

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 25th September, 1923.

	PAGE
Questions: Land grants, Coolup	808
Electric Light and Power Agreement Bill ...	808
Arbitration Court, particulars	808
Assent to Bill	808
Bills: Property, 2a.	808
Local Authorities (Additional Powers), 1a. ...	812
Lunacy Act Amendment, 1a.	812
Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders	812
Motions: Water Supply Department by-law, to	
disallow	813
Cancer, treatment at Public Hospital	821

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

QUESTION—LAND GRANTS, COOLUP.

Hon. H. STEWART asked the Minister for Education: 1, Have Messrs. Collins and Christmas each been granted a holding of about 5,000 acres of land near Coolup? 2, If so, (a) what was the date of approval of each application; (b) how are the properties situated with respect to the railway line; (c) on what terms was the land granted; (d) is the land suitable for establishing pastures of subterranean clover?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: A return showing the land held by Messrs Collins and Christmas has been laid by me on the Table of the House.

QUESTION—ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER AGREEMENT AMENDMENT BILL.

Hon. J. DUFFELL asked the Minister for Education: Seeing that the agreement which this House is asked to ratify by the Electric Light and Power Agreement Amendment Bill now before the House was entered into over two years ago, and that the work contemplated therein has long since been completed, will he inform the House what is the necessity for ratifying such agreement at the present time?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: The agreement which forms the schedule to the Bill varies the agreement with the Perth City Council which was ratified by the Electric Light and Power Agreement Act, 1913, and for this reason it has been considered desirable to submit it also for Parliamentary ratification.

QUESTION—ARBITRATION COURT, PARTICULARS.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Minister for Education: Will he lay on the Table of the House a return showing (1) The number of references of industrial disputes filed with

the Clerk of the Court of Arbitration that are awaiting hearing (a) by employers; (b) by employees; (c) the number of which issues have been settled; (d) the period in weeks that each reference has been awaiting hearing? (2) The number of applications for interpretation of awards awaiting hearing (a) by employers; (b) by employees (c) the period in weeks that each application has been awaiting hearing? (3) The number of citations for breaches of awards awaiting hearing (a) by employers; (b) by employees (c) the period in weeks that each citation has been awaiting hearing? (4) For the twelve months ended 31st August, 1923, the number of (a) industrial awards delivered; (b) decisions for interpretation of an award; (c) judgments for breaches of an award?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied that he had laid the return asked for on the Table of the House.

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to Supply Bill (No. 1) £1,790,600.

BILL—PROPERTY.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [437] in moving the second reading said: Members seem to have formed the impression that this is a formidable Bill. If they are still of that opinion after I have outlined its provisions, they may consider it advisable to refer the measure to a select committee. I have received from the Barristers' Board a letter acknowledging the receipt of a copy of the Bill sent for their consideration. The Bill introduced last session was also submitted to the board for consideration. Later on I shall make available the letter forwarded by the board which states that they, to a great extent, approve of the Bill but ask for time to consider it. I have replied acknowledging the amicable spirit displayed by the board and indicating that I have no desire to rush the Bill through the House. It is a big measure, and one of great importance. I have told them the House may consider it advisable to appoint a select committee, which would give some of the leading barristers an opportunity to state what amendments, if any, are considered necessary. Mr. Saver has given much consideration to the Bill, which, if carried, will prove of great advantage to Western Australia.

Hon. A. Lovekin: And increase the accounts of the lawyers.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is not what we are aiming at; our desire is to make co-ordinating easier. Last session a motion was moved by Mr. Duffell and seconded by me stating that, in the opinion of the Legislative Council it is of urgent necessity that the statutes should be revised

and consolidated. The law of property is an important statute and the passing of this Bill will be a step in the direction of giving effect to the resolution. The Acts and Ordinances relating to property and the practice of conveyancing are numerous, and go back to the reign of William IV. In the meantime, many reforms of that branch of the law have been made in England. This Bill, based on the measure read a second time last session, is introduced in furtherance of the resolution referred to and also with a view to making those amendments that are necessary to bring our law up to date with Imperial legislation which has for some years past been adopted in other parts of Australia, particularly New South Wales and Victoria and in New Zealand. Imperial Acts were passed in 1859, 1860 and 1874 to amend the law of property and relating to vendors and purchasers, and to simplify the title to land. These provisions from time to time were adopted or enacted by our Legislature. But the reforms introduced by Lord Cairns, Lord Chancellor of the Conservative Administration of Lord Beaconsfield, in 1880, and enacted in 1881 as an Act "to simplify the practice of conveyancing and for amending the law of property," and later amendments, although adopted in Australia, particularly in New South Wales and Victoria, and New Zealand, have hitherto not been enacted in Western Australia, although, as stated in the Encyclopedia of the Laws of England, vol. 3, page 586, "these important Acts have been generally adopted in almost every particular with admittedly beneficial results, and notwithstanding the length of time since their dates, no serious defect has appeared; and considering their wide adoption and application, the amount of litigation their provisions have given rise to has been small." In introducing the Bill of 1881 in the House of Commons, the Right Hon. H. H. Fowler said "It was a Bill of a purely technical character and was prepared by the Lord Chancellor (Earl Cairns) assisted by eminent conveyancers of Lincoln's Inn, and had the approval of the Incorporated Law Society. The details of the Bill related to the forms of conveyancing and would sweep away the redundancy of the present forms and abolish the large expenses connected with them." That, perhaps, supplies an answer to Mr. Lovekin. The aim of this measure is to reduce the work for lawyers, and to make conveyancing cheaper. That the provisions of these Imperial Acts are suitable to our local conditions is shown by the fact of their adoption in other States and in New Zealand, the Victorian Act having been in force since 1904. This Bill in no way alters the system of registration and dealings in land under the Torrens system (the Transfer of Land Act, 1893). That system was first introduced in 1874, from which date all Crown Grants have automatically become registered under the Act. Considerable areas of alienated land held under earlier titles continue unregistered, and it seems to be only right, in con-

solidating the law relating to such holdings, that it should be brought up to date and in accordance with modern legislation. But the Bill does not apply to registered land except where expressly provided. There are, however, some desirable amendments in the general law, as enacted by the Imperial legislation and adopted in Australia, which are equally applicable to registered land and to land under the earlier system, and these provisions, so far as they are applied to land under the Transfer of Land Act, are indicated in the text of the Bill. The general scope of the Bill and its divisions are set out in Clause 2. So far as the Bill is a consolidation of existing law, comment on its provisions is unnecessary. These provisions are indicated by the marginal references to the Act, the titles of which are set out in the first schedule to the Bill. The provisions of Lord Cairns' Acts are indicated in the margin by 44 and 45 Vic., C. 41, and 45 and 46 Vic., C. 39, and will probably be acceptable by the House without criticism, so far as it is also indicated by the marginal references that they have been adopted in New South Wales and Victoria. Lord Birkenhead's Law of Property Act 1922 (of which several provisions are adopted) is indicated in the margin by 12 and 13 Geo. V., C. 16. Part IX., dealing with easements, profits and restrictive covenants, however, is new, and extends to land under the Transfer of Land Act. The provisions of that Act on the subject are unsatisfactory, particularly as regards easements to be enjoyed by a registered proprietor over other land which is not under the Torrens system, or by the owner of unregistered land over other land which is under the Torrens system, and also as regards easements "in gross," that is to say a right of way etc., existing in its own right and not as appurtenant to the holding of adjacent land; and profits "a prendre" (that is "to take," such as the right to take timber, stone, etc., or access to water). These matters are dealt with, as I have stated, in Part IX. And as regards restrictive covenants, a clause is inserted from the New South Wales Act enabling the court to discharge land or to modify restrictive covenants when, by reason of changes in the character of the property, the neighbourhood, or other circumstances, the registration should be deemed obsolete, or the continued existence thereof would impede the reasonable use of the land without securing practical benefits to other persons. Part X., dealing with amendments of the Transfer of Land Act, is for the most part consequential. But Clause 163 deals with applications for the registration of a person as owner of land on a title acquired by adverse possession of land already registered under the Act. In some of the States, particularly South Australia, a person is unable to acquire any title by adverse possession if the land is already registered under the Act. Under our Act, however, as in Victoria, titles by adverse possession can be acquired. While retaining the law in that re-

spect, it is deemed necessary that the right of a person to be registered on a title claimed to have been so acquired should be put on a better footing, and therefore the section referred to has been introduced, but not to come into operation until the 1st July, 1926. Part XI. re-enacts the provisions of the Ordinance of 1856 relating to the registration of memorials, conveyances, mortgages and charges on land; but as regards the registration of certain encumbrances, such as writ of execution, Crown debts, pending actions (lis pendens), the provisions have been recast in Division 2 of Part XI., on the lines of the New South Wales Act, 1919, whereby these charges are required to be re-registered every three years. It is scarcely necessary to refer particularly to the provisions of the Bill in other respects at this stage. Any necessary explanation can be given in Committee. But the Bill is one which it is desirable to proceed with from the point of view alone of consolidation; and it would obviously be undesirable to re-enact in a consolidated form our existing statutory law as adopted from Imperial legislation when so much has been the subject of reform by later Acts passed by the Imperial Parliament and adopted in Australia and elsewhere. The foregoing seems to me a very careful exposition of the Bill, and when members read it in cold print it will enable them to grasp the exact effect of the measure.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: What was the reply of the Barristers' Board?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I will read it—

I have the honour by direction of my board to thank you for your courtesy in causing copies of the amended Property Bill now before the Legislative Council to be forwarded to my board for its consideration. These copies I have made available for my members, and have also invited the assistance of leading conveyancers in the profession with a view to ascertaining the scope and effect of some of the changes in the law introduced into this State by the Bill. At a meeting held to discuss the alterations introduced by the Property Bill it was agreed that in many respects the measure introduces salutary and useful amendments of the law. Difficulties, however, presented themselves on close examination of some of the sections, which call for a full consideration at the hands of practical experts in this branch of the law. Conveyancers present were unwilling to express a definite opinion as to the effect and result of these sections without further consideration and discussion. This Bill is a lengthy and complicated measure, and introduces far-reaching changes in the law existing in this State. The law of Property Bill recently passed in England has been postponed in its application till 1st January, 1925. The far-reaching importance and length of the Property Bill, as well as its technical nature, call for a much fuller consideration than the professional experts have been able to devote to this

measure in the short time since it has been available in its present form. In the opinion of my board this Bill is of such importance as to require a very full and expert investigation in the public interest before being placed on the Statute book. I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant, Reginald H. Goodman, Secretary of the Barristers' Board.

Hon. A. Lovekin: After that, do you propose to go on with the Bill?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Certainly. I think the board's letter is most satisfactory. They say the Bill will have a good effect on legislation. I propose that the measure shall have the consideration desired. My suggestion is that the Bill should pass the second reading and then go to a select committee, when the Barristers' Board will have an opportunity of going fully into the subject. We have in this House a lawyer, and he perhaps will go on the select committee.

Hon. H. Stewart: Are the Government asking for a select committee?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No, certainly not.

Hon. H. Stewart: I thought it appeared so.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No. I was merely expressing my own opinion, in reply to Mr. Lovekin's interjection. I caused the following communication to be sent to the Barristers' Board:—

Re Property Bill. I am in receipt of your letter of the 24th inst., and am pleased to know that the Barristers' Board regard the Bill as introducing salutary and useful amendments of the law. It is not my intention to hasten the stages of the Bill. On the contrary, it is my desire that its provisions should receive due consideration. The Legislative Council will, I have no doubt, think fit to refer the Bill to a select committee, which will afford the board ample opportunity of suggesting such amendments as may be deemed advisable. I am aware that the 1st of January, 1925, was fixed for the commencement of the Imperial Law of Property Act in view of its provisions assimilating the law of real and personal estate, abolishing copyhold and other special tenures, and amending the law relating to intestacy, etc. The few clauses adopted, however, do not, it seems to me, make such changes in the law as those provisions of the Imperial Act which led to the postponement of its commencement, and with which this Bill is not concerned.

After the careful manner in which the Solicitor General has gone into the matter, and has impressed upon me the great importance of the measure, I could have no desire to rush the Bill through. The Solicitor General himself has no desire whatever that the consideration of the Bill should be hurried.

Hon. H. Stewart: This Bill is a good deal different from the Property Bill of last session?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. The Bill has been considerably simplified, the object being to get hon. members out of the state of disquiet in which they seem to have been with regard to the subject. Mr. Lovekin appears equal to dealing with any question of law that arises in this Chamber, and if he would act on a select committee, together with others members of business acumen, we could get the measure dealt with effectively. I commend the Bill to the House because I have confidence in the man who drafted it. I am sure that he would not desire to alter the law of this country unless he knew that the alteration would be beneficial to the people. I do not profess to be a lawyer, and the question is a technical one beyond my scope. I trust that when the Bill is in Committee here, I shall be able to answer any questions which may be raised. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [4.58]: I desire to move the adjournment of the debate to this day month.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Make it this day six months.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Very well. I move an amendment—

That the word "now" be struck out, and "this day six months" be added to the motion.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [4.59]: I support Mr. Nicholson's amendment, mainly on the grounds which the Minister himself has supplied. It is perfectly apparent from the speech delivered to us on this Bill that the Minister himself knows very little about the measure.

The Minister for Education: I know a good deal about it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Minister has simply read us a report which has been prepared for him, and which does not touch the points at issue in any way. The Barristers' Board tell us that they want more time for consideration, and that the measure is one which contains useful and salutary amendments of the law.

The Minister for Education: Quite right; it does.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Minister has not touched upon one of those amendments, or shown us where the changes are coming in as regards the law.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It covers the whole of the law.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Well, I should like a little detail about the salutary amendments in the Bill, for those amendments require a good deal of consideration. For instance, in future, no Transfer of Land Act title will be a safe title. Under the Bill we shall be able to put into agreements all sorts of conditions outside the title, and it will not be necessary to register them on the title. Certainly that is an amendment requiring to be looked into. That it is an important Bill,

involving many changes in the law, is to be seen from the fact that Lord Birkenhead's Bill, in England, specially provides that it shall not come into operation until January, 1925.

Hon. H. Stewart: The Minister told us 1926.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is only for one part of this Bill. Lord Birkenhead's Bill is not to come into operation at all until 1925. They in England are looking into it. There is to be published a book on the subject, entitled "Topham's New Law of Property." I desire to have that book before I am called upon to consider this Bill in Committee. I am supporting Mr. Nicholson's amendment with a view to getting a little more time to look into the Bill. This is a responsible Chamber, and after we have passed the Bill we shall send it to another place with our hall mark upon it. As a member of this Chamber, I do not wish to send to the other Chamber any legislation that has not been properly and fully considered by us. If we attempt to pass the Bill this session, we shall be doing something that will bring us no credit, because the Bill seeks to effect very drastic changes in the law of property, and ought not to be passed without the fullest consideration. As I have said, in England the importance of Lord Birkenhead's Bill is shown by the provision that it shall not come into operation until 1925, the idea being to allow the lawyers to consider it in the meantime. Moreover, so important is it considered, that Mr. Alfred Topham, K.C., is writing a text-book on Lord Birkenhead's Bill, or Act as it now is. According to the publisher's notice, Mr. Topham proposes to point out in his book what is the old law, that is to say the law repealed or altered before the new Act takes effect; he proposes to tell us what the law before 1925 is; he proposes to tell us the new law, that is the law to prevail after January, 1925; and he proposes further to tell us the existing law, as it will be left unaffected by the new Act. When we get that text-book and study it in relation to the Bill before us, we shall have a better idea of what we are doing than we can have now. That book is not yet available, but in a few months we shall be able to get copies of it and so do better work. I looked into the Bill of last session, but I have not paid much attention to this revised Bill, because I relied on the promise of the Government that the Bill would be referred to the legal profession and their report obtained before we considered the measure at all. During the recent short recess the Bill has been referred to the Barristers' Board. The time that has elapsed is not sufficient for lawyers to grapple with it, let alone a number of laymen such as we are. The Barristers' Board say they want more time for investigation.

The Minister for Education: And we are quite willing to give it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The time we can have during the present session is not sufficient for anyone of us to thoroughly comprehend the

Bill. Last session I proposed this to the Minister's predecessor: Let us hand the Bill to the Barristers' Board and the legal profession, and before next session, during the recess, let us have copies of it with their suggestions, so that we may have due time in which to consider it. Yet nothing has been done. The Bill is again brought up with the intimation that the Barristers' Board require more time for investigating it. I have here a few notes, with which, however, I will not weary hon. members, because we can the better go into them when we come to discuss the Bill in Committee.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: But we should like to hear the hon. member's views on the Bill.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not know that I am prepared to discuss the Bill at length, for I have not had time to go through it.

Hon. H. Stewart: The hon. member is speaking to the amendment now, not to the Bill.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is quite true, and the amendment is asking for further time. I have not had time to do more than take up 20 clauses of the Bill. I find that they require much looking into. In those 20 clauses are drastic amendments, some of which I doubt whether hon. members will subscribe to. Suppose I wished to dispose of my property in such a manner as to provide for my wife during her lifetime and, after her, for my child. The Bill says that, no matter what one may do about this, after 21 years have elapsed if the settlor has not seen fit to make any other disposition, the property goes wholly to the wife, the child being left out. But, in the course of 21 years, the wife may marry again, and the child may be left stranded. That is an alteration of the law proposed by the Bill. I do not know whether it is a good alteration.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Which clause provides for that?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Clause 9 reads as follows:—

(1) No person (in this section called a settlor) shall settle or dispose of any property so that the income thereof shall be wholly or partially accumulated (a) for any longer period than (i) the life of the settlor; or (ii) twenty-one years from the death of the settlor; or (iii) the minority of any person who shall be living at the death of the settlor; or (iv) the minority of any person who under the trusts of the instrument directing the accumulation would for the time being, if of full age, be entitled to receive the income so directed to be accumulated. (b) For the purchase of land only, for any longer period than that mentioned in sub-paragraph (iv) hereof.

I do not know whether that is good. It is one of the things we require to look into. Further, we have the Transfer of Land Act, under which people can get an indefeasible title. It is not a good thing to do anything that will affect an Act of that kind. When

a man receives a Certificate of Title he knows that it is good against the world, and I do not want to see another Act passed that may contain conditions that will affect the value of such title. We should have more time in which to consider all these matters. If this Bill can be brought down next session we shall be able to get the benefit of the book to which I have referred, and gain more knowledge of the subject. It is obvious the Minister has not the grasp of the Bill that he should have.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I move—

That the debate be adjourned until October 9th.

Motion put and passed.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Local Authorities (Additional Powers).

2, Lunacy Act Amendment.

Received from the Assembly.

BILL—RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT OF MAINTENANCE ORDERS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short Title:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Has the Minister received any communication from the Crown Solicitor as to this Bill?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I consulted the Crown Solicitor, and I find that the amendment the hon. member desires to make is unnecessary, because it is already covered by the law as it stands.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I consulted Dr. Stow, who informed me that the Bill was intended to give two strings to the bow. I pointed out that the Inter-State Destitute Persons Relief Act, 1912, was identical with the Bill and was in force at present, and that this Bill would mean practically duplicating the law. It seems undesirable that we should duplicate Acts of Parliament dealing with the same subject, especially as the present Act is working well. The Act of last session was intended to apply the Inter-State Act to Great Britain. This Bill now provides that the law shall apply to every State, and thus bring it on all-fours with the Inter-State Destitute Persons Relief Act. Most of the cases dealt with under this law are those of poor people. The law is used, when a man leaves his wife and children, to obtain the money that he will only give when pressure is brought to bear upon him. If the Bill is passed as it is, there is a danger that the man who has left his wife in this State, and against whom an order has been taken out, may refer to a solicitor in one of the other States and be told that the Act itself has been impliedly

repealed by this measure, and he may therefore escape. This will leave a loophole for persons to get out of their just liabilities. Mr. Sayer promised to look into this matter and communicate with the Minister. He was inclined to agree with my view, rather than that of Dr. Stow. It would be better to report progress.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The matter is certainly worthy of consideration. Hardships may arise as suggested by Mr. Lovekin. There is such a thing as repealing an Act by implication. It would be desirable to look further into the question.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I cannot accept the suggestion that by implication an Act of Parliament can be set aside. This is a very simple Bill, and members should not have cause to worry over it. Under it people can be followed throughout the British Empire if they fail to do the right thing. It makes the way easier.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Just the opposite.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member knows everything. It will be easier to follow and punish the wrong-doer. I do not think Mr. Lovekin's point is worthy of consideration. We should go through the Committee stage to-day, and the Bill can be recommitted later if the Crown Law Department think an amendment is necessary.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Minister claims that the Bill will make the process simpler; speaking from practical experience, it will be the reverse. The Inter-State Destitute Persons Relief Act provides the machinery for collectors in each State. Orders are sent to them and the money is collected. Under the Bill there is no machinery, and we have to make it.

The Minister for Education: You can use the other machinery.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: But this amends the other Act.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: In any case, we cannot take the machinery under one Act and make it apply to another measure, unless the Parliamentary consent of those concerned has been obtained. Nothing of the sort has happened. We should see that legislation we pass is workable, and we have operated under the workable legislation in existence. The Bill will not be workable. No orders can be sent to England to be given effect to, because there is no machinery. The Minister says it is nonsense to say that an Act of Parliament can be overruled by implication. Such a ruling has been given over and over again. If the Minister consults "Maxwell on Interpretation of Statutes" he will find that time after time, Acts have been overruled by implication. I want to avoid anyone setting up the defence that we are acting under this legislation, whereas the Act has been repealed by implication. In any case, I ask the Minister to consult the Solicitor General who has expressed views in accordance with those I have mentioned.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is strange that if the Solicitor General has

expressed views as suggested by Mr. Lovekin, he has not brought them under my notice.

Hon. A. Lovekin: He said he would look into the matter again.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is strange that the Solicitor General has not mentioned such an important point to me. However, I will consult him and, if necessary, I will recommit the Bill to deal with this clause.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 to 5—agreed to.

New clause:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That a new clause be inserted as follows:—“Section 2 of the principal Act is hereby amended by the deletion of the word ‘other’ in line 4 of the definition of ‘superior court.’”

The definition provides that a superior court means “the High Court of Justice in England, Ireland, or Northern or Southern Ireland, or the Court of Session in Scotland, or any court in any other part of His Majesty's Dominions,” and so on. It has been pointed out to me that the inclusion of the word “other” may lead to complications. Its appearance in the Act was due to an oversight.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move—

That progress be reported.

The amendment has not been placed on the notice paper, and it may be more important than would appear on the surface.

The Minister for Education: You cannot make a speech when you move to report progress.

Motion put and passed; progress reported.

MOTION—WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT BY-LAW.

To disallow.

Debate resumed from 11th September on the following motion by Hon. A. Lovekin:—

That By-law 132 (4a) made under the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act, 1909, be and is hereby disallowed.

Hon. G. POTTER (West) [5.40]: Members are quite justified in viewing this by-law with a considerable amount of concern, if not with a great degree of apprehension. I do not know definitely by what process the departmental accountants have arrived at the rate to be charged, but it would certainly appear that the process has been inspired by a wish to save losses, or to guard against a departmental deficit. That is a very laudable object, but I propose to show by a simple and brief analysis that, while the object is a laudable one, it is misconceived in its application. While it is necessary to make good the losses or to guard against them, that process should

not be at the expense of something that is the life-blood of the community. I refer to industries. Mr. Lovekin dealt somewhat exhaustively with the system of accounting as between the water supply and the sewerage services. I shall not proceed to elaborate or reiterate the irrefutable logic he indulged in, but I hope the House will refuse to permit the perpetuation of these anomalies occasioned by the inconsistencies of this by-law. A comparatively few months ago the metropolitan folk were charged with having developed an aesthetic taste.

Hon. H. Stewart: In water?

Hon. G. POTTER: In the application of it. I cannot understand how, if the department or the Minister in charge of it, find fault with the people demanding and praying for a water supply and attribute that fact to an aesthetic taste, they can adopt that attitude. I cannot see how they can adopt that attitude simply because the voice of the people who asked for water has been stilled for a little time. How long it will be stilled, time alone will prove. Here we have an attempt made to balance the account as between water supply and sewerage, and that attempt is at the expense of industry. I know well there is something in the old adage that "all work and no play, makes Jack a dull boy." At the same time, Jack must have implements with which to play. When we look around and see the amount of water used when industry is starved and hampered by the Water Supply Department, it is time to cry a halt and not make too much of a god of play or sport. If we take the position of industry in this State, we realise it is like an army attempting to advance somewhere, its destination clouded in uncertainty, its flanks exposed, and its rear menaced. That is the position of industry here. An army in such a position finds itself eternally on the defensive and as eternally on the offensive. This by-law must at all times be on the defensive, and, at the same time, on the offensive as regards industry. If industry is to be allowed a defence, and we are prepared to allow it a reasonable measure of success, we should pause before we allow this by-law to be agreed to. There is no hon. member who has not pledged himself to the advancement of secondary industries during the last few months. When we remember what the great economists tell us, we realise that the country that has the nucleus of mechanical energy at a cheap rate—in this case we will say Western Australia—will be the country that will succeed. I assure hon. members that gold production is not the only industry that will benefit a country. There must be a plentiful supply of water and cheap energy. We have in Western Australia coal which is comparatively cheap. But what is the good of cheap coal if we cannot get cheap water, because coal and water are undoubtedly closely allied in the operations of our trade. We find to-day that some industries are being hampered in their expansion. It is not sufficient for an industry to maintain its position; it must advance in competition with

similar industries in other States and other countries. Let me deal with one specific instance. Mr. Lovekin mentioned wool scouring. We have from time to time—and we shall be doing it again in the comparatively near future—stumped the country preaching to the people the necessity for the manufacture of the raw material and export of the manufactured article. Only recently the country was stumped on the subject of the establishment of woollen mills and we heard everywhere that it was important that we should take the wool from the sheep's back, convert it into a manufactured article here and export that article. In Fremantle a strenuous effort has been made to carry on wool scouring operations, and the work that has been done in that direction has been comparatively successful. From the nature of this particular trade, it must be recognised that water plays a very important part. The industry, however, is hampered in competition with similar industries in the Eastern States by reason of the fact that elsewhere water is supplied at 1s. per thousand gallons, whereas in Fremantle the cost is 2s. 6d., and even then the industry is not receiving that water for which it pays.

Hon. E. H. Harris: How is that?

Hon. G. POTTER: By the same process that gave such inferior water to North Perth—on one day it was clear as crystal and on the next day was of very bad quality. The water at Fremantle was so bad that a considerable quantity of wool had on one occasion to be scoured a second time. That of course was detrimental to the wool. Any company that sets up operations at Fremantle is forced to go to considerable expense in laying down their own connections from the mains, and this, too, in spite of the fact that the original cost of the water is so much higher than that charged in any other part of Australia. To combat misadventures like the one I have referred to the wool-scouring company has been obliged to expend a good deal of its capital in erecting tanks for the storage of water, not because they fear a shortage at any time, but because they are not getting what they are actually being charged for. That is a serious accusation to make, but it is nevertheless true.

Hon. A. Lovekin: They pay for hills water and they get bore water.

Hon. G. POTTER: The industry to which I have referred is not the only one that is suffering in this respect.

Hon. H. Stewart: Which wool scouring works are you referring to?

Hon. G. POTTER: I do not know exactly how the hon. member would like me to define these works, but I would be delighted to take him over them. We hear frequently the cry about the need for secondary industries in this State, and we also know of people drawing attention to the success of Australia and to some extent Western Australia, in this direction, and the specious argument being used that there are large sums of money deposited in our banks. But I doubt very much the wisdom of quoting this as a proof of

the success of our industries; it would be better if this money were all invested, because, while it remains as it is, it is withdrawn from industry. Those people in Fremantle who have established an industry for the development of our natural resources, by virtue of having to invest their capital in the erection of mills, pumps, tanks and so on, are compelled to withdraw from their capital the money involved in that expenditure. In that way the expansion of the industry is prevented and the State suffers accordingly. We also hear the cry occasionally that the shipping lines should come direct to Fremantle, and make it the first and only port of call in Australia.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: The people of Bunbury do not say that.

Hon. T. Moore: Or Geraldton either.

Hon. G. POTTER: I do not intend to enter into a discussion as to whether it should be Geraldton or Bunbury. At the same time whichever the port may be, let the water supply be such that it will be possible for those engaged in the industry to compete with similar industries in the other States. Some people will say, "Do not cry stinking fish against your own State." But healthy criticism cannot be misconstrued as disloyalty to Western Australia. It may be said that though the charge for water is high, it is nothing in comparison with other costs that have to be incurred. While however, the charge may seem small as an individual item, in the aggregate it means a big amount. It may be regarded as considerable by say a board of directors sitting in London. They would have in view the fact that the charges at the port of Fremantle are about 300 per cent. higher than at least one other Australian port. That fact in itself would have some influence. Therefore I contend there is scope for a reduction in the price of water. I am speaking from facts as I know them. Again, let us take an ice factory. In Fremantle there are several very large ice making establishments, and by virtue of the quality of water that is being supplied the amount that has to be allowed for depreciation is excessive. In this respect the manufacturers of ice at Fremantle are very much worse off than those at Perth. I do not wish to be termed parochial, but it is necessary to make these comparisons. For the reasons I have given I heartily support the motion to disallow the by-law.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [5.55]: The hon. member who has just resumed his seat appears to have made out a good case and the views he has expressed are very largely in accord with my own. I assure him there is no desire on the part of the Government to impose such a high price for water as to interfere with the development of industry. Hon. members, however, know that there is a shortage in the supply of water, and when the difficulties are overcome the position will be very different. I appreciate the arguments

advanced by the hon. member. I have spoken similarly in this House. I have always taken the view that we should endeavour to help industries in every possible way, especially in the direction of supplying cheap energy and cheap water. It is the desire of the Government to reduce the price of water as soon as it is possible to do so in order to encourage its use for manufacturing purposes. Unfortunately at the present time we cannot encourage the use of excess water for the simple reason that we have not an abundant supply. The Government are making every effort to meet requirements. Hon. members have referred to the quality of the water supplied to residents of North Perth last summer, and they spoke as if it was the fault of the Minister for Works. It was an act of God; the Minister for Works was not to blame.

Hon. A. Lovekin: He put down the bores.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Why not go to the hills for water?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Water from the hills will be given to the people as soon as possible.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: We have heard that for the last 20 years.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The difficulties of last summer made it imperative that we should secure an increased supply without delay and the Minister for Works put down certain bores hoping to get potable water. If that had been obtained all would have been well. He was unfortunate in striking water which was not of a satisfactory nature. The hon. member will admit that last year the Minister for Works spent a great deal of money in an endeavour to get a supply of potable water for the people of North Perth.

Hon. A. Lovekin: He did not tell the public that.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am stating on behalf of the Government what the position is regarding the North Perth supply, and I am stating that the Minister for Works cannot be blamed.

Hon. J. Duffell: If the Minister for Works had been given the money he wanted a year or two before there would have been a different state of affairs last summer.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: If the money had been found two or three years ago the cost of carrying out the work would have been excessive.

Hon. J. Duffell: And what about the sufferings of the people?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The people would have had to pay interest on that heavy expenditure. At the present time money is cheaper and the cost of material is less. That is the position in regard to the metropolitan water supply. When the facts are clearly placed before the House members will find that in not one single assertion was Mr. Lovekin right.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You deny the departmental report.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It would not be necessary for me to speak at

length but that I feel it my duty to protect the department administered by the Minister for Works. I am pleased to take the opportunity to defend my colleague. In September, 1922, Mr. Lovekin moved that certain by-laws be disallowed, including portion of by-law No. 132 relating to prices for excess water for domestic and trading purposes. The motion was carried. In October, 1922, by-laws were again approved by Executive Council without amendment. Subsequently Mr. Lovekin moved that by-laws Nos. 69, 131 and 132 be disallowed, but he succeeded in striking out only by-law No. 132. The question at issue was the price of excess water for domestic and trading purposes and sports grounds. The amended by-law No. 132, reducing the price of domestic water only, was approved by the Executive Council in May, 1923. That portion of the old by-law dealing with the price of water for trading purposes was not altered. That may be a strong indictment against the Government.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The House said it should be altered.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It was amended in certain directions but not in the direction in which the hon. member now desires to amend it. Mr. Lovekin now wishes to disallow by-law No. 132 (4a) reading—

Trading and all other services not otherwise specified, 1s. 6d. per 1,000 gallons.

Mr. Lovekin said that twice last session this by-law was disallowed. The reply is that the by-law has been amended since it was last submitted. That portion relating to water for trading purposes has not been altered, but the price of domestic excess water has been reduced. Seeing the House passed the resolution, it may seem wrong on the part of the Government to take up this attitude, but I think the Government did right. They should be given time to thoroughly and efficiently supply the city with water before being asked to reduce the price of excess water.

Hon. H. Stewart: The hon. member said the Government supplied water for sports grounds at a lower rate than for industries.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is quite right.

Hon. H. Stewart: The House does not approve of that.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I shall deal with that point.

Hon. H. Stewart: We want to make sure that you do.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The price of domestic excess water has been reduced, which means a loss of £891 for 1922-23 and £2,000 per annum for subsequent years on the present rate of consumption.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Nothing of the sort!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member has no right to contradict my statement. It is useless for him to make assertions that he cannot prove. He has not made out his case.

Hon. J. Cornell: Have the officers made an estimate of the increased consumption as a result of the reduced price?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is not so much a question of revenue. I am compelled to touch upon these points to prove that the metropolitan water supply is losing money at present.

Hon. A. Lovekin: No.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I shall prove it. Let the hon. member try to prove my figures wrong. Until members know the position, they have no right to say I am wrong.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Page 23 of your own report shows it is not so.

The PRESIDENT: I ask hon. members to allow the Minister to make his statement without interruption.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: If the price of excess water were reduced, the consumption would be considerably increased, and that would be a serious matter to the people as a whole.

Hon. H. Stewart: You removed the anomalies by increasing the price to sports grounds.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Sports people do not use water in such quantities as it is used by industrial concerns. Mr. Lovekin said, "If under these regulations a bowling or cricket club, or a golf course requires water, it can get it for 9d. 1,000 gallons excess." The price stated by the hon. member is not correct. The charge for sports grounds is 1s. per 1,000 gallons, and it has to be remembered that these grounds are for the public benefit and there is no danger of sports organisations using more water than is necessary. Their funds are limited and they have to conserve their funds. But for industrial purposes—

Hon. H. Stewart: They waste it for industrial purposes!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member is not serious. He should not suggest that the Government do not wish to supply the water. They desire to supply it and reduce the price.

Hon. H. Stewart: And improve the quality.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No doubt industries would use more water if it were cheaper. But they might use so much as to embarrass the general consumers of Perth during the coming summer.

Hon. H. Stewart: You are justifying the price now.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: If the price were reduced to 1s., naturally they would use more, and for some time the Government cannot encourage the consumption of too much water. If they did, there would not be sufficient for domestic use. Mr. Lovekin also said, "We were told last session, when the Minister opposed us, that the average price of water was more than 1s. That may be so, but it cannot be taken into account, because this is dealing with excess water. The cost of pumping the water into the mains is under 2d. per 1,000 gallons."

Hon. A. Lovekin: According to your reports it is 1.86d.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION :

The reply to the hon. member's statement is that 2d. per 1,000 gallons includes only the actual cost of pumping, that is the cost of coal, stores and wages, but it does not include interest on the cost of pumping plant, bores, rising mains from pumping stations, reservoirs, reticulation and, in fact, all works that make supply possible.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is exactly what I said.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : No, the hon. member said the cost of 2d. covered all those items.

Hon. A. Lovekin: No, I said excess water.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : It costs as much to pump excess water as other water.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Nonsense!

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : The hon. member is not reasonable.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What about the overhead charges?

THE PRESIDENT : I cannot permit these argumentative conversations to continue.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : Interest charges are rapidly increasing on account of extensive works required to give an adequate supply. In addition, administrative expenses have also to be included in order to arrive at the cost of water per 1,000 gals. Mr. Lovekin specially refers to the cost of pumping excess water. What difference is there in delivering excess water as against water allowed for rates? I could understand there being a difference if we had to pump a million gallons as against half a million gallons. The hon. member must admit that the cost of 2d. per 1,000 gallons was quite outside the mark.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is correct.

Hon. J. Cornell: What is the amount?

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : I shall give the figures. I have dissected Mr. Lovekin's speech and I desire to quote his statements and give a specific reply to each. Mr. Lovekin said—

It was also pointed out that the metropolitan water scheme was showing a loss. It is making a loss merely on paper. There is really no loss at all. The accounts are put up, as many other Government accounts are, I am sorry to say, with a view to camouflaging the position—

That is a serious charge to level against the department—camouflaging the position. To place incorrect figures before the public would be highly improper.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I did not say "incorrect"; I said "camouflaging."

THE PRESIDENT : I ask the hon. member not to interrupt the Minister.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : Camouflage means incorrect.

Hon. J. Cornell: No, it means to obscure.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : It would be highly improper for any department to put up a statement that was not clear and explicit, and it is also improper to state that the figures were put up in such a way that any person of average intelligence could not

understand them. I am sure the Minister for Works would not for a moment tolerate such a thing.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is not what camouflaging means.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : What does it mean? It does not mean that everything is straightforward. It suggests a smoke screen, something that will deceive the public. I contend that the statement was not justified. The hon. member went on to say—

The accounts are put up, as many other Government accounts are, I am sorry to say, with a view to camouflaging the position, so that the department may be used more or less as a taxing machine. The accumulated loss spread over a number of years is £29,653. . . . None of the loss is due to water. . . . There is a loss of £92,688 due to sewerage operations.

My reply is that at the 30th June, 1918, the accumulated surplus on water supply, sewerage and drainage was £16,721. During the four years ended 30th June, 1922, there has been a loss on water supply of £18,855. The figures for the respective years are—1918-19, £1,692; 1919-20, £6,691; 1920-21, £3,729; 1921-22, £6,743.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is summarised in the report.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : These are the correct figures.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Then why print the report?

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : On sewerage the loss was £26,961, and on drainage £558, making a total of £46,374. Therefore, taking into consideration the accumulated surplus at the 30th June, 1918, the net loss to the 30th June, 1922, was £29,653. The loss on water supply for 1922-23 was £8,289 and the estimated loss for 1923-24 is £18,000, while the estimated surplus on sewerage for 1923-24 is £800. That is a reversal of the position as stated by Mr. Lovekin. The loss of £92,688 on sewerage operations referred to by Mr. Lovekin was for the period 1911-12 to 1921-22. There is no camouflage about those figures. They are perfectly straightforward. It is obvious that increased interest on account of new works must be met and if the revenue does not cover these charges, deficits must increase.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Your balance sheet shows that the revenue does cover those charges.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION : I wish to read what the hon. member said regarding a cheaper supply of water to the manufacturers of butter—

I admit that the metropolitan area will have to pay, and that this loss has to be made good, but it should not be made good at the expense of any industry, and it should not be made good at the expense of consumers of food supplies. I am told—I do not know if the statement is accurate, but probably Mr. Boan can enlighten us on the point—that on an average butter

is 2d. per pound more than it should be, due to the cost of water used in the refrigerators.

To me it is not clear how the price of extra water can to any great extent affect the cost of the butter. On analysing the figures, one must recognise the truth of my declaration that if the charge for water could be reduced to any material extent, there should be a corresponding reduction in the price of butter; that is, if the cost of the water is in any way a cause of the high price of butter. Without mentioning names, let me refer to three of the most important firms in the butter trade, whom I will describe as No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3. Firm No. 1 has in 12 months consumed 388,600 gallons at 1s. 6d. per hundred, costing £29 2s. 11d. Firm No. 2 has in 12 months used 367,900 gallons at 1s. 6d., costing £27 11s. 10d. Firm No. 3 in the 12 months has used 2,022,300 gallons at 1s. 6d., representing a total cost of £151 13s. 7d. If the price of the excess water were reduced from 1s. 6d. to 1s. per hundred, the total reduction to the whole of these firms would mean £70 per annum. It must be remembered also that refrigerators are used not only for butter but for a great number of other foodstuffs. Working the matter out, one will find that the extra cost of butter, due to the difference in the price of excess water, is a remote decimal of a farthing.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We do not know that it is anything at all, unless you give us the quantity of butter.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The difference seems to be like the German mark.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Calling to mind the foodstuffs other than butter which are involved in the calculation, one must recognise that the reduction is infinitesimal.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The amount you mention represents 2d. per pound on over 8,000 lbs. of butter.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Now I come to an important point. The hon. member said—

There is another point of interest, for there is an amount of £23,225 outstanding on account of rates and excess water charges as against a total loss of £29,000. From that one would infer that if the £23,225 had been collected last year, there would have been no loss at all. That is what the hon. member contends.

Hon. A. Lovekin: No. I contend that then the £29,000 would have been diminished by £23,000.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In that there is a difference of only a few thousand pounds. I contend that the hon. member has not made good a single point.

Hon. J. Duffell: Didn't you support the disallowing of the by-laws last session?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is beside the point. However, in fact I did not do so. Mr. Lovekin contends that the £23,225 collected from metropolitan water

supply would have gone towards eliminating the £29,000.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There is no doubt about that.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: An amount of £23,225 was outstanding on account of rates, and is included in the revenue account; and the loss of £29,000 is arrived at by taking this asset into consideration. If we did not collect the £23,225, the loss would be £52,225. The two amounts are not relative to each other. The loss of £29,000 is based on accrued income and expenditure, and not on cash receipts and expenditure.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But should not the amount of £23,225 be shown in the balance sheet?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Probably it should. The hon. member can find it. His argument, however, is not sound, and goes by the board. I will read another extract from his remarks—

Here again is a very peculiar position regarding the metropolitan water supply; it differs much from the position in connection with the Goldfields Water Scheme. The metropolitan scheme has to shoulder £388,261 worth of debentures, the interest charges on which amount to £15,837, and the sinking fund charges to £17,671. It will be seen that the sinking fund charges represent more than the interest payments.

The capital of the department at the 30th June, 1922, was—water supply £1,309,262, sewerage £669,752, and drainage £294,990; a total of £2,274,004. Of the amount of £1,309,262, debentures on the State Savings Bank were issued before the 1st July, 1912, for an amount of £676,676; that is, Perth and Fremantle £602,947, Midland Junction and Guildford £71,954, and Armadale £1,775; these three amounts making the total of £676,676. After the 31st June, 1912, all capital expenditure was financed from General Loan Fund. The apparent discrepancy which worries the hon. member is that in respect of these debentures we are paying more towards sinking fund than for interest. In regard to the debentures issued before the 30th June, 1912, for water supply, it was established that for the year 1912-13, and for future years, provision for redemption of the debenture water capital would be made by calculating one per cent. of the total issue, adding to this the amount of interest saved by previous redemptions, and appropriating a sum equal to the total of these amounts to immediate redemption of outstanding debentures. By this method complete redemption would be effected in about 41 years. Now the water supply capitalisation is £1,309,262. Of this amount £676,676 represents debentures obtained by the old metropolitan board. Those debentures are redeemable in 41 years' time.

Hon. A. Lovekin: What is the good of saying that when the accounts show £388,000 worth of debentures outstanding?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member does not give me time to

come to that point. The whole of the capital of £1,309,262, carries a sinking fund of 1 per cent. Half-yearly one per cent. of the total debenture capital, the one per cent. representing £6,804, is taken from the sinking fund for the purpose of redeeming debentures. Therefore the debenture capital is being gradually reduced, and thus interest is saved on the redeemed debentures. The interest saved on redeemed debentures is paid to the sinking fund, so that the amount of one per cent., being the £6,804 previously referred to, will be available every half-year until the expiration of 41 years, when the whole of the debenture capital will be paid off. If the sinking fund is not augmented by the saved interest, then the sinking fund will run dry long before the expiration of 41 years. The saved interest on redeemed debentures, which is paid into the sinking fund, is calculated at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and 4 per cent. The effect of this is that the contributions to the sinking fund increase because of the increase in the amount of redeemed debentures, and that interest charges decrease because the amount of unredeemed debentures becomes less. This is the point Mr. Lovekin wants. The unredeemed debenture capital at the 30th June, 1921, was £388,260, and the amounts payable for 1921-22 were therefore as follows:—One per cent. sinking fund on the original debenture capital of £676,676, £6,804; special sinking fund of $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 per cent. interest on redeemed debenture capital of £288,416, £10,870; making the total sinking fund payment for the year £17,674.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is not charged on £700,000 when you have only £388,000 outstanding.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I said that on the £676,676 one per cent. is charged for 41 years, and that amount is carried forward every year in order to meet the redemption obligation in 41 years. The total sinking fund for the year is £17,674, which would appear to be a very heavy charge, greater than the interest; but that amount has to be raised each year at one per cent. on the total capitalisation of the Metropolitan water supply, including the £676,676. The payments are made half-yearly in order to redeem a certain amount every half year. The interest on £388,250 is £15,830. That ought to make the position clear to the hon. member. We are paying one per cent. on the debentures as originally issued, in order to make up the sinking fund, which is responsible for paying off half yearly the amount necessary to reduce the debentures under the conditions of issue.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Is not that loading the water charge?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is carrying out an obligation entered into when the money was obtained. If the loan be not paid off in 41 years they will not have carried out their contract. The hon. member said that a tremendous lot of work is done by the Government and charged up to the Metropolitan water supply. That is not so. The Government maintain, independent

of water supply and sewerage installations, drainage schemes at various Government institutions. In all those instances the actual cost of maintenance is paid by the departments, State or Commonwealth, concerned, plus overhead charges.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Do you say there is no free work?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No; it is all paid for, either by the Commonwealth or by the State departments.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There is no free work at all?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There may be some—I am not clear on that point—but it does not obtain to the extent the hon. member would have us believe. The hon. member said he would charge 1s. per thousand gallons for excess water for industrial purposes, so that industry might be encouraged. That is very laudable, but the position does not render it practicable. If the charge were reduced from 1s. 6d. to 1s. per thousand gallons for excess water, there would be a loss for the financial year 1923-24 of £4,580 which, added to the estimated loss for the whole scheme of £18,000, would mean a loss for the year of £22,580.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Then you are going to lose all your revenue.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member endeavoured to show that we were not making a loss. I say we are making a loss, which in itself justifies us in maintaining the charge for excess water at 1s. 6d. per thousand gallons.

Hon. T. Moore: And the general taxpayer will have to carry the loss.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Exactly. The scheme itself ought to carry that. The hon. member was right in saying that we have at Loftus-street and in Fremantle approximately £40,000 worth of pipes and general stock carrying four per cent. interest, which means £1,600 per annum. The Metropolitan Water Supply has to pay 4 per cent. to the Treasury for the money in that stock. It is a fair charge on the Metropolitan Water Supply. The hon. member would have us think that a large stock ought not to be carried. It is not likely the Metropolitan Water Supply would carry on without having spares and necessary material on hand.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But £40,000 worth year after year!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is necessary to keep up to the required standard. It would not be advisable to have the stock reduced, for that would set up a dangerous position.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Does the hon. member's proposal mean a subsidy to city industries?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not see where the subsidy comes in.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: In the reduced price of water.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I suppose it would be so. The hon. member

thinks he could save this £1,600, but I say it is necessary to have the stock there, and therefore to pay interest on it. Mr. Lovekin said that big pipes are being laid mile after mile past vacant areas to supply distant parts, and that the water would not be required for many years.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I said the volume those pipes could carry would not be required for many years.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In Fremantle alone presently there will be supplied from 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 gallons per day. Those big pipes are necessary owing to probable increased population. They are portion of the proposed hills supply scheme to Claremont, Cottesloe, North Fremantle and Fremantle. Hon. members representing that province will realise the importance of the scheme.

Hon. G. Potter: People have been waiting for it for years.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have already explained why it has not been carried out before. If the big pipes had been purchased two or three years ago and the work then put in hand, it would have cost two or three times as much as it will cost today.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But according to these reports you have had the pipes in stock.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member is always making some such discovery. If the money had been expended a few years ago, so much greater would have been the interest, sinking fund, and the cost of water. The 30-inch main will begin at the King's Park reservoir, and extend to Swanbourne, where it will junction with a 24-inch main towards Fremantle. This main is designed to give 5,000,000 gallons daily to Fremantle. As soon as the hills water scheme is in working order it will enable the pumping stations at Claremont and Fremantle to be cut out, and will also enable Fremantle and the shipping to be supplied with hills water direct from Mt. Eliza. Surely that is a satisfactory position!

Hon. G. Potter: But the people are complaining about the price.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It all depends on the expenditure. If the expenditure were not so great, there would be no necessity to charge such a high price. I ask hon. members whether they do not desire this work to go on. Is it not satisfactory to think that these pipes are being laid down, and that the people of Fremantle are to get hills water within two years? The 24-inch main on the south side of the river is to go from Melville Park and junction with the 36-inch main at McIntosh's bridge on the Albany-road. It is expected that within a couple of years the hills water will be available. Therefore it is necessary to make due provision now.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Is that the Upper Canning scheme?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You say in two years. The Premier said in five.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: At any rate, we require to have a large quantity of water available within two years. The hon. member must have known that the Government were not wasting money in putting down these pipes on the other side of the river. There is special work in hand, and we all look forward to the day when the hills water will be available. I believe it will be within two years.

Hon. A. Lovekin: In two years time it is estimated that there will be 2,000,000 gallons from Churchman's Brook.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: And there are other schemes. The hon. member will find that the Government are so determined to give the people of Perth and Fremantle a proper and adequate water supply that they will use all expedition, and consequently it is likely that the supply will be very much augmented within two years. The hon. member said he considered "two per cent. a reasonable sinking fund charge." A sinking fund of one per cent. is provided for all capital expenditure. Earning four per cent. interest this will redeem the capital outlay in 41 years. I intend to oppose the motion. The member who moved it, and also Mr. Potter, have in view exactly the same object as have the Government, namely to give sufficient cheap water as soon as possible for the carrying out of industrial works. We are losing a considerable amount of money every year on the water supply. We will go on losing that until the hills supplies are available. It is the intention of the Government to do then all they possibly can to assist industrial works, but they cannot at present encourage the use of a great deal more water than is being used. One argument is that if we were to reduce the rate for excess water to one shilling we might double the quantity used. That would be splendid if we had lots of water available, but under existing conditions it might not be fair to citizens of Perth and Fremantle. The Government would be delighted if to-morrow they could reduce the price of excess water to one shilling. They realise they have responsibilities outside that. They also think that the people who use the water in the metropolitan area are those who should pay for it. It is not reasonable to ask the general taxpayer to pay for a reduction in the price of excess water.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We are not suggesting that the general taxpayer should contribute.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: If we are making a loss we are building up the deficit and the general taxpayer has to pay.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We are not making a loss.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is for the hon. member to prove that my figures are wrong. I maintain firmly and decidedly that we are making a loss.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Your report proves what I say.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member had better try to combat my figures. I ask the House to make inquiries to see whether what I have said is true or not. Let us have the thing thrashed out. We are going to make a loss of £13,000 on the metropolitan water supply, and if the motion is carried a further loss of £4,580 will have to be added. If there is a loss of £22,000 odd the general taxpayer must pay.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Four thousand pounds odd is the total value of the industrial water sold.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: If I happen to be a member of the Government when the hills water scheme comes in, I shall be happy to know that the Government will reduce the price of water as early as possible for the encouragement of industries. I ask members to hesitate before voting for the motion, because it means putting a heavier tax upon the general taxpayer.

Hon. T. MOORE (Central) [8.3]: I have been interested to hear so much about the metropolitan water scheme, but have been struck by the fact that whilst reference has been made to industries in the metropolitan areas, nothing has been said about those in the country districts. If there is going to be a certain low rate to apply to the metropolitan water scheme for industrial purposes, that should also apply to industries that are being carried on elsewhere in the State in those places where the Government have a scheme of their own. In Geraldton the Government have installed a water scheme where the rate for industrial and domestic use is 3s. per thousand gallons. Geraldton is an important port in the State, but the people there who are asked to carry on industrial enterprises are at a disadvantage compared with the metropolitan area. That is something the Government should take into consideration when they are talking of having a special water rate for industries in the city. Besides butter works at Geraldton, it is proposed also to start freezing works there. Both these enterprises will mean the use of a lot of water. If the frozen meat industry in Fremantle is going to be handicapped in regard to the price of water, to a still greater extent will the handicap be felt by the people of Geraldton who are supposed to compete with Fremantle. The Government are called upon to foot the bill if they do not make these different schemes carry the burden, but the general taxpayer, who pays for Government schemes in other parts of the State, will be called upon to pay his proportion of the loss in water supplies to industries in the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane. We are called upon to pay our share too.

Hon. T. MOORE: All parts of the State should get a fair deal.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We are going to give the goldfields £40,000.

Hon. T. MOORE: The price of water for the goldfields will be a long way above that which the hon. member desires to see for the

metropolitan area. Even then the price of water on the fields will be about 2s. 6d. a thousand gallons instead of 1s. 6d. That is for industrial purposes.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We are not objecting to that.

Hon. T. MOORE: If we are going to shoulder the responsibility of giving the advantage to the city, the principle should be extended to such places as Geraldton and other industrial centres.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We have no objection to that.

Hon. T. MOORE: Before I vote for any reduction in the metropolitan area I shall want an answer to my query. We know that a loss of £13,000 has been made in the city.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Nonsense!

Hon. T. MOORE: I am prepared to accept the Minister's statement. As a rule these estimated losses generally turn out to be greater at the end of the year than appears to be the case half way through the year. I object to the general taxpayer being called upon to pay for the water used in the metropolitan area, where the people are expected to enter into competition with the East, unless the principle is applied fairly throughout the State.

On motion by Hon. W. Carroll, debate adjourned.

MOTION—CANCER, TREATMENT AT PERTH HOSPITAL.

Debate resumed from 12th September on motion by Hon. A. J. H. Saw—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the Perth Hospital should be equipped with the modern X-ray apparatus necessary for the treatment of cancer by the method known as "deep therapy."

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [8.7]: I shall not have much to say in reference to the motion, not that it is unimportant, but I am not as competent as I should like to be to deal with this question. The matter has been before the House on several occasions through the instrumentality of Dr. Saw. He has several times spoken in an earnest manner upon the subject that is so dear to him. On looking through the files I notice that, in conjunction with some of the leading medical men of the State, he approached the Premier and put up a good case and received from him a most sympathetic reply. It is a matter for congratulation that we have in the House a medical man of such high standing in the profession as Dr. Saw. It is an advantage to us to hear him speak and receive first hand information upon the important questions with which he can deal so well. Mr. Colbatch last session, after Dr. Saw's speech, placed on record his high appreciation of the work done by that hon. gentleman. His desire was to give him every assistance in his power. There has been some sort of idea—I do not think Dr. Saw really believes it—

that the Principal Medical Officer is not quite as earnest in the matter as Dr. Saw would like. I read Dr. Atkinson's report of 1922. It is very satisfactory. He did not consider that the investigations into deep therapy had gone far enough to justify the Government in expending the large sum of money necessary for the installation of the X-ray apparatus required by Dr. Saw. He said there were other directions in which the money could be more beneficially spent at that time. His most recent report, which I received after Dr. Saw had moved his motion, expressed practically the same view, except for the fact that the price of the apparatus and installation would be very much lower. I do not want the impression to get abroad that Dr. Atkinson is opposed to the installation of the apparatus. He desires to see everything done that can be done in this direction. The Government have given close attention to the matter. They realise the ravages of the dread disease of cancer. Anything they can do, though it may seem to some people not to be justified, they are prepared to do if by spending money they can save lives. We know what a terrible thing cancer is, and what a great benefit it would be to the world at large if it were possible to find a cure for it. From the statistics available it hardly a household that is really free from it. The disease is of a far reaching nature must be apparent to members that there is and a terrible one. We as a Government, and the people as a whole, are most desirous of everything possible being done to alleviate the troubles of humanity in this direction. There is not a great deal known of the process of deep therapy, but the investigations are still going on. The position is more encouraging to the Government now than it was 12 months ago. The improvements in connection with deep therapy and X-ray treatment are more advanced and effective than they were then. I am more inclined, therefore, to support the motion for that reason. Another important factor is that the danger to the operator is practically eliminated. Some 18 months ago it was considered dangerous to operate with the X-ray apparatus. It is now understood that this phase of the question has been eliminated. There is, however, a danger from over dosage, but this difficulty it is thought can now be fairly definitely overcome. I desire to assist Dr. Saw in every possible way. Some 18 months or two years ago the cost of the apparatus was perhaps twice as much as it is to-day. It can now be purchased for about £1,500, whereas at the period I speak of it would have cost £2,500. There are more expensive machines running up to £2,500 which a year ago would have cost about £5,000. The process is a very expensive one, although nothing is too expensive when it comes to the question of saving life. At the same time it must be admitted that to carry on operations successfully, it would be necessary to have a qualified operator for the whole of the year. The services of such a man could not be secured under £1,000 or

£1,500 a year. That is a small amount to pay for a man of such high qualifications as are necessary for this work.

Hon. J. Cornell: If he saved five or six lives in a year it would be worth it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I would agree to that if he saved one life. That is the remark the Premier made to me when I spoke to him on this subject. He said, "If one life is saved, it will be well worth the expenditure." I think Dr. Saw will be satisfied that the Government are in earnest in their desire to assist in this direction. The general cost of upkeep is not ascertainable, but X-ray tubes alone cost about £75 each and have a life of from 50 to 90 hours. That is not a long time and it must be apparent to hon. members that it will not be a cheap process. It will be costly indeed. But even if it is costly, it is right that the Government should obtain the plant. It is said that the tubes alone for the treatment of each patient cost from £8 to £10. That is a considerable amount. In addition to that, repairs and depreciation of the plant generally will have to be taken into consideration. That item will be a considerable one, too. Roughly speaking, maintenance cost will be about £1,000 per annum, but that, of course, will depend on the number of cases treated. Roughly, the annual cost to the State will probably be from £2,500 to £3,000. With the other items I have mentioned the cost to the State will be probably from £3,000 to £4,000. The percentage of deaths in Western Australia from cancer was 7.94 in 1920, 7.99 in 1921, and 9.54 in 1922. Hon. members can see what terrible ravages this disease is making in our midst and how necessary it is for the Government to support any move that will reduce the death rate, which is indeed high. Roughly speaking, I understand that one in every eight persons 30 years of age and over who died during the year ended 30th June last succumbed to cancer.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: And it is an increasing death rate.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is so. Moreover, it is not a notifiable disease, so the proportion of sickness caused by it is not known. Cancer does not show itself and one cannot tell how it is affecting one's system. With all the wonderful things that have been done, as Dr. Saw has pointed out, it has not yet been possible to reach the root of the trouble. An Australian medical congress is to be held very soon and the Principal Medical Officer, Dr. Atkinson, is to attend that gathering. No doubt this question will come up for discussion and Dr. Atkinson will be able to report to the Government on whatever he ascertains from the discussions there. The Government desire to do all in their power to deal with this important question. I wish to point out—Dr. Saw will realise it, too—that while the Government do not oppose the motion, which I desire to see carried, they will in the future, and as early as possible, do all that can be done. It must be realised, however, that in the outlying dis-

tricts of the State we are experiencing considerable trouble regarding medical attention, hospitals and other matters coming under that heading. The expenditure entailed is considerable indeed and there is a limit beyond which we cannot go. The Government, however, will not make that an excuse for not carrying out the work dealt with in the motion. I do not desire to say any more except to thank Dr. Saw on behalf of the Government for having brought this matter forward and to assure him that it will receive the earnest attention of the Government. Wherever it is shown possible to save life, whatever the cost may be, provided it is within reason and within the power of the Government, such as, for instance, the expenditure upon this X-ray plant, it shall be done.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [8.21]: I would not have said anything on this motion had the Minister been more definite in his statement to the House.

The Minister for Education: What do you want that is more definite than I have said?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Minister says in effect that the Government support the motion and that they will inquire and see what can be done. As I consider this matter very important, I do not desire to wait any longer. Last session the Minister said that we should wait and see what other people were doing with their experiments and then we might do something. I hold we have as good medical skill in Western Australia as elsewhere, if the medical men had the backing by means of medical appliances and opportunities that doctors have elsewhere. I am sorry to say that our medical men have not those opportunities. They have not those appliances in Western Australia to enable them to cope with diseases, such as are available elsewhere. Our people suffer from ailments and when they ascertain the fact they usually consider they must go to Collins-street, Melbourne, Harley-street London, or North-terrace, Adelaide, in order to consult specialists. There is no need for them to go elsewhere because we have doctors equally skilled as those to be found elsewhere. The only trouble is that they have not the appliances at their disposal and we do not give them the same opportunities as those elsewhere. We spend tens of thousands of pounds in some directions, yet we cannot afford to spend money as suggested by Dr. Saw. I will mention one avenue of expenditure that apparently we are able to afford. I would instance the Wyndham Meat Works. We pay up to £5 for Wyndham bullocks and thus give a subsidy of £2 or £3 per head to pastoralists and squatters. We make a loss on that deal. Apparently we can afford that expenditure, but what about provision for suffering humanity so that we can cope with some of these malignant diseases? It is time we risked this expenditure and did something for suffering humanity. That is why I advocate something being done in that direction at once. There will not be such a great loss, but

even if a total loss is experienced, we shall have done something for humanity. Let me get away from the motion for a moment and give the House some information regarding the ordinary X-ray plant that we have at the Perth Public Hospital. I will give hon. members an illustration why it is necessary to have up-to-date plant available here, so that our medical men can have the same opportunities as are available elsewhere. Not long ago there was a lady in Perth, known to many hon. members who were in the habit of going to her library to procure books. For years that woman suffered excruciating torture. Apparently nothing could be done for her. Two operations were performed but nothing was achieved. She sold her business and thought she would get relief if she consulted a specialist in London. She went there and in the first instance she was charged 150 guineas for an operation which was carried out by a fashionable gentleman in Harley-street. For five weeks she was in a private hospital. As a result of that operation she got no relief. She had another operation which cost her £80. Again no relief was experienced. She was then X-rayed by an expert roentgenologist in England who pronounced her sound, nothing being wrong with her. Then she went to a French specialist and he told her that no surgical operation was required, but merely a few powders which he would provide and which he assured her would give her relief. She paid 10 guineas for the powders and they seemed to make her worse. Her money having gone, and no relief from pain having been secured, she considered the next best thing was to go back to her friends in Australia. When she landed at Fremantle from the boat her ill-luck seemed still to dog her. The friend to whom she was coming left her a note to say that she had gone to Singapore, where her daughter was to be married, and would not be back for five or six weeks. When my family heard about her plight, they asked her to stop at my house. She did so. When she sat on a chair she would often get off and writhe on the floor. She could not sleep on a soft bed so we had to get some hard planks and blankets to enable her to sleep. I watched the lady as well as I could. I did not know what was the matter with her. She saw a couple of doctors here, but they could not do anything for her. I looked up some of the medical books—I meddle with things I do not understand much about—in order to see if I could localise her complaint. I found something in the medical works which appealed to me as a possible cause of her trouble. I told her that at the Perth Hospital there was a first class X-ray plant which was one of the best procurable and asked her if she would consent to be X-rayed, telling her that it might be that there was some little pressure on the spine or something of that sort. She agreed and then told me that she had been X-rayed in England. She had paid 12 guineas for the privilege. She brought down a sketch which showed a drawing taken

from an X-ray film. She said it showed a distended gall bladder. I told her that I knew something about that as I had seen a lot of X-ray work and photographic work generally. I had never seen, however, anything like what she showed me. I asked her where the film was. She said that the specialist had not given her the film, but simply the drawing. I said, "To my mind that is all tarra-tiddle." I asked her if she would go to the hospital and get X-rayed. She agreed to do so and next morning we sent her to the Perth Hospital. The first photograph showed a stone in the woman's kidney which was about an inch in diameter, about $\frac{3}{4}$ in. thick and around it there were teeth like those on a circular saw. This stone was embedded in her kidney. She was taken to Dr. Ambrose and he sent her to the hospital that night. Next day he produced the stone from the woman's kidney. She was in the hospital for a few weeks and recovered her health. She has had no pain since and she has now gone to Sydney quite a new woman. It was a mere chance that this happened to that woman. Had she been X-rayed six months before at the Perth hospital, in all probability they would not have seen that stone, because the old style of X-ray plant would not have shown stones of certain compositions. For instance, phosphates and urates would not be detected and oxalates and calcium carbonates would show up. Here we have a woman who visited the specialists I have named, and who, if the plant had been available in the first instance at the Perth Hospital, would have been saved all the expense and suffering that she underwent. Thus we see the advantage of having such an up-to-date plant. The existing plant is only of use for taking photographs and for examining fractures. It is no use for treatment purposes, as the rays are not sufficiently short in length to give high penetration. And it is this higher plant that Dr. Saw referred to that does give some measure of a ray which will make the required penetration. The evidence I have been able to collect shows that where growths are superficial, this high frequency plant will give relief in 85 per cent. of cases. Where the trouble is deep seated, such as cancers in the abdomen, the rays cannot penetrate, and then they are not effective. The percentage of successes then is very low. I feel sure that if the late Lord Forrest, who had a malignant growth on the temple, had been subjected to treatment by such plant—if there had been a plant of that description in Perth—his life might have been saved. We might even have saved the life of the gentleman who destroyed himself the other day because he thought he had a cancer in the ear. If we had a plant such as that we could at least have given that man some hope. A friend in Melbourne wrote the other day to my wife that she had a cancerous growth in the breast, and that it had been diagnosed as such. I suggested that before she submitted to an operation she should consult Dr. Glendenning and see what he could discover with his treatment plant. I

do not know whether I am going outside the etiquette of the profession by disclosing names—it may be excusable in this instance. This lady called on Dr. Glendenning, and he gave her three sittings of two and a-half hours each, and cleared up the whole of the cancer. I could give hon. members quite a number of instances of similar successes, which are referred to in medical journals which I have here. All show that this particular plant is highly effective in a majority of superficial cases. Dr. Saw mentioned the other night that this treatment had been used for 10 years. I think he was rather in error there, because the later plants have come into use only during the last five or six years.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: I think I said since 1916.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: There is no doubt that high voltage plants were used then, but not to the same extent as since the introduction of the Coolidge tube which splits up the ray and lets out only the true X-ray. It was at one time supposed that all rays from these tubes were X-rays. The modern idea, however, is that only 10 per cent. of these rays are the true X-rays, and they are not really rays at all, but a heavy gas, and 90 per cent. light rays. The Coolidge tube, due to the target in it, splits up the light ray from the X-ray and allows the X-ray to come out, and thus you get the higher penetrative force. If you could get an improved style of Coolidge tube so that it would stand a still higher bombardment on the target, you would split the rays in shorter wave lengths and probably be able to deal with abdominal growths which are not amenable to treatment at the present time. Still, that is a matter for experiment, and it seems to me there is no reason why we should not experiment just as much in this State as they experiment anywhere else. Give us a plant and it will be found that we have men here of equal ability to those elsewhere, and that they will be able to make experiments which will result in relieving suffering humanity. I have here a paper on cancer therapy by Isaac Levin, of New York, who says—

The latest developments in the X-ray therapy, which have taken place in the course of the last five years consist first, in the construction of X-ray machines which produce 200,000 volts and more in the secondary, and of X-ray tubes which can withstand the high voltage input.

That is in five years. I have a picture of one of the plants here which hon. members may look at. The question of cost comes in. I have particulars of the cost of the plant similar to that which Dr. Glendenning recommended for purchase by the Melbourne Hospital. There is no doubt about it that the cost is high, but I say that the question of cost has no right to come into the matter at all when we are dealing with suffering humanity. If we can throw thousands of pounds into the sea here and there, surely we can afford a few hundreds of pounds to relieve

pain and suffering. I have an estimate of the cost of a suitable plant, which reads—

The deep therapy machine suitable for operation on 250 volts 40 cycles alternating current, complete with all controls (automatic) costs £1,357. This price includes special treatment table, special Coolidge tube and tube box as shown in the accompanying photograph. . . It is necessary when ordering a deep therapy plant to also arrange for the supply of deep therapy X-ray tubes. The life of these tubes is estimated at 90 hours. This information is absolutely authentic and has been obtained from an actual user. The maximum total cost of treating a patient exclusive of the cost of labour is £2 per hour.

That would be about the amount in the Melbourne case which I quoted, plus, of course, the doctor's fee, etc.

In addition to the above equipment it is necessary to have an intensimeter, a leaflet of which we enclose herewith. The price of this is £58 and, further, the cost of installation has to be added to the above figures, and is approximately £50, bringing the total cost of a deep therapy plant, complete with everything that is necessary, including a spare deep therapy Coolidge tube, to £1,550 delivered and installed at the hospital, and including expert tuition and demonstration.

In the early days it was necessary to insulate the room, but I believe by covering the walls with sulphate of barium you get excellent protection at practically no cost. So that we could get a complete plant for £1,550 and the treatment cost, exclusive of the operator, is £2 an hour. The amount is negligible when we consider the possibilities of effecting cures and giving relief. There have been many cures in superficial cases. Dr. Hadley, who is known to many members, contributes a paper to the *Medical Journal of Australia* of the 30th June last, in which he writes—

I maintain, however, that in certain respects greater assistance should be given to the profession in order to allow medical practitioners to exercise to the fullest extent their ability to cure or to bring back to near to normal certain of their patients with whom they have to deal. The assistance should be given by the public, who are the direct beneficiaries. The public cannot expect the profession to supply the expensive apparatus, organisation, and trained assistance necessary. . . . Vast sums of money are being spent on the war against these diseases, and we hope and believe that victory is not far off. In the meantime, are we not, whilst engaged on this front, allowing a most serious inroad to be made on another without taking any measures to stem it. How often one hears of some man who got his arm jammed a year ago, but his fingers are still too stiff for work, or one who broke his leg and is getting about

on a stick while the insurance company is still paying him. In the Perth Hospital alone last year 446 fractures and dislocations necessitated X-ray examination. I wish I could give the figures for such injuries in the whole State. They must be very large. . . . Some scheme should be worked out by which patients who do not need nursing could be housed while attending the orthopaedic centre. After the X-ray examination many could return to their own homes, to come in again later for final treatment when the bone was firm.

Let me conclude by quoting Dr. A. T. Nisbet, as reported in the "*Medical Journal of Australia*" of the 17th March, 1923. He spoke on the same lines as I have been urging, namely, that if the plant is valueless, it still holds out some hope to patients in trouble and pain, and the experiment—call it experiment, if you like—is well worth the money that may be spent upon it. Dr. Nisbet is reported thus—

He considered it almost criminal in these days of advanced X-ray knowledge not to give a patient operated on for cancer the benefit of this form of treatment. Even if deep ray therapy did not come up to some of the more optimistic expectations, there was a feeling that it was going to aid the surgeon considerably, and that the outlook from the patient's standpoint would be a much brighter one. . . . There were still many critics among the medical profession regarding X-ray therapy in cases such as Dr. Meyers had shown, but Dr. Nisbet wondered, if these critics some day found themselves affected with this dreadful scourge, whether they would not wish for the "slender" chance which deep X-ray therapy would give them.

I think that sums up the whole case for this plant and I ask the Government to say not only that they will consider it or will wait and see the result of experiments in other parts of the world, but will resolve to risk the few thousand pounds necessary and give the medical men of this State an opportunity to do their work as I am sure they wish to do it, and to give poor, unfortunate, suffering humanity at least some ray of hope or measure of relief.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [£50]: It is with a good deal of diffidence that I speak on a subject of so highly technical a nature, but the House and the country generally owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Saw for bringing before us such an important matter. I agree with Mr. Lovekin; the reply of the Government was not as satisfactory as we would like it to be. There seems to be a conflict of opinion between the P.M.O. and a large number of members of the medical profession as to whether deep therapy has got beyond the experimental stage. From the speech of Dr. Saw, it is clear that the Council of the British Medical Association favour the installation of the apparatus he wishes to see ob-

tained for the hospital. I understand the senior staff of the hospital also favour it. If the apparatus be not installed at an early date, some better reasons than those given by the representative of the Government should be advanced.

The Minister for Education: I did not say we will not do it at once.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I would like to hear the Minister say they intend to do it at once. It is twelve months since the P.M.O. adopted this attitude, and I am surprised there should now be any hesitancy on his part, seeing that such a period has elapsed. From all I can learn, the system of deep therapy has unquestionably been attended with considerable success in various parts of the world. The other day, according to a cable message published in the Press, Dr. Monckton Copeland, head of the Ministry of Health in England, said that one person in every seven of middle age died from cancer. From the figures quoted by the Minister to-night, it is quite clear that cancer in Western Australia, in common with most other parts of the world, is increasing. He quoted some figures showing that the death-rate for cancer was about seven per thousand, but the latest figures are over nine per thousand. Cancer is a disease of middle age and of old age, and everywhere cases are becoming more and more numerous. From the remarks of the Minister it seems that the capital cost of the apparatus would not exceed £1,500, and I take it the upkeep would not exceed £2,000 or £3,000 a year. In view of the comparatively small expense for the vast amount of good likely to be done, surely there should not be any hesitancy on the part of the Government. The Minister spoke of a medical congress to be held at some date that he did not mention.

The Minister for Education: In October.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I gathered from the Minister's remarks that the Government intend to await the decision of that conference.

The Minister for Education: I did not intend to convey that.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Then I am glad to hear that the Government have definitely decided to give effect to Dr. Saw's wishes.

The Minister for Education: I did not say that, either.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: If the Minister did not say that, the only possible meaning one can put on his words is that the Government intend to delay the matter for further consideration.

The Minister for Education: I said the Government are considering it now.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I would like to hear a definite statement that the Government have decided to proceed with the proposal immediately. The Minister is going to support the motion, but of what use will it be to carry the motion if the Government do not act upon it immediately?

Hon. A. Lovekin: They have been considering it since last session.

The Minister for Education: It is a good thing to get a vote in favour of it.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: The motion has not been sprung upon the Government without notice because, as Mr. Lovekin pointed out, it was before the House last session. So there has been ample time for the Government to give the matter full consideration. Meanwhile there have been cases, such as that referred to by Mr. Lovekin, of the man who had cancer in the ear. Cases of the disease appearing in various form are occurring constantly all over the State. I hope the Government will make up their minds speedily, and act upon the proposal without delay. By doing so they will recognise what a great scourge cancer is, that it is increasing yearly, and that for the comparatively small cost entailed the amount of good that is certain to ensue will be well worth while.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban—in reply) [8.57]: I thank the Minister for the sympathetic consideration I understand the Government propose to extend to the motion. At the same time I agree with Mr. Lovekin and Mr. Kirwan that it would have been much better had the Government said definitely at this stage that they did intend to go on with the installation of this plant. I thank members, those who have spoken in the House and some who have spoken to me privately, for the considerable support they have given my proposal. I did not intend to make any attack upon the attitude of the P.M.O., but I do think he was not unduly enthusiastic over the proposal, and I gather from the remarks of the Minister that that is his present attitude. Where I do join issue with him is in this: in throwing cold water on the proposal he was actuated by the opinion that there were other directions in which Government assistance was highly important as, for instance, in getting a pathologist, and in other directions both for country hospitals and for the Perth Hospital. I agree with him that these proposals are important, but I joined issue with him in regarding them as being more important than the question of cancer treatment. Since I mentioned this matter on the Address-in-reply a little over a year ago, there have probably been in the neighbourhood of 250 deaths from cancer in this State. Some of those people might have been saved and a good many of them might have had their suffering considerably alleviated. When I have spoken regarding the effect of deep therapy, I have tried to avoid the use of the word "cure." I have said that the growth has disappeared; and that, I think, is all we can claim at present. Medical men do not like to use the word "cure" either after they have operated on a case of cancer, or when it has gone through any other form of treatment, until at least five years have elapsed since the time of the operation or the disappearance of the growth. It is apparent that this treatment was only started in 1916, and

that it has become extensively used in the world only since some time after the Armistice. Therefore we have not yet had sufficient time to claim that these cases are cured. But we can say that the growth has gone. Whether it will come back again is another matter.

Hon. A. Lovekin: At any rate, it has cleared out.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The growth has disappeared, and no trace of it is left. Of course cancer cells may already have become dissipated in the deeper parts of the body, such as the liver or the lungs, where they may give rise to secondary growths. In Melbourne, besides two private practitioners having this apparatus installed, there will in a week or so be a double apparatus installed in the Melbourne hospital, capable of treating two patients at the same time. In Sydney two private practitioners, I know, have the apparatus, and according to my informant, there is a proposal to establish a central organisation where a plant, or several plants, will be installed capable of coping with the work from all the hospitals in Sydney. Now on the question of the expert who will be required to work the apparatus. No doubt, if we can get a man already skilled, so much the better. But if we cannot do that, I fail to see why a man already used to the ordinary X-ray technique should not, by study and by reading the quite full descriptions already given of this treatment, learn it just as operators have had to do in Melbourne and Sydney and other parts of the world. If that does not seem desirable, there is nothing to prevent his going to Melbourne or Sydney and acquiring the technique there; for it is the boast of the medical profession that we have no trade secrets, and that knowledge acquired by one is open to all. From what I know of the medical profession, I feel perfectly certain that those gentlemen who have already acquired experience in the Eastern States would be only too willing to place their knowledge at the disposal of any genuine seeker after the technique, who of course has already some knowledge of ordinary X-ray work. As to the cost, that entirely depends on the type of instrument which it is proposed to instal; but I do not see why the cost of working should fall entirely on the Government. There may be, and no doubt there will be, a number of patients in a position to pay for treatment. If they went to the East, they would pay for treatment there. We know that many of them are willing to go, just as the late Lord Forrest was, to the Old Country to try to obtain alleviation of their sufferings. If they are willing and able to pay, I do not see why they should not pay something towards the cost of their treatment if such an apparatus is installed in the Perth hospital.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But they should be able to get the treatment here.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Yes; and those who cannot pay, owing to scanty means, should be able to get their treatment free here. I desire once more to thank the House for the hearing given me.

Question put and passed.

On further motion by Hon. A. J. H. Saw, resolution transmitted to the Assembly, and their concurrence desired therein.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. J. Ewing—South-West) [9.6]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 5.30 p.m. to-morrow.

The object is to allow hon. members a little extra time in connection with the official opening of the new General Post Office. It would be inconvenient for hon. members to attend here at 4.30.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 9.7 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 25th September, 1923.

	PAGE
Questions: Sandalwood, exports and royalty ...	827
Canseway, repairs ...	828
Perth-Armadale Road ...	828
Bills: Inspection of Scaffolding, reports ...	828
Firearms, 28, defeated ...	828
Annual Estimates: Votes discussed—Lands and Surveys, Agricultural Bank, Treasury, Audit, Compassionate Allowances, Government Savings Bank, Government Stores, Taxation ...	835

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

QUESTION—SANDALWOOD, EXPORTS AND ROYALTY.

Mr. A. THOMSON asked the Minister for Mines: 1, How many tons of sandalwood have been exported since tenders for permit were opened on 15th September, 1923? 2, Upon how many tons has royalty been paid and what is the total amount of such royalty? 3, Is the amount of royalty paid at present £2 per ton, and is it payable by the sandalwood getter? 4, Is it a fact that prior to the closing of tenders the price, including payment of royalty by the getter, was approximately £11 per ton? 5, Is it a fact that