Treasurer one had to give full consideration to it. At the same time there is no reason why, if some rational proposal can be suggested, it should not receive consideration.

Mr. Bath: That idea of annual revenue would not be the best basis, because some hotels not of high annual value do big businesses.

The PREMIER: I take it the annual value would allow for that.

Mr. Bath: No; it is simply the annual value of the building.

The PREMIER: Well, I am opposed to that; because the man who spent money in improving the building would be under a disability not shared by another man who refused to spend a penny on his particular building. I do not know that I need say anything further in conclusion, except that the Government in bringing forward this measure realise that it is not perfect by any means. But I can assure the House it is one to which we have given every consideration. We have endeavoured to deal fairly and equitably with all classes of the community. We realise that with the discussions which are taking place daily hon. members are able to gain very much valuable information which should be of considerable assistance in moulding this measure into an effective Act. From what I can judge of its reception outside the House most reasonable people seem to consider that it is an honest effort on the part of the Government. And although we are unable to satisfy all the demands of the most ardent of the temperance reformers, still I think it would be in the interests of the community generally if hon. members endeavour to so mould this Bill that as a result the administration of the liquor law will be a great improvement on what exists at the present time.

On motion by Mr. Scaddan, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.21 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 22nd September, 1909.

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary:

Report of the Principal Medical Officer on the Medical, Health, and Factories Departments for 1908.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. R. W. Pennefather, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings was granted to the Hon. S. Stubbs on the ground of urgent private business.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1. Sea Carriage of Goods (returned to the Legislative Assembly with an amendment).

2. Fisheries Act Amendment (transmitted to the Legislative Assembly).

BILL—HEALTH.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day.

Clause 231—Notice of infectious disease:

Hon. G. RANDELL: It was provided in Subclause 4, that the local authority might order that the provisions of the section should extend in its district to any disease not specifically mentioned in the Act. Would not this deprive of its value the amendment made in an earlier clause? Because it seemed to enable the local authority to proclaim the disease of a nature previously mentioned as infectious.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The clause provided for notifying infectious diseases, and the subclause simply meant

that if there was any other disease not specified in the interpretation clause the local authority could insist on notification of that disease being sent. Even if it were to extend to the disease to which the hon. member referred it would not have the effect the hon. member thought.

Hon. G. Randell: The board may make orders under the subclause.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes, for the notification of the disease. It was a similar provision to that contained in Section 118 of the Act. He moved an amendment—

That the following be added to Subclause 5: "and shall be paid a fee of one shilling for each notification made under the provisions of this section."

It was to remedy an omission in the drafting. The effect of the amendment was that the medical officer in charge of a hospital would receive a fee of one shilling for notifying a case of infectious disease.

Hon. G. RANDELL: How did the notification connect with the earlier part of the clause?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was provided that he should notify and that he should receive a fee of 1s.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 232 to 235—agreed to.

Clause 236—Puerperal fever:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved an amendment—

That in line 1 of Subclause 1, the words "of puerperal fever," be struck out and "where there is a septic condition of the parturient canal within fourteen days after the expulsion of the contents" be inserted in lieu.

This amendment was being inserted at the request of the British Medical Association. They had a strong objection to the disease being defined in the way that had been done in the Bill, inasmuch as if it were known that they were attending a patient suffering from that illness other persons might refuse to engage them. The amendment got over the difficulty.

Amendment put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved—

That Subclause 2 be struck out.

The amendment was consequential.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Although the several preceding clauses had been passed, it might be as well to inform the Committee that they were inserted at the suggestion of the select committee which sat on the Bill. The object was to guard against infection being carried about in clothing. For instance, a factory might be perfectly healthy, and while the strictest supervision might be exercised, disease might be carried about in clothing, or in articles which were made up in unhealthy places. The clauses were inserted to deal with this difficulty.

Clauses 237 and 238—agreed to.

Clause 239—Medical practitioner to notify cases of tuberculosis:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved an amendment—

That in lines 3 and 4 of Subclause 1 the words "the then condition of any persons who are or during the preceding twelve months have been," be struck out, and "each person who has at any time during the preceding twelve months been" inserted in lieu.

The reason for the amendment was that it would be quite impossible for a medical man to report on a case that he may not have seen for 12 months. Several members, when speaking on the second reading of the Bill, drew attention to this matter, and the amendment was inserted also at the request of the British Medical Association.

Amendment put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved

That in Subclause 2, the words "or to a fee of one shilling if the case occurs in a public institution" be added.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: Who gets the fees in the public hospital?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The honorary staff.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 240—Aborigines:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved

That the clause be struck out.

It was intended to introduce an amendment to the Aborigines Act, and this clause would be re-inserted in a slightly different form in that measure.

Clause put and negatived.

Clauses 241 to 245—agreed to.

Clause 246—Local authority to provide hospitals:

Hon. M. L. MOSS: This appeared to be a new clause.

The Colonial Secretary: It was similar to Clause 130 of the existing Act.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The marginal note showed that it had been taken from the New Zealand Act of 1900. Knowing the New Zealand hospitals as he did, the burdens they had to carry and the cost they were to the local authorities, it could be readily understood why such a provision appeared in the Health Act of the Dominion, but he was surprised to learn that it was in the existing West Australian Health Act of 1898.

The Colonial Secretary: Sections 130 to 135 in the Act of 1898 dealt with the same question.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Perhaps the Minister would quote the clauses. The clause in the Bill stated—

> "The local authority may from time to time, of its own motion, and shall, whenever the Central Board so requires, provide, equip and maintain hospitals suitable and sufficient for the reception and treatment of persons suffering from infectious disease, and the reception of persons who have been in contact with infected persons."

The local authority in the case of a municipality was the municipal council, and outside it would probably be the roads board, and they would be called upon to provide, maintain and equip a hospital out of their limited revenue. That was a burden they could not bear. If that law existed at the present time it was not known whether it had ever been resorted to. Even if it was in the Act of 1898, there was no reason why it should be perpetuated in the existing Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member had the Act before him, and he would see that the sections in question were 130 to 135 inclusive. These sections gave exactly the same power as was proposed in the Bill before the Committee. The hon. member stated that the law had not been availed of. The law had been extensively availed of. It was provided that the local board should be charged with the maintenance and the care of persons suffering from infectious diseases. That was a wise provision to have in the Health Act. If a local body proved to be careless about their work, infectious diseases would occur.

Hon. M. L. Moss: How about an infected person who might come into the district of a local board from another place.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was a wise provision that the onus should be thrown on the local board. According to the present Act it was the duty of the local board to provide for the care and maintenance of indigent infectious persons. The Act placed on any hospital subsidised by the Government, or any public hospital, the responsibility, on the demand of the central board, of taking care of the sick at a reasonable rate. In the event of the local authorities failing to make proper provision for the sick, the central board could make that provision on their behalf. That procedure had been simplified in this Bill. Almost every board throughout the State was providing for their infectious sick, and the only board which was coming off lightly was that at Fremantle. Perth was doing this, and Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie had their own hospital, and were providing for the infectious sick. In the first place it was a charge on the local board, which had the power to recover from the individual, and therefore the Government had to pay half the cost of the erection of the hospitals, and half the cost of the maintenance of the indigent sick. The cost that was likely to fall on local hospitals was half the cost of the indigent sick. In many cases, take Jarrahdale for instance, when there was an indigent sick case the local authority sent it to the Perth hospital and paid half the cost. During his (the Colonial Secretary's) term of office the only boards that had disputed this right were the metropolitan boards, particularly the Perth board. But it had been proved by an appeal to the Supreme Court that they were legally liable for the cost during the last 12 months. This system had been

in force for the last 11 years, and was simply repeated in this Bill. Take the case of Perth. If an infectious case arose the Perth local board found where the case came from. The Bill gave power to the central board to say which local authority the particular case should be charged to.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: There were some of the provisions in the present Act that cast obligations on the local boards to do some of the things pointed out by the Colonial Secretary; but if members looked at Sections 130 to 135, and compared them with Clause 247 of the Bill, and succeeding clauses, they would find that there was a very large difference between them. Under Section 130 a local board might provide hospitals or temporary places for the reception of the sick. If a local board failed to do this the chairman of the central board proceeded to carry out the provisions, and might sue in the Supreme Court. Clause 247 provided that the site, size, and plans of the hospital should be submitted for approval to the central board, and there was a whole host of burdens cast on the local authorities. True, some of the provisions of the nature referred to by the Colonial Secretary in Sections 130 to 135 were contained in the present Bill, but even these burdens it was unfair to cast on the local authority. Where would the local authorities get the funds with which to carry out these obligations. There was nothing in the provision to prevent this state of affairs occurring. The central board might say to a local board, "you must build a hospital for infectious diseases," and state where the site should be, what its size was to be and the plans generally of the hospital. Was it not absurd to pass legislation of this kind, so that a central board could call on a local body to purchase a site in Perth, when we knew the local board had no funds for the purpose? It was an attempt on the part of the Government to shunt their responsibilities on to the local bodies. It was a sideway of dealing with the hospital question generally. Clauses 245 to 252 should be struck out.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: The provision that local bodies should provide hospital accommodation for the sick was always regarded as a big question. In the Bunbury district it mattered not where the sick people came from they were dumped into the Bunbury hopsital. The local bodies were so numerous that it would be impossible to ask them to provide this accommodation. There would have to be some means by which provision was made, so that existing hospitals could be utilised for the purpose. Around Bunbury there were five or six roads boards, and how in the name of commonsense could each of these local bodies comply with the law. The statute book should not be burdened with laws that could not be put into operation. It was utterly impossible for a local body, such as a roads board that collected a health rate of £20 or £50 per annum, to carry out these provisions. Some years ago, before the local boards were declared health boards, in one little settlement there were nine cases out of a population of 34 inhabitants dumped into the Bunbury hospital. The Bunbury board had to deal with the cases, and sent out someone to investigate and to report. It would come to this, that the principal local body or municipality in a district would have to bear the cost of treating these cases. It seemed like compelling local bodies to do what was almost impossible. The Government had failed to collect amounts due from the public hospitals, and now they were asking the local hospitals to do something which they themselves could not do.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: When Mr. Moss rose to speak it was his (Mr. Piesse's) intention to move that the words, "and shall whenever the central board so require" should be struck out so as to remove any danger from the local authority.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was not mandatory.

Hon. M. L. Moss: These local boards had no means.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They were doing this work to-day, except at Fremantle.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: The clause was good with that exception. Local bodies would equip hospitals for infectious cases. It was necessary that such hospitals should exist. People frequently sent persons suffering from infectious diseases by train long distances. He knew of a typhoid patient being taken by train for 200 miles, and after the patient left the railway carriage other passengers entered the compartment and travelled by that train. Some precautions should be taken. There must be infectious diseases hospitals in country places: the clause was good in that respect. He knew of two localities where the authorities purposed building accommodation for infectious cases. The conditions of the clause were very good as applied to the conduct of those hospitals but too much power was given to the central board over the local authority.

The Colonial Secretary: They have the same authority to-day.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: They had no right to possess such authority. In the past the central board had treated the local bodies as dirt under their feet. He moved an amendment—

That in line 2 the words "and shall, whenever the central board so requires" be struck out.

Hon. J. M. DREW: If the clause under discussion and the succeeding ones were carried a most unjust burden would be cast on the shoulders of a local body in the Province he represented, namely, the Geraldton municipality. There was a hospital there which cost a considerable sum to erect but it existed not only for the purpose of serving the municipality but also to serve the whole of the Murchison Goldfield, a portion of the North-West and a great deal of the Midland Railway lands. It would be very hard if the Geraldton people had to pay for the treatment of patients from all those places. There was a provision that the municipal bodies should bear some proportion of the expense of people who went to hospitals and were treated for infectious diseases, but it would be hard to make the Geraldton municipality pay one-half the cost for cases which came from 40 or 50 miles away. The clause gave to the central board too wide a power and he would consequently support the amendment.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: Personally he had no objection to the clause as it stood for the question raised by Mr. Drew with regard to the small municipalities would seldom, if ever, arise, as we must assume that the central board were composed of reasonable people who would not call upon the small municipalities to pay more than they should. At present, and under the Bill, the small municipal and other bodies could enter into a contract with the local hospitals for the treatment of infectious diseases.

The Colonial Secretary: And the hospitals cannot refuse to enter into the contract.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: It was quite right that in the larger municipalities infectious diseases hospitals should be built by the corporation. He took exception to Subclause 10 of Clause 247. At the present time the Government paid one-half the cost of indigent patients but it was now proposed to make that payment discretionary; that was not proper. The Government should be forced to pay one-half and such a matter should not be left at the discretion of a Minister. The infectious hospitals were necessary and should be provided by the local authorities; in that respect the clause was a good one.

Hon. R. W. PENNEFATHER: The clause left one in a delightful state of uncertainty, for it was impossible to know whether the municipality in which a person was found suffering from infectious disease were liable, or whether the municipality where the disease was contracted should be made to pay; apparently it was the municipality where the person was found to be suffering from an infectious disease. That was not fair because an indigent person might contract an infectious disease, owing to the want of sanitary conditions, in some other municipality than the one in which he was found suffering from the disease and which would be saddled with the cost of his treatment.

The Government should bear the cost of such cases.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: With regard to infectious diseases he presumed that typhoid fever would be one.

The Colonial Secretary: No.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: It seemed most unfair that the local bodies should be made responsible for the treatment of all cases of infectious disease found in their district.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No more power was given by the clause than there was in the existing law.

Hon. M. L. Moss: That is a bad argument.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was a very good argument for it showed that those hardships which had been referred to did not exist. All the boards in and around Perth had agreed to have their cases treated at the Perth Hospital, while the boards in and about Fremantle had agreed that their cases should be treated at a specified rate at the Fremantle Hospital. There was no complaint about that and there was not likely to be. If the amendment were carried it would reduce the clause to nothing. The local boards were asked to do certain things but there would be no power to enforce the request. If the amendment were carried, members would, by one stroke of the pen, alter a system that had been in force for many years, and would throw the responsibility of treating the people on the State. If the amendment were carried, he would go no further with the Bill, for the alteration would be altogether of too sweeping a character. The local bodies now carried on the work and should continue to do so. It had been somewhat hard on big boards such as those at Perth, Kalgoorlie, and Boulder during the past year on account of an epidemic of diphtheria. Small-pox and bubonic plague had never been under the direct control of the Central Board of Health but had been taken in hand by the Government separately.

Hon. M. L. Moss: They come within the definition of infectious diseases.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was necessary in order to meet other provisions in the Bill. If the amendment were carried the clause would be so much waste paper, and it would tax all the powers the Government possessed to enforce the local boards to look after infectious diseases. He could not proceed with the Bill if the amendment were carried, as too much responsibility would be cast on the Government.

Hon. R. LAURIE: There was considerable danger in Subclause 5 of Clause 247. Supposing for instance a person suffering from small-pox were to go and stay at one of the principal hotels in the City, everyone in the hotel would be isolated and half of the cost would fall on the local authority.

The Colonial Secretary: Has that been done in the past in smallpox cases?

Hon. R. LAURIE: The Minister dwelt on what had been done in the past, but there was nothing in the Bill to prevent such a thing being done in the future. Sea quarantining would pass entirely out of the hands of the Government very shortly.

The Colonial Secretary: It is out of their hands now.

Hon. R. LAURIE: If small-pox at a port came under the heading of sea quarantining, the laws we were making would not govern the case. All would remember when plague broke out here and it would be possible that the whole cost of isolating people in connection with an outbreak of plague and of treating patients would have to be borne under the Bill by the local municipality. That would be most unfair, for by the action they were taking the Fremantle authorities, for instance, would be preventing a spread of plague throughout the State, and yet they alone had to pay for it. How would it be possible to charge the other municipalities with a certain proportion of the cost?

The Colonial Secretary: Did Fremantle have to bear any portion of the cost of the last outbreak of bubonic plague?

Hon. R. LAURIE: They did not, but under this Bill they might be called upon to do so in the future. The Colonial Secretary had said that typhoid was not regarded as an infectious disease, but in the interpretation clause it was clearly laid down as such. If the

system of Government maintenance of hospitals had been abused—and he believed it had been—it was only right to check that abuse; but it was certainly hard that the whole cost of infectious diseases should be charged upon local authorities. Take the case of a man—and there were many such—coming down from, say, Kalgoorlie to the coast and entering the Fremantle hospital. It would scarcely be possible to ask the Kalgoorlie municipality to pay for that man's keep, and so it would be thrown—and as he had said, there were many such cases—upon the Fremantle municipality. He was of opinion that some modification of the clause was necessary.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: Notwithstanding what the Colonial Secretary had said typhoid was distinctly stated in the Bill to be an infectious disease. It was wholly unjust to ask a municipality to bear the cost of an outbreak which possibly began some miles away from that municipality. If the clause were agreed to the smaller municipalities would be simply overburdened: the central authority would insist upon the building of infectious wards in every centre, and the local authority would not be able to bear the cost. In other respects the clause was a good one.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: Possibly the clause would have a better reception if the Colonial Secretary intimated that the Government would provide half the cost of maintaining these hospitals, and also of the treatment of indigent patients.

The Colonial Secretary: That is the present law.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: If that were the case, and only half the cost would fall on the municipalities, it would be admitted that it was the duty of the municipalities to provide for their sick in this way. Certainly the erection of hospitals would be a costly affair.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Look at the added responsibility, when the central board can dictate what class of buildings shall be put up.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: Still, if the Government bore half the cost, he thought it perhaps only reasonable that the other half should be contributed by the municipalities. To strike out the words, as proposed by Mr. Piesse, meant that a great deal of the virtue of the clause would be lost.

Hon. G. RANDELL: In his opinion hon. members should vote on the general principle of the clause. It was in the interests of the local authorities that they should have the control of these hospitals and should bear the cost. That the Government would render assistance there could be no doubt; it was provided for in Clause 247, although it was not compulsory. He was sure there was no likelihood of a board constituted as the central board would be, or of any Minister, forcing upon any local authority that which they were not able to execute. The general principle was a sound one, and one upon which hon. members should proceed. It would relieve the Government of unreasonable demands made upon them from all parts of the State. It placed any Government in an invidious position to have the local authorities coming forward cap in hand for assistance which they could and should provide themselves. Every provision should be made for those unfortunately stricken down by disease. He believed the principle would operate with great benefit to all concerned. The Government would be relieved from duties necessarily cast upon them in the past. As the population increased so, more and more, the local authorities should take upon themselves the responsibility of carrying on local affairs. He would vote for the retention of the clause upon that principle, and also upon another in which he most heartily concurred, namely, that the central board should be endowed with very great authority. Experience had taught that it was necessary to exercise some outside authority upon many of the local boards of the State to compel them to carry out their duties. One had only to remember the outbreak of bubonic plague, when these local boards had to be pressed to carry out their duties. On these two grounds he would vote for the retention of the clause.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: The manner in which Mr. Randell had spoken showed conclusively how little was he in touch with the hugh development now going on in the outback districts. Mr. Randell would have a few up-country towns carry all the burden and responsibility of a serious outbreak of disease. It was most unfair to ask them to carry the burden at present, but they would endeavour to do it manfully, though they were not to be dictated to by the central board acting with the mistaken knowledge based on conditions applying to the metropolitan area. The responsibility should be carried by the Sate, though small municipalities were prepared to go to a certain extent, but not beyond it. There was a time of resentment coming when people would rise against these burdens.

Hon. S. J. HAYNES: It was absolutely necessary that great power should be given to the central board, and that the local authorities should be made to feel their responsibility. It could be said that the large waste of public money that had taken place in the past would not occur again, because the provision would lead to more acute care in regard to expenditure. The hon. member talked of oppression, but was it likely that the central board would do an oppressive act? Disconnected from all small ideas, the central board would consider the general welfare of the State, and if the local authority did not do its duty the central board should have the power to compel it to do it. There was ample protection if the central board made ruinous demands on local authorities: the result would be that the demands would not be carried out, because it was well known that oppressive laws carried out oppressively were a dead letter. He had never known of the central board to unduly press the smaller local authorities. The clause should stand in the interests of public health, subject to the suggestion made by Mr. Moss. Instead of the Government having discretionary power, it should be made mandatory.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: No doubt a provision of this kind would only be resorted to in the case of an epidemic, and until an epidemic actually occurred with its consequent heavy expenses the members would have no idea of what the cost would be to the local authorities. That the provision had been practically the law for 11 years was no argument for repeating what might be a mistake. We might be casting on the local authorities an obligation which their finances could not stand.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: They have stood it so far.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Except in regard to one or two outbreaks of plague, the expense of which the Government shouldered, there had been no outbreak of any consequence. Mr. Pennefather had pointed out a difficulty the local authority might be landed in with an outbreak caused by an infected case coming from another district, yet there was no provision by which the local authority might charge a proportion of the cost to the other district. That did not appear to be a statesmanlike policy. Therefore, while the amendment moved by Mr. Piesse was not the best, it was much better to take away this power from the central board, enabling it to direct the local authority to carry out the provisions of the clause; and unless the Government were prepared to give some more feasible and working scheme he would support the amendment. There should be some attempt to equalise the burden where infection came to one district from another.

Hon. R. LAURIE: Believing that the central board should be the paramount authority, an opinion he had expressed in regard to the appointment of inspectors, he must oppose the amendment; but at the same time he agreed with Mr. Moss that when dealing with the next clause we would have to safeguard the interests of the various towns in seeing that the Government bore a fair share of the burden that might be imposed on a town through no fault of the residents of that town.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was no threat when it was said the Bill would have to be dropped. No one

was more anxious to have the Bill passed into law than himself, because he knew how badly it was wanted, particularly for the provisions as to food stuffs, if for nothing else. If the amendment were passed it would reduce this part of the measure to a farce. This did not affect country districts at all.

Hon. M. L. Moss: It affected every part of the State.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY differed from the hon. member. The epidemic of diphtheria which raged recently was an exceptional thing. Even then the Government did not sit down and enforce all the provisions on the local authorities; doctors and nurses were sent out and the Government went to a good deal of expense, and in many instances, as far as the smaller local bodies were concerned, the whole of the burden was taken off their shoulders. The central authority should have supreme power to act in a moment. There was a provision existing in the present Act by which the proper local authority was charged up with the cost of the treatment of infectious diseases. A similar provision was made in the clause of the Bill subsequent to that under consideration. In connection with these clauses it would be shown later on that the local bodies would be protected to the extent that they were protected at the present time.

Hon. E. McLARTY: When Mr. Moss called attention to the clause, he felt as Mr. Moss did, but in view of the fact that the Leader of the House had given an assurance that the matter of the divided cost was mandatory no great harm could be done. When the financial clauses came before the House he would oppose any undue taxation on country districts, because as it stood the Bill was going to fall pretty heavily on some of them. The amendment proposed by Mr. Piesse, if carried, would alter the clause to a serious extent. The matter was one in regard to which members might trust the Government in the event of infectious diseases breaking out, and where there was a small community, to provide the necessary accommodation and to give the assistance that might be required. In the matter before the Committee the central board might well be trusted to deal fairly and the clause might be permitted to remain as it stood.

Hon. F. CONNOR agreed with some of the arguments advanced to the effect that the clause was simply helping the Government out of a difficulty. The Government, it seemed, desired to get out of their responsibilities to a large extent. With regard to the case of a roads board in the far North, how could they build a hospital, and there were chances in those distant places of infectious diseases breaking out more so than in any other part of the State. It was removing too much responsibility that should rest on the Government. In a country of such great distances it was not right that the matter should be placed in the hands of an irresponsible body of men, for after all, the central board was composed of nominees and they were irresponsible. Unless the Colonial Secretary could show that the smaller places would be safeguarded he would vote for the amendment.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Hon. members seemed to be under the impression that the central board would force a local board to build a hospital no matter how small that local board might be. At the present time there was only one hospital owned by a local board and that board happened to be a combination of three or four local boards on the goldfields. Provision was made in the Bill whereby any public hospital, or subsidised hospital, would have to take these cases when asked to do so by a local board, and that was what existed at the present time. These infectious wards were generally built very cheaply, they merely consisted of a cement floor, and iron roof, with canvas sides so that they might be opened. In such cases the burden that fell on the local board was only half the cost. He would be willing to make it obligatory on the part of the Government to pay half the cost.

Hon. R. W. PENNEFATHER: Would the Colonial Secretary give such an assurance in the event of a disease contracted in one district being brought to another?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That assurance had already been given.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: If the infection should be proved to have been brought by a person who had a month or two before come from oversea, would the Government then bear the whole burden?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: As a matter of fact the Government bore the cost of outbreaks of diseases such as small-pox and bubonic plague; it was not to be expected that the local boards should have to pay for expenses incurred in connection with such diseases. With regard to the point raised by Mr. Moss, the Government would bear the cost of a disease brought oversea, but the assurance could only be made to apply to the period of infection, which would not be many days.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: That assurance was satisfactory.

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

Ayes	5
Noes	17
Majority against ..	12

AYES.

Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. C. A. Piesse	*(Teller).*

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. J. T. Glowrey	Hon. W. Oats
Hon. J. W. Hackett	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. R. W. Pennefather
Hon. S. J. Haynes	Hon. G. Randell
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. R. Laurie	Hon. R. F. Sholl
Hon. R. D. McKenzie	*(Teller).*

Amendment thus negatived; the clause put and passed.

(Sitting suspended from 6·18 to 7·30 p.m.)

Clauses 247 to 251—postponed.

Clause 252—Power to establish or subsidise hospitals generally:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved an amendment—

That in line 3 the words "within its district" be struck out.

It might be necessary for a local authority to subsidise a hospital just outside its district.

Amendment passed.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE moved an amendment—

That the words "provided that such subsidy shall not exceed £5 per centum of the income of the said local authority" be added.

There should be some limit fixed, or some expression of opinion given as to what was expected from these local bodies. There might be a need for special collectors to obtain funds for hospital purposes, and those collectors might be met with the answer that the local authority had power to expend rates. Therefore, the Committee should fix a maximum.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The clause was exceedingly objectionable. In the Municipal Bill, the second reading of which had been passed, there was a clause which stated that a council might apply its ordinary revenue to subsidise any public or private hospital established within or without its district. Now we had the same thing in the Health Bill. No reason had been given to justify the appearance of a clause in the Bill by which a public authority could give portion of its revenue towards a public hospital. This provision opened the door for abuse. There might be circumstances in some part of the State to justify the provision, but we had not heard it. One would think local authorities were overburdened with capital. We knew that the subsidies were being cut down, and there was a possibility of their being a thing of the past directly. Local bodies found it difficult to pay their ordinary expenses. He would vote for Mr. Piesse's amendment if he could not get the clause struck out.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: This provision applied to local authorities, such as roads boards and municipalities, and it was almost outside the purview of the Bill. Anyhow, there should be a limit specified.

Amendment passed.

Hon. G. RANDELL: The clause was very poorly drawn. How could an institution which was established or maintained by a public body be described as a private hospital? It was quite right to say that a public authority could subsidise a private hospital. It would be

better if the clause were taken out of the Bill altogether.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was to be hoped the clause would not be struck out. The definition of "local authority" seemed to cover municipalities and roads boards, and, perhaps, it would be wise to make the clause read, "every local board" instead of "every local authority." It was desired to give power to the local board to use their funds to a maximum of 5 per cent. in the manner indicated. That was not a very wide, but it was a very necessary power, and had been asked for by many country local boards. First they asked for power to establish and maintain a hospital. Under the new system of hospital management it was desired in some districts that the local hospitals, instead of being controlled by a separate board, should be under the control of the local board. By that means a considerable amount of maintenance expenditure would be done away with. It was also desired that the local board should be allowed to subsidise an institution. Possibly the board would not be in a position to start or maintain a hospital, but in an adjoining district there might be an institution to which they were willing to contribute a certain amount of their revenue. Again, instead of establishing a casualty ward in their district they might desire to subsidise a private hospital there in order to have placed at their disposal a bed to receive casualty cases. The power really only applied to the smaller centres, for it would never be used in the larger ones, although there was nothing to prevent it. In a place like Kalgoorlie, if the local board desired to vote the sum of £30 or £40, a sum equal to 5 per cent. of their revenue, why should they not be allowed to do so? They would be spending the money of the ratepayers, to whom they were responsible.

Hon. S. J. HAYNES: It was hard to see how a local authority could establish and maintain a private institution.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was not intended to establish a private hospital, but to subsidise one. The clause might be badly drawn, but it would not be very difficult to remedy it.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The income of the City was, say, £20,000 a year; would it be possible under the clause for the City Council to pay 5 per cent. of that sum, or £1,000 a year, to some private hospital if they thought fit? The revenue of the Fremantle municipality was from £12,000 to £15,000 a year, and 5 per cent. of that sum would amount to £600 or £700; could that sum be handed over as a subsidy to a private hospital? The clause might read this way, "every local authority may establish and maintain any hospital, or may subsidise any private hospital." There would have to be a proviso limiting the local authority to certain districts. It was hard to know how that could be done, but at such centres as Albany, Bunbury, Perth, Fremantle, and Geraldton, the local authorities should not have the power conferred by the clause.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: The clause would be repugnant to the Municipal Act, as it was laid down in that measure clearly the purpose for which the municipalities could spend their money. So far as he could remember the municipalities had no power to subsidise anything in the nature of a private hospital.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: It was certainly impossible for a local authority to establish and maintain a hospital. The clause should read, "every local authority may subsidise a hospital up to 5 per cent., etcetera." How could a local authority establish and maintain a hospital when all they had to spend in that direction was 5 per cent. of their funds?

The Colonial Secretary: The local authority would not maintain the hospitals altogether.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Would the Minister agree to postpone the clause and put an amended one on the Notice Paper containing a proviso limiting this power to the small localities?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was no objection to postponing the clause, but he could not undertake to put in a proviso of the sort suggested, as it would be quite impossible to define

what local boards should or should not pay. Why should not the big local bodies contribute to the hospitals as well as the smaller ones ?

Hon R. D. McKenzie: Was there an expressed desire on the part of the local authorities to be given this power ?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The reason the clause appeared was that it was a request from a number of local boards in the country. When considering the question of taking over the hospitals it was decided to ask that the clause should be inserted in the Bill. Many towns along the Great Southern railway had taken over the hospitals on the promise that this proviso would appear in the Bill. It was only in the belief that the clause would be carried that the people agreed to take over the hospitals.

Hon. G. RANDELL: The clause was open to very great objection, for it afforded an opportunity for discrimination. There were a large number of private hospitals in Perth, and they might apply to the City Council for subsidies, and that body would discriminate as to those to be subsidised. There would be trouble immediately. The clause went beyond the scope of what the local authority should be allowed to do.

Hon. R. W. PENNEFATHER: The clause would serve a very useful purpose, and would come to the assistance of many roads boards in the remote parts of the country. A board would find it much more economical in many cases to contribute a small sum from their revenue to help a private establishment than to establish a hospital of their own.

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

Ayes	..	..	9
Noes	..	..	10
Majority against		..	1

AYES.

Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. R. W. Pennefather
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. J. W. Hackett	Hon. T. H. Wildiug
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. W. Patrick	(*Teller*).

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. S. J. Haynes	Hon. G. Randell
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. R. Laurie	(*Teller*)
Hon. R. D. McKenzie	

Clause thus negatived.

Clause 253—agreed to.

Clause 254—Nurses Registration Board:

Hon. J. W. HACKETT: The proposed board would consist of three members, of whom the president of the central board would be one while the other two would be medical practitioners to be appointed by the Governor from time to time. He would strongly urge the propriety of seeing that one of these two medical practitioners was a representative of the nurses. The clause and the succeeding clauses proposed very stringent regulations under which this registration board was to be conducted and under which the nurses were to act. In all such cases the party to whom the clause applied was allowed special rights of representation, such as obtained in respect to the dental board, the pharmaceutical board and others. He would urge that after the first appointment the nurses should have the right to elect at least one of these two medical practitioners.

Hon. G. RANDELL: There appeared to be a widespread desire that this registration of nurses should be restricted to the midwifery nurses. There had been a great deal of correspondence in the newspapers on the subject, and serious objections had been taken by the Australian Trained Nurses' Association to the proposal that they should be brought within the scope of the Bill. These objections, he understood, were based partly on the difference in training as between the midwifery nurses and the trained nurses, as they were popularly termed. He moved—

That the word "midwifery" be inserted before the word "nurses" in line 2.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Apparently Mr. Randell's objection was to any registration being provided for surgical and general nurses. It was

provided that the board might receive the registration of both midwifery and general nurses. If the hon. member desired to exempt the general nurses from registration his object could be obtained by withdrawing his amendment and moving to strike out a certain clause which appeared further on in the Bill. The question of the personnel of the board could be decided now, and if it were desired to object to the registration of general and surgical nurses that question could be discussed later on when the clause dealing with it was reached. If this amendment were to be carried it would mean a serious difficulty at a later stage.

Hon. R. LAURIE: When the clause mentioned by the Colonial Secretary, namely, Clause 266, was reached, he would move to strike it out unless special provision were made for these trained nurses who had established themselves here, and whose endeavour it was to keep the standard of nursing very high. It was his belief that there was no provision made in that clause for keeping up this high standard.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It would be much better if Mr. Randell would withdraw his amendment until the clause mentioned by Mr. Laurie was reached. He would undertake to recommit the present clause if the hon. member so desired.

Hon. G. RANDELL: That being so he would have no objection to temporarily withdrawing his amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved—

That the clause be postponed.

Motion passed; the clause postponed.

Clauses 255 to 257—agreed to.

Clause 258—Rules respecting the examination of midwifery nurses:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved an amendment—

That the words "and may provide that candidates shall produce evidence of having attended a prescribed number of cases" be added to Subclause 2.

It was provided that, for the purpose of the examination of candidates, the nurses' registration board might make rules providing that the candidates should produce evidence of having undergone at least six months' training at an approved institution: and by adding the amendment we further provided that the board might require candidates to produce evidence of having attended a certain number of cases. This meant that besides attending an institution for training purposes, it might be required of candidates that they must attend a certain number of cases before being registered. Unfortunately, there were no places in the State where they could get this training, though some medical practitioners afforded a limited number of nurses an opportunity of learning the art in a maternity hospital. However, it was the intention of the Medical Department to as far as possible afford an opportunity to nurses to get training in this particular direction. It was unfortunately the fact that there was a dearth of midwifery nurses, and a great amount of distress had been occasioned to women in this State on that account. The Government were determined as far as possible, if opportunity offered, to subsidise to a reasonable extent any institution that would afford an opportunity to girls to secure training in midwifery nursing. There was a ward for indigent cases attached to the Old Women's Home in Pier Street, which institution would be in Fremantle in a few weeks, and the Government intended to use that ward as far as possible as a training school for midwifery nurses. They hoped to be able to give the probationer during their six months' training the opportunity of attending the required number of cases.

Hon. R. LAURIE: It was pleasing the Minister had seen the advisability of making this addition to the clause, because there were no maternity hospitals in the State, and no places where proper training in midwifery could be secured, and six months' training without the opportunity of attending cases was of no great value. Considerable attention had been paid to a children's hospital, but no steps had been taken towards establishing maternity homes, so that it was pleasing to learn from the Minister that the Government were now going to take the

matter in hand. At any rate, six months' training was not sufficient.

The Colonial Secretary: It is all they have in England; it all depends on the number of cases.

Hon. R. LAURIE: In most cases the midwifery nurses were also trained nurses who had undergone the examination for general nurses. A request had been made to him that the examination of midwifery nurses should not be made too severe, but there should be no attempt to lower the standard by reducing the term. It would tend to endanger life more than had been the case in the past. A medical man had told him that this provision for attending cases was essential.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It might not be convenient for country nurses to come to Perth or Fremantle to undergo examination. How would they be required to produce evidence of their fitness?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was not likely that a nurse would present herself for examination from a remote district, as she would not receive the required amount of training; but if the practising nurse could produce evidence showing that she had gone through a maternity hospital, the board would register her.

Hon. V. Hamersley: They might be put to undue expense in providing the evidence.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They would only have to bring proof. Then it was at the discretion of the board to say what proof would be required. Anyone practising as a midwife to a certain date after the passing of the Act would be registered so long as the board had the knowledge that the candidate was competent.

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

Clauses 259 to 265—agreed to.

Clause 266—Regulations as to registration of nurses:

Hon. R. LAURIE: This clause should not pass unless the Minister promised that the nurses' association would have representation upon the board. He would not have spoken had not the Minister been so emphatic that the association would not get representation on the board and that he would not adopt the standard used by the association as the standard required in the Bill. A great deal had been said about the training required by the rules of this association. It was controlled by a council of doctors and had been established in the State for the last two years while it was affiliated with various associations throughout Australia. The standard adopted by the association was adopted by the Government hospitals. Probationers in the Perth hospital were required to be three years in the institution, and had to attend a course of lectures, embracing anatomy, physiology, general, medical and surgical nursing, hygiene and various other subjects. The educational standard demanded by the association was not high. All that was required was that the nurses should pass at least a standard equal to the fifth standard of the primary schools. The trained nurses' association rules showed what was required of a nurse. It had been stated that we expected too much, but that was not so. In the case of a typhoid patient, for instance, so much depended upon the nurse, in almost every case. There were times now that if a nurse had not the skilled knowledge nearly akin to that of a doctor the life of a patient might probably be lost. We did not want to lower the standard. If we examined the clause carefully it would be found that it said, that the Governor may make regulations and not the nurses' registration board. The Colonial Secretary, in his second reading speech said, we did not want this standard of the trained nurses' association, and he left it for members to infer that that standard was far too high.

The Colonial Secretary: Nothing of the kind was said.

Hon. R. LAURIE: That was the inference that was drawn. If the Colonial Secretary proposed that they would have representation on the board he would withdraw the amendment. There was no desire to put it to the vote. The taking of any step to lower the standard of nursing in the State would certainly be backward. The clause should be struck out.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY had no recollection of having said that he was desirous, or that it was his intention to lower the standard of nursing. Such was not his intention, and if the hon. member took that meaning from the remarks that had been made, it was certainly not the meaning it was intended should be conveyed. The Australasian Trained Nurses' Association was a body he had every respect for, and included among its members some of the best nurses in Australia. Their standard of training was very high, and no one would say that it was a bit higher than it should be. The articles of association provided for a course of training extending over three years in a hospital containing over 40 beds, and four years and five years in still smaller hospitals.

Hon. J. W. Hackett: Quite impossible in Western Australia.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was almost impossible in Western Australia, because at the present time there were only three hospitals that contained over 40 beds, namely, Perth, Fremantle, and Kalgoorlie. The request of the trained nurses' association was that there should be a board with representation for their own association and that the standard should be the standard fixed by the trained nurses' association. They went further, and requested that no nurse should be allowed to practise as nurses unless they had attained that standard. As the hon. member remarked, that would be a serious step to take. It would certainly constitute a very close corporation, more particularly in Western Australia, for the reasons which had been given, where the opportunities for training were so limited. How would people get on in the country who were suffering from a slight illness and who could not obtain a trained nurse, or who could not afford to pay for one? Then anyone who attended would render themselves liable to prosecution. That was what he objected to. This particular clause was put in at their request for their own protection. If Mr. Laurie did not desire that, if he spoke on behalf of the association, there was no desire to retain the clause. The clause did not lower the standard at all, and no one registered under the Bill could become a member of the association any more than it was possible to do so to-day. There was nothing to prevent every member of the trained nurses' association becoming registered straight away if they so desired. That was inserted with the belief that it would afford a certain amount of protection to the trained nurses' association, and a protection to the public as well without inflicting any hardship.

Hon. R. LAURIE: In the drafting of the clause there was no doubt that the Colonial Secretary had in his mind the lowering of the status of the nurses.

The Colonial Secretary: How do you make that out?

Hon. R. LAURIE: The Colonial Secretary had just stated that in the smaller towns it was not necessary for nurses to have the requisite training.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member misunderstood him. What he said was that there were certainly people in the country towns who could not afford to pay a member of the trained nurses' association, and he was going to introduce legislation to permit of an untrained person being engaged.

Hon. R. LAURIE: The inference then was that there should be another branch of nurses who had not the requisite qualification, and that being the case, under this subclause the Minister was going to provide for another grade of nurses. There was no objection to the grading of nurses, but when a young probationer was learning the profession of a nurse she should at least be able to pass the fifth standard of a public school. It was absolutely necessary that she should be able to read the text books now published. Some people might not be able to pay for a nurse who had the qualifications of a trained nurse, and the inference was that it was the intention of the Colonial Secretary to draw up regulations that would admit various grades of nurses. There was no desire on his part to lower the standard; it was his desire to keep it up. As far as nurses were concerned, the Government themselves had, by their own act, called for applications

for probationers, and those probationers were going on under the rules of the trained nurses' association. There would not have been any difficulty in connection with the matter if it had not been for the emphatic statement of the Colonial Secretary that he would not allow representation for the persons who were going to be most concerned in the matter, the trained nurses themselves. If a doctor called in a nurse at the present time he had the knowledge that that nurse, by being a member of the association here, or of the affiliated associations elsewhere, was thoroughly seized with the duties of a trained nurse, and that a patient could be left in her hands with perfect safety. It seemed, taking the inference of the Colonial Secretary, to have been the intention of the Government, to make regulations which would mean that they did not trust the registration board in the matter. In the case of midwifery nurses, it was left to the board, but in the other case it was left to the Government. Therefore, the only conclusion he could come to was that it was the intention of the Government to lower the standard.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: Why leave it to the Governor to make the regulations?

The Colonial Secretary: Leave it to the board then.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: Seeing that the Principal Medical Officer would be chairman of the board and two other medical men would be appointed on that board, the making of the regulations would be left to experts. The Governor in making the regulations would no doubt take the advice of the Principal Medical Officer, which would be the same thing. He moved an amendment—

That in line 1, the word "Governor" be struck out and "Nurses Registration Board" inserted in lieu.

Hon J. M. DREW: Unlike Captain Laurie he would be only too pleased if the Colonial Secretary would make some provision to meet the requirements of the poorer classes who could not afford to employ trained nurses, for trained nurses charged from 3 guineas to 4 guineas a week with board and lodging, which was beyond the means of any poor person to pay. There were two nurses' associations in Western Australia each with a fair number of members and it would be unfair if one of these associations was to receive representation on the board and the other not. The standard of one of the associations was very high, candidates having almost to pass an examination in English literature and mathematics. These nurses had to be almost lady doctors. The qualifications of a matron in Perth should be higher than the qualifications of a nurse sent to the country to take charge of a case of typhoid fever. Poor people should have an opportunity of employing nurses who had some training although not of the highest class.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: One was led to believe from the remarks of Captain Laurie that there was only one nurses' association. There would be three or four associations before long and probably the country nurses would form an association. It was "cheek" for the Perth nurses' association to require representation on the board. It was to be hoped the Colonial Secretary would stand firm in this matter. He knew something about nurses and nursing and he did not say a word about the high standard of the association referred to, he applauded it and hoped that the high standard would be kept up. But he objected to a monopoly being given to that association, and it would be a monopoly if this association were given representation on the board.

Hon. W. PATRICK opposed the amendment. We were not here to legislate for the nurses association but for the people of Western Australia and if we confined the representation to the trained nurses' association then nine-tenths of the population would have no nursing at all. We could not do better than pass the clause as it stood. He had nothing to say against the trained nurses' association but they should not be given a monopoly because instead of a charge of three or four guineas a week they might raise it to

five or six guineas. He had received good nursing from untrained nurses.

Hon. R. LAURIE: One could scarcely understand the arguments against the trained nurses' association receiving representation; one was led to believe that the standard of nurses was to be reduced. Reference had been made to the amount paid to nurses but there were nurses who never received 3 guineas or 4 guineas a week. Mr. Piesse had referred to associations that were about to be formed but surely those could be dealt with later on. Where was a monopoly to come in by allowing the trained nurses' association to have representation on the board. The board was only to make regulations so that nurses should have a certain qualification.

Hon. C. A. Piesse: A close borough.

Hon. R. LAURIE: At present the Principal Medical Officer would be the chairman of the nurses' registration board and he did not know what other members would be on the board but was it not possible that there would be on the board those who had not been practising their profession for some years? It was within the power of the Minister to appoint members on the board who were not practitioners and who knew little about the requirements of nurses. It would be better to have a man on the board who was in close touch with the nurses; perhaps it would be well to have a capable matron on the board. He objected to no representation of nurses on the board, and if the Colonial Secretary would say there would be a representative from the registered nurses' associations he had no objection. Those people who for a number of years had been carrying on the profession of nursing and those doctors who had taken an interest in seeing that nurses possessed proper qualifications should have some consideration. If Mr. Piesse wished to make provision for the future he (Mr. Laurie) would be satisfied.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: There was nothing in the clause providing for representation on the board, we were dealing with the making of regulations.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was in order in view of an understanding come to earlier.

Hon. R. LAURIE: It was understood when dealing with Clause 254 that provision would be made later.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Clause 254 was postponed in order to give consideration to a suggestion by Dr. Hackett, not that nurses should be represented on the board, but that the nurses appearing on the register, after the first twelve months of the register, should be given an opportunity to elect one of the medical men constituting the board.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: There was no necessity for dealing with that question at present.

Hon. G. RANDELL: The amendment, which he understood the Colonial Secretary would agree to, met with his approval. The Governor would naturally be guided by the Principal Medical Officer in the regulations he would make. There would be two grades of nurses and some would suffer from a defective training as compared with others of a higher qualification. Would the standard set by the board be as high as that of the Australasian Trained Nurses' Association?

The Colonial Secretary: No not quite so high?

Hon. G. RANDELL: While one had a good deal of sympathy with those desiring to obtain nurses who would undertake to work in the country, still, one must be careful to do nothing that would lower the standard. There were circumstances connected with the demand for nurses in the country which altered the position somewhat, for there the cases were mostly those in midwifery, where so high a qualification was not needed as in surgical cases and the fees charged were not so high. There was always the feeling that if certain nurses had qualifications inferior to others this fact would operate very seriously against them. It was absolutely necessary that in the City, at all events, the nurses should be as highly trained as possible on account of the many surgical cases dealt with, and it required nurses of a high order to treat such. A great deal depended upon the nurses in such cases. Members would

surely deprecate anything that would seriously interfere with the efficiency of the nurses or cause dissatisfaction in their ranks. So far as his experience went, there were in Perth nurses of a very high order, who had the confidence of a large number of people. Of course, the fees charged by those nurses were high, just as the more skilled surgeons received higher fees than those not so able. He intended to support the amendment. The board were the persons to frame the regulations as they had special expert knowledge, and would take good care to have a sufficient standard to obtain the confidence of the general public. That was what all desired.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: In other professions such as that of medicine, there were varying degrees of proficiency. Some of the doctors, for instance, had greater skill than others. Again, some universities had a higher standard than others, and probably it would be the same with regard to nurses qualifications. He, with others, was anxious that the standard should be sufficiently high to satisfy the public, but it should not be unreasonably high. The board might well be trusted to see that the standard was a good one. If it were not as high as that of the Australasian Trained Nurses' Association. those nurses who had higher degrees than others would naturally earn higher fees. The amendment should be carried, and the matter left to the board to decide.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: It was hard to see what nurses could have to object to, and why they wanted the clause struck out. There was already a very highly trained nurses' association. If nurses were not satisfied with the clause they need not register under it, there was no compulsion. The clause only gave a registered nurse power to call herself a registered trained nurse. If she did not think the standard was high enough she need not register herself.

Hon. R. LAURIE: Unless a nurse were registered under the board she should not be allowed to practice. The public should be protected against any chance of imposters acting as properly trained nurses. Mr. Kingsmill made the position very clear in his speech on the second reading of the Bill, and set out clearly how necessary it was that the standard of nursing should not be lowered. There might be a board which would know very little about nursing qualifications, and consist, to a certain extent, of medical practitioners who were not in constant touch with practical work, and, consequently, might lay down a lower standard than they should do.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. G. RANDELL: It would be necessary for paragraph *a* to be amended, as it did not seem right that nurses who had their full diplomas from recognised institutions should be compelled to pay the high registration fee of £1.

The Colonial Secretary: I am be quite prepared to have the fee reduced to 5s.

The Hon. G. RANDELL moved an amendment—

That in line 2 of Subclause 2 the words "one pound" be struck out and "five shillings" inserted in lieu.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It had been his intention to propose that the whole of Subclause *a* be struck out. He did not see why the nurses should be asked to pay a single penny.

The Colonial Secretary: The provision is only permissible.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: That being so he would support the amendment.

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

Hon. R. LAURIE: Was it the intention of the Colonial Secretary that Clause 254 should be reconsidered.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Clause 254 had been postponed, and he had promised to move an amendment, to the effect that nurses appearing on the registration should be entitled to elect one of the medical practitioners constituting the board.

Clause 267—agreed to.

Clause 268—Examination of School children:

Hon. G. RANDELL: The clause would be better placed if embodied in Clause 32. It had no connection whatever with the division in which it stood.

The CHAIRMAN: In the re-printing of the Bill the numbers of the clause

might be re-arranged without any action in Committee : but the clause would have to remain a clause and could not be inserted as a subclause.

Hon. G. Randell : That being so the clause ought to be made to stand as Clause 33.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : Certainly the clause should be transposed. In his opinion it should stand as Clause 34.

Hon. G. RANDELL : That would suit his views.

The CHAIRMAN : The Clerk has made a note of the desired alteration.

Clauses 269 to 272—agreed to.

Clause 280—Duty of police officers :

Hon. A. G. JENKINS : Apparently the Parliamentary draftsman had an idea that the police were infallible. In Subclause 2 power was given to a policeman to ask a person's name and address ; and if, in the opinion of the policeman, that person gave an incorrect name and address, it was in the power of the policeman to lock that person up. He moved—

That in line 3 of Subclause 2 the words "or who, in the opinion of such officer, states a false name or place of abode" be struck out.

Hon. R. W. PENNEFATHER : Presumably the Minister would agree to this amendment. The House had objected to this provision being inserted in the other Bills, and there was no reason why it should be inserted in this. It was too great a power to give to a constable.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : No objection would be offered to the amendment.

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

Clause 281—Power to take possession of and lease property on which expenses are due :

Hon. C. A. PIESSE : Some explanation seemed desirable in respect to that portion or the clause which stated that the local authority might take possession of such land or premises, and hold the same as against any person interested therein. Was it not altogether a new power to give ?

The Colonial Secretary : It is in the present Act.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE : That was not in itself sufficient justification. He moved—

That the words in line 4 "and may hold the same as against any person interested therein" be struck out.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : The corresponding section of the existing Act was practically the same. He would suggest that the clause be postponed and considered at the end of the Bill. In the meantime it could be looked into.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved—

That the clause be postponed.

Motion passed, the clause postponed.

Clauses 282 to 304—agreed to.

Progress reported.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1, Abattoirs ; 2, Opium Smoking Prohibition ; 3, Redemption of Annuities (received from the Legislative Assembly).

House adjourned at 9·35 p.m.