

short time. However, the Minister is determined. I can only suppose he regards it as an offence to employ anyone. We cannot deal further with the Bill to-night, but we might be able to do something on the third reading. Probably by that time members will have realised that the Bill is not wisely drafted, and it may then be possible to amend many of the clauses to which we have objected.

2 o'clock a.m.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	12

Majority for .. 5

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Munale
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Heron	Mr. Sleesman
Mr. Holman	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lamond	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Marshall	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Barnard	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Brown	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Davy	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Sir James Mitchell	Mr. Latham
Mr. North	(Teller.)
Mr. Sampson	

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Collier	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Denton
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Angelo
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. George
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Thomeon

Clause thus passed.

Clause 67—agreed to.

New clause—Amendment to Section 19:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I move—

That the following be inserted to stand as Clause 6: Section nineteen of the principal Act is amended by substituting the word 'shall' for the word 'may' in the first line thereof.

We are providing for a wider constitution for the unions that are registered, and striking out all reference to the specified industries and the restrictions that now surround a trade union. The existing Act provides that the registrar may refuse registration to any union if in the same locality there exists an industrial union to which the members, or the bulk of the members, can conveniently belong. The

suggestion is to make refusal to registration mandatory instead of permissive, to prevent overlapping and conflict between the organisations. There will be more reliance placed upon this provision than there has been in the past.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Have you any organisation in view?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If I had, I should tell the hon. member candidly. This can only apply to applications for new registration and not to unions already registered. It is to prevent the mushroom-growth of organisations that may conflict with existing unions.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Is it important that there should be only one union for each calling?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is most important for the employers, the court and the unions.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—HIGH SCHOOL.

Received from the Council and read a first time.

House adjourned at 2.10 a.m. (Wednesday).

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 1st October, 1924.

	PAGE
Questions: Mining, South Africa	1071
Education, Kalgoolie Caretaker	1072
Bills: Bunbury Road District Rates Validation	1072
Closer Settlement, 2a.	1089
Motions: Standing Orders Amendment	1072
Rinderpest claims, compensation	1072
Health Act, Food and Drugs Regulation, to disallow	1074

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

QUESTION—MINING, SOUTH AFRICA, REPORT.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Has any report been made by Inspector Phoenix regarding the mining industry in South Africa? 2, If so, will the Minister lay on the Table a copy of the report?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1 and 2, The report is now ready for publication, and a copy will be laid on the Table of the House as soon as it is printed.

QUESTION—EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, KALGOORLIE CARETAKER.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Colonial Secretary: Will he lay on the Table of the House the file relating to the transfer and disrating of W. Lewis, caretaker at the Kalgoorlie Central State School?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: Papers relating to the transfer of Caretaker W. Lewis from Kalgoorlie Central State school to Boulder State school will be laid on the Table to-day. Caretaker Lewis has not been disrated.

BILL—BUNBURY ROAD DISTRICT RATES VALIDATION.

Read a third time and passed.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS AMENDMENT.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. J. W. Kirwan—

That the revised Standing Orders of the Legislative Council, drafted by the Standing Orders Committee in pursuance of the instruction given to them on the 5th August last, be adopted.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [4.35]: The other day I moved that the debate be adjourned until Thursday, but this motion is on the Notice Paper for to-day.

The PRESIDENT: I thought you said Thursday.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I wanted to give members an opportunity to look at the Standing Orders. I therefore move—

That the debate be adjourned until to-morrow.

Motion put and passed.

MOTION—RINDERPEST CLAIMS, COMPENSATION.

Debate resumed from 25th September on the following motion by Hon. G. Potter—

That assuming the Federal Government are paying the State Government only £12,700 in satisfaction of all unsatisfied claims arising from the outbreak of rinderpest, this House is of opinion that the Government should appoint a board to inquire into all claims for compensation and should provide the balance of any sum requisite to meet just claims as settled by the board.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.37]: Generally speaking I am in accord with the remarks of Mr. Potter, but cannot agree to his suggestion that the Government should appoint a board to inquire into all the claims for compensation. The Government have already suggested to the Commonwealth Administration, and still maintain, that the Federal authorities should appoint a board to deal with all claims made for economic losses, and should take the financial responsibility. There is no doubt that the outbreak of rinderpest in this State was a great calamity, one that was likely to affect not only the herds of Western Australia, but of the whole of the Commonwealth. It should therefore be viewed, I contend, as a national question. The Government have communicated on several occasions with the Commonwealth Government, and strongly urged that the whole of the cost should be borne by that Administration. I am pleased to be able to state that our Federal representatives have done their utmost to obtain what we consider is justice for Western Australia. Mainly through their efforts the Prime Minister has agreed to provide £12,000 odd for the purpose of settling all claims for economic losses. This amount, however, is quite inadequate as the claims already received by the Government total £47,000. Some of the claims may be indefensible, but all of them are entitled to be investigated. When the outbreak first occurred the Commonwealth Government sent their veterinary officer to investigate. On his confirming the diagnosis a board was appointed, of which he was a member. This board was given full power to take any action considered necessary to stamp out the epidemic, and the measures adopted were very drastic. Not only the owners of cattle in the infected areas, but also many other dairymen, merchants dealing in fodder, market gardeners, bag merchants and others sustained losses. The effect on some of our people was practically ruinous. I will give an instance. One of the regulations provided that all cattle should during the outbreak be kept in paddocks securely fenced. This necessitated dairymen mustering their cattle in paddocks where there was no feed, the consequence being that they were obliged to hand-feed the cattle during the time the restriction lasted. As will be recognised, this caused considerable monetary outlay. The action taken under the direction of Mr. Robinson, the Commonwealth veterinary officer, was no doubt in the best interests of the State. But it must be realised that had not the disease been controlled and confined to the small areas that were infected, the consequences would have been disastrous not only to Western Australia, but to every portion of the Commonwealth. There is little doubt that the disease would have spread to the Eastern States had not these restrictions been imposed, and had not the State Government taken proper action

at the right time. The late Government agreed to the payment on a fifty-fifty basis to compensate for all cattle slaughtered. The total outlay by the State under this head amounted to £42,805, 13s. 8d. So far the Federal authorities have paid only £14,447 18s. 8d., and still owe £6,954 18s. 2d., as their half-share of the expenditure. The outbreak has cost the State a large amount. I am firmly of opinion that we have paid more than our fair share in the endeavour to free Australia of the disease. There is no doubt in the minds of the Government that this is a national question, and that the whole of the expense should be met by the Commonwealth Government.

Members: Hear, hear!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If this responsibility were accepted then Western Australia, in common with the rest of the States, would bear its proportion of the cost on a per capita basis. I am aware that the late Government agreed to the payment of half the losses caused by the slaughtering of the cattle, and we can therefore hardly expect to be compensated for that outlay. I do think, however, we are justified in expecting that the Commonwealth will bear the whole of the loss incurred in paying all just claims that have been received for economic losses. The hon. member suggests that a board should be appointed. As I have said, the Government have requested the appointment of a Commonwealth board, and have recommended that the same board that dealt with the claims for direct losses on fodder, vegetables, etc., should again act. It appears to me that if this motion were agreed to, the board to be appointed would merely review claims and sift out those that were unjust. Therefore the appointment of a committee to go through the claims and eliminate the unjust ones would be a waste of time. The Government fail to see that they should make good the default of the Federal Government and it would be unwise for the House to agree to a motion that would indicate an inclination on the part of the State to shoulder a burden that rightly devolves upon the Commonwealth.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [4.46]: I wish to say a few words in support of the views of Mr. Potter and also in favour of the remarks of the Leader of the House. The purpose Mr. Potter has in view is that those who have suffered as a result of the outbreak of rinderpest shall receive such compensation as is their due. The Minister has explained that delicate negotiations are now on foot between the State Government and the Federal authorities and the passing of the motion would tend to seriously retard those negotiations. If we were to agree to it, it would create an impression that neither the hon. member nor the House would desire to have conveyed. I have never been one of those who have carped at Federation. I have had little

sympathy with much of the adverse criticism indulged in concerning Federation. That criticism is often so baseless that it does considerable harm to the excellent case that can be established in favour of Western Australia receiving better terms from the Commonwealth. On this particular question of rinderpest compensation, I do not think any criticism of the action of the Commonwealth Government can be too severe. When State powers were surrendered to the Commonwealth, one of the recognised Federal powers was that of quarantine that enabled the prevention of the spreading of great disaster in the form of an epidemic that might threaten Australia. The Commonwealth was never threatened with a greater calamity than when rinderpest broke out in Western Australia. Those representatives of both the Federal and State authorities who were successful in stamping out the disease are worthy of public praise. They had to adopt drastic methods, for drastic and prompt methods were essential, and they proved successful. I agree with the contention of the Minister that this is essentially a national matter and not merely a State function. Because of that, the financial burden should come out of the national purse, and Western Australia should pay the cost of stamping out the rinderpest only in accordance with its per capita proportion as a member of the Commonwealth of Australia. It was not Western Australia alone that was saved from disaster, but the whole of the Commonwealth. I hope the Government will press that point. It is an outrageous suggestion that Western Australia should be asked to pay half of the £42,000 involved in stamping out rinderpest. In the interests of the State and in order to support the Government in the efforts they are making at present, I hope the hon. member will withdraw his motion.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [4.50]: I congratulate Mr. Potter and the other Parliamentary representatives of those parts of Western Australia affected by the outbreak of rinderpest, on the efforts they have put forth on behalf of the people who suffered losses. They have worked to the last ditch to secure justice. The Federal members have done excellent work, too, and Mr. Watson, I notice, is still moving in this matter. It is rather unfortunate that Mr. Potter has brought forward this question at the present moment. It would be unwise to press the motion now. I know that negotiations took place with Senator Pearce. Sir James Mitchell was Premier at the time and he endeavoured to get more consideration extended to Western Australia. I am satisfied that Senator Pearce did all he could to have more favourable consideration extended to the claims of Western Australia, but he is a member of the Federal Government and has to abide

by the decisions of that Government. I believe Senator Pearce is convinced that more should have been done for Western Australia. I would suggest that the motion should be withdrawn for the time being. It might be postponed from time to time and be dealt with later on if a satisfactory conclusion to the present negotiations is not arrived at. If the motion be withdrawn, it could be dealt with at a later stage in the session. I am sure no hon. member would wish to do anything to jeopardise the negotiations that are being carried on by the Government.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The motion could be brought forward in another form later on.

Hon. J. EWING: There is no doubt, as outlined by Mr. Kirwan, that the economic loss involved in the outbreak of rinderpest should be borne by the Federal Government, because it is a national matter. Mr. Potter should not be disappointed if he has to agree to the suggestion made by the Leader of the House. If he adopts that course, he will have the knowledge that he will have the full support of the House should it be necessary to take action later on.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [4.57]: It would be unwise to follow Mr. Ewing's suggestion and postpone the consideration of the motion. If the Government desire to make the Federal authorities stand up to their responsibilities, it will be rather a handicap to have such a motion standing on the Notice Paper of the Legislative Council, seeing that it contains a suggestion that we should contribute towards the expenditure involved. Mr. Potter will be well advised to follow the advice of the Leader of the House and withdraw the motion. Later on in the session he can move a similar motion in another form, so that it will not conflict with our Standing Orders. To postpone the further consideration of the motion, and to ask the Government to proceed with the negotiations would be inimical to securing the best results. I believe this is a purely national matter that the Federal Government should deal with, and I would not be a party to hampering the efforts of the Government in their attempt to make the Federal authorities stand up to their responsibilities. I suggest that Mr. Potter should withdraw his motion knowing full well that he has the entire sympathy of the House in his endeavours, and that if it is found necessary to bring the matter forward again, he will have our support.

Hon. G. POTTER (West—in reply) [4.55]: I thank the Minister for his clear and lucid expression of opinion on the question covered by the motion. I thank him for his statement regarding the attitude of the Government. Mr. Ewing has suggested that I need not be disappointed regarding the fate of the motion. I can assure hon. members that those who have

been in close touch with the rinderpest question will not be disappointed about anything, because they have bottomed the well of despair. It is encouraging to find such unanimity in this Chamber in the view that this is a Commonwealth matter. We are convinced on that phase of the question. I did not wish to appear precipitate in bringing forward the motion. It will be within the memory of hon. members that it is nearly a year since the outbreak of rinderpest in Western Australia, when many people were deprived, more or less, of their means of existence. It was only when we were instructed from most reliable sources that the Federal Government had definitely declared that they would not grant any further assistance beyond the total allocation of £12,700 that I brought forward the motion. I was fearful lest the Commonwealth Government would appoint a committee at the instigation of the State Government, and distribute the £12,700 among the many claimants without properly investigating those claims to see that all were justified. I was afraid that by such means the claims would not be carefully investigated so as to eliminate those that were unjustifiable. I desired that the real sufferers should gain a proper proportion in the distribution of the funds. In view of the statement by the Minister, and particularly in view of his advice that negotiations are still proceeding with the Commonwealth Government, it would be my last desire to do anything to jeopardise such delicate negotiations. I hope the Government will meet with a greater measure of success in their efforts than have those who have been endeavouring to arrive at a satisfactory settlement. In the circumstances, I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

MOTION—HEALTH ACT, FOOD AND DRUGS REGULATION.

To disallow regulation.

Debate resumed from 24th September on the following motion by Hon. J. Nicholson—

That Regulation 73 (Declaration of certain drugs) promulgated under the Health Act, 1911-19, published in the "Government Gazette" of the 11th July, 1924, and now laid on the Table of the House, be and is hereby disallowed.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.0]: The motion is rather sweeping. The part of the regulation the hon. member wishes to disallow really consists of two parts, one of which is already in existence, or was in existence before the regulation was declared. That is the first portion which deals with what are considered dangerous drugs, drugs

which can only be used safely in very small quantities, and which are dangerous on account of their prolonged action if taken for any length of time, or drugs which may possibly lead to the drug-taking habit. That regulation says—

There shall be written in bold-faced sans-serif capital letters of not less than six points face measurement in the label attached to every package containing medicines or medicinal preparations for internal or external use by man, in which are present any of the substances named in this regulation.

And there follows a list of various drugs. A similar list to this was promulgated in 1913 and was in vogue when the new regulations came out. The regulation has been extended to an extent, and now includes a certain number of drugs which did not appear in the former regulations. As the Colonial Secretary said, the reason for this was that a conference representing the Health Departments of all the States met in Melbourne and agreed to get common action taken all over Australia, and in fulfilment of the decision arrived at, the regulation now before us was framed. There are, I believe, drugs contained in the first part of the regulation about which the utility of their being included in the regulation is perhaps open to question. I allude to such a drug as bismuth. On the other hand, certainly 95 per cent. do undoubtedly come under the heading of dangerous drugs, that is to say, drugs that are poisonous except in extremely minute doses, or drugs that are harmful for one reason or another, and although there may be one or two drugs that are open to question, I do not think that the first part of the regulation should be disallowed. I consider that Mr. Nicholson in moving to disallow the whole of the regulation has gone too far. As an example, in the old regulation, the drug now known as barbitone was not included under that name; it was known under the name of veronal. But since the war, being a German preparation, it has become known as barbitone, and it would be a pity, I think, to have that particular drug struck out of the list. There are others that are included now in this list, which are undoubtedly harmful although they were not in the old list. I think the regulation, which hits up the wholesale vendors of drugs, and which hits up the patent medicine proprietors, is No. 4 of Clause 73, and reads—

Every package containing a patent or proprietary medicine shall have attached thereto a label on which shall be inscribed legibly and prominently, in the English language, the names of the ingredients therein for which therapeutic properties are claimed, and the measure, number, quantity, volume or weight of such ingredients contained in the dose recommended for an adult.

That I think really is the clause to which the patent medicine vendors take exception. For the first part of the clause which I read before, and which gives a large number of drugs, I think there is a good deal to be said, and I think also that the public should be made aware whether any particular medicine put on the market does contain drugs that are of a dangerous character. The public are entitled to have not only the names of the drugs stated on the label, but also the quantity contained in doses. Undoubtedly, therefore, the first part of the regulation should stand. With reference to No. 4 that may, to a certain extent, be open to argument, although speaking as a medical man I cannot support the action of the hon. member with reference even to this clause, for this reason: I know perfectly well that the wholesale dosing by means of patent medicines, very often does harm, and furthermore, the public are deceived by what I can only call the lying and misleading nature of the advertisements by means of which the patent medicines are brought under public notice. I say those words deliberately. Anybody reading some of the flaunting advertisements in the Press would imagine that these patent medicines contained some wonderful secret drugs which are not known to the ordinary pharmacist or to the medical profession. As the Colonial Secretary pointed out, that is not so. In the great majority of cases the patent medicines on the market have been analysed and their contents are known approximately, and many times have been published to the world at large in book and pamphlet form. I have here two books which were circulated in 1909 and in 1912, by the British Medical Association. The books are called "Secret Remedies" and "More Secret Remedies," and therein is contained approximately the correct formulæ of the majority of the patent medicines on the market. I am not alluding so much to those that are manufactured in Australia, but to those that have come from abroad. It is undoubtedly a fact that analytical chemistry is capable of analysing all inorganic salts and a great number of organic salts and various alkaloids, and it is possible to do so sufficiently accurately to be able to take a mixture and give the particular drugs contained in it. There are unfortunately certain vegetable extracts, for which no claim is made in in these books, that it has been possible to analyse and identify in the various patent medicines. But for the most part these are not of great importance. Certainly the most valuable remedies known to science can be identified and recognised in a mixture, and the formula given in these books that I have may be taken to be approximately correct. If it were not so I would point out to the House that the British Medical Association exposed itself to great risk, because these formulæ with the names of the patent medicines, are circulated through the medium of the books I have quoted. In many cases the

medicines are held up to ridicule, and in some cases they are classified as a fraud. There is no mincing of language in these books. It is apparent that the patent medicine vendor has his remedy if the statements published are not accurate, because one has only to bring an action against the British Medical Association and a sympathetic jury will almost invariably mulct the Association in perhaps some thousands of pounds.

Hon. J. Duffell: Has it ever been done?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: It was tried on one occasion in England and the action failed.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: The patent medicine man if he took action, would have to give himself away.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Actions have been brought in the past and have failed.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I think the Medical Association are protected by an Act of Parliament.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I am extremely doubtful as to whether there is any such Act. The British Medical Association publish these books with its name attached and do not hesitate to declare that the formulae are erroneous. I have had a little experience in this respect as one of the directors of the Australian Medical Journal, and I know that that Journal was hit up to the tune of several thousands of pounds by an aggrieved suitor, not in connection with these remedies, but in a libel case, and I have no hesitation in saying that the jury would undoubtedly be against the British Medical Association and against the medical practitioners generally. However, that is by the way. There is nothing wonderful and certainly there is no secret remedy of any great value in any of these patent medicines, and the exaggerated claims that one meets with in the Press, do undoubtedly mislead the public, and not only do harm, but also inflict considerable pecuniary loss on many people. I may take the House into my confidence with reference to certain patients that have suffered largely in a pecuniary sense from consulting the quacks who vend patent medicines. The first case I am going to refer to came under my notice some 20 years ago. The patient was an unfortunate man who had contracted syphilis, and instead of going to a medical man went for treatment to one of these quacks. The particular quack I have in mind advertises his patent medicines in the Press, and would undoubtedly come under this regulation.

Hon. A. Lovekin: They do not advertise to-day; they have not advertised for 15 years cures for syphilis.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I have seen this particular "remedy" I have in mind repeatedly advertised in the Press recently. The unfortunate man who was attended by the quack never got proper treatment. He kept on going to the quack herbalist who advertised his wares and sold drugs to the patient. When the man came to me he presented the most awful picture I have ever seen.

I have never in my life seen such extensive ravages as this man had unfortunately got through remaining untreated, or not properly treated, over a period of 12 months. I asked him how much the treatment had cost him, and he told me that he had paid that man for his quack remedies a hundred pounds. Only the other day somebody came in to see me about another matter, and incidentally revealed to me that he had been operated on six months ago for a stone in the bladder. Partly out of curiosity I said to him, "I suppose you had suffered a great deal before you underwent your operation." He said, "Yes." I asked, "How long had you been suffering?" His reply was, "Two years." I then said, "Surely your case could have been diagnosed in less time than that." He said, "Certainly. My doctor diagnosed the complaint two years before." "Well," I said, "why weren't you operated on?" He replied, "Oh, I was trying to dissolve the stone." I said, "No medical man would hold out any hope of dissolving a stone in the bladder by means of medicine." He said, "No, the doctor didn't, but I went to one of these"—naming a particular gentleman who advertises patent medicines in this city—"and he was trying for two years to dissolve the stone." I asked, "What did it cost you?" He answered, "Over £50." So the man lost £50 and put up with unspeakable agony for a period of 18 months or two years, and in the end—

Hon. A. Lovekin: You ought to give us the names of those men.

Member: Oh no!

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I have no doubt the House is perfectly aware, having seen it mentioned in the Press on many occasions, of the case of Little Jim. Little Jim is a dear little fellow who, I understand, had a tubercular spine, and after being treated in the Children's Hospital for a long time, and getting considerably better, he became a public favourite because of his being a sunny little chap and bearing his affliction with cheerfulness. I believe he is an extremely nice, engaging young boy. Some little time ago I suppose all of us saw what was printed about the wonderful cure of Little Jim by means of somebody's salve. After a time there was a dispute between the nurse who rubbed in the salve and the proprietor of the salve as to which could claim the greater credit for having cured Little Jim. I know that there are quite a number of people who to-day are under the impression that that poor little fellow has been cured; but I am going to inform the House that one of my surgical friends attached to the staff of the Perth hospital performed only three weeks ago a very serious operation on Little Jim for the particular complaint from which he has been suffering for all these years. Undoubtedly he has developed a large tubercular abscess, and instead of the complaint having been

cured, the poor little chap is now an inmate of the Perth Hospital. There is another case of what I can only call a misleading advertisement, which is frequently published in the Press. It concerns a child who is stated in the advertisement to have been in the Children's Hospital under the care of, I think, 10 doctors, and to have been submitted to treatment for a great many months—I forget the precise number. The advertisement proceeds to state that the child, having gone back to its mother's care, and having had a certain salve rubbed into it, is now cured of its paralysis and is running about. Every one of us who has any knowledge of the particular disease of infantile paralysis knows that it first comes in a pretty wide-spread fashion, owing to certain changes which take place in the cells of the spinal cord. Those cells can regulate the impulses which come down from the brain and are then transmitted along the nerves to the muscles and the limbs. In infantile paralysis those particular large cells in the spinal cord undergo an inflammatory change, and at first the complaint is pretty wide-spread. After a time a great number of cells which have not been damaged beyond repair undergo resolution, and numerous muscles that previously were paralysed again become capable of use. The object of the surgeon who has the care of these unfortunate children is to see that by means of proper splinting, and, when the time comes, by means of massage, the muscles which ordinarily antagonise the paralysed muscles are not allowed to over-act, and thereby cause various contractures to take place, giving rise to deformities which might be prevented. That is one of the reasons why these children are kept in hospital for a long period, and are carefully splinted. The object is to prevent deformity which can be prevented. Then, when the muscles regain their tone, as they do to a very large extent after the severity of the disease has waned, the limb is in a good position and the deformity has been prevented. Then the child is discharged from hospital and the mother is told to let the child use the limb, and the child is encouraged to use the limb. But anybody reading the advertisement to which I refer would never imagine that the child had been in hospital for many months, and submitted to the greatest care with a view to preventing deformity, but would imagine that the whole credit was due to some salve that had been rubbed into the skin a long way away from where the lesion really is, and could not have the slightest effect on the disease. These patent medicine men, by means of such misleading and lying advertisements, undoubtedly do gull the public; and I maintain that the public have a right to be protected against such people. There are undoubtedly various medicines used for ordinary, simple ailments which are of great use; and there is no reason whatever why

the public should not be allowed to get at them. My friend was extremely anxious about Cockle's pills and Mother Seigel's soothing syrup. There is nothing in Cockle's pills that is contained in the first list which my friend proposes to disallow; and had he confined himself to No. 4, and not tried to rule out No. 1, he would have been able to take Cockle's pills by night and Mother Seigel's syrup by day. There is no particular reason, so far as I know, why anyone who wants to take these drugs should not take them. But I think that undoubtedly it would be a great protection to the Australian public if all patent medicines had their formulae printed on them. I do not really think it would do them any harm, but I am quite in accord with those who maintain that with this numerically small State of ours we can hardly become the pioneers in the movement.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: If the other States are willing to take part in the movement, and it becomes universal in Australia, then I believe it undoubtedly would make for the improvement of the public health of Australia. Unfortunately it is no use Western Australia saying, "We will not have these drugs," if Victoria and South Australia continue to sell them, and if all that residents of this State who want the drugs have to do is to send an order for them by post to South Australia or Victoria. If the Government had the regulation in force and postponed its use until such time as the other States fell into line, it would show that we were willing to bear our share of the burden. In this connection we are only fulfilling a pledge which was given at the conference of medical officers of health held some time ago in the East. They are the responsible advisers of the various States, and on the occasion in question they tried to get the different Governments to bring in legislation of this character. I understand from the Colonial Secretary that it is in fulfilment of that pledge that this regulation has been promulgated.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I thought they were waiting upon us.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Everybody is waiting on each other, and I have no doubt there is someone behind the scenes trying to keep the thing back. I am quite in accord with the regulation as it stands, but I do think that before it can be brought into use we must have united action in all the Australian States. By that means, I believe, we could compel these patent medicine vendors to put on their labels the constituents of their mixtures. To a certain extent that is already done. Burroughs Wellcome, for instance, in nearly all their formulae do undoubtedly state not only the drug but also the exact dosage of the drug contained in the particular tablet. In the case of some proprietary articles of theirs I believe they indicate only the name of the drug without giving the dosage. Parke Davis & Co. do

much the same. I believe it to be a good thing to compel particular patent medicine vendors to do this too, as it would certainly undeceive the public from imagining that there is something wonderful, something miraculous in these particular nostrums. Now with reference to the drug habit. Of course the dangerous drugs are included in the first part. Mr. Nicholson alluded to chlorodyne, and I believe chlorodyne is used to a considerable extent on stations, where it is the practice to stock these remedies. Chlorodyne I consider to be an exceedingly dangerous and harmful drug. I believe chlorodyne has done more harm to people than it has ever done good. I am quite willing to admit that it will allay certain pains, but the point is very doubtful whether it would not be wiser to allow the pains to go on instead of allaying them by the administration of chlorodyne. Very often the action of that drug is distinctly harmful, even although it may stop the pain. Then another very grave danger is that people do undoubtedly get the drug habit through chlorodyne. One of the worst cases of drug addiction that I have experienced in my private practice was an unfortunate lady who, quite innocently, in order to relieve herself of pain, took chlorodyne, with the result that she became a victim of the chlorodyne habit. I believe chlorodyne to be even more harmful than morphia. Of course morphia is one of the constituents of chlorodyne. Undoubtedly the bottle containing such a drug as chlorodyne should have stated on it the particular constituents of its contents. Chlorodyne contains not only morphia but also, I think, some other fairly potent and dangerous drugs.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Under the old regulation No. 4, every bottle has those particulars on it now.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Every bottle containing chlorodyne should bear on it a statement that chlorodyne contains morphia, so that the public, when they seek relief from pain by taking chlorodyne, will know that they are running the risk of acquiring that terrible habit. I wish to protest most emphatically against a remark which I saw a month or so ago in the Press. It was a remark made by a responsible gentleman in Perth, connected with the Chamber of Commerce. It was reported in the Press; otherwise I should not have alluded to it. In reply to some interjection as to who was behind this particular regulation, the gentleman in question said that it was some of the medical profession. I have forgotten his exact words, but speaking from memory I should say he insinuated that the medical profession were behind this regulation because they wanted the public to go to them and use their prescriptions instead of taking these quack medicines. On behalf of the medical profession I want to say that that is not true. I am perfectly certain that the only people who were interested in getting this regulation promulgated were those medical men connected with the Health Depart-

ments of the various States. Of course I am not alluding in any way whatever to Mr. Nicholson, whose attitude has been perfectly fair.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: Are you referring to any member of the House?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: No. I am referring to a member of the Chamber of Commerce. I want to give his statement a direct contradiction.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But surely you do not take any more notice of that than I take of his remarks about me.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The hon. member can adopt what attitude he likes. No private medical practitioners were instrumental in getting this regulation framed. They have become so convinced of the gullibility of the public in respect of quack remedies, that they consider it is hopeless trying to correct them. I can assure the House I have not been approached by any medical man in reference to this, nor has any of them in course of conversation with me alluded to it. What I have said to the House to-night has been said because I think that when questions affecting public health come before the House it is my duty to give the House my views on the subject. It is because I am convinced of the enormous harm done by patent medicines that I cannot support the motion.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan) [5.32]: I have been a member of the Food Standards Advisory Board since 1911 except for a period when Mr. W. W. Garner took my place so that the patent medicine question could be dealt with. My work on the board is to deal with foodstuffs, and technical men are called in to deal with medicines and drugs. The first regulation submitted to Parliament was the work of that board originally, although later, in 1913, it went before a conference in Melbourne of analysts and heads of departments. Committees of technical men were formed to deal with patent medicines and drugs, and their reports were adopted by conference. About 18 months ago another conference was held in Sydney at which our Commissioner of Public Health alone represented Western Australia. Amendments were made to the drugs section and were adopted by conference. That conference subsequently asked the States to adopt those amendments in the interests of uniformity. Since 1911 three conferences have endeavoured to bring about uniformity, but it has been found that each State board puts up the case for its own State and drifts away from uniformity. It has now been arranged that if any State, say Western Australia, puts up a question, it is sent to New South Wales and the secretary in that State communicates it to all the other States with a view to getting uniformity. If any State objects to coming in, the question is held

over for the next conference. As a member of that board I have felt that I am not competent to deal with drugs and patent medicines and so when medical men have brought up recommendations I have supported them. The boards throughout the Commonwealth are concerned merely in bettering the public health. I can support Dr. Saw when he says the medical men are not concerned in these regulations. Certainly they have never been consulted when such regulations were being framed. I am in accord with the prohibition of the drugs mentioned, because the consensus of opinion holds that they are dangerous, but I doubt whether I can support the proposal that printed formulæ should be published on the bottles. As a member of that board I feel I should not take advantage of my position here to influence hon. members. I propose therefore merely to leave it to other members to come to a decision. I make this announcement in order that the House may know where I stand.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [5.36]: I want to run over the speech delivered by the Minister in opposition to the motion. Those who heard the Minister will agree that he was not altogether wholehearted in his opposition. In fact I doubt if he knew, until Mr. Nicholson's motion appeared on the Notice Paper, that he had laid the regulation on the Table. As a matter of fact I believe this regulation was framed and advanced near to the point of being laid on the Table while the late Government were still in office. So it might have been just as well Mr. Ewing's duty to lay it on the Table as it was that of Mr. Drew. Of course one can understand that whatever Minister happens to be in office he has certain duties to perform, and whether or not he agrees with them he does perform them. I do not think Mr. Drew has really very much sympathy with the regulation, especially since he represents a province covering thousands of square miles of territory where the population is sparsely scattered and where anybody in distress is unable to find a doctor or chemist, and therefore must have recourse to the next best remedy, which generally he can find procurable at the stores. I take it there is no party question whatever about this, and that therefore members, whether Nationalist or Labour, can judge it on its merits, looking at it in the best interests of their constituents. Mr. Drew told us in the first place that up to the present there is not in the other States any legislation going as far as this does. Dr. Saw has corroborated that. Mr. Drew told us that there was no legislation in New South Wales, and I think in reply to an interjection he said that if we waited until New South Wales passed legislation we should have to wait a long time. If that be so, Dr. Saw's suggestion comes in very appropriately; for if New

South Wales is going to wait a long time before it acts, there can be no uniformity and consequently we are only going to penalise our own people and our own traders by agreeing to this regulation. Evidently if New South Wales supplies these nostrums, and our own people in outback districts want them they can indent them through the merchants here, or send for them through the post if they are determined to have them. Thus to adopt the regulation means putting all the cost on our own people and depriving traders in this State of the business. We are being pretty well sucked dry by the Eastern States as it is, and I do not think we should willingly open the door to further losses of our vitality through having to do the trade with the other States, when we might better, more cheaply and more conveniently do it here. Victoria has passed a regulation but it does not go as far as this, and I am advised that it is not yet in operation. A telegram received by a merchant here last week asked whether Western Australia was going to give them a lead. Why should we, with our small population spread over a million square miles of territory, give a State like Victoria a lead in a matter of this sort?

Hon. H. Stewart: We gave a lead to her with the inspection of machinery.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Possibly we did, but there are only rare instances where it will be of material benefit to us to give leads to those great States. And especially when, if we do give a lead to them, it helps them at our cost. As soon as we pass this regulation we must, until they pass uniform regulations, do our trade with them at increased expense and increased inconvenience. Rather than bring about such a position, it would be better to support the principle advocated by Mr. W. D. Johnson in another place, namely the setting up of some organisation to protect the revenue and trade of the State. That would be more to the point than trying to drive away trade and injure the people. I suggest that if uniformity is desired we should let the East start first and give us the lead, as they have done in many other instances, some of which have not been to our advantage. The passing of this regulation would not lead to our benefit, having regard to our widely scattered population. The Colonial Secretary said that undoubtedly many of these nostrums would relieve constipation, but Epsom salts would do equally as well.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I suggest advertising that in the "Gazette."

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I would not dispute his statement, but are we going to describe it in the terms in which it appears in the prescriptions of our medical friends? It appears there as mag. sulph. While common Epsom salts is sold at about 1d. per pound, described as such it would not look too well in a prescription. In these days we look for medicines and even foods in as

near tabloid form as we can get 'them. A man starting on a journey does not want to pack pounds' weight of Epsom salts in his kit when he can get what he requires in the form of a pill, which will probably do him as much good and can be more conveniently carried in his vest pocket. Epsom salts is almost a boon in this State because we need not pay for it. Some of the bore water contains 50 grains of salts to the gallon, which would be a pretty good dose of anything of that kind. There is lime, magnesia, and chloride of sodium in the water, so that just as one can get free air, so one may get free medicine, paying only for the water.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Do you know the epitaph that appears in the Cheltenham cemetery?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: It runs like this—

Here lie I and my four daughters,
All through drinking Cheltenham
waters.

If we had stuck to Epsom salts,
We wouldn't be lying in these cold
vaults.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I suggest that when Dr. Saw writes his next prescription, instead of stating it as mag. sulph., he should show it as Epsom salts, for he could then look to receiving a large measure of patronage. The Minister said the ointments, which are sold at 1s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. per tin, were the same article as the "British Pharmacopœia" prescribes and that the "British Pharmacopœia" ointments could be obtained from any chemist for about 1s. per pound. I do not know who advised the Minister as to that, but I believe, is the basis of all these ointments and costs in the neighbourhood of 2s. per pound in itself, so I do not see how these British pharmacopœia ointments can be obtained at those cheap rates. The Minister asked how it was that most of the best-known firms made no secret of their formulae. I maintain that they do make a secret of their formulae. Mr. Seddon the other day referred to Parke, Davis & Co., a well-known firm, who manufacture various drug preparations, but I suggest that Parke, Davis & Co. by no means put their formulae on their bottles. I have some of their preparations here, in fact quite an interesting collection. The first is syrup trifolium compound, and the formula on the bottle begins—

Alcohol, 6 per cent. Each fluid ounce represents: red clover blossoms, 32 grains.

Who knows what red clover blossoms are to start with, and what particular medicinal value they have? I also consulted the "British Pharmacopœia" and could find in it nothing whatever about red clover blossoms. The label continues:—

Lappa, 16 grains; Berberis, 16 grains; Xanthoxylum, 4 grains; Stillingia, 16 grains; Phytolacca, 16 grains; Cascara

Amarga, 16 grains; Potassium iodide, 8 grains.

I have heard of cascara sagrada, but about cascara amarga I can find nothing. Out of the nine ingredients mentioned, two alone are to be found in the pharmacopœia; the other seven are practically Parke, Davis & Co.'s own preparations.

Hon. H. Seddon: What is the date of your pharmacopœia?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The date is 1914. Mr. Seddon, when dealing with this subject, told us that some old lady, a member of the W.C.T.U., took some peruna, and after a while found herself the worse for liquor. Since then she had not called a halt. In the olden days, when we used to have the agricultural dinners at Guildford, I remember a Minister of the Crown being present. He was a great Rechabite, and a member of various temperance organisations. At one of the dinners there was plum pudding and brandy sauce, and we all had a helping. The waiter again went to the Minister and asked whether he would have some more. The Minister replied, "Well, I do not care so much about the pudding, but I do like the sauce." Seeing that he liked the brandy sauce, some of us after dinner introduced him to a new temperance drink, and the Minister got very much into the condition of Mr. Seddon's old lady of the W.C.T.U. Here is another preparation called "Dicks' Mul-en-ol, from New Orleans, and the formula on the bottle says it contains 58.75 per centum of alcohol.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Have you a liqueur glass?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No; I assume you drink this neat from the bottle, but let me read the label. This is sold in a great prohibition country.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Do you take it with water?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Talk about the unfortunate public being deceived! Mul-en-ol is given out as the wonderful antiseptic for cuts, wounds, bruises, and sprains, burns and scalds, cramps and colic. In smaller type are given the directions for internal use—

Dilute with six times the quantity of water. Dose for adults, half to one teaspoonful; children, one year old, five drops; one to five years, ten drops; five to ten years, 15 drops. For full directions for treating other diseases, see circular around the bottle.

I have not that circular, but 58 per centum of alcohol is the formula, and I say that is as near to whisky as any publican in Perth sells and probably a little better. So, if any member should want a quiet nip in a temperance society, or a prohibition country, all he need do is to buy a bottle of this cure for burns, scalds and cramps and colic! A couple of teaspoonfuls in a little glass with five times the quantity of water will supply the need. There is a formula on the bottle, but what protection is that to the

public? I have a number of other preparations. Here is something that is prescribed by the doctors called Emollientine. The formula on the tin reads:—

A combination of aluminium hydrate, carbolic acid, isarol, lead oxide, mercuric chloride corrosive and zinc sulphocarbonate.

Out of those ingredients only three are to be found in the "British Pharmacopœia," and I am told my copy is the latest. This preparation is sold by chemists, and doctors regard it as being quite the proper thing. Another sample is a combination containing oleo resin, capsicum, camphor oil, turpentine, oil cajuput and croton oil, "together with a bland base agreeably aromatised." This is stuff that the Health Department say may be sold and prescribed. I have looked for some of the ingredients in the pharmacopœia and cannot find them. The formulæ on those bottles do not disclose the contents, any more than do those of any patent medicine sold.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: Are they compelled by law to give the formulæ?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes, they have to give the formulæ in a country where Mr. Seddon told us the other day the acid was put on the Press through the medium of the advertiser.

Hon. J. Duffell: That is the stuff to give them.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: People should be told that those things that may be called dangerous drugs do in fact contain drugs that are dangerous. There is in fact a difference between a dangerous drug and an article like aloes, which is the base of most of the purgatives sold as patent medicines. Let me take Dr. Collis Brown's chlorodyne. This is stated on the bottle to contain 14 per cent. of proof spirit, 18 per cent. of chloroform, and 2 per cent. of opium. The public have been protected in this country for the last 12 years. I think it was Regulation 61 that stated that the ingredients of dangerous drugs must be mentioned on the bottle. No one has raised any objection to that. People like Collis Brown and others immediately conformed to the regulation. It must not be imagined, however, that Collis Brown has given the whole of his formula, and he does not state the quantities of the various ingredients. Dr. Saw will agree that it is very difficult to analyse a preparation such as this. Those who have only a smattering of chemical knowledge know what a change is brought about by the addition of another volume of hydrogen, oxygen, or carbon when added to other chemicals.

Hon. H. Seddon: That is where the analyst comes in.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The analyst of this article can merely state that it contains an alkaloid, but no amount of analysis can state the contents of the bottle, or that there is in the mixture red clover

blossoms or lappa. The analyst would not know what to look for.

Hon. H. Seddon: He could tell the alkaloid.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: He could not tell what the reaction had been of one chemical or another, or what chemical changes had ensued. The patent medicine vendor says, "I make these preparations, and so far as I can, sell them direct to the consumer. I will advertise them in the Press, and will sell them as cheaply as possible straight to the public." Parke, Davis, and the other equally wily Yank-ees go about it in another way. Instead of using the Press as a means of selling their articles, they use the medical profession. They say "We will show the doctor that these preparations of ours are special articles which they can with perfect safety use in their prescriptions." They therefore, have the doctors, almost throughout the universe, acting as agents for the whole of their products, instead of the newspapers being used as a medium through which the drug is sold direct to the public.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: They do not put up deceptive advertising.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not know about that. I have here a bottle of syrup trifolium compound. That is prescribed by medical men. I have also the circular that Parke, Davis put out to the doctors. The circular states that the compound contains 6 per cent. of alcohol, and that it is an efficient alternative, of special value in syphilitic affections, and also a useful vehicle. It goes on to say—

Each fluid ounce represents red clover blossoms, lappa, berberis, xanthoxylum, stillingia, phytolacca, cascara amarga, potassium iodide.

I am game to ask any medical man to tell me what five or six of these ingredients represent. I am sure they could not do so.

Hon. H. Seddon: That is a broad statement.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I have a little knowledge of chemistry, through a brother-in-law of mine who went in for medicine. I also devoted a little time to it myself, but did not go on with it. Part of the examination that a doctor has to undergo before admission to the profession is a paper on botany and materia medica. That is a sideline. It is crammed up for the time being, but I do not know that any doctor or surgeon bothers about it afterwards. A doctor who went in for the chemistry of these articles would simply be wasting his time. I am safe in saying, therefore, that not one doctor in a dozen could write out the component parts of these ingredients.

Hon. T. Moore: Some of them may not exist.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes.

Hon. T. Moore: But they are put up on the public.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: We know that some of them are mythical, because they are the preparations of this firm, and we do not know what is in the mixtures. The circular goes on to say—

The above formula with the addition of 40 grains of cascara sagrada to each fluid ounce—

I should say there was a slight mix-up between cascara amarda and cascara sagrada. The circular continues—

—eligible when the addition of a gentle laxative is indicated.

This tells the doctor that the compound is an efficient alternative of special value in syphilitic cases, and then it goes on to say that it is a gentle laxative. That is what some of the pill advertisements say. The circular continues—

A glance at the formula will serve to show why this combination, introduced and manufactured by Parke, Davis and Co., is superior in efficacy to the usual type of alternative.

Of course it is their own preparation, and the wily Americans advertise it in this way through the doctors.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: There is nothing misleading in that.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Can the hon. member tell me what berberis is? The British Pharmacopœia does not answer the question.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Read the columns of your own paper and you will see something quite different.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The circular continues—

Every one of the ingredients possesses some degree of alterative action; combined, they constitute with good reason a favourite formula. The remedy has been long and faithfully tried in some of the largest clinical centres and has everywhere met with unqualified praise. In secondary and tertiary syphilis it acts as a tonic to the digestive and excretory organs, and aids the engorged glandular system in disposing of the products of tissue change. It may be employed to advantage in early secondary syphilis if mercury be added, the constitutional effects of the latter drug being thus readily obtained without salivation. In many forms of skin disease digestion and assimilation are at fault.

Doctors frequently prescribe this to their patients, and of course charge 7s. 6d. for the prescription. It is apparently a cure-all, just as is some of the other rubbish that is put before the public in the form of patent medicines. The circular continues—

the blood becomes surcharged with effete products, which are not, as in normal health, completely eliminated by the bowels, kidneys and skin. In these cases syrup trifolium compound will, by stimulating the action of the emunctories, adjust the balance of the processes of waste

and repair and markedly improve the existing skin affection.

There is nothing in all this about the preparation itself.

It is, however, as a general alternative that the combination may be employed with the greatest success. Administered to patients with sluggish circulation, constipation, anorexia, cold extremities, flabby muscles, and general malaise, its tonic action is very manifest.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Will it mend a broken heart?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Evidently it will. The circular continues—

Syrup trifolium compound may also be employed to great advantage as a vehicle for the more pronounced inorganic alternatives—

I wonder it does not claim to be able to perform a surgical operation.

—such as calcium iodide in strumous eruptions and the acne of adolescents; calcium sulphide in buboes and suppurating glands; mercuric iodide in specific ulceration of fauces; and for the administration of larger doses of potassium iodide in gumma or tertiary syphilis. In anaemia, chlorosis, amenorrhœa, etc., it may be alternated with some iron preparation, such as our solution iron peptonate and manganese, with very happy results. The physician can readily suggest modifications for its employment in each individual case.

That is like the advertisement for a well-known sauce "If you like the sauce try the pickles."

—but it has an alternative power of its own which in many instances will be found sufficient. Dose: One to four teaspoonfuls three times a day, after meals. I have circulars dealing with all these bottles, and the wonderful cures they effect. They put up the information in this form instead of advertising as the others do in the papers.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Oh, I see what you are driving at.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I knew that would draw the badger. Instead of advertising these things and disposing of them direct to the public, they pass them on to the doctors, who know absolutely nothing about the drugs contained in them or their efficacy, being merely told in these circulars that they are very beneficial. Any one of them, according to the leaflets, will cure anything under the sun.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Before the tea adjournment I was endeavouring to go through the arguments that have been advanced by the Minister in support of his contention that Mr. Nicholson's motion should not be agreed to. Another of the arguments advanced was that, if we got rid of these medicines, a large number of these proprietary lines that people need in cases of emergen-

cies, would be put up by local chemists. That does not seem to me to be a sound argument because I believe very few chemists here would be able to find the necessary capital to provide these nostrums in such quantities as to be able to spread them throughout the country stores for the purposes of sale. I do not think our chemists would have sufficient capital to do that. In the second place, I am not so sure that we would improve the position regarding the values of the so-called patent medicines. Those extant to-day have been used for many years by hundreds of thousands of people and the public have learnt to discriminate between those patent medicines of value and those that possess no value. Mr. Seddon quoted from a book entitled "Secret Remedies." I have gone through that book and of a hundred of those medicines, only six are known to-day. The public have discriminated against the patent medicines possessing no value. After having been connected with newspapers for over 40 years, I have seen many of the advertisements dealing with patent medicines, and on going through the list in "Secret Remedies" I found there were six only of which I had heard before. That demonstrates that there is very little in that line of argument. Then I come to another point, namely, the value of these patent medicines to the public. I have shown that the people in the back blocks need some facilities for meeting emergency ailments to a greater extent than the people in the cities. It has been suggested that the value of the patent medicines is practically negligible, because the ingredients may have cost from one-third of a farthing to 2d. or 3d. That may be so; no doubt it is so. On the other hand, we cannot reckon the cost of a man's suit of clothes merely by the material. The cost of labour, distribution, and so on, all help to add to the value of that suit. I have a prescription that was given to a relative of mine by a well known doctor. It is not necessary to mention his name but if any hon. member is interested I will show him the original prescription. She had to pay 7s. 6d. for the prescription and there was 4s. 6d. to pay for the bottle of medicine. Last week I took the prescription to a wholesale firm in the city and asked them to make it up and to put alongside each ingredient the cost price of the drug and the value of the quantity used in the bottle sold to me by the chemist. I am informed that, with the exception of a little colouring matter, the tonic was practically what is known as Clement's Tonic. This was a composition of it: 32 grains of quinine sulphate, worth 3s. 6d. an oz.; 400 grains of sulphate of magnesia, which is Epsom's salts; 160 minims of sulphuric acid, worth 6d. a lb.; 80 minims of solution of strychnine, worth 4s. a lb.; 1 ounce of syrup of orange, worth 2s. a lb.; and the usual water to fill up the rest of the bottle. The total cost of the medicine was 4.060d. The prices I have quoted are the Australian prices.

Had the medicine been put up in England or America it would have been cheaper. However, that bottle, as I have indicated, cost 7s. 6d. for the prescription and 4s. 6d. for the medicine. If, as I was told, the medicine was practically the same as Clement's Tonic, the bottle contained practically half the quantity of Clement's Tonic I could buy from any chemist for 2s. 9d. It will thus be seen that the question of value is not altogether on one side against the makers of the patent medicines.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You are showing up private enterprise.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No. Dr. Saw, who does not very often agree with me, will bear me out when I say that very few chemists in Western Australia are making money to-day. It is not the mere cost of the drugs that one has to look to, but to the cost of distribution as well. Mr. Gray is one of those who is responsible for some of that added cost, inasmuch as he and his friends limit the hours during which a chemist must work.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you say that the chemist could not make a profit on the medicine referred to by you?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: How long has a chemist to keep his shop open and how often does he make up prescriptions of that description? Dr. Saw will agree that chemists are not making fortunes these days. Most of them are making a bare living. It is not possible to judge things in that way. Then I come to Mr. Seddon's remarks. I find it rather difficult to understand his attitude because he represents a goldfields constituency, where there reside prospectors, station hands and others, who work in centres remote from civilisation. I cannot understand him presenting a handle to his next political opponent on the hustings to enable that representative of the Labour Party to point out that Mr. Seddon desires to deprive his constituents of the opportunity to go to the store and get a remedy to relieve him from pain and suffering.

Hon. H. Seddon: Perhaps they are able to assess the value of these so-called nostrums.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: People working in outback places like to have an opportunity to go to the store or the head station to get something that will give them immediate relief. It does not matter two straws to such people what the medicines contain so long as they get relief. As hon. members know, for some time past I have been suffering from bronchitis. I did not know what to do. I did not spare money in getting prescriptions but none of them did me any good. My daughter came home one day with a bottle of medicine which she said she had bought for me and asked me to take some of it. I took a dose or two and got some relief. In fact I slept that night. I went on with the medicine until I had taken a couple of bottles of it. It

cannot be said that I have developed the drug habit as the result, because immediately I got relief I did not desire to take any more. I have remained quite well since I left off taking the medicine. Mr. Seddon says that I paid for a little chloroform, a little acetic acid, some colouring matter, and a little sugar. He said that it was worth nothing, although it cost me 3s. 6d. The point is that I got relief from that medicine and what do I care what the drugs cost so long as I got that relief? I cared as little about this as I did about the prescriptions I got from the doctors. There is the fact; I got relief. Therefore this point, too, does not carry much weight. One argument advanced by the hon. member in opposition to Mr. Nicholson's motion was that it would be necessary to exercise supervision over the ingredients used in these medicines, because such articles as sulphuric acid are used. He said there were poisonous substances used. There is nothing in that because the position is regulated by the Pharmacy and Poisons Compilation Act. Every person who sells poison is subject to a penalty unless he holds a license from the Pharmaceutical Council. The fifth schedule to the Act contains a list of poisons that are not allowed to be sold without a license. Every conceivable poison is set out so that the first part of the regulation under discussion is hardly necessary. Then he said that many of the proprietary articles were frauds and called to his aid for proof "The Great American Fraud." I have been to America four times in the course of my life and was there as recently as 1921. You would be surprised at the change that has come over the American people. At one time when I first visited America I found that the people were of practically British stock; and that they had British names. Since then I could not help noticing that the race was getting away from the old stock and becoming polyglot. In 1921 the Americans had become what might be called a mongrel type, and instead of seeing essentially British names, one observed everywhere "Vitches" and "Meyers" and names of that sort, while on going down other residential parts one would come across thousands of people who could not speak a word of the language of the country. In my view the Americans have deteriorated. I have done business with them and I have found lacking that sense of honour that at one time prevailed there. Now, if you can be taken down, you will be taken down. Then look around at their public affairs, their Tammany Hall, and their graft in all directions, the corruption in high places. This is the source to which my friend, Mr. Seddon, goes in order to bolster up a case against the vendors of British patent medicines and also against members of this Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the hon. member to address the chair occasionally.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am trying to do so. I have only one consideration and that is for you, Sir. If I do turn away at times it is due to inadvertence. Mr. Seddon quoted some advertising matter which the American fraud book contains, and the effect was that advertising contracts were made with the newspapers with a stipulation that if any legislation of this sort were attempted, the contract would be open to cancellation. I do not see much objection to that. Then the hon. member insidiously suggested that whenever a regulation such as this was put up, if the Press did not try to help to get rid of it, the acid would be applied by the owner of the patent medicines and that they would no longer advertise with the newspapers. To my mind that is a wicked suggestion and is tantamount to the suggestion that doctors are behind the regulation. People can hold pronounced views without being corrupt in regard to those views, or without always looking to their personal interests. The hon. member told us that there were 1,600 newspapers that had received circulars from a particular American patent medicine proprietor, intimating that the "acid" would be applied and the contracts withdrawn if such a regulation were not resisted. Judging by the number quoted I should say they were small weekly papers. No reputable newspaper would tolerate such a thing for one moment. I can recall that some years ago the late Sir Winthrop Hackett saw me about an advertisement which was then being published by his newspaper and mine. The advertisement related to "Peruna." Sir Winthrop Hackett pointed out that from the information he had got "Peruna" contained a high percentage of gin and that women were drinking the mixture and that it was doing harm. He suggested that we should no longer publish the advertisement. I agreed and the advertisements were discontinued and the sale of "Peruna" ceased. For the sake of a mere few pounds, newspaper proprietors, and certainly those of any repute at all, will not sell their souls in the manner suggested. Speaking for myself, I desire to appear here with clean hands. I do not desire that there should be anything in the shape of suspicion in the direction that the Government have induced me to vote in a certain way because they advertise in my newspaper. Whilst I am a member of this House I would like it to be known that I receive no payment whatever from the Government for any advertisement which appears in the columns of my newspaper. I will publish anything supplied by the Government that may be regarded as public information and will make no charge. When one acts in that way, it is scarcely likely that he is going to submit to a patent medicine producer applying the "acid" to him. The insinuation is not worthy of the hon. member who made it. He could have id-

vanced it for one purpose only, but there is no need to refer to it. Mr. Langer, who controls the "West Australian," is not in this House. I know him well and I would like to see any of these patent medicine people put it up to him that unless he gave publicity to their views they would withdraw their advertisement. I can imagine what his answer would be. Hon. members must give newspaper proprietors credit for having some little honour. It might just as easily be suggested and it would be just as wicked to do so, that Dr. Saw had some motive in taking the stand that he has adopted.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Please leave me out.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am leaving out the hon. member. I have here a contract entered into by a newspaper with the proprietors of Doan's pills. It reads—

We agree to accept the above advertising contract on the following terms and conditions: Amount of space, 1,000 inches to be used at will within a period of 12 months. After all this space has been used up, the insertion of the advertisements is to be continued on the same terms until countermanded. Position: top of column and alongside reading matter. Advertisements not in these positions cannot be allowed for. Style of setting copy: Copy is to be set in same type as ordinary reading matter, with headlines similar to those used herewith. New matter will be used for each advertisement. Extra space: Additional space to be charged pro rata. Payments: Accounts to be settled monthly if correct. Voucher copies: Free file of paper to be regularly posted during currency of contract to Foster McClellan Co., 76 Pitt-street, Sydney.

There is nothing in that contract that savours of putting the "acid" on a newspaper. If there were anything of that nature, the contract would be folded up and returned. The only contract to which exception might be taken—I wish to be frank with the House—contained a provision that if there was any legislation introduced that would interfere with the sale of the particular article, the contract would terminate. Virol was the article in this particular instance and that is the only contract I know of which imposed such a condition. I understand, too, that that is an article that the medical profession say is a good thing to take. Zambuk was also referred to as a eucalyptus ointment and the suggestion was that anyone could make it, and sell it cheaper. The firm that manufactures it does send it round and charges for it a little more than the cost price of the ingredients. I am sure it benefits many. I can refer to another mixture regarding which I could give personal testimony and which is alluded to in "Secret Remedies." I have here particulars of an inquiry held in London as regards Dr. Collis Brown's chlorodyne.

It sets out that the analyses conducted were quite outside the mark and were by no means correct except as to some of the basic drugs contained in the remedy. I will not weary the House by reading them. I am in accord with most of what was said by Dr. Saw. He referred to there being two parts in the regulations. In dealing with the regulations we cannot deal with parts of it. The Interpretation Act under which we deal with regulations provides that a regulation may be disallowed, but cannot be amended. Therefore we cannot very well deal with part of a regulation. The course that has been pursued before has been that the whole regulation has been disallowed and the department has brought up an amended regulation in accordance with the wishes of Parliament. So that we cannot adopt the view suggested by Dr. Saw and I do not know that that is necessary in view of the Pharmacy Act, which prescribes all the poisons which must be shown and in view of the old regulation No. 61. Dr. Saw said that the people were deceived by lying advertisements. Some may be deceived, and I have no doubt that harm as well as good has resulted to the people who have used patent medicines. Taking it all round, these patent medicines are mostly harmless preparations, but they serve their purpose. They are easily and cheaply obtained, so why not let the people have them? Dr. Saw says that the public have a right to be protected. I agree with that, and I say the public are well protected against everything except these little harmless medicines. The hon. member also referred to tabloids. Some years ago Burroughs Wellcome registered the word "Tabloid," and ever since then they have been putting up tablets of declared quantities, such as two grains of strychnia, or five grains of quinine, and they mark on the bottle the contents of each tabloid. Everybody makes tabloids to-day. They are manufactured here in Perth. In fact, imported tabloids are a thing almost of the past. There is a heavy dumping duty on them. No complaint can be made about tabloids. Dr. Saw also referred to chlorodyne. Chlorodyne may do harm. We find people who contract the habit of taking chlorodyne. However, I do know this, that when I was travelling on the P. & O. steamer "Victoria" from here to England and when off at Colombo I had a very bad attack of dysentery, from which I could get no relief until I took chlorodyne—I think I took the whole bottle. It gave me relief. Whether it was poison, or whether it was worth 3d., or worth 10s., I did not care two straws: I wanted relief, and I got it from the chlorodyne. If these things only act in that way to the public, we are doing something of value, rather than harm, in allowing them to be distributed.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I believe chlorodyne was very effective as a remedy for cholera in India.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I understand that was so. Some years ago—perhaps Dr. Saw will remember this—there was an inquiry in England as to the manufacture of chlorodyne, and the manufacturers disclosed the ingredients and said, "Now make chlorodyne." Nobody could blend the ingredients. There are all sorts of things, such as chlorodyne and pain-killer, which no one but the proprietors can make to-day, any more than anybody except the proprietors can make Lea & Perrin's sauce. Holbrook was a director of the Lea & Perrin firm, and he started in business for himself, making Holbrook's sauce and Holbrook's pickles. But Holbrook cannot to-day make Lea & Perrin's sauce; there is only one Lea & Perrin's sauce. No one except the members of the family have ever been able to discover the secret of the blending of that sauce.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Lea & Perrin's and Holbrook's sauce are the same sauce in different bottles.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: There is the same difference between those two sauces as between chalk and cheese. Dr. Saw has made reference to the injurious use of these patent medicines. There is, however, a set-off to this. A former member of this House told me an incident which is in point. He got internal pains, very bad ones; and he called in a doctor, who said to him, "If you don't have an operation within the next 24 hours, you will be a dead man." The former member replied, "I don't like knives and operations, and I would sooner die." The doctor then said, "Let me call in someone to consult with." Another doctor was called in to consult, and he said the same thing as the first doctor, that the patient would be dead very shortly if the operation was not performed. But the patient persisted, "No, I won't have it at all;" and I believe the next day he sent out for a box of Beecham's pills and took them. That man lived ever afterwards, and became a member of this House, and did not have the operation, and has not been in hospital since.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: "Hark the herald angels sing, 'Beecham's pills are just the thing.'"

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If the hon. member interjecting would like me to verify that instance, I am quite prepared to do it. It shows how some things will help some people, while they are no good to others, who in their turn find some other nostrum good for them. I am trying to cut down what I intended to say. I have, however, found what I was looking for; it is on page 2089 of the "Government Gazette" of the 26th June, 1913, and reads—

61.—Declaration of Certain Drugs. (1)

There shall be written on the principal label attached to every package which contains any of the substances, or preparations, derivatives, or alkaloids of any of the substances named in this regulation, a statement of the name of the substance

or substances, or of the preparation, derivative, or alkaloid of the substance or substances contained in it, and the quantity or proportion present in it, in the following form:—This mixture or (alternatively) the contents of this package, includes (or include) (here insert the name of the drug or drugs required to be declared, and the quantity or proportion of each contained in the mixture or package).

Then the regulation goes on to give a long list of drugs, practically the same as that in the Pharmacy and Poisons Act and in the regulations. No harm is being done to the public by the sale of all the harmless ingredients made up into these patent medicines, whilst the dangerous ones must be declared. A good deal of convenience, however, is given to the people by their being enabled to go to stores all over this vast country and on the spur of the moment buy something in relief of an emergency. We have never heard of anyone being killed by taking a patent medicine. These patent medicines are made up in bulk under supervision.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw interjected.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: If the hon. member interjects in that way, I will reply that people have been poisoned by getting preparations from chemists. A recent case of the kind occurred at Ballarat. However, I do not wish to pursue that line of argument. I suggest that these medicines can do no harm, that they can only do good; and therefore I shall support Mr. Nicholson in vetoing the regulation.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [8.9]: If there was any doubt in my mind as to whether I should support the motion, it would have been removed by the speech of the Leader of the House and also by Dr. Saw's remarks. Dr. Saw showed clearly that it was an absurdity for 360,000 people to start to enforce a regulation like this when in Australia there are six million people, the rest of whom, so far as the Governments are concerned, no matter what the medical men who attended the conference in the East may say, have no intention whatever of enforcing such a regulation. In fact, when Mr. Nicholson raised the point, the Leader of the House reviewed this aspect of the question, and said the mover had made a very clever point. He also said that without New South Wales the rest of the States could do nothing with regard to the patent medicine trade. Hence, uniformity must follow and New South Wales would do nothing. New South Wales contains two million people, and I believe that a year or two ago one million of them resided within a mile of the Sydney General Post Office. The enforcement of the regulation therefore would mean that the traders of this country would be compelled to get all patent medicine goods from the Eastern States. I speak on behalf of the

great north and the people there, whom I represent. I have here one page representing a sample of hundreds of orders that I could produce from North-West clients. The order includes such things as Bates's salve, chlorouyne, embrocations, eye lotions, Friar's balsam, and zambuk. My friends representing the pastoral community place orders for these articles with local houses, which execute them. If the regulation is enforced, it means that all the local houses will be prevented from selling these remedies unless the formula is printed on the bottle or the package. What will happen then? The orders will go to South Australia. New South Wales, at all events, distinctly lays it down in its Act that no formula shall be disclosed. In Tasmania, I understand, the regulation was promulgated by the Government, but was disallowed. Victoria, in fulfilment of the undertaking given by the medical fraternity at the conference, put up a regulation, but then saw the difficulty and suspended the regulation for six months. Queensland, I understand, gazetted a similar regulation, but allowed it to remain a dead letter. In South Australia nothing has been done. We know that as a result of Federation Western Australia has been the tail and the Eastern States have been the dog. By this regulation we propose to make ourselves the tail and to ask the Eastern States to be the dog that supplies the goods. Could anything be more monstrous? We talk about patent medicines as if they were harmful. However, the generation to which I belong, and to which most members of this Chamber belong, was reared on patent medicines. There was no doctor within 50 or 60 miles, and when young we got nothing but patent medicines. I ask the medical fraternity to compare our generation with the rising generation, brought up on doctors' prescriptions, and to say which is the harder. After all said and done it comes to faith. No matter what the bottle contains, if you have faith, it will have the desired effect. There was more in the Hickson stunt than people imagine. The medical profession know that if they were to write their prescriptions in clear English instead of in dog Latin, the patient would probably let the medicine alone, and get better quick and lively. I guarantee that nine out of ten people in this State are, like myself, unable to read a doctor's prescription. If the patient knew what the doctor was prescribing, nine times out of 10 he would not take the medicine, and if he did take it, it would do him no good. I want to treat all people alike. Doctors should not think they are the only people playing the game. Twenty-five years ago a leading doctor of this State told me that I had a floating kidney, and that if I did not have an operation, that would be the end of me. I asked how much the operation would cost and was told either 25 guineas or 50 guineas—I do not remember which. I then asked how long I would have to lie up, and the reply was "Three weeks." At my wife's suggestion, a friend of mine

then booked my passage to New Zealand. I went there and consulted a medical adviser who had been brought out specially to cure people. I saw him three times, and he charged me 10s. 6d. for each visit. He asked me how long I had had the pain, and I told him as long as I could remember. He said it was a contracted muscle, that I must have sustained an injury at some period. He sent me to a masseur, who applied the battery and cured the ailment. And here I am today, 25 years later, to tell the tale. I relate this with the object of showing that there are black sheep amongst the medical profession, just as there are among the patent medical circle. At the same time, in fairness to the medical profession, I must admit that but for Dr. Saw I should have been a cripple for life. Some 20 years ago I was thrown out of a buggy and my leg seriously injured. Dr. Saw, to whom I went, said it had to be put into plaster of Paris, the alternative being lameness. I had confidence in the doctor, and so he was able to fix up my leg. The Government have the power now to analyse any medicine, and if it prove to be unsatisfactory, they can publish a notice warning the public that it should not be taken. If this were a Federal matter in which the whole of the people were joined together to enforce such regulation, I should have no objection; except that I say the formula asked for under the regulation is not required by any other English-speaking community in the world. Here we are, 360,000 people, and we dictate to these patent medicine proprietors what description they must put on their bottles. If we do that they will not bother about the Western Australian trade, but will continue sending their goods to the East, whence they will be shipped back here. This regulation was put up by the Medical Department. It has been suggested that Mr. Drew did not see the regulation when he was tabling it. Possibly he did not. It may be that it was prepared by his predecessor, who knew that the House could disapprove of it if members did not like it. I hope the House will disapprove of it. I could relate many other instances of advice given that, if acted upon, might have resulted in death, not by patent medicines, but by doctors' prescriptions. Recently a friend of mine became very ill. He used to roll in agony on the floor. Some of the best doctors called in declared that he had gallstones. His wife, a highly qualified nurse, said that his heart would not stand an operation. She undertook his cure herself. What did she give him for his gallstones? Olive oil and juice of lemon. She claimed that the mixture dissolved the gallstones. Certainly I can assure members that he is as well to-day as ever. We are told that patent medicines kill people. Well, we learn on the highest authority that in the old days the Lord killed people with water, not with patent medicines. In the days of the Flood He killed people with water, and

again, He killed them with water in the Red Sea. I am satisfied, and the people I represent, those in the outback country, are satisfied that if this regulation is agreed to, it will merely force the trade away from Western Australia to the Eastern States. If the Eastern traders were put upon the same footing as our agents I would not mind; but as it is, if we force the trade out of Western Australia in this way, we cannot complain of business flourishing in the East at our expense.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [8.21]: I should not have spoken on this question had it not been for the references made to the Press. I recollect what happened when we had a similar motion in 1913. That motion was carried by an overwhelming majority. On that occasion, as on the present, Mr. Drew opposed the motion and supported the regulation. I was away at Kalgoorlie when the vote was taken. I can assure members that neither then nor now was or has any acid been applied to me or to the newspapers over which I have control. All my life have I been a Pressman. I have always earned my living as a Pressman and, naturally, I am jealous of the reputation of the profession to which I belong. I do feel, however, that possibly Mr. Lovekin misconstrued the remarks of Mr. Seddon. I can scarcely believe that Mr. Seddon intended any reflection on the Press. He quoted from a contract that, evidently, some unscrupulous patent medicine vendors endeavoured to foist on certain newspaper people in America.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Would it not have been more to the point to quote a contract here rather than one in America?

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: In America sometimes things are done that are not in accordance with the British conception of what is right. The American standard of right and wrong is very different from the British and Australian standards. Because a contract of that kind was framed in the United States is not to say that any newspaper of Australia would consider it for one moment. Those with any knowledge of the Press must know that whatever the fate of the motion, it will be treated on its merits, and without any regard whatever as to how it will affect the newspapers. I have strong reasons for supporting the motion. In the first place, the regulation is utterly futile, will not serve the purpose for which it was framed, and will not prevent the sale of deleterious patent medicines—for I suppose some patent medicines are deleterious. The publication of the formula can easily be evaded. Mr. Lovekin quoted numbers of formulae published on the bottles, formulae that had no meaning whatever. They referred to drugs that may or may not have any existence. To the average person such formulae would be utterly without meaning. I fail to see

what good purpose could be served by the regulation. Its only possible effect will be utterly without meaning. I fail to see that may be regarded as objectionable will publish some formulae that will answer the purpose, while patent medicines, old established remedies, to which even the doctors have no objection, will decline to publish their formulae. So our Western Australian agents will be deprived of the sale of medicines accepted as being of value. And, moreover, as Mr. Holmes pointed out, so long as the Federal Constitution remains as it is, if the regulation be passed, we shall be giving preference to the agents of South Australia as against the Western Australian agents. In no way can the State Government interfere with trade and commerce between the States. There is no power to prevent the importation of these medicines without the formulae from South Australia. Do the Government desire to give the South Australian agents an advantage over the agents in Western Australia? I am quite sure they do not. Yet that will be the direct result of the passing of this regulation. Furthermore, I feel strongly on this question because I represent an outback constituency. Our first consideration should be the people in the remote parts of this vast State engaged in pastoral, mining or agricultural pursuits, far away from the comforts and pleasures of civilisation. Even if everything Dr. Saw said about patent medicines be accepted, surely those patent medicines are better than nothing at all when a doctor is not available! Without them, life in the back blocks would be almost intolerable. It is only those who have lived hundreds of miles from the nearest doctor and chemist that can know what a boon those simple remedies are to sufferers from any of the hundred and one complaints to which prospectors, miners, pastoralists, shearers and others in far back districts are liable. I am somewhat surprised that the Government should have brought forward a regulation of this kind, and I feel I should not be doing my duty to my constituents, and especially to the people in the back blocks, if I did not vote for the motion.

Hon. G. POTTER (West) [8.31]: I should not like to cast a silent vote on a subject that has caused so many conflicting emotions. Whenever such a question is brought forward we hear of conjectures both inside and outside the House, and on this occasion much has been said of newspapers and doctors. I do not think any newspaper in Western Australia would be so forgetful of its responsibilities as to do the things that are done in the land of the wooden nutmeg. It has been said outside the House that the doctors are behind this movement. I think it is largely a question for medical opinion, and if the doctors

have been responsible for starting a campaign that is going to do some good for the people, they should be complimented upon their action. I believe the doctors are sincere and that their aim is to give the people the benefit of their years of professional training. It has been said that doctors' prescriptions are written in a dead language, but in the past we have heard references to the benefit of having such prescriptions written in Latin. Latin is chosen because it is a dead language and not liable to change of meaning. It may be that in another language some little nuance would appear and differ from time to time, possibly during the life of a medical practitioner. Further, one little word might have different meanings within the bounds of a State of the size of Western Australia. Nothing can be said against doctors writing their prescriptions in Latin. I asked a medical practitioner, who is not in private practice, as to the efficacy of Latin for prescriptions and he said, "I have seen a prescription written in French and certain drugs were called by their French names, and it was particularly difficult to decipher the prescription." A person in search of health might set out for another country and take with him the prescriptions he had been using as a guide to the doctors he proposed to consult.

THE PRESIDENT: Is the hon. member going to connect his remarks with the motion?

Hon. G. POTTER: Yes. It has been stated that there is an analogy between putting a formula on a label that someone could understand and a doctor writing a prescription that the general public could not understand. It has been said that some of the preparations represent a very small cost, whereas the chemist's charge is considerably higher. The doctor is not responsible for that. No matter how cheap a certain medicine may be, there may be difficulties in dispensing it. As Mr. Lovekin mentioned, there was a grievous fatality through a dispenser making a mistake in a prescription. It is necessary to have men of the highest training as dispensers, and they cannot be obtained for the salary that would be paid to a young lady selling sweets. Reference has been made to the drugs put up by Parke, Davis & Co. and it has been said they are using the doctors as distributing agents, instead of advertising their preparations. If that be so, they should be complimented upon their discretion. The firm have large research laboratories upon which they spend a lot of money, and from whom better than the medical fraternity could they obtain an opinion as to the effect of their drugs upon patients? It has been mentioned that certain ingredients contained in the formulae on bottles do not appear in the "British Pharmacopoeia." I do not suppose the "British Pharmacopoeia" is a closed book. Doubtless, as a new drug is discovered, so its pages are open to re-

ceive it. Now I come to the most conflicting part of the question, the practicability of giving effect to this regulation without causing grave disability to the people of this State. We should not do anything to injure the people in the conduct of their business. The Leader of the House some time ago spoke of the futility of putting on the statute-book laws that could not be enforced. When Mr. Nicholson replies, I should like to hear him deal with the possibility of giving effect to the regulation.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	9
Majority for				5

AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. A. Lovekin	(Teller.)
Hon. G. W. Miles	

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. W. H. Kitson	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

BILL—CLOSER SETTLEMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. H. A. STEPHENSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.45]: It is my intention to vote against this Bill, which is unfair, unjust, inequitable and not in the best interests of the State. I am not in favour of a board of civil servants. If it is necessary to appoint a board let men outside the service be requested to carry out the work. Heads of departments are appointed for specific duties, and should not be asked to run about the country as members of boards and Commissions, etc. The Minister for Works has all the powers necessary for resumption of any land that is required by the Government. I am strongly opposed to Clause 7. That is a very arbitrary clause, and would have a very bad effect on settlers. Mr. Holmes went fully into this matter, and as I agree with what he said I do not intend to reiterate his remarks. Unless the Minister is prepared to amend the Bill along the lines suggested by Mr. Holmes, it is not my intention to vote for the second reading.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (South-West [8.47]: I have no intention of reiterating what I said before on this question. I have pointed out that the Minister for Lands has ample power under the Land Act without this Bill. I have also said that in the South-West division practically every estate adjacent to the railways has been offered to the Government. This Bill is an improvement on its predecessors in that it includes all lands with the exception of pastoral leases. I took strong exception, when the previous Bill was introduced, to the non-inclusion of conditional purchase lands, and I am pleased that these have been included in the Bill. Lands adjacent to railways in the extreme South-West would have remained entirely untouched by the previous measure. I do not know why the Government have found it necessary to introduce this Bill. I noticed when it was introduced in the Assembly the arguments of the Minister in charge of it were used by the present Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition, however, contradicted the Minister, and his own words were quoted against him. I went through the debate carefully, and to me that seemed to be an extraordinary position. It is unreasonable that the board should consist of an officer of the Lands Department, one of the Agricultural Department and a member who shall have a knowledge of the locality. I have yet to learn that the officers of the Lands Department have any special qualifications enabling them to decide whether or not land is being put to reasonable use. There is a reason for appointing an officer of the Agricultural Department, but that does not exist in the case of an officer of the Lands Department. The board will probably have its office in the Lands Department, and can at any time call upon any officer of the department for any information required. The whole of the information of the department is at the disposal of the board at a moment's notice. It may be argued that the board without having an officer of the Lands Department to direct it, would be somewhat at sea, but that argument does not hold water because the information would be at its disposal at all times. I fail to see how the board can show that a man is not putting his land to reasonable use. The ordinary individual is on the land to make a living, and the more he can make out of it the better he is pleased. Why should a man holding an area of land put it to some use that is unreasonable? I cannot follow that line of reasoning. If the board were to deal entirely with land left lying idle, well, and good, but the Bill distinctly states that any owner of a property, that is considered by the board not be put to reasonable use, can demand that the Government shall take over the whole property. He is not called on to hand over that particular portion not being used. A man may own 5,000 acres and be farming 3,000 acres. His banking account may not permit of his spending sufficient money every year to

make a very big show on the remaining 2,000 acres. Will the board be able to say that this man is not making reasonable use of his 5,000 acres and recommend that the Government should take it over? If that is done it will mean repurchasing a number of small estates. Every member who has studied the question must admit that the repurchase of estates for subdivision has proved a lamentable failure. Not one estate that has been repurchased, subdivided, and sold has not been written down very considerably. The only people who can be satisfactorily settled on repurchased estates are those with a certain amount of capital of their own. The Dardanup estate was recently purchased and subdivided. Mr. McLarty opposed the purchase except it was for subsequent sale to people with means. He said it had been proved that people could not be satisfactorily settled on repurchased estates unless they had means of their own. With regard to land upon which little or nothing has been done, except to comply with the Land Act, and purchased some time ago for speculative purposes, the Government can step in and use it with great advantage to the State. This is a far-reaching Bill. I am afraid, from my knowledge of the Avon Valley, where millions of acres that are not being worked are supposed to exist, that people will jump to the conclusion that these millions of acres are adjacent to existing railways. If members will study the plan, drawn by the surveyor who made the report, they will find that although that area of land exists a great deal of it is second and third class. What is worse is that it is dotted about all over the place, and there is not one tract of first-class country of any extent that can be subdivided. If the House decides to pass the Bill the personnel of the board must be altered. The objections that were raised when a similar Bill was introduced still hold good in some respects regarding this Bill. Of course the Minister has to approve the recommendations of the board before action is taken. The board is to consist of two civil servants and one outside man. It will be rather a case of "heads, I win" and "tails, you lose," so far as the outside man is concerned. Probably one of the lands officials will be chairman. The officer of the Agricultural Department and the other gentleman may come to a decision, but I would not be surprised if the chairman used two votes in order to beat them. Is it not more probable, however, that the two Government officials will stick together? This leaves the matter in an unsatisfactory position. I strongly advise the Government to reconsider the personnel of the board. The clause dealing with it is one of the most important in the Bill. Should the board make recommendations regarding a certain property, and the Minister approve, the owner is notified and may decide to subdivide it. After the board approves of the price and subdivisions, the blocks are put up for sale. Should there be no purchasers, who is to de-

fray the expenses incurred by the owner of the land? It is outrageous to suggest that the owner should be put to that expense without any recompense.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: In the last Bill we inserted a clause providing that the Government should reimburse the owner.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: And it is necessary for a similar amendment to be in the present Bill. Have the Government an idea that they can obtain possession of land at less than the true value by the exercise of the option to purchase on the values in the possession of the Taxation Department? I remember an interjection in this Chamber to the effect that if a man considered the unimproved value of his land to be £1 and the Taxation Department valued it at 15s., the individual was defrauding the State. That seemed to be a most extraordinary way of looking at it. The department made the valuation and apparently was satisfied that it was correct. A man should have a chance to put up his case in favour of an alteration in the land value before action is taken under the provisions of the Bill. Land may have increased considerably in value since it was assessed ten years ago. On the other hand, we know that money was advanced by the Agricultural Bank and spent under the direction of inspectors on land that has proved worthless.

Hon. T. Moore: There is no land here that is absolutely worthless.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I referred to the poorest wodge country which varies from worthless to medium. Through lack of knowledge, the officials advised the farmers to clear their land first. The result was disastrous to the farmers and bad for the financial institution involved in the transaction. There is another view of the question. A farmer may have sons anxious to make a living on the land. The holding is cleared gradually with that end in view. The father looks forward to the time when the boys become of age and when he will be able to subdivide the property, retaining a portion for himself and distributing the balance among his sons. It seems very hard indeed to contemplate that that father should be deprived of his opportunity to provide for his sons. Some of us are wealthy enough to put money by in investments, knowing that our children will be amply provided for after we are gone. The bulk of us, however, are not in that position, and therefore we try to make a home for our children on the land. Let hon. members picture the disappointment of the man who has struggled to pay his land rents for many years, putting in the best years of his life in clearing the holding and bringing up his family on the estate, when the land board comes on the scene and recommends the resumption of the estate so that it may be cut up and handed over to strangers. It is not right. That could be done under the terms of the Bill, if the board considered that the land was not being adequately used. We know

how hard it is to carve out a home in the South-West. We are told that men are disappointed because they cannot get land when inquiry is made for it at the Lands Department. I can assure the House that we could throw open a very considerable area of land in Western Australia without touching an estate at all. First of all we should comb out the country now under the control of the Forests Department. Unless the Leader of the House can inform me that it is the intention of the Government to have a close classification made of the so-called timber land I will not be able to vote for the Bill. That land is now under the control of the Forests Department, and the object of a classification would be to ascertain what land, immediately adjacent to a railway, might be made available for settlement. It is no good saying that the land has been set aside for forest purposes. Those of us who have studied the Act know that the object of the measure was to provide revenue for the Forests Department. Those of us who had the privilege of seeing the first draft of the legislation submitted by the former Conservator of Forests must have stood aghast at the temerity of any individual who attempted to foist such a measure upon the State. If the course I suggest be adopted, it will be found that large areas of land will be immediately available for selection. Then again, sons of farmers in the South-West are told, when they apply for holdings, that they cannot have the land because it may be required for group settlement purposes. I have no objection to the immigration policy, but we should look after our own people first. The Muirs pioneered some of the back country in the neighbourhood of Lake Muir. They penetrated miles and miles away from anyone and made a home in the back blocks. They suffered all the disabilities that pioneers have to labour under, and later on they found that their children could not get a few acres adjoining the old homestead because, forsooth, that land may be required at some future date for group settlement. I should imagine that our own people should provide the best type of settler. Sons of the soil with a little assistance from their parents or relatives will make more satisfactory settlers than the imported article. The immigrant has to learn everything, whereas the young man who has grown up on his father's holdings in the country must be in a better position to make good. At the present moment we find that class of would-be settler cannot obtain land. The unoccupied territory that I refer to comprises thousands upon thousands of acres south of Lake Muir extending down towards Nornalup Inlet. Despite that, men are refused holdings to-day. If the second reading of the Bill be agreed to, it will not be with my vote unless the Leader of the House is able to reassure me regarding the suggestions I have thrown out. I have always failed to realise the justification for

such a measure. The Mitchell Government introduced a Closer Settlement Bill, and now we find the present Government following suit. There must be some good in the legislation that I cannot appreciate. Some people have an idea that once the Bill becomes law large tracts of land will be thrown open for settlement immediately. I know of one estate only in the South-West that was not offered to the Government at a reasonable price. I admit it would be of benefit if the owner made that land available for purchase. In common with Mr. Moore I know that the estate will never be purchased under the provision of the Bill because there are about £40,000 worth of improvements on the estate and no one would think of purchasing an area of that description. I am afraid that if the Bill becomes law a great many people will be disappointed with the results. It may be that some people will be induced to spend a little more money than they are doing nowadays. The huge areas that are to be thrown open do not exist. If any extensive area comprising a million or two million acres is found to be available I am afraid it will consist for the most part of poor land, with the better areas so scattered as to make it a difficult problem to handle. I trust that when the Leader of the House replies to the debate he will do me the honour of replying to the several points I have made during my remarks.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Gray, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 1st October, 1924.

	PAGE
Questions: Sandalwood roots, oil distillation ...	1092
Agricultural lime, Bornholm deposits ...	1092
Railway Advisory Board's reports ...	1092
Mining battery, North End ...	1093
Bills: State Lotteries, 1R. ...	1093
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, report ...	1093
Bunbury Road District Rates Validation, returned ...	1105
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, Com. ...	1105
Leave of absence ...	1093
Motion: Overseas marketing, to inquire by Select Committee ...	1093

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

QUESTION—SANDALWOOD ROOTS, OIL DISTILLATION.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Forests: 1, Of the 600 tons of sandalwood roots available under the monopoly scheme, is it a fact that the original distiller, who first made sandalwood oil a commercial possibility in this State in 1914, was eliminated altogether in the distribution of roots by the Forestry Department? 2, Is it a fact that another firm, who commenced operations six years later, were granted a monopoly of all the roots, thus warding off competition? 3, Was the original distiller given any opportunity to put forward his just claim for consideration before the monopoly of roots was granted? 4, Is there not a note on the file by the Conservator of Forests agreeing to refrain from giving any such monopoly before allowing this distiller to put in his claim? 5, Is it not a fact that the original distiller in question was forced to use outside influence to enable him to obtain only one-sixth (namely, 100 tons) of the roots available to enable him to prevent the closing down of his works? 6, Will the Minister go thoroughly into this matter before making any arrangements for the distribution of roots for the ensuing 12 months, or for a longer or shorter period?

The MINISTER FOR FORESTS replied: 1, No. 2, No. 3, No monopoly has been granted. 4, Yes. 5, No. 6, Yes.

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL LIME, BORNHOLM DEPOSITS.

Mr. A. WANSBROUGH asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Owing to the shortage of agricultural lime, will he take into consideration the advisability of having an investigation made of the Bornholm deposits? 2, If these are found suitable for agricultural purposes, will he have a report prepared showing the approximate quantity available? 3, If the reply to No. 2 is favourable, will immediate steps be taken to have the lime made available by cheap transport?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, This deposit was investigated in 1915 by the Assistant Government Geologist—the late Mr. H. Woodward—who reported that there was an unlimited supply of low grade limestone available, but not suitable for agricultural purposes as it contained a high percentage of silica, which would render the resulting lime of little value as a neutralising agent. 2 and 3, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—RAILWAY ADVISORY BOARD'S REPORTS.

Mr. J. H. SMITH asked the Premier: 1, Has he received reports of the advisory board dealing with (a) railway communi-