

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. ANGWIN: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	17

Majority for	4
--------------	----	----	---

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Brown	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Male
Mr. Carson	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Dalglish	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Davies	Mr. Osborn
Mr. George	Mr. J. Price
Mr. Gordon	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Layman
Mr. Hardwick	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Bath	Mr. W. Price
Mr. Collier	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Heilmann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ware
Mr. Horan	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. O'Loghlen	(Teller).

Motion thus passed; the debate
adjourned.

BILL—POLICE (CONSOLIDATION).

Received from the Legislative Council
and read a first time.

House adjourned at 10.19 p.m.

PATR.

For the day.

Hon. J. Mitchell

Mr. Bolton

Legislative Council, Thursday, 30th September, 1909.

	PAPER
Papers presented	742
Bills: Landlord and Tenant, 1s.	742
Health, 3s.	742
Abattoirs, 2s., Com.	742
Public Education Endowment, 1s.	749
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, Com.	749
Vaccination Act Amendment, 2s.	749

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: Annual
Report of Government Savings Bank.

BILL—LANDLORD AND TENANT LAW AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Hon. M. L. Moss,
and read a first time.

BILL—HEALTH.

Third Reading.

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

BILL—ABATTOIRS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 28th of
September.

Hon. E. McLARTY (South-West): I
moved the adjournment of the debate in
order to have an opportunity of saying a
few words upon this Bill. I would like to
have heard from the leader of the House
an approximate of what these abattoirs
are likely to cost.

The Colonial Secretary: They are al-
ready built at Kalgoorlie; that is the
only place we propose to deal with just
now.

Hon. E. McLARTY: I understood this
Bill referred to abattoirs for the metro-
polis.

The Colonial Secretary: No.

Hon. E. McLARTY: With reference
to the abattoirs at Kalgoorlie, I know
from the best authority, that they are
altogether inadequate for the require-
ments, and they can be made little use of
unless a considerable amount of money
is spent in addition to what has already
been spent. The place is too small, and
is inconvenient for the trade. :

The Colonial Secretary : Does that information come from people interested in the trade ?

Hon. E. McLARTY : I have it on reliable authority. The killing for Kalgoorlie is very considerable, and it is impossible for the number of men that would be slaughtering at the one time to get through the number of stock required. At the week end the killing for the Saturday's trade amounts to about 50 bullocks and from 800 to 900 sheep, lambs and pigs ; but there is only accommodation, I believe, for six or eight slaughtermen, and that number of men could not possibly cope with the business they would have to get through. There has been a great lack of forethought and management in the provision of sufficient yards. There is only one yard, I am informed, and all the stock belonging to the different firms have to be mixed up in the one yard. That is undesirable. It leads to confusion. Should half-a-dozen different owners purchase their stock and turn them all into one yard it is not always an easy matter to pick out the right cattle, especially when most of the work is done at night time, as is the case in summer. I know that a trial has been made. One firm was asked to make a trial of ten bullocks : these were slaughtered and it was found that it took two men to do at the abattoirs the same work that one man could do at the slaughter house. That is certainly not progressive, for the labour is far more. People in the trade complain that it would be utterly impossible—and I agree with them from my own knowledge of the business—for them to get through the work required. There is no accommodation for yarding the sheep except a few at a time, and hon. members will see that at a place where the business runs to 800 or 900 for the Saturday's killing considerable yarding accommodation is required. I understood that the Bill also referred to the proposed abattoirs for the metropolis which concern me more than the abattoirs at Kalgoorlie, and I was going to point out to the Leader of the House that if the Government contemplated providing abattoirs for the metropolitan area, they should not be guided by what has been done in Kalgoorlie, and

that far more elaborate accommodation will have to be provided. I would be glad to see the Government or a corporation undertake in this State what has been done in the Eastern States, that is to provide sufficient accommodation for public saleyards. I understand that in Melbourne and Sydney these yards are very profitable concerns, but here there are no public saleyards, and I think it would furnish some advantage to the general public if they were provided. I hope that when the most suitable site can be decided on, and that is a matter for careful consideration, something will be done in this direction. I know it has been suggested to have the abattoirs at North Fremantle. For my own part, I think a more unsuitable place could not be suggested. I do not think it would be at all suited to the requirements.

Hon. M. L. Moss : Then where would you put them for the export trade ?

: Hon. E. McLARTY : At any rate this Bill does not affect this part of the State.

The Colonial Secretary : Not until the public abattoirs are built in the metropolis.

Hon. E. McLARTY : I simply wish to point out that the trade are not satisfied with what has been done in Kalgoorlie, and that the abattoirs at Kalgoorlie do not meet with the requirements.

Hon. R. W. PENNEFATHER (North) : The remarks of the hon. member in regard to the Kalgoorlie abattoirs recently built by the Government do not reconcile this with what was brought under my attention during the visit of the Meat Supply Commission to the locality. The works were almost completed then, and they certainly seemed to provide for the wants of Kalgoorlie and the whole of the surrounding districts. There were spacious yards, well fenced, and there were large buildings divided into compartments necessary for the killing of animals. Every convenience that could be imagined seemed to be there, but there was one thing noticed—a marked reluctance on the part of those interested in the trade at being compelled to slaughter their cattle in public abattoirs. To my mind that is the reason actuating some of these gentlemen up there who want to keep on their

own establishments and slaughter in their own way, to which they have been accustomed. It may be cheaper to do so, but I doubt it. At any rate it is not so sanitary as the system provided in the public abattoirs. There was no complaint made about want of accommodation but there was one complaint we could see at the root of the whole thing and it seemed almost universal, and that was, a disinclination to bring under regulated authority the slaughtering of animals for public consumption. If Mr. McLarty had been at Kalgoorlie I am sure he would not have said what he has said to-day, but he would have been constrained to admit that there is ample accommodation provided at the abattoirs.

Hon. F. CONNOR (North-West): While I agree with the general principles of the Bill I have one complaint to make in connection with it, and that is that the Government have not made a general Bill. There has been a howl all over the State on this question about a certain section of the community playing an unfair game on the public generally; and I notice some remarks that fell in another place from a gentleman high up in politics in which he abused that particular trade in no measured terms. I think it is time the Government stepped in and stopped the possibility of such unfair remarks being made by a responsible man. The one complaint I have to make about the Bill is that it does not go far enough. When the Government takes up a thing like this they should do so in such a way that it will compel all slaughtering to be done under Government supervision, and by the Government themselves, if necessary.

The Colonial Secretary: So it does where public abattoirs exist.

Hon. F. CONNOR: Where public abattoirs exist I do not know, but there is a qualification in that. The Government should take the matter up and not shirk it. They should have it absolutely the law that no beast shall be slaughtered anywhere except under Government supervision. That is the position I take up as far as this Bill is concerned. There is not much in it to cavil at except

that it does not go far enough. It is the same with nearly every other measure that is brought here. All they want is a possibility of shuffling out of their responsibilities. I would have no shuffling out in connection with this matter. I would say to the Government, now that you have put your hand to the plough see the thing out. There are several matters in connection with the clauses that I will refer to when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. I will say no more at present except to support the second reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (In reply): I only wish to say in the first place that this is a Bill which gives the Government power to establish and maintain public abattoirs. Then another power given and contained in Clause 6, Subsection (c.) is that which prohibits the slaughtering of stock except in public abattoirs. The only public abattoirs in existence at the present time are those in Kalgoorlie, and it is really because of those that the Bill has been introduced. It will be necessary to proclaim an area of perhaps 10 or 15 miles around that public abattoir, and then the principle that Mr. Connor mentioned will be carried out, namely, that it will not be possible to slaughter stock in any other than a public abattoir. As soon as public abattoirs are established in the metropolitan area an abattoir area will be proclaimed, and there again it will not be possible to slaughter stock other than in these public abattoirs. Of course, it will be possible to exclude private abattoirs which may be existing around that area. The benefit of public abattoirs is well known. They are of great assistance to the stock owner: they will supply him with opportunities of slaughtering independent of any buyer, of placing the meat in cold storage, and of disposing of it just as he likes.

Hon. F. Connor: And it will make the cost to the consumer heavier every time.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Even though it may make the cost to the consumer heavier, which I doubt very much, the abattoirs are wanted from a health point of view, because, there

can be no proper supervision over a meat supply where there are not public abattoirs, and where private abattoirs are scattered all over the place. Where you have big abattoirs like those at Robb's Jetty, which require the constant attendance of a couple of inspectors—

Hon. F. Connor: And they want assistance.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; there are more inspectors required since the introduction of branding. But as I was going to say, there is nothing to prevent—as they exist to-day—abattoirs being built in a small way all over the metropolitan area and throughout the country to such an extent that it will be quite impossible to have an inspector at every place. Periodical visits are made to these places at the present time, but the only manner in which we can have proper supervision over the meat supply, and preventing diseased and unwholesome meat from going into consumption, is by a system of public abattoirs. That is the benefit to be derived from the health point of view, and I have already mentioned the benefit from the sellers' point of view. I cannot see how the cost to the consumer can be increased, because public abattoirs are open, as I have stated, for everyone to use. At a private abattoir the owner only can slaughter, and anyone else who wants to come in will have to pay the private owner any price that he may demand. It goes then without saying that public abattoirs must cheapen the meat supply. The remarks made by Mr. McLarty with regard to the public abattoirs which have been erected in Kalgoorlie were not warranted. I have seen those abattoirs, and hon. members have heard the remarks made by Mr. Pennefather, who was Chairman of the Meat Commission which inspected these abattoirs. Personally I have had no experience with regard to abattoirs, but I have seen these and the other abattoirs at Robb's Jetty, and recently in Queensland I visited the Queensland Meat Company's abattoirs at Pinkenbah, where they slaughter 120 bullocks a day, and can slaughter up to 250, and a proportionate

number of sheep and small stock; and to my eye these abattoirs did not seem any bigger than those at Kalgoorlie. Undoubtedly it is true, as Mr. Pennefather has said, that there has been resistance to these abattoirs in Kalgoorlie. Naturally the people who have their own abattoirs are not likely to welcome public abattoirs and, therefore, as the hon. member says, it was quite apparent to the Commission that the Government institution was not welcomed by those interested in the private abattoirs. The Bill before the House is simply for the government of abattoirs, and to prevent stock being slaughtered anywhere but in public abattoirs after an abattoir's area has been proclaimed; and, secondly, it gives power to municipalities to erect and control public abattoirs.

Hon. E. McLarty: It is all right as far as it goes, but you will find that there is not sufficient accommodation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Power to make regulations:

Hon. G. RANDELL: Subclause (m) appeared to be a rather one-sided affair. It was contemplated there that stock could be destroyed and disposed of without compensation being paid to owners. It was just possible for the inspector or controller, whoever he might be, to make a mistake, and there was no provision, if that mistake was proved to have been made, for the owner to receive anything in the shape of compensation. Could such a provision be included in the Bill?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was no necessity for such a provision. All animals were taken to the abattoirs for slaughter, and if after slaughter they were found to be diseased, the diseased portion would not go into consumption.

Hon. G. RANDELL: The explanation was satisfactory, to some extent, but some provision might be made in the case of the destruction of stock. If an owner disputed the decision of an officer he should have the opportunity

of sustaining his objection by employing another, or two other persons to inspect the animal. The more he (Mr. Randell) became acquainted with experts the less confidence he had in them.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was no need to provide compensation in the case of an animal being diseased. It was different in the case of live stock. The animal would be slaughtered at the abattoirs in any case, and it was only after slaughter that the disease was discovered, and then there could be no dispute because the carcass was open for anyone to inspect. It was not the usual course to condemn the whole of the carcass, only the affected part would be cut away and destroyed; therefore, there would be no need for payment of compensation.

Hon. F. CONNOR: As the Government were taking the responsibility of this procedure there was no need to argue the question. What he desired to know was why the word "the" was required in the second line of the subclause.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The word was hardly necessary, and could be deleted. He moved—

That in line 2 of paragraph (m) of Subclause 1 the word "the" be struck out.

Amendment passed.

Hon. F. CONNOR moved an amendment—

That in lines 2 and 3 of Paragraph (m) of Subclause 1 the words "or reasonably suspected by any officer to be affected or infected with disease" be struck out.

He wished to know to what extent the Government would interfere with people in the industry. He moved the amendment so that discussion could take place.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It would not be desirable to strike out the words. This provision was copied from the Queensland Act, which had been in force for some time, and the power was found necessary there. It was inserted to afford a certain amount of protection to the officers. As in the Health Bill so in this Bill, there must be extensive powers if there was to be a pure meat supply.

Hon. G. Randell: The cattle were brought in to be slaughtered, and when slaughtered, the disease would be detected.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: If an animal was slaughtered it could be easily seen whether the animal had been diseased. If regulations were made placing large powers in the hands of inspectors, animals that were not diseased might be destroyed. If a carcass was diseased it was readily ascertainable after the animal was slaughtered, but there was a doubt in a live animal as to whether it was diseased or not. This power should not be allowed in the Bill. He had had experience of the incapacity of persons connected with the administration of the Stock Diseases Act of 1895, where thousands of pounds worth of animals were going to be destroyed because they were supposed to be infected with disease, and an order was given to slaughter these animals, which were valued at something like £20,000. An order had been given to deport the animals to an island on the coast or to destroy them. Within a fortnight the animals had been released, for it was found they were not diseased.

Hon. R. LAURIE: Power was possessed at the present time for inspectors to kill animals suspected of being diseased, and if animals were suspected of being diseased inspectors should have power to kill them.

Hon. F. CONNOR: There was nothing provided in the Bill whereby if an animal reasonably suspected to be infected and was killed, compensation had to be given to the owner if the animal was found not to be diseased.

Hon. G. RANDELL: Paragraph *l* would be quite sufficient protection without Paragraph *m*.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the amendment was carried it would affect the Bill very seriously. The measure gave power not only to condemn a carcass, but to condemn any animal brought for slaughter. Assuming bullocks were yarded for slaughter, if an inspector suspected one to be diseased, that animal had to be slaughtered because there could not be any proof until the animal was killed. If the owner

knew of the suspicion of the inspector there was nothing to prevent the owner taking the animal away and allowing it to go into consumption elsewhere if this power was not in the Bill. This provision only applied to cattle that were brought to the abattoirs for slaughter, and if an inspector suspected an animal to be diseased, until the animal was killed it could not be ascertained whether the animal was diseased. But the animal having been brought in for slaughter, no damage could be done. The words were very essential.

Hon. E. McLARTY: No great hardship could ensue because the animal had been taken to the abattoirs for slaughter, and if it was not diseased, the meat would go into consumption. If it was diseased the carcass would be condemned. He had seen the inspection at Robb's Jetty, and generally speaking, the inspectors were reasonable men. He had had animals condemned, not because they were diseased but because they had been badly bruised when on board, and were not fit for consumption. The provision in the Bill only applied to stock taken to the abattoirs for slaughter.

Hon. F. CONNOR: Where did it say in the Bill that this paragraph only applied to stock brought in for slaughter?

The Colonial Secretary: In Clauses 3 and 4 provision was made.

Hon. F. CONNOR: The powers contained in the Bill would not be curtailed by carrying the amendment. The power at present in existence was quite sufficient.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Bill was introduced merely for the control of abattoirs. Clauses 3 and 4 set out that there should be districts proclaimed and the clause in question only applied to such districts. All cattle taken to abattoirs were for slaughter and it would be very dangerous to allow a cattle owner to take cattle there which had once been suspected, without it being necessary that they should be slaughtered, otherwise the cattle might be taken away again and distributed in some other district.

Hon. R. W. PENNEFATHER: If the word "stock" used in the subclause were limited definitely to stock brought

for slaughter to the abattoirs, Mr. Connor's objection would fall to the ground, but as there was no qualification of the word, it meant stock in any district proclaimed by the Government. That embraced a very considerable area around the abattoirs, therefore any stock in that area would be liable to be slaughtered on suspicion. If it were provided that in the event of an animal which had been slaughtered by order being found not to be diseased, compensation should be granted, it would be a different matter altogether.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was no need for the provision suggested, in fact there was a great objection to it, for it would have to be proved that the stock was brought to the abattoirs for slaughter. The area proclaimed would not be a very large one and would only embrace the populated parts. It would not extend into the country, and the supervision would be only immediately around the abattoirs.

Amendment put and negatived; clause as amended put and passed.

Clause 7—Avoidance of existing licenses:

Hon. F. CONNOR: What would be the position of the present licensed abattoirs of Kalgoorlie when the measure came into force? Would those people who had spent large sums of money on the abattoirs there be compensated? The Colonial Secretary had stated the Bill would apply to the goldfields and particularly Kalgoorlie. There were places there on which money had been spent by compulsion, in accordance with the regulations made under Government and municipal laws, under which certain classes of improvements had been carried out. Had not these improvements been carried out the licenses would not have been granted. Were the owners of those places, who had been compelled to spend their money, to be compensated?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No compensation was provided for in the Bill for any private abattoirs that might be within the proclaimed area, but it was not the intention of the Government to proclaim an area where there were good and sufficient private abattoirs. As to Kalgoorlie, where public abattoirs exist-

ed, he did not know that the private abattoirs there were worth much ; at all events, those he had seen were not, and the losses to the owners would consequently not be great. For the past eight or nine years it had been known to the people of Kalgoorlie that it was intended to build public abattoirs there, and no great expense had consequently been incurred in the erection of abattoirs. The present premises would not be a complete loss to the owners, for they could be turned into yards. He could not say whether any compensation would be paid or not.

Hon. F. CONNOR : That was no answer to his question. If the Government had determined they would not pay compensation the Colonial Secretary should say so. It was an absolute injustice that people who had been compelled to build premises there on certain lines should not be compensated. By the simple clause under discussion it was clearly set out that there should be no compensation. He applauded the Government for bringing the Bill in as a necessity for it existed, and the chief objection he had was that they had not gone far enough and made the provisions compulsory all over the State. If it were proved that the premises say at Kalgoorlie were up to the necessary qualification at the time notice was given to the owners to bring them up to the qualification, the value of the premises, at the time at least, should be granted as compensation. The sum to be fixed by arbitration or other means should be the amount actually spent under compulsion. That was only fair play and justice, and surely members would take into consideration the facts he had stated. All knew that it was necessary at times when altering laws to create hardships, and that certain people had to put up with losses, but this was a very distinct and clear case where the Government should take into consideration the granting of compensation.

Hon. R. LAURIE : It was provided by Clause 3 that the provisions might operate in any district. While it might not be very harsh in Kalgoorlie, where for years past people had known there were going to be abattoirs, it would be

very harsh indeed if brought into existence in places where persons had invested a lot of money in permanent works, such as at Owen's Anchorage, Fremantle. There was one particular instance where at least £15,000 was spent in erecting works, and if the Government extended the operations of the measure to the Fremantle district it would mean that the owners of those valuable works, permanent works, would suffer an immense loss. The Royal Commission on the meat question distinctly and clearly gave it as their opinion that so long as the owners of such buildings carried on their operations in a manner required by the Government, they should not be interfered with unless some compensation was allowed. Due weight should be paid to the ideas of the Commission on that question, for they were in a position to speak.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : With regard to the case at Kalgoorlie he was not in a position to say whether any compensation should be granted. At the same time he with other members of the Government believed that there should not be confiscation, or the doing away with any rights, without compensation. It was true that the Bill could only apply to Kalgoorlie, where the loss, if any, would be very small indeed. Still, as the hon. member had pointed out, it was possible that if a public abattoir were to be erected at Fremantle, the establishments already at Robb's Jetty might be threatened. Something might be done by way of providing that where private establishments were of a sufficiently high standard they should not be affected by the erection of a public abattoir.

Hon. F. Connor : The private abattoirs in Kalgoorlie are better than the Government establishments.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : That could scarcely be agreed to. After all, it would be only just and right that some proviso should be put in in case a subsequent Government, not seeing the matter in the light in which it presented itself to the present Government, might, in the event of a public abattoir being erected in the Fremantle district

see fit to close up the Robb's Jetty abattoirs. With the view to giving further consideration to this point, he would be quite willing to report progress without going right through the Bill.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Offences:

Hon. F. CONNOR moved an amendment—

That in Paragraph (d) the word "written" be inserted before the word "order."

Amendment passed.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 10 and 11—agreed to.

Progress reported.

BILL—PUBLIC EDUCATION EN- DOWMENT.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day.

Clause 12—Amendment of s. 378:

Hon. G. RANDELL: Seeing that the municipalities were now in conference assembled, further consideration on the measure might well be postponed.

Progress reported.

BILL—VACCINATION ACT AMEND- MENT.

Second Reading.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS (Metropolitan) in moving the second reading said: Perhaps it will be useless to express the hope that the debate will not resolve itself into a question of vaccination versus anti-vaccination. That is by no means the object of the Bill. The Bill is simply to provide that any person who has conscientious objections to having his child vaccinated may, by making the necessary declaration, be exempted. I might point out that there is at the present time in New Zealand, South Australia, and, I am informed, New

South Wales, similar Bills on the Statute Books. In England also, the matter was fully considered. I believe it was not even brought to a division in the House of Commons, or if brought to a division there was a very small minority against the Bill. I am also informed that last year although there were 7,750 births in the State, only 616 children were vaccinated. This shows one of two things; either that the people at large are not in favour of compulsory vaccination, or those who administer the law themselves are not in favour of it. I do not know which of these two reasons lends itself the more to argument, but it seems to me that where there is a law so strenuously disregarded as is this law, there must be some sound argument against it. The Bill, I am informed, has been considered by various municipalities in the districts in and around Perth and from the information I have been able to gather the municipalities of Midland Junction, Guildford, North Perth, Subiaco, Cottesloe, East Fremantle, and others, and the West Guildford, Bayswater, and Belmont roads boards have all passed resolutions in favour of the Bill. In fact, the only council in which a hostile resolution has been passed is, I understand, the Perth city council, and then only by a very narrow majority. Some members may use the argument that because the law is disobeyed it is no ground for its repeal; but this Bill does not seek to repeal compulsory vaccination; it simply provides that where a person has conscientious objections to having a child vaccinated he can comply with certain formula, and if he does not make the statutory declaration he is liable. There can be little objection to a clause of this character because the chances are there will be few people who will take advantage of it and few people who will have conscientious objections to vaccination. I am not prepared to argue whether vaccination is right or wrong. Some medical men tell us that it is absolutely compulsory, and some say that it is a ridiculous thing that children should be vaccinated. Some tell us one thing, and the others

tell us exactly the opposite. So where there is such a difference of opinion among medical men, it is hard for a layman to decide; but where so many municipal councils have thrashed the matter out so thoroughly, and when so many parents of children last year disapproved of the Vaccination Act, and considering this Bill has passed another House almost unanimously on four occasions, I think we are justified in giving support to the measure. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. R. LAURIE (West): I intend to vote against the second reading of this measure. There is nothing in the arguments adduced by Mr. Jenkins to make me alter my opinion. Those of us who have seen the ravages of smallpox, and even those of us who have seen one or two cases introduced into this State, and those of us who have noted the care taken to safeguard the people in the State from contracting smallpox from the cases brought in, and the care usually exercised on all ships coming from Eastern ports, those who recognise the extraordinary precautions taken by the Government and the medical officers to prevent the introduction of smallpox have sufficient evidence before us to make us pause before passing a measure of the character just introduced. I do not see that because only 600 children were vaccinated out of the 7,000 born last year it is any reason why we should take it that the people do not want vaccination. Rather does it appear to me to be an utter disregard of the law and carelessness on the part of those who should see the law compelling these children to be vaccinated should be carried out. If we look at what has happened in Eastern countries where the conditions for the spreading of the disease are similar to those here—

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: Why not refer to the other Australian States where this clause is in existence, and tell us the effect there?

Hon. R. LAURIE: Then let us take the Eastern States. Only a few years ago there was a case of smallpox landed from one of the mail steamers, and

what extraordinary precautions were taken to see that the disease did not get a hold! What a safeguard it would be to this country if the law to enforce vaccination were carried out? I have with me to-day two illustrations, one showing an unvaccinated child that died of smallpox and a vaccinated child who did not contract it. Another illustration is a photograph of three members of a family brought to an isolation hospital with their mother who was suffering from smallpox. One child was unvaccinated; the other two had been vaccinated. The appearance of the child unvaccinated can be seen by members from the illustration. The two vaccinated children did not contract the disease. I will pass round these illustrations to members. When I was a boy my younger brother who had not been vaccinated contracted smallpox and his appearance was just as bad as that of the children in the illustration. I had been vaccinated and I merely sickened; I did not have to go to bed, and I did not have more than half-a-dozen marks on my body. These illustrations clearly demonstrate the benefits of vaccination, and in the circumstances, can it be expected of me that I would do otherwise than oppose a measure of this description? There is no excuse in saying that the people have not carried out the law. I am sorry to say that daily the law is set at defiance. In nearly every direction measures are brought before the House to protect people and to carry on trade of different characters, but if the present law were carried out there would be no need for bringing them forward. Mr. Jenkins mentioned New Zealand. I have a report issued by Mr. J. Malcolm Mason, Chief Health Officer in New Zealand, which shows the efficacy of vaccination. It is a table which shows that of those who were vaccinated the number who died were very few, but if we take the other side of the sheet and see those who were not vaccinated and recovered we see they are very few while those who died were overwhelmingly numerous in comparison with those who were vaccinated and died. We are living in a

country tropical in some portions. Those of us who have lived in the old country will remember the care taken in regard to smallpox. We know that if a man gets an attack and has not been vaccinated the fact is clearly distinguishable on his person for the remainder of his life; and that is in a cold country. On the other hand notice some of the steamers that come here with Malays on board from Asia, and see those who have been attacked by smallpox. We may ask ourselves that if vaccination has been so effective why should we not continue it? Surely no one tells us it has not been effective? There has been no attempt on the part of the hon. member to do so.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: I could quote plenty of cases where it has been disastrous to the health of the children.

Hon. R. LAURIE: I am glad the hon. member has made the interjection because I shall read him something. This is what Mr. Mason, the Chief Health Officer of New Zealand, says—

"To remove the objection sometimes raised against vaccine, namely, the possibility of disease being transmitted from one child to another through vaccination by means of humanised lymph, the Government have made it illegal to use other than pure calf lymph."

In earlier days it used to be the case of getting vaccine from the healthy child, but the Government of New Zealand have made that illegal. The report goes on to say—

"Every mother and father is asked to read the lesson the recent epidemic teaches. The children cannot protect themselves, but they will be sacrificed should the disease obtain a foothold in the Colony. Absolutely pure calf lymph is supplied by the Government free of charge to all medical men, and parents can have their children vaccinated any day by applying to the public vaccinator of their district."

I believe that a person can go to any public vaccinator in Western Australia and get pure calf lymph. Perhaps the Colonial Secretary can inform us

on that point. It does away with the old trouble of a child getting some vaccine matter in its arm or leg—because doctors now generally vaccinate on the leg because there it cannot be disturbed, or a child cannot lie on it so easily as it can on the arm; instead of getting the vaccine from a healthy child it is now got from pure calf lymph. We know that research in all branches of medical science is progressing every day and we know that by the inoculation of something into the blood a person can destroy much that needs destroying. If the people of the State can see that every one is vaccinated and that the law is carried out while it is on the statute-book, then children, through no fault of their own, or through the carelessness of their parents, or those who should carry out the law, will not be destroyed, but will live to grow up to be healthy citizens of the State. The old fashioned idea that by vaccinating a child it is going to be destroyed or weakened has died out, and there are many people who would not dream of leaving their children unvaccinated. On the other hand there is a great danger of the unvaccinated child to the population in the event of smallpox outbreak. Why should the people of Perth and Fremantle be at the mercy of those who, probably through ignorance or carelessness, will leave their children unvaccinated? At any rate I could not possibly dream of moving one iota from the position I have taken up. I must vote against the second reading of this measure.

Hon. G. RANDELL: (Metropolitan) This is a subject that has occupied my attention for a good many years. Some time back I received information from a reliable source, I believe it was *The Lancet*, but unfortunately I have mislaid it, so that I cannot read it to the House this afternoon. However, the evidence therein is overwhelmingly in favour of the good effects of vaccination, so that if I were to vote for the passing of this Bill I believe I would be guilty of a great dereliction of duty to the people of the State. We could not possibly put ourselves in greater danger than to fail to

use the remedy used by Dr. Jenner many years ago that has proved through all this time most efficacious for the prevention of the fatal effects from smallpox. It was well known that some of those who had been vaccinated had not escaped, but in every case they had received the disease in a minor form, so that there is really very little danger to be feared after vaccination. I do not think it is right that we should run any risk for the sake of humouring parents, for I cannot call it anything else. I think their failure to discharge their duty to their children, and to the country, would be an error which I hope this House will not be willing to commit. We know very well that if cases of smallpox were to arrive from outside the State, every precaution would be taken to prevent the spread of the disease and I think hitherto these precautions have been taken very successfully, except perhaps with regard to the cases which occurred a few years ago, and in which the people of the State suffered rather badly.

Hon. J. W. LANGSFORD : We can all get re-vaccinated.

Hon. G. RANDELL : I am proud to say that on that occasion I did not get re-vaccinated because I felt that the vaccination that I received in boyhood was sufficient to carry me along. I have five spots on my arm, and if my memory serves me correctly, there were some 40 boys vaccinated from me at that time. This was done I suppose because I was considered to be a particularly healthy boy. There may be some danger in communicating the disease in this way but that is only where the condition of the subject is not healthy. At the present time, however, as pure lymph from the calf is used, there can be no danger to be feared. I feel sure from the evidence I have had from time to time, and which was repeated the other day in the newspapers, we can accept vaccination with perfect safety. Therefore I shall not change my mind, neither will I run the risk of being a party to vote for this measure, and inflict what will be a dangerous Act upon the inhabitants of Western Australia. That so many persons have failed to have their children vaccinated seems to me to be

a serious danger to the State, but I think we can readily understand the position, when we see the various directions in which the parents are neglecting the duties they owe to their children. How sad it is to see that there is need for children's hospitals, waifs homes, and other institutions, simply because the parents have utterly failed to do their duty to their children. The neglect to secure immunity on the part of the parents is quite in harmony with, I am sorry to say, that widespread failure which parents are manifesting in the care and upbringing of their children. I do hope that a majority of this House will reject this measure, especially as we have had very few arguments submitted in favour of it by the hon. member who introduced the Bill.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS : I thought it would resolve itself into a vaccination and anti-vaccination discussion. I can give you all the literature you want about it later on.

Hon. G. RANDELL : There is no question about the overwhelming evidence we have in favour of retaining this remedy which was introduced by Dr. Jenner so long ago, and which has proved so beneficial in many parts of the world, and especially will it be beneficial in Australia, and particularly in Western Australia, where we are very liable to receive cases of smallpox by being so much closer than the other States to places like Ceylon and India. Therefore it behoves us to be more on our guard against allowing this disease to come into the country and obtaining a foothold. I hope hon. members will see their way to reject the Bill.

On motion by Hon. C. Sommers debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.6 p.m.