made

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made

No 2—New clause—Add the following clause, to stand as No 3:—A printed report and balance-sheet together with the Auditor General's Report thereon shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament on or before the 30th September in each year, if then sitting, or at the next ensuing session thereof.

THE PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be made

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That the Council's amendment be amended by striking out the words "30th September" and inserting in lieu "31st July"

The Industries Assistance Board terminate their year on the 31st March, and under my amendment would have four months in which to prepare a report and balance sheet, have the balance-sheet audited, and both presented to Parliament. I do not think the new clause, in view of the Trading Concerns Act, is worth a hang.

The Premier: I agree with you.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If we make this date the 31st July we have reason to hope that we

may get the balance-sheet by the end of September.

The PREMIER: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment just moved. It is an intricate business preparing reports and balance-sheets and having the necessary audits made.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: None of the balance-sheets under the Trading Concerns Act is here yet.

The PREMIER: The amendment made by the Council does not say that the report and balance-sheet shall not be presented before the 30th September, and it is possible for them to be submitted before that.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment of the member for North-East Fremantle. There is no reason why seven months should elapse before the board present their report and balance-sheet. Although the Government are lackadaisical in not demanding the production of these documents earlier in the year, they should make an effort to get out of their groove. Some of the reports are two years overdue. We should let our civil servants know the obligations cast upon them and for which they are paid. It is a bad example to set to the service to allow them to get behind so much in presenting a report of their operations for the year. There is no justification for turning down the proposal of the hon. member. As things are, it is little wonder that the service are getting out of hand and that the deficit is creeping up, because we are not apprised as to how things are going. As soon as this policy of allowing reports to be kept back so long is discontinued the better it will be for the country. If the members of this Industries Assistance Board are not prepared to do their work in the reasonable time allowed, they should make room for others who will.

The Premier: I will convey that message to them.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The best way to do that is to carry the amendment just moved. If we fail to do so the board will merely say that the Premier is a genial old chap, is treating the whole matter as a huge joke, and that although the Act says they must present their report at a certain time, the Premier does not apparently look for it. Is Parliament to run the country or are our civil servants to do so?

The CHAIRMAN: Before there is any further discussion on the amendment, I draw the attention of hon. members to "May," page 371, under which I must rule the Council's amendment out of order. "May" says—

In like manner it is not within the scope of a Committee on an expiring laws continuance Bill to amend the provisions of the Acts proposed to be continued.

On this ground I cannot see how the Committee are justified in accepting the Council's amendment.

Hon. P. Collier: It is Mr. Lovekin's amendment, too.

The CHAIRMAN: I must, therefore, rule the Council's amendment out of order.

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

## BILL—RAILWAYS CLASSIFICATION BOARD.

### Council's Requested Amendments.

Schedule of three amendments made by the Legislative Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

No. 1 Clause 2.—Definition of "Accredited representative," Insert after the interpretation of "Commissioner"—"Head of Branch" means an officer in control of one of the recognised divisions of the staff, who receives his instructions from and communicates with the Commissioner directly

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 2. Clause 2.—Insert after the interpretation of "Regulations"—"Sub-head of Branch" means an officer in control of some recognised section of a division of the staff, who receives his instructions from and communicates with the head of the branch directly

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be made.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I do not agree with this amendment. I only returned to the city this morning and have not had an opportunity of making inquiries about it. My opinion, however, is that it will give too wide a definition altogether. I suppose at least 50 men will not come under the control of the board if the amendment be agreed to. The board is being brought into existence to deal with the whole of the railway officers' staff, and if we are going to whittle them away in this fashion many will be outside the jurisdiction of the board, and the board will not be of the value that it would otherwise be. If it is our desire to make the Bill effective we must deal with a majority of those who will be affected. The definition is much too wide.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This House passed a clause exempting heads and sub-heads as regards classification, and another place has defined "head of branch," which amendment we have agreed to. With reference to the question of "sub-head of branch," if we do not accept the amendment of the Council we shall leave the position very wide. I also understand it was mentioned in another place that the definition had been agreed upon between the Commissioner and the Union. I will refer the member for Geraldton to page 2395 of "Hansard."

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 3. Clause 4—Strike out Subclause 5:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am at a loss to know why this amendment has been made. The Bill has been taken from the Victorian Act, and the subclause gives power to the Governor to at any time remove a member of the board. Another place thinks that power should not be given. If the amendment is

agreed to, a member of the board will hold office for his term of three years. I move—

That the amendment be made.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment made.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

#### BILL—DENTISTS. In Committee.

Resumed from 17th December. Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clause 21—Registration of practitioners subject to examination:

The CHAIRMAN: The member for York has moved an amendment that the following paragraph be added:—(d) Provided also that the following persons shall be entitled forthwith to be registered by the Board as dentists, that is to say:—(1) Every person who for seven years prior to the 1st day of August, 1920, has been engaged in the work of a dental assistant, and who was on the 1st day of August, 1920, alone or with co-partners an employer of or in partnership with any dentist.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I cannot support the amendment. One objection is that under this a dental assistant might be the boy who shows patients to the torture chamber or might be the lady nurse who endeavours to assuage the torture. Some safeguard ought to be made, providing that the dental assistant is one actually engaged in the work of a dentist.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And has proved himself qualified.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: After seven years be ought to be qualified. There are two kinds of dentistry, namely operative and prosthetic. It would be wrong to allow the prosthetic assistant to practise operative dentistry. That is another defect in the amendment. In Victoria provision is made that assistants who have attained the age of 21 years and have been practising dental surgery for three years, shall be admitted without examination.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We had the same provision in our first Act. Is that their original Act?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I cannot say. It is an Act which was passed in 1910. In the New South Wales Act of 1912 provision is made that any person who proves to the satisfaction of the board that he has practised dentistry in New South Wales on his own account for not less than eight years prior to the commencement of the Act, shall be entitled to be registered. Those two Acts are certainly much more restrictive than is the amendment before us. Until the amendment is considerably altered I will oppose it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I agree in the main with the views of the Attorney General. In order to overcome the objections, I will endeavour to make the paragraph acceptable to the Committee. I move an amendment on the amendment—

That after "in" in line 3 of sub-paragraph (1) "Western Australia in" be inserted.

Mr. Griffiths: I intended to move that amendment myself.

Hon. P. COLLIER: When we have dealt with this I will move two further amendments.

Mr. PICKERING: The insertion of these words will not bring about the desired end.

Mr. O'Loughlen: There are two others to come.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition will not commit the member for Sussex to accept any later amendment. I suggest this, merely to save time.

Hon. P. Collier: The next two amendments have no bearing whatever on this one.

Mr. PICKERING: I must deal with this one as I find it. What is required is a uniform Commonwealth Act. This would overcome the difficulty of members of the profession practising in one State and being refused registration in another. An attempt to amend the law was made in Victoria early this year. The idea was to render eligible for registration without examination, any person who had been practising the profession for three years. It will be interesting to read the views of the Melbourne "Argus" on the point.

Hon. P. Collier: Oh never mind what the "Argus" thinks about it.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Tell us what the Busselton "Times" thinks about it.

Hon. P. Collier: I move that it be taken as read.

Mr. PICKERING: I insist upon reading it. It is as follows:—

When the amending Dental Bill was before the Victorian Parliament in 1910 a plea was put forward on behalf of certain men who had engaged in the profession without passing any tests or gaining a certificate of competency. It was decided that these individuals should be "recorded" and allowed to practise. There was a clear understanding, however, that in future no one should be allowed to practise as a dentist until he had satisfied the prescribed authorities of his fitness for the work. Now there is again a movement in favour of opening the back door to the profession, this time for the benefit of certain dental mechanics. In the interests of the public it is to be hoped that the agitation will be disregarded. Strong muscular development and a pair of forceps are no longer considered an adequate equipment for a dentist. Care of the teeth is recognised as a science of vital importance, and it would be lamentable if the public were exposed to the operations of men who have had none but a mechanical training. These dental mechanics may be expert enough at their own special work, but they have not proved their fitness to perform operations which, if unscientifically done, will injure the patient's health and possibly cost him his life. The plea that the present agitation is being conducted in the interests of returned soldiers is a subterfuge. The University authorities have made special provision for returned soldiers, who, it is gratifying to observe, have no wish to enter the profession by the back door and thus lower its prestige.

The Melbourne "Herald" of the 8th September last says in a sub-leader—

Hon. P. Collier: This has no bearing on the Bill.

Mr. PICKERING: I think it has.

The CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment before the Chair for the insertion of three words I must confine hon. members to that amendment.

Mr. PICKERING: I will defer the continuation of my argument, which, however, is vital to the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: We must observe the rules of debate. I must ask hon. members to confine themselves to the amendment before the Chair.

Amendment on amendment put and passed

Hon. P. COLLIER: I move an amendment on the amendment—

That after the word "dental" in line 3 of sub-paragraph (1) there be inserted the word "surgery."

This further amendment gets over the objection raised by the Attorney General. The work which will have to be done will then be work done in a dental surgery.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not know whether the hon. member intends to go further, but the insertion of the word "surgery" will not remove the objection. A person engaged in a dental surgery might be merely a nurse handing swabs to the dentist.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I have a further amendment to move, that after the word "assistant" there be inserted "by the performance of dental operations in the mouth." Thus seven years of actual experience of dental operations in the mouth would be ensured.

Mr. PICKERING: We now have the full text of the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, and it is obvious that, under it, all the operating mechanic would have to do would be to make a statement that he had been engaged in such operations as are enumerated in the amendment, and then ipso facto would become registered as a dentist.

Mr. O'Loughlin: What would the board be doing?

Hon. P. Collier: He would have to prove his statement.

Mr. PICKERING: I cannot support the amendment, which I feel opens the dental profession to the introduction of elements which are undesirable. In connection with professions and trades the present trend is not such as, in my opinion, encourages the development of the best in students. We are deficient in expert mechanics. Why? For the obvious reason that there is no school of training for them. The practice of apprenticeship for a number of years has fallen into desuetude, and to-day the most elementary knowledge of a trade enables a man to become registered or enrolled as a tradesman. It is now sought to extend that principle to the important profession of dentistry. The Victorian Act lays down three years as the period of practice necessary to qualify a man to become registered without examination. Every possible precaution should be taken to protect the public against the danger involved in this amendment. Our educational reports lay great stress on the lack of proper dental examination of children—showing the vital importance of the profession of dentistry. Seeing that the

measure introduced in Victoria was on right lines, I now propose to read a sub-leader published in the Melbourne "Herald" of the 8th September last—

The amendment to the Medical Act, affecting dentists only, just introduced into the State Parliament, does not appear to have a single solid argument in its favour. The Bill provides for the recording by the Dental Board of Victoria of all who began work in the profession in 1907 or earlier, and were not yet 21 years of age at a date in 1910. In plain English, this means the admission to the ranks of qualified dentists of a number of persons whose proficiency may be entirely limited to such practice as they have gained as dental mechanics. A colourable justification is given to the amending Bill by a clause allowing of naval and military service being counted. But the concessions made by the University to returned soldiers studying dentistry are so generous that no further provision by Parliament is at all necessary. Moreover, while such a provision might assist a very small number of returned men, the harm that it would do to the profession as a whole, by diluting it with untrained practitioners, must be far greater. A representative of 85 returned soldiers now pursuing a dental course at the University strongly protested against the injustice that the Bill would inflict upon them, and declared that the supposed concession was devised simply to let others in by the back door. Sir John Monash, whose experience of the value of the trained as against the untrained man is unsurpassed, also strongly opposes the Bill. The General's argument in favour of placing the hall mark of the Government upon no other than highly trained technicians is unanswerable. The doctors and the dentists are more emphatic still in their opposition to the measure. Every skilled profession has ultimately to reach the stage at which experience and practice alone are recognised as an insufficient guarantee of efficiency. Training, followed by examination and registration, becomes essential. In the transition period due allowance is made for those practitioners who have not had the opportunity to gain the formal educational qualification. Many of them are, of course, by dint of their own ability and hard work, fully qualified for the competent practice of their profession. An interval of years is therefore allowed, so as to include these persons in the official register. The profession of accountancy, for example, has passed through this stage. The architects are now agitating for a similar measure. The dentists believed that they had left behind them that period of transition. Full provision was made under the Dental Act of 1910 for the recording by the Dental Board of Victoria of all persons who before a certain date were earning their living in dentistry. The profession was steadily becoming filled with highly qualified men and women. The present Bill seriously threatens the maintenance of that standard by an unwarranted dilution of the qualified body. It is to be hoped that the Government will withdraw the Bill, or at least that the measure will be among those which the rapidly expiring session causes to be dropped. The

public will certainly support the protest of the dentists, who have laboured long and earnestly to gain for their profession the high status to which its great utility and scientific claims entitle it.

Hon. P. Collier: What publication have you actually been reading from?

Mr. PICKERING: The "Australian Journal of Dentistry" of the 20th September, 1920. This brings me to the point that members of this House have many times conceded that there should be a formal apprenticeship in all trades. It is still more essential, however, that we should have apprenticeship and examination in a profession such as dentistry, which vitally concerns our health. Moreover, large numbers of dental students are serving their apprenticeship under the conditions of the Act of 1894, in full faith that their interests will be safeguarded. Why should they be exposed to the competition of the inexperienced and the untrained? I will quote another extract dealing with the speech by Major Baird, Chief Secretary of Victoria. He attended a dinner which was given by the Odontological Society and during his speech he is reported to have said--

He had been deeply interested in all they had said, and he hoped it would bear fruit. He did not know how the other members felt, but he himself felt that he had had the best treatment at the hands of dentists that he had ever had. He usually approached the dentist in fear and trembling and went away swearing that he would never go there again. He appreciated very much the manner in which the toast of Parliament had been proposed. Whatever might be said against it, there was no doubt that Parliament was the leading institution in the land. He had listened with great interest to what had been said of the educational facilities given to the dental students of Victoria, and he thought they had the best dental education almost in the world. The pioneers of dentistry in Victoria had brought the education of dentistry up to a very high standard indeed, and he hoped that the standard would be maintained. It must also be admitted that if they had the finest educational facilities at least in the Empire, this was backed up by the finest Dental Act in the world, and if this were admitted, it would be admitted that the Victorian Parliament had done its work well in this respect. Regarding the present position as to the desire of these dental mechanics to be recorded, the Act of 1910 put the profession of dentistry on a certain basis, and it also saved the rights of certain men who had been practising dentistry or were supposed to have been practising dentistry. He felt that the Parliament of 1910 was in the best position to judge whose rights should be saved. They, after careful deliberation and debate, decided that the men who were then 21 years of age or over, and who had practised dentistry for a certain time, should have their rights saved. He felt, also, that the present Parliament should not depart from that position. With all that had been said to-night, he had been most impressed with what had been said by Mr. Duckworth and Capt. Wilkinson. He felt it was not fair to do something, even for the

returned soldier, that was not honest and just. In his own case he had returned from the South African war when 21 years of age. He had not passed his matriculation, and he had then to pass his matriculation and qualify for the legal profession, and he had done it. He had had no assistance but had to do it off his own bat. He felt that any other returned soldier should be able to do the same, and with the facilities offered in the Dental College he thought they had every chance to become qualified. He felt that the service rendered by the dental profession to this country should have a high status. He believed it should be the full status of a profession, and if you once admit that the work rendered to the community was of sufficient importance to have the status of a profession, then men entering that profession should have to do a full course of study beforehand. He was prepared to do all he could to keep the status of dentistry as high as possible, and he gave them this assurance, that the Government would oppose the proposed measure. He wished to thank them again for the invitation to be present, and he trusted they would go on doing the good work they had been doing, and if they were made of the same stuff as the soldier student who spoke to-night, he knew they would continue to do good work.

This is a question to which we require to give serious attention because it is vital in the interests of the community. Particularly should we be careful because of the proposal to change the mode of procedure by which these men can be registered as dentists. The attitude of the Victorian Government is very clear on the statement by Major Baird. I regret that a measure like this should be introduced in the dying hours of the session. The Act of 1894 is as good as that in Victoria. The Legislature in those days foresaw the necessity for prescribing the methods by which dentists could be registered. Surely those men knew their duty. No one made a complaint against the provisions in those days. Are we, because certain persons wish to evade the Act, to consent to this proposal? Why should we not reduce the period, or even wipe the whole clause out and provide for no examination at all nor yet for any training? Let us wipe the whole thing out as it stands and let us have the old scramble when men used to go round with a horse and cart and a number of bells and drag out teeth. I protest strongly against the proposals of this Bill and I protest against the amendment.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I venture to say that the whole of the remarks of the member for Sussex have no bearing upon the amendment. He quotes extracts from the "Argus," from the "Melbourne Herald," and from Mr. Baird.

Mr. Pickering: Major Baird.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I said Mr. Baird. The war has been over for two years and I for one do not wish to continue the use of titles gained during the war now that we have reverted to times of peace. I do not desire to perpetuate the reference to military titles.

Mr. Lambert: Cheaply gained by some.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not approve of the use of these titles and continuing the military atmosphere.

The Attorney General: We will be like the United States soon.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, where every second man is a colonel. I would prefer the use of the plain prefix "Mr." The member for Sussex came forward with these statements, although, by no stretch of imagination, are they applicable to the question under discussion. To quote the opinion of Mr. Baird, however, which the hon. member has read, he distinctly states that the Dental Act in Victoria is the best in the world. Presumably, they have the highest trained men under that Act and yet in that very State, under their Act of 1910, it states that any person who has been practising for three years prior to the commencement of the Act may be registered.

Mr. Pickering: That is the parent Act which has been amended.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member holds up for public approval the Victorian Act, yet under that Act they register any man who has been practising for three years. He now objects to register men who have been engaged in dental surgery for seven years. The profession to which the member for Sussex belongs, and the members of which were responsible largely for drawing up the Architects Bill, provided that anyone who has practised for an architect for 12 months should be registered.

Mr. Pickering: That was the parent Act.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It does not matter. The principle is the same. The hon. member is quite right in being concerned about the public interest, but while he is content to allow architects who have been practising for 12 months only to be registered, he objects to dentists who have actual practical experience every day for seven years, being registered. Where is the consistency?

Mr. Pickering: I have not mentioned the dental board.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I know that, but I also know that is the attitude of the dental board. It has been recognised not only in this measure but in all other legislation, that men who have had a number of years of practical experience in a profession have a right to be registered as qualified to practise in their professions for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Pickering: You will not find that in the professions of law and medicine.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not know, because they never reject anyone. They allow those who desire to pass in law and medicine, to keep on standing for examinations until they get through. As a matter of fact, some of the greatest nonentities become qualified both for law and medicine. I believe many men who have never made a study of the law at all, and have never passed any examination, would make better lawyers than those who have passed the necessary qualifying examinations. Give me a man with a practical knowledge of his trade, profession or calling in preference at all times to the man who has merely passed examinations. It will be found among all men

who have passed examinations that a percentage of them have no more qualifications or capacity than men who have never studied at all.

Mr. Hudson: Would that apply to apprentices in the different trades?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Some of the best tradesmen in the State to-day are men who were never apprenticed at all. They have had experience by actual practical work, and to them the apprenticeship stands in the same category as the examination stands to men in the other professions. In this case those who would be registered would require to have seven years' actual experience and if they are able to successfully carry out their work for seven years, it shows that they must have given satisfaction.

Mr. Nairn: In addition to which, those who are registered have to give satisfaction to the board.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It has been the practice when introducing legislation of this description to include a drag-net clause which would qualify a large number of people, simply because they were engaged in the calling. If this principle is a right one, there is nothing very wrong or drastic about the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. The member for Sussex characterised the Victorian Act as the finest in the world. In Victoria there is a dental college which gives assistants opportunities to brush up their knowledge and qualify with greater rapidity than could students in this State. Mr. Joske, dental registrar in Victoria, stated—

I think the members of the Dental Board, in securing the passing of this great piece of legislation—the Dentists Act, 1910—which is, I think, a monument of administrative and legislative capacity on the part of the board, deserve the sincere and lasting gratitude of all the members of the dental profession.

A few days ago an Opticians Bill was introduced in another place, and the principle sought to be established under that measure was far more elastic than the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition. One of the qualifications set down in that measure is that the applicant has been engaged as a principal, manager or assistant for at least three years in the practice of optometry, and has for the three months immediately preceding the commencement of the Act been continuously resident in the State. There appears to be a dearth of dentists in Western Australia. In 1899 we had 52 dentists; in 1920 we have 53 dentists, notwithstanding that the population has increased by 140,000 during that period. This shows that the board have been particularly conservative and have excluded many who were qualified to practise. I do not wish to say anything in disparagement of the dental board, but they evidently want to keep the profession a close preserve. Dr. Drake, a doctor of dentistry, who came here, was not allowed to practise. He had to fight his way at heavy

expense through the court, and after having established his claim in the court, the board made a special rule to meet similar cases. It is not fair that any man who can bring proof of his bona fides should have to fight his way through the court to get registration. If the board desire to keep the profession a close preserve, it should be sufficient to tell them that, though the population has increased by 140,000, the profession has increased by only one dentist in the last 20 years. The amendment proposes only a fair thing, and it will safeguard the public, while at the same time those in the profession will be permitted to practise.

Mr. PICKERING: An attempt has been made to mislead on the question of the parent Act and the amending Act, and reference has been made to a drag-net clause. Obviously when starting, it is only just to those practising in a profession to make provision for them, but once a start has been made it is ridiculous to upset the qualifications laid down.

Mr. Lambert: How many times has the Victorian Parliament amended its dental legislation?

Mr. PICKERING: So far as I can see not at all since the Act of 1910.

Mr. Lambert: That was an amending Act.

Mr. PICKERING: Plumbers must pass an examination before being permitted to do any work in connection with the sewerage system.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They are ordinary workmen, not professional men.

Mr. PICKERING: If this is necessary in connection with sewerage work, surely in a matter pertaining to the health of the people, it is essential that applicants should prove by examination that they are qualified.

Hon. P. Collier: On a point of order, I submit that the argument of the member for Sussex has no bearing on the amendment, though it might be in order if used in opposition to the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold that point of order.

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I move an amendment on the amendment—

That after "assistant" the words "by the performance of dental operations in the mouth" be inserted.

Mr. PICKERING: The acceptance of the amendment would probably necessitate a clause to define "dental operations." I am anxious that it should not be possible to drive a coach and four through this legislation. Might not a dental operation mean a minor work, such as cleaning the teeth? The Committee are endeavouring to pass legislation which will flood the profession with a lot of inexperienced persons to practise on the people of the State. The whole crux of the clause is the passing of the examination.

Mr. O'Loughlen: How many would pass?

Mr. PICKERING: The whole of those engaged in dentistry. Anyone keeping accounts or sweeping out the place would be eligible.

Hon. P. Collier: Would sweeping out the office be a dental operation?

Mr. Lambert: Then anyone cleaning your brass plate would be qualified to be an architect?

Mr. PICKERING: I strongly oppose the amendment.

Mr. LAMBERT: The fact that the member for Sussex knows nothing of the dental legislation of Victoria shows that he has given the matter very immature consideration.

Mr. Pickering: Do you know everything about it?

Mr. LAMBERT: I have all the Acts before me.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Coolgardie will address the Chair.

Mr. LAMBERT: Twenty years ago, when the parent Act was passed in Victoria, a recording measure was passed reordering all who had been practising dentistry for three years. I do not hold with that principle. This principle is infinitely better, as it safeguards the public.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. LAMBERT: The parent Act of Victoria was passed in 1890. In 1910 what was generally known as the recording Bill was passed. After considerable investigation and negotiations between all parties affected by dental legislation in that State, the Government brought in this new legislation. That legislation gave the right to any man who had been practising dentistry in Victoria to be regarded as a dentist. The recording Bill was brought in to remove the anomalies which existed under the parent Act. We are virtually in the same position in Western Australia. Anomalies have existed under the parent Act in this State. Indeed, if we put a strict interpretation upon it we should have the closest of close preserves. The present position in dentistry owes its origin to the judgment of the Chief Justice in the appeal before the Full Court with regard to the case of the dentist Blitz. In the course of his judgment the Chief Justice said that anyone in this State could perform a dental operation under the supervision of a registered dentist. Most of the men who have been practising dentistry in this State and earning their livelihood from that work have been doing their work thoroughly and well. The appeal case of which I speak was fought by the Dental Board, which shows the jealous regard they have for their profession. This Bill, in my opinion, would not add one member to the dental registry of Western Australia, but these men feel that after having been allowed to practise dentistry for so long, recognition of their work should be



given in the way proposed. It is not a matter of endangering the life of a patient when all that is done is to extract a tooth.

Mr. Pickering: That is only the elementary phase of dentistry.

Mr. LAMBERT: Other phases of dentistry can be equally well assimilated by any person who is capable of understanding the elementary parts of it. Those who have been practising legally under the parent Act have acquired a considerable amount of knowledge. All we ask is that those who have been doing this work and giving satisfaction for seven years should be deemed to be qualified to be registered as dentists. There are some dentists in this State who are chary about allowing others to become registered. I should like to read the qualifications that were specified as being necessary under the Act of 1894.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That was a concession granted at the time.

Mr. LAMBERT: Since that Act was passed we have had no amending dental legislation.

Mr. Pickering: This is not a recording Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: No, but it is on all fours with the recording Bill of Victoria.

Mr. Pickering: Why was it necessary to change the Act in Victoria?

Mr. LAMBERT: It was done as a result of a promise between all parties. Those who were actually practising dentistry said, "We will support your efforts to become registered if you will knock out certain advertising phases of the profession in Victoria." We must see that the public are properly safeguarded and we must give to these men who have been practising dentistry fair and reasonable means of becoming practitioners in this State.

Mr. Robinson: Where is the safeguard in the clause?

Mr. LAMBERT: Practising dentistry for seven years.

Mr. Robinson: Do you consider that a safeguard?

Mr. LAMBERT: To my mind, it is. If they have been practising dentistry for seven years, I can hardly see the necessity for an examination.

Mr. Robinson: Even you are in favour of an examination.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know that I could level any forcible argument against an examination. To-day no person can practise dentistry in Western Australia unless he is a bachelor of dental science. The board will not admit a licentiate of dental surgery. Therefore it is almost impossible for us to add to our ranks of dentists.

Mr. Robinson: A licentiate cannot call himself a dentist in Victoria.

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes, he can. My desire is to show how impossible it is for us to get additional dentists in this State.

Mr. Pickering: The position will not be improved by widening the Act.

Mr. LAMBERT: Let me ask the member for Sussex to consider carefully whether we should not have dental recruits in Western Australia? Everyone is desirous of seeing the public properly safeguarded. Is there any better safeguard that can be suggested consistent with doing full justice to those men who have been offering their services in Western Australia, some of them for 10 or 15 years?

Mr. ROBINSON: Do I understand that the effect of the clause is that dental assistants who have practised as such for a period of seven years, may then become full-blown dentists? If that is so, surely hon. members cannot understand it because I cannot think anyone in this House will agree to such a wholesale prostitution of the Dental Act. We might as well rip up the Dental Act altogether.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We are discussing the amendment.

Hon. P. Collier: We are discussing the whole field of dentistry.

Mr. ROBINSON: The effect of the clause in the amendment will be to permit these gentlemen who have practised as assistants in dentistry for a period of seven years without any qualification other than the mere service of time, whatever suffers they may be, to practise as dentists.

Hon. P. Collier: On a point of order, we should try to confine ourselves to the subject. We have had a discussion over the whole field of dentistry which is irrelevant.

The CHAIRMAN: I must uphold the point of order. The subject is important and I have no desire to confine hon. members to the four corners of it, but it appears to me that we have been getting considerably beyond the clause. The amendment is to insert certain words to the proposed new clause. Any hon. member may vote for the insertion of certain words, and if those words are added, when the clause is put as amended, he may vote against the clause. If hon. members will now confine their remarks to the amendment, we will get on better.

Mr. ROBINSON: I am utterly opposed to the amendment and when the clause is put, I shall express my opposition to that as well.

Amendment on the amendment put and passed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment on the amendment—

That the following be added at the end of the paragraph:—"And passes before the board a written, oral and practical examination in surgical and mechanical dentistry."

The addition of these words will enable the board to say whether or not they are justified in registering the candidate. There will be no longer any doubt as to whether the candidate is qualified.

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

|                |    |
|----------------|----|
| Ayes . . . . . | 9  |
| Noes . . . . . | 24 |

Majority against . . 15

AYES.

|               |              |
|---------------|--------------|
| Mr. Angwin    | Mr. Robinson |
| Mr. Harrison  | Mr. Roche    |
| Mr. Hickmott  | Mr. Thomson  |
| Mr. Johnston  | Mr. Maley    |
| Mr. Pickering |              |

(Teller.)

NOES.

|               |                |
|---------------|----------------|
| Mr. Angelo    | Mr. Lambert    |
| Mr. Brown     | Mr. Lutey      |
| Mr. Brown     | Mr. Mitchell   |
| Mr. Collier   | Mr. Nairn      |
| Mr. Davies    | Mr. O'Loughlin |
| Mr. Draper    | Mr. Plesse     |
| Mr. Duff      | Mr. Teesdale   |
| Mr. Durack    | Mr. Underwood  |
| Mr. George    | Mr. Willcock   |
| Mr. Green     | Mr. Willmott   |
| Mr. Griffiths | Mr. Hardwick   |
| Mr. Holman    |                |
| Mr. Hudson    |                |

(Teller.)

Amendment on the amendment thus negatived.

Mr. PICKERING: I thought the amendment moved by the member for North-East Fremantle would have met the wishes of most reasonable men. It was a most liberal amendment, and I cannot understand any member voting against it. We are now in the position that, in certain conditions, anybody can operate on the inoffensive public.

Mr. Lambert: They are doing it to-day.

Mr. PICKERING: But I go to those places where I know there are qualified men at work. In any case, if it is being done it is done under the supervision of practical men.

Hon. P. Collier: Some of them 80 years of age!

Mr. PICKERING: I do not know that, but I know that all practical dentists in Perth are thoroughly well qualified. I am opposed to allowing unqualified assistants to set up for themselves. We are asked to give them the endorsement which should be reserved for fully qualified dentists. Necessary facilities for training men are to be found in the public hospitals.

Mr. Lambert: They have not a dental instrument in the Perth Public Hospital.

Mr. PICKERING: I am assured that proper provision is made to enable students to acquire the necessary knowledge. Yet thoroughly well-trained students are to have no advantage over mechanical assistants who have served for seven years. The leader of the Opposition said it was possible to drive a coach and four through any Act of Parliament.

Hon. P. Collier: I never said anything of the sort.

Mr. PICKERING: It will be, not a coach and four, but a coach and twelve if the proposed new paragraph is allowed to stand. I am not opposed to liberalising the measure, so long as it is liberalised on sane lines. Human life might be jeopardised by a wrong procedure in an operation under anaesthetics.

Hon. P. Collier: Some of the registered dentists may have got in without any qualification at all, under the original Act.

Mr. Lambert: Yes, I will give the hon. member a list of them.

Mr. PICKERING: I am out to safeguard the interests of the people.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And give everybody, even dentists, a fair deal.

Mr. PICKERING: Yes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This new paragraph will not do it.

Mr. PICKERING: No, of course it will not. It is not common justice. When we have authorities like Dr. Jull and others pointing out the vital importance of the careful examination and treatment of the teeth of children, are we to so widen the Bill as to enable anyone who has the slightest acquaintance with the profession to operate on the public? I feel sure hon. members will recognise the justice of the position as I have placed it before them.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The member for Sussex has made a number of inaccurate statements. has made a number of inaccurate statements. people who are established as dentists in this State and who have put in seven years of time and have devoted their energies to building up a practice. As stated by Mr. Joske, the secretary and legal adviser of the Dental Board of Victoria, when legislation is introduced to shut the door great care should be taken to ensure that fair play is observed. Why has not the member for Sussex recognised this terrible danger to the public before? The Dental Board here have created a close corporation. Some hon. members are practically stonewalling the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Second Schedule, referred to in this clause, calls for the passing of a university examination. But here we have a provision to admit without examination any person who has been practising as a dentist for seven years. On the other hand, a person who has practised for six and a half years must pass an examination. I moved my amendment, which was defeated, because I was informed that all the dentists were willing to pass the examination. If we are to be entirely guided by the legislation of the Eastern States in this respect, we shall have to pass a new Dentists Bill every year. A section of the New South Wales Act requires eight years' practice on his own account for an unregistered dentist to become registered, and then he must make application within three months of the passing of the Act, and further must satisfy the Dental Board of New South Wales that he has practised, or been employed, for eight years "in the required manner." What exactly those words "in the required manner"

mean, I do not know. If the present amendment is carried, the clause will be inconsistent with itself. I hope hon. members will vote out the entire clause, so that the Attorney General may introduce a more suitable provision.

Mr. ROBINSON: I do not think there is a single member of this House who is opposed in principle to allowing qualified men, however they may have come by their qualifications, to practise dentistry. All we want to ascertain is, are they qualified? Surely no one in this Chamber will maintain that a man becomes qualified because he has practised a trade or a profession for a number of years? We are judged in this world by our results, and not by the time we have served at a thing. The member for Coolgardie, in advocating this clause, said he was quite prepared to have proper safeguards. I asked him what safeguards there were for the public under this clause. The only one that the hon. member could find was the stipulation that a man must have been an assistant for seven years. But unless there is a provision for examination of such a man prior to admission, the safeguard is not worth twopence. The Committee has put itself in a curious position by accepting the last amendment. These men who, in the course of this discussion, have become known as "the assistants" are quite willing to pass an examination, as I know from my interview with them last year when I was in charge of a similar Bill. They intimated that it would be as easy for them as "kiss your hand" to pass an examination, and I believe that would be so in the case of the best of them. Unless that examination is in the clause, out the clause must go. For whom is the member for York acting? Is he regarding the interests of the public in this matter? His only stand, as a member of this House, in putting forward what he has put forward is that his action has been in the interests of certain individuals.

Mr. Griffiths: Undoubtedly.

The Minister for Works: That is a reflection on the member for York.

Mr. ROBINSON: Undoubtedly it is a reflection on the member for York, but he admits it. The hon. member said he wanted to controvert the inaccurate statements made by various hon. members. He did not give us a single one of them. There has been no inaccurate statements made by the member for Sussex or myself.

Mr. Griffiths: He made an inaccurate statement regarding the 1910 Act. He said they wanted to repeal it.

Mr. Pickering: It is quite true.

Mr. ROBINSON: It is simply a question of demanding that we shall have qualified men. This is not a Government clause. It was moved by the member for York and members have heard him say for whom he was acting.

Mr. LAMBERT: The public should be safeguarded, and the member for Canning has a fair idea of the position regarding

these men who are practising dentistry. If he is not satisfied that the public are sufficiently protected, a qualifying clause could be added giving a discretionary power to the board to say that an examination must be held. That should meet the objection raised by the member for Canning.

Mr. Robinson: Quite.

Mr. LAMBERT: If the member for Canning were to submit an amendment on those lines, it would meet the wish of members. Where anaesthetics are administered, these people operate under the supervision of a medical practitioner. It should be remembered that the board, while it is concerned in keeping up the standard of dentistry in Western Australia, also tends to make it a close preserve for the dentist.

Mr. Robinson: I do not want to encourage that.

Mr. LAMBERT: I suggest that the member for Canning submit an amendment to give the board discretionary powers to demand an examination as I have suggested.

Mr. ROBINSON: It is rather difficult in the heat of a debate to draft an amendment to comply with the position suggested by the member for Coolgardie, which I welcome. I asked the member for Sussex to draft an amendment. He has done so, and has requested me to move it. I will do this, as I think it meets the position which has been raised. I move a further amendment to the proposed new paragraph—

That the following proviso be added:

"Provided that it shall be within the powers of the board to call before it such applicant for registration and, if not satisfied as to the qualifications of the applicant, may require the applicant to pass a practical examination in mechanical and surgical dentistry."

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment which has been rejected read: "And passes before the board a written, oral or practical examination in surgical and mechanical dentistry."

Mr. ROBINSON: That is compulsory.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish members to understand the difference between the two proposals.

Mr. ROBINSON: One is compulsory and the other is discretionary.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me a difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

Mr. ROBINSON: Oh no, that is not so.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not ruling the amendment out of order. I am prepared to put it as one was compulsory and the other was discretionary.

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

|       |    |    |    |    |
|-------|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes  | .. | .. | .. | 15 |
| Noes  | .. | .. | .. | 15 |
| A tie | .. | .. | .. | 0  |

| AYES.        |                |
|--------------|----------------|
| Mr. Angwin   | Mr. Nairn      |
| Mr. Brown    | Mr. Pickering  |
| Mr. Davies   | Mr. Robinson   |
| Mr. Harrison | Mr. Rocks      |
| Mr. Hickmott | Mr. Teesdale   |
| Mr. Hudson   | Mr. Underwood. |
| Mr. Johnston | Mr. Maley      |
| Mr. Lambert  | (Teller.)      |

| NOES.         |                |
|---------------|----------------|
| Mr. Angelo    | Mr. Holman     |
| Mr. Collier   | Mr. Lutey      |
| Mr. Draper    | Mr. Mitchell   |
| Mr. Duff      | Mr. O'Loughlen |
| Mr. Durack    | Mr. Plesse     |
| Mr. George    | Mr. Willcock   |
| Mr. Green     | Mr. Hardwick   |
| Mr. Griffiths | (Teller.)      |

The CHAIRMAN: I give my casting vote with the noes.

Further amendment thus negatived.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I move—

That progress be reported.

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

|                |    |
|----------------|----|
| Ayes . . . . . | 5  |
| Noes . . . . . | 26 |

Majority against . . 21

| AYES.         |               |
|---------------|---------------|
| Mr. Hudson    | Mr. Underwood |
| Mr. Pickering | Mr. Johnston  |
| Mr. Robinson  | (Teller.)     |

| NOES.         |                |
|---------------|----------------|
| Mr. Angelo    | Mr. Holman     |
| Mr. Angwin    | Mr. Lambert    |
| Mr. Brown     | Mr. Lutey      |
| Mr. Collier   | Mr. Maley      |
| Mr. Davies    | Mr. Mitchell   |
| Mr. Draper    | Mr. Nairn      |
| Mr. Duff      | Mr. O'Loughlen |
| Mr. Durack    | Mr. Plesse     |
| Mr. George    | Mr. Rocks      |
| Mr. Green     | Mr. Teesdale   |
| Mr. Griffiths | Mr. Willcock   |
| Mr. Harrison  | Mr. Willmott   |
| Mr. Hickmott  | Mr. Hardwick   |
|               | (Teller.)      |

Motion thus negatived.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It was amusing to hear the member for Coolgardie say that the principal reason for the Bill was to break up a close preserve by giving an opportunity to become registered to dentists who have not shown their qualification by examination. When the Bill becomes law and these few persons are registered, the profession will be as close a preserve as ever before.

The Honorary Minister: But there will be a few more birds in the wood.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Only a few and they will do their best to prevent any

widening of the Act to admit others under similar conditions. Once legislation has been enacted, it is bad to amend it and again throw the door open. In 1912 similar legislation was passed in New South Wales and the door was thrown open. That legislation was amended in the 1915-16 session and again in the 1916 session. If we are continually amending the Act we shall be either throwing the door open or doing an injustice to some people. If it were suggested that a similar thing should be done for engine-drivers and plumbers the member for York would be the first to object.

Mr. HUDSON: Another half-dozen will evade the Act and then come to Parliament for another Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: On a point of explanation, the member for Yilgarn said that these men had been practising illegally.

Mr. HUDSON: No, I said another half-dozen would come and ask for another Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Why should we compel men who have been practising for 6½ years to pass a stiff examination if we allow others who have been practising for only six months longer to be registered without any examination at all? Is it fair? This is a wrong practice to adopt and I hope the clause will be negatived.

Mr. PICKERING: I move an amendment—

That all the words after "every person" be struck out with a view to inserting other words.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. PICKERING: Is it not in order?

The CHAIRMAN: No, those words have been passed.

Mr. PICKERING: I thought we were discussing the new paragraph as amended.

The CHAIRMAN: It is impossible to go back. The hon. member can move to add to the clause if he so wishes.

Mr. LAMBERT: Move that they be examined by the architects' board.

Mr. PICKERING: Yes, I shall move an amendment that the following words be added: "And that the qualification examination should be that set by the architects board." This will reduce the position to an absurdity.

The CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the architects and I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I hope the new paragraph will not be accepted. I agree to a large extent with the remarks of the member for North-East Fremantle. It is no test of ability that a man has been employed for a good number of years. Many people work well under supervision, but as soon as the supervision is removed they become incompetent. In a profession like dentistry some proof of ability is necessary. It is better to have a shortage of dentists than to allow incompetent people to tamper with the mouths and teeth of the general

public. I trust the amendment will not be carried.

Mr. LAMBERT: In 1917 the Imperial Government appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the ramifications of dentistry. After an exhaustive examination into the qualifications necessary on the part of those seeking entrance into the profession, the Royal Commission, which consisted of the most eminent men in dentistry in the world, came to the conclusion that after five years of continuous dental service to the public such persons were entitled to registration. The claims of the dentists in Western Australia are on all fours with the claims of those in England. There would have been an added safeguard if the dental board had been given power to order examinations, but the Committee has seen fit to say that it is not necessary to give the board that power. Hon. members need have no fear about supporting the amendment, and I commend it to their approval.

Mr. PICKERING: I move a further amendment—

That a new paragraph be added as follows:—"Notwithstanding anything in the foregoing it shall be competent for the dental board to call applicants for registration before it with a view to ascertaining their qualifications, and the board shall have power to refuse such applications."

The Attorney General: Clause 23 already covers the hon. member's amendment.

Mr. PICKERING: The clause does not go fully into the point raised in my amendment. This Bill was a consolidating measure of 34 clauses and two schedules, but the vital parts of it have been cut out and the real issue now lies in an amendment moved by the hon. member.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine himself to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. PICKERING: We have an amended clause before us which has not been considered by the Parliamentary Draftsman.

The Attorney General: The hon. member is quite wrong.

Mr. PICKERING: The clause was amended by the leader of the Opposition from his place.

[Hon. G. Taylor took the Chair.]

Mr. Lambert: Tack a few words on after the word "affirmation."

Mr. PICKERING: Will the Attorney General accept my amendment?

The Attorney General: I am not in the habit of accepting amendments containing unnecessary words.

Mr. PICKERING: I regret that the whole trend of the debate has been directed against the interests of the general public. We have a number of ill-considered amendments submitted to the Committee.

Mr. Lambert: On a point of order; is the hon. member right in reflecting upon hon.

members, and stating that our decisions are ill-considered and opposed to the public interests?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in reflecting upon other hon. members.

Mr. PICKERING: I apologise for having reflected upon the intelligence of members, but I think they were unwise in arriving at the decision they did.

The Honorary Minister: Where are we?

Mr. Johnston: Wasting time!

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member would not take my assurance that his amendment was unnecessary. If he had been serious in taking up the cause of the public, he would have made himself acquainted with the other provisions of the Act of 1894. Moreover, he is showing that he has not the remotest idea of what is before the Committee. He does not even seem to be aware that the first 18 clauses of the Bill have been struck out. The board has power to make rules as regards the examination of persons who may claim registration as dentists. Some persons come forward and claim to be registered upon certain facts. The board says, "Prove your case," and under another clause of the Bill the board has power to compel that applicant for registration to prove his facts upon oath. That is sufficient to effect all that is necessary. I wish to make these remarks now in the interests of the public. We are at a late hour of the session, and unless the Bill reaches the Legislative Council to-night there is little hope of it being passed. In the opinion of a majority of members of this House this short Bill, which now consists of only five clauses, has some merit. The object of the five clauses is to liberalise the provisions entitling those qualified to practise dentistry in this State, and not only that but what is far more important, conserving the interests of the public. Are we going to sit here to-night and apparently deliberately attempt to prevent the Bill leaving this Chamber? If that is the object of members they are not exercising their discretion in the interests of the public at large.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is a matter of opinion.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am speaking of all the amendments; I do not refer to the amendments proposed only to-night. But when we have a list of amendments put forward which will necessarily take up considerable time in discussion, I feel justified in reminding hon. members of the position of the Bill and the period of the session.

Mr. Pickering: Whose fault is it that it is brought down so late?

Hon. P. Collier: Yours, because you talked so much throughout the session.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I object to the remarks of the Attorney General.

Mr. Green: He did not refer to you at all.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have endeavoured to carry amendments which we consider to be in the interests of the public. No member would move an amendment which was not in the best interests of the public.

The Attorney General: My remarks were confined to the Bill as a whole.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This is the only clause that I opposed. I believe the Bill will be detrimental to the interests of the public. The public must be assured that a man who practises dentistry is properly qualified.

Mr. LAMBERT: When this legislation is passed any man may practise dentistry in Western Australia. If the member for North-East Fremantle believes he is safeguarding the public interests by opposing the Bill he is making a mistake.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I am only opposing this clause.

Mr. LAMBERT: To-day any person may practise dentistry in this State under the supervision of a registered dentist. The Bill can have only good effect.

Mr. PICKERING: I resent the remarks made by the Attorney General. Any amendment I have moved to-day has been moved because I considered it to be in the best interests of the public. I may have erred in the nature of the amendments submitted, but the intention behind them—

The CHAIRMAN: The amendments of the hon. member are not now under discussion.

Mr. PICKERING: In justice to myself, when an imputation has been cast upon me—

Mr. Green: The Attorney General did not look at you.

Mr. Lambert: The Attorney General looked at me.

Mr. PICKERING: He particularly exonerated the member for North-East Fremantle.

Hon. P. Collier: He was looking at me all the time.

Mr. Lambert: He was only looking for you to assist him.

New paragraph, as previously amended, put, and a division taken with the following result:—

|      |    |    |    |    |    |
|------|----|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | .. | 23 |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | .. | 6  |

|              |    |    |    |
|--------------|----|----|----|
| Majority for | .. | .. | 17 |
|--------------|----|----|----|

# AYES.

|               |                |
|---------------|----------------|
| Mr. Angelo    | Mr. Lambert    |
| Mr. Brown     | Mr. Lutey      |
| Mr. Collier   | Mr. Maley      |
| Mr. Davies    | Mr. Mitchell   |
| Mr. Draper    | Mr. Nairn      |
| Mr. Duff      | Mr. O'Loughlin |
| Mr. Durack    | Mr. Plesse     |
| Mr. George    | Mr. Teesdale   |
| Mr. Green     | Mr. Willcock   |
| Mr. Griffiths | Mr. Willmott   |
| Mr. Hickmott  | Mr. Hardwick   |
| Mr. Holman    |                |

(Teller.)

# NOES.

|               |               |
|---------------|---------------|
| Mr. Hudson    | Mr. Roche     |
| Mr. Johnston  | Mr. Underwood |
| Mr. Pickering | Mr. Angwin    |

(Teller.)

New paragraph thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 22—Power to reduce period of apprenticeship or practise on service with forces:

On motion by Attorney General the words "Section 20" and "Section 21" in line 2 were struck out, and "Sections 3 and 4" inserted in lieu.

Clause 23—Power to take evidence on oath and summon witnesses:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Owing to several clauses having been cut out, I move an amendment—

That in line 2 the words "and of any dentist against whom any complaint is made under Section 19" be struck out.

These words are no longer applicable.

Mr. PICKERING: The Attorney General when dealing with the last clause said that Clause 23 would provide all the safeguards desired. Is it the Minister's intention to move any further amendments to the clause?

The Attorney General: No, not of any other nature.

Amendment put and passed.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move a further amendment—

That in lines 5 and 6 the words "or any complaint against a dentist" be struck out.

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

Clause 24—Annual license fee:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move an amendment—

That the whole of Part V., Clauses 24 to 34 inclusive, be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

First schedule—put and negatived.

Second schedule:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move an amendment—

That the following new clause be added to stand as Clause 2:—"Repeal of Section 10: Section 10 of the principal Act is hereby repealed."

Section 10 of the principal Act takes the place of Clause 20 of the Bill.

Amendment put and passed.

Title:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Because the Bill is no longer an Act to consolidate the law relating to dentists, but becomes merely an amendment of the Act of 1894, I move an amendment—

That all words after "two" in line 1 be struck out and "amend the Dentists Act 1894" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed; the title, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and an amendment to the title, and the report adopted.

### Third Reading.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

## BILL—DIVORCE ACT AMENDMENT.

### Council's Amendments.

Message received from the Council notifying that it had agreed to the Bill subject to certain amendments.

## BILL—WORKERS COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

### Council's Amendments.

Message received from the Council notifying that it had agreed to the Bill subject to certain amendments.

## BILL—STAMP ACT AMENDMENT.

### Council's requested Amendments.

Message received from the Council notifying that it had agreed to the Bill subject to certain requested amendments.

## BILL—CORONERS.

### Council's Message.

Message received from the Council notifying that it did not press its amendment No. 3, which the Assembly had declined to make.

## BILL—LUNACY ACT AMENDMENT.

### Council's requested Amendments.

Message received from the Council notifying that it had agreed to the Bill subject to certain requested amendments.

## BILLS (6)—RETURNED.

Message received from the Council notifying that it had agreed to the undermentioned Bills without amendment:—

- 1, Permanent Reserves.
- 2, Narrogin Recreation Reserve.
- 3, Navigation Act Amendment.
- 4, Justices Act Amendment.
- 5, Bayswater Drainage Works.
- 6, Transfer of Land Act Amendment.

## BILL—GRAIN ELEVATORS (No. 2).

### Second reading.

Debate resumed from 16th December.

Mr. MALEY (Greenough) [9.43]: It is somewhat confusing to have the two Bills before the House at the same time. Bill No. 1 provides for the payment of calls on shares in the West Australian Grain Growers Co-operative Elevators, Ltd., whereas Bill No. 2 confers on the company the sole right to construct elevators for the bulk handling of grain. In Bill No. 1 applications for shares have been invited.

The Premier: That is not being discussed now.

Mr. MALEY: No, but I want to show how it will operate against the Bill before us, because within a period of five years the company must provide bulk handling facilities at Geraldton.

Mr. Willcock: No. The proviso shuts that out.

Mr. MALEY: I am going by the Bill, and particularly by the reference to the Geraldton zone in Clause 3. Applications have already been invited, successfully, for shares from portions of the Geraldton zone as defined by this Bill. Shares have been taken up by farmers at Three Springs, and at Carnamah, and elsewhere in the Geraldton zone. The capital derived from the taking up of those shares will be applied to the establishment of grain elevators at Fremantle.

The Premier: That is a matter for the individuals taking up the shares.

Mr. MALEY: No. The proposition was submitted before the No. 2 Bill was brought down. Undoubtedly the position so created is one which must operate against the prospects of the establishment of an elevator at Geraldton.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is no intention of putting up an elevator at Geraldton. Read the proviso to Clause 3.

Mr. Willcock: Under that proviso, if an elevator is not put up at Geraldton, nothing will happen to the company.

Mr. MALEY: The fact remains that farmers in that district have taken up shares for the purpose of establishing elevators at Fremantle, and I want to point out to the Premier that such a state of things will operate against the establishment of an elevator at Geraldton within the prescribed term. The outside districts will be interested to observe the progress made with the establishment of elevators at Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Bill should go to a select committee for inquiry.

Mr. MALEY: I am not too keen on delegating our powers to select committees. In any event, it is too late for a select committee to consider this measure.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Bill should have been brought down earlier.

Mr. MALEY: That may be so. The two Bills, one following on the other's heels, are confusing. There seems to have been no definite aim in view when the first Bill was drafted. The shares which the organisers who went into the various farming districts have succeeded in placing may result in the establishment of an elevator at Fremantle, with the help of the Commonwealth Government.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And with that of the State Government.

Mr. MALEY: I understand that the State Government are not in this business at all, but that the whole of the money which is to be advanced will be advanced by the Commonwealth Government. The State Government, I gather, are merely providing the sites. I fail to see how these two Grain Elevator Bills can be separated from each other.

Mr. SPEAKER: But the only Bill now under discussion is the No. 2 Bill, which is before the House.

Mr. MALEY: I maintain that I am perfectly in order in calling attention to the definition of the Geraldton zone in the other Bill, and in pointing out that considerable capital has already been raised in the Geraldton zone for the establishment of elevators at Fremantle, a fact which must eventually operate against the establishment of an elevator at Geraldton within the prescribed period of five years. The farmers in my district have practically been robbed of a portion of the capital which is required for the establishment of an elevator at Geraldton. I do not think the Premier can deny that. I stand for the establishment of the system of bulk handling of grain. I hope that the definite establishment of that system at Geraldton will materialise under this Bill, but I must express my fear that the measure brings neither Geraldton nor Bunbury nor Albany any nearer the possession of an elevator. I welcome the bulk handling system, but am distinctly opposed to the attempt by means of this Bill to deprive the Geraldton zone of a portion of the capital that is needed for the establishment of an elevator at Geraldton.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [9.53]: I welcome this measure for the establishment of the bulk handling system of wheat in Western Australia.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Can you as an architect honestly say that, in view of the present cost of cement?

Mr. PICKERING: I will deal with that point presently. The proposition is one that dips into the Geraldton district and also the Bunbury district.

Mr. Mahey: You can speak for yourself.

Mr. PICKERING: It is the intention of the bulk handling company to start operations at Fremantle and Bunbury in conjunction. The cost estimated by experts is "not exceeding £800,000," but in any case the cost would not exceed one million pounds,

which latter sum would suffice for the establishment of the scheme as outlined in the Bill, inclusive of a silo at Bunbury. To be complete, the scheme must eventually provide for bulk handling at both Geraldton and Bunbury, in addition to Fremantle.

Mr. Thomson: What about Albany?

Mr. PICKERING: I expect an elevator will be established at Albany in due course. As regards the cost of construction, I am informed by the elevator company that they have entered into agreements with the cement companies for all supplies required. They did this realising that otherwise they might find themselves in the same predicament as the New South Wales Government, who, after having called tenders for the construction of silos and rejected those tenders, were faced with the fact that they could not obtain supplies of cement, options over all the available supplies having been secured by the tenderers. It must be remembered that under this Bill bulk handling is to be conducted by a co-operative company. The company is comprised entirely of wheat growers, and embraces wheat growers of every political faith. The wheat growers throughout the State have evidenced, by their applications for shares in the company, their desire for the establishment of the bulk handling system. The Federal Government recognise this to be the fact, inasmuch as they are granting the additional money which is needed to enable the work to be carried out, namely, £550,000. One of the stipulations made by the Federal Government was that there should be an undertaking by the State Government of Western Australia to pass all needful legislation, in the absence of which no payment will be made by the Commonwealth Government. The sites are not being assigned to the Federal Government at all, but will remain the property of the State. Further, the period over which occupancy of these sites is permitted to the elevator company is limited by the Bill. All the Federal Government desire is reasonable security, and the Western Australian Government are endeavouring by this measure to afford such security. One strong argument in favour of bulk handling is the source of supply of corn sacks. Most people know that jute goods come from India, and the study of current history tells us that the industrial position in that country is anything but satisfactory. Like all other States of the world, India is confronted with serious industrial difficulties. In addition, we know that the political aspect of India is anything but satisfactory. Having regard to those facts, and realising that the only source from which cornsacks can be supplied is India, we must recognise that in the absence of a system of bulk handling this State may find itself at any moment precluded, by lack of cornsacks, from garnering its grain. I can imagine no more serious calamity for our wheat growers, or for the State as a whole. I am not advancing a purely hypothetical theory, but one which is based on facts that



must be plain to every person who has observed the trend of history. One knows what industrial conditions are practically all over the world, and one knows that India is not exempt.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The fact of your using that argument shows that your case is weak on other points.

Mr. PICKERING: I put up that argument because I believe it is important in the interests of the State that adequate means should be devised for meeting the possibilities of the situation. The Bill also affords adequate means of dealing with those periods of uncertainty which frequently occur. We need only carry our minds back to 1914 in order to realise the seriousness of the position in which the State finds itself when it is unable to get rid of its surplus grain.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That was the time of the drought.

Mr. PICKERING: I allude to the period of the war.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The drought year was 1914-15.

Mr. PICKERING: I will touch on that aspect later. During the period of the war we found ourselves in the unsatisfactory position of having large harvests, but no possibility of disposing of our grain. Thus the State was forced to take up a position which for the first year or two had disastrous effects on the wheat growers. Let me take also the case of reserves of grain. It is a rational course for a country to endeavour to carry over its supply of grain for at least one season. It is only possible, in my opinion, under a system of bulk handling to carry over the grain satisfactorily because under such a system of storage, the risk from damage from vermin, from weather, from fire, and so on, is eliminated.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The whole lot will only carry about a million bushels. The argument is ridiculous on the face of it.

Mr. PICKERING: It will be necessary to provide certain retainers at the terminal ports and elsewhere. There were other people than ourselves who were seized with the necessity for storing grain and one was Joseph of old. Much has been said on this point that I will not traverse the same ground. Under a bulk handling system much of the expense which farmers at present have to bear, will be eliminated.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We will know if that is so or not when we know what the New South Wales experience proves.

Mr. PICKERING: The result will be of interest to the consumer as well as the grower because the cost of the product is a convincing reflex of the price at which it is sold. The evidence of Mr. Metcalf of the well known firm of Metcalf & Co. is interesting on this point. The company made an offer to the New South Wales

Government in the course of which it was stated—

Messrs. Metcalf & Co. offered to construct silos and pay for them themselves. They asked for no monopoly and offered at the end of 25 years to hand back the plant to the Government free. In the meantime, they would guarantee to handle wheat at 2d. per bushel cheaper than under the bag system. On this basis, they stated that at the end of 25 years they would have made £7,000,000.

The firm guaranteed to handle the wheat at 2d. per bushel cheaper than under the bagging system. On that basis the firm contended a profit of seven millions would have been made. In view of the assertion by a firm such as Metcalf & Co., that statement is worth listening to and I trust members will take cognizance of the facts I have related. Some members suggested that we would find difficulty in dealing with the wheat in other countries such as the British Empire.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Bill does not deal with wheat. This is a bulk handling measure. It does not deal with the disposal of wheat in any other country.

Mr. PICKERING: But as to the conditions in other countries, the question of the disposal of the wheat to be handled by the elevators in those places is applicable.

Hon. P. Collier: The measure serves to allow the hon. member to wander from China to Peru and back again.

Mr. PICKERING: Different ports in England are equipped with the bulk handling of wheat, including London, Liverpool, Bristol, Hull, and Glasgow. A great proportion of the wheat is transhipped into the central towns and is carried in barges.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: In bags.

Mr. PICKERING: My information is to the contrary.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Agent General was my informant last May.

Mr. PICKERING: My informant is a gentleman who went home in the interests of bulk handling to gain information there from a mercantile point of view. He went through Great Britain and the Continent.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I thought so, from what you stated regarding India.

Mr. PICKERING: In addition to the bulk handling facilities in Great Britain, other places on the Continent, which are also fitted for this work, are Marseilles, Havre, Brest, Bordeaux, St. Nazaire, Rouen, Dunkirk, Antwerp, Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Hamburg, Emden, Bremerhaven, and Genoa.

Hon. P. Collier: Is that all?

Mr. O'Loughlin: What is the custom at Genoa?

Mr. PICKERING: I say that that port is equipped with bulk handling facilities so that it may work in unison with the other ports I have mentioned.

Hon. P. Collier: You have talked yourself to the point of exhaustion.

Mr. PICKERING: Very nearly. There is only one exception that I know of and that is in the Far East.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Japan is moving now.

Mr. PICKERING: I am endeavouring to answer questions which have been put up by members opposite. If they want information—

Mr. O'Loughlen: We are delighted to have it or we would not be here.

Mr. PICKERING: I have investigated this matter in the interests of members of the House. I am not a wheat grower myself and I do not pretend to have an abnormal knowledge of wheat. I have made it my business since I have been in the House to fight the battle of the wheat growers.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If you do that, you will oppose this Bill.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Most of the people look for an official announcement from the leader of the party.

Mr. PICKERING: Dealing with the question of shipping, an interesting and informative statement was made by Mr. G. Walker, who gave information regarding the position of bulk handling in relation to the shipping trade before a select committee in Sydney.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Is that Lindley Walker of Sydney?

Mr. PICKERING: Yes. A prevalent idea in regard to the shipping of wheat has been exploded by Mr. Walker in giving evidence in Sydney before the Agricultural Select Committee. Mr. Walker said—

Lining of ships is not necessary. I do not know of lining being put in any vessels now in any part of the world in connection with the carriage of bulk wheat. The Navigation Board framed regulations regarding the question and has submitted them to the Government. There was no recommendation in them that vessels should be lined. Bulkheads and shifting boards would be necessary.

Mr. Walker also said that he had spoken to a large number of captains whose vessels had been engaged in bulk grain handling, and each had assured him that lining was needless expense. If the wheat touched the skin of the ship experience showed the damage was trifling. Bag cargo was loaded on top. He did not know of any cargo carriers of modern construction that could not carry bulk wheat from Australia. "Loading wheat in bags," he added, "will delay a vessel in port for ten days; to load bulk wheat would only mean a delay of ten hours."

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He is the man who said a third of the wheat would have to be put into bags.

Mr. PICKERING: He has not said so here.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But he has stated that that would be the position.

Mr. PICKERING: The member for Geraldton (Mr. Wilcock) asked for certain information regarding the wheat in the elevators and terminal elevators. The Government would have to fix the standard or grades and the wheat will be placed in A, B, C, and other grades, which will be indicative of the quality. Every elevator operator will have to pass an examination as to his fitness. It would be futile to allow a man who is unqualified—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This Bill does not apply to any of it.

Mr. PICKERING: It does not deal with that aspect, but it is evident that, in order to get the best results from the bulk handling scheme—

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member were to speak about the Bill and not worry about the questions of the member for Geraldton, we would get on better.

Mr. PICKERING: It is essential in order to get the good wishes of members, with a view to securing the passing of this measure, that information should be given.

Mr. SPEAKER: These things are not proposed in the Bill. There is nothing about grading or the matters the hon. member has been dealing with.

Mr. PICKERING: It seems necessary that I should point out these matters in order that members may know what the position is.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Seeing you have gone to so much trouble to get this information, I think we should have it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But all the member for Geraldton said was that the Bill was incomplete because some of these provisions were not inserted.

Mr. PICKERING: It is necessary to have another Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: We can discuss the grading of wheat when that Bill comes forward.

Mr. PICKERING: If you will permit it, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the wheat grower will have a fair deal regarding the wheat which goes through the elevators. I am sorry you will not permit me to show the basis on which the wheat is dealt with in the elevators. What will be done, however, is that a very careful investigation of the grade will be made and the growers will get their wheat certificates accordingly.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They did that in Canada, but not under a Bill like this.

Mr. PICKERING: The necessary legislation will follow along those lines.

Mr. Wilcock: The Bill does not deal with these things at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! Let us deal with the Bill. We can deal with other Bills when they come along.

Mr. PICKERING: It has been pointed out that the Grain Elevator Company is not dealing with wheat. It is obvious that not only the interests of the grain growers, but of the consumer and the State, will be conserved by the proper carrying out of this work.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It does not say so in this Bill.

Mr. PICKERING: I do not know why you should baulk me in giving information to the House. There are so many questions of interest in connection with the position. I should like to bring arguments to bear to show what the position really is, but these matters would be ruled out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member is in order in submitting arguments which will secure his object in passing or rejecting this Bill, but his arguments must be relevant to the Bill before the House.

Mr. PICKERING: One argument against the Bill which was used by one member was the difficulty in obtaining money in exchange for the wheat scrip. I can assure the hon. member I will make available to him all the information I have in my possession on that point.

Mr. O'Loghlen: He will call at your office to-morrow morning.

Mr. PICKERING: The bulk handling system will conserve the interests of the consumer as well as the grower and will also conserve the interests of the overseas export trade. It would also eliminate waste in the costs of handling and make the transit much more rapid. Surely we are serving the best interests of the public when we desire to see that modern systems are adopted. Nowadays there is a tendency to cut down the length of the day's work and to cut down the length of operations generally.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Even in speaking.

Mr. PICKERING: I have been purposely brief this evening. We should be prepared to adopt up to date methods in dealing with the handling of our wheat supplies. It affords the maximum convenience at the minimum of cost. These are factors which provide strong arguments in its favour. It affords the maximum security. Wheat contained in elevators of the description which it is intended to erect ensure perfect safety to the grain from the ravages of vermin, weevil, fire or weather.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That will not apply.

Mr. PICKERING: It will. I trust that members will give this Bill the same passage which we gave to the proposition which was put before us some considerable time ago. I regret that after this House had endorsed that agreement it was dealt with adversely in another place. Had it been given effect to this system would have been installed at a smaller cost than the outlay which will be involved to-day. We would have had all the advantages of an up to date bulk handling system—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You would have had only storage.

Mr. PICKERING: We would have had the main part of the scheme.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No; you would have had no machinery or anything of that kind.

Mr. PICKERING: We would have been miles further on the road than we are to-day, and at considerably less cost. We know

from what the member for North-East Fremantle said that the cost of building is excessive, but no one can say what will be the trend. If the present high cost is likely to be maintained, then it is useless to postpone the entering into an agreement for this proposition when we have the favourable terms offered by the Federal Government, and when we realise that the farmers of this State have gone so far in a measure of co-operation as to find a considerable sum to give effect to their desires. I am bound by my platform as a member of the Country party to give my support to this measure, and I trust that the few remarks I have been permitted to make, and on which I would have liked to enlarge, will have the effect of obtaining support for this Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Right of company to construct elevators:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 the words "shall have the sole right" be struck out.

The company will never be able to carry out the works provided under this Bill. The measure proposes to give them the sole right to handle the wheat in bulk in the Geraldton, Albany, Bunbury, and Fremantle districts, but the member for Greenough has pointed out that there is no intention of constructing elevators anywhere outside Fremantle.

Mr. Maley: I did not say that.

Mr. Willcock: He said that the shares from the Geraldton district were taken up for Fremantle only.

Mr. Johnston: That is for a start.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not think the company have any intention of carrying out the provisions of this Bill, and therefore we should not give them the sole right for the next five years. The capital of the company is not nearly sufficient to carry out the works. The capital of the company is set down as £1,500,000, provided they can raise it. They cannot register until 150,000 shares have been applied for, and they cannot go to allotment until 300,000 shares have been applied for. The first £100,000 has to be expended before the Commonwealth will advance any money at all. I am sorry I could not obtain a report which was in the library two years ago and from which I quoted at the time. It would have proved my contention why we should not give this right. I shall have to quote from my own statements which appeared in "Hansard" of the 11th April, 1918. I had sent a communication to the Minister for Agriculture in New South Wales, Mr. Graham, following a report which appeared in the "West Aus-

tralian" on the 17th December, 1917. The report stated—

Finality was reached by the State Cabinet yesterday regarding the acceptance of tenders for the erection of country wheat silos, and a Sydney terminal elevator. The Minister for Agriculture (Mr. Graham) subsequently announced that the total sum to be expended under all contracts was £1,172,000. The Government was now in a position to put in hand the whole of the work which was immediately necessary in connection with the silos, including machinery for the terminal elevator.

Mr. Graham replied as follows:—

In reply to your letter of the 19th ultimo asking for certain information in regard to the number of silos, etc., included under the contracts let by this Government, I have to inform you that there are 71 silo plants in all in the country, and one terminal elevator at Sydney. The country silos consist of from one to six sets of tanks. Each tank has a capacity of 50,000 bushels, and the total capacity of the 71 silo plants is 11,000,000 bushels. In addition thereto there will be a terminal plant at Sydney which will have a capacity of about 5,000,000 bushels, and only the latter will have cleaning machinery attached thereto at present.

The one elevator with machinery and the 71 silos in the country cost £1,172,000 at that time, and a considerable amount has had to be added since. A Victorian engineer went into this matter very fully, and after having visited America, he presented a report to his Government. This is a report I should have liked to quote from to-night. He not only investigated the question of cost but the question of administration. He estimated that to erect a silo in Geelong to carry about a quarter of a million bushels, together with silos in the country—approximately the same number as we would require in this State—would cost about one and a half millions. This shows clearly that the cost under present conditions for the construction of silos in this State will be approximately two and a half millions, that is, if we are to have a well-equipped bulk-handling scheme. There is another reason why the company should not be given the sole right. The time is not far distant when the bridges across the river at North Fremantle must be removed, and when they are removed and a little dredging is done, high ground will be available to work on. At Rocky Bay, and even on the other side of the river, but at Rocky Bay for preference, the whole of the work could be done by gravitation, and some other party or even the Government might be able to work elevators there by a system of gravitation which would be considerably cheaper to the farming community. They would be able to dispense with the engineers and other employees who would be constantly required under the scheme now proposed.

Mr. Harrison: What is the distance from the water front?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: About as far as from Parliament House to the Public Works offices. The elevators could be erected somewhere near the present abattoirs. It would be necessary to have a pumping plant or an endless belt to carry the wheat. It would be necessary to spend money on machinery to load the ships and provide facilities for sucking the wheat out of the trucks. Considerable expense would also be saved by handling the trucks on the gravitation system.

The Premier: It could not be done both ways.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, it could. When the site is being levelled it will be no trouble to provide proper grades for the trucks. The system of gravitation could be carried out quite cheaply. It is not fair to give this company the sole right to the elevators. Why should we hand over the control of our wheat to one company? Some other co-operative company may want to start operations.

Mr. Maley: Another company is not likely to do so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The capital will be limited to a large extent. I do not believe in monopolies. The security that will be held by the Commonwealth will be the land that will be given by the State Government.

Mr. Thomson: Surely the elevators are some security!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is the land which is the main security. When it is handed over to the company it is taken away from the Government and the Government can do nothing for 25 years. If it is found that the costs imposed by the company are too high, the Government will be powerless for a quarter of a century.

Mr. Thomson: Then the farmers could revert to the bag system.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Under present costs the bag system would be the cheaper one.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I protest against the striking out of these words. There will be left no incentive to the grain growers to put their money into this movement. They require proper security for the money they will be putting into the business. It is proposed that the elevators shall be extended throughout the wheat-growing districts of the State. The prospectus points out that it is proposed to commence with an additional instalment in the State of approximately 70 country elevators and one terminal.

Mr. Maley: That was put before the wheat growers in the Fremantle zone.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It is also proposed to gradually extend the system by providing additional facilities as development justifies them. The main portion of the wheat is grown in the Fremantle zone, and it is proposed to extend the system to Geraldton, Bunbury, Albany, and other zones where wheat is grown.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Do you think the majority of the growers in the Fremantle zone would authorise the extension to Geraldton, for instance?

Mr. JOHNSTON: Yes. The prospectus shows that if sufficient support from the growers is immediately forthcoming, it is expected that the bulk handling system can be established in Fremantle in time for the crop after next. If the Industries Assistance Board settlers had been permitted to come into the business the scheme would have been established in the Fremantle zone as desired within the next two years. I hope the Government will stick to the Bill.

The Premier: You should stick to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I am sticking to it. I hope the Government will give the sole right to the co-operative company to establish these elevators.

The PREMIER: If these words are struck out it will deprive the company of their security, and the Bill will not mean anything. It will be impossible to make more than one scheme pay. This company will have to borrow practically all the money required and they must have some security before they can do that. Unless the company has the sole rights asked for they will have difficulty in inducing people to take shares. These words I hope will be allowed to stand.

The CHAIRMAN: If the words proposed to be struck out are struck out the clause will be meaningless. I take it all the hon. member wants to strike out is the word "sole."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is so. The company will still have the right to handle the wheat for 25 years, but would not have a monopoly.

The Premier: They could not raise the money to build the works without having the sole right.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then they could not raise the money at all.

The Premier: They have got it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They have £550,000 from the Commonwealth and are looking for £150,000 from the State Government. No company in the world was floated under such conditions. They cannot carry out the proposed works under two millions of money.

Mr. Smith: How much do you think they would cost?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: About 2½ to three million pounds. The farmers are being gulled into a proposition they do not understand.

Mr. Harrison: They become shareholders in the company.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Once the farmers get this money from the Government on the scrip held by the Industries Assistance Board they will see the fallacy of the thing, and will be asking the Government to relieve them, and the Government will have to do so.

Mr. MALEY: There is sufficient protection given to enable others to come in and carry on operations at other ports.

Hon. P. Collier: But everybody else will be shut out for five years.

Mr. MALEY: It is not likely that anybody else will form a company to establish elevators at any of the other ports.

Mr. HARRISON: If the words are struck out the Committee may as well throw out the Bill. There would be no security for the Commonwealth Government. The Bill gives security, and without it no one would be foolish enough to put their money into the venture.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No milling company under this subclause can construct elevators for the bulk handling of their grain. It is not likely that wheat is going to be handled all the time by one company; others may come here to buy wheat and they may desire to construct elevators in which to store the wheat to await a suitable market.

The Premier: This means for shipment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It does not say so.

The Premier: I will make that clear.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In three or four years' time wheat buyers may find it necessary to store their wheat; they would want to store it in bulk.

Mr. Smith: The company could do it for them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They could not do so; they would not be able to build sufficient silos in which to store all the wheat.

Mr. MALEY: Put in the words "bulk handling of grain for export."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It ought to come out altogether.

Mr. Harrison: You will emasculate the Bill.

The Premier: If you make it "bulk handling of grain for the public" it will be all right.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Is the company going to provide storage on the farms?

Mr. Smith: Yes, if you give them the money for it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That the following be struck out:—"It shall be unlawful for any person other than the said company to construct or use elevators for the bulk handling of grain in any of the said districts so long as the right hereby conferred upon the said company continues within the district."

The Premier: It is a modest amendment. It would strike out the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It would save the farmers money if we could do it.

The PREMIER: The hon. member wishes to protect the millers and others in the use of silos for the storage of grain. I do not think the Bill would deny those people the right. I suggest the hon. member withdraw his amendment and insert after "grain" the words "for the public." Then any person who wanted his own silo could erect it.

Mr. MALEY: "Public" is a very wide term.

The PREMIER: Still I am not going to deny the right of millers to store their own

grain. No hon. member should object to that. I do not think the provision will affect the mills, but I would sooner throw out the Bill than block the millers.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This opens up a fairly big question. I suggest that we report progress and refer the question to the Crown Law Department, so as to see if this affects the mills. The Premier said that no hon. member would object to the millers having their own storage.

Mr. Smith: You want to block the progress of the bulk handling scheme.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I admit it, because I want to block the robbing of the farmers.

Mr. Smith: They are robbing themselves.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, they are not. They do not understand the position.

Hon. P. Collier: They have been caught napping.

Mr. Smith: They are not mugs.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, for they are sending in to have their applications for shares cancelled. We are going to have erected in Fremantle within the next few months a mill belonging to a Great Southern company.

Mr. Johnston: They are in my electorate also.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: And there is another large mill to go up on the north side of the river, adjoining the Government stores. They also will want elevators.

The Colonial Secretary: It will not affect them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I say it will.

The Premier: No, it will not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Clearly, it will affect them. Read again the words I propose to strike out. These mills will take their grain in bulk, and that being so it is our duty to protect them.

The Premier: I agree with that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The only way to protect them is by carrying the amendment.

Mr. Johnston: Why not put in the words "with the consent of the Government"?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I would not object to that. That would be a protection for them. It is a very good suggestion.

The Premier: But I will not accept it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It would afford a protection, because then the Government would deal with every case on its merits.

Mr. Willcock: I do not suppose you would have one application in 10 years.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government would be able to decide each case on its merits.

Mr. Maley: Why not insert the words "for export"?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment with a view to inserting the words "except with the approval of the Governor."

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. MALEY: I move an amendment—

That after "grain" in line 10 the words "for export" be inserted.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If anyone bought a lot of wheat and wanted to put it in the elevators, he would have the privilege of storing it in bulk locally.

The PREMIER: I hope the amendment will not be accepted. Wheat might be stored in bulk and then bagged for shipment.

Mr. Maley: I think you are only quibbling.

The PREMIER: The hon. member has no right to say that. He should not judge other people by himself. If we insert after "grain" the words "for the public," it will safeguard the interests of the people to whom the member for North-East Fremantle has referred. All the grain handled by the company must be handled for the public. The elevators would be a public convenience and the company must not deal in grain.

Amendment put and negatived.

The PREMIER: I move an amendment—

That after "grain" the words "for the public" be inserted.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: What is the meaning of the words? Is it intended that I should not be able to put up a silo and handle wheat for someone else? If I put up a silo and stored wheat it would be for the public.

The Premier: It would not be for the benefit of the public.

Mr. Harrison: It would be for the benefit of yourself or your company.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The amendment of the member for Greenough would have met the case.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That after "district" in line 12 the words "except with the permission of the Governor" be inserted.

The PREMIER: If the amendment were accepted the Government could give anyone permission to do what the company will be permitted to do under this measure. I advise the Committee not to be caught by the member for North-East Fremantle, who is determined to defeat the Bill in some way or other.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I cannot understand the Premier's objection. He seems to have no faith in the Government.

The Colonial Secretary: There might be half a dozen Governments in the next 25 years.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government with which I was associated were accustomed to do things honourably. The honest intention of this Bill is to establish a system of bulk handling of wheat for shipment or sale, and place it in the hands of one company. I would point out that there may be a change in the system of marketing the wheat in the future, and that other people may want to build silos or provide storage accommodation of their own. If the producers cannot get bags for their wheat there must be silos into which to put it. The Premier is evidently

afraid that some Government may come into office which would do some dishonourable action.

Hon. P. Collier: We hear so much about the Country party coming into power that perhaps he is justified.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am willing to trust the Government. My amendment will protect the general public, the buyers of wheat and the sellers of wheat. There is a danger in allowing one company to become the possessor of the whole of the wheat in Western Australia. We must be very careful not to place the principal food of the people in the hands of a monopoly.

The Premier: I agree with you.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is why I desire to see this amendment carried. The member for Williams-Narrogin has stated that the Westralian Farmers have nothing to do with this business. As a fact this is a subsidiary company which has taken over the Westralian Farmers' agreement. We have seen that Mr. Basil Murray has been re-appointed to the position of managing director of the Westralian Farmers, and that it is intended he shall devote greater time to the question of the establishment of these elevators. If this company is floated there is no doubt a further subsidiary company will later on be formed for the purpose of purchasing grain. It should, therefore, be made lawful for any other person to put up elevators if they so desire, so that the position may be safeguarded in the interests of the State.

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

|      |    |    |    |    |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | 5  |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | 19 |

Majority against .. 14

#### AYES.

|             |              |
|-------------|--------------|
| Mr. Angwin  | Mr. Willcock |
| Mr. Collier | Mr. Lambert  |
| Mr. Lutey   | (Teller.)    |

#### NOES.

|               |               |
|---------------|---------------|
| Mr. Angelo    | Mr. Maley     |
| Mr. Brown     | Mr. Mitchell  |
| Mr. Draper    | Mr. Pickering |
| Mr. Duff      | Mr. Plesse    |
| Mr. Durack    | Mr. Smith     |
| Mr. George    | Mr. Teesdale  |
| Mr. Griffiths | Mr. Thomson   |
| Mr. Harrison  | Mr. Willmott  |
| Mr. Hickmott  | Mr. Hardwick  |
| Mr. Johnston  | (Teller.)     |

Amendment thus negatived.

[Hon. G. Taylor took the Chair.]

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (d) of Subclause 2 be struck out.

There is no necessity for the paragraph.

The Premier: The paragraph is in the Commonwealth agreement, and it makes the position safe.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The concern will never pay an eight per cent. dividend, or anything like it. I do not believe the shareholders will ever get a shilling out of it. With the interest payable to the Commonwealth Government, the company would have to earn 14 or 15 per cent. in order to pay eight per cent. to their shareholders. The paragraph is mere window dressing. Then there is also the next paragraph, providing for distribution of surplus profits, after payment of all expenses and after payment of 14 or 15 per cent. between the Commonwealth Government and the shareholders! The Bill has been so drafted as to delude the farmers.

Hon. P. Collier: The Bill is worthy of the wild cat days of Coolgardie.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government have no right to lend the authority of the State's name to this wild cat proposition. I predict that the farmers' representatives in Parliament will be those who in a few years' time will most keenly regret the passing of this measure. The suggested profits could not materialise unless the elevator company became a monopoly and imposed prohibitive handling charges. The farmers, I observe, are already drilled to the point of being willing to pay a charge of 2s. 6d., in the belief that they will get 2s. of it back. Money has been advanced by the Commonwealth. If it were all shareholders' capital and the cash was there they could use it, but money has been advanced by the Commonwealth to carry out the work.

Mr. Smith: We have heard a lot about co-operative companies going bung. They should not be able to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have been connected with co-operative companies and know that they cannot go bung provided they do not give credit. Many of these co-operative concerns started in a truly co-operative spirit, but extended their operations to credit business and in consequence failed.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I challenge the Premier to produce any Act passed by this legislature conferring any rights on a company, in which a proviso is inserted which allows them to evade responsibility. The proviso is the portion of the Bill which makes me think this is a dishonest measure. The proviso should not appear there, and if the company is honest and intends to carry out its obligations, there should be no necessity for it. I know my attitude will be perhaps criticised during election time, but I do not care a hang for that. I know that this means something of advantage to the Fremantle district, but it is not in the interests of the State and I therefore oppose it. The only district in which it is proposed to erect the elevators at present is Fremantle.

The Premier: Why object to the elevators being erected there?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Because I believe in honesty.

The Premier: But this is honest.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is not. The company has no intention of fulfilling the conditions set out in the Bill.

Mr. Smith: That is all nonsense.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is not nonsense, and you know it.

Mr. Smith: I do not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: You do. I know more than the hon. member thinks. I could tell him something that he does not know. He would be rather surprised although he is a chairman of directors. That is not the point, however. The point is whether Parliament should endorse in an agreement for the erection of terminal elevators such a proviso as I have mentioned. It gives the company an opportunity of evading their responsibilities.

Mr. Smith: We have an obligation to Geraldton, Bunbury, and Albany.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is no obligation under the Bill. If such an obligation were there, I would agree with it. I am not against bulk handling as such, but I say the time is premature. The time for bulk handling in Western Australia will come in the course of a few years. It is provided that these elevators must be constructed within five years. So far as Albany, Geraldton, and other outports are concerned, the conditions of the agreement will not be complied with within five years and the obligations will be cancelled so far as they relate to those ports.

The Premier: It is optional.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This portion of the work will be cancelled because the elevators at those ports will not be payable propositions within the term of the agreement and then an agitation will start with a view to the Government taking over these non-paying propositions and constructing the silos for the purpose of storing wheat at the smaller ports.

Mr. Harrison: You say these will not be profitable.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In my opinion it is premature to embark upon this proposition at the present time. The first payable proposition will be at Fremantle because of the larger quantity of wheat to be handled there. It will be many years before the outlying country districts will enable the elevators at the outer ports to be profitable. At Geraldton, for instance, the Government have not commenced providing the proper harbour there and in the circumstance it would be impossible to build the elevators there, seeing that there is no harbour fit for the wheat ships to enter.

Mr. Smith: You would like us to erect the elevators before the ships could go there.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, I say that this proviso should not be there at all. I

mention this to show there is no intention to carry out these works at Albany, Bunbury, and Geraldton. This proviso ought not to be here. The non-paying part of the proposition will be thrown on the Government of the day. I hope the Government will agree to the deletion of the proviso. Has the Premier ever known a company of this description that has not had to put up a big deposit as a guarantee that they will carry out their agreement?

Mr. Smith: Yes, the Meekatharra-Horse-shoe Railway Company.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is a very different thing. They are going out into the wilds to see if there is anything there. But here is an elevator company going to build on the best sites in the State. I should not be surprised if they asked the Premier to shift the railway station to make room for their elevators.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will speak to the proviso.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I was drawn aside by the chairman of this company. Never have we had such a proviso in any piece of proposed legislation. Other companies have had to put up a deposit as a guarantee that their work will be carried out, and have had to build their works in the time allowed this company in which to begin.

The Premier: If they do not do the work they will be relieved of any obligation.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is why I want the proviso to come out. I move an amendment—

That the proviso to Subclause 3 of Clause 2 be struck out.

The PREMIER: I do not wish the Committee to think I did not understand what the clause meant when it was put in. It means that the company please themselves about the erection of these elevators. If the company do not erect all of them, they will be relieved of their liabilities. They can erect an elevator at Fremantle and refrain from erecting one anywhere else. It is the intention of the company to erect elevators at all the places enumerated, but whether they have sufficient money for the purpose is another question. A great deal of wheat will still have to be shipped in bags. It may be found that wheat in bags will pay better than wheat in bulk.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It will pay the State better.

The PREMIER: What the hon. member says is perfectly right; the company can erect elevators at Fremantle and leave them unerected at other ports.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I will support the amendment. Paragraph (b) of the clause is nothing but a sham. It gives the impression that elevators must be erected at Geraldton, Bunbury, and Albany within five years. But when we come to the proviso, it is clear that the company need not build the elevators. It has been said that without a monopoly the company could not finance. In return they



should endeavour to adhere to the provisions of the Bill to construct elevators at various outports within five years. There seems to be an intention that they shall not do the work. If the company have a monopoly they should carry out the work, because no other company could undertake to enter for the smaller outports. The monopoly is worth so much to the company.

*12 o'clock midnight.*

Mr. Johnston: To the wheat growers.

Mr. WILLCOCK: The right is being conferred on the company. If the wheat growers of the Geraldton district desired to erect an elevator during the next five years, they could not do it.

Mr. Johnston: They could, through the company.

Mr. Smith: What about the Geraldton meat works?

Mr. WILLCOCK: If this company were as genuine, I would be satisfied. The company will be able to raise money in the Geraldton and other districts and utilise it to provide elevators at Fremantle.

Mr. Smith: They are not raising money in those districts at all.

Mr. WILLCOCK: The member for Greenough said they were.

Mr. Smith: We cannot prevent people from sending in applications for shares, but canvassers have not been to those districts.

Mr. Maley: They have.

Mr. WILLCOCK: If the elevators are not constructed within the five years stipulated, the money of the shareholders will be gone, and another company would not be able to raise the capital.

Mr. JOHNSTON: It is essential to the scheme that this clause be retained. If any canvasser has gone beyond the Fremantle zone, I can only assume it has been done in error. The campaign was to cover the wheat growers who ship from Fremantle, and so far as I know no one else has been asked to subscribe. The company are asked to raise £266,000, upon which the Federal Government will advance a loan of £550,000. As soon as that money is raised it is desired to start in the Fremantle zone. Later on the campaign would be extended to the Geraldton district, in order to provide elevators there. If the times financially were bad, and the Geraldton farmers did not support the movement, it would be possible for the Governor to forfeit the £800,000 spent in the Fremantle zone, unless the protection afforded by this clause were retained.

Mr. Willcock: We only wish to destroy the sole right, a perfectly legitimate request.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Without the clause the people who have already subscribed something like £150,000 would have no security. For the protection of those who have subscribed, the clause should be retained. This is the most important clause in the Bill

from the point of view of those who have given whole-hearted support to this movement.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Do they know the clause is here?

Mr. JOHNSTON: If they did not know, they would thank the Government for looking after their interests, and my constituents would thank me for doing my best on their behalf.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I consider that I am here to look after the interests of the State. The hon. member is trying to lead the Committee astray. Subclause 3 gives discretion to the Governor in this matter, but the proviso affords the company all the protection and the State none.

The Honorary Minister: The company only have protection for what they do.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am afraid I shall not be here to see the elevators constructed.

The Honorary Minister: You are a pessimist.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Is this not enough to make one feel downcast? It makes one doubt the honesty of everything that is brought before Parliament.

The Premier: This is a perfectly safe clause.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, it is not so from the point of view of the State.

The Premier: The State is fully protected.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Not at all. The protection to the State lies in Subclause 3 without the proviso. With the proviso left in, the company can pick out the best part of the State and leave the rest upon the hands of the Government. I appeal to hon. members to protect the State against the possible actions of this company. The subclause without the proviso gives the company all the protection that is needed, but at the same time will completely safeguard the interests of the State. The proviso is not an honest one, for it is designed to enable the company to evade the main provisions of the Bill.

Mr. Smith: You would like to cut out Geraldton altogether.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The deletion of the proviso will mean the bringing of Geraldton within the terms of the Bill. On the other hand, if the proviso remains, Geraldton will not be furnished with an elevator for many years to come.

Mr. Pickering: Why not?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Because an elevator at Geraldton would not pay for many years to come.

The PREMIER: The member for Geraldton suggests that elevators may not be built at the out ports, because they are not likely to prove payable propositions there. In that case the Government would not build them either.

Mr. Willcock: The out port elevators would pay if all the elevators were built simultaneously.

The PREMIER: If the company did not proceed to do the work at Geraldton, for instance, the Government could give them notice of cancellation at any time. Three months' notice suffices to cancel permission for the construction of any particular elevator. If the Geraldton district farmers wanted to construct an elevator and the company would not construct it, the Government would give notice of cancellation to the company, whereupon the farmers could proceed with the work.

Mr. Willcock: Cancellation could not take place before the expiration of five years from the passing of this measure.

The PREMIER: Yes, it could. The clause gives absolute protection. Notice of cancellation can be given at any time.

Mr. Willcock: I do not agree with your view.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I call attention to the state of the Committee.

[Bells rung and a quorum formed.]

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The statements which the Premier has just made prove that he has never read the Bill.

The Premier: I have read it.

[Mr. Stubbs resumed the Chair.]

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Under paragraph (a) of Subclause 2 of Clause 2, and under Clause 3, notice of cancellation in the case of Geraldton, Bunbury, and Albany could be given only after the lapse of five years from the enactment of the Bill. The Government would not take action so long as the company had given evidence of its bona fides. If the company does not start operations, however, the Government will take action. I protest against the manner in which members are absent from the Chamber and not taking any interest in this matter, particularly those who should be here looking after the interests of the country instead of the interests of the company. However, that is not my trouble. What does concern me is that the State is not protected under this proviso.

The Premier: If the company constructed the elevators at Fremantle and not at Geraldton, for instance, we could take away the Fremantle works. You know that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know nothing of the kind. The proviso does not say that the Government shall take over the works; it merely says that it shall be lawful for the Government to forfeit them.

Mr. Willcock: It says that it shall be lawful for the Governor-in-Council to revoke their rights.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government have no power to interfere in such circumstances until the time has elapsed.

The Premier: Well, cut out that part. It makes no difference.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is the point I have been making. It is not the intention

of the company to carry out the provisions of the Bill. That is why I say it is a dishonest measure and one calculated to delude the public. I desire to conserve the interests of the State and I am confident that bulk handling will come in the near future.

The Premier: The farmers have the right to do it if they want to. They alone are concerned in the export of the wheat.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the Premier had allowed me to finish he would have seen my meaning. I know the Premier has had a very rough time during the last 48 hours and that it would be better if he allowed someone else to look after this business and have a little sleep. It would be better for his health. He should not get irritated. I am not against the Premier regarding the Bill but against this particular portion. Bulk handling must come eventually and my objection to the whole business is that the time is not opportune for it. The work could be done considerably cheaper a comparatively short time hence.

The Premier: The member for Geraldton says it will not pay at that port.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Of course it will not. The first portion to pay will be at Fremantle, not because it is Fremantle, but because it is the port where the largest supplies will be handled. The outer ports, such as Geraldton and Bunbury, will have a smaller area from which to draw their supplies of wheat and, in these circumstances, the construction of elevators at those ports would not be possible as payable concerns for years to come. If the company can get rid of its obligations to construct the elevators in those outer ports, the farmers in the districts affected will have to depend on bags in order to send their wheat to Fremantle, or even to these ports. They contend that there will be a loss in consequence, but I doubt that very much.

The Premier: So do I.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This company will have no offset to balance the loss at these outer ports. The scheme should be taken as a whole. I want to put the Government in the same position as the company. If we strike out the proviso that result will be achieved. With the proviso in the measure the company will have an advantage.

Mr. TEESDALE: If this is a company comprised of the farmers themselves and they have the enterprise to go in for this work, you cannot blame them because others have not got that enterprise. There can be no loss in other districts where they have not started the work.

Mr. Willcock: But the company will have the right to do this throughout the State.

Mr. TEESDALE: I take it that the company is comprised of the farmers throughout the State.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But the measure will involve the State as a whole in a loss.

The Premier: Each unit must stand alone.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: These farmers in the outer districts will be at a disadvantage.

Mr. TEESDALE: Why penalise the people of Fremantle because Geraldton is a small place?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not, but at the same time I would not start this scheme for some time yet. The Government should have the right to say where the work is to be carried out under the agreement. The proviso will supply a loophole by which the company can evade its responsibilities. This agreement gives the company a loophole to get out by. It is not a fair condition. Let us have equity for both parties. No private man would enter into an agreement like this.

The Premier: I entirely agree with that, but it is for the Government to trust the farmers.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It means that the Government must trust the farmers, but the farmers need not trust the Government. Subclause 3 provides all that is necessary, but the proviso shocks my sense of fairness.

The PREMIER: The company is entirely a farmers' company. I know, and they know that with the money they have they cannot build more than one terminal elevator. But if they can get it going, they will probably be able to secure money with which to build the others. It is ridiculous to say that the losses at Geraldton should be made up out of the profits at Fremantle. If the elevator at Geraldton cannot be made to pay, it should not be erected. Each of these elevators must stand alone and pay alone.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You do not apply that to the railway system nor to the State ships either.

Mr. Willcock: The overhead charges, the administrative charges would be all in one.

The PREMIER: No, the cost of each elevator would have to stand alone. If we cut out the proviso it means that if the company do not complete the work at each of the four ports they will lose everything.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. Willcock: They will lose only their monopoly. There is no question of forfeiture.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Ask your Attorney General.

The PREMIER: I have consulted the Attorney General within the last minute, and he says I am wrong. I told the Committee the Government would be able to give the company notice at any time that we intended to terminate their right to erect elevators at Geraldton or any of the other ports. I thought Subclause 3 gave us that right. The Attorney General says it does not. If the hon. member will withdraw his amendment to strike out the proviso, I will move to insert words which will make it clear that we can cancel the arrangement at any time. That will meet the hon. member's wishes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No, it will be good enough without the proviso.

The PREMIER: I want to be able to revoke the right to construct elevators if the work is not progressing satisfactorily.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This means that they have to do it within four years.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I suggest that after "expressed" in line 3 of Subclause 3 of Clause 2 the following be inserted: "or in the event of the company failing at any time during the periods fixed by this Act for the construction of the elevators respectively to make progress with such construction to the satisfaction of the Governor." As the measure stands, the elevators have to be constructed in Fremantle within four years, and in Geraldton, Bunbury and Albany within five years after the commencement of the Act. Constructed means completed. Therefore, on the strict meaning of the measure, the company might do nothing until the four years were up and all that period would be wasted. The amendment which the Premier now proposes would give power to step in if satisfactory progress was not made with the work.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is another side to the question. So long as the company made certain progress within the four years—

The Attorney General: Progress to the satisfaction of the Governor.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know what that means. The company could say they had ordered material and were getting this, that and the other done. Then six or eight months before the four years were up, they could make a start and they would be able to convince the Government that they had made progress. As the clause stands, the company have to construct the elevators at Fremantle within the four years. That is definite. The amendment will release the company.

The Attorney General: No, the clause will retain its value.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is, if the Government wished to enforce it. The clause does not state that the Governor shall cancel the right conferred. The only thing which the Government can take away from the company is the monopoly.

The Attorney General: It is not intended to mean that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Perhaps not, but that is the effect. The only safeguard for this State is—

The Premier: To wipe out the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I would do so if I had my way. The only safeguard is to wipe out the proviso. I am trying to impress on the Premier that Subclause 3 without the proviso does not state that the Governor shall cancel the right. It says that it shall be lawful for the Governor to cancel the right if it is thought desirable. If certain conditions prevailed and the company could not fulfil the other portions of their contract, the Government instead of cancelling what the company had already done, could give them an extension of time. If the conditions prevailing were such that the Government knew the company could carry out the work and would not, the company should be penalised, and the only punishment provided is to

take away their sole right. The Government have no power to enforce the other portions of the agreement. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

The PREMIER: I move—

That in line 3 of Subclause 3 after the word "expressed" the following be inserted: "or in the event of the company failing at any time during the periods fixed by this Act for the construction of the elevators respectively to make progress with such construction to the satisfaction of the Governor."

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That the proviso be struck out. I am strongly of opinion that the proviso should not be retained. The Government should be put on an equity with the company. If the company do not carry out the agreement in a bona fide manner, they should lose the monopoly.

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

|      |    |    |    |    |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | 6  |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | 19 |

Majority against .. 13

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin  
Mr. Collier  
Mr. Lutey  
Mr. Maley

Mr. Willcock  
Mr. Lambert  
(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Angelo  
Mr. Broun  
Mr. Draper  
Mr. Duff  
Mr. Durack  
Mr. George  
Mr. Hardwick  
Mr. Harrison  
Mr. Hickmott  
Mr. Johnston

Mr. Mitchell  
Mr. Nairn  
Mr. Pickering  
Mr. Plesse  
Mr. Smith  
Mr. Teesdale  
Mr. Thomson  
Mr. Willmott  
Mr. Griffiths  
(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I move—

That the following proviso be added:—"Provided also that any share capital subscribed in the West Australian Grain Growers' Co-operative Elevators, Ltd., by any shareholder whose property is situated in any district as defined in Section 3 of this Act shall not be utilised in erecting elevators in any of the other districts as defined in this Act."

My fear is that the people outside the Fremantle zone will have their money put into elevators within the Fremantle zone, and will not have enough money left to subscribe to elevators within their own district.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I support the amendment. In Canada, where there is a cer-

tain area under crop in any district, the farmers can demand that the co-operative company shall build a silo for the purpose of holding the wheat of that area so long as they subscribe 15 per cent. of the cost of such silo. I should like to see a clause inserted in this Bill compelling the company to construct elevators under similar conditions if the Government can raise the money necessary to advance 85 per cent. of it. All the farmers should be served the same. It would not be fair if the farmers in one district were deprived of the benefits of the elevator system simply because their available money had been expended in erecting elevators in other districts. The smooth-tongued promoters of this elevator company never talked to the farmers about possible disadvantages of the elevator system. Farmers in the outlying districts cannot provide capital for two elevators—one for themselves, and one for other farmers in some other district. Let us follow the Canadian system in this respect. Geraldton has already had an unfortunate experience with regard to the promised establishment of meat works.

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

|      |    |    |    |    |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | 4  |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | 19 |

Majority against .. 15

#### AYES.

Mr. Lutey  
Mr. Maley

Mr. Willcock  
Mr. Angwin  
(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Angelo  
Mr. Broun  
Mr. Draper  
Mr. Duff  
Mr. Durack  
Mr. George  
Mr. Griffiths  
Mr. Harrison  
Mr. Hickmott  
Mr. Johnston

Mr. Mitchell  
Mr. Nairn  
Mr. Pickering  
Mr. Plesse  
Mr. Smith  
Mr. Teesdale  
Mr. Thomson  
Mr. Willmott  
Mr. Hardwick  
(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.  
Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

## BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS.

### Council's Amendments.

Schedule of 88 amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

No. 1.—Clause 4: Definition of "Employed," line 2, after "not" insert "other

than work of repairing building plant or machinery”:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Does this refer to the machinery in the factory or to other machinery? I presume it means the machinery in the factory where the worker is employed.

The Attorney General: Yes, I think so.

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

No. 2.—Clause 4: Definition of “employee,” line 3, strike out “wages” and insert “pay.”

No. 3.—Clause 4: Definition of “employee,” add at the end “but does not include any contractor or employee of a contractor engaged in the work of repairing any building plant or machinery.”

No. 4.—Clause 4: Definition of “factory,” Subclause 3, after “appliance,” in line 2, insert “exceeding one horse power.”

On motions by the Attorney General the foregoing amendments were agreed to.

No. 4a.—Paragraph (a): Strike out all words after “prison.”

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I must point out that there is an amendment missing from the Notice Paper. In line 1 of Subclause 1 of the definition of “factory” the word “two” was struck out in the Council and “four” inserted in lieu. I feel I am in a difficult position in regard to these wrongly stated amendments.

Hon. P. Collier: I think we had better stick to the Notice Paper, and proceed with what we have.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Then we shall have in one place a factory consisting of two persons, and in another place a factory consisting of four persons.

Mr. PICKERING: I know this amendment was carried, because I have consulted the clerk of another place.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But have you consulted “Hansard”?

Mr. PICKERING: Yes, it is shown in “Hansard” that it was carried.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I understand this amendment was made in another place. However, it would be better to postpone the rest of the amendments in the definition of “factory.” I move—

That the remaining amendments made by the Council in the definition of “factory,” from 4a to 7, be postponed.

Motion put and passed.

No. 8.—Clause 4: Definition of “public holiday.” After “Christmas Day” insert “Anzac Day.”

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—  
That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 9.—Clause 4: Definition of “shop.” Strike out the words “whether a member of the shopkeeper's family or not.”

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Here again the amendment is wrongly stated. It should be definition of “shop assistant.” However, I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I oppose this. It will have the effect of exempting a member of the shopkeeper's family, who will then be able to canvass for orders after hours.

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

No. 10.—Clause 4: Definition of “shop assistant,” paragraph (b), strike out “boarding house” in line 2.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I cannot agree to this. I do not know the difference between coffee palace and boarding house. The words should remain in. Attendants and waitresses in boarding houses are under shocking labour conditions. I want to see them retained in the Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I support the hon. member. The people conducting coffee palaces will merely alter the name to boarding houses and will then be exempt from the Act. This was never contemplated. If the protection of the Act should extend to those employees engaged in coffee palaces, it should also extend to those employed in boarding houses.

Mr. Nairn: Is there any legal distinction between the two?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not think so.

The Attorney General: The only distinction is that at a coffee palace you can get meals and at a boarding house you cannot.

Mr. Willecock: Every place of this kind on railway construction work or on the mines is a boarding house, but when they become a bit flash they are called coffee palaces.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It sounds rather more aristocratic to call them coffee palaces, but they are really boarding houses.

Mr. PICKERING: I have in mind a boarding house run by a mother and her daughters without labour. If the two daughters were paid, the premises would be brought under the operations of this measure.

Hon. P. Collier: But this is all-embracing.

Mr. LUTEY: I hope that the word “boarding-house” will be retained. There will be no end to the confusion if the word is struck out. The employees in boarding-houses should enjoy the same protection as those in coffee palaces.

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

No. 11. Clause 4.—Definition of “Shop assistant,” paragraph (b), lines 5 and 6, strike out the words “or in the premises of a registered club”:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. WILLCOCK: We should not agree to this amendment.

The Attorney General: We want the Bill. A club has no license. It has a certificate on complying with certain rules.

Mr. WILLCOCK: Very well, I shall withdraw my objection.

Mr. LUTEY: Some clubs are really hotels, except that they cater for members only, but their employees should be granted decent conditions.

The Honorary Minister: A club is a home.

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

No. 12. Clause 4.—Definition of "Shop assistant," paragraph (c), strike out the words "in a shop or warehouse" and insert "in connection with the business of any shop or warehouse and in the building in which such business is carried on":

No. 13. Clause 4.—Definition of "Shop assistant," paragraph (c), in line 3 of the proviso strike out the word "only" and insert "only" after "shopkeeper," in line 2:

No. 14. Clause 9, subclause (2), line 8, after the word "oath" insert "or affirmation":

No. 15. Clause 11, paragraph (f), strike out "or as may be declared by proclamation to be necessary."

No. 16. Clause 13.—Strike out "an inspector shall not" and insert "no inspector or interpreter shall":

On motions by Attorney General the foregoing amendments were agreed to.

No. 17. Clause 14.—After the word "inspector," in line 1, insert "who holds a certificate from the Commissioner of Public Health that in his opinion such inspector is competent to exercise the powers conferred by this section":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I hope the Attorney General will allow this amendment to be negatived.

The Attorney General: It seems all right.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Why should the Commissioner for Public Health have to certify in this case? The Public Service Commissioner is the man to say who is responsible for appointments to the service. I am prejudiced against giving these doctors such power. They sometimes have their likes and dislikes. In a position of this sort the Commissioner for Public Health could readily veto the appointments made by the Public Service Commissioner. When a man has a junior position he may be all right, but when he reaches the top of his department, he is apt to be autocratic, and we have had some evidence of

that state of affairs. It should surely be sufficient for a man to hold the certificate of the Railway Sanitary Institute.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member has not taken the correct view. This matter is not taken out of the hands of the Public Service Commissioner. All we say is that the inspectors shall be appointed from a certain class, namely those who hold certificates of fitness to undertake the work. These certificates are given by the Commissioner for Public Health. The Public Service Commissioner can then appoint anyone from that particular class.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If a man held a certificate of the Railway Sanitary Institute how would he then get on?

The Attorney General: There should be no difficulty in the way of his obtaining a certificate then.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There might be a dislike on the part of the Commissioner for the individual in question. If these men already hold certificates what has the Commissioner to do with the matter?

Mr. THOMSON: I do not know that this amendment is necessary. Under the Bill, every inspector is compelled to hold a certificate showing his fitness to deal with health matters. These inspectors are not called upon to do more than report to the health authority what they consider to be breaches of the Health Act.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not think there is real need for this amendment. The clause, however, deals purely with health matters, and our factory inspectors are not necessarily versed in health matters. An excellent factory inspector might not be competent to give instructions on questions relating to health. A difficulty inherent in the amendment is that a number of the factory inspectors might not be able to obtain the suggested certificate from the Commissioner of Public Health, and thus the working of this measure might be hampered somewhat; the Government would possibly have to bring in other inspectors, qualified under the Health Act, for this part of the work. But, no doubt, the Commissioner of Public Health would be reasonable in his requirements.

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

No. 18.—Clause 15, paragraphs (b) and (c), strike out the words "or other official" in each paragraph:

On motion by the Attorney General, the foregoing amendment was agreed to.

No. 19.—Clause 20, Subclause 2, strike out "limit of time" and insert "state a reasonable time within which it is possible for":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This amendment does not make sense, and does not fit into the Bill. Let the Council state what it means. I move —

That the amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 20.—Clause 21, provision (4), line 4, strike out "of the district within" and insert "held nearest to the place in":

On motion by the Attorney General the foregoing amendment was agreed to.

No. 21.—Clause 22.—Add the following proviso at the end:—

"Provided this section shall only apply where the occupation of a factory is a tenant under a lease or agreement made after the commencement of this Act."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The object of this amendment is to avoid any retrospective operation. Obviously the new clause as it appears in the schedule, contains yet another mistake. It refers to the "occupation of a factory." It should mean I take it the "occupant" or "occupier." As it stands, it does not make sense. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 22.—Clause 29, paragraph (a), strike out "Chief Inspector" and insert "Minister."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 23.—Clause 33, line 4, after "thirty-two" insert "for such time as he shall think fit."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If we agree to this amendment, it will probably allay the anxiety of some members in another place although it means nothing. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I have no objection to the amendment, but it is a perfectly idiotic one. When we say that the Minister may by notice under his hand exempt something, we give him power without limitation to grant the exemption. This is a childish and silly amendment, but, of course, it will do no harm. It does not alter the power of the Minister in the slightest degree, whether the amendment is agreed to or the clause remains as in the Bill.

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

No. 24.—Clause 35.—Strike out the clause, and insert in place thereof the following:—Restriction as to hours of Asiatics. (1904, No. 22, Section 23.) 34.—No person of Chinese or other Asiatic race shall be employed in any factory for longer hours than women may be employed therein under this Act; nor shall he be employed before eight o'clock in the morning nor after five o'clock in the evening.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This proposed clause is the same as Section 23 of the Act of 1904. One reason why this clause has been inserted is to prevent any danger of the Bill being reserved for Royal assent, as it is desired to bring it into force as soon as possible.

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

No. 25. Clause 39.—After the word "factories," in line 2, insert "fruit-drying factories."

No. 26. Clause 40, Subclause (1), line 5.—Strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)."

No. 27. Clause 41, paragraph (b).—Strike out "sections thirty-nine or" and insert "section."

No. 28. Clause 42, lines 5 and 7.—After "Easter Monday" and "New Year's Day" insert "Anzac Day."

No. 29. Clause 44, Subclause (1), paragraph (b), line 3.—After "in lieu of" insert "Christmas Day."

No. 30. Clause 44, Subclause (2), line 4.—Strike out "twenty-eight days" and insert "one month."

No. 31. Clause 45, paragraph (g).—Add at the end, "but such permission shall only be granted on the ground of old age or infirmity."

No. 32. Clause 52, line 1.—Strike out "a" and insert "any," and strike out all the words after "child."

No. 33. Clause 59, line 7 of Subclause (1).—Strike out "the" before "medical" and insert "a"; strike out the words "for the district."

No. 34. Clause 62.—Add a new subclause to stand as (4) as follows:—"(4) The occupier of the factory shall be deemed to be responsible for any such contravention and, subject to Section 137, may be proceeded against accordingly."

No. 35. Clause 74, line 3.—After "factory" insert "or shop."

No. 36. Clause 78, Subclause (5), line 2.—After "person" insert "before such person has obtained the said certificate."

No. 37. Clause 84, Subclause (1), line 3.—Strike out the word "by" occurring after "or," and strike out the words "in motion."

No. 38. Clause 84, Subclause (2), paragraph (c).—Strike out "the cause of death or."

No. 39. Clause 91, lines 3 and 4.—Strike out "by" and "in motion" in line 4.

No. 40. Clause 97, Subclause (1), paragraph (a).—Strike out the word "prison" in line 1.

On motions by the Attorney General the foregoing amendments were agreed to.

No. 41. Clause 97, Subclause (2).—Strike out "thirty-seven" in line 2 and insert "excepting paragraphs (c) and (d)."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Paragraph (d) provides that a woman shall not be engaged in a factory between 6 p.m. and 8 a.m., but the amendment will make it lawful for a woman in a reformatory to be employed between those hours. A woman in one of these institutions needs her rest just the same as a woman working in any other establishment. I do not attach so much importance to working on holidays.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was thought that for the sake of discipline inmates of institutions might be required to do some work on holidays.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Paragraph (d) does not relate to holidays.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Regarding paragraph (d), some inmates of the Home of the Good Shepherd are engaged in packing laundry work between 5 p.m. and 7 p.m. and they do not work so many hours per day as the measure permits.

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

42. Clause 97, Subclause (2).—After the word "Act" in line 3 insert "and Subsections (1) and (2) of Section 37 except that part of Subsection (1) which relates to the payment of persons for extended hours of employment":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

The inmates of reformatories and charitable institutions are not paid wages and therefore are not to be paid for overtime, but their working hours should be limited to the hours prescribed for other workers.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move—

That the amendment be amended by striking out "and (2)."

Subclause 2 provides that no person shall be employed for more than four and a half hours continuously without an interval of at least half an hour for rest and refreshment. Persons working in a laundry are entitled to this period for rest and refreshment.

Amendment put and passed; the Council's amendment, as modified, agreed to.

No. 43. Clause 100, Subclause 2, in line 4 of first proviso strike out "municipal"; after "locality" in same line insert "not within a district."

No. 44. Strike out all the paragraph from "The following" to "under this Act" inclusive.

Strike out the word "specified" in the second proviso and insert "district or."

Strike out Subclause (5).

On motions by the Attorney General the foregoing amendments were agreed to.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: In amendment No. 44 made by the Council there is

the following proviso:—

After Subclause (4) add the following proviso: "Provided that, excepting in the Metropolitan Shop District, shops may remain open until 9 o'clock on one evening in each week unless and until the abolition of such shopping night is determined upon by a poll of electors as hereinafter provided."

I hardly think at the present juncture that this is necessary, and I move—

That the Council's amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. PICKERING: We should amend the proviso so as to make it possible for country towns to have their half-holiday on Wednesday and the late shopping on Saturday night.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member has not read the Bill. Clause 101 provides for shops to be closed on Wednesday. This is a new proviso inserted to give country people an opportunity of deciding whether they will keep open until 9 o'clock in the evening on any particular night in the week.

Progress reported.

## RESOLUTION—RETURNED SOLDIERS AND RAILWAY PASSES.

### Council's Message.

Message from the Council received notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Assembly in the resolution submitted by the Council that railway and tramway passes should be granted to certain returned soldiers.

*House adjourned at 2.52 a.m. (Wednesday).*