

vision to which he has referred. It will mean in practice that no person will be able to get a license without the municipality receiving full value for it. The land will be specially sold for that purpose or specially leased, unless in the meantime we have prohibition altogether, in which case there will be no licenses at all. I appreciate what the hon. member said in regard to the construction of roads in front of Government property, but I do not see that any provision could be included in a Bill such as this to compel the municipality to do anything. The matter raised by Mr. Ewing in regard to Subclause 8 of Clause 40 can be discussed in Committee. The agreement referred to in Clause 47 was an agreement made in 1913, and the basis of it was an estimate that current could be manufactured at .52d. Therefore it was thought quite safe to make the agreement with the Perth Municipal Council to sell to them at .75d. What has happened is that the estimate has not materialised, and it appears to have been a bad bargain from the point of view of the State, but a good bargain from the point of view of the municipality, when the rate was fixed for a period of 50 years. Personally, I realise fully the extent to which the municipality of Perth was prejudiced by the acquiring of the tramways by the Government, and consequently—I am speaking for myself—I take no exception to the small advantage they are getting in this direction.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 10.5 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 9th November, 1920.

	PAGE
Condolence: Railway accident, Mornington	1507
Questions: Arbitration Court agent	1508
Parliamentary Officials' salaries	1508
Bills: Dividend Duties Act Amendment, 1r.	1508
Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 1r.	1508
Land Act Amendment, 1r.	1508
Narrogin Recreation Reserve 1r.	1508
Wheat Marketing, 1r.	1508
Divorce Act Amendment, 1r.	1508
Innkeepers Act Amendment, 1r.	1508
Licensing Act Amendment Continuance, 1r.	1508
Sale of Liquor Regulation Act Continuance, 1r.	1508
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 1r.	1508
Factories and Shops Bill, Com.	1508
Assent to Bills	1525

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

CONDOLENCE—RAILWAY ACCIDENT, MORNINGTON.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Mitchell—Norham) [4.32]: Since the House adjourned last week, a terrible disaster has overtaken the people of this country. I refer to the most unfortunate railway accident which occurred at Mornington on Saturday night. Hon. members are, of course, well aware that there has been great loss of life, and they know that the accident has brought sorrow to many homes, as well as creating consternation in the minds of those who are engaged in the timber industry. This is really the first big railway accident Western Australia has experienced during all the years the railways have been running here. I am sure that the House would wish to express its sympathy with the relatives of the deceased men, and also sympathy with the men who have been injured and with their friends. I move—

That this House desires to express its deepest sympathy with the relatives of the men who lost their lives in the recent unfortunate railway accident at Mornington.

Hon. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [4.34]: In seconding the motion which has been moved by the Premier, I desire to say that I join with the hon. gentleman in expressing the deep regret of the members of this House, and I am sure of the whole of the people of this State, at the extremely sad accident which has occurred in the South-West. It is one of the most tragic happenings that have occurred in the history of Western Australia. Fortunately, we have hitherto been free from like events. All the people of the State will sympathise with the relatives of those who met their death in that terrible calamity, and also with the men who are injured. I am sure I voice the opinion of every member of the House when I say that our deepest sympathy goes out to the bereaved relatives.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN (Forrest) [4.35]: I desire to say just a word to supplement the remarks of the Premier and the leader of the Opposition. In my opinion it is a proper thing that public men should not be unmindful of the sorrows of others. There has been a very serious disaster, and it demonstrates the risks associated with the timber industry. Several of the unfortunate victims were men who had faced the bursting bombs of the battlefield, and they have come home only to be killed in following a peaceful avocation. It is but right that the House should express its sympathy with the relatives in the terrible loss they have sustained. As I personally knew several of the victims, I can only say that I think a fitting inscription on their headstones would be that they lived for their fellow men.

Mr. HARRISON (Avon) [4.36]: I support the remarks which have fallen from the

Premier, the leader of the Opposition, and the member for Forrest. The people of this State suffered a severe shock on receiving the news of the terrible tragedy in the South-West. Up to then this State had been wonderfully free from accident in the running of its railways, and the sympathy now felt is the keener on that account. I am sure the sympathy of every member goes out to the bereaved families, and also to the injured men.

Question put and passed, members standing.

QUESTION—ARBITRATION COURT AGENT.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN asked the Premier: 1, What are the terms of appointment of Mr. Aleock as arbitration advocate for the State sawmills and Railways sawmills? 2, How long has Mr. Aleock been retained? 3, What is the total amount paid to this advocate up to date in the sawmill case? 4, What is the total anticipated cost to the two departments for this representation?

The PREMIER replied: 1, £2 5s. per day while actually on the case, with subsequent adjustment for minor expenses. 2, Since the date of the log, viz., 12th March, 1919, but this case has only engaged part of his time. 3, By the Railways and State sawmills, £255. 4, Approximately £378.

QUESTION—PARLIAMENTARY OFFICIALS, SALARIES.

Mr. STUBBS asked the Premier: 1, Has any action been taken to comply with the promise made by him to the Committee of Supply when considering the Parliamentary Estimates, that the salaries of the Parliamentary officials would be increased in accordance with the views expressed by members? 2, If not, when will such action be taken?

The PREMIER replied: 1 and 2, The matter is receiving attention.

BILLS (10)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Dividend Duties Act Amendment.
 - 2, Industries Assistance Act Continuance.
 - 3, Land Act Amendment.
 - 4, Narrogin Recreation Reserve.
 - 5, Wheat Marketing.
- Introduced by the Premier.
- 6, Divorce Act Amendment.
 - 7, Innkeepers Act Amendment.
 - 8, Licensing Act Amendment Continuance.
 - 9, Sale of Liquor Regulation Act Continuance.
 - 10, Workers' Compensation Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Attorney General.

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair, the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Division:

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I move an amendment—

That after "shops," in line 18, "and" be inserted; and that "and offices," in line 19 be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: On page 3 of the Notice Paper will be found a number of amendments which the Minister proposes to move. They are all consequential and so, unless members desire to discuss any of them, I will not put them from the Chair.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The print of the Bill now before the Committee embraces the amendments agreed upon by the select committee. The amendment just made gives effect to the decision of the select committee, that the Bill shall not apply to offices. The remaining amendments in my name on page 3 of the Notice Paper are merely consequential on the select committee's amendments actually made in the print of the Bill. In the hurried redrafting and reprinting, words such as "or" and "and" have in certain instances been omitted, and the amendments on the Notice Paper are necessary to restore them. All the remaining amendments in my name are merely consequential.

The CHAIRMAN: Seeing that all the Minister's amendments are consequential, to save time I will take them as accepted, and will not put them from the Chair unless any hon. member intimates that he desires to discuss any of them.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Interpretation:

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

That the following definition be added—
—"district" means a shop district established under this Act."

When we come to a later clause I will move an amendment to provide that the metropolitan area be regarded as one district. It is already provided that certain action may be taken in any municipality, district or specified locality, but in my opinion we require a definition of "district." I intend therefore to move later to insert the provisions in the existing legislation dealing with the metropolitan district. As the Bill reads now, a vote could be taken in any municipal district in the metropolitan area or in any specified locality. I hope the Minister will not raise any objection to my amendment, because I think it will be of advantage.

The Minister for Mines: I have no objection to the amendment.

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

Clauses 5 to 17—agreed to.

Clause 18—Factories to be registered:

The MINISTER FOR MINES: As the Bill did not receive close consideration during the second reading stage in view of the fact that it was agreed that it should be referred to a select committee representative of both sections of the House, it is desirable that where there are vital alterations in the existing law, the attention of members should be drawn to the fact. Under the existing law, a factory is registered once only, but the inspection of such factory must continue year after year, and the result is that we have to keep a staff to make these inspections. The Bill provides for an annual registration, just as we have provided for an annual registration under the Inspection of Machinery Act, and the clause provides that where a factory is already registered it shall remain registered until one month after the Act comes into force.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 19 to 31—agreed to.

Clause 32—Working hours of women and boys:

Hon. P. COLLIER: The clause deals with the hours during which women and boys shall work, and the proviso says that the commencing hour shall be eight o'clock in the morning, but it may, with the written consent of the inspector, be seven o'clock. It may be argued that there are circumstances in which it is desirable that women and boys should begin work at seven, but I intend to oppose the proposal even to the extent of giving discretion to the inspector. I do not know of any occupation where work has to commence at seven o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Davies: Other than the railways.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There, of course, they work the clock round. There are other trades where work is carried on at an early hour in the morning, but it is not desirable that boys under 16 should commence at seven o'clock.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member will notice that the clause provides that work shall not be commenced until 8 o'clock, but representations were made to the select committee, that in certain cases it was necessary that women and boys should be available to commence work in a certain class of factory at the same time as the men. It was found necessary therefore to give this permission, otherwise it would be impracticable to bring the men in at the early hour.

Hon. P. Collier: Was any particular industry given as an illustration?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Two or three instances were brought under notice. In another clause it is provided that where an industrial agreement is made a common

rule, the provisions of the Bill shall not apply. It may be therefore that an agreement or award may provide that women and boys shall not start work until nine o'clock, in which case the Bill would not apply.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Suppose the award says six o'clock?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That too will take precedence over the Bill. There are certain trades that must be carried on in daylight and darkness, and so long as the parties have thrashed out the matter before a tribunal and have come to an agreement, then we say that the Factories Act—which is intended to meet conditions where no award operates—shall not apply. It is desirable that inspectors should be able to give written permission if necessary that persons should be employed at these hours.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We are endeavouring to educate our youths. Many of these boys have to attend technical classes at night and also military training, and it is often between 9 and 10 p.m. before they can go home. Surely 8 o'clock in the morning is early enough for them to begin work. I move an amendment—

That the proviso be struck out.

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

Clauses 33, 34—agreed to.

Clause 35—Limitation of working hours in factories where Chinese are employed:

Hon. P. COLLIER: Why are the restrictions placed upon employers in the matter of employing Asiatics limited to night watchmen? Why should they not apply all round? Is it necessary that we should have to pass legislation to induce our shopkeepers to refrain from employing Asiatics in this capacity? Apparently the Asiatic is given preference over the returned soldier in this matter. At any rate it is a small thing to introduce into a Bill of this nature.

Mr. Teesdale: The job of a night watchman is the best in the city.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And Asiatics are being employed by those very shopkeepers who not so long ago spoke of their patriotism and sold so many flags to the people. It ought to be sufficient to appeal to their patriotic instinct to get rid of these Asiatics and employ men of their own race. It is rather humiliating to the people of the State that we should be asked to pass legislation of this nature.

Mr. Smith: How many Asiatic watchmen are there in the city?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I understand there are seven, and we are asked to legislate to force our patriotic shopkeepers to refrain from employing these men instead of, say, returned soldiers. Who are the shopkeepers employing these Asiatics, and have they given evidence before the select committee as to the merits of these night watchmen? There must be some sound reason why they continue to give preference to these persons.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Hon. members know that except for these few lines in the clause there is nothing new in the Bill as regards the employment of Asiatics in Western Australia. It is considered undesirable that we should have men of the Asiatic race parading our principal thoroughfares at night in the capacity of watchmen. To suggest that it is un-British to make this provision in the Bill and to cast a slur upon our shopkeepers is not quite fair. The Bill does not go as far as I should like on many of these points. I should like to make it an offence for any person, whether he sold flags during the war or has done so since, to deal with Chinamen instead of white men merely because he can do so at less expense to himself. To many people patriotism does not cover everything when they can get their commodities cheaper. Many so-called patriotic people in Perth are patronising Chinamen who work under all sorts of conditions, merely because they provide commodities at a cheaper rate than do returned soldiers. These things grow upon us and we do not appreciate that they are continuing uninterruptedly until someone draws our attention to them. I do not know whether, in making provision that Asiatics shall not be employed as night watchmen, we are not doing a thing that is very desirable. Are these people a desirable class to have abroad at night? We go as far as we can in saying that they shall not be employed as night watchmen. Even those carrying on business before 1904 had to be registered.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Not as workers, but as business concerns.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Every shop and factory has to be registered and they have to comply with the different provisions of the Bill, if they employ Asiatics. In order that people may be able to appreciate the difference between the conditions operating in such a factory and the conditions where British are employed, we put restrictions upon the former. We provide that all such goods have to be branded. We provide that, notwithstanding their desire to work all hours, and under all sorts of conditions, they shall not be allowed to do so. If they commit an offence our inspectors will see that they pay the penalty for it. This provision does not stand by itself. It is not the only restrictive provision in the Bill, and the object of these provisions is to level up conditions, so to speak, and make the competition more fair between those employing British labour and those employing Asiatics. They are not introduced into the measure for the purpose of giving the Asiatics a slap in the face, but because we are jealous of the conditions in which the Britishers work. We do not want to see the introduction of some other foreign element not so jealous of their working conditions, which would undermine those operating for the white races. I would

like to go further than the Bill in order to level up conditions, so that the Britishers may live in reasonable circumstances.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Is not the competition brought about by Britishers themselves?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is, to an extent.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: To a very large extent.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: As one hon. member has already mentioned, the reason why the 'Ghans, as they are referred to, are employed is that they are cheaper. People make purchases from Chinese fruit shops and other businesses, notwithstanding that they can get the same goods from returned soldiers, because they can get those goods cheaper.

Mr. Foley: There is no evidence to say that the people referred to in the clause are working cheaper than anyone else.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not say that there is, but I am drawing attention to a point which was taken, I think, by the member for Williams-Narrogin, regarding people dealing from Asiatics.

Mr. Johnston: They ought to be ashamed of themselves.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have heard this talk about white and black labour, and so on, until I am tired of it. We generally find that the people who are talking the loudest are the first to turn round and go into a Chinese shop and purchase their goods there.

Mr. Foley: Or else buy from hawkers at the gate.

Mr. Chesson: And send their washing to a Chinese laundry.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: This clause is merely aimed to level up the conditions so that British workers may be able to live in reasonable conditions. If we were to go to a foreign country, we would have to comply with such laws as were provided there. If the foreigners come here they must comply with laws which we pass in order to protect the interests of our own people.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I raised the point because, in my opinion, the clause is inconsistent with other provisions in the Bill, dealing with the employment of Asiatics. The marginal note to the clause is as follows:—“Limitation of working hours in factories where Chinese are employed.” There is a wide distinction between placing restrictions upon the employment of Asiatics and the total exclusion of that class as the clause seeks to do. I cannot see why, if Chinese can be employed all day and every day in a factory—and the Bill permits that—it is inconsistent to say that the same factory owner cannot employ a Chinese as a night watchman. Obviously, it is inconsistent. I am not arguing for the employment of Asiatics, and I hope that will be understood.

Mr. O'Loghlen: I hope it will be.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It will, and ought to be. I am not arguing for the employment of Asiatics as night watchmen, but I think we should preserve some consistency in the provisions of the Bill. The Minister made a point regarding the Asiatics wandering about at night.

Mr. Underwood: They would not be doing much watching, if they were abroad.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There is no principle involved in the clause. It is merely inserted, because there has been some complaint against the employment of Afghans or Asiatics as night watchmen in Perth. In order to compel those concerned to employ white people, this provision has been introduced. Asiatics come into competition with white people in furniture factories and in other directions, and if that is right, why should we not be consistent?

Mr. Willecock: Disabilities are placed upon them.

Hon. P. COLLIER: In this case the disabilities amount to displacing the Asiatics altogether, and placing someone else in their positions. For my part, I am surprised that such a thing should be necessary. At the same time, I see no greater harm in these people competing as night watchmen than I do in their competing in other avenues.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: This is not the only Bill which contains an element of inconsistency. The object of the Factories and Shops Bill is to eliminate unfair competition, whether in trade, employment or the conduct of businesses. The leader of the Opposition is correct when he says there is a distinction between penalising people and excluding people from this class of employment. If these people should be thrown out of employment as night watchmen, there are other avenues for them. There is hawking, for instance, to which they could turn their attention, and they would depend for their success, or otherwise, on the generosity of white people. My objection is not to the Asiatic who gets the job, but to the people who employ him.

The Minister for Works: You are concerned about cupidity, not competition.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Unfortunately for Western Australia these people have established themselves for many years in our midst, and are allowed to carry on business. With that great British tradition regarding vested interests, we must, I suppose, still continue to allow them to operate. The conditions upon which they may continue are set out in this Bill. If an employer engages Asiatic labour, he must make that fact known broadcast by having his goods branded. This will afford the public an opportunity of knowing that Asiatics have been indulging in unfair competition. We had evidence from widows, struggling to maintain a home for their children, who said that owing to Chinese laundries keeping open till all hours it was impossible for them to get on.

Hon. P. Collier: A night watchman is not in unfair competition.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: They are to this extent, that an Asiatic so employed deprives a Britisher of a job that is open for him.

Hon. P. Collier: That is not unfair competition.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Will the leader of the Opposition say that if a Britisher applies for employment, and is turned down by alleged patriotic employers in order that they may engage Asiatics, instead, it is not unfair competition?

Hon. P. Collier: Why not extend these provisions; why stop there?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The leader of the Opposition knows that we cannot extend them. He was in office for some years and I do not think that he brought any provision forward to deal with this. He knows it cannot be done. The Minister has made reference to the encouragement given to Asiatics by members of the British community. He probably alludes, among others, to representatives of the working classes, who advocate a white Australia. I admit that there is something in that connection but doubtless they were guided by others of the community, including Sir Walter James and Senator Lynch, as well as others I have seen in Chinese shops. I do not want to particularise but it is undoubtedly true that some people show a preference for Asiatics by employing them and thus depriving Britishers from getting a job. I shall not worry if the provision is not passed, but I point out that we cannot under the provisions of this Bill wipe out the Asiatic competitor in other branches of industry. We cannot pass a law to prevent those Asiatics who are here from earning a living. If we did, it would cause international complications. I know of no State in Australia, however democratic or radical it may be, where this has been suggested. All we can do is to regulate the employment of Asiatics, prevent them from working excessive hours, and insist on their marketing their commodities so that the public will be able to identify them and thus restrict unfair competition. I support the clause; I regret that it is necessary. I cannot give the names of shopkeepers, because we did not examine them. We proceeded on the line that it was obvious this practice was in existence, and we are now endeavouring to check it. The shopkeepers employ Asiatics, and I believe they have admitted that the Asiatics are sober and more reliable than Britishers. Possibly they are cheaper, but the shopkeepers do not admit that. I do not know that there is any element of danger about their being employed as watchmen. If I got a chance to wipe the Asiatic out, I would do so.

Mr. Underwood: How many are there?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: About seven or eight. A syndicate take a contract and they successfully compete year by year. This provision will prevent them from employing Asiatics if Britishers are available for the job. If we cannot go the whole way, we

should go part of the way. These people will have an opportunity to work at other callings. I wish I had a list of the names so that I could make an indictment against shopkeepers who howl about their patriotism, and yet refuse to employ their own race for this work.

Mr. Roche. The Fremantle shops employ Britishers.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Then they would not be affected by the Bill. Would anyone suggest that this work could not be done satisfactorily by Britishers? The Bill may be a little inconsistent but it is impossible to cover the whole of the ramifications of the Asiatic trade. If we did so, we would wipe out an industry in the north. I would not be much concerned about that, but the problem would be to know what to do with the people who were deprived of their livelihood. If we prevent Asiatics from indulging in unfair competition, we shall accord to the British worker that element of protection which, through the greed and avarice of employers, he is now denied.

Mr. FOLEY: I think that the leader of the Opposition, in resenting this provision, was not entirely opposed to the employment of Asiatics as night watchmen. I can understand his objection to the employment of Asiatics generally. When an attempt was made some years ago to prevent the employment of Asiatics in my electorate, complications arose. No one knows this better than the leader of the Opposition. I believe that the clause is a good one. I have had a good deal to do with the Perth Health Board, and the greatest trouble experienced by the health authorities is with the foreigners who own factories. I would sooner see white people employed in place of Chinese at furniture making, but unfortunately there are many people who advocate preference to Britishers and who have Chinese carts delivering goods at their doors. Some years ago the then member for Roebourne, Mr. Gardiner, and myself in walking home after a late sitting, saw furniture being loaded on to lorries from an Asiatic factory, and I followed one of those lorries to a place which professed to sell furniture on which no Asiatic labour had been employed. If white watchmen were employed we would have better supervision over factories of this kind. The adoption of this provision should be a lesson to the Government of the State. On one of our water supplies an Afghan was employed and I resented his employment and he was put off. If any question arose between the public and the owner of a factory, a Britisher would be able to give a more intelligible statement to the court than could an Asiatic watchman. The only inconsistency in the Bill is that we cannot go so far as we should like.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 4 the words "as a nightwatchman" be struck out.

It may be true that I was in office for five years and did not do anything to restrict the employment of Asiatics. Had I made an attempt, I should have done something a little more effective than this nonsensical proposition. The member for Forrest spoke about eliminating the competition of the Asiatic, and the whole provision will shut out seven men. Why stop at night watchman? The effect of the provision, instead of eliminating competition, will be to transfer the competition to some other avocation. These men if deprived of earning a livelihood as night watchmen will displace seven Britishers at other work. There is no reason behind the clause. If we are going to eliminate competition, why confine ourselves to night watchmen? Asiatics are engaged selling vegetables.

Mr. Willcock: Everybody knows that.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Of course. If we are going to provide that Asiatics shall not be employed for the reason that they are displacing Britishers, why stop at seven night watchmen?

Mr. O'Loghlen: Move it, and I shall support you.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If the select committee had in mind the wiping out of competition, they might have gone a little further. The hon. member said we could not prevent the Asiatics from earning a living. What other effect will this provision have? The hon. member argues that it is wrong for seven Asiatics to earn a living as night watchmen, but that it is not wrong for them to earn a living in the numerous other occupations they follow.

Mr. O'Loghlen: It is the employer I want to hit.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There are more employers than those referred to by the hon. member.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Name one.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Any number of Chinese run shops and employ their fellow countrymen. This clause will prevent a Chinese factory owner from engaging an Asiatic as watchman, but it will not prevent the Asiatic from being employed to assist in the shop. What is the difference? What is there peculiarly wrong in Asiatics being night watchmen any more than anything else? The hon. member says we cannot prevent them from earning a living; but here we propose to prevent them from earning their living as watchmen. Why?

Mr. Teesdale: Because we have so many disabled men who cannot take on other occupations.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I should not regard the position of night watchman as one for a disabled man—to walk around the blocks of the city in the dark for the purpose of protecting property. Anyway, this is a tinpot thing to put into an Act of Parliament.

The Minister for Mines: Strike it out, then.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No; I propose to extend the clause so as to provide that no shopkeeper shall employ any person of Asiatic race. Why is there no proposal to wipe out Chinese and Japanese cooks?

Mr. Jones: At the Weld Club.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not think clubs come under this Bill; probably I shall move to bring them under it. An unanswerable case can be made out on behalf of the women who are being displaced from eating houses by Asiatics. Possibly, however, if we carry the Bill as far as we ought to carry it, it will be held up for the consent of the Home Government, which consent might be refused. I do not think any measure on the statute book specifically excludes Asiatics.

The Minister for Mines: We refuse licenses to Asiatics.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, and miners' rights, but not by specific legislation. It is done by administrative act.

Mr. Munsie: Under the Mining Act an Asiatic is not permitted to be employed on a lease in any capacity.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Let us extend this clause, and see how far we can go. The carrying of the amendment I have moved would make the clause a far-reaching one.

Mr. BROWN: I regret the discussion which has occurred. The select committee took the view that white unskilled labour could take the place of the six or eight Asiatic night-watchmen employed in Perth streets, and that the Asiatics could find some other employment. In my opinion there is danger in employing Asiatics as night-watchmen in the streets, especially as, if a fire broke out in a building not under an Asiatic night-watchman's care, that Asiatic might not show himself so active in giving the alarm as a European would. In a few years, as the city extends, there may be 70 or 80 Asiatic night-watchmen employed, instead of seven or eight, unless this clause passes; and then there would be considerable difficulty in getting rid of them. I hope the leader of the Opposition will not press his amendment.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I support the clause as it stands. In every other sphere of Asiatic employment we impose some disability. We cannot put up on, say, Mr. Lathlain's shop a placard stating it is watched by a nigger. On the other hand, every article of furniture made by Asiatic labour is stamped with a notice to that effect.

Hon. P. Collier: But we do not stamp Chinese vegetables.

Mr. WILLCOCK: But we know when we are buying vegetables from a Chinaman. As regards cooks in restaurants, the industrial agreements provide for preference to Europeans, thus tending to eliminate Chinese and Japanese. If an Asiatic is employed in a restaurant and there is a white man available, the Asiatic must be dismissed and the European put in his place.

Hon. P. Collier: Why cannot the same thing be arranged as regards night-watchmen?

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. SMITH: I move an amendment—

That after "Asiatic," in line 3, the words "or African" be inserted.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The amendment would cause difficulty. It should specifically state "coloured African races."

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 36—agreed to.

Clause 37—Overtime:

Hon. P. COLLIER: This provides that the prescribed number of working hours may from time to time be extended. Extended by whom?

The Minister for Mines: By the employer—of course within certain limits.

Hon. P. COLLIER: As set out later on? The Minister for Mines: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 38 to 40—agreed to.

Clause 41—Permit for extended hours:

Hon. P. COLLIER: Paragraph (f) provides that women and boys residing at a further distance than one mile from the factory shall, when working overtime, be provided by the employer with a sufficient meal or alternatively an allowance as tea money. I think one mile is too great a distance. In fact, I do not think there should be any distance qualification at all. I move an amendment—

That after "boy," in line 4, the words "who resides at a farther distance than one mile from the factory" be struck out.

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

Clause 42—agreed to.

Clause 43—Half holiday for women and boys:

Mr. MUNSIE: I should like from the Minister an explanation of the meaning of this provision. Apparently it means that an employer can arrange with his employees to have another day than Saturday as a half-holiday. Since the Bill makes provision for the taking of a vote to decide between Saturday and Wednesday as the half-holiday, why should employers be permitted to make individual arrangements with their employees?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: This provision applies only to areas outside of shop districts. Each shop district shall agree upon a common half-holiday, but outside of shop districts individual arrangements may be made.

Mr. Munsie: Then this does not apply to shop districts at all?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 44—agreed to.

Clause 45—Payment of wages:

Hon. P. COLLIER: Paragraph (g) seems to conflict with the powers of the Arbitration Court. It is set out elsewhere in the Bill that an award shall override any of the provisions of the Bill, yet the paragraph gives the Chief Inspector of Factories the power to agree to employ a woman over 21 years of age for a lesser wage than that prescribed by the court. At least that is how it appears to me. Does the paragraph mean that if the Arbitration Court prescribes a minimum wage, the Chief Inspector shall have the power to consent to a woman being paid at a lower rate than that fixed?

The Minister for Mines: Women must not be employed for less than the minimum rate fixed for the district by the court.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It does not seem to be very clearly expressed.

The Minister for Mines: It cannot conflict with Clause 152 because that is very definite.

Mr. WILCOCK: The select committee found that women were employed in some cases at occupations which were not covered by an award of the court and the clause provides that no woman shall be employed at a lower rate than that provided by any award of the court without the permission of the Chief Inspector. The spirit of the Act is that women must be employed at a certain rate, and unless the Chief Inspector had good reasons, he would not give the permission provided for in the paragraph. For instance, a woman may be a cripple, or she may be suffering from some disability; it would be in such a case that the Chief Inspector's permission would be sought.

Hon. P. Collier: That may be the intention but it is not clearly expressed.

Mr. WILCOCK: I do not know how we could get over it unless we stipulated that the basic wage for women should be so much, and we could hardly do that in the Factories and Shops Bill.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 46 to 51—agreed to.

Clause 52—No child to be employed without permission:

Hon. P. COLLIER: I object to the clause. The age at which a child may be employed in a factory—a boy at 14 and a girl at 15—is too young. The compulsory school age is 14 and the clause contemplates the employment of boys at an age when they are not permitted under the Education Act to leave school. Even though it may be urged that in cases of hardship or distress, where widows are rearing families, it may be necessary for a boy under the age of 14 to go into a factory, for my part I am going to object to a child entering a factory at that age, even with the permission of the inspector. No child in Australia ought to begin to earn a

living in a factory at that age. It is too tender an age altogether. I should like to see the school age raised from 14 to 16 and to keep out from factories children under 16 years of age. I move an amendment—

That the following words be struck out:

“Who has not obtained the permission of the Chief Inspector to be so employed.”

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We all share the opinions expressed by the leader of the Opposition, but I do not know that it has hurt many of us here to-night through having had to work at an early age. So long as a child is not compelled to work unduly hard, and is given an opportunity of being brightened up in other directions, I do not know that it has a very harmful effect upon them to work when young. I would point out, however, that certificates issued by the Chief Inspector of Factories are subject to another certificate being first of all issued by the Education Department, permitting the child to leave the primary school because of certain conditions and go to a factory, provided the child continues to take some form of education afterwards. It must be remembered that in some families conditions exist that render it necessary for the older children to earn something for the support of the remaining members of the family. Very few children in this State will be affected by this clause.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 53 to 66—agreed to.

Clause 67—Women not to be employed within four weeks before or after confinement:

Hon. P. COLLIER: The period set down in this clause is altogether too short. In the interests of the race, we must go as far as possible to protect the mothers in these circumstances. We should see that they are not forced into factories to earn their living too soon before or after the date of confinement. I intend to move an amendment to provide that women shall not be permitted to work in any factory during the eight weeks immediately prior to or after confinement.

Mr. Hickmott: How would you provide for the maintenance of the women during that period?

Hon. P. COLLIER: That was what was said in England in the old days when it was proposed to take the children out of the coal mines and from the cotton factories in Lancashire. Children went to work at six o'clock in the morning, and worked on till six o'clock at night, and the child coming off duty got into the bed just vacated by the child going on duty. The same thing was said then: “How will the children be provided for?” Mainly owing to the work of Lord Shaftesbury, whose name is that of one of the very few aristocrats associated with big reform movements in England, that sys-

tem was stopped. If we take women out of the factories here eight weeks before the date of their confinement, provision will be made for them. If that is not the case in a young country like Australia, then I am not optimistic as to our future. The country, however, will not become insolvent, nor will the women starve if such a provision is made. I move an amendment—

That in line 3 "four" be struck out and "eight" inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The leader of the Opposition correctly expressed what is the feeling of members regarding the employment of women in our factories. We might follow the matter to its logical conclusion and provide that no married women should be employed in our factories. Their duty is at home looking after their families. It is only women capable of rearing families who are provided for in this clause, and while they are in that state, they should be at home and not in the factory at all. I cannot quite see where we should draw the line.

Hon. P. Collier: You are drawing it at four weeks.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We do not say in the clause "married women." We simply state that no woman shall knowingly work, and no occupier of a factory shall knowingly require or permit any woman to work in any factory during the four weeks immediately prior to or after her confinement. I do not suppose there would be one per cent. of married women to whom this clause would apply.

Hon. P. Collier: Take the case of the others.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The married woman who has to rear a family and finds it necessary to continue to work in the factory till the last moment, and to go back as quickly as possible after the event, will do so only because, for instance, her husband is unable to maintain them and she has to get food and clothing for the children. If we take such a woman out of the factory she will simply go elsewhere to earn money or else go to the Charities Department. If she did the latter, there would be no necessity to go to the factory during that period at all. Such a woman would probably go back to the wash tub two or three days after her confinement instead of waiting for four weeks before returning to the factory. This clause is not inserted so much from that point of view, as from the moral aspect, involved in a girl working up to just before and returning immediately after, her confinement. It is a difficult matter to deal with. There are some who consider that such a provision should not be placed in an Act of Parliament. We were not so modest and the clause accordingly appears in the form suggested. Many women, of course, work harder at home than they would do in the factory.

Hon. P. Collier: The worker in a factory stands on her feet all day.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The bulk of the factories have sitting accommodation now. I agree that it would be desirable if we were to exclude women for the more extended period suggested by the leader of the Opposition. The clause as it stands, however, is a step in the right direction, and is a more advanced proposal than appears in any other Act in Australia of which I am aware. We might at least give this a trial. It may be very difficult to apply it in some cases, for where necessity drives, people know no law, and it is not easy to disclose such things as we are discussing. I do not know whether a prosecution could take place under this clause, all the circumstances being considered, but the provision will afford an indication that Parliament is opposed to the condition of affairs existing.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The evidence of women was to the effect that the period should be six weeks.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not object to that. I will accept an amendment for six weeks prior to the confinement, if the leader of the Opposition will make it four weeks afterwards.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Witnesses said that the longer period was required after, rather than before the event.

Hon. P. Collier: I will agree to alter the amendment to provide for six weeks.

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

Clauses 68 to 74—agreed to.

Clause 75—Sitting accommodation to be provided:

Mr. JOHNSTON: The clause provides that suitable sitting accommodation for all females shall be provided. The proportion suggested is one seat for every three females employed. That is not strictly suitable accommodation.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The clause merely provides that the factory shall afford suitable seating accommodation for females employed, for the purpose of enabling them to have a rest occasionally during the day, the proportion fixed being one seat for every three females. The clause goes further, however, and provides that the accommodation shall be conveniently situated for the use of the employees concerned. It is not intended that the seating accommodation shall be provided for those who are engaged at work at which they can sit down. This provides for those who are mostly standing at their work, thus enabling them to sit down occasionally.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 76 to 83—agreed to.

Clause 84—Notice of accidents in factories:

Hon. P. COLLIER: Notice must be sent to the inspector if an accident causes loss of life to an employee or incapacitates an em-

ployee for more than 24 hours. This, I take it, is to give the inspector an opportunity to inquire into the cause and inspect the scene of the accident. If a serious accident resulting in the death of an employee occurs no notice need be given until after the expiration of 24 hours, and before the inspector would have an opportunity to inspect, all evidence indicating the cause of the accident might be removed. In the case of a mine accident, notice must be sent to the inspector immediately a serious accident occurs. What is the reason for the 24 hours' notice?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The subsequent clauses explain the reason. The inspector has to inquire and report, and the Minister may direct an inquiry before a magistrate. It might be desirable that an accident should be reported immediately because an employee might be so injured that his death would result subsequently, but if every accident had to be reported and the inspector had to investigate, we would need an army of inspectors. There are thousands of factories; we register every place where one person is employed.

Hon. P. Collier: The nature of the accident has to be set forth in the report, and the inspector could decide whether it was necessary to inspect.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Clause 85 makes it obligatory on the inspector to proceed to the factory and inquire.

Hon. P. Collier: That could be altered.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: We view an accident as being serious if a person is incapacitated for more than 24 hours.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is three days.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: No, 24 hours. If a girl ran a needle into her hand she might be incapacitated for more than a day, but we would not require an inspector to report on that. In a mine it is essential that no one should interfere with the scene of an accident until an inspection is made, but in that case, though every accident is immediately reported, it is not mandatory for the inspector to proceed and report.

Hon. P. Collier: A comparatively trivial accident which would keep a person off for 24 hours would have to be reported, and the inspector would have to proceed immediately to the factory, whereas if a serious accident occurred, the inspector might not get the report for 24 hours.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: We could insist on the report being lodged in not less than 24 hours. There is no comparison between a factory and a mine. Where an accident happens in a factory through the boiler or machinery, it would have to be reported to the Inspector of machinery.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Would that apply to a girl running a sewing machine needle through her finger?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Then you must increase the number of inspectors considerably.

Hon. P. Collier: The basis should be the nature of the accident rather than the time.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The provision in the clause was considered preferable. After all, this is only a starting point.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 85 to 96—agreed to.

Clause 97—Certain laundries exclude from the operation of Act:

Mr. CHESSON: I move an amendment—

That after "thirty-eight" in line 3 of Subclause 2, the words "sixty-seven" be inserted.

This will embrace, in addition to the clause mentioned, the clause which provides that women shall not be employed within six weeks before or after confinement.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: I have no objection to the amendment; the provision is certainly desirable. A good deal of evidence was taken by the select committee on the question of bringing laundries conducted by certain institutions under the provisions of the Act. After careful consideration the committee included Subclause 2, which applies the clauses relating to hours of work, working hours of women and boys, evasion of working hours, and the keeping of records to every reformatory, industrial school and institution conducted for religious or charitable purposes. This is a valuable step forward from the point of view of seeing that the inmates of institutions are not sweated, but are worked under reasonable conditions. The institutions will be compelled to keep a record of the hours worked giving some assurance that they shall work the same hours as factories outside.

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

Clause 98—Act extends to factories controlled by Government or local authority:

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What power has the Minister to enforce this clause on the Government? I tried very hard once to prosecute the Commissioner of Railways for infringement of the health laws, and I was definitely advised that it could not legally be done.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Of course the Crown cannot prosecute itself, but the hon. member knows that we have quite a number of Acts, such as the Inspection of Machinery Act, applying to the Government in the same way as to private persons. Those Acts are in fact applied to the Government. The responsible Minister would take action to prevent any public department from deliberately evading an Act of Parliament. Again, as regards the Government-owned steamers, if we did not comply with the law, and an accident occurred, any person injured might sue the Crown for damages, and probably recover extra heavy damages.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 99—agreed to.

Clause 100—Closing times of shops:

Mr. JOHNSTON: The abolition of the late shopping night represents the most important change in policy proposed by this Bill. I am not opposing the change, but I would like to hear from the Minister as to the reasons of the select committee for recommending it.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Only one witness out of about eighty was against the abolition of the late shopping night.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is true that this clause contains the most important alteration proposed by the Bill. The measure provides that shops shall close at 1 p.m. on one day of the week, and that on the other five days they shall close not later than 6 p.m. This means the abolition of the late shopping night. Apart from shop assistants, a great number of shopkeepers in various parts of the State have given evidence with regard to this proposal; and their evidence has been overwhelmingly in favour of the abolition of the late shopping night. The late shopping night was, I think, a custom which grew more from the vanity of the public, and from their desire to provide themselves with amusement, than from any real necessity for late shopping. Originally shops kept open until 11 p.m.; then they began to close at 10 p.m.; and now the hour is 9 p.m. No one has gone bankrupt because of these changes, so far as I know. When the shops kept open until 11 p.m., people used to rush in to be served at 10.59 p.m., after spending hours before the shop fronts gossiping with their friends. Only one witness was opposed to the abolition of the late shopping night; and he, remarkably enough, came from Fremantle. I have also received a communication from an association of business men at Fremantle opposing the abolition of the late shopping night. However, prominent shopkeepers in the metropolitan area favour this proposal, so long as it is made a general rule. They say they believe all the business to be done can be done in the hours proposed by this Bill. Some shopkeepers have said that they individually would not do the same amount of business in the reduced hours, because portion of the business would go from one point to another. A suburban shopkeeper has said that he personally would be ruined by the proposed change, because the business he is now doing after 6 p.m. would go to the town shops. Next, a city shopkeeper would come along and say that he would be ruined because the business he is now doing after 6 p.m. would go to the suburban shops. I have not yet been able to make up my mind exactly who will be ruined. Nowadays no one finds more difficulty in getting his shopping requirements met than he did when shops kept open until 11 p.m. There is no wisdom in having long shopping hours, which some of the shopkeepers have assured us are very costly, for the reason that when keeping open until 9 p.m. they must let half their staff off for tea between 6 and 7 p.m.

and the other half between 7 and 8 p.m., with the result that for only one hour out of the extra three do they have the full staff available, while incurring heavy extra expense for lighting and so forth. I remember years ago when we were told that to close the shops on Saturday afternoons would spell ruin to many. It is largely a question of custom.

Mr. Money: And a question of the train service.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Well, we altered our train service to suit the altered circumstances. We have frequently had to do so, especially at Geraldton. The evidence before the select committee was overwhelmingly in favour of the abolition of the late night shopping, so long as it was made general. We had to spend considerable time over the problem of bringing the small shops into line, but I am certain that when we adopt the change the general public will be glad of the alteration.

Mr. FOLEY: We all recognise that there must be some alteration in regard to the late shopping night. The last time we made an alteration many declared that they would be ruined. In my opinion the hardship will fall exclusively on the smaller shops. It will result in centralisation, in putting added business into the big city firms doing a considerable parcel and postal trade.

Mr. MONEY: I agree with the last speaker. Undoubtedly the proposed change will mean centralisation and will rob the smaller shops to enrich the larger. The people of each district by referendum ought to decide whether or not the late night should be abolished. This question was not before the electors at the last elections.

Hon. P. Collier: Many questions have cropped up since the last elections.

Mr. MONEY: In my district it has never been before the electors. We should not take from the people the right to say whether or not they shall have a late shopping night. If it is desirable to alter the present custom, it should be altered by the people themselves.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member argues that because this was not submitted to the people at the last general elections, Parliament has no right to make a change. Then he goes on to declare that it should be left to a poll of the people. Surely the hon. member is not serious. There is no more reason why a person working in a shop should be subject as to his working hours to the will of the people than should a person working in a mine. Why should shop employers alone have to work for 12 hours at a stretch on one day in the week? Is it essential to the well-being of the people, or to the conduct of business? Certainly not. Not only is it not essential, but I say it is nothing more than a mere custom. Yet the member for Bunbury would perpetuate that.

Mr. Money: I say it should be left to the people.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Why should the people be able to say that thousands of shop employees shall work 12 hours a day, largely for the amusement of those who have finished work?

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is provided that the half holiday shall be Saturday, with the proviso that a majority of the shopkeepers in any shop district shall have the right to petition the Minister to change the holiday from Saturday to any other day. That is conferring a very great power on a majority of the shopkeepers. It is an important departure from the provisions of the existing Act. Take the metropolitan area from Midland Junction to Fremantle, over which the half holiday has been fixed on Saturdays. Under this provision, over that area we may have half holidays on every day in the week. We should retain the provision which enables us to fix a common half holiday over that area. We do not want the shops in Perth to be closed on Saturday, and people going to Subiaco to do business. I would like to retain the right of the people to decide the matter if necessary by way of referendum.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We are giving fairly extensive powers to the Minister, but after all it is difficult to get an Act of this kind which can apply practically to the whole of the State, without giving powers to vary conditions in one district as against another. The purpose is to give power to the Minister by proclamation, only at the request of the majority of the shopkeepers in any particular centre, to vary the half holiday. While we were taking evidence in the country it was suggested that from the point of view of the employees it did not matter in the slightest whether the half holiday was on Saturday, Wednesday, or Thursday. In the metropolitan area it is entirely different. The people in the town should not be so interested as those in the country. The select committee thought that the Minister should have the power by proclamation to meet the wishes of the shopkeepers in those cases where they would be expressing the opinions of those who would be doing business with them.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What about Kalgoorlie or Boulder?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It would not apply in those towns. In a centre like the metropolitan area a referendum would be taken, but where there was no point in taking a referendum the shopkeepers themselves would determine whether it was desirable to close on Wednesday or Saturday afternoon.

Mr. PICKERING: In country districts any day but Saturday would be suitable for the half holiday. The farm hands all receive their holiday on Saturday, and that is the only day on which they have a chance to go into the township to secure their supplies.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I recognise the need for machinery which will permit of the variation of the half-holiday in the different parts of the State. Kalgoorlie and Boulder have selected by general consent the Wednesday half-holiday, and I do not think there would be any desire to change that day to Saturday; and so it might be in country towns. Moreover, I object to giving so much power to shopkeepers without consulting the shop assistants or the general public. When the Saturday half-holiday was introduced in the metropolitan area, it was largely the result of agitation on the part of the shop assistants. In this case the whole power is centred in the majority of the shopkeepers. True, the Minister states that the power rests finally with the Minister, and that no Minister would dare to alter the half-holiday. But if a majority of the shopkeepers in pursuance of this clause were to present a petition to the Minister, urging the change of the half-holiday, pressure would be brought to bear on the Minister to give effect to it and it could reasonably be argued, "Why have you placed this provision in the Act if you have no intention of acceding to our request?" I have no desire to see the Saturday half-holiday taken away from the desire of the majority of the shopkeepers without consulting the wishes of the employees or the general public. It is throwing a great deal of responsibility upon the Minister. The whole of the shop owners in a district may petition for change, while the shop assistants may petition to the contrary effect. No doubt the Minister would take a referendum in the event of any such dispute.

The Minister for Mines: Surely in a small country town the shopkeepers can give an opinion which would render unnecessary anything like a referendum?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, but there is no opportunity given to the employees in country towns to express an opinion.

The Minister for Mines: There are very few of those.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not suppose there would be many, but most of the shop employ one or more assistants who would be entitled to consideration.

Mr. MONEY: To obviate the difficulty in reference to the Saturday afternoon holiday it would be better if the Bill provided for the continuation of the present arrangements and in the event of an alteration being desired there would be no necessity for a proclamation or petition. I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of the proviso, "Saturday" be struck out, and "the same day as at present observed" be inserted in lieu.

Mr. JOHNSTON: In most of the country towns the Saturday night shopping is continued up to 9 o'clock, while the clause proposes to bring in the Saturday half-holiday.

This would dislocate everyone's business, and I hope the amendment will be accepted.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Under Clause 99 the existing conditions will not be affected. When a variation is required a petition can be lodged.

Amendment put and negatived.

On motion by Hon. W. C. Angwin, the following words were added after "substitution" in line 10 of Subclause (2):—"The following Electoral Provinces, namely, the Metropolitan Province, the Metropolitan-Suburban Province, and the West Province are hereby united into one shop district by the name of the "Metropolitan Shop District" and shall be deemed to have been established by Proclamation under this Act."

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 101—agreed to.

Clause 102—Registration of small shops:

MR. SMITH: Subclause 3 would operate very harshly against a number of poor people. It would, for instance, prevent Maoris, who come under the heading of Polynesians, from obtaining a license to conduct a small shop. The Jews of Palestine would come under the heading of Asiatics. My experience is that they are hard-working and industrious people. There are many such persons in Perth who are earning a living by keeping small shops. I know of some who are the mothers of men who have fallen at the Front. Why should we debar these people from keeping a small shop? I move an amendment—

That Subclause (3) be struck out.

MR. O'LOGHLEN: You would cut out Polynesians and Asiatics.

MR. SMITH: I refer to the Jews of Palestine.

HON. P. COLLIER: They are all going back to Palestine now.

MR. SMITH: No, they are not. The subclause will work a hardship on many Jews who are keeping small shops in the suburbs.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. SMITH: As the Committee have decided to retain the subclause, I move the following amendment—

That the following words be added: "Provided these restrictions shall not apply to Jews."

By excluding members of the Jewish race, we would inflict a hardship on a large number of respectable citizens. It is not the intention of the Committee that hardship should be imposed. I trust the Committee will agree to the proviso I have suggested.

MR. O'LOGHLEN: It would be unwise if any distinction, as suggested by the member for North Perth, were agreed to. It postulates that it was intended to inflict a hardship upon certain sections of the community. Such was not the intention of the Committee.

The intention is to eliminate unfair competition which has grown up in the suburban areas, whereby these small shops are kept open till all hours while the shops kept by persons who have to employ assistants have to be closed at certain hours. The small shop nuisance has become very pronounced in the outer suburbs and we have come to the conclusion that they should only be allowed to continue in certain circumstances. We provide that widows, old or physically disabled persons and, in cases of great hardship, others may be allowed to continue in business at the discretion of the Minister.

MR. SMITH: If a person comes from Asia, he cannot have a small shop because he is precluded from opening one.

MR. O'LOGHLEN: If the Jews come from Asia, can the proviso be in order, seeing that we have already decided that Asiatics are not allowed to have shops?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The amendment simply eliminates one section of those affected.

MR. O'LOGHLEN: In those circumstances then, if it is beneficial so far as this particular class of people is concerned, I have no objection to the amendment. I do not desire to penalise the Jews.

HON. P. COLLIER: I question whether Subclause (3) includes the Jews at all. The Jews comprise a sect, not a race, and the distinction between the Jew and ourselves is one of religion. The fact that a Jew is born in Palestine does not make him an Asiatic any more than an hon. member born in India would be an Indian.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Under the State and Federal law at present, persons born in countries along the Mediterranean coast in Asia Minor are termed Asiatics and cannot receive the full privileges of citizenship here.

HON. P. COLLIER: All I can say is that I think the law is wrong.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: So do I.

HON. P. COLLIER: The locality of birth does not determine the matter. Numbers of Englishmen have been born in India but they are not Indians.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Our laws interpret that they are Asiatics when they are born in these countries in Asia Minor.

MR. PICKERING: You might have Asiatic Jews, as well as European Jews.

HON. P. COLLIER: Yes, that is so.

MR. O'LOGHLEN: They say that the Jews started Bolshevism.

HON. P. COLLIER: I do not know where this will lead us.

MR. SMITH: My amendment will make it clear.

MR. PICKERING: It will complicate matters.

HON. P. COLLIER: I do not desire to encourage any disabilities regarding the Jews, who are very estimable citizens, but it is

hard to make distinctions. The amendment would admit those who are not British subjects but who are born in alien countries, while at the same time it will exclude British subjects, in the person of those coming from India.

Mr. Smith: Why did you not vote to knock out the clause altogether?

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. member did not push the question to a division otherwise I might have voted with him.

Mr. WILLCOCK: I venture to assert that not more than one per cent. of the Jews in Western Australia came from Asia. Just because there was a question of the nationality of one Jew who came from Palestine, members are seeking to call them all Asiatics. Fifty to sixty per cent. of the Jews in Australia came from England.

Mr. Pilkington: They may still be of the Asiatic race.

Mr. WILLCOCK: But they are British subjects. This will not prevent any Jew, Asiatic or Polynesian from keeping a shop. It will merely prevent any such person from keeping his shop open later than other shops.

Mr. Johnston: When Australians' shops are closed.

Mr. WILLCOCK: That is so. If we believe all we have heard about the commercial instincts of the Jewish people, they will be able to make sufficient during the ordinary hours without seeking the advantage of an extra two hours' trading.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The member for North Perth is asking that Palestine Jews shall be given two hours advantage over Australian shopkeepers.

Mr. Smith: That is not what I asked.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I would put them all on the same footing.

Mr. Smith: That is what I want.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I know many Palestine Jews, and good citizens they are, but I do not believe in giving them an advantage which Australian shopkeepers will not enjoy.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If the amendment is passed, every Jew will have an advantage over Australian shopkeepers.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The member for North Perth should make his amendment read that the restriction in Subclause 3 shall not apply; otherwise the proviso will apply to the whole clause.

Mr. SMITH: I shall accept the suggestion of the member for Boulder.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment now reads, "Provided that Subsection 3 shall not apply to persons of the Jewish race."

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	18
Noes	16
Majority for	2

AYES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Draper	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foley	Mr. Smith
Mr. George	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Hardwick
Sir H. B. Lefroy	(Teller.)
Mr. Maley	

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Locke
Mr. Collier	Mr. Troy
Mr. Duff	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Jones	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Lutey	(Teller.)
Mr. Money	

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

Clauses 103, 104—agreed to.

Clause 105—Chemists' and druggists' shops:

Mr. JOHNSTON: I wish to move an amendment to alter the closing time from 6.30 to 8 p.m. I have received a circular from a large number of chemists in the metropolitan area who object to the closing hour being 6.30 p.m.

The Minister for Mines: Who are they?

Mr. JOHNSTON: H. H. Bingemann, F. R. Plummer, H. F. W. Mohr (W.A. Apothecaries, Ltd.), F. W. Collett (Edward Dean & Co.), John Shadwick, A. E. Arnold, P. B. Gillett, H. F. Spencer, W. O. Osborne, W. R. Read, W. Wright, I. H. Tindale, A. R. Davis, F. T. Lorman, F. W. F. Danker, John Rowe, and I. A. C. Murdock.

Mr. Griffiths: Cut out seven of them.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I shall not cut out any. Among the names I recognise the principal chemists in Perth.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Not at all.

Mr. LAMBERT: I have a prior amendment. I move an amendment—

That paragraph (a) be struck out.

If my amendment is carried, chemists and druggists will have to close at the same hour as other shops, namely, 6 o'clock.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: On a point of order, the member for Williams-Narrogin has an amendment to move, and if the amendment of the member for Coolgardie is carried, the member for Williams-Narrogin will be debarred from moving his.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If the amendment of the member for Coolgardie is not carried, the member for Williams-Narrogin will have an opportunity to move his. If on the other hand it is carried, it will indicate that the Committee favour 6 o'clock closing for chemists and not the later hour

suggested by the member for Williams-Narrogin.

Mr. JOHNSTON: If the member for Coolgardie would agree to move to strike out all the words after "at," I would then be in a position to move my amendment. Having moved my amendment before the member for Coolgardie moved his, I contend that I should not be prevented from moving it by any amendment of his.

The CHAIRMAN: I have not yet put the hon. member's amendment. Does the member for Coolgardie accept the suggestion?

Mr. Lambert: Yes, so long as I can get the opinion of the Committee as to my amendment.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Bill provides that chemists' and druggists' shops may remain open until 6.30, but that other classes of shops shall close at six. What we want is an expression of opinion from the Committee as to the amendments of both hon. members, and the only way to secure this is to adopt the suggestion of the member for Williams-Narrogin.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Pharmaceutical Society have taken a vote of their members, the majority of whom are in favour of the early closing. The master chemists are prepared to keep a night dispensary going in case of necessity, and this would overcome any difficulty that might be created by the shops closing at the earlier hour suggested. A medical man usually knows where to get a prescription made up if it is urgently required. The member for Williams-Narrogin apparently desires to go back to the old order of things.

Mr. Johnston: I want the eight o'clock closing, in the interests of the lives of the people.

Mr. LAMBERT: Hardly a single master chemist is in favour of keeping open to a late hour. Anyone who deals with a chemist knows that chemist's address; or, failing that, it will be known to the doctor. There is no occasion to keep chemists' shops open late merely to meet possibly imaginary cases of emergency. In country districts everyone knows where a chemist is to be found.

Mr. Money: And country people frequently have to travel 10 or 12 miles in order to reach a chemist.

Mr. LAMBERT: Quite so. From what I have read of the evidence, I believe that the select committee examined this question very carefully. The only serious objection to a uniform closing of chemists' shops was made by Mr. Scurlock.

Mr. Smith: If you are backing the select committee, why do you not stick to their recommendations?

Mr. LAMBERT: The evidence of certain witnesses has since been modified. Mr. Scurlock has written to the Pharmaceutical Society as follows:—

I consulted with Messrs. Arnold and Spencer—

These are men who were opposed to the idea of uniform closing, desiring to remain open until 8 or 9 p.m.

and we are of opinion that we do not want to stand in the way of the majority attaining the ideal of early closing. We are therefore agreeable to 6 p.m. as the closing hour, on condition that the clause in reference to the supply of medicine by chemists after six, should, in the interests of suburban residents, be given a liberal interpretation; and we suggest that the word "necessary" replace the word "urgent."

Mr. Mansie: The word "urgent" does not appear in the Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Bill says "in any emergency," which means practically the same as "urgent." Shutting the shop at 6.30 p.m. would mean that the chemist would not get away before 7 o'clock, and that would not be fair to either the master chemists or the assistants. There are very few chemists' shops in the suburbs.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Are there not?

Mr. Smith: There are half a dozen in my electorate.

Mr. LAMBERT: The suburban shops are mostly branches of Perth shops. Closing at 6 p.m. means that the chemist will not be away before about 6.30, and this will ensure every necessary opportunity for the making up of a prescription. There are chemists residing at their places of business who sit at their shop doors until 9 p.m.; but is it fair to bring those chemists into competition with other chemists who desire to get away from business at a reasonable hour? Not one responsible master chemist in the metropolitan area has offered any opposition to six o'clock closing. We should at least have some regard for the interests of the young assistants.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I support the Bill as it stands.

Mr. LAMBERT: I quite believe that the hon. member is sincere in holding the views he does.

The Minister for Mines: It is a very good step forward.

Mr. LAMBERT: There is no doubt about that, and I do not think that the Minister is really opposed to the 6 o'clock closing. If the clause is altered to 6.30, that really means that the shops will remain open till about 7. If one or two delay closing, others will remain open. The chemists took a vote on the question and those in favour of closing at 6 o'clock totalled 51, and those against 12. The greater number of those against, have now withdrawn their objections.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There are 107 in the association.

Mr. LAMBERT: They were circularised and notified that the ballot would be taken. Ballot papers were sent out, and of those returned, an overwhelming majority was in favour of 6 o'clock closing.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That was the determination of a minority.

Mr. LAMBERT: At any rate, on the vote that was taken only 12 out of 63 voted against it, notwithstanding the recommendation that was brought in that no unnecessary harm would be done to the public if the chemists were brought into line with others in the community regarding 6 o'clock closing.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The petition referred to by the member for Williams-Narrogin was signed by 17 chemists, who opposed the shortening of the hours. Of those 17, three represented one shop, another was unregistered, and three others withdrew their objections. The number was brought down three to ten.

The Minister for Mines: That was on the basis of the compromise we discussed when we arrived at 6.30.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: As indicating what a country chemist thinks of the matter, let me quote the following letter. He says—

Emergencies are few and far between. The emergencies constitute the big argument in favour of keeping open the chemist's shop. In theory, the chemist has an evening hour to provide for emergencies, which have a pleasant little habit of occurring after he closes, however late he may be. In practice, they have to keep open to oblige a few lazy people who are too tired to come round early. The Sunday morning hour—when the chemist could get one—was chiefly taken up in supplying photo. films, face powders, and shampoos. The work of a pharmacist is exacting and responsible. From eight to ten hours, a meticulous exactitude is enough for any man, and I think the public will be efficiently served in that time. It is not fair to ask any man to be a slave to his profession, and a little forethought on the part of the public will enable pharmacists to live more like normal human beings, without any real injury to anyone.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They can close up if they like.

Mr. Lambert: And because of these people, he wants to keep open. It is absurd.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The letter also states—In Victoria a Bill was carried shortening the chemists' hours. This was carried in conjunction with other businesses, grocers, etc., and was law before the chemists noticed it. Then there was an uproar. A meeting of chemists numbering 160 was held, and much fuss was made. The president pointed out it was now law, and he advised that they give the Bill six months' trial, and then meet; if it were felt there was an injustice being done or inconvenience inflicted, they should petition the Government for an alteration. Six months later they met, and those who were most strongly against the shortening of hours, were quite satisfied that the innovation had worked most satisfactorily. Of that big body of chemists, four were in favour of reverting back to the old time.

Regarding the point which has been made regarding the assistants and the long hours they have to work, there is no doubt that it is difficult to get the right type of young man to take up the profession, because of the fact that long hours interfere with study.

Mr. O'Loughlen: That is wrong.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I have a son working hard for the profession, and I know what is done.

Mr. O'Loughlen: There are plenty of boys who are waiting to step into positions in chemists' shops.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: My boy is working hard and is "swatting like billy-o" to get through his examinations.

The Minister for Mines: I know his father "swats like billy-o" here.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The shortening of the hours to 6 o'clock would give these young fellows a chance to get home at a more reasonable time.

Mr. BROWN: The evidence before the select committee was entirely in favour of 6 o'clock closing. We examined three witnesses, of whom two were definitely in favour of 6 o'clock closing, and one was indifferent. In Albany we examined two witnesses who were in favour of 6 o'clock, and in Katanning we gave a chemist there an opportunity to give evidence. He did not appear, as presumably he was too busy, and we came to the conclusion that so far as Katanning was concerned, there was no objection to 6 o'clock closing. Out of 102 chemists in the metropolitan area who were asked by ballot to decide the question, only 14 opposed 6 o'clock closing. The conclusion of the select committee was that they were almost wholly in favour of 6 o'clock. The committee appreciated the arguments put up by certain chemists that if the hours were reduced from 8 to 6 o'clock in one jump, the change would be so great they would not know where their business stood. The committee decided that a compromise between 6 and 8 o'clock would be fairly met by 6.30. It was on that ground that the committee recommended the 6.30 closing. A good many of the chemists outside the metropolitan area argued that persons going to work in the morning would leave prescriptions to be picked up on their return in the evening if they were allowed till 6.30 p.m., and so there would be no hardship on the outside chemist. It is a very good compromise, and will not interfere with either the welfare of the chemist or the convenience of the public.

Mr. PICKERING: The report of the select committee shows that most of the chemists are against early closing.

The Minister for Mines: It is not so.

Mr. PICKERING: Mr. Plummer objects, and Mr. Spence objects.

Mr. Lambert: Plummer is not in business, and here is a letter from Spence showing that he does not object.

Mr. PICKERING: I believe the majority of the evidence is against the proposal.

Mr. Lambert: Here is a ballot taken among the chemists.

Mr. PICKERING: If the same thing is to apply to country chemists as to the city chemists it will not fit in at all. At Busselton it is essential that the chemist's shop should remain open later than other shops.

Hon. P. Collier: Under the Bill the chemist can make up prescriptions at any time.

Mr. PICKERING: But if the doctor is out of town?

Mr. Lambert: Then the chemist could not get a prescription. The chemist in Busselton lives on the premises.

Mr. PICKERING: He does not.

Hon. P. Collier: Then he ought to.

Mr. Pilkington: He can still supply medicines in an emergency, even if there is no prescription.

Mr. Lambert: What about keeping open architects until 8 o'clock? It would do a lot of you fellows good.

Mr. PICKERING: Country chemists should be allowed to keep open until 8 o'clock. I will oppose the amendment.

Mr. Lambert: Your opposition is a tribute to my intelligence.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The select committee gave a great deal of time and attention to this point, and I think its recommendation might be accepted, although not of course without consideration. The chemists were given every opportunity for expressing an opinion on this question. A fair percentage of them did so, but the balance apparently did not care which way it went. We called only three of those chemists representing the view of those who wanted 6 o'clock, but those opposed to the earlier hour were invited to come along in force. Thus it may appear from a perusal of the evidence that there were more opposed to it than in favour of it. In point of fact, the large majority of the chemists were in favour of the reduction of the hours. The question affects, not the chemists alone, but also the convenience of the public. Because of this, we got into touch with the West Australian branch of the British Medical Association, and asked them whether, in the public interests, it was necessary to keep the chemists open after 6 o'clock. They called a meeting at which 24 doctors attended, and the meeting was unanimously in favour of 6 o'clock. Dr. Holland, who was appointed to give evidence before the select committee, said that doctors would be glad to have the chemists' shops closed at 6 o'clock, for it would then give the doctors an opportunity for fixing an earlier evening consultation hour. He assured us that the public would not suffer, because in cases of emergency the necessary medicine could always be procured. Both the doctors and the chemists are prepared to meet the position. The only difference of opinion amongst the chemists was that of city against suburb, the diverting of

the business from one chemist to another. Among the opponents of 6.30 p.m. closing is Mr. Danker.

Mr. Lambert: He would not have a dozen prescriptions a week.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Under the measure he would be able to dispense doctors' prescriptions at any time. Chemists will not be able to sell face powders, but there is no need to keep chemists' shops open in order to supply face powders. The compromises would give the general public half an hour after other shops close, which is a reasonable time.

Mr. Pickering: Are you sticking to 6.30 p.m.?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, because it represents a step forward. If later on chemists desire to adopt 6 o'clock closing, they can then move in that direction.

Mr. PILKINGTON: I support the amendment. There appears to be an overwhelming mass of evidence in favour of 6 o'clock closing, not only from chemists but from the doctors.

The Minister for Mines: Dr. Carter, who was formerly a chemist, gave evidence in support of 6 o'clock closing.

Mr. PILKINGTON: It is important to notice what the doctors said, because the medical profession may well represent the needs of the public. The doctors would be the first to object to 6 o'clock closing if their patients were likely to be deprived of the assistance of chemists when required. I have not heard any evidence in favour of closing chemists' shops at 6.30 p.m.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Not the slightest evidence was tendered by country chemists or anyone else to indicate that any real hardship would result to the public if 6 o'clock closing were adopted. As a member of the select committee I agreed that 6.30 p.m. represented a reasonable compromise, but since the presentation of the committee's report, the principal opponents of early closing have further considered the matter and have asked for other amendments. I therefore intend to support 6 o'clock closing.

The Minister for Mines: Why not stick to the Bill?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Why did not the Minister stick to the Bill earlier in the evening? I do not wonder at the chemists who opposed early closing having recanted, because when they gave evidence, they had not perused their own trade journals which clearly indicated the advantages which had followed the introduction of shorter hours in Victoria and New South Wales.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: In Flinders-street, Melbourne, I saw three chemists' shops open at 8 o'clock on Sunday night.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Under this measure our chemists will be able to open on Sunday night, but their shops will be closed on Sunday and holiday mornings. The chemists who opposed early closing now favour 6 o'clock closing. I shall support 6 o'clock closing, believing that an overwhelming ma-

majority of the chemists desire it and that no hardship will be inflicted.

Mr. LAMBERT: If any member has a doubt regarding the attitude of chemists generally I would point out that, of 63 who voted on the question of early closing, 51 favoured closing a 6 p.m. A few chemists would keep open all night if permitted to do so. The member for Sussex would keep the lash over a man all night long.

Mr. Pickering: Do not be silly.

Mr. LAMBERT: He always adopts that conservative attitude towards any measure which aims at improving the general conditions of workers.

Mr. Pickering: On a point of order, am I the subject of discussion or is this Bill under discussion?

The CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Pickering: I object to the remarks of the member for Coolgardie.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Coolgardie may proceed.

Mr. LAMBERT: If the member for Sussex were a chemist he would keep assistants working all night. This is his attitude to anything that savours of reform. The hon. member closes his office at 6 o'clock or earlier, and a majority of the chemists are asking to be permitted to close their shops at a reasonable hour. The chemists desire to safeguard the public interests; they are prepared to open a night dispensary. What additional safeguard would the hon. member desire?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I intend to vote for the clause as it stands. The committee have done well to make the closing hour 6.30. We must give consideration to the suburban chemists. In the past there has been a tendency to drive the business into the city to the detriment of the suburbs. There are 102 chemists in the metropolitan association and only 51 voted on the question of early closing, and I guarantee that most of these reside in Perth and Fremantle.

Mr. PICKERING: I give an unqualified denial to the misstatement of the member for Coolgardie. The conditions which appertain to the city and suburbs do not apply to the country. I shall support the Bill as it comes before us.

Mr. LAMBERT: The chemist in Busselton not only runs a chemist shop but a motor service to Augusta, and is away from his shop for two or three days a week, and it is upon this flimsy pretext the member for Sussex has built his argument. The moment any suggestion is made for the earlier closing of shops the old bogey about the suburbs being ruined is brought up again. I will not refer to the question of the casual way in which the evidence was taken by the select committee.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Nothing of the sort!

Mr. LAMBERT: Surely the hon. member will not hold that because a few people have tendered evidence for or against this proposal there is nothing more to be said in

the matter. It is the commonsense of Parliament that should prevail.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	17

Majority against 6

AYES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Pilkington
Mr. Jones	Mr. Troy
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lutey	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Broun	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Brown	Mr. Smith
Mr. Draper	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Foley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Maley	(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 106—Closing time for certain exempted shops:

Mr. LAMBERT: Is it possible to insert a new clause?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can move a new clause at the end of the Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: I desire to move it here. I wish to move a new subclause providing that "upon the expiration of twelve months after the proclamation of this Act the Minister may, on requisition, alter the hour of closing to six o'clock."

The Premier: Parliament can do that.

Mr. LAMBERT: That is all very well, but the Premier knows these things are different.

The CHAIRMAN: Where does the hon. member desire to move that these words be inserted?

Mr. LAMBERT: At the end of Clause 105.

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 105 has been put and passed. I have called Clause 106.

Mr. LAMBERT: I did not hear you call it.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member said he desired to move a new clause, and I said he would have to move it at the end of the Bill. Clause 105 is passed now.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not think the Committee understood that you put Clause 105, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must resume his seat. The Committee is on Clause 106. Does the hon. member desire to discuss Clause 106?

Mr. LAMBERT: No; but I do not like—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must resume his seat.

Mr. SMITH: Where are cooked meat shops and fish and oyster shops exempted from having to close at 6 p.m.?

The CHAIRMAN: Not under this clause.

Hon. P. Collier: They are provided for in the Bill. They can keep open till 11 p.m.

Mr. SMITH: Under which clause?

Mr. Willecock: Under Part 2 of the Fourth Schedule.

Mr. SMITH: That schedule does not say what hours these shops may keep open. They are not even mentioned in the other exempting clause, Clause 111.

Mr. Willecock: Provision is made for them in some part of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow this discussion to proceed any further.

Progress reported.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

- (1), Parliament (Qualification of Women).
- (2), Westralian Meat Works.
- (3), Supply (No. 2), £350,000.
- (4), Carriers.

House adjourned at 11.32 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 10th November, 1920.

	PAGE
Questions: Butter from the Eastern States ...	1525
Repatriation, preference to returned soldiers ...	1525
Venereal diseases, compulsory examinations ...	1525
Leave of absence ...	1526
Bills: Treasury Bonds Deficiency, 3a. ...	1526
Nurses' Registration, recom., report ...	1526
Opticians, 2a. ...	1527
Guardianship of Infants, 2a. ...	1532
City of Perth Endowment Lands, com. ...	1533

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

QUESTION—BUTTER FROM EASTERN STATES.

Hon. J. DUFFELL asked the Minister for Education: Have the Government acquired the whole or any part of the butter imported from the Eastern States and, if so,

on what terms as regards quantity and price? If the answer to this question is in the affirmative, what is the reason for this action?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, No, but the Government by guarantee have assisted the committee of the West Australian Butter Factories' Association to purchase 250 boxes at landed cost, viz., 2s. 7½d. lb. 2, To assist the local butter factories in marketing their product.

QUESTION—REPATRIATION, PREFERENCE TO RETURNED SOLDIERS.

Hon. J. E. DODD asked the Minister for Education: 1, Have the Government provided in contracts made by them, such as the Wheat Marketing Agreement and others, for preference to returned soldiers? 2, If not, will they insist upon the principle of preference being observed in all future contracts?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, No. 2, Yes, where practicable.

QUESTION—VENEREAL DISEASES, COMPULSORY EXAMINATIONS.

Hon. J. E. DODD asked the Minister for Education: 1, Is it a fact that the Commissioner of Public Health has used the power of taking action on secret information under Section 256 of the Amending Health Act, 1918, against women only? 2, Of the 40 women who were compelled to submit to medical examination since the Act came into force, who pays the expenses in the following cases:—(a) the six women found to be free from infection; (b) the two women who were doubtful; (c) the woman whose case is pending? 3, Are the women who were wrongfully required to undergo bodily examination unable to ascertain on what grounds the Commissioner of Public Health had reason to believe they were suffering from venereal diseases, and have they the means of ascertaining on whose information he acted? 4, Upon what grounds do the Health Department claim that the provisions of the Act in relation to compulsory treatment are operating successfully, when only 26 cases out of 40 suspects have been subjected to treatment?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, The Commissioner has not differentiated in the action taken. In one case a statement implicated a man, but despite every effort to trace him he was not located. 2, In all cases mentioned persons had the right to go to the district medical officer or public hospital and be examined there gratis. This information was conveyed to each person when first approached on the matter. It is incorrect to state that six women were found to be free from infection. In each of these cases one negative examination was made. Such negative ex-