

help in every way in the administration of the measure. The Bill also contains provision for the appointment of the board, the appointment of the chairman, and members' term of office. The board is to be constituted of a veterinary surgeon and two thoroughly competent men. The Bill has been considered very carefully in another place, where, as we know, there are many horse-breeders and pastoralists; and the fact that the measure has met with the approval of hon. members elsewhere is in itself a certificate of fitness for it. 1 move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.
On motion by Mr. Green debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.34 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 2nd November, 1920.

	PAGE
Questions: Wyndham Meat Works, employees ...	1337
Immigrants from Overseas—(1) From 1st September, 1920; (2) From 1st October, 1920 ...	1337
Bills: Building Societies, 3a. ...	1338
Public Service Appeal Board, 2a. ...	1338
Guardianship of Infants, 1b. ...	1343
Treasury Bonds Deficiency, 2a. ...	1343
Nurses' Registration Bill, 2a. ...	1348
City of Perth Endowment Lands, 2a. ...	1350

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

QUESTION—WYNDHAM MEAT WORKS, EMPLOYEES.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN asked the Minister for Education: 1, Is it a fact that the Government have engaged engineers or mechanics from Queensland for employment at the Wyndham Meat Works? 2, Is it the intention of the present Government to man the Wyndham Meat Works next season with men brought over from Queensland?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Last season, out of 395 men engaged 25 were brought from Eastern States because of special knowledge and experience. 2, The manager and the union will confer in regard to the agreement for next season, and the policy of preference to qualified Western Australians, when available, will be adhered to, consistent with the necessity for securing efficiency of working and safety of plant and meat.

QUESTIONS (2)—IMMIGRANTS FROM OVERSEAS.

Period from 1st September, 1920.

Hon. J. CORNELL asked the Minister for Education: 1, How many immigrants have arrived in Western Australia from overseas for period 1st January, 1920, to 1st September, 1920? 2, How many came from (a) the British Isles, (b) other countries, and what countries? 3, How many were—(a) married men, (b) married women, (c) single men or widowers, (d) widows or single women, (e) children? 4, How many were discharged soldiers, and in what forces did they serve? 5, How many were nominated? 6, How many paid their own fares? 7, How many had their fares paid by—(a) the British Government, (b) other Governments, (c) the Western Australian Government? 8, Are there any records that show the aggregate amount of capital possessed by each immigrant on landing in Western Australia, if so, what are the approximate amounts? 9, Did any land without capital, if so, how many, and how many were married men with wives and families? 10, Was any monetary advance made per immigrant by the British or other Government, if so, to how many, and what is the approximate amount? 11, Are there any records that show the various avocations given by each immigrant, if so, what are they and can they be verified? 12, Do representatives of organisations, other than Government representatives, meet immigrants on arrival at Fremantle, if so, what organisations, and for what purpose? 13, How long are immigrants housed and cared for by the Government after arrival, and what is the approximate cost per head? 14, On arrival in the State or on discharge from the receiving home, does the Government only take the responsibility of placing immigrants in employment on farms or elsewhere; if not, does any outside organisation do so, and if so, what is the name of the organisation? 15, When placing immigrants in employment in country districts, are they supplied with railway warrants, if so, are all such warrants issued by a Government official, if not, who has been given this authority? 16, When placing immigrants in employment in country districts or employment elsewhere, is every precaution taken to ascertain that the wage paid is a fair remuneration and commensurate with the ruling rate? 17, Have any immigrants selected land for period 1st January, 1920, to 1st September, 1920, if so, how many, and what is the approximate acreage? 18, Have any immigrants purchased improved or virgin farms from sources other than the Government for period 1st January, 1920, to 1st September, 1920, if so, how many, and what is the approximate acreage? 19, What are the conditions other than those set forth in the Discharged Soldiers' Settlement Act, under which immigrants are asked to select land, and are they given any special consideration not allowed to the ordinary land

settler? 20, When an immigrant is placed in employment by the Government or other organisation, are any records kept which show—(a) the full period of employment, (b) his leaving the employment he has been placed in for other employment, (c) his dismissal or loss of employment through illness or other causes, if so, how many immigrants placed in employment for period 1st January, 1920, to 1st September, 1920, are now seeking employment? 21, What is the approximate cost per immigrant to the State for period 1st January, 1920, to 1st September, 1920? 22, Have the Federal Government borne any of the cost of landing immigrants in Western Australia, if so, what is the proportionate amount?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, 750. 2, (a) 750, (b) nil. 3, (a) 108, (b) 117, (c) 216, (d) 171, (e) 138. 4, 251, British Imperial Forces. 5, 231. 6, 17. 7, (a) 475, (b) nil, (c) (portion only) 253. 8, Yes, among assisted and ex-Imperial Service men. £36,390, average per head of £72 10s. 9, Not any among assisted and ex-Imperial Service immigrants. No records of capital brought by nominated immigrants. 10, Not to my knowledge. 11, Yes, Agent General's London files, which are forwarded to the State Immigration Department. 12, No. 13, Ten days; 10s. 14, No. Ugly Men's Voluntary Workers' Association has placed its services at the disposal of the Government to assist in placing all immigrants in employment on land. 15, (a) Yes, (b) Yes. Answered by (b). 16, They are placed as trainees, and as such receive a fair remuneration for work done, which is gradually raised to ruling-rate as they become proficient. 17, Applicants are not required to state whether they are immigrants or not. 18, This information is not furnished to the Lands Department. 19, The same as apply to ordinary land settlers. 20, (a) No. (b) No, only when he applies for another position. (c) No, only when he applies for another position. On being first placed they are advised, if out of employment, to immediately communicate with the Immigration Department. 21, For passages only, £9 1s. 3d. per head for assisted and nominated. Including all immigrants the cost per head is approximately £3 10s. 22, No.

Period from 1st October, 1920.

Hon. J. CORNELL asked the Minister for Education: 1, How many immigrants have arrived or are expected to arrive in the State from overseas for period 1st October, 1920, to 1st December, 1920? 2, Are there any records that show how many came or are coming from—(a) the British Isles, (b) other countries, and what countries; if so, what are the figures? 3, Are there any records that show how many are—(a) married men, (b) married women, (c) single men or widowers, (d) widows or single women, (e) children, if so, what are the figures? 4, How many are discharged

soldiers, and in what forces did they serve? 5, How many were or are nominated? 6, How many paid or are paying their own fares? 7, How many had or are having their fares paid by (a) the British Government, (b) other Governments, (c) the Western Australian Government? 8, Are there any records that show the aggregate amount of capital possessed by a number of immigrants? If so, what are the approximate amounts? 9, Are there any records that show the number of immigrants who have no capital? If so, what are the approximate figures? 10, Is any monetary advance being made to any of the immigrants by the British or other Governments? If so, to how many and what is the amount allowable to each individual? 11, Are there any records that show the various avocations given by each immigrant? If so, what are the relative figures, and can they be verified? 12, What is the approximate cost for immigrants to the State for period 1st October, 1920, to 1st December, 1920? 13, Are the Federal Government bearing any of the cost of landing immigrants in Western Australia for period 1st October, 1920, to 1st December, 1920? If so, what is the proportionate amount?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, 156 have arrived, and approximately 200 to arrive between the dates mentioned. 2, (a) Yes. (b) Yes. Regarding (a) the figures are as stated in Question No. 1. Regarding (b) nil. 3, (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), Yes, of those who have already arrived. The figures are for (a) 27, (b) 27, (c) 43, (d) 30, (e) 29. 4, 70, British Imperial Forces. 5, 15 of those already arrived. 6, 9 of those already arrived. 7, (a) 116 of those already arrived, (b) nil of those already arrived, (c) 31 of those already arrived (portion only). 8, Yes, £4,773 among the immigrants who have already arrived during period mentioned in Question No. 1 as assisted and ex-Imperial Service immigrants. No records of capital brought by nominated immigrants. 9, Yes, for assisted and ex-Service immigrants. Figures, nil. 10, Not to my knowledge. 11, Yes, but to furnish the figures would necessitate approximately 500 files being gone through. 12, For those who have already arrived during period under review, approximately £300. 13, No.

BILL—BUILDING SOCIETIES.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly, with amendments.

BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 27th October.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM (North-East) [4.40]: This Bill is the outcome of the

simultaneous cessation of work on the part of the civil servants of Western Australia. The title of the Bill reads "An Act to establish a Public Service Appeal Board, and to prevent the unauthorised cessation of work on the part of public servants." The enactment of a measure to establish a public service appeal board is all right, but I am rather inclined to think that if the present Government, or any other Government, are of opinion that by means of a Bill such as this, they will prevent the unauthorised cessation of work in the future, they are going to be disappointed. The mere fact of including that in the title of the Bill will not have the effect of bringing about what the Government desire so far as the unauthorised cessation of work is concerned. It is a matter of meeting out to the civil servants some measure of justice similar to that which the average worker considers himself entitled to receive. The Bill, however, goes further and provides that there shall be certain penalties in the event of a strike. It is not my intention to take up a great deal of time in drawing attention to Clause 15, the object of which is to prevent strikes in the future. In my opinion the clause will not have the desired effect, and it would have been much better if it had been left out of the Bill altogether. I shall make an attempt when the Bill is in Committee to bring about the deletion of the clause. I shall take the same stand in regard to Clause 14, which has been inserted for the purpose of protecting the members of the civil service who took part in what is now known as the simultaneous cessation of work in the earlier part of the year. It has apparently been found necessary by the Government to include the clause to provide against victimisation, but surely the clause is unnecessary. I am not prepared to believe that the present Government or any other Government are going to do anything in the direction of victimising any set of workers employed by them. The workers themselves would not permit it, and why the Government have seen fit to insert the provision in the Bill is beyond my comprehension. I do not know that the members of the civil service themselves asked for this provision. I am rather inclined to think, however, that it is the outcome of a certain degree of panic on the part of the Government. We know that industrial disputes take place between employers and employees, and that a certain amount of bitterness is created at times, and that it has been necessary in the past, when effecting a settlement, to provide against the victimisation of any person who may have taken an active part in a particular dispute. But we find the Government of the State asking Parliament to pass a clause such as the one I have referred to, and, by embodying it in the Bill, making it the law that there shall be no victimisation; whereas the very title of the Bill declares that it is for an Act to establish a public service appeal board and to

prevent the unauthorised cessation of work on the part of the public service. When in Committee I will do my best to have that clause deleted. Victimisation should not be tolerated, and its prohibition in the Bill is not going to cut one way or the other. The employees of the Government, whether in the public service or engaged in other occupations, would not tolerate victimisation. We have got past that. The workers of Western Australia are in line with the workers throughout the Commonwealth, and are not prepared to tolerate anything in the nature of victimisation. There is another clause which I think would be better out. In the Arbitration Act is no provision to enable counsel or solicitors to appear on behalf of a union. To my thinking, if Subclause 5 of Clause 8 remains in the Bill there will be a great deal of unnecessary delay in dealing with applications before the appeal board. I will do my best to have that provision struck out. It is proposed that a judge of the Supreme Court shall be appointed chairman of the board. In my opinion we have laymen better qualified than any of our judges to fill the position. Owing, not only to the environment of his early training, but also to his later work, a Supreme Court judge is not in touch with the workers and cannot obtain a sufficient knowledge of industrial affairs to qualify him for the position of chairman of this board. I should like, therefore, to see that provision struck out with a view of affording a wider scope in the selection of the chairman. It is time we got away from the traditional appointment of Supreme Court judges to positions such as this. What we ought to aim at is the securing of a man thoroughly conversant with all phases of the industry, and so capable of effectively dealing with questions to be brought before the board. In connection with the election of a representative of the public service to the board, it is proposed that there shall be at least 85 per cent. of the public servants comprised in the membership of the Public Service Association to qualify the association to appoint a representative to the board. I should like to see that 85 per cent. qualification supplanted by a simple provision for the appointment being made by the Public Service Association. There is no good logical reason why there should be any such restriction as to the membership of the association. In all other matters, as asserted by Mr. Panton, majority rule obtains; therefore if a majority of the public servants are members of the Public Service Association it should be sufficient to entitle the association to appoint its representative to the board. Even in Parliament laws are enacted by a majority of those voting, yet it is proposed to tie up this proposition in the manner set out in the clause. When in Committee I will vote against that provision and endeavour to secure for the association the right of nominating their representative.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [4.51]: It had not been my intention to speak on the second reading, if at all, because I understood that the Bill was the outcome of a conference between the Government and the public service, and therefore I thought they had arrived at conclusions satisfactory to both parties. I am not a very firm believer in the Arbitration Court, because very often, when an award of the court is given, one side or the other goes away dissatisfied. On the other hand, I am very much in favour of conferences. As I say, I was under the impression that the Bill was the outcome of a conference between the Government and the public service; and having seen no protest in the newspapers I was prepared to support the Bill with, at most, one slight exception, until I heard the speeches made by other hon. members. I am now wondering whether those hon. members have been voicing their own opinions or the opinions of one or other of the parties to the conference, or, possibly of other Government officials interested in that conference. Mr. Panton and Mr. Cunningham have both brought up a number of objections. The question is whether those objections have not been considered by the conference and whether the provisions to which those hon. members take exception have not been inserted with the concurrence of the parties. I should like to know that; because, if it is so, then it is of no use our attempting to dictate to either side after conclusions satisfactory to both have been arrived at.

Hon. J. E. DODD: What about the country's point of view?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: The country will take the point of view which most appeals to it. As a representative of the country, my point of view is that if both parties are satisfied with the Bill, then if we can see our way to carry out what apparently is an amicable settlement, it is better for us to do that than to intrude our own views. The only objection I myself have to the Bill is against Clause 10, which is a very difficult clause to deal with, making, as it does, the findings of the board absolutely final. The board is to be like a court of arbitration. It is to be final, and effect must be given to every decision of the board, or of a majority of the board. An award of the Arbitration Court, of course, is final, but the award of a board of this kind will, perhaps, scarcely carry all the authority of an award of the Arbitration Court. The difficulty which suggests itself to my mind is that during a financial year some award may be given by this board which will unexpectedly load the Colonial Treasurer with £150,000 worth of increases in salaries. If we had some method by which such an award, before coming into operation, had to be submitted for the approval of Parliament, it would be a safeguard. On the other hand, if such a method were adopted, a difficulty would at once arise as to finality. Suppose such an award were given at a time when Parliament was not

sitting. If the award were given effect to straightaway, subject to confirmation by Parliament, there would not be much satisfaction if, six months afterwards, Parliament refused to agree to it. It is a very difficult question to deal with; I do not see how we can do anything except what the Bill provides. I have merely drawn attention to these points so that I may be enlightened before I decide how I shall vote. The first point, as I say, is as to whether or not the provisions of the Bill have been agreed to at a conference, and the second is that, even admitting that the conference arrived at a satisfactory conclusion, will not difficulty be created by giving such wide powers to the board as are contained in Clause 10? In regard to the provisions mentioned by Mr. Cunningham, I can only imagine that they were put in with the concurrence of both interested parties. If such is not the case, it may mean opening up the whole Bill; if this happens, and if all the objections outlined by hon. members are given effect to, there will be very little of the Bill left. I shall await with interest the elucidating of the two points I have referred to. In the meantime I will support the second reading.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [4.58]: I take the same attitude as the last speaker. I understood that the Government had made certain arrangements with the public service and that the Bill represented an obligation on the part of the Government to the public service to afford them improved conditions. The whole object, we are told, is to secure a contented public service. I doubt whether the Bill in its present form will achieve that object. The Government gave the civil servants an undertaking to do certain things, and it is practically incumbent upon Parliament to honour that undertaking. Even if there were parts of the Bill which it would be difficult to accept, I would still give my support in the direction of honouring the obligations of the Government. I do not think, unless the leader of the House can give me a satisfactory reply, that this Bill will satisfy the service with regard to the question of increments. It appears from the public utterances of leaders of the civil servants and from those of some members of the public, during the period of the strike, that under the classification of officers made, I think, during 1912, annual increments were expected to be paid in accordance with such classification. There is, however, nothing in the Public Service Act to give that impression. The automatic increments up to £204 that were provided for male juniors up to the age of 21 have been altered by the Government so that the maximum amount will now be £252. These automatic increases have always been paid, and yet there has been this great outcry about increments and these statements by civil servants that they were entitled to them. The "West Australian" on the 13th July publishes a rejoinder to the Premier by the disputes committee of the

civil service. The paragraph in question is as follows—

The Premier states that the Government have already given such measure of relief as is necessary, but this is not so. It has been shown that whole classes of the service have received nothing, and the greater proportion of the rises in salary of which the Premier makes such a strong point cannot legitimately be called grants of relief. As a matter of fact, many of them are merely grade rises within the classification range of the officer concerned, and as such are only part of his constituted legal salary which has been withheld in the past;

Strong language, Mr. President!

such tardy acknowledgment by the Government of their legal obligations has no right to be described as a measure of immediate relief. These rises are part of the officers' accrued rights, and it should be remembered that these accrued rights have quite legitimately been looked upon by officers in the past as something on which they could completely rely in entering upon extended financial obligations—such, for instance, as the purchase of a home. The withholding of increments in the past has put officers in a most difficult position, as it has made them unable to fulfil obligations of that nature; therefore to call the payment of such increments by the name of immediate relief is misleading.

If the officers in the service understood the Acts and regulations under which they were appointed, and entered into obligations on the ground that they were entitled to certain increments annually, they were taking a course which was unwarranted, because the Act does not provide that such increments shall be paid. Their attitude is perhaps more clearly demonstrated by the speech of Mr. E. A. Mann, as it appeared in the "West Australian" of 20th July. This was in connection with the public meeting at His Majesty's Theatre. In addressing a packed house of civil servants and a few members of the public, Mr. Mann, who took a leading part during the strike on behalf of the civil service, is reported to have said—

The only thing the committee were afraid of in regard to the members of the general public was that wrong or false information might be spread among them. Stressing the necessity for immediate relief in regard to the lower paid men the speaker instanced the case of a man with a wife and five children whose case had come before the committee by way of an application for relief. Relief to the extent of £3 per week had been granted, and that was actually higher than the salary the man was receiving from the Government. As to the higher paid men, they had just as much claim to an increase of salary as the others because they had entered into financial commitments, commensurate

with their salary and position. Personally, through increments which had been withheld from him, he had contributed a sum of £1,300 to the revenue during the last six years, in addition to paying income tax on the salary he actually received.

That statement was unjustifiable. It is the type of statement which has given the public a wrong impression as to some of the grievances under which the civil service has laboured. If the increments are to be annual increments, let the Government make them so. Up to the present the Government have not clearly indicated that these increases are not annual increments.

The Minister for Education: Yes, they have.

Hon. H. STEWART: They have temporised on the matter. There is no instance in which the Government have definitely refuted that statement.

The Minister for Education: Yes!

Hon. H. STEWART: After this speech was made, one of my constituents challenged me as to my attitude on the question. I wrote to the "West Australian" dealing with the position of automatic increments, but the paper had not the decency to publish my letter. The following day there appeared a statement by the Premier which briefly set forth the position, but did not do so very strongly. Some members of Parliament are not fully aware of the position. On the Notice Paper of 4th December last year, dealing with the Parliamentary Allowances Bill, Mr. Lovekin had the following amendment:—

"Provided also that the section shall not apply unless and until the just claims of civil servants are met by the recognition of annual increments under the existing classification, and adequate living allowances are provided for officers employed in the lower ranks of the service."

That is an indication that the position regarding increments is not as well understood as it should be. In his reply I want the leader of the House to say whether on this appeal board will rest the responsibility of dealing with the matter of increments to officers in the service, or whether that will be removed from their jurisdiction. It is quite evident, from the impression that is abroad amongst the civil servants that these increments have been withheld from them, that this question is a fruitful source of dissatisfaction. If a definite understanding is not arrived at beforehand I think the civil servants will feel that they have reason to be dissatisfied. If the civil servants do understand the position it is difficult to credit that men would make such statements as I have shown they have made. On the 9th July a meeting of the University Lecturers and Assistant Lecturers Association was held and a resolution of sympathy with the civil servants was carried. The resolution stated that it was hoped that their efforts to secure

the appointment of a board of appeal, with an independent chairman on which the teachers would have direct representation, for the purpose of securing increments and remuneration at least to the extent demanded, would meet with complete success. This shows that there is a certain amount of confusion in the minds of the lecturers of the university. We do not expect everyone to know the details of the Public Service Act, but it is desirable that the civil servants and members of Parliament, and the more enlightened section of the public, should know the exact position on this question of increments. The system now in vogue in the civil service has been handed down to us, with modifications, from the English civil service and dates from the time when clerical workers practically constituted the great majority of the civil service. The Act and the regulations were drawn up with this in mind. In Western Australia there are departments which are essentially technical, but are being run by clerical men. Why should it be thought that because a man is a clerical man he has administrative gifts? There are generally more widely distributed amongst men who are trained from the technical point of view. The technical officers of the service must possess special knowledge, but they have not the power to make themselves heard and do not receive the attention they should. As a matter of fact, the technical officers in the departments are of more importance than the clerical officers. It is right that the clerical branches of the service should be managed by men who are versed in that class of work, but that is not to say that many technical men could not do the work as well. The technical officers as a whole should be classified by men who have themselves been so trained that they can classify them correctly. There were a good number, when the strike took place, who gave consideration to the whole question. There is no doubt that there was a good opportunity on the part of the Government to go into the whole matter then, and to effect alterations in connection with the service under which technical officers would receive that consideration which is expected in modern times. Such an alteration would be beneficial not only to the industries with which they are more particularly associated but to the State itself. Before the strike took place, some of those who were regarded as among the more highly paid officers of the civil service, when discussing the position, indicated that they were dissatisfied because year after year their work, the excellence of which in many instances was recognised not only here but throughout the Commonwealth and in some cases in Europe as well, was not appreciated within the service nor did they receive pay comparable with that received by technical men outside the service. So far as Parliament is concerned, we want to see a well paid and efficient civil service. I have come into

contact with men in various parts of the State, at Collie, Wagin, and the Murchison, who a year or two ago were in the civil service and who are now doing twice as well as formerly. Such men get disgusted with departmental methods, and leave for their own benefit. If this position is to continue too long, the State will be left with staffs comprising the less suitable officers of the service. The general public want to see an efficient and well paid service. The system as it exists to-day is a cumbersome one, and we have heard over and over again of the difficulty experienced in getting rid of officers who cannot be regarded as suitable, and yet this position continues year after year. I support the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. J. W. HIOKEY (Central) [5.18]: I am at a disadvantage in not having been present when the Bill was introduced by the leader of the House, but I am satisfied from a perusal of his remarks and of the speeches of other members, that the Bill is one for the Committee stage. After reading the speeches on the debate so far and perusing the Bill, I have been forced to believe that to a certain extent the success of the civil service in the future is bound up in the title of the Bill and in Clauses 14 and 15. I appreciate the remarks of some members, but it is essential that we should have a contented service. Contentment is the essence of service. I am satisfied that the Bill has been drafted by someone who was either ignorant of industrial affairs or did not give the measure sufficient thought. I recognise in the very title of the Bill that the Government, if they pass it in that form, will come, to use the words of the classics, "a cropper at the first fence." The Bill is the aftermath of the recent strike. But those who are experienced in these matters will recognise that there are penalty clauses introduced in this Bill which would not be tolerated by any section of the community, irrespective of whether they were civil servants or not. The title of the Bill shows that it is one to establish a civil service appeal board. I understand that certain overtures have been made to metropolitan members to cut out the additional words which appear in the title, namely, to prevent the unauthorised cessation of work on the part of public servants. As one who has quite recently had a lot of work to carry out in the settlement of disputes in the metropolitan area, I can assure members that the work of the industrial disputes committee has been so overloaded that they have had to call in the services of country members of Parliament, who have perhaps some spare time on their hands, to assist Mr. Panton and others in the settlement of disputes. We have some knowledge of disputes, and while I do not desire to be regarded as egotistical, I would like to advise the Government to be guided a little respecting Clause 15 of the Bill and the title of the measure. It has been contended by

some hon. members that the carrying of this clause will prevent the civil servants going on strike. Personally, I think that if the Government are of that opinion, they will be making a blunder. I do not think that any such provision will prevent the Government employees going on strike. It will not stop employers or employees taking what action they think fit. How would Dr. Saw welcome a clause of this description introduced into some legislation in connection with the organisation to which he belongs? Naturally, if the medical organisation desire to go on strike and are not prevented by legislation, the same consideration should be extended to others.

Hon. J. E. DODD: They are just as liable as the workers. Nobody is allowed to strike according to law.

Hon. J. W. HICKEY: That is so, but if there is some provision already existing to prevent strikes, what is the necessity for including such a provision in this Bill? It is evidently a blunder, and it will react on the Government, because it will irritate the civil servants. I trust that in Committee this clause will be eliminated and also that the title of the Bill will be amended in the direction I have suggested. This provision will have a very far-reaching effect, and if agreed to it will be found that whatever discontent has existed in the past, that discontent will be greater in the future, notwithstanding whatever compensating features there may be in the Bill. Such legislation as this cannot fail to create more discontent. It must be remembered that the civil servant of to-day is not the civil servant of some years back. Civil servants have looked forward to some amelioration of their conditions under the Bill, and they will kick against any proposition like this. As one having some little experience in industrial matters, I would sound a note of warning to the Government to accept a compromise, or at least agree to amendments when in Committee, to get over some of these more objectionable aspects. There is another clause providing that a judge of the Supreme Court shall preside. We who have had experience in industrial affairs recognise that such a provision as this raises difficulties in the event of appeals being made later on. Often there is a possibility of not getting an appeal launched. It is obvious that it is not always necessary that the whole of the community should know what is happening in industrial matters. Dozens of industrial troubles occur of which the public are not aware, and if we had to have a judge of the Supreme Court to settle them, they would never be settled at all. Often it is necessary to go to court, and in such circumstances the wheels of industry are necessarily held up. The chances are that when we require the judge for the Arbitration Court, it will be found that he is at Kalgoorlie or somewhere else, and the work cannot be proceeded with. It is advisable to make other arrangements or else we will have

to appoint more judges or a judge to act exclusively upon Arbitration Court matters. I hope that some provision will be made in Committee in order that any other qualified person may be appointed to deal with matters before this board. There is another aspect to which objection may be taken, and that is the clause granting permission to counsel to appear. It is quite true that some people can afford counsel to appear for them, but in many cases our experience teaches us that it is unnecessary, for officials can present cases in quite an acceptable form, without frill and without any unnecessary prolonging of a discussion. With due apologies to the learned profession, an hour or two does not concern lawyers appearing before such tribunals. They are often content to appear for an hour or so and then adjourn to a future date. This does not appeal to the workers. I hope that some alteration will be made, and that this provision regarding the appearance of counsel will be eliminated. I support the second reading of the Bill, and will take advantage of a later opportunity to perhaps move a new clause and certain amendments, as well as supporting various amendments of which notice has been given.

On motion by Hon. J. Mills, debate adjourned.

BILL—GUARDIANSHIP OF INFANTS.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—TREASURY BONDS DEFICIENCY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 27th October.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.30]: I had hoped until I heard the speech by Sir Edward Wittenoom that we might be able to do something more than enter a mild protest against this Bill, and it may not be too late even now if I can convince members that the best thing and the proper thing for us to do is to reject the second reading of this Bill. By associating ourselves with this measure, even after entering a protest, we make ourselves a party to the present methods of government. I regard this Bill as the only one which, during the session, will afford the Legislative Council an opportunity to bring to bear on the financial position some direct effect. I myself would not be prepared to vote for the rejection of the Appropriation Bill, the financial Bill of the Government, recognising as I do that the power of the purse is in another place, or for the rejection of a taxation Bill, because we should be going dangerously near to the line where we would break our constitutional rights. It was in 1916 that a Bill of this description was first introduced, and the debate was carried on in 1917. I do not wish to worry members by making

lengthy extracts from the "Hansard" reports of the debates, but I can give this assurance, especially to those members who have been elected since 1916, that they will find in those reports a most interesting and valuable light thrown on the present position of Western Australia. Mr. Drew, who was the leader of the House up to 1916, declared on the 28th February, 1917—

This measure opens up the whole financial question and provides an opportunity for the unrestricted expression of views of hon members on this important subject.

I think he was perfectly right, but in order to appreciate our present position and the position of the present Government, we have to follow the utterances of different members of the Ministry, who, after all, have had control of this country, we might almost say to the exclusion of Parliament. Mr. Drew said that "for four years he had sat in this Chamber and withered under the lash of the present Colonial Secretary"—that is the present leader of the House. I am not surprised that Mr. Drew said that. Anyone who was present during those four years from 1912 to 1916, would say that Mr. Drew was quite justified in that utterance. Now let us see what the leader of the House said and what the different Treasurers have said, how they came into office, and how this amount which we are called upon to deal with under this Bill, came to be built up. In December, 1914, the present leader of the House made some interesting remarks. I shall not quote an extract which throws an unfair light, as can be very readily done, on a particular speech by dissociating it from the context; neither do I intend to make interminable extracts. What I wish to do is to pick out what I consider to be one or two characteristic criticisms addressed by the present leader of the House against the Labour party between 1912 and 1916—

The Government are enjoying a more generous revenue than was ever enjoyed by their predecessors, but the position in which they find themselves is due to a general laxity of administration and unprofitable trading concerns.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Want of business acumen.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I shall come to the business acumen part of it later on. On the 3rd August, 1915, the present leader of the House said—

This is merely an instance of the muddling incapacity which has produced the present financial position. We cannot go about the country without finding at every step not only gross extravagance but muddling.

I much regret, Sir, that we are now deprived of any contribution by you to our financial discussions, but if it is not open to any objection, I would venture to quote what you said on the 7th March, 1917, because you then put into words exactly what I feel to-

day. You were dealing with a precisely similar Bill—

I am indeed sorry that the Government have not thought fit to tackle the question in a more straightforward way— That is a good word; that is exactly what I want to say. On that occasion you continued—

and a pluckier manner. The question of finance was the paramount question on which they came into office, the question for which other things should have been neglected.

That is exactly what I maintain to-day. What does the Public Service Bill or any other Bill which has been introduced this session turn on? It turns on our financial position. Recognising that the Legislative Council has not the full control of the purse, and ought not to have full control of the purse, if we pass this Bill, we associate ourselves to that extent with the incapacity and muddling of the Government. I shall now quote an interesting extract from a speech made by the leader of the House on the 7th March, a speech which had the closest reference to this Bill—

I venture to express the opinion that if in the past, not only here but in another place, had the financial proposals of successive Governments been subjected to the same close criticism that this Bill was submitted to in this Chamber, the necessity for this measure might never have arisen.

I say that this is quite true to-day. In the words of the present leader of the House, it is the "muddling incapacity" to which I wish to direct attention to-day. It is not as if we were still in the throes of a great crisis. During the war there was some reason why we should be moderate in our criticism. There were many good reasons why we should gloss over the position of affairs, one of which was to present a united front to the enemy, but one of the burdens which the war has laid upon us is this financial reconstruction which is so necessary at present. Tracing the administration from the Wilson Government through the Lefroy Government and the Colebatch Government, down to the present Government, after their vicious and violent attacks on the Labour Government and their gross extravagance—this is how they got into office; this is why they got into office—what is the record which these financial magnates and experts have put up to compare with the Labour party's record?

Hon. J. E. Dodd interjected.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Ever since I came into this House, and even before, I have not supported the Labour party in any way, but I have wished to be reasonably fair to them, and I was struck with this point, that studying their finances, I thought we had surely reached the high-water mark when they took office and continued their capers. But there was some justification and some

excuse to be found for them. When they first took office we were not at war, and therefore the necessity for economy was not so great. If they were extravagant, they were not incapable; in fact they were pretty shrewd administrators, the same Labour gentlemen, at carrying out their own programme, and they were not financially dishonest. We can prove up to the hilt from our own Auditor General's report, the financial dishonesty of the four Governments who have since held office. I am not speaking without the book. I intend to deal with the Auditor General's report and the financial dishonesty of the Government later on. Before coming to that I have a few more words to say regarding their muddling incapacity. It is not the Bolshevik, it is not the Sinn Féiner, and it is not the Labour Government who will bring Western Australia to its knees, but such Governments as we have had during the last four years; and I say without any hesitation and I think almost without fear of contradiction, that the administration of the last four years has at this moment almost brought Western Australia to its knees. At the time when the sands were running out in 1916, they had a mighty difficult job in hand. I admit the difficulties which confronted them when they took control of the finances of the country, but whatever chances they had in 1916, they have heaved them away until the position now is almost an impossible one. Personally I believe it will be impossible to get the country up again. Let us have a few more lines from what we were told in 1917. For the purposes of this discussion I take the four latest Governments as one. From the time the Wilson Government displaced the Labour Government up to the present moment, I shall regard the administration as that of one successive continuous Ministry of the same set of people and of the same party, whatever that party might be. It is true that they have taken into their ranks the ex-Labour leader who was discarded, but I pay no attention to that. Had the Mitchell Government dissociated themselves entirely from their predecessors, some of my arguments and criticisms would have fallen to the ground, but I do not think this could be seriously maintained either inside or outside the House. In 1917 the then Colonial Treasurer, Mr. Gardiner, in speaking on a similar Bill, said—

This country has to be told that ours is a fixed determination that we must live within our income. The country has to be told and re-told that. Members of Parliament will have to be told it—

As if members of Parliament did not know—

—and they will have to tell to their constituents that, for the good government of the State, the question of finance is all important. Heads of departments will have to be told it, and told it emphatically. So far as the administration of this State is concerned, it is to consist of the barest

necessities until we have enough to pay for anything else.

I am prepared to stand by that. But what has become of the warning then given? The present Treasurer tells us that we must go on borrowing. I have read the warning of Treasurer Gardiner; and I treat with the greatest consideration anyone who is Treasurer of this State. But in the same year—in fact, on the 27th July, 1917—Mr. Mitchell, who is now Treasurer, in reply to an interjection, "There are people who say we should cease borrowing," stated—

I daresay there are, but I do not agree with them; as in my opinion loan money is essential to the development of this State.

I ask hon. members to observe the advance we have made under the present Treasurer's policy. He was a supporter of Treasurer Gardiner and of Treasurer Wilson. Treasurer Wilson was even more severe than Treasurer Gardiner in his criticism of the Labour party and even more insistent in urging the necessity for straightening up the finances. Speaking purely from a public point of view, I think that anyone who has followed Treasurer Wilson in his speeches on Bills of this nature—for it was the late Mr. Wilson who introduced the first Treasury Bonds Deficiency Bill—will admit that Treasurer Wilson had a sounder and firmer grasp of the financial situation than either of the other Treasurers. But apparently he completely failed, and Treasurer Gardiner was put in his position. Hon. members have heard what Treasurer Gardiner said. He emphasised the point over and over again. He was turned down, or turned himself down, or found it impossible to carry on with his colleagues, or with another Chamber, or with this Chamber. He was got rid of. Who came next as Treasurer? I am not quite sure whether the leader of this House was Treasurer for the few months that he was Premier. At any rate, we can pass that over. Now we have a Treasurer who tells us that this country has never been in a more prosperous or more satisfactory position than it is in to-day. I wish I could believe it. There is no one more dearly attached to Western Australia than I am, or more anxious to see it successful. However, it is impossible to conduct the public finances in the way we are going on in this country. What vexes me so much, and makes me so indignant, is that all the principles for which we inside this House and many outside it have fought, the principles of sound government and the principles of sound finance, have been betrayed by our leaders who have held office. It looks to me as though the Labour people must win all along the line. What was the one division between the two parties? The Labour party's policy was one of the Government controlling all the means of production and exchange on behalf of the people. The other party were going to encourage private en-

terprise and put things on a sound business footing. I am not here to express approval in any form of the Labour party, but I do understand them; and I say that the people who are going to win the Labour party's victory are the people whom we have put in office for the last four years. I do not propose to go any further with regard to the incapacity of the Government, because I think most members agree with me, and because the figures speak for themselves. We had this deficit of four millions, and now it is $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions. There are two or three points connected with finance to which I shall refer, not as a proof of dishonesty, but certainly as some evidence of incapacity, on the part of the Government. I will take the latest matter, and it is a very interesting one, and one of considerable importance. It refers to these long dated and these short dated Treasury bills and loans. I quote from the "Statistical Abstract" issued on the 30th June, 1920, and I am giving round figures. The total debt of this State at that date was 47 millions sterling.

The Minister for Education: That is gross.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Yes. It is quite true that we must deduct the amount of the sinking fund, and that brings the debt back to about 40 millions. But this is the important point to me, that if we look at the debentures and the inscribed stock and the Treasury bills and bonds, we find that the debentures are $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions, the inscribed stock $34\frac{1}{2}$ millions, and the Treasury bills £9,400,000.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: What is the currency of the Treasury bills?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: That is a valuable interjection. We ought to know, but owing to the lack of up to date information before the Chamber it is impossible to answer that question.

The Minister for Education: If you ask for the information you will get it.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I will ask, then, for the Auditor General's report for the year ended 30th June, 1920. The only safeguard which we ordinary members of Parliament have is the Auditor General's report. I ask the leader of the House for that report now. When are we going to get it? The hon. gentleman knows perfectly that we have not got the Auditor General's report, and that we cannot get it until too late to deal with the current figures. A member of another place raised exactly the same point, saying that until the reports were before members they could not deal with the public accounts. However, I do not wish to be taken off my particular point. We have $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions of debentures, and the Treasury bills amount to, roundly, $7\frac{1}{2}$ millions. That is a total of 10 millions of money. I cannot tell what is the currency of the Treasury bills, but they are pretty sure to be short dated. Thus one-quarter of the debt of this State is in short dated Treasury bills and debentures. The importance of that matter can be

seen from a cablegram published in the "West Australian" of the 28th October, reporting a speech made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, at a dinner given to Mr. Kell, the Deputy Governor of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, by the Imperial Industries Club. Mr. Chamberlain is reported as saying—

He assured Mr. Kell that while he was Chancellor of the Exchequer in the present circumstances he would not welcome Australia as a borrower of short-term money. Australia would, however, always have the British Government's goodwill when she invited investors to take up long-term loan issues for the development of the Commonwealth.

It seems to me that is a matter of very considerable importance, a matter upon which the Treasurer of this country should have been fully posted, and acted accordingly. But he has not done so. He has landed us now with a quarter of our debt in these short-dated securities, the very thing the Chancellor of the Exchequer says he has no time for at present—anyone who is following affairs can easily understand why. But there is another important matter. What is the use of Ministers going about and saying we have loaded ourselves up with this sinking fund, and that the sinking fund is what is bringing us down? All those short-dated securities pay no sinking fund whatever. That is the legal position. This Bill provides no sinking fund; but if hon. members will go back to Mr. Wilson's original Treasury Bonds Deficiency Bill they will find that his funding Bill of 1916 did provide for a sinking fund. It is only one more indication that Mr. Wilson, whatever may have been his shortcomings, and whatever may have been the difficulties of the situation in which he found himself, had much sounder ideas of dealing with important financial matters than his successors have. The Auditor General's report for the year ended 30th June, 1919, touches on this deficiency of revenue. I do not wish to be unfair to the leader of the House or to his colleagues in these matters, but, in order to save time, I ask our leader if he thinks it is possible for the ordinary member of Parliament to grapple and deal with these financial questions unless he has the reports before him? His answer we heard this afternoon, "What do you want? I will get any papers you want." I say the Auditor General's report for the year ended 30th June, 1919, throws a very interesting light on this Bill, and should be read by us. But we have not the Auditor General's report for the year ended 30th June, 1920. I hope the hon. member will not tell us that since the Auditor General is a servant of Parliament, and not a servant of the Government, Ministers are therefore absolved from their responsibilities in this matter, because I imagine, without knowing the facts of the case, it is easy to suppose the Auditor General saying, "How can I get my report ready

for you in time to present to Parliament it you will not let me have these figures." We are therefore compelled to throw ourselves back on the 1919 report. This appears on page 5—

The original Treasury Bonds Deficiency Act of 1916 made provision for a sinking fund in regard to bonds issued, the effect of which would have been to re-charge the Revenue fund over a period of years with the deficits. An amending Act has, however, since been passed which suspends payment to the sinking fund; therefore ordinary revenue services remain a permanent loan charge.

This is worth noting, too—

It has to be borne in mind that when the State borrows money the debt created is usually larger than the amount of cash received, owing to discounts under the issue terms of the loan, flotation fees, commissions, advertising charges, etc. Therefore although the amount of £2,766,465 is shown above as having been borrowed, the indebtedness of the State to the lenders of this money is greater. The following figures, taken from the information published in the different returns of the Treasury, indicate the amount for which the State was liable at 30th June, 1919, on account of deficiencies on the Revenue fund:—Nominal value of bonds issued to lenders, £2,893,505; less amount over-raised, £41,167; total, £2,852,337. Add deficit for 1918-19 not covered by borrowed money, £652,014. Total, £3,504,351.

I do not regard that as of first class importance, but it is necessary for us to remember that when we have a deficit of half a million which we wish to cover by a Bill of this nature, we have to cover a bit more owing to charges and expenses, all of which go on to loan funds. They are not added to the sinking fund. There is a second matter—one does not like to use harsh words in connection with these matters—and if anyone will tell me after I have read the Auditor General's report on this particular performance of the Government, that that performance is not dishonest, I shall be glad to withdraw and apologise. It crops up in connection with insurance companies' deposits. It will be within the recollection of most hon. members that two years ago the insurance companies in this State were compelled to put up £5,000 apiece into the hands of the Treasurer, and in moving the second reading of the Bill which provided for that, the then Treasurer said, "The object of raising money in this particular way is twofold; in the first place it is to provide some security for the insurer which we already do in regard to life insurance companies." I hope hon. members will appreciate what that means. It means that a paternal Government in order to protect us—the ordinary unsophisticated policy holders—are going to collect a certain amount

of cash from the insurance companies in this State, so that if we have a fire in our premises and the insurance companies default, there will be a sufficient amount of cash in the hands of the Treasurer to protect us. That was the first ostensible object of the Bill. The second object was this—

The funds are intended to be paid—I am quoting from the remarks of the Treasurer—

into a separate account and utilised for the purpose of advancing pound for pound on the capital raised for the promotion of secondary industries in this country.

I protested against the passage of this Bill, but, unfortunately, very few members supported me. The Bill went through and the Treasurer collected the money amounting to, I think, £195,000. The Auditor General's report on this particular subject says—

When the accounts for the year closed, 39 companies had, under the provisions of the Insurance Companies Deposit Act, 1918, paid £5,000 each to the Treasury. Section 4 of the Act provides that where an insurance company has acquired the share capital of some other company, if the Treasurer so certifies, one deposit of £5,000 by the acquiring company shall suffice. Eleven companies have been brought within the provisions of this section and the cases of two companies are under consideration, viz.: Palatine Insurance Company and Patriotic Insurance Company. The State pays interest at the rate of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum on the amount received (£195,000). The cash was credited to a special banking account, the credit balance on which was taken into consideration when arriving at the interest rate of one per cent. allowed by the Commonwealth Bank on State funds, subject to a minimum and maximum balance. At the close of the year, however, the special banking account had been reduced to £5,000, the balance (£190,000) having been used for current requirements. As stated elsewhere, there is no statutory authority for the State to use the money.

Hon. A. Lovekin: A forced loan.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Having been paid to the special account, it is a distinct breach of faith on the part of the Government, and should not have been touched. The Auditor General's words will carry a great deal more weight than mine. As an interesting commentary on that, let me read what the present leader of the House said in 1916 when he took control of this Chamber. These are his words:—

The intention of the present Government in regard to the finances is to restore full Parliamentary authority. I think I could not express our policy in that respect any better if I spoke for half an hour. We desire in all these matters to restore the

authority of Parliament; in every respect it is the desire of the Government to restore the authority of Parliament in dealing with the State's finances.

We did not seem to have much control over that £190,000. I am not going to repeat what I have said in this Chamber about the sinking fund, because that was stopped by a higher authority than ourselves—I mean by the Imperial Government. But I would ask hon. members who are not acquainted with all the circumstances of the case to look that up in the public records, and they will see that the Labour party, in all their extraordinary financial proposals—I am not speaking of Queensland; I am speaking of Western Australia—never did anything as bad as the present Government have done in regard to insurance money and in regard to the sinking fund. Yet the Premier on the 20th November, 1919, said that the deficit was due to some extent to the sinking fund, and "hon. members have very rightly asserted that the sinking fund should be kept intact." Those were the words spoken by the Treasurer who is at present in control of our finances. I do not know what hon. members think about that; I know what I think, and I would vote without the slightest hesitation for the rejection of the Bill now before us, for the reason that it would throw back on the Government the responsibility for what they are doing and from which hon. members and many people outside wish to be entirely dissociated. We should declare that we will not countenance in any form the financial performances of the present Government. We have our constitutional limits and rights. I scarcely think we were within our rights when we followed the advice of the leader of the House. We rejected the taxation proposals of the Labour Government, and we did it then under the guidance of the present leader of the House.

The Minister for Education: I was not leader of the House then.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The hon. gentleman seems to think that I was referring to him then as the official leader of the House. Since coming into this House he has taken charge of it and everything he has said has been done. That is why the Government find themselves in their present position, and we have let them do it. So far as the Bill before the House is concerned, I wish to dissociate myself from the financial performances of the Government. We can fairly reject the Bill. It will not put the country to any inconvenience; it will not bring about any financial crisis, but it will mark in the strongest possible way our disapproval of the financial policy and the administration of the Government. I deeply regret that Sir Edward Wittenoom thinks that we cannot do anything but pass the Bill. I agree, of course, that his opinion must carry weight.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: We pass the Estimates?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: At any rate I am not prepared to be a party to the rejection of the Estimates and to bring about a financial crisis. I am prepared, as a member of this House, to refuse to pass this Bill and I will certainly have the greatest pleasure in dividing the House even if I can get only one member to support me.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [7.30] in moving the second reading said: I feel bound to offer some apology, because it seems that the Bill does such a very little for a class of people for whom we have always been disposed to do a very great deal indeed. I am not going to say anything in praise of the work of the nurses during the war, or in praise of their work in our hospitals in times of peace, or in praise of their work particularly in the outback portions of the State. I think the latter phase of their work must be regarded as one of the most important factors in aiding the development of the country. The very presence in these outback communities of women, as they invariably are, of enlightenment and refinement, has an influence upon the community altogether apart from their services in attending the sick that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to overestimate. It seems to me that, although this Bill does something for the trained nurses, it does very little indeed in comparison with what all of us would be eager to do for them. All the Bill does is to provide for the registration of nurses and to protect their registration and their badge against use by unqualified persons, and it extends to them one very small practical privilege. This is conferred by Clause 12, which reads—

On the appointments of nurses in any public hospital within the meaning of that term in the Hospitals Act, 1894, or in the Government hospitals, including hospitals for the insane, preference of employment in regard to future vacancies shall be given to registered nurses. Provided that nothing herein contained shall be construed to interfere with the employment of probationary nurses.

This is practically the only real solid privilege that the Bill gives to nurses, but, in my opinion, it is well worth while placing this Bill on the statute-book for the reason that it will give legal standing to the trained nurses, and it will be the first step towards something of a very practical nature in the interests of the nurses. The Bill does not set up any sort of monopoly or close corporation. It does not prohibit nursing by

unregistered nurses. I think that at some future date such a provision might very well be enacted, with due protection for the outlying portions of the community. The time may come, and come very soon, when it will be considered desirable that only trained nurses shall be allowed to practise nursing for payment. However desirable this may be, it is not included in the present Bill. As the Bill stands at present, it contains nothing to prevent other than trained and registered nurses from nursing. One project which the Trained Nurses Association have in view at the present time is the establishment in the city of Perth of a nurses' home. The Government have been approached in this matter, and they offered assistance in certain directions. The nurses, I understand, require a block of land. The Government have a block of land which, according to the latest advices received from the association, is suitable, and the Government are prepared to give it to them. A number of people in different parts of the State have expressed their willingness to subscribe towards the building fund. It is intended that the home shall be on a self-supporting basis, and it will confer great benefits on the nurses and will be of great benefit to the public generally. It will give nurses a home where they can live during times not occupied by their avocation.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Is not there a nurses' home now?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Before the war there was a recognised nurses' home, but during the war the number of nurses became so small, owing to nearly all of them having gone on active service, that the home was abandoned. At present premises are being used as a nurses' home, but they are inadequate for requirements. They will not accommodate a sufficient number of nurses, and the intention is to establish a home on thoroughly up-to-date lines as soon as possible.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw. The present premises are rented.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes, and they are inadequate, and I do not know that the situation is quite suitable. It cannot be questioned that the establishment of a nurses' home will be greatly to the advantage of all parties. In the scheme there are many practical advantages from the point of view of the community and not only in regard to the convenience of the medical fraternity, a very important point. It will be possible for the nurses to do what I believe is done in some of the other States, namely, to take a round of cases. There may be patients whose parents cannot afford the constant attendance of a nurse but to whom attendance by a nurse for a short period of half an hour or an hour or so each day would meet the necessities of the case, and would prove an inestimable boon. When the nurses are established in a home such as is projected, it will be an easy matter for some of them to establish rounds of this sort,

and attend a number of patients and thus bring their services within the means of the people. This will enable the nurses to increase the good they are able to do for the community. I mention this only incidentally; it is not affected by the Bill in any way, but a project of that kind will be facilitated by giving the nurses a standing by statute, and that is practically all which this Bill does. I repeat that the Bill creates no monopoly and no close corporation. It does not prohibit the practice of nursing, even for payment, by unregistered nurses. All it does is to protect the association, the registration of the nurses, and the nurses' badge, and extends preference of employment to trained nurses in Government hospitals. Clause 2 of the Bill makes provision for the establishment of a board to consist of five members, of whom the chairman shall be the Principal Medical Officer of the State for the time being. The other members of the board shall be a medical practitioner and three nurses. They shall be appointed in the first instance for one year, and subsequent appointments shall be made for a term not exceeding three years. Excepting in the case of the medical practitioner, the appointments shall be made by the Governor on the nomination of the registered nurses. Every appointed member of the board shall be eligible for re-appointment, and provision is made for the secretary of the Public Health Department to act as secretary to the board. It is not intended that the board shall be the means of incurring large expenditure. The duties will be very small, and such as might be conveniently carried out by the officer named. Provision is made for the keeping of a register of nurses, which register shall consist of two classes, the general nurses and the mental nurses, and the register will show the name, address, and qualifications of each registered nurse. The board have to satisfy themselves in regard to the character and good fame of the persons applying for registration.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What about examination?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Clause 5 sets out who may be registered as nurses. Members will agree that the provision is entirely reasonable, and that anyone who cannot comply with the requirements set down in the clause should not wish to be registered as a nurse. Provision is made for examinations, which shall be held by examiners appointed under the Act. When a nurse is registered, she will be given a certificate in the prescribed form and provided with a badge, and later on in the Bill it is made an offence for any person to falsely pretend that she is registered, or to wear a badge of the prescribed form or so nearly resembling it as to be liable to deceive. Provision is also made against the fraudulent obtaining of registration, and also for the de-registration or erasure of names from the register in cases of offences committed by nurses. Clause 11 is merely of a formal

nature, dealing, as it does, with the application fees and fines. Clause 12, to which I have already referred, gives preference to registered nurses in certain circumstances. Clause 13 makes provision for the appointment of examiners. The Bill is a very simple one, and in my opinion it is only a first step towards doing something to which nurses are fully entitled, and I cannot see a single provision in the Bill to which exception can be taken. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. A. H. PANTON (West) [7.41]: As the leader of the House said, there is not much in the Bill to which exception can be taken, but, to be consistent with my argument on the Public Service Appeal Board Bill the other night, I would like to see provision made in this Bill for the recognition of the Australian Trained Nurses' Association. The board is to consist of the Principal Medical Officer, ex officio, a medical practitioner, and three nurses. I would like to see the clause amended to read three members of the Australian Trained Nurses' Association, because I am advised that this association is the body which holds itself responsible for the nurses throughout Australasia. Subclause 5 of Clause 2 should also be amended by substituting for "registered nurses," "members of the Australian Trained Nurses' Association." I regard it as essential that where there is an association representative of any section of the community—and I understand that the Australian Trained Nurses' Association is the one to which our trained nurses belong—it should be the body to choose the members of the board. I have a decided objection to all these boards being dominated by civil servants. If we have the Principal Medical Officer in the chair and the secretary of the Health Department as secretary of the board, nurses who have grievances will find it very difficult to get their grievances rectified. I would prefer to empower the nurses to appoint their own secretary. Unless the Minister can show why the secretary of the Public Health Department should be secretary of the board, I do not propose to give my vote in favour of that provision. Clause 5 should contain some provision for nurses who have passed through a training school some considerable time since. Instead of this clause reading—

Every person who has attained the age of 21 years and at the commencement of this Act holds a certificate of not less than three years' training,

I should like to see inserted after the word "certificate" the words "from a recognised training school at the date when the period of training was in vogue." I am advised by returned nurses especially that there are many qualified nurses who have been trained, but who probably have only done two years in a training school in Australasia. I do not know whether that training would be considered to be sufficient under this Bill.

Apparently, those nurses who started in a training school, which only provided for a two years' training, will not be eligible for registration under this Bill, if the word "training" applies only to the actual time spent in the training school. I think that difficulty can readily be overcome.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Three years' training in a hospital.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: Much depends on the definition of the word "training." Take the case of the Perth Public Hospital; a probationer goes in there—

The Minister for Education: Read the proviso to Clause 5.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: The clause speaks of two years' training in a hospital.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Read on.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: The proviso says—

Provided that the board would accept a certificate of two years' training in a hospital in which the recognised period of training was two years.

The question is whether a training school is a hospital. The returned sisters want to be sure that no nurse, who is a properly qualified nurse and who has done two years in a training school, which is not a hospital within the meaning given in the Bill, shall be debarred from obtaining a certificate. Clause 12 provides for preference to be given to registered nurses. Is it not possible to induce the British Medical Association to give preference to registered nurses so far as operations are concerned? If they would do that, it would afford some recognition to nurses for the work they are doing. With these reservations I support the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. A. J. H. Saw, debate adjourned.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH ENDOWMENT LANDS.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [7.50] in moving the second reading said: In order that members may have an opportunity of understanding the provisions of the Bill, I have laid an explanatory plan on the Table of the House. The circumstances of the case are briefly these. The city of Perth is the owner in fee simple of the endowment lands which are held as an endowment in perpetuity. The city of Perth is also the owner of what is known as the Lime Kilns Estate. I think this is more popularly known as Perry's Estate. That land was acquired by purchase, and the city of Perth consequently holds it in just the same manner as a private owner, and has all the powers that the private owner would have in regard to it. The reserve 16921, that is the reserve along the coastline, has been vested in the city of Perth by the ordinary vesting order under the Land Act for the purpose of public recreation. The Bill deals with these three

lots of property; first of all the endowment lands, which the city of Perth holds as owner in fee simple, and holds as an endowment in perpetuity, the Lime Kilns Estate, of which the city of Perth is the freeholder by purchase, and this reserve along the shore of the North Beach, which has been vested in the city of Perth in the ordinary way purely for the purpose of recreation. The object of the Bill is to facilitate the efforts of the Perth City Council in developing these properties, in making them revenue producing so far as the municipality is concerned, and also affording opportunity of public recreation. The Bill extends the boundaries of the city of Perth to include the whole of these lands. That is the first provision. It is undoubtedly a necessary provision if the development of these estates is to be proceeded with. In Part VI. of the Bill the council are given all the powers of an owner in fee simple in respect of the land, excepting the reserve—they are not given any of these powers in regard to the reserve, which is shown on the map and is near the sea shore—subject to the proviso in Clause 39 whereby the proceeds of sales of the endowment lands must be applied to the development of these lands. The proceeds of sale of the Lime Kilns Estate which was acquired by the City Council by way of purchase, are not regulated in this manner. They have bought the land and have a private owner's right in it, and can do as they like. So far as the endowment lands are concerned, the proceeds of any sale must be applied to the development of these lands. No contribution to the sinking fund for the repayment of borrowed money must be paid out of the proceeds of the sale of the endowment lands, except in proportion to the amount of such borrowed money as may have been employed in the development of the endowment lands. The surplus proceeds must be vested in the joint names of the city of Perth and the Colonial Treasurer, in view of these lands being held as an endowment in perpetuity. So far as the recreation reserve along the sea frontage is concerned, no power to lease any portion is given except with the approval of the Governor-in-Council. It is contemplated that in regard to this foreshore, leases will be given for refreshment kiosks and things of that kind, but such leases cannot be given except with the approval of the Governor-in-Council, and there cannot with regard to the recreation reserve be any sale.

Hon. J. Duffell: The same provisions as are extended to the South Fremantle beach?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am not familiar with the conditions there, but I believe they are very similar to these. With reference to the endowment lands in the Lime Kilns Estate, the valuations and rating will be on the unimproved capital value. We had a discussion in the House the other day on this question of the method of rating. I pointed out at that time instances in which the one local governing body had adopted the two systems, the system of the unimproved capital value

as applying to their rural lands, and the annual rental value as applying to their municipal lands. If the Bill is carried, that dual principle of rating will apply so far as the city of Perth is concerned, until some amendment of the Municipalities Act may be made. If this Bill is carried, the existing portion of the municipality of Perth will continue to be rated on the annual rental value, and these additions that are being made to the municipality of Perth will be rated on the unimproved capital value—that is after they have been disposed of by the council, for so long as they remain the property of the council there will be no rates. It will be necessary in Committee, I think, to amend Clause 2 of the title of Part 2 by striking out the word "optional." When the Bill was originally framed it was intended that the municipality of Perth should be given the option as to the method of rating to be employed in regard to these lands. They might rate the land on the unimproved capital value or on the annual rental value basis. In the course of consideration in another place the option of rating on the annual rental value was struck out. Clause 7 originally read—

Rates for any year in respect of the said lands or any portion thereof may in the discretion of the council be imposed on the annual value of the capital unimproved value.

If hon. members will look at the Bill as it reached us they will find that the clause has been amended to read—

Rates for any year in respect of the said lands or any portion thereof shall be imposed on the capital unimproved value.

It seems to me it would be necessary for us in Committee to strike out the word "optional" in the two clauses in which they occur, because the option vested in the council in the original Bill has been removed. Incidentally, this is evidence of the growing favour towards the system of rating on the unimproved capital value. Part 3 gives power to the City Council to construct and run tramways. There is nothing exceptional, I take it, in that provision. Clause 25 confers on the Government the right to purchase at any time at a price to be fixed without regard to goodwill. Part 6 confers on the Council power to borrow money for the purpose of developing the estate to the sum of £250,000. That is a large sum of money, but it is recognised that it will require a considerable sum of money to properly develop this estate, to construct tramways, etc. So far as the provisions of the Municipalities Act with regard to the borrowing of money applying to these lands is concerned, the Council must proceed, before borrowing money under the Bill, in the same way as they would have to do under the Municipalities Act. That is give the ratepayers a chance of protecting and vetoing the loan if they see fit. The only exceptional privilege that is given in regard to this right to borrow £250,000 is that this sum of money

shall not be taken into account in estimating the borrowing powers in the municipality. The borrowing powers of every municipality are limited by the amount of their annual income, but under this Bill, when the council estimate their borrowing powers on the basis of their annual income, it will not be necessary to take into account any proportion of the £250,000 which may have been raised under the special authority given by the Bill. By Clause 40 very full powers are conferred upon the council in respect of these lands. The object of the Bill is to enable the council, as proprietors of the lands, to develop them for purposes of leasing and sale, the same as would be the case with an ordinary land owner. The contention may be put forward that it is contrary to the principle of endowment to permit of the land being sold. That may apply in cases where after sale there is no possibility of the holder of the endowment receiving further revenue from it. I do not think that argument can apply in a case of this sort, because after sale the council still have opportunities of obtaining revenue from the land. At present no revenue can be derived from it, and without some power to develop the estate, let leases, and make sales, the endowment is of no value. With this power the endowment will be of value in a twofold way; there will be the immediate revenue, which must be spent in the development of this particular land, and there will also be the revenue that will be continuous and everlasting in the shape of rates derived from the people who purchase this land. Although in certain circumstances the contention may be set up that when people sell endowment lands they lose their endowment, in this case I think it can be fairly contended that this provision merely enables the council to obtain some value from the endowment lands. Clause 45 provides that no license for the sale of liquor shall be granted without the approval of the council. The other provisions of the Bill, such as those regarding the control and management of the undertaking, are merely such as might be expected in a Bill of this nature, and I am not aware of any unusual provision regarding any one of them. There is one clause, the necessity for which it is advisable to explain. Members will be aware that the city council have the right under the electric light power agreement of 1913—I refer to the schedule of the Electric Light and Power Agreement Act of 1913—to obtain from the Government the whole of their electric current for municipal purposes at a price of three-farthings per unit. That provision was inserted when it was thought that electricity would be produced at the new station at .52d. per unit. These expectations were not realised and, although the electric power station is doing very well and showing an improved position year after year, it will be some time before they get the working costs down to .52l. per unit. It might have been contended

without this provision in the Bill, that whatever current the council wanted for the new tram should be supplied at three-farthings per unit. This clause provides that that provision shall not apply, and that the price to be charged for current used shall be one mutually agreed upon between the Government and the city council. That is a provision to which the city council have agreed; in fact, I think I may safely say that the whole of the provisions of the Bill have been approved by the city council. The Bill, I am sure, will be thoroughly understood by members when they have had an opportunity of examining the very complete plans which I have laid upon the Table. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [8.2]: In seconding the motion for the second reading of the Bill, I have only one or two observations to offer. The Government are to be congratulated on bringing this measure before Parliament, particularly when it is recalled that the city of Perth, more perhaps than any other municipality, has suffered severely owing to the withdrawal of the Government subsidy and the change which was made last session in connection with the control of traffic. The revenue of the city of Perth has suffered most severely and the introduction of this Bill has perhaps been rendered necessary because of the loss which the city has sustained and the necessity which arises to find other sources of revenue. The endowment lands have been lying idle for many years and it has been recognised that it is absolutely impossible to develop these areas and turn them to good account without proper facilities for taking the people to and from the areas. The present Bill will render it possible for the city to open up their endowment lands and make them accessible to the public. It is hoped that these lands will become revenue producing in the course of a few years. The Bill, as I have seen from "Hansard," was very closely debated in another place, where it was thoroughly thrashed out by members well versed in municipal law and municipal government. So thoroughly debated was it, that I feel sure that it will be hardly necessary for members to give the Bill that close attention which it is so often deemed essential in this Chamber. I desire to draw attention to one or two clauses, however, and the first one to which I will make reference is Clause 25, which gives power to the Government to purchase any tramways constructed under this Act. The clause reads—

The Governor shall have the right at any time of purchasing from the council any tramway constructed under this Act. The right of purchase shall be exercised by the Governor by causing six months' notice in writing of the intention to so purchase to be given to the council, and in the event of the purchase price not being agreed to,

the same shall be determined by arbitration under the provisions of the Arbitration Act, 1895:

Then there is added the following proviso—

Provided that in estimating the amount of purchase money to be paid on such purchase, allowance may be made to reimburse the council for any loss or portion thereof sustained in operating such tramway during a period not exceeding the first seven years after completion, but no amount shall be allowed for the good-will of the council.

It will be noticed that, having regard to the Interpretation Act, the word "may" can possibly be interpreted in a way which would be hardly fair to the council. I feel sure the Government have no desire to be unfair. This provision is purely permissive. We can easily conceive the position that for a number of years at the outset the council will be bound to experience a loss on the running of the trams. When the estate has been opened up, say in four or five years, the council will probably have turned the corner, and it will be necessary, in these circumstances, for some provision to be made whereby the council shall be entitled to claim to be reimbursed for their losses in the event of the Government desiring to purchase the undertaking.

Hon. J. Duffell: The council will be covered to a certain extent by the sale of the land.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: They will be covered to a certain extent, it is true. It is only fair, however, that the council should be given the power to claim for losses as a matter of right. Naturally the council would not be entitled to build up a claim which could not be supported on good and sufficient grounds, but if they claimed for a loss, they would be required to show details of that loss when they came before the arbitrators. As the proviso stands now, it is purely optional for the Government to step in and exercise these powers and they may also arrogate to themselves the right of purchase.

The Minister for Education: It is optional with the arbitrators.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It does not follow. The proviso sets out that an allowance "may" be made to reimburse the council for any loss, and so on. It is doubtful whether this allowance may be made by the Government or by the arbitrators.

The Minister for Education: It may be made by the Government, and if they do not come to an agreement with the council, by the arbitrators.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The power should be given to the council to claim to be reimbursed for any loss, but this is a matter which can be dealt with in Committee. There is only one other clause which I have noticed in glancing through the Bill and I intend to make further inquiries to see whether it is necessary. The matter I refer to is contained in Clause 30 and references to the

matter also appear in Clause 31. These clauses relate to the striking of a special rate. (Clause 30 reads—

If in any year the proceeds of such special rate are in excess of the sum required for the purposes set out in the preceding section, such excess shall be retained and credited against any sum raisable for like purposes during the next ensuing year.

Ordinarily, these rates are struck from year to year and where there is an excess, it is carried over and applied to the next year. One can appreciate that it might not be necessary to strike a special rate each year in respect of these lands and to obviate any trouble arising on that score, I would suggest the insertion of the words "or any subsequent year" in the clause I have quoted. A similar amendment would be necessary in Clause 31. I am sure the Bill is one which, in view of all the circumstances, particularly as it will mean opening up such a large estate, is advantageous in every way, and will receive the endorsement of hon. members.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [S.T.]: I intend to support the Bill. I only rise to refer to a remark which fell from the Minister with regard to the supply of electric current for use in connection with the tramways on these endowment lands, when such tramways are constructed. The Bill provides that the price of current is to be mutually agreed upon and the Minister stated that he did not expect the working costs at the power station to get back to the price at which current was sold to the council, namely three farthings per unit, for some time. I think the hon. member was on good grounds when he made that remark. I should say that at no time now will the costs get back to three farthings per unit under present methods. Wages, certainly in our time, will not be less than they are now, and the coal costs, the cost of haulage of coal over the railways, and other costs as well, will tend to rise instead of fall. All this will militate against a fall in price of current. There is a way, I think, if we could find the money to do it, by which the price of current could be reduced. I have recently been in a country where one could get for power purposes, electric current at a farthing per unit and the current in that case was transmitted for a distance of 77 miles and it is to be transmitted soon a distance of 450 miles at 110,000 volts, after being generated alongside a coalfield. In 1900 I wrote a letter to the then Commissioner of Public Works, the late Mr. B. C. Wood, suggesting that the electric current for Perth should be generated at Collic and transmitted to the city, and the pumping stations of the Coolgardie water scheme, thus saving the cost of haulage. The then Government electrician reported that the loss in transmission would be so enormous as to render the proposition impracticable.

Hon. J. Ewing: They are doing it in Victoria.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes, so I understand. I wrote that letter as the result of having seen the power scheme operating between Niagara Falls and Buffalo City, a distance of a couple of hundred miles; and now, as I say, there is this other power scheme of 450 miles, over which current is taken and supplied for industrial purposes at one farthing per unit. In that scheme the current is generated by coal, not water. In many instances, this has been found to be the cheaper form of generation. It seems to me that even now, if we were to use the slack coal at Collie and generate the current at a high voltage, such as 60,000 volts, as they do in America, and transmit it to the power house here, where it could be transformed down, we should have some chance of getting electric current at a reasonable price. But while we continue to generate our current from coal carted over long distances at high rates of carriage, we shall never get it at the three farthings per unit which the Minister speaks about.

On motion by Hon. J. Ewing, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.18 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 2nd November, 1920.

	PAGE
Questions: Railway project, Yorkkrakine-North Baandee	1354
Aboriginal corpse, railway transport	1354
Industries Assistance Board	1354
Offal supplies, prices	1354
Kalgoorlie Hospital, employees' wages	1355
Leave of absence	1355
Bills: Meekatharra-Horseshoe Railway, 1B.	1355
Guardianship of Infants, 3B.	1355
Railways Classification Board, 2B.	1355
Coroners, Council's amendments	1384
Building Societies, Council's amendments	1384
Annual Estimates, Votes and items discussed	1355

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

QUESTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, YORKKRAKINE-NORTH BAANDEE.

Mr. PICKERING (for Mr. Harrison) asked the Premier: 1, In view of his promise, given to the deputation from the Yorkkrakine-North Baandee Railway League which waited upon him in August last, that, if the

report of the Railway Advisory Board was favourable, he would at once proceed to have the survey made, does he consider the report favourable? 2, If so, will he fulfil the promise given to the deputation that the survey would be proceeded with?

The PREMIER replied: 1. The report is, I consider, satisfactory. 2, Yes, in due course.

QUESTION—ABORIGINAL CORPSE, RAILWAY TRANSPORT.

Mr. WILLCOCK asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Has his attention been drawn to the following paragraph which appeared in the "Geraldton Express" of the 22nd October: "Our Yalgoo correspondent reports a free and easy but extremely disgusting method adopted by the authorities in conveying a corpse by train. At Wiluna, as related elsewhere, a drover has been arrested on a charge of murdering a blackfellow, and the latter's remains had to be brought to Perth. The course followed was to place the body in the lavatory of the compartment in which the constable and the aboriginal witnesses travelled. As the deceased native had been dead about two months, one can imagine what the effect would be. One would have thought that an air-tight coffin would have been provided and a truck used. Isn't it a mockery to have a Health Department and an army of sanitary inspectors when the Government of the day send a decomposed corpse over six hundred miles in a railway carriage with passengers?" 2, If the facts are as stated, will he issue instructions to prevent a recurrence of a similar deplorable incident?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, The paragraph in question had not come to the notice of the Hon. Minister for Public Health. 2, The facts of the case are substantially as stated in the paragraph in question, except that the remains were much dried up and consisted of bones and skin. No nuisance appears to have been caused, but the course followed in transmitting these remains was not a proper one, and instructions have been issued which will prevent a repetition.

QUESTION—INDUSTRIES ASSIST- ANCE BOARD.

Mr. PICKERING asked the Premier: Do the operations of the Industries Assistance Board extend to the South-West and Great Southern districts of the State.

The PREMIER replied: To the South-West, no. To the Great Southern Railway districts, yes.

QUESTION—OFFAL SUPPLIES, PRICES.

Mr. JONES (for Mr. Green) asked the Premier: 1, Is it a fact that the Prices Regulation Commission has recently fixed the