

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 8th November, 1927.

	PAGE
Bills: Bridgetown Lot 39A, 1B.	1872
Broomehill Lot 602, 1B.	1872
State Insurance, Report ...	1872
Transfer of Land Act, 2B.	1872
Land Tax and Income Tax; Council's pressed request ...	1877
Mental Diseases, Council's Message ...	1884
Annual Estimates: Department of Public Health ...	1884
Public Utilities ...	1700

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

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Bridgetown Lot 39A.

2, Broomehill Lot 602.

Introduced by the Minister for Works.

BILL—STATE INSURANCE.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—TRANSFER OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE (Hon. J. C. Willecock—Geraldton) [4.38] in moving the second reading said: The Bill has been prepared for the purpose of simplifying and improving the procedure under the Transfer of Land Act. The present Western Australian Act of 1893 was based on the Victorian Act of 1890. Since then there have been nine amending Acts in Victoria and eight in Western Australia. As the consolidation of various Acts is in progress, it was considered desirable that before the Transfer of Land Act was consolidated, it should be brought up to date and amended in directions that experience in this and other States has shown to be desirable. In the other States as well, the Transfer of Land Acts have been based on the original Torrens Act that was brought into force in South Australia about 50 or 60 years ago. Owing to the passing of that legislation, transactions in respect of land are more easily accomplished in Australia than elsewhere throughout the world. In fact, it caused rather a revolution in connection with

land titles. The Act made dealings under that heading much more simple and really enabled them to be coped with without trouble. Instead of having to go to all the trouble that was experienced formerly, that legislation made it merely necessary to search the titles to ascertain the ownership of land.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It saved time and expense.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It saved a tremendous amount of time and quite a lot of money. Before the passing of the Transfer of Land Act in this State, all sorts of deeds, conveyances, memorials and other legal documents had to be assembled and duly produced to definitely prove that the man who desired to dispose of land was in fact, the real owner.

Mr. Sampson: At times months were occupied in making the necessary investigations.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Often it took longer than that. Then, again, the absence of some document resulted in transactions being held up for considerable periods. Now the position is that each block of land that is brought within the scope of the Act is registered. A lot of land in Western Australia has not been brought within the scope of the present Act.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There is not much.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: About 80 per cent. of the land already alienated has been brought under the Act and the remainder has not been dealt with in that way.

Mr. Sampson: It is very costly to bring land under the Transfer of Land Act.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It is costly, but once that expenditure has been incurred, the procedure is so simple that it enables transactions in land to be completed expeditiously and satisfactorily.

Mr. Sampson: That is a set-off against the expenditure.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: However, the passing of the Transfer of Land Act made the business of dealing in land generally much more simple. The applicant is given a certificate of title by the Registrar of Titles and the person whose name appears on the title is recognised as the owner of the land. There is a possibility that some people may have rights in connection with land so registered. In fact, the name of some person may be registered on the title, and yet he may not properly be the owner of the

land. To meet such instances there was established an assurance fund from which anyone whose land had been dealt with improperly could be compensated. It may be that through some misadventure the Registrar of Titles gave a certificate of title to a person who should not have been registered as the rightful owner of the particular land affected. Subject to endorsements on the title, the persons whose name appears on the certificate of title can embark upon deals in connection with the land by way of mortgage or sale or in any other way he may desire. There are occasions when the certificate of title does not necessarily prove ownership, because people may claim land by what is known as **adverse possession**. Although someone may hold the certificate of title for a block of land, someone else may have acquired rights by having been in possession of the land for 12 years. In such circumstances the latter person can claim a title for the land, and that is taken by means of the process known as **adverse possession**.

Hon. W. J. George: But if the man whose name appears on the certificate of title has paid the rates during that period, the other man cannot get the land.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That is so. This procedure is what is known as **jumping land**. However, should there be a block for which there does not appear to be any owner, and an individual occupies it for the period I have mentioned, he can make application for **adverse possession** and become the registered owner of the land. Then, again, municipalities and road boards have power to sell land after a fixed period for the non-payment of rates. Should that be done, the local authorities, having sold the land by public auction, a fresh title can be issued to the purchaser of that land. That title is issued by the registrar on a certificate from the local authority. Even then the original owner may still possess his certificate of title, but it would be of no use to him because the land would have been forfeited for the non-payment of rates. That man, claiming to be the owner of the land, may endeavour to sell it to someone else, but anyone desirous of purchasing land should consider other things besides the certificate of title. After all the title is only a duplicate. An intending purchaser should search the Titles Office and if the search disclosed that the man was in fact not the

owner of the land or that the land had been sold for non-payment of rates, the intending purchaser would know the position and could act accordingly. Titles are also subject to easements which, while leaving the owner in possession of the land, give other people rights of way over the land, or right to light, or rights of profit, as they are termed, namely, the right to obtain water, cut timber, or quarry stone, etc. What are known as **restrictive covenants** also exist, such as the prohibition of buildings, noxious trades, hotels, etc. If the land is subject to a restriction called a **restrictive covenant**, it must not be used for any of the purposes prohibited under the covenant.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Like Roe-street.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes. There could be a restrictive covenant in respect of buildings to be erected on certain land. An owner may sell a portion of his land subject to a restrictive covenant against the purchaser not to erect a hotel on it. That applies to some of the Crown lands. In certain towns, lots are sold and the titles stipulate that the blocks are not to be used for the erection of hotels. Experience has shown that many modifications are required for the more efficient working of the Act. The Bill is technical but it has been thoroughly considered as regards the requirements of owners, purchasers, and the simplification of procedure in the Titles Office, while in other directions it will give a clearer title and generally prove beneficial in dealings with land either by sale, lease, mortgage or caveat. At present it is not compulsory to register easements, rights of way, or profits, although they may be in existence. A man may own a block of land and someone else may have right of way over it obtained from years of usage, or for some other reason, and it is not compulsory to register such a right. A *bona fide* purchaser may acquire the land in all good faith and he may discover afterwards that other people have rights over it of which he was unaware. The certificate of title, therefore, is not a clear title and probably such land would not be worth the money paid for it. A certificate of title does not necessarily have to disclose existing easements. The Bill provides that easements, profits, or leases of a duration of three years and upwards shall be registered. Intending purchasers will then know exactly the position. A certificate of title is supposed to give a clean title and yet such encumbrances may exist and

people may know nothing of them. We are giving people at least 12 months' notice to register any rights they have in land. It is proposed that people who have not registered any right they have in property by the 31st December of next year will have no claim against the owner. They may have a claim against the original owner, but they would not have a claim against an owner who in the interim had bought the land on the certificate of title.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is the law now.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No. A man may buy a block of land and the fact that a water right or other right exists may not appear on the title. After the transaction has been completed the purchaser finds that some other person has rights over the property.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: An agreement or lease of over three years must be shown.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes. Regarding adverse possession, which means what is colloquially known as jumping land it is proposed that claimants shall protect themselves by caveat, and they will be allowed until the end of next year to do so. Any person having rights over land should lodge a caveat and have it endorsed on the title that a caveat exists. It is proposed that if anyone having rights of any description over land, particularly in regard to adverse possession, does not protect his interests by the end of next year, while those rights may be conserved against the original owner, they will not be conserved against someone who has bought the land in good faith. If a man produces a clean certificate of title and other people with rights have not protected their interests, such interests will not be recognised and will not hold good against a new owner. Consequently people then will not be buying a pig in a poke as at present.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is the law now.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No. The Solicitor General, the draftsman and the Commissioner of Titles say that those things are not clearly stipulated at present.

Mr. Thomson: I thought that when a man was giving a transfer he had to stipulate all encumbrances.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes, but those encumbrances may not be known to people. They cannot be known unless they are endorsed on the title or protected

by caveat. Failing a caveat, a bona fide purchaser after the end of next year will know that the land cannot be affected by adverse possession. That is the law in South Australia, but it has been modified to the extent that the adverse possessor's title is good as against the registered possessor at the date of acquirement. Provisions from Victoria and New South Wales will enable easements to be removed from titles on proof that they have been abandoned or have ceased to exist. In Victoria and New South Wales, when it is proved that easements have ceased to exist, they may be removed from the title and a clean certificate of title may be issued.

Mr. Thomson: So long as they remain on the title, they can be claimed?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Yes. Under our law no power is given to the Commissioner of Titles to remove such easements. A man may have a block of land on which is a building with a wall common to that building and the building on the adjoining block. The two buildings may be pulled down and yet the easement may still remain on the title. It is desired that the Commissioner of Titles shall have power to remove easements from the title when it is shown that they have ceased to exist, so that the title may not be encumbered in any way. Provision is also made for restrictive covenants to be discharged. I explained earlier what was meant by restrictive covenants. They are restrictions on the use to which certain land may be put. Although no one may desire a restriction to continue, there is no power for the Commissioner of Titles to remove it. A man having a section of land might cut it into five or six blocks which he leaves to four or five of his children. He may impose a restriction that nothing but brick houses shall be built or that the land shall not be used for gardening, factory or certain other purposes. Someone else may acquire all the blocks, but while the restrictive covenant remains it is difficult to deal with the land because a clean certificate of title cannot be given. When it can be proved that restrictive covenants have ceased to exist, the Commissioner of Titles should have power to remove them, and give a clean certificate of title, thus permitting the land to be dealt with in the ordinary way. At present uncertainty exists regarding the rights of persons who

have obtained judgments against registered proprietors. The proposed amendments deal with the respective rights and duties of the execution creditor, the registered proprietor and persons entitled to unregistered interests. For simplification in office working and convenience of land owners, it is proposed to have separate mortgage and charge registers, thus doing away with a vast number of entries now necessary on certificates of title. A man might have a mortgage on a block of land on which is erected a building. He might sublet it or give a second and third mortgage. All those transactions have to appear on the original certificate of title and the entries pile up. While the first mortgage will appear as an encumbrance on the certificate of title, any further dealings in the land will be recorded in the register dealing with mortgages. The same procedure will apply to any charge. "Charge" is used in the sense of an annual payment payable to some person for a term of years, or for life, and charged on the land like a mortgage. A man on dying may leave his land in trust for his widow, subject to her receiving an annuity of perhaps £200, £300 or £400 a year. It is proposed to record such charges in a register instead of on the title. Provision is made that mortgages, leases and other instruments shall be in duplicate, as is the case with certificates of title. Then no dealing will be registered unless the duplicate held by the owner is produced and is filed.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It will be a good deal more costly for some people.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I do not think so. At present, when transactions of the kind are going through the Titles Office, the mortgage and second mortgage have to be produced and registered, and particulars have to be endorsed on the certificate of title. There is no necessity for all that. The owner of land is not concerned what a lessee does with it so long as the lessee does not infringe a restrictive covenant. So long as the owner's rights are preserved, he is not concerned with what a lessee does. Yet all those transactions are now endorsed on the original certificate of title. In regard to Crown grants, after the expiration of the time for conditional purchase, it is often found that owing to difficulties of survey and other questions, the Lands Department

are not ready to issue a title. What is known as a permit to occupy is given in place of the title, until the proper Crown grant can be issued. On these "permits to occupy" are endorsed any dealings that may have taken place in regard to the particular block of land, but the law says that when the Crown grant is due, all the details, notwithstanding that they may have been discharged and finished with, have to be endorsed on the Crown grants when issued. It is sought by this amendment to provide that if these dealings occur during the time when the permit to occupy is held by the owner, when the Crown grant is issued, and these transactions are finished with, they shall not be endorsed on the back of the title. In other words it will not be necessary to endorse these transactions as is done at present. Provision is made for the issue of special leases and mortgages in lieu of a duplicate that may have been lost or destroyed. Improved measures are provided for calling in duplicates of certificates of title, where they have to be rectified, cancelled, or dealings have to be registered thereon. The present procedure is, for a person neglecting to obey the requisition, to be summoned to show cause, but the disregard of the order of the court is not specifically dealt with. The new procedure provides that any person disobeying the order of the court may be committed. Power is also given to the Commissioner to have the amount due on any mortgage, when a foreclosure application is made, determined by the Master of the Supreme Court. At present when people own land the subject of a mortgage, there is often a disagreement as to the rights and charges, and the amount due to various individuals connected with the deal. It is now sought to give power to the Commissioner, not to give the decision himself, but to refer the matter to the Master of the Supreme Court, who will say, from the documents placed before him, how much money each person is entitled to receive with respect to the deal. Provision is made with regard to caveats. The Transfer of Land Act says that there can be only one caveat on land in regard to one deal. If the original owner has, say, a property worth £20,000, and desires to sell a small portion of it for £300 or £400, and has a mortgage upon it of £10,000 to some other individual who is quite satisfied that the owner should sell a portion of the block, at

present the caveat must be taken off before he can dispose of a moiety of the land, and it is not possible to put the caveat back.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That law is an ass.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It is silly. Provision is now being made whereby, if the caveator is willing to allow any deal of that kind to go through, the caveat will not be taken off; consequently, it can remain instead of, as at present, being voided altogether. It is proposed to have three registers instead of one, that is, one for certificates of titles, one for mortgages, and one for easements, profits, covenants, etc. This will obviate the necessity for a vast number of entries on the certificate of title relating to subsequent dealings with the mortgagee, etc., after the first registration thereof on the certificate of title. Furthermore, the number of competent witnesses to the execution of documents is enlarged, and power is given to the Governor to still further enlarge it. As regards adverse possession, a middle course is proposed. In South Australia the adverse possessor obtains no title, no matter how long he remains in adverse possession. In Western Australia he can obtain a complete title. It is proposed to support adverse possession as against the registered proprietor during the period of adverse possession, but to leave the certificate of title free from the adverse possession as regards any person buying the land in good faith. The adverse possessor is therefore bound to make good his claim in the period mentioned, or run the risk of loss should the owner sell during such period. The Bill, while it does not deal with any great principle, requires very careful consideration. It has been put up for the purpose of simplifying dealings in land. It is not a matter of Government or party policy.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Nothing to do with it. I should say.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It merely simplifies the law. Legal people who are interested in this particular part of the law may find something in the Bill with which they do not agree, and something which they think should not be amended. In those circumstances, I do not want to hurry the passage of the Bill, and am prepared to agree to a reasonable adjournment.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Say till next Tuesday.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: If it is thought desirable, we might have a select

committee appointed to deal with it. I think, however, after the Bill is perused, and after the memorandum which is printed in connection with it, and which explains each clause, is also perused, the Bill will be generally understood. No doubt the memorandum is as technical as the Bill. Those people who are used to dealing in land will, however, soon acquire a knowledge of the proposed amendments, and will not, I think, find it very hard to understand the effect of the proposed alterations in the law. I do not claim to be an expert in matters appertaining to land transfers, but I feel, after studying the Bill and the accompanying memorandum, and comparing it with the original Act, that I have a good grip of it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Let us cross-examine you.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: In Committee I shall be prepared to suffer a bombardment of cross-examination. In view of my explanation of the Bill, and the memorandum, it should not be difficult for members to understand the proposed changes.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That will be something new.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I do not suppose that any people except those interested in these particular matters will bother much about the Bill. The law will be simplified and improved, and generally brought up to date. That will be an advantage to all concerned. Our Transfer of Land Act will be consolidated by these amendments, and the various laws that have been passed during the last 35 years on this question will be brought together. This will be of considerable advantage. It is no use consolidating the Transfer of Land Acts without first making amendments that are desirable.

Mr. Thomson: The suggestion of a select committee is a good one.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: All I wish to ensure is that there shall be a general understanding of the proposed amendments, so that everyone will realise how it is intended to amend the law.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is purely a legal matter.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I do not know what a select committee composed of laymen of this House could do in the matter.

Mr. Thomson: The evidence they would get would be the important factor.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Now that this amendment has been brought down it will be the function of those who do business in land transfer and deal in land generally to get a copy of the Bill and the memorandum that will also be available. After the explanation I have given, I think everyone interested will have a general idea of what it is desired to do in this direction. If there is anything wrong with the Bill, I shall be quite prepared to have the various points discussed in Committee.

Mr. Thomson: Will this make the procedure more costly?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No; it will simplify the law and give greater security to those who buy land in good faith on the evidence on the certificate of title. The Bill will provide sufficient proof to the purchaser that he has a clear title on the purchase of land. The Leader of the Opposition says he would like the matter to be adjourned for a week. If at the expiration of that period it is desired to appoint a select committee, I shall not offer any objection. If, however, it is found that members are in a position to deal with the Bill, and the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to go on with it, we might as well proceed to put the Bill through. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Council's Pressed Request—Speaker's Ruling.

Message from the Council notifying the Assembly that it pressed its requested amendment, now considered:

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [5.12]: I move—

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering this Message.

MR. SPEAKER [5.13]: I am sorry I shall have to detain the House for a while, because I cannot accept the motion moved by the Premier, on the ground that it is illegal. I trust the Chamber will indulge me while I make the position perfectly clear. I want members to know that we are

dealing with a taxation Bill, a money Bill, a Bill that the Legislative Council by law cannot amend. It is not a new creation, it is not some imposition of the past few years, that limits the Council in its actions in this respect. It is almost as old as constitutional history. To enable members to follow my reasoning I trust they will bear with me whilst I read from one or two constitutional authorities. I will first quote from "The Constitutional History of England" by William Stubbs, D.D., Vol. 3, page 270, as follows:—

That the Commons should have a decisive share in the bestowal of money grants had become since the reign of Edward III. an admitted principle; and the observance of the rule is illustrated by the history of every Parliament. In the foregoing pages the regular votes of taxation have been noticed as they occurred; and the decision of Henry IV. in 1407 has been referred to as recognising the right of the Commons to originate, and, after it has received the assent of the Lords, to announce the grant, generally on the last day of the session. The ordinary form of the grant expresses this; it was made by the Commons with the assent of the Lords spiritual and temporal. This particular form curiously enough occurs first in the grants made to Richard II. in 1395, the previous votes of money having been made by the Lords and Commons conjointly. It was observed in 1401 and 1402, and henceforth became the constitutional form.

That has existed in the Mother of Parliaments so long as the years mentioned in the quotation. That it is the constitutional law of England upon the point I refer to stands good; and, mark you, I can give you a whole night's quotation from authorities on the point. I now refer to "The Law and Custom of the Constitution" by Anson—

Legislation which has for its object the grant of public money or the imposition of burdens upon the taxpayer possesses some special features which require to be specially noticed. In the first place, such legislation is under the entire control of the House of Commons. A Bill relating to Supplies must begin in the House of Commons; it is formulated there, and though it needs the concurrence of the Lords it cannot be amended by them on its way to receive the Royal assent.

That is the law of the British Parliament. We have inherited that law. This battle has been fought here again and again. This Chamber is the responsible Chamber. This Chamber elects or approves of Ministries, dismisses Ministries, and forms new ones. This Chamber takes all the responsibility. The other Chamber proverbially is a House

of review and takes no responsibility. It cannot elect a Ministry. That Chamber cannot be held in that respect to be a House responsible to the people. This is not a matter of our Standing Orders. If it were, we could vary them and alter them from week to week if we were foolish enough. But this is a matter of law itself. It is so important that the framers of our original Constitution, endorsed of course by the British Parliament itself, laid it down as an unalterable principle in governance, in the control of the purse. This House alone is responsible. But by some slight amendment, shall I say, or out of a desire of courtesy to the other Chamber, but never altering the real principle, the South Australian Parliament, and also the Federal Parliament—which latter, by the way, is not on all fours with the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council here—granted some concession to the Council and the Senate respectively. That concession, so often quoted in other places, gave the other Chamber, not the power to amend, not the power to alter, but simply power to make a request—a request that this Chamber would alter. No more than that. We have had many troubles in this very Chamber in that respect, and I have had the pleasure of participating in some of them; but the matter culminated in 1921, when a measure was passed making an amendment to the original Constitution Act. Now, here is reaffirmed, if it were necessary, that the Legislative Council may not amend Loan Bills, or Bills imposing taxation, or Bills appropriating revenue or moneys for the ordinary annual services. The Legislative Council may not amend any Bill so as to increase any proposed charge or burden on the people. The special point to which I now desire to direct the attention of hon. members is Subsection 4 of Section 46 of the Constitution Act—

The Legislative Council may at any stage return to the Legislative Assembly any Bill which the Legislative Council may not amend, requesting by message the omission or amendment of any item or provision therein, provided that any such request does not increase any proposed charge or burden on the people.

And next we have—

The Legislative Assembly may, if it think fit, make such omissions or amendments with or without modifications.

That is a distinct statement and expression of the law. It has an authority entirely be-

yond all our Standing Orders. Without a separate Act of Parliament receiving the Royal assent, we could not set aside the section I have just read. And observe that the whole of the power given there is to make a request—nothing more. The Legislative Council may not amend, but it may request by message omissions and alterations, suggesting amendments for us to make. The Legislative Council has—I regret to have to mention this, and I trust I do not say it in any disparaging sense—made its own Standing Orders, and No. 237 of the Standing Orders of the Legislative Council says—

The Committee shall be empowered to recommend the Council to make, press, modify, and generally to deal with the requests on the Bill.

I do not think I need tell hon. members that the Legislative Council's Standing Orders govern that body, and that body alone. They cannot affect the conduct of this Chamber. We can take, I respectfully submit, no pressing. Pressing is not allowed, not mentioned, not suggested, under the words I have read from the Constitution Act. On this aspect I would like to make just a slight reference to Broome's "Legal Maxims," page 505—

Expressio unius exclusio alterius.

Interpreted, "The express mention of one thing implies the exclusion of another." Broome is particularly pointed in drawing our attention, on page 514, to the fact that—

A statute, it has been said, is to be so construed, if possible, as to give sense and meaning to every part; and no maxim was ever more applicable when applied to the interpretation of a statute than the expression "*Expressio unius exclusio alterius.*"

I hope to apply that rule of law to the reading of Subsection 4 of Section 46 of our Constitution Act. No power exists to press or to carry a matter further than a mere request. As many requests as you like; but no pressing of a request, for to press is, in effect, a more courteous way of insisting. To press a request on a money Bill is to treat a money Bill precisely as all other Bills are treated. Now, as everyone knows, money Bills are a special exception to the general treatment of Bills, for the reasons I have stated. Owing to the way matters have been conducted in the Federal Parliament, the point has received the considera-

tion of Quick and Garran in their "Annotated Constitution of the Australian Commonwealth." They speak of suggested amendments, and give some preliminary illustrations, and then proceed—

On the other hand, in the case of a Bill which the Senate may not amend—

And that is our case—

the House of Representatives alone is responsible for the form of the measure. The Senate cannot strike out or alter a word of it, but can only suggest that the House of Representatives should do so. If that House declines to make the suggested amendment, the Senate is face to face with the responsibility of either passing the Bill as it stands or rejecting it altogether. It cannot shelve that responsibility by insisting—

I put it, pressing—

insisting on its suggestion, because there is nothing on which to insist. A House which can make an amendment can insist on the amendment which it has made, but a House which can only request the other House to make amendments cannot insist upon anything. If its request is not complied with, it can reject the Bill or shelve it, but it must take the full responsibility of its action. This provision, therefore, is intended to declare the constitutional principles: (1) That the House of Representatives is solely responsible for the form of money Bills to which the section relates. (2) That the Senate may request alterations in any such Bill. (3) That if such request is not complied with, the Senate must take the full responsibility of accepting or rejecting the Bill as it stands.

I take that to be sound law upon this question; and this case under my consideration being on all-fours—that is to say, a money Bill, a Bill the Council cannot amend having been considered by the other place and a request sent by message, that message having been considered and the Bill returned—the power given under our Constitution Act is exhausted. They can go no further; on them now is the responsibility either of accepting the Bill or of rejecting it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [5.30]: In view of your ruling, Sir, I move—

That the following message be sent to the Council:—"With reference to Message No. 13 from the Legislative Council dealing with the Land Tax and Income Tax Bill, the Hon. the Speaker has ruled affirming the illegality of further consideration of the request made by the Council. The Bill is therefore returned herewith, and the concurrence of the Legislative Council desired therein."

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [5.31]: In this we are departing from a custom that has obtained for many years. It has been objected to by you, Sir, and by others on many occasions, but it seems to me that before we depart from it we should recollect that it has served us well. Whatever we may say about the law, we are entitled to make our own laws more or less, and we have our own Standing Orders governing the position.

The Minister for Justice: Standing Orders cannot alter the Constitution.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, but Parliament can. Under this departure probably we shall be just where we were, except that the Bill will be rejected. If we agree with your ruling, Sir, it will mean that the other House will merely reject such measures in future.

Mr. Panton: Let them reject, and take the responsibility of their action.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But we ask them to concur in our Bills. If they reject such a measure, what is to become of the Premier's taxation proposals? I know the hon. member has been a member of another place.

Mr. Panton: That is not to be counted against me, surely!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, it is very much in the hon. member's favour. When the hon. member came down here from there he was altogether a better man than he is to-day, if only because he then sat in Opposition. At any rate, if your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is accepted, and if Bills can only be either approved or rejected by another place—

The Premier: Money Bills only.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, but there are a few on the border line. If members think the minority should have no protection, that what the Government say on all taxation measures should go, of course one can understand it. The Government would always like to be in that position. But another place have responsibilities. Under the ruling, in future they are only to take the responsibility of saying "yes" or "no" to a Bill. I know what would happen if my friends were in another place. They would not hesitate to take the responsibility of rejecting measures, even to the inconvenience of the Government and of the country. I do not know why the method that has obtained in the past should not continue. Under the Constitution we can make it fit

what seems to be the reasonable requirements of this situation, although a difficult one.

The Minister for Justice: It will be time enough when we do that.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Government must take the responsibility. I do not agree that it is wise to depart from the custom that has obtained for so long, especially since that custom is supported by our own Standing Orders. Surely in a matter of this sort we are in a position to say what should be done. In future another place will have to reject measures instead of sending them back with suggestions for amendments.

The Minister for Mines: They will still be able to send along suggestions for amendments.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There are in another place men just as responsible as are we here. They are justified in dealing with matters that we send to them, except of course that they have to follow a prescribed course in dealing with money Bills. It seems to me this proposed departure will lead to far more trouble than we have had in the past. We have not in the past given up our right to control money matters. Another place, we are told, has a perfect right to reject our measures. Of course so; it could not be otherwise. But what is going to happen when a measure such as this is rejected? Of course we shall have opportunity to submit an amended measure, taking guidance from the discussion in another place. Probably that is what will have to be done in this instance. If the 26 members sitting on the Government side in this House are going to say to the country, "We shall have this proposal and nothing else," where shall we get to with our legislation?

The Minister for Justice: But money Bills and taxation proposals are our responsibility.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It seems to me the method of the past has not worked badly. It fits our own Constitution. I believe we have always acted constitutionally in the past and that probably we are acting against our own Constitution in the proposal the Premier has just made.

The Premier: No, no.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: At any rate I think so.

The Minister for Justice: You would contend that all the authorities, including Quick and Garran, are wrong?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Quick and Garran have nothing to say about this House. They refer to the Federal Parliament. Our written Constitution is one thing, while the written Constitution of the Commonwealth is quite another thing.

The Premier: We have been yielding our constitutional rights to another place.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think so. It is of no use the Minister for Justice saying that Quick and Garran take up a certain attitude. They are dealing with the Federal Constitution.

The Minister for Justice: Our law is just the same.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not think so. I am sorry the Premier has moved this motion.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.38]: I also am sorry that the Premier has moved this motion. As a matter of fact the request from another place is only an endeavour to put into effect what the minority in this House were desirous of having. I am not surprised at the yells of derision from the Government side. How often have we heard from that side yells of derision because the minority in another place have not been able to carry into effect what they consider desirable. When first I came to Parliament I thought we were here to arrive at a spirit of compromise. Another place has exhibited a spirit of compromise. When, last session, this selfsame Bill was before Parliament, another place refused to pass it without a conference. That conference occupied very many hours. There we have a precedent establishing that on a money Bill the Legislative Council are entitled to press their requests and go to a conference. In my opinion they are entitled to press the request they have made on this occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member disputing my ruling? If so, he must do it on a specific motion. It is not a matter of precedent, nor even of Standing Orders; it is a matter of the law laid down in the Constitution Act. It is on that, the law alone, that I have given my ruling.

Mr. THOMSON: Very well, but we are dealing with the motion before the House.

Mr. Kenneally: You are dealing with the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not traverse my ruling, unless he wishes to disagree with it.

Mr. THOMSON: Then I am afraid I shall be reluctantly compelled to disagree

with your ruling, if only to put my remarks in order. The motion moved by the Premier is based upon the ruling given, and therefore we are entitled to discuss the ruling.

Hon. G. Taylor: No, no.

Mr. THOMSON: But if we are to discuss the motion, we must of necessity traverse the ruling.

The Premier: There is only one way of doing it.

Mr. THOMSON: Well then, I shall have no alternative. It is distinctly laid down in our Standing Orders that another place has the right to ask for a conference.

Hon. G. Taylor: No, another place does not ask for a conference.

Mr. THOMSON: But for this ruling, the course followed on this occasion would have been the same as that taken on the previous occasion; the Premier would have asked for a conference with another place. But you, Sir, have laid it down that all money Bills require the concurrence of another place. In the very section you have dealt with, namely, Section 4 of the Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1921, it is provided—

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member, does he traverse my ruling?

Mr. THOMSON: I must do so to deal with the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member can deal with the motion, but must not traverse my ruling unless he moves a specific motion making it legitimate for all members to discuss the ruling.

Mr. THOMSON: May I have a copy of the motion the Premier has moved?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will send you a copy.

Mr. THOMSON: We are actually dealing with your ruling, Mr. Speaker. You have ruled that it is illegal to have any further discussion with another place with regard to this taxation measure. The only way in which I can discuss the matter is to point out that, and to disagree with your ruling; at least I must traverse the ruling you have given so as to advance my arguments as to why we should confer with another place, and why the Legislative Council is entitled to ask the Assembly to consider the question. I maintain it is not illegal for another place to ask us to consider their request. It is distinctly laid down in the Constitution Act, 1921—

Bills appropriating revenue or moneys, or imposing taxation, shall not originate in the Legislative Council; but a Bill shall not be taken to appropriate revenue or moneys, or to impose taxation, by reason of its only contain-

ing provisions for the imposition or appropriation of fines or other pecuniary penalties or for the demand of payment or appropriation of fees for licenses or fees for registration or other services.

Then the Act goes on to say that the Legislative Council may not amend Loan Bills or Bills imposing taxation or Bills appropriating revenue, etc. The Legislative Council are not amending any Bill; they are merely making a request.

The Minister for Mines: Pressing their request.

Mr. THOMSON: They are entitled to do that.

The Minister for Mines: They are not.

Mr. THOMSON: They are not endeavouring to impose an increased charge; they are endeavouring to reduce charges. The Constitution Act goes on to say—

The Legislative Council may at any stage return to the Legislative Assembly any Bill which the Legislative Council may not amend—

I wish to emphasise the words "at any stage." I contend therefore that our Constitution does not agree with the ruling you have given or the authorities you have quoted. You, Mr. Speaker, have ruled that having once submitted their request to this House that is all the Legislative Council can do, and that then they must concur or take upon themselves the responsibility of rejecting the measure. Section 4 of the Constitution Act definitely states that the Legislative Council may, at any stage, return to the Legislative Assembly any Bill that the Legislative Council may not amend, and that they may by message request the omission or amendment of any item or provision therein, provided that any such request does not increase or propose a charge or burden upon the people. I maintain that the Legislative Council are justified in pressing for the consideration of their request. They are asking for a relief of the burden on the people. According to your ruling, and to the motion before the House, if the Legislative Assembly passes the motion—and I have no doubt the Government, with their majority will do so—we shall be challenging another place their right to consider this Bill. You yourself, Sir, in ruling have laid it down that all the Legislative Council can do is to request. If the Legislative Assembly refuses to agree to that request the only alternative will be for the Council to concur or throw out the Bill. I regret to

state that I cannot agree with the ruling you have given and the authorities you have quoted. I have no doubt, however, that the information supplied to the House is very valuable. You have gone back to ancient days, but at the same time I contend that the section of the Constitution Act which I have quoted definitely gives the Legislative Council the power "at any stage" to return to the Legislative Assembly a Bill which the Legislative Council may not amend, and may request by message the omission or amendment of any item or provision therein.

Mr. Panton: Having done that, have they any right to press their request?

Mr. THOMSON: I contend they have that right as has been laid down in actual practice by the present Government. In 1924 the Premier, Mr. Angwin, and Mr. Richardson were appointed by this House to confer with another place on a similar Bill and in similar circumstances. I hold therefore that the Legislative Council on this occasion are entitled to press their request.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Now an attempt is being made to sandbag the Upper House.

Mr. Kenneally interjected.

Mr. THOMSON: I believe in doing justice to all sections but my friend, the member for East Perth, represents one section only. This is a matter that affects the rights of the people generally. Under the law of the land we have a Legislative Council and that House conducts its business under certain standing orders.

Mr. Panton: This is not one of them.

Mr. THOMSON: I ask the hon. member to read Section 4 of the Constitution Act.

Mr. Panton: I heard the Speaker's ruling; that is enough for me.

Mr. THOMSON: That shows the hon. member's bias. I am now discussing the ruling that has been given by the Speaker and the motion moved by the Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has no right to discuss my ruling.

Mr. THOMSON: I am discussing the right of another place to press the amendment to the Bill now before us, and I maintain that under Section 4 of the Constitution Act the Legislative Council has every right "at any stage" to return to the Legislative Assembly any Bill. I have no desire to move to dissent from your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but if necessary I shall be prepared to do so.

HON. W. J. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington) [5.54]: I cannot understand why there has been so much talk on this question. The different powers possessed by the two Houses were for many years a matter of controversy, and in 1921 a Bill was passed to amend the Constitution. So far as my recollection serves me, the amendment was intended to set at rest a question that had been troubling members for a long time, and that question was, who was responsible for financial matters—the Legislative Assembly or the Legislative Council. Who is responsible for submitting the Estimates to Parliament and seeing that expenditure is properly carried out? The answer is quite clear. The Government of the day bring forward the Estimates, they submit proposals for taxation, etc., and this House has the right to deal with those questions. My views with regard to the Legislative Council are pretty well known, and I should be sorry if anything I said were to be regarded as a disparagement of what I can call an essential Chamber. There are times when it is necessary for members of this House to assert the rights and privileges which are conferred upon them by the Constitution and which have been handed down to us from the Mother of Parliaments. The position is very clear—at least it is very clear to me—and at the risk of repeating what another hon. member has said I may be pardoned if I quote the first message that came to us from another place. "The Legislative Council returns herewith a Bill intitled 'An Act to impose a land tax and an income tax' with the request that the Legislative Assembly will make the amendment therein as set forth in the schedule attached." The Constitution Act, 1921, gave the Council the right to make such a request, but that Act never gave the Council the authority that they assume in their Message No. 13 to press for their amendment. That is what causes me to adopt the attitude I am now taking. We should stand firmly on the rights conferred upon us though we might propose to meet them in a spirit of conciliation. We cannot, however, adopt that attitude when we receive from the Council a message that is autocratic in its wording, and a message that this House cannot accept. If the Legislative Council had asked the Assembly to meet them in conference, it would have been all right, but when a message that is mandatory comes along to us, pressing for an amendment that has already been considered and refused.

then I cannot see what all the talk is about. You, Mr. Speaker, quoted rules that the Legislative Council had made for themselves. I submit that the Legislative Council cannot make rules that are contrary to the Constitution. If they have made such rules, those rules are not binding on this House and we cannot recognise them. The Constitution Act seems to me to be very clear, that the Legislative Council may not amend the Bills imposing taxation. By the message that they have sent us they are attempting to amend the Land Tax and Income Tax Bill.

The Premier : And they are insisting upon the amendment.

Mr. Thomson : Read Section 4; they may at any stage return a Bill.

Hon. W. J. GEORGE : I am not saying whether they can do this once or a dozen times. The Constitution says they may not amend Bills imposing taxation. Very well, then there is provision made that they may return a Bill to the Legislative Assembly requesting an omission or an amendment. The Legislative Council did that and they were quite within their rights in doing so. Later on they said to this House, "We have your refusal to agree to our request; now we press it." There is nothing in the Constitution that gives the Upper House the right to press anything upon this House. I think every member, irrespective of on which side of the House he may sit, should be very jealous of the privileges of this House. He should see that we do not allow a mandatory notice to come from anybody not permitted by the law to exercise that power. I regret very much indeed if the action that must be taken by this House, will raise trouble with the Legislative Council. There are times when we must stand together to protect the privileges of this Chamber, which is the people's House.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [6.1] : If I may judge from the trend of the debate, I take it there will be a division on this question and I do not wish to record a silent vote. I heard you, Mr. Speaker, read authorities to support your ruling. I do not think there was any necessity for that. The Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1921 defines perfectly clearly the position of the Legislative Council in its relation to this House and money Bills.

By no stretch of imagination has the Council any authority under the Constitution Act to press an amendment to a money Bill. There is no need to debate that point. In the past I took a prominent part in this question, and I am indeed pleased and proud to think I have lived long enough as a member of this Parliament to at last see the Assembly prepared to stand up for its rights in opposition to the Upper House. I would be prepared to give to the Legislative Council all the powers and latitude provided in the Constitution Act, but the members of that Chamber are going beyond their jurisdiction when they endeavour to press their ideas regarding taxation upon this Chamber. It is idle for the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson) to say that the amendment sought to be pressed does not impose a burden. The Bill is a money Bill and the action of the Council is an interference with the Government, who are responsible to the people for the finances. This House is supposed to hold the purse strings; it has been merely supposition in past years because we have allowed our powers to be whittled away.

Mr. Sampson : You agree with the point of view of the Council in this instance?

Hon. G. TAYLOR : If the hon. member has watched my career in this House, he will know that I have never supported the Legislative Council when that Chamber exceeded its jurisdiction.

Mr. Thomson : You never once supported the Council; you have always opposed it!

Hon. G. TAYLOR : I have supported the members of the Legislative Council when I considered it right to do so in connection with ordinary Bills, but they have no right to press an amendment of the description now before us. I hope the House will oppose the action taken by the Council and stand firm for the principle, despite what the consequences may be. The blame will be at the doors of the members of the Legislative Council and we will demonstrate that we will not submit to them tamely, as we have done in the past.

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

Ayes	32
Noes	10
				—
Majority for	22
				—

AYES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Millington
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Corboy	Mr. North
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Panton
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Richardson
Mr. George	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Heron	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Kenneally	Mr. Troy
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Mailey	(Teller.)
Mr. Marshall	

NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Thomson
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. Maan
Mr. Latham	(Teller.)
Mr. Lindsay	

Question thus passed, and a message accordingly transmitted to the Council.

BILL—MENTAL DISEASES.*Council's Message.*

Mesage from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Assembly.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1927-28.*In Committee of Supply.*

Resumed from the 2nd November; Mr. Lutey in the Chair.

Department of Public Health (Hon. S. W. Munsie, Minister).

Vote—Medical, £167,966:

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Hon. S. W. Munsie—Hannans) [6.10]: The vote before the House is not the total vote for the departments under my control but merely that for the Medical Department. As the Health Department is so closely allied to the Medical Department, I propose, instead of making two separate speeches, to introduce the Estimates for both the Health and Medical Departments in one speech. The function of the Medical Department is to provide medical attention, medical officers, nurses, hospitals, and so on, for the people, and to control homes for

the aged and infirm. During recent years there has been a considerable increase in these votes, but there has also been a big increase in the accommodation for, and privileges extended to, the people. In 1923 there were 54 hospitals with an aggregate number of beds occupied totalling 940, and costing £175,838. At the close of the financial year ended the 30th June last, there were 77 hospitals with an average aggregate of 1,187 beds occupied, and costing £240,526 for administration and maintenance. In other words, there have been increases of 23 hospitals, of 247 beds occupied, and of £64,688 in additional cost. During the year various extensions have been made. These included work at the King Edward Memorial Hospital, where there were established pre-natal wards, and also accommodation for infant health centres. I will deal more fully with those phases when I address myself to the Health Vote. A new hospital has been completed at Collie. Any hon. member who had a knowledge of the conditions that obtained there in the past will doubtless agree that a new hospital was wanted.

Mr. Thomson: The old one was a disgrace.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: During the first year the present Minister for Works held office, he paid visits to Collie and Katanning. At each place it had been urged for some considerable time that there was great necessity for the erection of an up-to-date hospital. In his judgment the Minister decided that the old hospital at Katanning was the worse of the two then existing institutions, and decided that the Katanning hospital should be built first. The fact remains, however, that both at Katanning and at Collie new hospitals have been erected.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I was pointing out that new hospitals had recently been built at Collie and Katanning. The Minister for Works thought the old Katanning hospital worse than that at Collie, but I thought Collie the worse of the two. However, both those places have new hospitals and they are a credit to the districts concerned. There is still great need for extra hospital accommodation. Hospitals are being erected at Pemberton and Quairading, and a hospital ward is being

provided at the Old Men's Home. The provision of a hospital ward at that institution is long overdue. The building and equipment will cost in the region of £12,000, for which money an 80-bed ward will be made available.

Mr. Sampson: That will relieve the hospitals at Perth and Fremantle.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, both of them.

Mr. Sampson: Has anything been done to provide additional quarters for the nurses at the Perth Hospital?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, excellent quarters have been completed, having a fine lecture room attached. Additional quarters have also been built at Fremantle, and we have been able to reduce the nurses' hours from 63 to 54.

Mr. Sampson: That is for day work.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: No, for both day and night work. During the year a new children's ward has been erected at the Fremantle Hospital and it was officially opened last Sunday. We are now considering the erection of hospitals at Goomalling, Fitzroy Crossing, Esperance, Narembeen and Morawa. Extensions and additions are in progress at Bunbury, Busselton, Carnarvon, Margaret River, Merredin, Northam, Wagin and Wickepin. There was not the slightest doubt that increased accommodation was necessary at those places.

Mr. Sampson: Reverting to the question of nurses' hours, it might be possible to reduce them to 48.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That matter is under consideration. Another hospital opened last year was the Dental Hospital, Perth. That institution is filling a long-felt want; the need for it has been realised for many years. Even with the opening of the institution, it is not possible to get reciprocity with the Eastern States in the matter of training dentists, but we could certainly never have secured reciprocity without a dental hospital. The provision of a dental hospital was the first step towards getting reciprocity. It might surprise some members to learn that prior to the opening of the Dental Hospital about 70 youths were apprenticed to dentists in this State. They had paid £6,000 by way of premiums to be taught the profession, and when they completed their training they could practise only in Western Australia. A dental hospital was also necessary to deal with many cases from the Perth Hospital. At the hospital, the honorary staff, both den-

tists and doctors, extracted teeth, but there were no facilities for providing new sets of teeth. At least 20 people past middle age and in almost indigent circumstances have had their teeth extracted at one or other of the big public hospitals, but it was not possible to provide them with new sets of teeth. Now, however, they can go to the Dental Hospital and get new sets.

Mr. Sampson: Does the Dental Hospital provide service for the patients of the Woollooloo Sanatorium?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, if in the opinion of the officials it is necessary. Some have received attention already. It is only fair to refer to the work done by the Dental Hospital. For the first six months of its existence to the 30th September, the records of the various departments show:—Number of patients admitted, 1,419; general anaesthetic cases, 258; local anaesthetic cases, 854; conservative treatments, 314; prosthetic cases, 133; and orthodontic cases, 5. One man who had a broken jaw was treated for dental troubles. Free treatment in all branches was given to 426 patients. Thus 426 people have been benefited by the opening of that hospital when, in its absence, they would have had to go without treatment.

Mr. Sampson: Each case means a separate patient?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes. I think that record justifies the first six months' existence of the Dental Hospital. The board of management of the hospital is working in conjunction with the school dentist and the dentists throughout the State. When I agreed at the outset to give a subsidy towards the completion and maintenance of a dental hospital in Perth, I got members of the Odontological Society to make some offer of assistance. Every member of the organisation was written to and everyone expressed his readiness to treat school children in country districts when recommended for dental treatment either by the school dentist or by the school medical officer, the treatment to be free of charge, provided the requisites were supplied by the department or the hospital.

Mr. Kenneally: Does that apply to the North, too?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: It applies wherever there is a registered dentist. That shows a very fine spirit and members will agree that it represents a step in the right direction. Another matter worthy of note is that in every town except

Kalgoorlie where there is a hospital and more than one doctor, the doctor can follow his patients into the hospital. Quite recently I have agreed to the subdivision of one of the big wards at Kalgoorlie as an intermediate ward. The work is now in progress and when it is completed, I hope during the next fortnight, doctors at Kalgoorlie and Boulder will be able to follow their patients into the hospital.

Hon. G. Taylor: Is that done to the Perth Hospital now?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: No, not in hospitals that have an honorary staff. It does not apply to Fremantle, either. We cannot expect an outside doctor to follow his patient into an institution where the whole of the medical and surgical work is done by an honorary staff. It is pleasing to record also that the administration of hospitals in this State is economical. Some people might think we are spending too much on hospitals and that costs are not kept within bounds. The figures show that the administration of our hospitals is equal if not superior to that of the hospitals in any other State. In the larger hospitals of Melbourne and Sydney the cost varies from 12s. to 15s. per day whereas in the Perth Hospital, the Children's Hospital, and the Fremantle Hospital the average daily cost is respectively 10s. 3d., 10s. 6d., and 11s. 10d. per day. There are 25 hospitals departmentally managed, some of them being very small and relatively costly. In the departmental hospitals of the North-West there are sometimes no patients, but we have to keep the staff. Sometimes there are two or three patients. Naturally, such hospitals tend to make the average cost fairly high, but even including them, the average number of beds occupied in the 25 hospitals was 304, and the average cost 10s. 6d. per day. At the King Edward Memorial Hospital the daily cost last year was 9s. 5d.

Mr. Lindsay: You are referring to Government hospitals, not to assisted hospitals?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That is so. There is no need to refer further to the hospitals, but I wish to speak on public health. From the public health point of view there is an increase of £1,679 over the figures of last year. That is made up principally by the payment of the salaries of two additional school dentists, whom I hope to appoint this year, provision for incidental expenditure in further dental work, and provision for subsidies to three more infant

health centres. With regard to medical examinations of school children, our staff at present consists of two full-time medical officers, and one officer on part time. This position has been brought about by the resignation of Dr. Dale. Dr. Jull is acting as principal health officer, and is therefore unable to give the whole of her time to school medical work. Besides the three medical officers, we have three school nurses. During 1926 15,541 school children were medically examined. This is just about treble the number of school children who were ever examined in any one year in the history of the State. We are, therefore progressing slightly. I hope before long we shall be able to say that all school children have been examined. Even with our existing staff it is hoped we shall be able to examine school children at least twice during their school period. If we can succeed in doing that, we shall have done almost as much as is done in any other State, and certainly a great deal more than is done in most other countries. With regard to the dental treatment of school children, the Treasurer agreed to find the money for the appointment of two extra dentists. This provision appears on the Estimates. The work of the dental officer who has been appointed has revealed the absolute necessity for more work being done in this direction. He was appointed only at the end of last year.

Mr. Griffiths: There is only one now?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, for the present. When the Estimates go through an advertisement will be inserted inviting applications for the positions of two more dentists. I hope this addition to the staff will take place soon after the new year. The inspections carried out by the dentist reveal the fact that the condition of the teeth of school children is appalling. Of 566 children examined under the age of eight years, 505, or 90 per cent., were found to require treatment. The number of decayed teeth per child examined was in the region of five. That is a serious state of affairs. In making this report the dentist, on the information he could gather from the Education Department and the Health Department, took a fair average of the schools throughout the State, except in the North-West. I think he examined two schools completely in the immediate vicinity of Perth, one in Fremantle, one at Midland Junction, one in the South-West, one in the Great Southern, two on the goldfields, and one on the Murchison.

Mr. Richardson: Are inquiries being made into the cause of the trouble?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The dentist is making inquiries. A good deal of the trouble is unavoidable under existing conditions. He believes that it can be remedied by giving attention to the children's teeth in the early stages.

Mr. Davy: Have you any comparative statistics to show that in certain portions of the country the trouble is worse than it is in others?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I believe the worst school amongst those examined was either at Guildford or Midland Junction, but it was certainly in that area.

Hon. G. Taylor: The percentage of defective teeth is appalling.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes.

Mr. Richardson: It is more than appalling.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Some of the defects are not serious. Some would be minor defects, but would still be defects.

Mr. Davy: Defects due to want of care?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, care and treatment.

Mr. Davy: Decay of some sort?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: In some instances. In other cases there was corrosion on the teeth. If this were not removed, in a little while the teeth would become decayed.

Mr. Griffiths: Is it suggested that we are likely to become a toothless race?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I do not know. The number of decayed teeth per child examined was in the neighbourhood of five. The school dental officer carried out treatment in cases where parents agreed to its being done. There is no charge for the treatment. So far, treatment has been confined to children under 8 years of age. Some 800 children between 5 and 14 were examined and 82 per cent. of these had bad teeth, an average of 2.8 decayed teeth per child.

Mr. Sampson: Does the dentist suggest what should be done to remedy the trouble?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Not up to date. He reported on what he had discovered in these schools. He must be given time to make suggestions later. When he has been in the position a little longer, he can go into the question of what should be done.

Mr. Sampson: Were they mostly cases of ordinary corrosion?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: No. I think the visits by the dentists will lead to an improvement in the position. The teachers have certainly tried to instil into the children the necessity for keeping their teeth clean. They teach hygiene in that direction as it is, and are deserving of credit for what they do.

Mr. Sampson: What is the cause of the trouble?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: No doubt a good deal of it is due to the amount of sweets Australian children eat. We do not attempt to treat all school children, that is from the youngest up to 14. What we have in view is taking children between 7 and 8, and seeing that they get proper treatment at those ages. At the end of five years, with the efficient staff which I hope we shall have, it should be possible to ensure that every child attending school up to the age of 14 has been attended to dentally. When that time comes it is hoped we shall be able to keep in touch with the whole lot as they go on. It would be an impossible task to set five or even ten dentists to examine all children from their commencement at school up to the age of 14, and give such children dental treatment. The object is to take those between 7 and 8 and set them on right lines. It is desired to examine each child twice during the school period, the second examination, if possible to be not later than at 12 years of age. That is the system recommended as being the best after considering the methods adopted in many other countries. If we can succeed in having that done, my liability from the health point of view will be considerably decreased in a few years' time. I am not a medical man and have to take advice from those who are experts in the matter. Both Dr. Atkinson and Dr. Dale have definitely assured me that, leaving out the accident causes and those that are in the Perth Public Hospital through senile decay, and taking the average complaints of the average man and woman who receive treatment at the Perth Public Hospital, if these people had had their teeth attended to in the school days it would have been possible to reduce the number of patients held in the hospital, of ages from 30 years upwards, by at least 10 per cent. If we spent £5,000 a year on the dental treatment of school children we should be getting out of the expenditure lightly if the result

meant a 10 per cent. decrease in the number receiving treatment in our hospitals. It is intended, when the two new dentists are appointed, that most of their time shall be devoted to country schools. In regard to the psychological clinic, I should like to say a word in praise of the psychologist. I do not think any civil servant has done more with the finances available than the present psychologist has endeavoured to do. She has done magnificent work even with her limited means.

Mr. Griffiths: And done it quickly.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, she has done exceptionally good work. Members will be convinced from her report that she is exceptionally thorough in all her work from beginning to end. She has outlined a fine scheme, but it would cost too much money to put it into operation in one year. I have advised her not to be backward in advocating what she thinks is necessary in the treatment of mental deficiencies.

Mr. Mann: I am sure she will not be backward.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I do not wish people generally to be deterred if she cannot get all she is asking for at once. Her first recommendation to me would have involved an expenditure of about £60,000. That cannot possibly be found in any one year. Her most immediate necessity is a school somewhere in the metropolitan area for the treatment and teaching of mental deficiencies.

Mr. Mann: You do not think there will be any overlapping between your department and the Education Department?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Not if I can avoid it. Many of the State school teachers are qualified to give various lessons to children who would be in the school if it were in operation to-morrow.

Mr. Mann: It is a matter of the Education Department going to the Health Department for advice.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I would rather say it would be the Education Department accepting the advice of the Psychological Department as to what was best to be done. If there is anyone who knows the correct treatment or teaching of mental deficiencies it should be a trained psychologist.

Mr. Mann: If there was ever an idea of removing the psychologist to the Education

Department, your department would resent it.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I do not think there is any such move. None of the departments is prepared to recommend the appointment of a psychologist. All say there is not sufficient work in the department to warrant the appointment of one. While we had the Gaols Department, the Lunacy Department, the State Children Department, the Children's Court, and the Education Department all asking for some method of treating mental deficient—

Mr. Mann: I hope the lady will not be removed to the Education Department.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: While all asked for this treatment, not one department was prepared to recommend the appointment of a psychologist for its own use. Only as the result of a conference of the departments was it discovered that among them they could find employment for a psychologist, and so a psychologist was appointed. It is the unanimous wish of the board controlling the matter—a board comprised of Mr. Andrews, the head of the Education Department; Mr. Trethowan, head of the Gaols Department; Dr. Bentley, head of the Lunacy Department; Mr. Cox, lecturer in psychology at the University; and the Principal Medical Officer—that the psychologist should remain under the Health Department. In infant health work the Estimates show an increase of £329, this amount being required for the provision of a new centre at Bunbury and, probably, an additional country centre before the end of the financial year. It has been said to me that the mothers of the State do not take an active interest in child welfare centres. That however, cannot be said truthfully. I have here figures for the quarter ended 30th June last relating to the 12 centres in existence—Stirling-street, Golden Age, Victoria Park, North Perth, Subiaco, Claremont, Cottesloe, Fremantle, Baywater, Bassendean, Midland Junction, Northam, and Kalgoorlie. The actual work of those centres during the three months in question comprised the following:—Births reported 829; new babies visited (a) under two months 670, (b) over two months 159; new babies attending centres (a) under two months 375, (b) over two months 309; total number of babies attending centres 1,979; total attendances of babies at cen-

tres 7,029; total visits to households 3,145; effective calls 2,667; total consultations regarding mothers (a) expectant 182, others 145; total consultations, including correspondence, 10,382; number referred to doctor or hospital (a) mothers 72, (b) babies 160; re-establishment of lactation (a) breast 872, (b) complementary 230. Those figures absolutely speak for themselves as to the work of the infant health centres. I do not know of any movement anywhere that has done more for the future generation than the health centres. On this subject I am able to speak from experience, having visited numerous centres. Indeed, I have grand-children attending them.

Mr. Davy: You do not look a grandfather.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I have five grandchildren, and am proud of it. One of my grandchildren is eight years of age.

Mr. Davy: Your grandchildren ought to be proud of you.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: They are. One of them, I believe, would scarcely have been here to-day but for the advice, care and attention of one of the sisters at the centres. I can unhesitatingly recommend any mother, irrespective of what her child may be like, to take it to the infant health centre and get the advice—and follow it—of the trained nurse in attendance. I wish to get it recorded in "Hansard," and if possible in the Press, that the impression that infant health centres are established for the purpose of treating sick babies is altogether a wrong idea. They do not exist for that purpose at all. If a baby is sick, certainly the proper place to take it to is either the doctor's consulting room or the Children's Hospital. Infant health centres have been established for the purpose of preventing babies from becoming sick. If only mothers would take their babies to the centres, many of the beds occupied in the Children's Hospital to-day could be done away with. Some difficulty is being experienced in obtaining trained nurses for the centres. Up to the present there has been no opportunity of obtaining the necessary training in Western Australia, where nurses so far have not been able to qualify in infant health work. The Council of the Infant Health Association have just agreed, after consultation with the acting Principal Medical Officer and the

matron of the King Edward Memorial Hospital, to begin at an early date—I hope next month—the training of infant health nurses at the King Edward Memorial Hospital. Whilst I do not know that there will be no difficulty in securing reciprocity, in obtaining recognition of our nurses in the Eastern States, I am hopeful there will be none. The Principal Medical Officer informs me, and from my own observation I can state, that there is not in the Commonwealth an institution where a nurse could be trained so well as at the King Edward Memorial Hospital in Subiaco. No other hospital in Australia combines all three departments under one roof. The nurses who go there for training will be able to secure instruction in midwifery, pre-natal, and child welfare work.

Mr. Mann: I understood that was so too at the Women's Hospital in Melbourne.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Unfortunately it is not. Quite recently I received a letter from the lady doctor in control of that institution congratulating the Western Australian Government on combining pre-natal clinics with a child welfare centre under one roof, the only institution of the kind in Australia. The lady doctor added that she had for the last five years been vainly trying to induce the Victorian Government to establish such an institution. The training of nurses at the King Edward Memorial Hospital will overcome the difficulty of securing nurses and the disabilities resulting from centres being understaffed. Recently a deputation waited on me to ask for relief in that respect, and I promised to help if possible. The deputation in question represented a centre which could only employ a relieving nurse for five months of the year. I offered to take that nurse into the Health Department for the other seven months of the year, leaving her to attend to child welfare during the five. If the training system is established at the King Edward Memorial Hospital, there will be no need for this expedient, because our own trained nurses will be coming on every two or three months. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) asked whether the Health Department had done anything regarding deep therapy treatment for cancer. It is about two years since the department put up a proposition for deep therapy treatment. The first request came from the

Perth Hospital authorities, who asked whether the Government could establish a deep therapy plant at the hospital. The Principal Medical Officer considered at that time that the deep therapy method had not been tested sufficiently to warrant him in recommending the expenditure. In his opinion the better course was to make arrangements with two local medical men who had plants to treat patients recommended to them as being suitable cases. I agreed to that proposal, and up to the 20th of last month the number of cases treated upon the department's recommendation totalled 41. The cost to the same date has been £694, and the amount refunded £52 8s. 9d. I am sorry to say the treatment has not proved as successful as one would have liked; but there is one case in which, so far as is known, a cure has been effected, since the individual has been working for the last 15 months and there is no sign whatever of recurrence. A complete cure is, therefore, anticipated.

Mr. Sampson: Of cancer?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, or sarcoma. I have here notes from various doctors as to the results of deep therapy treatment up to date, and I will read three of them. Dr. Syme Johnson writes—

Much benefit, though I originally thought the outlook hopeless. First series gave such distinct benefit that I have just commenced another series, and it is hoped to improve things to such a point that an operation may be done.

Dr. Donald Smith reports regarding a lad who was under treatment previously from July, 1926—

Tumour almost disappeared and still improving. Can breathe better through nose. There is very much less swelling than there was.

Dr. Male, superintendent of the Children's Hospital, reports—

In the case of a little girl who was in this institution, she was operated on in April, and deep therapy was administered in June. Although probably too early to arrive at a definite conclusion, the child when seen in August seemed to be in very good health. She had put on some weight and seemed happy, and there was no clinical evidence of any recurrence.

That is to say, evidence of the cancer returning.

Mr. Davy: A case of a child suffering from cancer?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Unfortunately we have had cases of cancer in children under three years of age.

Mr. Davy: But cancer of a very different brand; malignant growth.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Cancer nevertheless. There are three distinct names for cancer, but all three names unfortunately represent the same disease. Dr. Atkinson and Dr. Donald Smith have informed me to that effect. One, namely, the cancer known as sarcoma, Dr. Donald Smith is positive in his statement that it is he could get patients suffering from that class of cancer in its early stages a complete cure could be effected by the deep therapy treatment.

Mr. Sampson: There are a great many varieties of sarcoma.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: Yes, but if all cases could be treated in their early stages great benefit would result. I do not think there is any thing else I need say about the Medical and Health Department. It is a department continually asking for, and getting, and expending, more money, but it is a department where expenditure has to be made without much revenue. I hope members will not think the expenditure incurred is too great. Also I hope that the expenditure from a curative point of view will not be increased very much in the future, but that the expenditure from a preventive point of view will be at least trebled within the next five years.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [8.16]: It is gratifying to note the work done for infant welfare and to remember that it was initiated by the previous Government. Of course it had to be continued and extended, and I am glad that is being done.

The Minister for Health: You provided a subsidy for one year only.

MR. SAMPSON: Well, we take one step forward and go ahead. I suppose you have had the same experience of Treasurers. They do not provide a grant for two years. The best one can do is to get a grant for one year. That was what happened in my time. However, I am glad that good results have been secured. I am as gratified as is the Minister at those results. It is interesting to note the report submitted by the Minister respecting deep therapy, but it is disappointing to learn that only in a small percentage of cases has good resulted. I have heard of one case in Melbourne. There a lady of 70 years of age received the utmost benefit from the treatment. She is in the best of health to-day, although it is now three or

four years since the treatment was applied. As to research work, I feel that this should be carried out in the bigger centres, where the equipment is more up to date, and where there are funds available for the purpose. I regret that the Minister did not refer to the treatment of school children in the outer suburban areas. I am hopeful that not only in the big city schools and schools in the larger country centres, but that in all schools the children will be given this very necessary service.

The Minister for Health: One of the school medical officers has been at work exclusively on country schools.

Mr. SAMPSON: We want the smaller schools also to receive attention.

The Minister for Health: Every school in the State will receive attention.

Mr. SAMPSON: That will be very gratifying. Hospital finance is a matter of the highest importance. We all realise the difficulty. We know that upon the public spirit of the citizens depends to a large extent the funds available for hospital service. The time has arrived when all members should urge the provision of funds either by the imposition of a tax, which probably is the best method, or by a vote on the Estimates sufficient to do what is required. It has been suggested that premium bonds provide a means whereby hospital services could be furnished.

Mr. Griffiths: What about Mr. Huelin's scheme?

Mr. SAMPSON: It is an excellent one. If it were adopted, the anxiety of the Minister and others interested in hospital work would be at an end.

The Minister for Health: Do not say that. It would not meet requirements by a long long way.

Mr. SAMPSON: Doubtless under it some money could be voluntarily contributed. At present a large section of the people does not contribute at all, and consequently the difficulties in providing hospital services are very great indeed, notwithstanding the honorary service provided in the Perth and many other public hospitals. It has been urged that a lottery is preferable to the present method of raising funds. I do not know that we are reduced to the stage where it is necessary to depend upon a lottery, but I agree with the Minister and others that it would be far better to have a lottery and devote the proceeds to hospital service, than to see such large sums of money regularly

sent over to the lottery promoters of the Eastern States. Until the position is taken seriously and until the people generally determine that they are not going to stand for the present method, the officers of the various hospitals, particularly the Perth Hospital, will have to continue devoting their time to the securing of funds rather than to the carrying out of their legitimate duties. We shall never have the necessary hospital service until a tax is proposed. If that were done it would be a great relief and would be helpful in every way. We should then see initiated the advantages that follow the prevention of disease, and we should be in an altogether better position than we are in today. I hope the Minister will not think that, in saying this, I am criticising him. Not for a moment. I believe that he looks at this, not from a party standpoint, but from the standpoint of what is best for the people generally. The most important question in Western Australia is that of hospital service. If that could be provided many difficulties arising from its non-provision would end.

MR. GRIFFITHS (Avon) [8.25]: The hon. member referred to hospital finance. The committee of the Kellerberrin hospital, with which I am associated, are considerably perturbed over the proposals put forward by Mr. Huelin. I rang up the department and asked for an outline of Mr. Huelin's scheme. The information I got contains one point that I should like to have made clear. Possibly the Minister can enlighten me. In one paragraph of the letter received by me it is stated that the scheme evolved would mean that every hospital would receive 6s. per day for every patient, and that the difference between the 6s. per day and the actual cost to the hospital would be made up from a subsidy to be provided by the Government. The committee of the Eastern Districts Memorial Hospital were under the impression that they would have to provide hospital accommodation free, and in return would get from this fund 6s. per patient per day. I understand that the cost per patient at the Kellerberrin hospital is something like 15s. per day. This letter states that the difference between the 6s. per day and the actual cost would be made up from a Government subsidy. Perhaps the Minister can explain that. There is very little to be said on the Vote. The Minister has gone very fully into the work of the department, including the child welfare branch.

There is one little matter I should like to bring under the notice of the Minister, who referred to the experimental treatment of cancer. I understand that Dr. Mitchell of the Wooroloo Sanatorium has been offered the use of an electrical apparatus for the experimental treatment of the patients at Wooroloo, but that he declined the offer of Mons. Justin Christofleau, on the score that he was a Government officer in charge of a Government institution. This apparatus has been successfully used in cases of leprosy in Siam, and authenticated cases of consumption have been beneficially treated by it. Since it was offered gratis to Dr. Mitchell for experimental purposes, I rather think the experiment should have been made; although, on the other hand, Dr. Mitchell, possibly, is quite right in refusing to carry out such an experiment at a Government institution. The Minister may have heard of this.

The Minister for Health: It has not been put up to me. It is the first I have heard of it.

MR. GRIFFITHS: I understand that the apparatus has been used with great success, and I know that young Trouchet is in France to-day at the place where the inventor lives, and has cabled to Perth that he has seen extraordinary things done by this electroculture, both in respect of animal life and of flowers. The Minister may make inquiries. I should be delighted to think I had brought under his notice something likely to be of benefit to the unfortunate men at Wooroloo. I need not say any more. Everybody is in sympathy with the Minister and I congratulate him on the good work that he is doing and the humanitarian spirit he is displaying.

MR. LATHAM (York) [8.30]: I am not going to detain the Committee; I merely wish to say that the department is rendering very good service and we are grateful to the Minister for the statement he made and the details that he supplied. I would, however, have liked to see the report of the department submitted to the House before we were asked to consider the Estimates. We get only a biennial report of the work of the Medical Department. Surely the department is important enough now for a report to be presented annually.

The Minister for Health: The reason is that the principal medical officer is not back from his trip abroad.

MR. LATHAM: The work of the department is of such importance that we should have an annual report.

The Minister for Health: We have had it for the last three years.

MR. LATHAM: I wanted to look up some figures and the latest report I could get hold of was that for 1925. I submit that the department should publish a report annually.

The Minister for Health: Yes, it should be published annually.

MR. LATHAM: When we come to the items dealing with the entertainments tax I hope the Minister will give me an opportunity to say a few words. I compliment the Minister on the way in which he submitted his Estimates and I may be permitted to say that we are all agreed that he has done very good work.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [8.33]: I had hoped that the Minister would have dealt with the future finances of the hospitals. We know that the Minister made an attempt some time ago to finance these institutions by means of lotteries. I supported him at the time, but the effort failed and apparently the Minister does not intend to do anything further in this regard in the immediate future. After having perused the reports of the department and after having read Mr. Huelin's scheme, I think something should be done to place the finances of the various hospitals on a sounder basis than that existing to-day. I am speaking now more on behalf of the assisted hospitals. When one goes through the report of the Medical Department for the year 1923-24—so far as I am aware no report has been published since that time—and compares the assistance rendered to the hospitals at that period with what is being done to-day, the conclusion must be arrived at that something further should be done. It does not seem fair that certain districts should be forced to provide for the whole of their expenditure whilst other districts provide practically nothing except what they receive from the Government and the revenue they collect by way of charges made for the treatment of patients. I am aware that hospitals in the country have a hard struggle but it has not been quite so bad since the passing of the Workers' Compensation Act which has enabled the hospitals to collect fees from patients more than they ever did before. Once a hospital is established in a new district, it is almost invariably the case

that within 12 months it is found necessary to duplicate the buildings because of the increased demand for accommodation. Country hospitals have to find pound for pound, and that proves a constant drain on the resources of the people who subscribe. On going through the report one gets the different figures and is able to find out what the various institutions cost. The difference in some instances is considerable, but that fact may be explained because some hospitals are small and others have to keep nurses there and in that way add to the expense. I have taken out some comparative figures with regard to the average cost of the treatment of patients at the same class of hospitals. These figures very considerably, but I do not blame the Minister for that. The report I am quoting from deals with 1923-24, and so far as I know the figures given there are those that apply at the present time. I might add that the Minister was good enough to give me a small donation towards one of the hospitals in my district.

The Minister for Health: That was because the number of patients had increased, and the hospital was entitled to the grant.

Mr. LINDSAY: The matter I am trying to fathom is whether there is a fixed ratio for the various institutions. I have taken five hospitals—Bruce Rock, Goomalling, Moora, Wyalcatchem, and Wickepin—and I find that the average rate of subsidy granted to those hospitals by the Government is 1s. 2d. per patient. The costs of these five hospitals vary considerably and run to as high as £1 8s. 4½d. and down to as low as 10s. 7¼d. The rates of subsidies per patient per day are—Bruce Rock, 1s. 2¾d.; Goomalling, 9¾d.; Moora, 1s. 5d.; Wyalcatchem, 11¼d., and Wickepin, 1s. 5d. It will be seen that there is no comparison with the actual subsidy received from the Government. I have another list that refers to the hospitals at Cue, Leonora, Merredin, Mt. Magnet and Meekatharra, and I find that the average rate of subsidy per patient per day there is 7s. 6d. Those are Government assisted hospitals. We have five hospitals receiving 1s. 2d. and on the other hand five receiving 7s. 6d. Then we come to Government hospitals and I have taken Bunbury, Collie, Katanning, Narrogin and York. These are Government hospitals of the same class as the first five I mentioned, those in the agricultural districts. Whilst the first five receive 1s. 2d. the other hospitals of

the same class receive 8s. 7d. per patient per day.

The Minister for Health: Are you sure that a good deal of that 8s. 7d. does not include doctor's subsidy?

Mr. LINDSAY: It sets out in the annual report, "The total cost excluding D.M.O."

The Minister for Health: Yes, but in one of those hospitals I think we are paying a subsidy of £300 a year to keep a doctor there.

Mr. LINDSAY: I can only deal with the figures I have before me. When we come to the Government hospitals, the subsidy per patient per day is not shown, but the cost per patient per day is shown. In certain of the hospitals, patients pay fees. We have 25 Government hospitals in the country, and the average cost at those hospitals per patient per day is 10s. 6d. I have given the average cost at 8s. 7d. Another remarkable statement is that the average cost of the metropolitan hospitals worked out at 10s. 10d. I worked out this average from the costs as they appear in the report. There should be a more equitable basis of dealing with Government assisted hospitals. I am under the impression that with regard to Government hospitals in the country they have to find a portion of the money required for building purposes. One that is referred to in the report is Katanning. The average cost there was 10s. 4d. and the Government subsidy per day was 7s. 11¾d. I assume that the Government hospitals have to pay a proportion of the cost of the new buildings. Katanning has done that. The small country hospitals are in much the same position. They not only have to find a big proportion of the cost to meet the general expense of the hospital, but they have to bear a proportion of the cost of re-building. At Goomalling efforts are being made to build a new hospital at a cost of £4,700. The figures I have show that this district receives only 9¾d. per patient per day, the lowest figure paid in the State.

The Minister for Health: No, it is not the lowest.

Mr. LINDSAY: It was then. To-day it is 1s. 4d. Whilst Goomalling was 9¾d., I find from the report that payments were made at the same time as high as 17s. 7½d., 18s. 2d., 15s. 11d. and 16s. 8½d., and there was one instance of £2 12s. 7½d. There is always a certain number of indigent patients, and it naturally follows that the people of the district have to raise funds to keep the institution going largely because

of the number of patients treated from whom nothing is received. Further, because of the very fact that people in the country start to build hospitals, there follows in 12 or 18 months time the demand for increased accommodation. I can prove that, especially in respect of the Wyalcatchem hospital. The subscriptions that were raised at the outset totalled £787 and one would have thought that with the pound for pound subsidy received from the Government, the amount would have been sufficient, at any rate to meet the exigencies of the position for a few years. Not so, however. In the following year—1924—another £212 had to be raised and again in the succeeding year £398, whilst in 1926 £182 was raised. Then it became necessary to build nurses' quarters and the Wyalcatchem Road Board found £912. Since 1923 Wyalcatchem has raised £2,627 for the purpose of enlarging the hospital and the Government also found a fair amount of money. In addition to the subscriptions towards the building operations, the people have to contribute towards the cost of maintenance. The Goomalling community have been forced into the position of erecting a hospital at a cost of £4,600. As a matter of fact I understand that the total cost will be £6,000. Regarding Wyalcatchem, there is still a difficulty about the water supply. Money will have to be found for that. One cannot help remarking on the very fine spirit displayed by the people in those districts who are prepared to find so much money for the relief of the sick. But it is probable that that generous spirit will be affected if the districts do not get as fair a deal as is given to hospitals in other parts of the State. I am not criticising the Minister on that score because it is a practice that has grown up in the past. In the list I mentioned, there are to be found hospitals that have been receiving patients at the rate of about one per month. It naturally follows that it is hard to deal with such institutions. It is easy to start a hospital, but it is less easy to close down an old-established one. Such hospitals cost a lot. At the same time, I cannot understand why the York hospital, for instance, should receive 12s. from the Government in respect of each patient there, whereas at the next town, the Beverley hospital receives only 2s. That is what occurs under the present system. Some better method should be adopted to raise the necessary finances

to place our hospitals on a reasonable footing. The hospitals in the agricultural area that I have mentioned should be placed on a much better footing than at present.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [8.46]: As a country member I wish to say a few words regarding the position of the people in the outer districts. It is pleasing to members to know that we have such an enthusiastic Minister in charge of the Health Department. He has done remarkably good work since he has been at the head of the Health Department and I am gratified to hear that he intends to continue his efforts along those lines. It is a matter for congratulation that it is his intention to give the country people the same facilities regarding medical inspections as are enjoyed in the larger towns. The children attending schools in the metropolitan and suburban areas receive better medical attention than is possible under existing conditions in the country areas. In the country, and particularly at the smaller schools, the children may be examined by a medical officer, but subsequently very long periods elapse before the examination is repeated. In my opinion it is necessary for medical inspections to be conducted at least twice a year. Diseases can develop rapidly and of late years medical science has discovered what an important part the eyes, nose, throat and teeth play in the health of the rising generation. After the reports are furnished by the medical officers, it is the duty of parents to see that proper medical attention is provided for their children. Very often parents take no notice of the reports upon the condition of their children, whilst at times the complaints from which the juveniles are suffering are such that the parents are not in a position to detect. It is necessary for a medical man to examine the children before such complaints can be ascertained. It is pleasing therefore to know that it is the intention of the Minister to have the same medical attention devoted to the schools in the country as has been extended to the city schools in the past. I fail to see why the doctors who reside in the smaller towns where there are schools should not be authorised to make the necessary medical inspections twice a year. I do not know what the cost would amount to, but it should be done in the interests of the country children.

The Minister for Health: The children at the town schools do not receive medical inspections twice a year, nor yet once a year.

Mr. BROWN: It would be helpful if we could get the inspection once a year.

The Minister for Health: I am hopeful that in the near future every child will be examined during the school period. If we do that, we shall do more than most other countries in the world.

Mr. BROWN: While there may be a doctor in every country town where there is a school, it has to be remembered that there are a number of smaller schools five or ten miles out from the larger centres and the children attending those smaller schools receive no medical attention at all.

The Minister for Health: Nor does a doctor inspect town schools under those conditions either.

Mr. BROWN: To expedite matters, could not the department instruct local doctors to carry out the school medical inspections?

The Minister for Health: No.

Mr. BROWN: Why?

The Minister for Health: Is it not part of their duties.

Mr. BROWN: If the local doctors were instructed to carry out the medical examinations they would have to be paid fees.

Mr. Latham: Arrangements might be made by which the medical men could be subsidised.

Mr. BROWN: I hope the Minister will give some attention to this phase in the interests of the children attending the smaller country schools. We know that the best migrant we can have is the child born in Australia, and if we can safeguard health in that direction, we shall be doing something in the interests of Australia. Regarding the hospital at Pingelly, I am pleased that the Minister has provided a grant and the people have raised about £800. A building was erected for the hospital towards which the Government paid £400 and the local people contributed a like amount. That was a considerable time ago and since then the building has been lying dormant. I would like the Minister to say what he intends to do with the building. As the money has been paid over, it is time instructions were given to carry out the necessary repairs and make the hospital a going concern. Regarding the financial aspect of hospital work, we cannot get

away from the fact that something will have to be done to adequately finance the institutions. At every little centre throughout Western Australia people have agitated for a local hospital. The expense attaching to such institutions is considerable because they must be staffed, and qualified nurses cannot be expected to work for a small fee. The result is that many of the small hospitals get into difficulties and that emphasises the fact that in the near future something definite will have to be done to place them on a sound footing. I regard the Perth Hospital as a national institution. We know that patients go there from all over Western Australia, even from districts where there are local hospitals. I do not know whether the explanation is that more expert advice is available here, or whether the facilities for dealing with various diseases are more up-to-date. Even the Perth Hospital, which is really a national institution, has to depend upon voluntary contributions.

Mr. Sampson: Every hospital is a national institution from the standpoint that it protects public health.

Mr. BROWN: If the Government were to provide the necessary funds for that hospital, it would be more satisfactory than the existing position under which voluntary contributions have to be relied upon. The same applies to the country hospitals as well. People are always arranging fetes and so on to raise money for their hospitals, but the financial aspect will have to be faced very soon. I congratulate the Government, and particularly the Minister himself, on the good work that he has been doing. I know that if he had the money at his disposal he would do much more than has been possible to date. I hope he will be able to secure additional funds and continue his good work.

HON. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) [9.55]: The Minister gave the Committee some alarming figures when he quoted from the reports dealing with the dental examination of school children. I think the Minister said that 90 per cent. of the children were suffering from diseases of the teeth in some form or other. That is an appalling percentage, especially if the diseases referred to are of any magnitude. We should devote funds to investigate the position regarding these defective teeth, and particu-

larly in the direction of research work to ascertain the cause. We are asked to vote £167,000 in round figures, and a large proportion of that will be for hospital purposes.

The Minister for Health: That is all for hospital purposes. The vote for health matters is separate.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: There must be some cause for such a large percentage of defective teeth in the children, and surely with scientific developments, it should be possible to ascertain that cause, and to effect remedies. From year to year we shall be called upon to vote sums of money to enable attention to be given to the teeth of our young people, and that will be an ever-increasing amount unless we find out the cause of the trouble. The Minister would be wise to set apart funds for research work. Two or three years ago there was an alarming report regarding the prevalence of pediculosis. That gave rise to annoyance on the part of parents, and I notice that the matter was dropped after a few letters had appeared in the Press. After all, pediculosis is a complaint that need not exist. Children's heads can be kept free from vermin by parents without the Government being called upon to render assistance. It is quite possible for people to expect too much from the Government. In that particular instance, the report was one of the most damaging I have ever heard of regarding the parents of the children at our State schools. The whole thing caused such alarm and was so objectionable, seeing that it looked so bad for such a report to go forth to the world, that we have never heard anything more about it. Has there been any alteration in that respect?

The Minister for Health: There has been a wonderful improvement.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am pleased to hear that.

The Minister for Health: There are two places only in the State where there is an agitation about the same thing, and we hope to remedy the position there.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I hope the Minister will not relax the departmental efforts in that direction, no matter what the parents may say. They should not be considered if they allow the heads of their children to become affected. It is the concern of the State to look after the health of our sick,

but I am afraid we are prone to look at it in the wrong way. If we are to do that properly, we should provide the means by direct taxation. The charity business and the various efforts resorted to to raise money are wrong. The Government find a certain amount of money, but not sufficient to enable the work to be carried out. Hence we see in the streets tickets on sale for various art unions and other means of raising money. A big stunt has been in progress in the interests of the Perth Hospital. I do not know whether that effort is yet completed.

The Minister for Health: It has six weeks to go before completion.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It has been running for along time and I thought it might have been completed by now. It is to be hoped the appeal will produce the amount of money needed. When the Federal Government relinquished their entertainments tax we picked it up for hospital purposes. Last year the Minister collected something like £29,000 under this heading and spent between £26,000 and £27,000 of it. That was of some assistance, certainly, but it goes hardly anywhere towards the funds needed. Last year we had 77 hospitals that provided 1,187 beds at a cost of £240,526. In 1923 our hospitals provided 940 beds at a cost of £175,838. Those are hospitals that the Government financed to a smaller or greater extent and the increase in three years has been remarkable. We must realise that this is a rapidly growing item of expenditure and the only way to cope with it is by imposing direct taxation. I do not know whether the Premier has received a deputation from the associated hospitals, but there has been a suggestion from that body that the Government should introduce legislation to provide for hospitals by way of taxation.

The Minister for Health: The Premier sent the deputation on to me.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I represented a couple of hospitals at the conference. We accepted a scheme and appointed a deputation to wait on the Premier with a request that legislation should be introduced in keeping with the proposal. Is it of any use asking whether the Government are likely to bring down a measure this year?

The Minister for Health: Not this session.

The Premier: We cannot get our ordinary tax Bill through.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: We shall get that through all right. I do not want the Pre-

mier to become alarmed about anything that happened this afternoon.

Mr. Thomson: I thought he rather invited a scrap.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The ordinary tax Bill will be all right. The Government should bring down a policy for direct taxation for hospitals so that everybody would contribute. That is a fair thing. Under the system of street collections the generous people are giving all the time. There are two hospitals in my district and the workmen there are contributing as much as 2s. and 2s. 3d. a week towards the upkeep of the local hospital, while thousands of men working about Perth are not contributing anything directly to the upkeep of the Perth Hospital from which they derive a great benefit. That is not right. The Government should institute a tax so that the cadging element could be eliminated and everyone would have to contribute. The Minister spoke of the necessity for more deep therapy treatment. Some three or four years ago deep therapy treatment had not been proved successful for the treatment of cancer.

The Minister for Health: It has not been proved absolutely successful.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: A few years ago we heard much of the success of radium for the cure of cancer. That, however, seems to have died out. I have not been closely connected with the hospitals for the last three or four years.

The Minister for Health: There is more faith in radium treatment.

Hon. G. Taylor: Than in deep therapy treatment?

The Minister for Health: No; there is more faith in radium treatment now than ever before.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: If deep therapy treatment proves successful I hope the Government will arrange to have the necessary appliances provided at the Perth Hospital. It has been said that the Perth Hospital is the State hospital. That is undoubted. In this State we have a large number of hospitals with only one doctor and, if there is a serious operation to be performed, one doctor cannot do it. He needs another to administer the anaesthetic.

The Minister for Health: In many cases the matron administers the anaesthetic.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes, but efforts are made to send patients to the Perth Hospital because the facilities there are much better than those in a smaller hospital. Consequently we must regard the Perth Hospital

as the State hospital. It is a very fine hospital. Three or four years ago I went through some of the hospitals in the Eastern States. They had not a great lead on our hospital, and ours has been extended since then. I do not think it would take long to get a Bill passed to provide for taxation for hospital purposes. I venture to say the great majority of people are absolutely sick and tired of the present methods of raising funds for hospitals.

Mr. Latham: It would be much cheaper for everyone.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: All sorts of devices are adopted to raise money for hospitals. The present state of affairs is awful, and I hope the Government will seriously consider the necessity for introducing legislation this session.

(Mr. Angelo took the Chair.)

MISS HOLMAN (Forrest) [9.9]: I congratulate the Minister for Health and the department on the work done during the last 12 months. Unfortunately, a great number of my constituents are too far distant to be served by the increased number of hospitals. There are some places without so much as decent means of transport to take patients to hospitals. I am pleased to see an increase on the Estimates for the school of dentists. That will mean much to the children in the South-Western district while children in distant parts will be able to get some benefit in the near future from the dentists being appointed. It is agreed that many of the ills to which the human body is heir arise from bad teeth, and the appointment of dentists to attend to the school children should be productive of great good. There is a slight increase in the estimate for school inspectors. I hope we shall derive benefit from their work. The department have done much work in the last 12 months. I believe the number of school children medically examined totalled about 15,000. That is a very fine record. I hope my constituents will have an opportunity to participate in that benefit next year.

The Minister for Health: The School Medical Officer will start in your district in January.

Miss HOLMAN: I am glad to hear that. Unfortunately, there are not many dentists in my district who are members of the Odontological Society. To a great extent we have to depend on travelling dent-

ists, and the cost to parents for the treatment of children's teeth is very high. I understand one dentist charges 5s. for the first extraction and 2s. 6d. for the second. At such high fees parents cannot afford to have their children's teeth treated. We have always had a good deal of trouble at the bush landings and in the back districts of the South-West owing to lack of sufficient inspection by health officers. I understand that the Minister has arranged a system of districts for next year and I hope that under that system we shall receive more inspection than we have had in the past. Possibly the Timber Industry Regulation Act will also help us. The inspectors under that statute will doubtless work in with the departmental inspectors. At some of the bush landings the sanitary conditions are absolutely revolting. To anyone who has not been there, they are beyond imagination, and how any self-respecting company can allow such conditions to continue, I do not know. The bush landings have always been hotbeds of typhoid fever. If the scheme proposed by the Minister will help us, we shall be very glad to have it. I congratulate the Minister on the infant welfare work and the State Psychologist on her work. It is gratifying to learn that everything possible will be done to help her. It may not be possible to give all she asks immediately, but if we are assured that the fruits of her work of the last 18 months will not be lost, it is perhaps as much as we can expect at present.

MR. THOMSON (Katanning) [9.14]: The Minister and the Government might well feel flattered at the words of appreciation that have fallen from every member who has spoken on these Estimates. I desire to add my meed of appreciation of the sympathetic way in which the Minister and the Government have dealt with the hospital question in the country districts. There is no doubt it is one thing amongst many others that are outstanding, namely, the Government's sympathetic consideration for country districts. I support the remarks of the member for Toodyay. The Government might adopt a more uniform method of subsidising committee and public hospitals in the way of maintenance. It has been the established policy of Governments to give a pound for pound subsidy for the erection of new buildings. That proved very benefi-

cial. It put the various districts on their mettle. Instead of asking the Government to do everything for them, those districts which have not had the benefit of hospitals have guaranteed their half of the cost. Some hospitals have great difficulty in making ends meet. Considerable dissatisfaction exists. People may have to find half the money for the hospital, and experience great difficulty in coping with the financial situation. Some districts have more indigent patients than others. A case connected with the Katanning hospital was recently brought under my notice. I received a letter from a member of the Katanning Road Board saying that in the hospital there are at present eight cases of contagious disease, all having come from an adjoining district. It was calculated that the board's proportion of the interest on the capital outlay upon the portion of the building used by those patients would be approximately £11 for the time during which that particular ward was being occupied. The adjoining district does not contribute anything towards the load that is being carried by the Katanning district in the matter of finding interest on the outlay on the hospital. Should these cases prove to be indigent, it will have an effect upon the Katanning hospital, which is practically self-supporting, and will also prejudice the reputation of the town. I do not know whether the Minister has had similar information brought under his notice, but I commend this matter to the consideration of his department. I know that the Minister is governed by the funds that are available. If he can persuade the Treasurer to subsidise hospital committees, I am sure his action will be greatly appreciated in country districts. The member for Mt. Margaret dealt with the position as to the raising of funds. Many people are disgusted with the present methods. In the metropolitan area they are particularly appalling. Every Friday pedestrians in the metropolitan area have boxes thrust under their noses by ladies who are collecting for some charitable organisation. No doubt these ladies are doing excellent work, and are certainly giving up their own time to it. The hon. member is enthusiastic as regards direct taxation. Possibly at the risk of incurring the displeasure of many of my own people, I wish to remark upon the extent to which Queensland has benefited by what is called "the iniquitous Golden Casket."

Mr. Sampson: It is one of the great industries there.

Mr. THOMSON: Many people are strongly opposed to all forms of gambling; and are great believers in direct giving. Many such persons, when it comes to a question of direct giving, give but very little. It is astonishing to note the amount of money Queensland has been able to collect for its hospitals. For the year 1925-26 the sum of £696,716 was raised by the Golden Casket. The sum of £32,500 was paid in taxation, and £188,298 was paid to the Home Secretary's Department. From 1922, when the scheme had its inception, to 1926 the Motherhood, Children and Welfare Hospital Fund, which is administered by the Home Secretary's Department, received the following amounts:—Payments to hospitals, £822,211; payment to the Bush Nursing Associations, £2,916; erection and equipment of baby clinics, maternity services and nurses' quarters, £179,203; erection of creche and kindergarten buildings, £4,725; grants to charitable institutions £950; sundry payments, £801; and the balance—£109,017—has already been earmarked for the erection of maternity wards. We know that a very large sum of money is going out of the State every year to Queensland and Tasmania per medium of sweep tickets. Many people in this State are in fact making provision for hospitals in Queensland.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Make it an offence to sell the tickets in this State.

Mr. THOMSON: It is illegal to gamble. There has never been so much gambling in the State as there is to-day. We have gambling in many forms, all allegedly in the interests of charity. If assistance were provided as it is in Queensland, practically the whole of the money raised would go to the fund that was being raised.

Hon. G. Taylor: We have not the field to operate in, such as Queensland has in New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr. THOMSON: I cannot follow the hon. member's reasoning. If that were so this State should not be sending money to Queensland and Tasmania. During the last three or four weeks thousands of pounds have gone to Tasmania.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It always will go there.

Mr. THOMSON: The people are not backing race horses when they send their money to Tasmania or to Queensland. They

are investing their money in a form of gambling in the hope of securing winning tickets. I do not frequent racecourses nor follow horse racing, and I am not a gambler, but I was particularly struck by the Queensland figures. This morning, when I reached Perth, I nearly knocked over a box standing on a small pedestal on the Perth railway station. On the box were these words, "One penny will keep the Perth Hospital for two seconds." This is one of the appeals that is being made for that institution. To all intents and purposes we are conducting what may be termed a State lottery. People buy a ticket for 1s., and if they are fortunate enough they may get a trip to Java, Singapore or some other place. That is a distinction with very little difference. I am in favour of funds being made available for our hospitals. The proposal put up by Mr. Huelin before the conference of Associated Hospital committees has a great deal in its favour. Everyone who contributes is to be allowed to deduct the amount from his expenses if he is obliged to go into the hospital. I wish to thank the Government for having provided Katanning with such an up-to-date hospital. Just as the Perth Hospital is a great convenience for people in all parts of the State, so is the Katanning hospital proving a great convenience and comfort to the people of the surrounding districts. I visit it very frequently. The patients say they are very fortunate in having such an excellent building, and such fine services rendered to them while they are there. The statement of the Minister concerning the condition of the teeth of State school children reveals a deplorable position. The Medical Department should make keen and searching inquiries in an endeavour to ascertain why so many children in this State suffer from bad teeth. If the teeth are in good order a person is able to eat well and digest his food. Every Minister has dealt with this department sympathetically, and done the best he could with the funds at his disposal. It redounds to the credit of the present Minister and the Government, who have made a considerable sum available to the department, that so much good work has been done. It is true the finances have been fairly buoyant. The department has been sympathetically administered. In the present Minister we have one who is indeed sympathetic to a degree, and one whose example it will not be easy for any other man to follow. I have pleasure in extending

my meed of appreciation to the Minister and the Government for doing what they have done for country hospitals.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Public Health, £34,745—agreed to.

Vote—Public Utilities: Aborigines Cattle Station (Moola Bulla), £5,360; Aborigines Cattle Station (Avon Valley), £1,708; Albany Cold Stores, £250—agreed to.

Vote—Goldfields Water Supply Undertaking, £132,783:

Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister might have told the Committee that for the first time in the history of this undertaking the revenue is greater than the expenditure. The figures are—expenditure £132,000, revenue £171,000. No doubt there is a little interest drawn from the general provision of interest, but it would be very little. An amount of £45,000 is written off because of the concession in the price of water to the Kalgoorlie mines. Is that still charged to revenue?

Hon. J. Cunningham: Yes.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That cannot be continued, because according to what the Minister shows there will be a profit of £39,000 this year. The amount should be a revenue charge. We are boosting the income of the undertaking by charging the £45,000 to the Mining Development Vote, and thus the undertaking is enabled to show the profit of £39,000. The Minister is in a position to reduce the cost of water to the Kalgoorlie mines in a legitimate fashion, and he should no longer expect the £45,000 to be charged as hitherto.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM (Honorary Minister): While the undertaking shows that profit, renewals and repairs are needed for pipes which have been down for a number of years. Such expenses are largely met out of revenue. Eventually the cost of renewals and repairs will probably come out pretty evenly with the profit.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But you show a profit.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Estimates are Estimates.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I hope that will not get into the papers.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I was in hopes of hearing something as to recasting the

scheme for the supply of water to agricultural areas. With the large increase of consumption there—it amounts to more than 50 per cent. of the water pumped, the gold fields consumption being something under 50—and as the loan has been redeemed, the price of water to agriculturists should be reduced. In some agricultural districts it is almost ridiculously high, and presses hardly upon new settlers, who incidentally are unable to make full use of the water for which they are rated. I compliment the Minister on the manner in which the department have hurried up the payment of rates. One young settler whose case I know of had paid £100 by way of an old debt for water which had never been used. It was a debt he had taken over with the property. When the current rate notice had been issued to him, the department threatened to cut off his water supply because he could not make payment immediately. The settler, having a decent crop in hand, thought he would get the department to hold off until after the harvest; but they cut off his water. The poor young fellow has since passed away. I wrote to the Minister asking him to use leniency in the case; I do not know whether the hon. gentleman received my letter. I know of many other cases in which the department have pressed unduly instead of waiting until proceeds from crops have become available. I thank the Minister for the extension at Bodalmin. At the time of the opening of the scheme the Minister was requested to consider an extension southward. This I hope will receive mention on the Loan Estimates.

Mr. SAMPSON: I regret that the department's functioning in the Parkville, Darlington and Glen Forrest districts shows absolute lack of facilities and of new works notwithstanding the great need existing for them. The Parkville people have offered to guarantee the department against loss. In the case of the Greenmount Road Board's guarantee, notwithstanding that the supply is within a few miles of York-road, the department impose a charge of 5s. 6d. per thousand gallons. The road board in question guaranteed £50 annually, and it was suggested that the amount might be used in water on the York-road. That water the department decided should be charged at 5s. 6d. per thousand gallons. It would be a good thing for roads in general if water could be sprinkled on them dur-

ing summer; they would stand up better to heavy traffic. At Parkerville a 1½-inch pipe runs from York-road to the Children's Home. In addition, there are other consumers of water from that supply. The scheme is not one that is supported by reason, as the great majority of the Parkerville people are unable to obtain a supply of water. Their position is as it was a quarter of a century ago, or perhaps at the dawn of creation. Parkerville is not at a great distance from Pertin, and there is a fairly good train service, with a probability of a train soon leaving Mt. Helena at 6 a.m. and thus enabling workers at the Midland Junction shops to attend in time. Parkerville remains in isolation because it has no water supply. At Mt. Helena, which is further out and at a greater altitude, water from the goldfields supply is available. It would be possible at comparatively little expense to reticulate Parkerville. The water could come down from Mount Helena by gravitation and so there would be no great expense either for the installation or for maintenance. The people there are becoming very disheartened. It is a sad commentary on the consideration received by the outer suburban areas, when a place so close to Mundaring is still lacking this essential facility. It is a distinctly unfair position, for the people of Parkerville are prepared to meet practically the whole cost of a reasonably good supply. Through some misunderstanding on the part of a departmental officer the work of increasing the supply was not proceeded with.

The Premier: It is one of the jobs that ought to have been carried out.

Mr. SAMPSON: It would have been carried out, but that a departmental officer did not properly state the position. I do not blame the present Government for that. Indeed it is not a question of blaming any Government. The ex-Minister for Works recommended, and the ex-Treasurer approved of the work, but owing to a misunderstanding it was not proceeded with.

The Minister for Lands: When did this occur?

Mr. SAMPSON: In 1924. Since then nothing has been done.

The Premier: Apparently nothing was done before then.

Mr. SAMPSON: Parkerville, Glen Forrest, and Darlington were all part of one scheme. Glen Forrest and Darlington se-

cured their supplies, but Parkerville is still awaiting one. The department is charging the Greenmount Road Board 5s. 6d. per thousand gallons for water poured on to the York-road. Yet it was agreed that the rate to be charged Darlington and Greenmount should be 2s. 6d. However, even a charge of 5s. 6d. is to be preferred to the position of the people of Parkerville who have no water supply except what comes through a 1½-inch pipe. Several deputations have waited on the Minister, but so far nothing has been done.

Mr. Mann: Did not somebody discover a gold mine there?

Mr. SAMPSON: Right through the ranges there are indications of gold, but it has never been found in payable quantities.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! These are not the Mining Estimates.

Mr. SAMPSON: I have spoken of this lack of water at Parkerville session after session.

The Premier: You are getting used to it now.

Mr. SAMPSON: I can only repeat that it is very unfortunate and that the people at that centre have no occasion to feel grateful to the Goldfields Water Supply administration.

Mr. CORBOY: I hope the Government's expressed sympathy with the settlers at Yilgarn will result in some tangible benefit this year. I know we must wait for the Loan Estimates to learn what the proposals are, but I desire to draw attention to the fact that the position there is rapidly becoming acute. The Government Statistician's estimate of the returns from this year's cropping in the Yilgarn district is nearly 900,000 bushels. Considering this is only the third year of settlement, it is a magnificent result. But the settlers if they are to progress must stock their holdings as well as grow wheat, and they cannot do that without water. Many of them are still carting water considerable distances and have not made provision on their holdings for water because the Agricultural Bank quite properly has discouraged them from doing so, thinking that in a district through which the goldfields water main runs, it would be better to serve the settlers from the main rather than have them instal individual catchments that probably would fail in the dry season. The position is rapidly becoming acute and after

this year it will be absolutely necessary to give those settlers some water service. This year they have over 60,000 acres under crop for an estimated return of 13.7 bushels per acre average for the whole district, or 880,000 bushels. They must have a water supply with which to carry on. That area is drier than most of the settled agricultural areas, and probably more subject to years in which it will not be possible for them to fill their dams. I hope that before the settlement proceeds south from Southern Cross—it has already started—or at all events before it reaches large proportions, the men in the localities now settled will have water supplies at their disposal. I do sincerely trust that provision will be made on this year's Loan Estimates to give them a water supply to enable them to carry on. For if it is not done this year we shall be faced with the difficulty of having a huge settlement southwards to deal with. The difficulty of providing them all with a service in the quickest possible time will only be accentuated through our having the increased number to deal with. I hope the Minister will be able to make provision on this year's Loan Estimates for those settlers who have carried on for three years under most difficult conditions.

Mr. BROWN: I desire to draw attention to the poor quality of water we are receiving in Pingelly. I believe the Minister for Works has tasted it, and in consequence will bear out what I say. We get our supply from the Hotham River. The water is hard and brackish and by the time it runs through the pipes to Pingelly it is quite useless. Yet we are paying 3s. in the pound for that water. Dozens of ratepayers are not using a gallon of it. There is nothing they can do with it, for it will even kill lawns. I must admit that last year the Government placed on the Estimates £400 for making fresh inspections of rock catchments. Engineers were sent out and their report came along the other day. They had only sufficient money to inspect one series of rocks, and their estimates are £51,000 for the installation and £9,000 for the reticulation, or £60,000 in all.

The CHAIRMAN: The water you are referring to will come under another vote.

Mr. BROWN: What was in my mind was that we should get the goldfields water scheme extended down there. If I am out of order I will speak on a later division.

The CHAIRMAN: You can make that suggestion about the goldfields water scheme. I thought you were criticising the Pingelly supply.

Mr. BROWN: We have the goldfields water scheme within 30 miles of Pingelly.

The Premier: That is a pretty long distance.

Mr. BROWN: The goldfields water supply scheme could well be taken to Pingelly. It would serve Brookton and Mt. Kokeby, and everyone adjacent to the pipeline. I wish the Minister would get a report upon it and ascertain what the cost would be.

The Premier: After he gets the report the trouble will be to get the money.

Mr. BROWN: I hope the matter will be taken into consideration.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Kalgornlie Abattoirs £2,608—agreed to.

Vote—Metropolitan Abattoirs and Saleyards, £27,879:

Mr. SAMPSON: Are the latest methods of killing now used at these abattoirs?

The Premier: The very latest methods are used there.

Mr. SAMPSON: Some criticism was levelled at the killing methods there, and I am glad to know there has been an improvement.

Mr. LATHAM: A big revenue comes from these abattoirs. The charges must be high to produce £48,000 last year. Is the revenue in excess of what is required for interest and sinking fund charges? If so, the consumers must be paying a considerable amount for the services that are rendered.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department, £144,311:

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Is it intended to sewer that portion of Oxford-street which is not now sewered? I notice that the scheme is going out as far as Loftus-street, but no new section has been sewered in Oxford-street. Is there a chance of that work being provided for on the next Loan Estimates?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I cannot say what new areas will be provided for until the Loan Estimates are completed. There are many demands for works to be carried out, and it is a question of how the allocations can be made by the Treasurer.

Hon. G. Taylor: Last year the Minister said the Leederville end would be done.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We are doing a block up there now, but I cannot say how far we can continue the work this year.

Mr. J. MacCallum SMITH: The water supply in the metropolitan districts, particularly North Perth, is very unsatisfactory. I believe that the Minister has said the department are doing their best to remedy the evil, and that expert chemists were being appointed to improve the methods. I fail to see any provision for the appointment of these experts, and I should like to know what is being done. The matter is a serious one for the people. The supply is unsuitable for domestic purposes, destructive to clothing and expensive to use. After all these years the Minister should be able to give us a definite statement on the matter. The continuation of the system of meters is also undesirable. It is a costly means of collecting a few thousand pounds. The amount collected from excess water is not great, but something like £160,000 is sunk in meters. The interest upon that would absorb most of the revenue collected from excess water. The meter system should be abandoned. The installation of deep drainage in parts of my electorate seems to have been stopped, and people are continuing with the old system. Only a small section of the deep drainage scheme has so far been completed. It is time we had some pronouncement on the subject.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If meters are going to be abolished, I urge that this reform should have general application. There are fine garden lands in the Great Southern. If meters are abolished I hope people in the country will be able to enjoy the same benefits as those who live in the metropolitan area.

Mr. NORTH: The Minister gave us some information recently concerning the intentions of the department in extending the deep drainage system. Last session an Act was passed allowing local authorities to instal their own septic tanks. They are not willing to go on with this work, which would save the department a lot of money, because of the uncertainty as to how soon the Government drainage scheme will follow. I should be glad if the Minister would say how he feels disposed towards the local authorities in this matter. If he said he would postpone the deep drainage for 10 or 15 years, he would relieve them of anxiety on the

point. Seeing that some years must pass before the city is fully sewered, it would be of great advantage if all the local authorities, including the Perth Road Board, inaugurated the septic tank system that is so successful in Adelaide and other cities. An officer of the City Council who has recently returned from the Eastern States was favourably impressed by the use of this small apparatus in the outer suburbs of Eastern States capitals. It is of no benefit to any local authority or householder, if after spending the money involved in installing the septic tank system the deep drainage comes along within three or four years, and adds to the burden of the ratepayers. It is true that about 75 per cent. of the money spent on the septic tank system can be used towards the cost of connecting up with the deep drainage system. No one is anxious to incur that expense if within a little while all the houses are to be connected with the Government scheme. Although I believe the department would not actually extend their works unless the request came from the local authorities, yet to put my district right I would be glad if the Minister would state his intentions in cases where the local authorities set out a whole area on a proper septic tank system. Such a system would in any case result in a thorough cleaning-up of the metropolitan district. A definite policy should be stated so as to correlate the sewerage of all the suburbs. In fact, millions of pounds are involved, and these could be well spent in other directions, because deep sewerage of the metropolitan area, in which there is estimated to be room for six millions of people—the same population as that of London—must be beyond the means of metropolitan residents for the next 15 or 20 years.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Is it intended to extend the deep water drain in East Perth? The drain has been left practically at a dead end, with the result that when the waters come down neighbouring properties are flooded. The City Council are prevented from extending streets, and properties are filled in to the utmost extent they can be, until the drain has received attention. Further, the City Council are prevented from giving access to that part of the electorate by reason of the fact that one of the main streets crossing the drain cannot be completed unless it is pulled up again so that the drainage work may be effected. After the winter rains the ground in the

vicinity of the drain becomes a succession of puddle holes. The drain has been stunted on its road to the river, and the sooner money can be provided for its extension beyond the Jewell-street crossing the sooner will that portion of the city be given the opportunity to develop as it should.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As to the appointment of a chemist, referred to by the member for North Perth (Mr. MacCallum Smith), the chemist is engaged under the Government Analyst, Dr. Simpson. Dr. Simpson is the officer we hold responsible, but the chemist has been allotted to him to specialise on the question of metropolitan water supply, under which vote he is provided for. As to meters, I wish we were in a position to invite metropolitan residents to use as much water as they could to beautify their homes, make gardens and so forth; but we shall not be in a position to do that for at least 20 years, according to departmental estimates; and possibly the city will grow so much in 20 years that at the expiration of that period consumers of water may still find themselves narrowly restricted. Without meters there would not be enough water to supply the metropolitan area during winter, let alone summer. The object of meters is to restrict the use of water. Without them there would not be enough water for domestic purposes all round. The only means of preventing a great shortage of water in the metropolitan area is meters; that is, until there has been an opportunity to put the big hills scheme through. It is expected that 7,000 meters will be installed during the next few months. We hope to get 70 or 80 per cent. of the service metered; so far we have had only 40 per cent. With so many new buildings going up and so many people desirous of getting lawns established, the sprinkler, in the absence of a meter, never stops but goes on night and day, with the result that in summer people on the high levels get no water at all.

Mr. J. MacCallum Smith: But why should the scheme take 20 years?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The big reservoir at Canning is expected to take six or eight years to construct, partly owing to financial considerations. It will hold about four times as much water as Mundaring Weir. Looking to the future, I cannot see there is any possibility of restricting the meters, and the only hope we have of giving a decent water supply is by having

meters. It is merely a question of checking the supply, not of metering. Apart from that I do not regard it from the financial point of view at all. As to the question of sewerage, activities under that heading are dealt with under the Loan Estimates. This applies also to the storm water position mentioned by the member for East Perth (Mr. Kenneally). It is impossible to say what will be done until the Loan Estimates are finalised and they are being considered at present. The vote under consideration now deals merely with salaries and with administration. When the Loan Estimates are before the Committee I will take the opportunity, as the member for Claremont (Mr. North) suggested, to give some idea as to what attitude we will adopt regarding future sewerage operations.

Vote put and passed.

Vote — Other hydraulic undertakings chargeable to revenue, £31,650:

Mr. BROWN: I wish to draw attention to the poor water supply at Pingelly. The supply is drawn from the Hotham River, where the water is brackish. By the time it reaches Pingelly through the pipes, it is impossible for man or beast to use the water. The pipes are so rusted that it is impossible for one to lean against the uprights without danger of them breaking through. The position is serious. The people there have to pay a water rate of 3s. in the pound and the town is rated on the capital value. I pay so much per year that if I were to erect a 1,000 gallon tank each year, in about three or four years I would have all the water I required, but at the same time I have to pay the rate, whether I use the water or not. When I first went to Pingelly I was charged for excess water, but I found that it killed all the plants and adversely affected the lawns as well. The result is we get no excess water now, except for the bowling green and a small park. The Government provided £400 in order to enable engineers to make an inspection of the rock catchments in the district. The money was only sufficient for one inspection to be made and the report showed that a scheme by which water would be secured from that catchment would cost £60,000. There are other rock catchment areas but, owing to the inadequacy of the grant, the engineers could not report on them. It is possible that a good holding ground would be found at

one or other of the remaining rock catchments. The Coolgardie water pipes are within 30 miles of Pingelly, and I do not know what it would cost to convey the water from Beverley. I have been informed that if the water were taken beyond Beverley, the pipes between Northam and Beverley would have to be increased in size. The Government had done good work in regard to rock catchments. In Kondinin there is a beautiful supply drawn from the rock catchment there, but I understand the townspeople object to the rate that has been imposed, which, I believe, amounts to 3s. in the pound. They have a beautiful supply of water, but if they had to pay the same rate and get the water we have in Pingelly, I do not know what they would say.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: The exorbitant valuations are the cause of the trouble.

Mr. BROWN: That may be so. I know that the banks, hotel and other large buildings at Pingelly are rated upwards of £30 a year, and yet they do not use sixpenny-worth of water. If the supply were a good one, a considerable quantity would be used in connection with the gardens. I believe the Pingelly people would be in pocket if they scrapped the present scheme and put down a number of wells in the district to keep the stock going. I would like the Government to authorise an inspection of the rock catchments west of Pingelly. I hope the Minister will be able to do something for the people there, and also to ascertain if it would be practicable to provide a supply from the Coolgardie scheme through Beverley.

Mr. FERGUSON: The township of Moora is absolutely without water supply. I believe it is the only town of its size and importance in Western Australia that is in such a position. Many efforts have been made during the last 30 years to secure a supply, but failure attended each attempt. The departmental officials endeavoured once or twice to provide a water supply. Through lack of local knowledge they have always failed to furnish us with that essential commodity. On one occasion the department proposed to construct a dam in a certain area where they were told insufficient water would be available. After some time had been spent in making tests, they gave up the proposition and took the advice of local people that they could have followed earlier and thus saved expense. On another occasion they proposed to construct a dam in the river

and, had it not been for the public outcry, it would have been done, and a supply would have been available that would have been unfit for consumption because the water in the river is so salty. At the outbreak of the war the Government Geologist were prevailed upon to put down a sub-artesian bore to test the district. It cost, I believe, £8,000 or £9,000, but was never completed. The people of Moora are desirous that another bore should be put down so that the district might be thoroughly tested for sub-artesian water. If such a supply does exist, the farmers would at once make use of it in order to carry more stock. I have brought this under the notice of the Minister, but so far I have failed to get anything done. A little time ago a proposal was made to put down some wells and reticulate the town from that supply. However, the residents will not have anything to do with it, for they believe there is not sufficient water there. The department proposes to enter into an agreement with the local people, who will be asked to pay a certain rate for reticulation from this source, but the people will not listen to it. The task devolves on the department to supply Moora with water. The people are willing to pay for it. They are quite used to paying for everything that they get.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But you do not pay for what you do not get.

Mr. FERGUSON: We have paid for a lot of things that Northam and other places have had. I urge on the Minister the necessity for supplying Moora with water. I have been there for some 30 years and I know that numerous attempts have been unsuccessfully made to get a water supply.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I should like to ask the Minister what has been done in regard to providing flood gates to regulate the flow in the Avon River at flood time. I think the Minister will be able to enlighten us on this point. I would again emphasise the charges for water supply on agricultural extensions from the main. The original loan, we know, has been redeemed, the scheme is now our own, and while there may be replacements to be made in the pipe line, still it is time we had a reduction in the charges, especially to those settlers a long way out from the pipe line.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I desire to clear up a misunderstanding that arose during the elections. It was in relation to the Edjudina

dam. I find from the files that when the dam was transferred in August, 1925, it was arranged that it should be kept in good order. There is nothing later on the file, except a letter from me in February of this year. I was of opinion that it was always the function of the lessee to keep the dam in order, that being the ordinary agreement with the Government for wells and dams when handed over to other people. In February I wrote to the department and I got a reply from Mr. Munt, the Under Secretary, dated 9th March. It reached me at Laverton, three or four days later. Mr. Munt wrote—

I have by direction to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo regarding the condition of the Government dam at Edjudina. I have to inform you that the tank is leased, and that in accordance with the agreement the lessee agrees to maintain in good working order the condition of the tank and equipment at his own cost.

That, of course, was what I had been expecting. I received that on about the 12th or 14th March. A couple of days before the election my opponent came through the district. He told me that where I had failed in my duty as a member for so many years, it had fallen to his lot to get things done that I could not get done. He said I had unsuccessfully made an application but that all he had to do was to speak to the Minister in Kalgoorlie and the work was put in hand. I did not believe that and when speaking in his presence at the meeting, I said it was a misunderstanding and that he was inclined to impose on the credulity of the electors. I said that I had a letter from the Under Secretary, Mr. Munt, explaining that the tank was leased and that under his agreement with the Government the lessee had to keep it in order. My opponent then said he did not believe Mr. Munt's letter and that if he got in Mr. Munt would be rooted out.

Mr. Thomson: What a lucky escape Mr. Munt had.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes; my opponent was a blustering sort of chap. He made the statements, not at Edjudina where the dam is, but at Laverton, where Mr. Cunningham, the Honorary Minister, is just as well known and respected as he is in any other part of Western Australia. The people of Laverton, knowing Mr. Cunningham, believed me and disbelieved my opponent. They said, "If Cunningham wouldn't do it for Taylor, he wouldn't do it for you merely as propaganda work." When

I came to Perth I rang up about it and they said the work was put in hand.

Hon. J. Cunningham: It was never put in hand. Who told you that?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I think the reply was that the work was to be put in hand, but that the flood had stopped it.

Hon. J. Cunningham: The work was not to be put in hand.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: But I think your letter said it was to be put in hand.

Hon. J. Cunningham: I did not say anything of the kind.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I understood the Honorary Minister had promised him to get the work done, but I did not believe his statement. If the Minister tells me that it was not to be put in hand, I must accept his assurance. The following letter was written on the 15th March:—

Whilst at Kalgoorlie recently a request was submitted to me that the Edjudina tank, which is now dry, should be cleaned out. I was given to understand that the tank is leased to a Mr. Green, pastoralist, but prospectors and sandalwood pullers draw their supplies from it. I think if the engineers get into touch with Mr. Green, arrangements could be made for the local people to clean out the tank and thus obviate the department's sending men and gear to such a distance. Will you please take the matter up accordingly? Sgd. Jas. Cunningham.

Men went out there from Kookynie to undertake the work.

Hon. J. Cunningham: You are wrong in that because there is no authorisation for expenditure on the file. How could they go out if they were not authorised?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I only want the Minister to say that. I am only repeating what my opponent said. The rains came on and the tank was filled in a few hours. I made inquiries and was told the work was to be put in hand. According to the file, the Minister was met in Kalgoorlie, but there is nothing to show by whom he was met. The Minister is well known in Laverton and Mt. Morgans, and it is not right that a statement should be made that he, for the purpose of getting a few votes for a supporter, did that sort of thing. My opponent mentioned on the same occasion several other things that he said he had got done, but in fact they were not done. He said Mr. Munt was an enemy of the Minister and of the Government and, if he was returned, Mr. Munt would be put out. The present Minister for Agriculture was Minister for Mines at the

time, and he was to be put out, too. If that man had been returned, he was not sweet on the Premier, either.

The Premier: It is just as well for us that you beat him.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Minister might be able to clear the matter up. I do not want the electors to be under the impression that the Minister did something that I feel sure he would not do.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM (Honorary Minister): I admit that the Pingelly water supply is very much as the member for Pingelly (Mr. Brown) said, but it was provided many years ago. Since then, I understand, quite a large amount of clearing has been done in the adjacent country, with the result that the salinity of the small creeks and streams flowing into the catchment has increased considerably. The result is that the water supply has a much higher salinity now than it had when the work was first completed. The hon. member mentioned that the department were fully alive to the wants of the district. Only recently a sum of money was set aside to ascertain the estimate for providing an adequate water supply for the town. The hon. member is already aware of the contents of that report. It is impossible to provide a scheme for Pingelly at a cost of £60,000 because the ratepayers could not raise the necessary annual charges. The member for Moore (Mr. Ferguson) pointed out that the Water Supply Department had already offered to provide a supply for that town, but the local people would not have it. The position is that a scheme was outlined, and it was found that the maximum rate of 3s. in the pound struck on the annual value of the town property would not provide sufficient for the annual charges. The road board were approached with a view to their providing the money or putting up a proposition. Finally the people of Moora declined to have the scheme on their minds. What they asked was that the department should put down another bore to locate an artesian or sub-artesian supply. The hon. member has been notified within the last few days that there is no chance of the department going on with the work. The member for York (Mr. Griffiths) spoke of the extensions from the 30-inch main into the agricultural areas and he appeared to be all at sea. He asked for a reduction in the price

of water supplied by those extensions on the ground that the goldfields water supply loan had been repaid. Surely the hon. member must be aware that no charge is made for the water from that scheme. The only charge made is a rate sufficient to pay interest, sinking fund and maintenance on the extensions. The settlers accepted the extensions with their eyes open and many of them are fortunate in receiving water at a very low rate. A majority of them are now enabled to stock their holdings, and I have heard it said by members sitting on the Opposition benches that the wool proceeds from the sheep they are now able to run return more than sufficient to pay the charge for water. The agriculturists whose holdings have been connected with the goldfields scheme are fortunate indeed. The member for Mt. Margaret (Hon. G. Taylor) certainly did write to the department, as the file discloses, and asked that something be done in the way of cleaning out the Edjudina dam. That was on the 9th March.

Hon. G. Taylor: No, it was replied to on the 9th March.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: That is so. When the reply was sent out, I was in Kalgoorlie. The hon. member knows that the departmental officers, realising that he wanted a reply, furnished the only possible reply. When I was in Kalgoorlie I met some people from Ejudina, who told me the tank was dry and that it would be an opportune time to have it cleaned out. I sent word to the Under Secretary outlining the facts, and asking him to act accordingly. That meant he would have to obtain a report and ascertain whether it was possible to undertake the work. The Under Secretary drew my attention to the fact that there was a clause in the agreement between the pastoral company and the department, providing that the lessee should maintain the tank in good order and condition. The liability of the department, therefore, ended when that agreement was entered into. The obligation was on the lessee to have the tank cleaned out, and he has been notified accordingly with a view to keeping him up to the agreement. While this matter was under consideration there happened to be eight or ten inches of rain, and I understand the tank has since been full. I am not responsible for the remarks of the opponent of the member for Mt. Margaret at election time. Some candidates make extraordinary remarks on such occasions. The hon. mem-

ber has been long enough in Parliament to realise that very often one can attach but little importance to remarks that are made at random during an election campaign.

Hon. G. Taylor: He put you in a bad light, but I am glad it has been cleared up.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Much depends on how a person views such a matter. I am sure the hon. member would not bring himself to think that I would stoop to do such a mean thing during his absence.

Hon. G. Taylor: I defended you and denied it.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The member for Avon referred to the overflow from the salt lakes into the Avon River. An engineer visited the place to collect the necessary data, to enable the department to be possessed of information as to the position. Beyond that report nothing has been done.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Perth City Markets, £650—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 9th November, 1927.

	PAGE
Question: Railway routes	1708
Leave of absence	1708
Bills: Loan and Inscribed Stock (Sinking Fund), 2R., passed	1708
Racing Restriction, 2a.	1708
Hospitals, Report	1708
State Children Act Amendment, Com.	1708
State Insurance, 1R.	1715
Railways Discontinuance, 2R.	1715
Constitution Act Amendment, 2R.	1721

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

QUESTION—RAILWAY ROUTES.

Sandstone and Leonora to Lawlers.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Chief Secretary: Will he lay on the Table the 1911 report of the Railway Advisory Board on

the railway routes from Sandstone to Lawlers?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: Yes, if the House so desires. I suggest the hon. member move for the production of the paper.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. E. Rose, leave of absence for three consecutive sittings granted to Hon. W. T. Glasheen on the ground of urgent private business.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Loan and Inscribed Stock (Sinking Fund.)

Passed.

2, Racing Restriction.

Transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—HOSPITALS.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—STATE CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 15:

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That the following paragraph be added:—“Subsection (2) of Section 15 of the principal Act is amended by the omission of the words ‘and reformatory’ and of the words ‘established before the commencement of this Act.’”

The clause repeals Subsection 1 of Section 15, but retains Subsection 2; and this amendment, as has been pointed out by Mr. Lovekin, is necessary to put matters in order.

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

Clause 6—Amendment of Section 34:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I ask the Committee to omit this clause. The Children's Court say that if a child is to be released on probation or taken away from an industrial