

conducting it. Another feature of the Bill is that the president is to be one of the Government representatives, and nominated by the Government. I think this is a wise provision. As a matter of fact, in the past, with only one exception, the president has been one of the Government nominees. But, in order that there may be no misconception on this point, I want to say that, during the time one of the representatives of the insurance companies was chairman of the board, no fault was ever found with his conduct of affairs, and this provision is not intended in any way to reflect on the fact that one of the insurance companies' representatives was at one time chairman of the board. I do not think the board ever had a more efficient, more painstaking, or more single-minded chairman than Mr. Basil Burray. But it is considered desirable that the chairman of the board should be one of the Government's nominees. In this respect the Bill follows the South Australian and New South Wales Acts. This also was one of the requests made by the 40 local authorities who were contributors to the board's funds, and who waited on me during last September. An amending Fire Brigades Bill was passed in Victoria in 1915, and an amending Bill was passed in South Australia in 1913. Both of those Acts have been carefully studied in the compilation of the Bill now before the House, and as far as the Government can provide, it contains the best features of those Acts, embodying them with what we believe to be the sound features of the Act at present on our statute-book. There are, of course, many features of the Bill which hon. members will wish to discuss in Committee, but I think I have sufficiently explained its provisions, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 8th March, 1917.

	PAGE
Questions: Chaff, high price	2224
Base metals, treatment	2224
Sewerage system and City Council premises	2225
Esperance-Northward railway construction	2225
Mines Department employee	2226
Collic coal miners and Arbitration award	2226
Bills: Ports and Harbours, 2a., Com., 3a	2226
Early Closing Act Amendment, petition, 2a., Com.	2227
Friendly Societies Act Amendment, Council's Message	2235
Mental treatment, 2a., Com., 3a.	2235
Special Lease (Stirling Estate) Council's amendments	2246

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

QUESTION—CHAFF, HIGH PRICE.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Industries: 1, As it is generally conceded that there is sufficient hay stocked to supply the State chaff requirements for over twelve months, can he explain why chaff continues at such a high price? 2, If not, will he investigate the matter, and take action if he finds the market is cornered?

The MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIES replied: 1, I do not know that there is a sufficient supply of hay in the State to meet our requirements for over 12 months. 2, I have no power to take any action in the matter.

QUESTION—BASE METALS, TREATMENT.

Mr. HUDSON asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Has his attention been drawn to a report appearing in the *West Australian* of the 28th ultimo of a deputation representing the Mines Departments of New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland, which waited on the Prime Minister at Sydney on the 27th February last? 2, Are the statements relating to the exportation of base metals from Western Australia made therein correct? 3, Has the Government been asked to establish a refinery in Western Australia for the treatment of base metals? 4, Does the Government intend to do so? 5,

What action has been taken by the Government to secure the treatment of base metals produced in Western Australia on reasonable terms?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Yes. 2, The only statement is that of Mr. Jones, viz., "Western Australia is allowed to export copper, silver, lead, and zinc," which is only partially correct. These metals, in the metallic marketable condition, are allowed to be exported from Western Australia as from other parts of Australia under the conditions imposed by the Federal authorities. Ores of these metals which can be treated within Australia are not allowed to be exported, but in a few special cases export has been permitted by the Federal Government under specified restriction and conditions. Each such shipment requires special authorisation from the Federal Government. 3, The Federal Government have suggested that the Fremantle and Ravensthorpe smelting works be extended to deal with other metals besides the lead and copper at present smelted there, in order that Western Australian metallic ores may be smelted within the State. This does not necessarily involve carrying the process of treatment to the final stage of producing refined metals. 4, At present the suggested scheme does not appear to be practicable, but the matter is receiving attention with a view to action in the direction indicated when such becomes justifiable. 5, The Government is making cash advances on ores of the base metals, and shipping and selling these for ore-producers at bare cost. The Phillips River smelting works have been leased from their owner, and are being operated by the Government to treat the copper and gold ores of the Phillips River district at actual cost. The Fremantle Trading Company's smelting works at Fremantle are under obligation to the Government to purchase non-argentiferous lead ores from the public on a tariff approved by the Government, and which is generally more favourable to the ore-sellers of this State than the tariffs obtaining at present in Port Pirie or Newcastle. Representations have been made to the Prime Minister by both the present and the late Government urging him to permit export of ores from this State to Great Britain unless they can be treated in

Australia with an equally good financial return to the ore-producers, and exception has been taken to the action of the Federal authorities in forcing all ores to be treated at Australian works without also first binding such works not to exceed reasonable charges for treatment, which should be subject to Government approval.

QUESTION—SEWERAGE SYSTEM AND CITY COUNCIL PREMISES.

Mr. SMITH asked the Minister for Water Supply: Will he see that the City Council have their premises and those of their Chinese tenants sewered as well as private owners?

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLY replied: Representations have been made to the Perth City Council in the matter of connecting with the sewers premises on properties acquired by the Council. At the request of the Council the matter was allowed to remain temporarily in abeyance, the Council paying sewerage rates meanwhile. It is understood that the Council is considering a scheme for developing these lands in connection with the City improvements, and is disinclined to incur the expense of installing house drainage meanwhile as some, if not all, of these premises will have to be demolished. This has been confirmed by reference to the Town Clerk to-day. The matter is being followed up by the department.

QUESTION—RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, ESPERANCE-NORTHWARD, RESUMPTION.

Hon. T. WALKER asked the Premier: Before the House prorogues, will he afford the House an opportunity of considering the motion standing in my name relating to resumption of construction work on the Esperance-Northward railway?

The PREMIER replied: Although I am of opinion that it would serve no good purpose to discuss the matter until the report of the Royal Commission is available, I will endeavour to give an opportunity of considering the motion referred to.

QUESTION—MINES DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE.

Hon. P. COLLIER asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Has one J. J. East been employed by the Mines Department recently? 2, What date did he commence duty, and what particular work is he engaged upon? 3, What salary or allowance does he receive? 4, What is Mr. East's particular standing in mining circles, and what are his qualifications for the work upon which he is now employed? 5, Is there not an adequate well-trained staff of permanent officers in the department qualified to report and advise upon all or any of the matters which now find employment for this self-credentialed so-called mining expert? 6, What was the purpose and result of his visit to the Esperance district, and what was the cost of same? 7, Is it intended to employ Mr. East in connection with any scheme of prospecting for oil in the South-West portion of the State?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Yes. 2, He was employed from 13th December, 1916, to 3rd January, 1917, and again from the 9th February, 1917, to 3rd March, 1917, and was engaged in examining portion of the Esperance district, and in obtaining some information on the Eastern goldfields. 3, £1 1s. per day, with travelling allowances on public service scale. 4, Mr. East's standing in mining circles is a matter of individual opinion, and the qualifications for the work on which he has been employed are his knowledge as a mining man, and his ability to collect information and present it in a lucid form. 5, Yes; but no member of the staff was available when Mr. East was engaged. 6, The object of his visit was to locate a mineral deposit reported by the late Surveyor General Roe. The result was that the deposit was located, but it proved to be of no value. The cost of the trip was £41 1s. 6d. 7, The question of the employment of Mr. East or any other person will be determined after a scheme for prospecting for oil in the south-west portion of the State is finalised.

QUESTION—COLLIE COAL MINERS AND THE ARBITRATION AWARD.

Mr. A. A. WILSON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, As the Railway Depart-

ment is paying fully 3s. per ton increase in price for Newcastle coal under Judge Edmund's award, is it the intention of the Government to pay a commensurate increase for the local fuel; if so, when, and what amount per ton? 2, Is he aware that the coal miners of the Eastern States received up to 20 per cent. increase in their wages through the medium of Judge Edmund's award? 3, Is he aware that Collie miners have received no increase through Judge Edmund's award? 4, Will he see that the Government pay Collie coal its just increase, and so give fair play to Collie miners?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, The matter is under consideration. 2, No. I believe, however, that there has been an increase in wages under the award. 3, Yes. 4, The desire of the Government is to deal fairly by the industry, and the matter is under consideration.

BILL—PORTS AND HARBOURS.

Second Reading.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister—Perth) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: It is not necessary for me to speak at any length on this measure as it is purely of a formal character. On the advice of the Crown Solicitor this short Bill was prepared because it was believed that no legal control existed in regard to the Perth Waters. In 1860 an ordinance was passed, called the Customs Ordinance of 1860, which gave power to deal with certain navigable rivers and harbours of Western Australia. Later on the Act was repealed and the powers were included in the Customs Act of 1902. The control of the Customs administration and legislation became a Federal matter when Federation was brought into existence, and it is therefore doubtful whether there is any legal authority to proclaim the Perth waters and the Melville water from Fremantle bridge as far as it is navigable up the river. This is a Bill to give the Chief Harbour Master power to control the Perth waters or any navigable river. That power is supposed to exist to-day but if anything in the nature of an action was brought about, it is questionable whether this power would hold good. To put the matter

beyond doubt this Bill is introduced, so that there may be legal control exercised over the Perth waters or any other navigable river that may exist in the State. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

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

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Petition.

Mr. VERYARD (Leederville) [4.45]: I have a petition to present from the master hairdressers asking that there should not be any alteration of the existing Early Closing Act. The petition is in conformity with the Standing Orders of the House. I move—

That the petition be received and read.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I submit that the wording of the petition is of no value until we know who signed it and how many signatures there are on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member who presents the petition is obliged to see that it conforms with the rules of the House.

The Premier: There are about two dozen signatures on the petition.

Question put and passed; petition received and read.

Second Reading.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister—Perth) [4.48] in moving the second reading said: It is not necessary for me to say very much on this Bill because a glance will reveal that it is self-explanatory. Its purpose is to bring the hairdressing establishments into line with other businesses. At the present time under the Early Closing Act the hairdressers close their establishments on Wednesday afternoon and remain open on Saturday afternoon. It is considered by the hairdressing trade that it is unfair to them that they should have to remain at work while others are enjoying the Saturday half-holiday.

It is not a question of whether we believe in the principle of early closing or not; it is a question that the Saturday half-holiday is now recognised as universal throughout the State, and the Bill is the result of a petition of some 6,000 people asking that the half-holiday for the hairdressers be made uniform with that of other businesses in the State. Hon. members will readily understand that it is an anomaly that hairdressers should be compelled to close on Wednesday afternoon and so inconvenience the public a great deal, and have to remain open on Saturday afternoon when no one requires their services. At any rate, that argument applies to the City. Some little inconvenience may be caused in other parts, but, as in other things, somebody must suffer a slight inconvenience.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It only suits the City.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): It suits more than the City. The point is, why should hairdressers be treated differently from others? We might just as well argue that it is wrong to imprison a man or fine him for selling a pound of sugar after 6 o'clock, or to allow a carpenter or bricklayer to work after that hour.

Mr. Underwood: You allow carpenters to work when they like, so what are you talking about?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): That is exactly my argument. We can argue that it is improper to allow carpenters to work after 6 o'clock, but we must not allow grocers' assistants to work. At any rate that is beside the question. The question is that the Bill provides that the Saturday half-holiday shall apply to hairdressers in exactly the same way as it does to other businesses. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. SCADDAN (Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [4.52]: I am not going to oppose the second reading of the Bill because I am of the opinion that a majority of the hairdressers in the metropolitan area are desirous of closing on Saturday afternoon. There is no reason why one section of the shopkeepers should be exempt from the Early Closing Act.

Mr. Underwood: You should close tea shops at the same time.

Hon. J. SCADDAN: I would have no objection to that if a majority desired it. It is all a matter of opinion, after all. I am not a frequent visitor to the hairdressing establishments, and under those circumstances I am not so intimately concerned as some of my friends around me who have such a fine crop that they require to visit the hairdresser frequently. That, however, is beside the point. Requests have been made on numerous occasions for a Bill of this nature. I cannot understand why those who desire to visit the hairdressing establishments cannot do so at a time so that the hairdressers might be free on Saturday afternoon.

Mr. Underwood: A man cannot send his face to the barber's while he is at work.

Hon. J. SCADDAN: The only point in connection with the Bill is that it is not easy to follow because one has to turn up the principal Act to learn how it applies. The Bill of course really means that the hairdressers will fall into line with the other shopkeepers and that if there should be a change from Saturday to Wednesday closing it will apply to hairdressers as well as other shopkeepers. There are too many establishments open on Saturday afternoon.

Mr. Underwood: Close the tea shops too.

Hon. J. SCADDAN: I am talking about the hairdressers now.

Mr. Willmott: You might as well close the fruit shops too.

Hon. J. SCADDAN: I am surprised at the hon. member for Nelson talking about closing fruit shops when he is desirous of finding ways and means for disposing of fruit.

Mr. Willmott: I am not desirous.

Hon. J. SCADDAN: What? I am astounded at the hon. member saying he is not desirous of disposing of fruit. I recognise that there are certain forms of business which must be carried on even on Saturday, but only those businesses which are really essential to the public convenience should be conducted on Saturday afternoon. There is no reason at all why the hairdressers should not close on Saturday. My view of the matter is that if the public are inconvenienced by the

proposed change they will soon make a demand that the hairdressers should reopen their establishments on Saturday. In the meantime we might make the experiment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [4.58]: For some considerable time there was an agitation for the closing of the hairdressing establishments on Saturday afternoons, but there was a good deal of opposition to it from the hairdressers themselves. A great majority of the hairdressers employed by the owners of saloons in the metropolitan area have for years been doing their utmost to get the establishments closed at one o'clock on Saturday because they realise that by so doing they will also bring about the closing of the suburban shops to a large extent. In many suburban shops, however, the owners themselves are carrying on the business and it is known that they get as many as they possibly can inside their doors before one o'clock and that then they are obliged to attend to those customers, often carrying on their work until as late as 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Foley: They are only allowed an hour.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is no time mentioned. A deputation waited upon me in connection with this matter and I pointed out that the suburban shop-keeper did the bulk of his business on a Saturday afternoon.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): That applies right through the Early Closing Act.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: And I put before the deputation the position of a man who is employed throughout the morning if it were impossible for him to be shaved in the afternoon. In the case of such a man the Hay-street hairdresser says, "We will sell him a razor and he may shave himself." The position then would be that the man, having obtained a razor with which to shave himself on Saturday, would shave himself on Monday also, and the hairdressers would then find that in securing the closing of the shops on Saturday afternoon they will be injuring their own trade. The majority of men will not be satisfied with shaving on Friday in readiness for Sunday, and the result will be many will purchase razors and shave themselves.

In certain trades and callings it is essential in the interests of the public that they shall remain open at certain times. It would be equally logical to say we should close the tea shops in Perth and Fremantle on Saturday afternoon because a man can buy his own tea just as he can buy his own razor. If there is anything in that argument, why should we not also stop our trams and trains from running on Saturday afternoon, if it is right that the hairdresser should be given his weekly half-holiday on Saturday? Such things can sometimes be carried too far. It has to be remembered too, that the other shops contained in the schedule to the principal Act were closed on Saturdays as the result of a referendum to the people. I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill, as it is the request of a large majority of hairdresser employers, as well as employees, but at the same time I think that those who are advocating this measure are doing an injury to their own trade.

Mr. WILLMOTT (Nelson) [5.4]: I should not have risen to speak on this Bill had it not been that I think I was slightly misrepresented in connection with an interjection I made just now. I want it to be distinctly understood in this House and elsewhere that I did not say it was desirable to close fruit shops on Saturdays. I say fruit shops should be open on seven days a week so as to allow people an opportunity of getting that much needed and helpful fruit.

Hon. J. Scaddan: Why could they not get that food on the six days as is done in the case of other food?

Mr. WILLMOTT: I say they should be open on seven days of the week in order that people might be able to get their fruit fresh. It has to be remembered that were it not for a defect in the original Bill we would not be discussing this measure to-day. In the principal Act every class of business is included in the schedule with the exception of hairdressing saloons, and I think it right that we should give these people an opportunity, if they choose, of closing on Saturday afternoons. They have expressed a desire to be permitted to close on Saturday afternoons and I think it would be unfair for this House to act contra to their wishes. Any inconvenience

which the public may suffer as a result would be nothing compared with the great convenience which would be conferred on the employees of our hairdressing establishments. As things now are, those employees who have relatives working in other lines of business which close on Saturday find themselves divided when taking their pleasure on Saturday. They are ostracised, for while they take their recreation on Wednesday their families are free of business on Saturday. The effect is to break up families, and the arrangement presses most unfairly on the employees of hairdressers in the metropolitan area.

Mr. VERYARD (Leederville) [5.8]: There have been complaints by master hairdressers between Fremantle and Midland Junction of the loss of trade and the inconvenience which will be occasioned to their patrons if this amending Bill be passed. I think it is well that the House should be seized of the position. If this Bill becomes law there are many working people who will find it impossible to attend at their hairdressing saloon before one o'clock in the day.

Hon. J. Scaddan: You did not take that aspect into account when you wanted to close the hotels on the fields before eleven o'clock although the men do not knock off till one o'clock.

Mr. VERYARD: I do not think the present time opportune for making this change. If as a result of the passing of this Bill many persons find it impossible to visit the hairdresser on Saturday afternoon, owing to the limited time, they will attend to their own wants and as a result the trade will suffer permanently. I would point out that the trade has already suffered considerably by the enlistment of some thousands of our citizens, particularly in the metropolitan area. A petition has already been presented on this matter, and I have since received a letter from one master hairdresser who did not have the opportunity of signing the petition. It has to be remembered that petition was very hurriedly prepared, and that the people interested in the question had no idea that this amendment was to be introduced until matters were well forward in connection with this legislation. The

writer of the letter I have referred to points out how practically impossible it will be for the trade, particularly in the suburban districts, to be maintained if they are compelled to close on Saturdays after one o'clock. It has already been pointed out that not only will the masters be suffering a loss but that some ten or fifteen thousand citizens of the metropolitan area will also be inconvenienced. Those people make it a practice to wait upon the hairdresser every Saturday afternoon. The suburban hairdressers will certainly be sufferers if this Bill be passed, because it will be impossible for them to remain in business in competition with the City businesses if Saturday closing is enforced. When in Committee it is my intention to move an amendment to Clause 3 which will bring the law in conformity with the law in Victoria. The provision there, which I can regard as a wise one, is that the option is given to persons engaged in this trade whether they shall close on Wednesday or on Saturday afternoon. That arrangement would meet the wishes of members, I believe, and I am also sure that it will meet the wishes of persons engaged in the trade. The people interested in this business have already intimated that they will be satisfied if they be given this option. The amendment I propose to move will be to delete Clause 3, which proposes to amend Section 11 of the Act, and to insert in its place the provisions of the Victorian Act, which provide that a master hairdresser shall have the option of closing between defined hours on either Wednesday or Saturday. It is also provided that when the hairdressers shall have made their choice they cannot alter it for three months. My proposals will give them the option of closing on the Wednesday or the Saturday, and I think that will meet the case. We must endeavour to protect the hairdressers in the suburbs as against those in the City.

Mr. FOLEY (Mt. Leonora) [5-17]: It is not my intention to oppose the second reading. The Bill is said to be likely to detrimentally affect the suburban hairdressers. I believe that practically all the employees desire to have the Saturday afternoon holiday. No harm will be done to the owners of the City shops if they close on Saturday, but to meet the wishes of the suburban shopowners we should

have a provision giving to those of them who do their own work the right to keep open until 2 or 3 o'clock on the Saturday afternoon. In the Early Closing Act the small shop provisions give the small shopkeepers the right to keep their establishments open until 8 o'clock, whereas others in a larger way of business have to close at 6 o'clock. In the case of the small hairdresser doing his own work we should provide for him a similar privilege. Alternatively I would suggest the appointment of a small committee consisting of Messrs. Allen, Veryard, and Taylor to go into the question and consider it in all its bearings.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret) [5-20]: There is no doubt about the necessity for the Bill, but I am afraid the measure goes beyond what is desirable. The proprietors of hairdressing saloons in the City really do no hairdressing themselves. The Bill is to protect the employees. If it does that, it is all that is required. In Committee I will endeavour to amend the Bill, making it apply only to the Assembly electoral districts of Perth, West Perth and East Perth. That will cover those parts of the metropolitan area in which hairdressers' employees are to be found, and it will leave the hairdresser in outlying centres who employs no assistants free to keep his establishment open. Such a man will be able to continue his operations on the Saturday afternoon without in any way cutting into the trade of the bigger hairdressers in the City. If we make the Bill apply to the whole of the metropolitan area it will have the effect of closing up a number of hairdressing saloons in which no employees are engaged. I do not think it is the function of Parliament to do that. We should be able to protect those who require protection without interfering with the rights of others. If we pass the Bill as it stands the House will be taking the responsibility of closing up hairdressing saloons without a referendum; in other words, Schedule 4 of the Early Closing Act will not apply.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): The Bill does not touch that at all. It alters Wednesday to Saturday, that is all.

Mr. TAYLOR: But what about the referendum?

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister) : The referendum was taken for the whole of the metropolitan area in 1912.

Mr. TAYLOR : The hairdressers who voted on that occasion have all gone. They were never brought within the scope of the Early Closing Act. The Bill will bring in the hairdressers without any further referendum.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister) : Another referendum could be taken.

Mr. TAYLOR : But the Bill places the responsibility on Parliament instead of on the electors. We are dealing only with hairdressers. As I have said, there is necessity for the measure, but there is also necessity to protect the tradesmen in the outlying districts. Under my proposal, we would be doing all that is desirable for the hairdressers in Perth.

Mr. GRIFFITHS (York) [5-25] : Only the other day, in conversation a Subiaco barber pointed out to me that on five days of the week his takings did not exceed 8s. or 9s. and that Saturday was the only day on which his takings were at all substantial. He said that if the Bill passed he would have to close down. The proposal that it should be optional for the barber to close on the Wednesday or the Saturday should meet the position very well.

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [5-26] : A large proportion of the population of Perth consists of employees in one or another industry. If we are going to close all the shops at the same time, where are those employees to get their customary hair cut and shave ?

Mr. NAIRN (Swan) [5-27] : This is a very small matter, but nevertheless one to which we should give a good deal more consideration than has been given this afternoon. Most of us have occasion to visit the barber, but apparently very few here realise what effect the Bill will have on those engaged in the calling. If we are to injure a man's business it is of little moment whether it is as small as a barber's shop or as big as a warehouse. Before we do any man an injury we should have full knowledge of the subject, which, in this case, we do not seem to have. Personally, I hope the Bill will not be persisted in, for I feel that some injury is likely to be done if the Bill is passed. Many assistants are employed in the hair-

dressing saloons on Saturdays only, Saturday being the busy day in the trade. Are we to take their employment from those men ? Again, while it is proposed to close the shaving end of the saloon, someone in the shop part will be selling tobacco and cigarettes which could reasonably have been bought 24 hours earlier and put away until required. Thousands of people like to have what they call a clean up on Saturday.

Mr. Taylor : That is what we want here.

Mr. NAIRN : The phase that appeals to me is that someone's livelihood will be seriously affected by this Bill ; and therefore we should hesitate.

Mr. S. STUBBS (Wagin) [5-30] : I have read the petition, which contains the names of reputable business men such as Saunders and Nathan, and others who have been engaged in business for 25 years in this City.

Mr. Taylor : Neither Saunders nor Nathan has ever had a razor in his hand.

Mr. S. STUBBS : I will not be a party to the committing of any injustice, therefore I shall support the amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (Greenough) [5-31] : It has been suggested that if hairdressing saloons are closed on Saturday afternoon they will lose a deal of business. That seems only natural, as, when other businesses close, their employees visit the saloons for a shave or a haircut or both. Saturday afternoon is likely to be the best time of business for hairdressers, and to close them up on that afternoon will deprive them of the best half-day's business they get through the week. A proposal has been made to exclude from this Bill hairdressing saloons in the suburbs which are carried on solely by the proprietor. In that case the hairdressers in the city should also be exempt. To close their establishments on Saturday afternoon will mean that many people will be forced to shave themselves, and the ultimate result will be that the proprietors of City hairdressing saloons will reduce hands. Thus, the employees will, in the end, be the sufferers. I favour the amendment.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [5-33] : I suggest to the Minister in charge of the Bill that he agree to an adjournment for a day or two, in order that a way may be

found out of the many difficulties to which attention has been drawn. I quite agree that the men employed in city hairdressing saloons should have their half-holiday on Saturday, in the same way as other employees. But we cannot overlook the fact that in the suburbs, in North Perth, Mt. Lawley, Subiaco, and indeed throughout the suburbs the hairdressing saloons are nearly all one-man shows in which a capital of perhaps £30 or £40 has been embarked. Those establishments earn practically half their weekly takings on Saturday afternoon. The effect on them of the Bill must be to close them up. To allow them to keep open on Saturday afternoon will inflict no hardship or inconvenience on city employees. Certainly their being allowed to remain open will be a convenience to large numbers whose only opportunity to have a shave is on Saturday afternoon.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): That argument applies all through early closing.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No. If I want a pair of boots I can buy them during the week; but a shave three or four days old is not of much use to me on Sunday. Thousands of working men knock off at one o'clock on Saturday.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): At twelve o'clock.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Allowing that, it still means that these men must rush straight away from their work to the hairdresser.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): They have Friday night.

Hon. P. COLLIER: True; but if they get their shave on Friday night it means that they will not have clean faces on Sunday, or when they go to work on Monday. If there is a day on which a man likes to be clean it is Sunday. The difficulty might be overcome by adopting the suggestion of the member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor), to exclude small suburban shops. I would not, however, deprive the hairdressers' assistants of the Saturday half-holiday; though I do not think the House is justified in taking away the living of a number of small men in the suburbs.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson—Sussex) [5-36]: I hope the House will pass the Bill without further discussion. It

seems to me that there cannot be a single argument raised against this measure that could not be raised against the whole of the Early Closing Act, which is the law of the land. To me it is amazing to find hon. members who in the past have advocated the closing up of every industry on Saturday afternoon now refusing to extend to the employees of this little industry of hairdressing the same benefits which other enjoy. I know many of us thought, in years gone by, that the introduction of early closing legislation in this State meant ruination. We argued on the same lines as have been adopted this afternoon. We feared that early closing would prove disastrous. But the majority prevailed and the legislation was passed; and I do not think to-day there will be found one dissenting voice against the Saturday afternoon half-holiday. It is supported on the ground of the benefit to public health, if on no other. I cannot for a moment understand why the hairdressers' assistants should be debarred from a Saturday half-holiday when it is granted to the shopkeepers' assistants and other employees. If it is suggested that we should protect one individual as against another, the only logical procedure is to restore to every individual his full liberty and revert to the system of times gone by, doing away with the Early Closing Act. According to my observation, most of the hairdressing saloons in the towns at any rate are empty all Saturday afternoon and during most of Saturday evening too. The employees are simply compelled to attend in the saloons, doing little or no work. It is much better that these employees should have Saturday afternoon free to enjoy with their families, than that they should be forced to remain in the hairdressing saloons with little or nothing to do. Of course, no legislation of this description can be passed without injuring somebody; and I have no doubt that some small tradespeople in the suburbs have suffered through our early closing legislation. But I cannot conceive of any argument applying to a suburban hairdresser that does not apply equally to the suburban storekeeper. If we are going to legislate for one section of the community and exclude another section, then our legislation will be unfair. I think we would do well to pass the Bill and so give hair-

dressers' assistants the right which undoubtedly they ought to have in common with other workers, to a Saturday half-holiday. There is in the Colonial Secretary's office now a petition bearing 4,000 signatures in favour of hairdressing saloons closing on Saturday afternoon. There have been previous petitions and deputations on the subject. I myself have been approached by various deputations on this matter during the last seven or eight years. The member for Boulder (Hon. P. Collier) urges that a man must have his shave on Saturday night in order to be cleaned up for Monday morning.

Hon. P. Collier : No ; for Sunday.

The PREMIER : Does not the man have to get a clean up on Monday night, Tuesday night, and other week nights ?

Hon. P. Collier : That is absurd.

The PREMIER : The hairdressers' assistants are entitled to the Saturday half-holiday, or else the workers who get it now through legislation which has been passed are not entitled to it. We should either do away with the whole thing, or else let the hairdressers' assistants have the same facilities as other employees have for enjoying the week end.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister—Perth—in reply) [5-43] : I scarcely thought it necessary to say anything in introducing the Bill, and I certainly did not expect to be called on to reply. Like the Premier, I am greatly surprised at the opinions which have been expressed from the other side of the House. All the arguments used this afternoon I remember as having been hurled at my head in the past, when I was not particularly keen on the principles of enforced early closing.

Mr. Green : And now you are the champion of the workers.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister) : I always have been. Seventeen or 18 years ago, when early closing legislation was first introduced, it was badly needed to prevent unscrupulous shopkeepers from working their employees very long hours indeed. Later, however, the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act was passed, and under that measure the hours of employees were legally fixed. Thus there was no longer any real necessity for the retention of the Early Closing Act. The argument advanced to-day on behalf

of the small suburban hairdresser applies equally to every shopkeeper affected by the Early Closing Act. Only recently Sir Charles Goode, the head of Goode, Durrant & Co., Ltd., mentioned in the course of conversation that some 60 years ago, when his firm first started, he himself got together a connection by selling late in the evenings in a suburb. It is not possible for young Sir Charles Goodes to do that nowadays, by reason of the Early Closing Act. That measure certainly helps the big man as against the small man. But that is beside the question, because the principle of closing shops at six o'clock has been accepted, and also the principle of the Saturday half-holiday.

Hon. P. Collier : But do not you see the difference between a grocer or a draper and a hairdresser ?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister) : No, I do not. Surely the member does not argue that the journeying hairdresser who has a little money to start on his own should be entitled to any more consideration than the drapers assistant ? I take this opportunity of drawing attention to the inconsistency of members opposite and I refer more particularly to my friend the member for North-East Fremantle who introduced in 1911, and passed the present Early Closing Act. Now the very Act which he introduced, when we say that it shall be made universal he is opposed to it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Mr. Holman in the Chair ; Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 11 of Early Closing Act.

Mr. VERYARD : This clause should be deleted so that the new clause which I have indicated should be inserted in its place. The provision will do an injustice to a large number of those engaged in the hairdressing trade. It may assist a number of employees in regard to their holidays, but that is all. I desire to insert the clause which appears in the Victorian Act and which makes it optional for the trade to decide on which day the holiday shall be

held. The clients of hairdressers cannot await the convenience of the shopkeeper. If these shops are closed they will lose the trade. It is pointed out that injustices will be done. In one case a shopkeeper points out that he will lose no less than two-fifths of his income. All employees are entitled to get their holidays on Saturday if it can be arranged but the public should receive some consideration.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY : Clause 3 is the whole Bill and we have already decided the principle on the second reading. If members vote against Clause 3 they will be voting against the principle of early closing. The member for Leederville proposes to vote against the clause in order to substitute a provision leaving it optional to hairdressers to say whether they should close on Wednesday or Saturday. If that provision is inserted we shall have the whole trouble which arose in the past ; under the old Act we had a grocer keeping his shop open on one side of the street and another grocer closed on the other side of the street. This Bill is brought forward on a petition signed by 6,000 people in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Griffiths : Make it optional in the suburbs then.

Clause put and passed.

New Clause :

Mr. TAYLOR : I move—

That the following be inserted as a new clause :—“ That the foregoing provisions shall only apply to the Perth, West Perth and East Perth Electorates of the Legislative Assembly.”

I want to assist those in the metropolitan area who are wagos men and who desire to have their Saturday afternoon off. This Bill is not brought forward by the instrumentality of the proprietors, but at the instance of the industrial workers. The Hairdressers Association have been fighting for years to get their Saturday afternoon holiday. I want to protect the man in the suburb who employs no one but who gets his living practically on Saturday afternoons. The trend of our legislation is driving the business into the big man. Is there any part of the world where we can find larger emporiums than in the City of Perth ?

Hon. J. D. Connolly : Are you in favour of the repeal of the Early Closing Act then ?

Mr. TAYLOR : I am not. But the legislation that is passed has the tendency I have mentioned. It is making it hard for a new man to start. This Bill is going to place the responsibility on Parliament of closing up the hairdressers wherever it applies, without leaving the matter to a plebescite of the people. I want to protect the individual workers in the hairdressing industry. I am covering practically every employee in Perth but am not speaking of Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. Angwin : They want it too.

Mr. TAYLOR : And I know that outside people do not want these places kept open on Saturday afternoons because they are not in town at that time. In the suburban areas of Leederville, North Perth, or Subiaco, from two o'clock in the afternoons the streets are crowded and remain so up till about 9 o'clock at night. That is the only occasion when the workers have a chance of getting a clean up. They should have this Saturday afternoon, and the man who is his own employer should also be protected. My suggestion will also meet the convenience of the very section of the public which is least catered for in Parliament, namely, the workers. These are not able to afford to go to a barber every day like the member for East Perth, who has more jobs at his disposal than whiskers. I want to put East Perth on a proper footing, and on the same footing as West Perth and Perth. I trust the Minister will see the justice of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH : I support the amendment. It would be a great injustice to the working men in North Perth if they were unable to have their weekly clean up. In the City very few people patronise the saloons on Saturday afternoon, and the hairdressers are doing practically nothing all the time. In the outlying suburbs, however, where the shops are generally owned and worked by one man, there are crowds of people waiting to be attended to in these establishments. It would be a hardship upon the people concerned if these shops were closed up.

Mr. ALLEN : If the arguments that have been used apply to North Perth and Subiaco, they should equally apply to West Perth. In my constituency there are only a few of such shops, but the same arguments ought to be applicable to them. Between the hours of 2 o'clock and 6 o'clock on Saturday very little work is done in the

barbers' shops, but from 6 o'clock onwards there may be people who want to make use of them. It is only fair that this should be made to apply to other centres in the metropolitan area. The employees in these establishments need their half-holiday on Saturday, because on the Wednesday afternoon they have nowhere to go.

Hon. J. SCADDAN: I suggest to the Minister that the hairdressers should be allowed to keep open a little longer than the ordinary shops, and that they should be allowed to remain open until 2 o'clock on Saturdays. If there is any warrant for the extension of time on ordinary week days, there is a still greater warrant for the extension of time on Saturdays. Some of the workers only shave twice or three time a week, but nearly all of them shave on Saturday, and should have an opportunity of doing so. To meet the convenience of a fair proportion of their customers these shops should be allowed to keep open for half an hour or an hour after the other shops have closed.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	9
Noes	24

Majority against ..	15
---------------------	----

AYES.

Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Veryard
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Smith	Mr. Taylor
Mr. S. Stubbs	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Robinson
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Collier	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Connolly	Mr. Walker
Mr. Foley	Mr. Willmott
Mr. George	Mr. A. A. Willson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. F. Willson
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. O'Leighen
Mr. Mitchell	(Teller.)
Mr. Mullany	

New clause thus negativéd.

Hon. J. SCADDAN: I suggest that the Minister can get over the difficulty by allowing small hairdressers to register as small shopkeepers. In the schedule of the Bill hairdressers are included, but if they were removed from the schedule they could then register under Section 6 of the principal Act as small shopkeepers.

Mr. TAYLOR: Would I be in order in suggesting an amendment that the Bill should operate within a radius of half a mile of the post office?

The CHAIRMAN: The sense of the Committee has already been taken on that question and the amendment would not be in order. An amendment on the lines suggested by the leader of the Opposition, however, would be in order.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

Message from the Legislative Council received notifying that the amendment made by the Assembly had been agreed to.

BILL—MENTAL TREATMENT.

Second Reading.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister) [7.41] in moving the second reading said: This is a measure the introduction of which has been necessitated by the war. At the present time there is a great number of soldiers who, unfortunately, are returning from the Front with their minds more or less temporarily affected. Under our Lunacy Act it is not possible to treat patients in the hospital for the insane unless a certificate has been signed by at least two medical men certifying that the patient is insane. It would be highly undesirable to pronounce these unfortunate men insane, because they are not so in the true sense of the word. They are suffering more or less from shock and are consequently only temporarily mentally affected. The best place to treat such cases is in a hospital for the

insane, whether it be a public hospital or a private institution. It devolves upon the Federal Government to care for the wounded soldiers but the Federal Government do not control hospitals for the insane, and naturally cannot undertake the care of the men, and there is no Act in any of the States except Victoria under which such cases can be treated in public institutions. It has, therefore, been decided to submit this legislation. The Prime Minister recently wrote to the Premier of the State as follows :—

I have the honour, at the instance of my colleague the Treasurer, to draw your attention to the advisability of making special arrangements for the treatment of returned soldiers who are suffering mentally. It is understood that in each State except Victoria it is necessary that a certificate of lunacy be obtained before any person can be admitted into a mental hospital. This is undesirable, and I shall be glad if action can be taken in your State similar to that which is carried out in Victoria.

The Bill has been drafted on the lines of the Victorian Act, and it has no other object than to permit of the treatment of mentally affected soldiers without their having to be certified as lunatics. The Commonwealth authorities are quite willing to pay the State the cost of treatment of these soldiers, and have entered into arrangements accordingly.

Mr. Thomson: Is there any provision for appeal?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): There can be no necessity for an appeal. The patients will be in the Hospital for the Insane for mental treatment only, just as other patients may be in the Perth Public Hospital for bodily treatment.

Mr. Carpenter: Will they be separated from the other patients?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): They will be in their own divisions. A great many of them will not be put into the Hospital for the Insane proper, but will be in the observation wards either at Claremont or in the Perth Public Hospital. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [7.48]: Hon. members should be careful in passing the Bill. This is another of the attempts of the Federal authorities to get rid of their proper responsibilities. The Hospital for the Insane at Claremont has not sufficient accommodation for the number of inmates already there. All the wards are overcrowded. For the last two or three years there has been an outcry for additional accommodation at that institution.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): It does not necessarily follow that they will be treated at the Hospital for the Insane at all.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But they are being sent to that institution. The Federal authorities should have a special institution in which to deal with those patients. Some day one or other of those patients, or their relatives, will be applying for a position, or perhaps seeking to take out an insurance policy, involving the answering of a number of questions, including that of sanity. In such cases it will be of no avail, while admitting that the person was an inmate of the Hospital for the Insane, to contend that he was there under a special Act. It means the placing of an imposition on those men who are suffering from mental shock as the result of fighting the nation's battles. These men should be looked after by the Federal authorities and treated in a Federal institution.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): What difference would it make?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It may make all the difference in the world, not only to the men themselves, but even to their relatives.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): They must get better treatment in an established hospital for the insane than in a temporary institution.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Again, there is a possibility of some of those men who are being sent to Claremont suffering from nothing more than mental derangement becoming permanently insane as the result of their surroundings in that institution. They should be treated in an outside institution where they will not be regarded as lunatics. I am afraid that the effect of their being treated at Claremont will be detrimental to them in more ways than one. This is merely another of the many attempts

made by the Federal authorities to escape their obligations to the soldiers. Moreover, as I have said, there is no room at the Claremont asylum for any additional patients. I understand the Federal authorities have taken over a portion of the sanatorium at Wooroloo for the treatment of consumptive soldiers and are sending special nurses up there to deal with those men. Why cannot the Federal authorities provide a mental hospital in the same way? I regard the Bill as being exceedingly dangerous.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara) [9-55]: I regret that the Bill should have been introduced at all. I intend to oppose it. I have as much sympathy as any other man for the returned soldier, but I protest against this puff and self-advertisement about doing something for the returned soldier, something which is of no use to him. The Bill provides for the omission of the customary doctors' certificate. In ordinary cases this certificate is for the protection of the individual, and by removing the necessity for it we remove a vital protection which should be accorded to the affected soldier. Apparently the Ministry have not considered the Bill. Somebody has a bee in his bonnet and the Government, without giving due consideration to the proposal have said, "Yes, here is something more for the returned soldier; let us shove it in." Again, it is provided that soldiers mentally deranged may be received in licensed houses. If this is good for the returned soldier, it is good for everybody. We all have the greatest sympathy for any man, soldier or civilian, mentally deranged, and if we can do anything to relieve his condition it should be done. The Asylum for the Insane was instituted, not to punish deranged people, but if possible to cure them, and if there is any better method than the one we have adopted we should apply it to all. To say that we shall apply special methods to those of the returned soldiers who are mentally affected, and at the same time deny it to other citizens, is to put Parliament in a most invidious position. I trust the Minister will drop the Bill, because it will be useless to the soldiers.

Mr. CARPENTER (Fremantle) [7-59]: I had intended to stress the same point, namely, the possible danger of some injustice being

done to a returned soldier on the ground that he has some mental peculiarity in consequence of which he may be sent to an asylum without the certificate, or even the examination, of a mental expert. I quite believe the Bill has been introduced with good intentions, but I am equally sure the Government must admit there is a danger here when we withdraw from the soldier mentally afflicted the safeguard which we give to the civilian. I am not going to say one word against the men in charge of our military hospitals. I believe that in their special line they are good and capable surgeons; but a man may be a first class surgeon and still have no knowledge whatever of mental derangement; and it is quite possible that a soldier's natural peculiarities or natural obstreperousness might mislead a military surgeon into saying, "This is a case for mental treatment: I will put you somewhere else."

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): That is where the Inspector General of the Insane comes in. The man would not be kept a day longer for mental treatment than the Inspector General for the Insane says he should be.

Mr. CARPENTER: If that is so, why should we not take another step and say that the soldier should not be sent for mental treatment at all unless his case calls for it? Would it not be safer to first have an examination by a medical man who knows something about mental cases? My point is that I do not like the idea of allowing the medical officer of a military hospital to have the power to say to a soldier under his care, "I have done with you; I am going to send you to some place where mental cases are treated," and that this should be done without the calling in of a mental expert to endorse the military surgeon's opinion. There should be a safeguard that, before a man can be transferred from a military hospital to an institution for the treatment of mental cases, he should be examined by an expert in mental cases. Evidently the framers of the Bill have recognised the objection which has been voiced by the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) to putting, shall I say, the stigma upon a returned soldier of having been confined in a lunatic asylum.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): And that is exactly what we are now doing.

Mr. CARPENTER: The framers of the Bill have recognised the objection; but the Bill does provide that soldiers may be sent to a lunatic asylum, though that action is modified by the proposal to farm mentally deficient soldiers out, to place them in the care of someone with a boarding-house, provided that the someone pledges himself to look after him and to observe certain conditions.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Would a boarding-house come under the provisions of the Lunacy Act?

Mr. CARPENTER: I refer to that clause of the Bill which provides that any person, for payment or not, if and so long as he complies with the conditions imposed by the regulations under this measure—we do not know what the regulations are going to be—may receive to board or lodge or may take charge of any person who comes under this measure.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Provided the regulations under the Act are complied with.

Mr. CARPENTER: I repeat, we do not know what the regulations are going to be.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): What is your complaint?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We do not want returned soldiers sent to the asylum at all.

Mr. CARPENTER: That is the point. Returned soldiers who are mentally affected should be placed somewhere under the care of a medical man qualified to treat them, and not placed with a boarding-house keeper. If this were provided by the Bill, I do not think there would be any objection whatever to the measure. The necessary amendment could be made by striking out the first part of the clause and then amplifying the clause.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): That would bring us back to the boarding-house keeper.

Mr. CARPENTER: No, the very opposite. The Bill as it stands gives the boarding-house keeper a chance to get a patient or two who may or may not be well looked after. The Commonwealth Government by arrangement with the State could

set up a temporary hospital to which mental cases among the soldiers might be sent for proper care under a qualified man. Everything of course depends upon the administration of this Bill. I object to a military surgeon being empowered to decide on mental questions without the man who is concerned having any redress. In the case of a returned soldier who was a nuisance in the military hospital, the military surgeon might want to get rid of him. Then the soldier, being sent to such an institution, would have to remain there until someone else—who we do not know—says he may come out. A semi-private institution should be established to which returned soldiers mentally affected may be transferred; not as to a lunatic asylum at all, but as to a place in which such cases might receive private treatment without incurring the stigma of having been confined in a lunatic asylum. I hope the Government will take steps to give practical effect to that idea.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [8.10]: As I read the clause on which the member for Fremantle (Mr. Carpenter) has commented, it allows any person to receive cases under this Bill, whether for payment or not. Unless some provision of this nature is made, it will be impossible for a parent to keep within his house a son who has returned from the war, suffering from temporary mental affliction as the result of wounds or shock. As the law stands, anyone suffering from mental disorder comes under the Lunacy Act, and in the absence of a provision of this kind it is impossible for the friends of returned soldiers to take charge of them in such circumstances. In many instances all that is necessary to bring about a cure is the affectionate care of friends and relatives, the question being purely one of time. To-day I saw a returned soldier who has been affected in a most peculiar manner by what he has gone through at the Front. He says that when his mind tells him he wants to go forward, his body goes backwards; and he has lost all sense of direction. All that this case requires is care in a home.

Mr. Green: The case suffers from the same trouble as your Government.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I did not hear the hon member's interjection,

which was probably a jest. For my part I am speaking seriously, and I do not consider this a matter for jesting. Under the law as it stands, a case of the kind I have described cannot be treated at home. I have known several cases of people who were restored by the care of their friends and relatives, but who, except for such care, would have necessarily been committed to a lunatic asylum. This Bill, if it becomes an Act, will, I take it, be administered with great care and consideration. Certainly, any military surgeon or any other man who would off-hand send a patient to a lunatic asylum would be acting most wrongfully. Where the necessary care can be given at home, the case should be treated at home; but that cannot be done unless this provision or some provision like it, becomes law.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson—Sussex) [8.12]: There seems to be some misconception with regard to the measure. It has been brought in at the request of the Federal authorities in order that there might be in the different States establishments where soldiers temporarily incapacitated in this direction might be treated, without having any stigma attached to them. A letter written by the Prime Minister to me on the 25th January last states—

I have the honour, at the instance of my colleague the Treasurer, to draw your attention to the advisability of making special arrangements for the treatment of returned soldiers who are suffering mentally. It is understood that in each State except Victoria it is necessary that a certificate of lunacy be obtained before any person can be admitted into a mental hospital. This is undesirable—
Mr. Hudson: Does he give any reason why it is undesirable?

The PREMIER: The undesirableness is obvious. We do not want the stigma of lunacy attached to a soldier who is suffering only temporarily from mental disorder due, say, to shell shock.

Mr. Hudson: Do you propose to put such a soldier in with the other patients?

The PREMIER: If he can be kept separate, it will be done.

Mr. Hudson: There ought to be some guarantee of his being kept separate.

The PREMIER: We desire that the soldier should have all the benefit of the expert treatment available in these institutions without having the stigma of lunacy attached to him. The Prime Minister's letter says—

This is undesirable, and I shall be glad if action can be taken in your State similar to that which is carried out in Victoria. I enclose copies of the Victorian Act No. 2,600 and the regulations thereunder. These are the provisions of the law which enables the Victorian authorities to accept soldiers for mental treatment without requiring certification of lunacy.

That is the point. The Prime Minister goes on to say—

It will be appreciated also if accommodation can be provided for soldiers separate from that used for other patients. Each soldier patient will be entitled to a war pension of 30s. per week, and it is proposed that the pension be divided so that the State shall receive £1 per week for the patient's accommodation, leaving 10s. per week available for the soldier's dependants, or for accumulation of payment to him on his discharge.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Commonwealth Government ought to be ashamed to send such a letter. Ten shillings a week for a man's family!

The PREMIER: The letter proceeds—
The cost of the patients will be more than £1 per week, but it is understood that your Government will be prepared to bear the additional amount involved in respect of soldiers admitted to mental hospitals in your State. Full particulars as to the number of mental patients now in Western Australia as well as an estimate of the number which may be expected, will be obtainable by your officers on reference to the Commandant in your State. I shall be glad to know if you can see your way to giving this matter sympathetic consideration.

The reason why this is necessary is that when the services of an institution are required to deal with these cases the regulations must be complied with. I understand that every one of the other States has passed this Bill and complied with the Prime Minister's request. Its object is to

enable these men to receive the benefit of treatment in these institutions in just the same way as they would in our ordinary hospitals. With the exception of the Perth Public Hospital, where a patient may be treated in the observation ward, Claremont is the only institution which is suitable. At the asylum at Claremont we have experts.

Mr. Hudson: How many of these men are there now?

The PREMIER: None that I am aware of, but there may be some. It must be remembered that the Minister who introduced this Bill has had an opportunity of investigating the question. In the case of patients who cannot be taken charge of without payment, arrangements will be made. I think we would be doing the right thing in passing this measure. We would be providing that special treatment which cannot be given in our ordinary hospitals, and we would be doing this without attaching the stigma to patients of being lunatics. I have no doubt the Inspector General and his staff will do their utmost to see that these patients receive every comfort and proper treatment. It is our duty to make all arrangements we possibly can for these men. It would be a crying shame if we did not do everything in our power for them. What would happen if this House refuses to pass this Bill? Some of those unfortunate men will be sent to Claremont on the certificate of two doctors; others will be allowed to roam round at their own will, and others again will be driven from pillar to post, perhaps. We should freely make this provision, believing that it is required.

Mr. Hudson interjected.

The PREMIER: That carries with it the greatest condemnation I have heard of that excellent institution at Claremont. When we know that 33 per cent. of the patients sent there in the ordinary course are allowed to leave the institution after being cured, it is a splendid record. It shows that we may freely send people into that institution, even our own relatives, in the sure faith that if they can be cured, they will be. I think it would be a great pity if we did not assist those returned men who have done so much for us.

Mr. Hudson: No one wishes to deny them.

The PREMIER: You are denying them treatment at the institution if you do not pass this Bill except they are sent there as certified lunatics. I say we should give them the advantage of receiving at the institution that treatment which cannot be had at the ordinary hospitals.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But they must be first certified.

The PREMIER: Of course, for the protection of the public and for the protection of the patient himself, if he is in the condition that he is dangerous to the public, he must be certified. I hope the House will pass this Bill and give the proposal contained in it a trial, thus permitting these men to have treatment under the same conditions as in our ordinary public hospitals.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [8-23]: I desire briefly to support the second reading of this Bill and agree with the Premier that all of our institutions should be thrown open to cases which might arise. There is one thing which I would draw attention to, and which in my opinion is as great a stigma as it would be to certify these men as lunatics. It seems to me that if it is desired to segregate the unfortunate victim of the war it would be a good idea to utilise the inebriates' home connected with the Claremont asylum.

The Premier: I have that in mind.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am pleased to hear the Premier give this House the assurance that he has this in mind. No stigma should be thrown on the unfortunates who are sent to that home. However good the intentions of the authorities may have been when they established an inebriates' home at Claremont, I think it might have been established elsewhere.

Hon. P. Collier: They are not there now; those patients were being treated at Whitby long before we left office.

Mr. LAMBERT: I understand there are still some inebriates there. As a matter of fact, I visited there a few months ago. If that portion of the Claremont institution could be utilised for the purpose, I hope the Government will be given the opportunity. I hope with the Premier that the House will agree to this measure and that these men will be admitted to the institution irrespective of any financial consideration. I think further that any institution which this State possesses should be thrown open for the

benefit of the unfortunate victims of the war. There is a great difference between the man who is considered to be insane and the man who is suffering from the effects of drink, and, I say, however good the intentions of the Government might have been when the inebriates' home was established, the whole of the surroundings do not lend themselves to the curing of such patients. There is no disguising the fact that a man who is suffering from mental shock is a proper subject for admission into an institution of this kind.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But it is the responsibility of the Federal Government. They get out of everything they can.

Mr. LAMBERT: It does not matter to me whether the Federal authorities should properly make the provision. Every one will admit that any one of our State institutions should be used for the benefit of the men who return from the war. Any institution which belongs to the State should be readily made available by the State authorities for the purpose of assisting the unfortunate victims of the war.

The Minister for Works: They are our own men.

Mr. LAMBERT: Certainly they are, and there should be no question as to whether we should do what we can for our own people or that we should avoid doing so because it is the responsibility of the Federal authorities. No stigma is sought to be cast upon these patients. The Bill desires as far as possible to remove any stigma.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Yes; "I won't convict you, but I will send you to gaol."

Mr. LAMBERT: That is not the intention at all. The remarks of the Premier have convinced me that this institution should be made available, and also any other institution there may be belonging to the State.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [8.30]: I am not apprehensive that any great injustice will be done under the Bill for those whom it is sought to benefit. I do say, however, that it would not be asking the Commonwealth authorities too much to ask them to provide for a separate institution for the reception of these men. There is no one who will deny that these unfortunate men are entitled to the best skill and the best nursing that the State can pro-

vide. From some of the speeches which have been made, however, one might imagine that it was not possible to obtain that skill or nursing in any other institution except in the Claremont asylum for the insane. It is not a question that they would have to be taken care of for the protection of the public and for their own welfare in addition; that goes without saying. The whole point resolves itself into whether these men will have any stigma cast upon them in future life because of the fact that they have spent a term in the Claremont asylum for the insane. I do not know that there should be any stigma cast upon anyone who has been unfortunate enough to be in that institution for a period, but we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that in the eyes of the general public it is more or less of a handicap in after life and something of a stigma upon those who have been unfortunate enough to be put in there. If there is any considerable number of these soldiers afflicted in this way, it is not asking too much for the Federal authorities to provide them with the best medical skill nursing and attention that can be obtained in the State in a separate institution altogether.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The State officials could help them.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is only a matter of cost, and it is a question of whether the Commonwealth Government are prepared to pay the expense necessary to provide an institution such as I have just referred to. Judging from the letter which has been read by the Premier from the Prime Minister, however, we can see that they are not prepared to meet very much expense in that direction. The letter, which discloses the intentions of the Federal authorities on a very important point, has nothing to do with the Bill, of course. If they do carry out their intentions I say it is the most scandalous piece of parsimony I have ever heard of in my life. If a married man with a family dependent upon him is unfortunate enough to return to the State afflicted in a manner which renders it necessary for him to go to this institution, and he is entitled to 30s. a week as a pension from the Defence authorities, what do they propose to do? They propose to deduct £1 per week in order to pay the State Government for his upkeep in that institu-

tion, and allow him the sum of 10s. per week for the maintenance of his wife or family or dependants.

Mr. Thomson : That is a most scandalous thing.

Hon. P. COLLIER : It is indeed a most scandalous thing. Would it be asking too much of the Federal authorities to allow that person to draw the full amount of his pension from the Defence authorities, and in addition ask them to pay the State Government say £1 a week, or whatever amount is necessary, for the cost of maintenance of this individual in the institution ? I hope there will be such a protest made by the Government, or by the House, or the people of the country as will have the effect of forcing the Commonwealth authorities either to withdraw or abandon any such intention. If they do not withdraw it it will be an everlasting disgrace to those who are responsible for it.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [8.35] : I have been struck during the debate with the need for intellectual progress, and social sanity in our community. I think there is something very wrong in that special kind of legislature that calls a disease of the brain a stigma. A soldier comes back with a diseased leg, a broken leg, or any other portion of his frame, severely or permanently or temporarily injured. That is looked upon as something to be proud of. He can show his wounds. "He jests at scars who never felt a wound." The man who has upon his body the scars from the wounds he received in the defence of his country is an honoured and respected man. When, however, there is one little portion of the human anatomy—an important portion I will admit—wounded, injured, and the cause of injury being the defence of his country, there is the stigma upon him.

Mr Carpenter : That is not the point at all.

Hon. T. WALKER : Why should it be looked upon in any sense as such ?

Hon. P. Collier : It should not be.

Hon. T. WALKER : As a matter of fact we do not alter the character of the illness or of the infirmity by calling it some other name. A man becomes mentally deranged because of the sufferings and the attacks upon his nervous system, which he has received under most extraordinary

circumstances. These are the facts, and

II attempts to disguise them savour to me of hypocrisy. I have pity for the man who loses his eye in the war. I have, if possible, a greater pity for him who loses his mental vision. They are of the same character, and as I would send a man to the hospital for treatment who had his arm injured, so would I send him to the mental hospital for treatment of his mental infirmity. In that there is no disgrace.

Mr. Carpenter : No one said so.

Hon. T. WALKER : No, but let us see how we are talking now, as if it were to be something that a man was to carry not only throughout his life, but to be carried throughout the life of his dependants and possibly his descendants. Is it not an evidence of the terrible hypocrisy, and shallowness and ignorance of the society in which we live ? I am commenting upon the fact, and the sooner we try and expose this condition of affairs and raise the minds of the general populace to a proper comprehension and apprehension of the exact condition of the mentally alienated, the better it will be for us. There is nothing so much neglected, upon which there is such an amount of popular and even scientific ignorance, as that matter affecting the mentality of mankind. It is time that those in power and in position in the State removed the mass of superstition and prejudice and bias that exist to-day in regard to those who have the severest misfortune that can befall a man.

Hon. W. C. Angwin : You have to take things as they are, and not as they should be.

Hon. T. WALKER : No, we have not to take things as they are, but to try and make them better. It is within the recollection of many of us that lunacy was looked upon as a species of crime in itself, and lunatics were flogged, whipped, and treated to all kinds of hardship as being afflicted with the devil or a pernicious volition. We have now grown up in this State an institution possessed of magnificent buildings at Claremont with all their accessories, most modern in their appliances, and more humane perhaps than ever in past history was exhibited in the treatment of the mentally defective whether temporarily or permanently. Even

there now, with all due respect for the experts who preside over this institution,—and I do give them my respect—there is much to learn and much room for improvement. But above all is the need for improvement in a House like this and room for improvement in the Federal House, the highest court in Australia, room for improvement in their freedom from pandering to popular prejudices and popular antipathies towards those whom the hand of fate has temporarily placed out of the track of relationship with their fellows. Under these circumstances I can see nothing wrong with the intention of the Bill, but I am heartily at one with the member for North-East Fremantle and others who have spoken in condemnation of that equally pernicious, mean, and contemptible, spirit shown by the Federal authorities who are seeking to foist the responsibility for the cure of these unhappy men upon the State.

Hon. P. Collier : And taking their pensions away.

Hon. T. WALKER : It has shocked me. Is there moral insanity as well as mental short-sightedness in those who are responsible for the management of the future of those who come back from the war ? It wounds me when I reflect that at the present time, when we are anticipating the return, on the declaration of peace, of all those who have gone to serve us, we should not only be seeking from the great central heart of Australia, to thrust our burden upon the separate State, but that we should be taking up the sixpences and pennies at every street corner to make provision for the future of these our heroes who come back with their scars and their mental infirmities in consequence of their services to us, and to our successors. Let us buy powder, buy guns, buy ammunition, fix up well the training camps, and secure the transports, and see to the comforts of the men in the field and send them stockings and lollies at Christmas time. Let us spend the money there if we like. But that great central heart that should send pure blood through every vein of this great Federation should surely look to the future and say "It is our duty. We have asked these men to go rightfully in the defence of the Empire, in defence of our protection, in defence of all that is

sacred in the British cause, and when these men come back we will not discuss the paltry few shillings that shall keep them in the hospital for the care of their mental infirmities, and for the time they are there we shall see that they are adequately provided for in every respect." Instead of giving them reason to curse the hour that sent them to receive their wounds, physiological or moral or mental, we will let them see how grateful, not the man at the street corner, but the nation, can be to its heroes, to those who have served it, made it a fortress for all future time, a beacon to every nation in the southern seas, a warning to those who cast avaricious eyes upon our territories and our wealth. It shall mark this country for ever, not only as a land of heroes, but as a land of citizens who know how to appreciate heroism. I have the objection, therefore, to this measure, that it shuffles off responsibility ; that it shows no high and national appreciation or generous gratitude for services ; that it heaps more superstition on popular ignorance, because it panders to the dullness of mind and to the perversion of intellect that look askance upon the man wounded mentally ; that the measure seeks by hypocrisy and subterfuge to pretend to protect such a man by calling a scientific fact by a new name and removing those very safeguards devised to protect a man from being wrongfully, against his will, sent to an institution of that kind.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister—Perth—in reply) [8-48] : Someone just now interjected that he wondered whether the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) was for the Bill or against it. While admiring the hon. member's eloquence, I have been unable to make up my mind whether he approves or opposes the measure. Certainly, I admire the noble sentiments to which he gave expression. I agree with him, too, that people are too apt, or have until recently been too apt, to regard sickness of the mind very differently from bodily sickness. Apparently, the complaint against this Bill is that it seeks to cast a stigma on the returned soldier. Let me point out here that the remarks made in regard to the payment of pensions refer to a matter for which the Government of Western Australia have no responsibility.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We are not blaming the State Government on that account.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The State Government are justly entitled to be paid for the treatment, and the Commonwealth Government are justly entitled to pay for the treatment, of cases under this measure. By no stretch of imagination can it be said that the State Government will be taking part of the soldier's pension. If hon. members generally, and the members for Fremantle and North-East Fremantle in particular, would regard the Bill as a whole, instead of concentrating their attention on particular clauses, they would find that it is a very different measure from what they believe. It provides that any person complying with regulations under this Bill may, for payment or not, receive or board or lodge or take charge of any person coming under this measure.

Mr. Carpenter: I make no objection to that.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The member for Fremantle seemed to take every objection to it. He said that the Government seemed to be legislating for boardinghouse keepers to board these afflicted soldiers.

Mr. Carpenter: I said that a separate home should be provided for these soldiers.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): If hon. members will look at the title of the Bill, they will find that the measure is intended to facilitate the treatment of mental disorder of recent origin arising from wounds, shock, and other causes. Part II. of the Lunacy Act imposes strict safeguards, and rightly so. Before a person can be declared of unsound mind, he must be so certified by at least two medical practitioners, and so forth. This Bill excludes only that part of Part II. of the Lunacy Act. That Act is a very comprehensive measure.

Mr. Carpenter: Part II. applies. That is the trouble.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The remainder of the Lunacy Act will apply to persons who will be treated under this Bill. Really, the sole object of this Bill is to obviate the certification of such persons as lunatics. They will have all the protection, which is very great, of

the Inspector General of the Insane. No person will be able to receive these patients except under the conditions laid down by regulation. Great exception has been taken to the sending of soldiers thus affected to the hospital for the insane. I say, and the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) must know this, that there are certain cases among these patients which cannot be treated properly except in the Claremont institution. That institution is a large general hospital, classified into many divisions to suit persons suffering in different degrees from sickness of mind. The patients are placed in various wards and treated exactly as in the various wards of the Perth public hospital or any general hospital. I take it that only such patients as can be most effectively treated in the Claremont hospital will be sent there.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Where will they be put when they are sent there?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): I will now read extracts from the regulations under the corresponding Victorian Act, which regulations will be adopted here—

"Institution" means any institution, home, house, private or public hospital, or part thereof approved by the Inspector General of the Insane and set aside exclusively for the reception of persons in the Naval or Military Service requiring mental treatment.

That definition shows at once that the intention is to establish and proclaim, wherever possible, private hospitals for the treatment of these cases, where they will be under the protection of the lunacy law and of the Inspector General of the Insane. Another regulation reads—

Any person in the Naval or Military Service, having been on active service and requiring mental treatment, may be received into any institution approved under these regulations on production of a request and statement in the Form attached (Schedule No. 1), duly signed by his commanding officer, and may be detained for any period not exceeding six months. The period of detention may be extended for any further period or periods by certificate under the hand of the Inspector General.

Mr. Hudson: Can the Minister give the assurance that what the Bill proposes represents only a temporary expedient, only a beginning?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): This is only for special cases during the war.

Mr. Carpenter: Oh, no!

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): Here is another regulation—

The superintendent of any institution shall forthwith after his or her (the patient's) admission enter or cause to be entered the names and particulars of every person admitted for treatment under the Mental Treatment Act, 1915, in a book in accordance with the Form in Schedule No. 2 to these regulations and shall forward a notice of every admission, death, discharge, or removal to the Inspector General in accordance with as the case may require the form in Schedules No. 3 or 4 to these regulations.

One of these patients cannot be received for 24 hours without the matter being reported to the Inspector General of the Insane. The Inspector General must issue a license before the private hospital can be established, and he must visit the private hospital at stated times. Thus all necessary protection is afforded to the sick soldier. But the object of the Bill is that he shall still not be certified as a lunatic. He has not the stain of lunacy on him, which, unfortunately, I agree—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You know it is regarded as a stain?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): I know that; and for that reason this Bill has been introduced. The object is to afford the soldier every care and the most skilful treatment without having him certified as a lunatic. Thus, if later a soldier who has been treated applies to have his life insured he will not be compelled to disclose the fact that he been mentally treated, as patients from the Claremont institution, for instance, must declare.

Mr. Carpenter: That is too thin.

Hon. T. Walker: The inquiries of the insurance companies will be too searching for such a fact to be hidden.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): It will not be disclosed unless

the insurance companies alter their conditions.

Hon. T. Walker: That can easily be done.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): It would be very unfair and improper if the insurance companies did it.

Mr. Hudson: Do not you think it would be better for the Commonwealth to provide a separate institution?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): I do not agree with that view. It might as well be urged that the Commonwealth Government should set up a special phthisis hospital for returned soldiers, while the State Government already have a phthisis hospital and a phthisis sanatorium, with expert physicians.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Mr. Carpenter in the Chair; Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Power to receive for treatment soldiers suffering from mental disorder:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not opposing the action of the Government who I know are endeavouring to assist the Federal Authorities in this matter. I think, however, that we shall be doing an injustice to the soldiers by putting them into the general hospital for the insane.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Do you not think it will probably be necessary to send some of them there?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We must take things as they are, and we all know that it will be detrimental to the soldiers and to their relatives if the unfortunate men are sent to an institution like the hospital for the insane. This clause provides that there will not be any necessity to get the certificates of two doctors in order to secure their admission to the hospital.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: You must understand that such disorders cannot be treated anywhere else.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not agree with the Honorary Minister. There is plenty of land about there on which buildings could be erected and where these men could then get the necessary medical

attention. In this way they would be kept out of the asylum grounds. My opinion is that this is a desire on the part of the Federal Government to get out of a responsibility which should be theirs. It must also be remembered that at the present time there is no accommodation at the hospital for the insane; it is all taken up. Therefore it is necessary that additional buildings should be erected. That being the case, why cannot the Federal Government arrange for the erection of the buildings for the accommodation of these soldiers and provide a staff.

Mr. Smith: What will you do with the patients in the meantime?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It would not take any time to erect these buildings. I am not blaming the Government because they are merely complying with the request of the Federal Government.

The Premier: It will take 12 months to put up the necessary building.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Things can be done very quickly sometimes. I move an amendment—

That in lines 16 and 17 the words "a hospital for the insane" be struck out.

The clause will then provide that it shall be lawful for any person to be received for medical treatment into a reception house or licensed house without any order or certificate.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I hope the Committee will not accept the amendment because the effect of it will be to spoil the whole Bill. The Federal Government know exactly what is required, and while they could erect a building themselves, that would take a considerable time. Even then it would be necessary to declare that building a hospital for the insane, and it would have to be worked by the State because the Federal Authorities have no control over lunacy matters. That is the reason, too, why they are asking the State to take this action. Suppose we erected a special hospital a mile away from the the present Claremont hospital, the patients would go there just the same without a certificate and it would soon become known as a hospital for the insane. What therefore is the difference? The meaning of the words "hospital for the insane, reception house, or licensed house" is obvious. They apply to three classes of patients

the bad case which may be violent, that which is taken into a reception house for observation, and that which may be taken to the home of the parents of the patient. Or it may be a hospital licensed for the purpose of receiving patients for mental treatment. If the amendment be carried what is to become of the bad cases? Are they to be allowed to wander about the streets, or must they be locked up in a police cell? The Bill indicates clearly that its provisions aim only at the treatment of persons incapacitated during the war, but not that the Bill shall operate only during the war.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—SPECIAL LEASE (STIRLING ESTATE).

Council's Amendments.

Consideration of schedule of amendments made by the Council, resumed from 30th November, 1916.

In Committee.

Mr. Carpenter in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

No. 4.—First Schedule, lines 19 and 20 of Lease: Omit the words "and cement":

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There was some misunderstanding when this matter was previously under discussion, and I think also there was some misunderstanding in another place. The representative of the company in Western Australia was under the impression that cement would not be required and he asked that the words "and cement" appearing on lines 19 and 20 of the schedule be struck out. It is apparent now, from the opinion of engineers and experts, that lime will be required; consequently, the words "and cement" should remain in the schedule as passed by this Chamber. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. HUDSON: I desire to draw the attention of members particularly to this measure, as there has been a great objection raised against it. It appears to me to be

a Bill which should have been brought before the House as a private Bill. Hon. members will observe from the Notice Paper that we have received an intimation by Message from another place of a resolution which was carried there that in the opinion of another place Bills seeking concessions should be brought before Parliament as private Bills. The point I wish to make is taken under our Standing Order 381. The Minister for Lands has pointed out that a mistake has been made by the promoters and by another place in striking out the words "and cement." It is evident the Bill was introduced with a desire of providing lime for the manufacture of cement, for the building of railways, the management of railways for the carriage of goods, and possibly of passengers also. Under the law of Western Australia, the Railways Act particularly, it is required that notice shall be given to the general public of the intention to introduce such legislation where it is for the benefit of an individual or corporation. The Standing Order I have quoted requires that notice of intention to apply for a Bill shall be given in a newspaper and an opportunity given those who object of giving notice of objection, and of having that objection considered not only by the House but by a select committee, which must necessarily under our Standing Orders be appointed to inquire thoroughly into the nature of the Bill. I submit this Bill is essentially one which should have been given notice of as a private Bill, that notice should have been given to objectors in order that they might have an opportunity of appearing before a select committee to inquire as to its provisions.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I do not think there is any objection except by one party.

Mr. HUDSON: I am not taking my views from the hon. member as to that.

The Premier: It is a Government Bill.

Mr. HUDSON: There have been objections from all quarters, I understand, against the proposal to disturb the bed of the Swan river for the purpose of taking out shell. That is what the Bill is wanted for, and that is why there is necessity for advertising.

The Premier: Shell has been taken out of the river for years past.

Mr. HUDSON: Not to the extent contemplated in this Bill. It has been represented to me there is strong objection.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I represent the district from the Canning Bridge to Fremantle and I do not know of any objection.

Mr. HUDSON: It is intended under the Bill to give power to a company to construct railways and operate them, and, further, to take shell from the bed of the river; and I submit this Bill should not be further considered. I therefore move—

That the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not quite sure whether the hon. member, in speaking to this motion, was quite in order. So far as I am aware the practice of this House has always been that a motion of this nature is put without discussion.

[Mr. Holman resumed the Chair.]

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

Ayes	15
Noes	20

Majority against .. 5

AYES.

Mr. Chession	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foley	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Green	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lambert	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Mullan	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Nairn
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Connolly	Mr. Robinson
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Smith
Mr. George	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Veryard
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. E. D. Johnston	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Thomson
	(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: When we debated the question on a previous occasion the House viewed with grave concern the proposals contained in the Bill. It was made abundantly clear to us that it was not intended to go on with the manufacture

of cement with the assistance it was proposed to get at the Stirling estate, but that it was purely a question of making cement from shell proposed to be taken from the Swan River. Now that has all been changed again for the second time, and we are back to the original proposition that the lime is required for the manufacture of cement. In my opinion it is not proposed to use this lime for cement purposes. Certainly if we take the words "and cement" out of the schedule there will be nothing left. Instead of dropping the Bill and devoting attention to the shell proposition, it is said that we must go on with the Bill and disagree with the Council's amendment. Does the Minister propose to go on with the other amendment which gives the lessees power to spend money on the dredging works? If the money is to be thus spent, it is a clear indication that the lease will not be used for the supplying of lime to agriculturists. The Minister disagrees to the Council's amendment because he realises that if the cement proposition is deleted there will be nothing left in the schedule. Can the Minister give us an assurance that he will move to disagree with all the amendments from the Council? The Minister should let us know exactly what is proposed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am not concealing anything from the Committee. I believe that the intention of the lessees is, not only to utilise the lime deposits, but to utilise the shell from the river as well.

Hon. W. D. Johnston: That is not the statement the Minister made when last the Bill was before us.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have already explained that I desire that these words "and cement" should be re-inserted, and that we should not agree with the Council's amendment. I explained also that there had been some misconception here on the part of those representing the principals, who are in South Australia, that they were under the impression that the lime would not be required for the manufacture of cement, and that the shell alone would be sufficient. The lessees now find, after experiment, that it is necessary to use this lime in connection with the manufacture of cement. Further, they intend to spend a large sum of money here and at Capel. It is intended to erect

works for the conversion of the shell into lime. They have not yet decided whether the works shall be at Burswood or at Coffee Point. They have land under offer at both places, and I have every reason to believe that they intend to spend £40,000 in the erection of buildings and plant, and to spend a considerable amount of money at Capel also. From my knowledge of the people connected with this enterprise, I believe they are genuine in their intentions. They have already paid a half year's rent to the Lands Department, which serves to show their bona-fides. I also believe they have the money at hand to go straight ahead with the work. All they want is to have this lease granted to them so that they may have power to proceed. I regret the exclusion of the word "cement" in another place. This was not done at my instigation. I should be satisfied for the Bill to become law as it passed through this Chamber. For some reason the representatives of the lessees in Western Australia got it into their heads that they would not want to use lime with the cement, and the word "cement" was therefore struck out. They thought it might harass them in their operations, but now I believe, they find that they do require a certain amount of lime to use with the shell.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What attitude does the Minister propose to take up in connection with amendment No. 6?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I think that where these lessees are operating in two places under the same Act, and are obliged to spend £10,000 within a definite period and another £10,000 later, we might permit them to extend that expenditure over either one or other of the works enumerated in the Bill.

Mr. Lambert: Are they merely going to dredge the river for the shell?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, and they will take it away to the works. If the lease is granted they would close for one or other of the sites which have been offered to them for their works. I think I have power to prevent any interference with the convenience of the public under this lease. I would prefer to see works carried on, both at the Capel and on the Swan. I hope the amendment of the Legislative Council will not be agreed to.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is problematical whether these people can manufacture cement from the products of the Swan. It appears that the company desire to get sea shell and burn it for lime and lime only, and that it is not their intention to manufacture cement in the State.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This compels them to make cement.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Minister would be well advised to refer this matter to a select committee so that he could get the benefit of the experience of the experts in the State. The Minister is accepting a grave responsibility in allowing a company to dredge the river and disturb it unless he is satisfied that the company can manufacture Portland cement in the State.

Mr. Thomson: That is the company's risk.

Mr. LAMBERT: We ought to be satisfied that the company can make Portland cement before we allow them to exploit the river. There is sufficient lime in the State without interfering with the bed of the river in order to get it. In my opinion the proportion of silicate of alumina in the clays that I know in the State is not sufficient for the manufacture of Portland cement.

The Premier: Why should they not dredge the river?

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not think that the public will be very pleased with the result that would be brought about by the working of two dredges on the river in this way. The Minister knows he would not like to accept the responsibility of having a couple of dredges washing sea shell in the river, while plenty of shell deposits are available elsewhere.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I regret the hon. member is so sceptical in regard to this matter. He has pointed out that there is no clay available for the manufacture of cement.

Mr. Lambert: I said I did not know of any in the State.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is almost as good. This proposal, however, is not a new one. It has been before the late Government, and the expert officers were asked for their advice. They sent samples of the shell from the river to South Australia, where the shell was manufactured

into cement, and this, on submittion to the Engineer-in-Chief of Western Australia, was approved by him as first-class cement. The clay to be used in the manufacture of cement is the clay out of the river, and has been already tested.

Mr. Lambert: My remarks apply equally to the late Government. They ought to have had reports from their responsible officers.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The late Government made every possible inquiry. I believe they had a Bill on these lines prepared for submission to Parliament. Both Governments who have gone into the matter are satisfied with the proposal. It has had about 12 months' consideration.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Two years' consideration.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am satisfied that this is a *bona fide* concern.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: My present doubts arise from these people constantly changing their minds.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The people who changed their minds were not the principals in the matter, but the agents here.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Who are the principals?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The agents here got nervous, and asked for an amendment, but their principals do not ask that those words be struck out. We are not now really considering the question of dredging the Swan river, because we dealt with that question in the body of the Bill. We are now dealing with the question of the working of the lime deposit at Capel. The principals are willing that the words which were struck out should be reinserted. Then, if the lime is not used for both agricultural purposes and cement manufacture, it will be a breach of the conditions of the lease, which will thereupon become forfeitable.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I secured a postponement of the consideration of the Council's Message because it appeared to me that the lessees under this Bill were trying to get out of their undertaking. If they were not going to manufacture cement, my action in surrendering portion of a class A reserve in this connection would have been a mistaken one. When in Adelaide a few months ago, I was seen by Mr. Scott and another

gentleman, and they asked me why I had changed my attitude on this matter. I replied that in my opinion they did not intend to carry out the agreement they had made with me as Minister for Works for the manufacture of cement. They stated that quite the contrary was the case, and they showed me correspondence from which it appeared that they were endeavouring to contract with the Commonwealth Government for the supply of cement in 1918. In connection with the lime and cement business, I have previously impressed on hon. members the necessity for preventing the establishment of a monopoly; and unless this Bill is passed a monopoly will be established. I shall be very pleased if they are two manufacturers of lime in the field. With the assistance of the Attorney General a clause has been inserted forbidding the two manufacturers of cement to work together; and thus there will be competition as regards cement. The suitability of shell from the river for the manufacture of cement was never discussed; but according to information which I have received the borings for the Rocky Bay bridge disclosed shell to a depth of 100 feet. So it would seem that there is plenty of shell from one end of the river to the other. It had previously been arranged that a specified area was to be dredged by the lessees, under the supervision of the Engineer-in-Chief. The objection to two dredges working in the river is a lame one, for there has been a dredge working in that quarter for years. The Perth City Council, too, are anxious to be allowed to dredge for shell for road making purposes. If I thought that the company did not intend to make cement. I would not support the Bill.

Mr. Hudson: Do you really think they are going to.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do.

Mr. Hudson: Then you are easily gulled.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The site for the manufacture of cement has not been chosen yet, but I understand that the idea was to erect works at Brunswick. Hon. members to-night have, however, stated that the works may be at Burswood or at Coffee Point on the Swan River. I hope it will be at the latter place. I think it is our duty to carry this through so that the company shall not

have a monopoly in connection with the manufacture of cement.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Has the Minister satisfied himself with regard to the dredging right over the river? Dredging has been carried on in the river in the past, but an exclusive right has never been given to anyone. I would like to know whether the granting of this exclusive right will interfere with the movements of boats over the area granted in the lease, and whether the Government have satisfied themselves that there is not going to be any pollution of the river through shell being removed with the debris.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member must know that we have been dredging shell from the Swan River as long as I can remember, and I have lived longer than the hon. member. All our footpaths in Perth were originally made with shell from the river. Dredging was always being carried on, and yet the river was never polluted. Look at all the foreshore which has been reclaimed entirely with shell from the river. It might be argued that there will be a great deal more shell used by this company than has ever been removed for reclamation purposes and for footpaths. Hon. members need not fear any harmful result, because if hundreds of thousands of cubic yards of shell have been taken from the river without it having been polluted, the removal of millions of cubic yards will certainly not bring about pollution. Apart from the question of establishing an industry, I think the dredging of the river will be a good thing, from the point of view that we shall get a greater depth of water. We must remember, too, that the shell is not going to be thrown out and scattered about in such a way that it will find its way back into the river. It is going to be taken to works and treated. As long as I can remember the question of dredging the river, with a view of bringing the steamers to Perth, has been widely discussed, and no one ever raised the question of pollution.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The river will be polluted if steamers are allowed to come up to Perth.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That may be, but there is certainly no danger of pollution from the operations which will be

carried out by the company. If we find at any time that anything that is detrimental is being done, the work will be stopped. Everything which is to be done will be subject to the Minister for Lands' approval. I hope hon. members will not raise any further objections. The whole matter has been very carefully considered.

Mr. S. STUBBS: Some 20 years ago I was one of many who paid a big price for land on the foreshore of the Swan river, believing that there were no finer beauty spots anywhere. With all respect to those who have been advocating the dredging of the river, I can say that, having a knowledge of what has been done to the rivers in Victoria by dredging, there is a likelihood of the river being discoloured and polluted. That is what happened in Victoria, and in some cases the pollution was so serious that fish could not live in the water. I may be out of order in speaking in this way, but if I am pulled up I shall move an amendment, the object of which will be to prevent the Swan river from being polluted. I am going to endeavour to prevent the scenic beauty of the Swan river being destroyed by dredging operations. We have insufficient tide to carry away the discoloration that is bound to follow on dredging.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: There is no comparison between the amount of dredging done to date in the Swan River and the amount of dredging which will be necessary to secure shell for cement. Hitherto the dredging has been done by an improvised plant, so constructed as to stir up as little mud as possible. While it is known there is a deposit of shell in the river, it is also true that there is a very large deposit of objectionable and dirty mud. At the time when the City council was anxious to establish baths, I, as Minister for Works, took an active part in endeavouring to have those baths established as speedily as possible. But considerable difficulty was experienced in obtaining a site sufficiently clear of mud. A site thought to be desirable was chosen near the brewery, but when an examination was made there it was found that there was an enormous depth of mud. It is desirable that we should, if possible, convert that deposit of shell into a marketable commodity, but there is cer-

tainly the danger pointed out by the member for Wagin. In addition to that, the Minister has intimated his intention to agree to a further amendment which, if passed, gives the Committee no guarantee that the lime will be used. It therefore becomes a question as to whether the Committee has sufficient information to guide it. The member for North-East Fremantle has reminded me that the late Government dealt with this question, but the schedule to the Bill is a totally different proposition from that considered by me when Minister for Works. The present schedule specifies an area of 200 acres extent on which a dredging plant may be used, and a fairly large plant will be required to operate machinery costing £20,000. In my opinion there is the danger pointed out by the member for Wagin that if these operations are permitted property on the river frontage will be depreciated in value.

Mr. GREEN: I should like the Minister to report progress and lay on the Table of the House the file dealing with this matter. I have some doubt whether the company will be able to make cement on a commercial basis in this State.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: How is it other companies can do it in this State?

Mr. GREEN: Instances have been known where companies have secured concessions with the idea of trading them off on an unsuspecting public. Personally I do not know where the silica can be obtained in this State for the making of cement.

The Premier: Why not let them have a shot at it?

Mr. GREEN: If I were satisfied they were going to have a shot at it I would not mind. But I fear they may unload it on to the public. In countries where cement is made in large quantities it is not necessary to go to the expense of dredging for shell or of finding silica.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We have been buying cement of Chinese manufacture.

Mr. GREEN: I am glad the hon. member has made that interjection. I visited the Green Island Company's works from which the late Minister for Works purchased £22,000 worth of cement. It is in the British settlement of Hong Kong; and

there they hew out a mountain of rock which requires no mixture with anything else. The rock itself is treated and passed through the kilns without any mixture during the process of manufacture. At other places where cement is made the natural rock is being used. So cheaply is cement manufactured at Green Island in consequence of the accessibility of the rock, that it is sold at 7s. per barrel. What hope, then, can there be of successfully establishing an industry depending on the costly dredging of shell from the Swan River? I am rather sceptical regarding the commercial aspect of this venture. If we knew where the lessees are to get the silica we might have more confidence in the project. We should have *prima facie* evidence that the proposed company has some reasonable expectation of making a success of the business.

Mr. THOMSON: If a company is prepared to spend £40,000 in the establishment of a new industry we should welcome its advent, even at the slight risk of interfering with the beauties of the river. If the dredging of the mud flats between here and South Perth will give us a depth of 20 or 30 feet of water, it will tend to improve the water frontage. During the last 12 months we have imported £22,225 worth of cement. If we can manufacture that cement in Western Australia it will mean the expenditure in wages of possibly £10,000. How, then, are the objections of hon. members opposite to be accounted for? The member for Kalgoorlie said that he was sceptical. He is not the first in the State to be sceptical. I can remember when it was popularly stated that we would never be in a position to grow enough wheat to feed our own people. Yet to-day we are exporting millions of bushels of wheat. I see no reason why we should not have cement manufactured within the State. It seems that even in Parliament we are not prepared to support local industries.

Mr. Hudson: You are speaking for yourself.

Mr. THOMSON: Judging by the remarks of the hon. member a little while ago, local industry is not likely to get much sup-

port from him. I hope the motion will be agreed to and that the Bill will pass.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	10

Majority for .. 9

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Nairn
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Robinson
Mr. Connolly	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Thomson
Mr. George	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Harrision	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Mitchell	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsl
Mr. Foley	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Green	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Hudson	(Teller.)
Mr. W. D. Johnson	

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

No. 5.—First Schedule, line 22: After the word "sterling" insert "from the date of the passing of the Special Lease (Stirling Estate) Act, 1916":

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 6.—First Schedule, paragraph 3: After the words "hereby demised," in line 5, insert "or the dredging works used in connection with the license granted under the said Act":

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: This is an important amendment. If we insert these words we have no guarantee that the lime deposits will be worked at all. The amendment says that the company shall do certain things at Capel or elsewhere. Clause 4 of the Bill says that these people shall supply lime to the agriculturists at the rate of one-half of the total output, but if they put their machinery and plant at either of the places mentioned by the Minister they

cannot possibly use the Capel lime with any profit to themselves. It cannot be a commercial proposition to rail and cart lime all that distance. I am not opposed to the establishment of any industry, but I do want to see that every industry is firmly and fairly established, and that the dangers which were pointed out by the hon. member for Coolgardie will not occur. We have no guarantee that these people are putting their own money into the venture. The concessionaires get this concession and proceed to form a company, saying that it is a sound proposition and pointing to the fact that Parliament has passed the thing through as evidence of its soundness.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why do you agree to the granting of any of these concessions? You raised no objection in regard to the other one.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: There was an objection in the other case, but Parliament gave a direct instruction by resolution that the agreement had to be presented and considered. In that case it was not a Government measure at all. It was simply a case of the Government carrying out the direct instructions of Parliament. If I had my way we would be operating the Lake Clifton deposits as a Government concern. On one occasion we did provide a sum upon the Estimates for the purpose of opening them up. The position is that by adopting the amendment we shall give the lessees a right to the Capel lime deposit without any responsibility to work it, without any obligation except payment of the annual rental of £50. The Lake Clifton concession stipulates a minimum daily production of 50 tons of lime. South-Western members want the Capel lime made available to the agriculturists; but, if this amendment is adopted, there is every probability that no lime will be made available. The Chamber appears not to understand the issue. Under the clause as it stands, the lessees have to spend a certain amount of money, which means that they will build a railway; and that, again, means that they will produce a certain quantity of lime. If the Council's amendment is agreed to, there will be no guarantee whatever of any lime being made available. Should the words "and cement" be retained and the other

words inserted, the words "and cement" will be discounted.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: This lease is to be granted for the purpose of the manufacture of lime to be used in agriculture, and of cement.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: How much lime is to be manufactured?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The burden of the hon. member's song is that we are giving the lessees the right to monopolise the lease without working it at all.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You are transferring all the expenditure from the land demised by the lease, to Coffee Point or Burswood.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member contended that, if by any chance, the lessees decided to spend nothing on the lease, but to spend all their money on the dredging work, a serious position would be created. But Clause 2 of the lease provides that the lessees shall work the land reasonably and to the satisfaction of the Minister for Lands. Unless they do that, their lease becomes forfeitable.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Why not provide for a minimum output of 50 tons per day?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Hon. members had this Bill before them previously, and it went to another place, and now it has come back. The introduction of fresh matter at this stage is altogether unusual.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I tried to get this matter introduced when the Bill was originally before this Chamber.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We are now dealing only with the Council's amendments, and I do not think we have a right to consider other amendments. The position under the Bill seems to me perfectly fair. The two leases are to be worked in conjunction. As the Bill is, so to speak, a double-barrelled measure, as the lease at Capel is to be worked in conjunction with the dredging on the Swan, it is only fair that the lessees should be permitted to spend part of their money at Capel, and part here.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: They do not want the Capel area.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We can forfeit the Capel area. I have no evidence

that the intention of the lessees is to do other than carry out the agreement as it appears in the Bill.

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister has failed to explain the necessity for the amendment. The effect of it is clear; it relieves the proposed lessee of the obligation to expend £10,000 on the land known as Stirling Estate lot 241, and that that sum may be expended on the Stirling block or on the dredging works used in connection with the concession. This £10,000 might then be put into dredges or works at Capel. The Government then would have no security for the carrying out of the work at Capel beyond the payment of the rent and the right of the Minister to cancel the lease. There is no time fixed for the commencement of the work, and the lessee would have the right to expend this money on dredges and machinery which could be removed at any time, whereas under the lease originally drafted, the lessee had to erect works on the land itself, by which means the Government would have a substantial security.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Perhaps hon. members have not the Bill as it has come to us from the Upper House. The amendment made by the Legislative Council reads—

Such license shall be renewed annually during the term of the special lease granted under the authority of this Act, so long as such lease continues, and shall be held subject to such regulations made under the Land Act, 1898, and in force for the time being.

If the lease at Capel is forfeited, the license on the Swan river will also be forfeited.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Will the Minister agree to add to Clause 4 that they must put out 50 tons of lime per day? That is in the Lake Clifton Bill.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I cannot agree to that. If they do not work this lime deposit properly the lease can be forfeited, and if that is forfeited away go the dredging operations. They must carry out their obligations. If the leases had been granted separately there might have been some danger.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If they were separate leases there would not be the danger that exists in the combination.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I think they ought to put out a certain quantity of lime, but I do not see any necessity for prescribing it in the Bill.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The very fact that they are to spend £20,000 on the lease is an assumption that the lime will be used for cement. Half the total output of lime must go to the agriculturists, but if the proposed words are left out the lime will not be used for cement, and consequently there will be no output.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Then how can they work it?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: There is no need for them to work it. Let the Minister prescribe a minimum output. It is unfair to give a monopoly lease where there is good lime, unless a minimum output is specifically prescribed.

The Attorney General: It must be worked to the satisfaction of the Minister.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We ought to lay down a direction for the Minister. Unless the Minister agrees to the imposing of a minimum output there is very strong objection to the clause.

The Attorney General: Read Clause 2.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Under that the concessionaire can put out lime to the extent of a ton or so per day. If the Minister wants to have the lime deposit worked in order that lime might be available to the agriculturists he should prescribe in the Bill that it shall be so available in at least a given quantity. He should put into Clause 4 the same conditions that are contained in the Lake Clifton Act. Except this be done the agriculturists will have no guarantee at all, while the concessionaire will have a monopoly of the lime deposit.

Mr. Hudson: In another place the Colonial Secretary said the concessionaire could put the improvements where he liked.

The Attorney General: To the satisfaction of the Minister for Lands.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Apparently the Minister is not prepared to put into the Bill anything guaranteeing to the agriculturists the promised lime.

Mr. FOLEY: The Minister would be well advised if he accepted the suggestions made by the member for Guildford. These

people are under no obligation to put their improvements anywhere except in the place that they desire. They are not being asked to comply with any of the conditions that were imposed in the case of a similar concession.

The Attorney General: They have to put up £10,000.

Mr. FOLEY: Is it specifically stated in the Bill that they have to put up this amount for work on this particular lease?

The Attorney General: With the amendment, no.

Mr. FOLEY: The Attorney General now says they have not got to put up this money.

The Attorney General: The £10,000 has to be put up. If the amendment is read in with the clause it is obvious that the money has not necessarily to be spent on the land but on the whole premises to the satisfaction of the Minister.

Mr. FOLEY: They have not to spend the money on the land the concession for which they are asking and on which the conditions set out in the schedule apply. If this concession is granted the Government will not be doing what they have done in the case of the other men. The proposed dredging operations are very mythical. These people could easily get hold of some old dredge and stack her up on the banks of the river, and say they had spent their £10,000 in that direction.

The Attorney General: That is arrant nonsense, and only the lateness of the hour excuses it.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: They can do as they like.

The Attorney General: No, the money must be spent to the satisfaction of the Minister, and you know it.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is not here.

Mr. FOLEY: All these people seeking concessions do not stick to the covenants contained in the schedules. Ministers have not given a sufficient guarantee that the money which they say has to be put up will be put up. Under the Lake Clifton proposals there was a distinct guarantee. With regard to this £10,000, I contend that a year is too long a time to allow for the payment. It is long enough for the people in-

terested to hawk the proposition around Australia to see if they can do anything with it. The Government have not given the matter fair consideration, and have not applied the same conditions in this case as they did in the other. I hope the amendment will be defeated and that members will fight hard against it.

The Attorney General: The result will be to give a monopoly to the other men, whom you are apparently working for.

Mr. FOLEY: That is an unwarrantable assertion and I ask the Attorney General to withdraw it.

The Attorney General: I withdraw the statement.

Mr. FOLEY: In fighting against this amendment we are not fighting for one man, but in order that everyone shall have equal opportunity and be put upon the same footing. We should put into the hands of no one the right to say that they can spend this money in any way that they please. The Colonial Secretary pointed out conclusively that they could do so. Let the measure be delayed until next session. If the lessees do not intend to start operations until next year, there can be no hurry. Parliament will be meeting again in June. I intend to fight this point to the end.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The wording of the Lake Clifton lease in this respect is that "the output for the time being of the demised premises"—practically the same wording as under this Bill—"shall not be less than 50 tons per day." Why not insert a similar provision here?

The Attorney General: The Lake Clifton lease adds the words "if the demand is made." And that does not apply until after the railway has been built.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: A distance of 20 miles is involved there. In this case I would not demand that the lessees should supply before they have means of communication.

The Attorney General: Some latitude would have to be allowed. Obviously, these lessees could not supply for some time to come.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I acknowledge that. If the Government are prepared to insert such words as I have suggested, I shall be satisfied.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not see much objection to what the hon. member asks. The lease is to be granted primarily for the manufacture of lime for agricultural purposes; and one of the conditions is that the lessees shall work the land for the purpose for which it is demised, bona fide to the satisfaction of the Minister for Lands for the time being. The Minister might require the lessees to produce 100 tons per day. I have no objection to the 50 tons per day.

Mr. O'Loughlen: That was suggested an hour ago.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Clause 2 relates, not to the output, but only to the works. The object of the member for Guildford would be attained if the clause were made to read in this way: "That the lessee works the land continuously bona fide for the purpose for which it is demised, and outputs lime to the satisfaction of the Minister for Lands for the time being."

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Why not add the words I suggest? Why not have the two leases alike?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The other lease is dependent on the construction of a railway, and in this case there is no railway to make the provision dependent upon. The railway in the Lake Clifton case is set off as against the money here. In this case a sum of £10,000 is to be spent, not as the member for Leonora suggested, to my annoyance, on the purchase of an old barge, but to the satisfaction of the Minister for Lands on the land demised and on dredging work in connection with the license granted on the Swan river. The purpose for which the land is demised under this Bill is the manufacture of lime. I would be prepared to advise the Minister for Lands to insert words to the effect that—

The CHAIRMAN: It would not be an amendment on the Council's amendment. Standing Order 310 provides—

Amendments made by the Legislative Council shall be agreed to either with or without amendments; or disagreed to; or the consideration thereof postponed; or the Bill ordered to be laid aside.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The words could not be inserted in this amendment of

the Council. The Minister for Lands interprets that clause to mean that the lease shall be worked for the purposes of the Act, producing lime to the satisfaction of the Minister, which means that he has control of the output. The State and the agriculturist are sufficiently protected by that clause. If this Bill is not passed and this concession given, it means that the man who has the Lake Clifton deposit will have a monopoly, and we are just as anxious as the member for North-East Fremantle to prevent that.

Mr. Hudson: These are two distinct concessions and they should be kept distinct.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Will the hon. member show me how this is to the disadvantage of the State?

Mr. Hudson: This amendment, as the Colonial Secretary in another place said, leaves it optional with the lessee to spend his money where he likes.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If the Colonial Secretary said that, I would say he is wrong, because the words are, "The sum of £10,000 shall be spent to the satisfaction of the Minister for Lands for the time being." As there are two contracts it does not matter where the money is spent so long as it is spent bona fide.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The proper place to put in the words is in paragraph 4 of the lease, but we cannot do so under the Standing Orders. I take it that the Attorney General or the Parliamentary draughtsman could add another paragraph without altering the sense.

The CHAIRMAN: Only a palpable error can be altered.

The Attorney General: How about tacking on to the proposed new clause the words, "And shall supply lime up to a certain quantity."

12 o'clock midnight.

Mr. FOLEY: I move—

That progress be reported.

Motion put and negatived.

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

No. 7: New clause.—Add the following to stand as No. 8:—The said Henry James Scott and his transferees shall not hold or have any interest in any lease or license granted in pursuance of the Special Lease (Lake Clifton) Act, 1916:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. S. STUBBS: I move an amendment—

That the Council's amendment be amended by adding the following words:—“And shall carry on all works and the dredging and prevention of pollution and obstruction of the Swan river to the satisfaction of the Minister, and shall submit plans of all buildings to be erected for the approval of the Minister, and shall supply lime from the special lease to be granted under this Act to the public so far as there is a demand for same in such quantities as the Minister may direct.”

Amendment passed; the Council's amendment, as amended, agreed to.

[*The Speaker resumed the Chair.*]

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of the Hon. H. B. Lefroy, the Hon. R. T. Robinson, and the Hon. W. D. Johnson drew up reasons for not agreeing to two of the Council's amendments.

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

House adjourned at 12.25 a.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 13th March, 1917.

	Page.
Papers presented	2257
Bills: Kingia Grass Tree Concession, Select Committee's report	2257
Mental Treatment, returned	2272
Special Lease (Stirling Estate), Message	2272
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 2a., Com.	2272
Public Service Act Amendment, 1a.	2294
Roads Act Amendment, 1a.	2294

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Roads Act by-laws, Kalgoorlie. 2, Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery; Report of Trustees for year ended 30th June, 1916. 3, Report on the Nornalup area by Mr. Camm.

BILL—KINGIA GRASS TREE CONCESSION.

Consideration of Select Committee's Report.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) [4.35]: In moving that the report of the select committee be adopted, I would like, first of all, to mention one or two matters which lie beneath this report. The case of the kingia grass tree may be taken as typical of the case of most of our small industries, and, by the way in which we treat the development of the kingia grass tree industry so may it be supposed we will continue to treat the others of our small industries. This House, composed as it is of thirty members who are not bound to one another, at all events so far as the bulk of them go, by any consensus of opinion or shade of political thought, has evolved during its career what might be termed the foreshadowing of the policy of the Legislative Council in connection with various subjects. For instance, it will be well within the recollection of hon. members that there is a decided trend in this House to treat the alienation of land reserved by the Crown with a great deal of caution, I might almost say a great