

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 4th December, 1900.

Question: Aborigines Protection Board—Urgency: Imperial Contingent, Invitation—Question: Commonwealth Inauguration—Question: Beaufort Street Bridge, Perth—Question: Dairy Expert, Credentials—Papers presented—Question: Railway Bridge for William Street, Perth—Question: Boring for Coal at Jandakot—Question: Pension, Mr. M. H. Smith—Leave of Absence—Motion: Wine Industry, State Aid: Division—Conspiracy and Protection of Property Bill, Council's Amendments—Public Service Bill, Amendments—Bills of Sale Amendment Bill, Council's Amendments—Collie Coal, Reward for Discovery; Committee's Report, adoption—Perth Public Hospital Inquiry, Select Committee's Report, debate resumed, adjourned—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—ABORIGINES PROTECTION BOARD.

MR. QUINLAN, by leave, asked eleven questions relating to the Aborigines Protection Board, to which the Premier (having previously been informed of the questions) answered as follows:—1. When was the Aborigines Protection Board authorised by the Government to take over the distribution of the funds set apart for the welfare of the natives? Answer: Before 1889 by a board, and since 1889 by a board appointed under the Constitution Act, 1889.—2. How was this board constituted, and who were the members? Answer: By the Constitution Act, 1889, and the Aborigines Act, 1889. The members were Dr. Waylen, Rev. Mr. Nicolay, Mr. S. H. Parker, Mr. G. Leake, and afterwards Mr. Sewell and Mr. Moorhead.—3. How did the board allocate the money placed at its disposal? Answer: As they thought best, with the approval of the Governor.—4. Under what conditions, if any, did the Government undertake to supplant the board? Answer: It was desired that the care of the aborigines should be under the control of the local Parliament.—5. When and how have the Government undertaken the duties of the Aborigines Board? Answer: Since 1898 as a special department of State.—6. What amount was at their disposal when they undertook the duties of the board? Answer: £5,000 a year by Act of Parliament and £5,421 out of revenue. That was the first year.—7. What insti-

tutions benefit by the moneys spent, and how much on each and upon what principle was the basis of distribution? Answer: The last annual report, now on the table, shows the details of expenditure.—8. Was there any understanding arrived at, and what was it, between the Aborigine Protection Board and the Government when the latter took over the management of the board? Answer: No.—9. What arrangement was made with the imperial authorities and the colonial Government in the matter? Answer: An Act, 61 Vict., No. 5, was passed by the Imperial Government.—10. On what basis does the Government allocate the aborigine funds? Answer: The Chief Protector recommends and the Governor-in-Council approves.—11. Who is the responsible official of the Government in the distribution of these funds? Answer: The Chief Protector, under the Colonial Treasurer.

URGENCY—IMPERIAL CONTINGENT, INVITATION.

MR. MORAN (East Coolgardie): With the indulgence of the House, he wanted to move the adjournment in order to refer to a matter that was of some considerable importance to this colony. There was a body of the finest troops in the world coming here to Australia; and if it was the wish of the military authorities here, and voicing the opinion of the people of Western Australia as he believed he did in this matter, it was desirable that these troops should be asked to disembark at Fremantle and remain a short time in this colony. Personally, he thought that Western Australia had been somewhat slighted in connection with the federal celebrations, and he did not feel satisfied with the way things had been carried on lately, for he felt Western Australia was not being considered as we ought to be. He wished to draw the attention of the Government to the fact he had stated, in order to elicit some expression of opinion as to whether the Government would take steps with a view of getting this splendid body of imperial troops to disembark at Fremantle and remain a short time in the colony. We knew that at the present time the military spirit was fairly strong in this colony and in Australia; and it was of importance to encourage this spirit

in every way. He formally moved that the House do now adjourn.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The hon. member was to be thanked for having brought this matter under the notice of the House. He (the Premier) had had it in mind for some time to move in regard to these troops, for it seemed to him desirable that we should make representations to the imperial authorities in the direction the hon. member had named. He did not know what were to be the movements of the troops in journeying to Australia, but he felt certain that if it was possible to arrange the matter, the imperial authorities would be glad to meet our wishes. He would undertake to move the Administrator to send a telegram to the Secretary of State for the Colonies in regard to the matter mentioned by the hon. member, and to urge on the imperial authorities the desire of this colony that we should have an opportunity of welcoming these soldiers before they returned to the mother country.

Motion (adjournment) put and negatived.

QUESTION—COMMONWEALTH INAUGURATION.

MR. HALL asked the Premier: Whether the Government intended to take any steps towards celebrating in Perth the inauguration of the Australian Commonwealth on the 1st of January next.

THE PREMIER replied: The Government would be glad to act in concert with the local authorities in this matter.

QUESTION—BEAUFORT STREET BRIDGE, PERTH.

MR. HALL asked the Commissioner of Railways: When the Government intended carrying out the resolution of this House, passed on the 6th of June last, "That the widening of the Beaufort street bridge should be proceeded with without further delay."

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS replied: The Government had not lost sight of the matter, and hoped to put the work in hand at an early date.

QUESTION—DAIRY EXPERT, CREDENTIALS.

MR. HUBBLE asked the Commissioner of Crown Lands: Whether it was

his intention to investigate the charges made by the hon. member for the DeGrey against the dairy expert of the Department of Agriculture, and lay the result of such investigations on the table of the House.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS replied: Yes; such investigation will be made, and from information already obtained I have every confidence that it will be shown that the assertions of the hon. member for the DeGrey are altogether without foundation. The papers will be laid on the table of the House.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the **COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS**: Papers as to the appointment, qualifications, and identity of Mr. Alexander Crawford, Dairy Expert of Agricultural Department.

By the **ATTORNEY GENERAL**: Annual Report on Patents.

Ordered to lie on the table.

QUESTION—RAILWAY BRIDGE FOR WILLIAM STREET, PERTH.

MR. GEORGE asked the Director of Public Works: What steps, if any, had been taken by him to fulfil the promise made by him to the electors of Perth, that the bridge over the railway in William street should be put in hand at once if he became elected.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS replied: Plans were in course of preparation, and would soon be completed.

QUESTION—BORING FOR COAL AT JANDAKOT.

MR. WILSON asked the Director of Public Works: When the Government intended putting down a bore at Jandakot to test for coal, as promised some two or three years ago.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS replied: The attention of the Government Geologist would be directed to the matter, and his advice asked in regard to same.

QUESTION—PENSION, MR. M. H. SMITH.

MR. WALLACE asked the Premier:—1, Whether the Government had received any communication or application from one M. H. Smith, in respect of pension or

gratuity for services rendered. 2, If yes, what did the Government intend doing.

THE PREMIER replied:—1, Yes. 2, The matter is under the consideration of the Postal Department.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by the MINISTER OF MINES, leave of absence granted for remainder of session to the member for the DeGrey (Mr. Darlôt).

On motion by the PREMIER, leave of absence granted for remainder of session to the member for York (Mr. Monger).

MOTION—WINE INDUSTRY, STATE AID.

MR. HARPER (Beverley) asked for leave to submit a motion without notice. His reason for bringing it up at this late hour of the session might be easily explained. It was in regard to the wine industry of the colony. The Government at an early stage of the session introduced a Bill dealing with this matter amongst others (State Aid to Manufacturers Bill), but that Bill was subsequently withdrawn. Those persons who were interested in the wine industry of this colony had since been endeavouring to get some action taken by the Government in regard to this industry, but nothing definite had been done; therefore he asked leave at this stage of the session to move a motion on the subject, to point out the difficult position the wine industry was in, and the extreme danger which menaced it in the future unless something was done by the Government in the way of help. He moved:

That, with the object of stimulating the wine industry of the colony, it is desirable to encourage the establishment of a Central Winery and Storage Cellars; and that the Government be authorised, should they think fit, to assist in that direction by—(a.) Advancing money, or (b.) Guaranteeing interest on money advanced to any co-operative company of *bona fide* vineyard proprietors formed for the purpose of establishing and carrying on such winery and cellars.

Vine-growers found that in the course of a short time they would be face to face with the competition of growers in the Eastern colonies, where growers had been aided by Governments in almost every direction, having received bonuses for planting and assistance in the export

of wine, besides the fact that large capitalists had embarked in the trade during some years past. It was against competition resulting from this assistance in the other colonies that the growers here would have to stand or fall, when intercolonial free-trade came into operation. Wine growers here generally commenced in a small way, and gradually worked up to the condition in which they stood at present. They had not had any assistance from the Government other than the import duty, which he believed was less here than in other colonies. Growers in this colony had to face the great expense of clearing land and the difficulty of starting the business with very small capital; whereas growers in the eastern colonies who would be competing against growers here under free trade, had the advantage of ample capital, and their expenditure was must less in the cost of planting, while they were also largely aided by the Governments in those States. Persons interested in the industry in this colony affirmed that it would be impossible for them to stand against the competition they would have to meet in a year or two, unless the Government gave some assistance; and in fact, this competition might easily be commenced immediately, without waiting for the beginning of intercolonial free-trade, because large growers in the eastern colonies had vast quantities of wine on hand, and it would be to their interest as business men to introduce their wine here on sale for a time even at a loss, until they got the benefit of free-trade at a later period. They might do this knowing full well that every year the opportunity for them would improve in selling their wines in this colony, while the opportunities for those who were producing wines here would be failing; therefore he urged on members in this House that some assistance should be given to growers in this colony, because it was with then a question of life or death for the wine industry. Those who were engaged in it were convinced that the smaller growers in this colony would have to go down, unless something was done by the Government to assist them. If we considered what this country had done for the mining industry in the way of establishing public batteries, we might fairly take that as being to some extent a parallel case.

This House had voted considerable expenditure in establishing those batteries, and it was obvious that as time went on, some of those batteries must decline in value and would in all probability result in a large amount of capital being sunk that would never be recovered, although the country might be well recouped by the development of the mining industry. He did not ask that the same principle should be applied to building up the wine industry, which was often spoken of as the most promising industry in this colony; but he asked that assistance should be given in maintaining the industry which had already been started and had attained some development. Unless this assistance were given, those now engaged in the industry would lose all the labour they had put into it during many years, and all the capital they had been able to scrape together for the same object; therefore he asked this House, and particularly those members representing the gold-mining industry—remembering that the farming interests in this colony had always given the utmost assistance in developing the mining industry—that they should do something now to save an industry which was threatened with extinction as the result of unequal competition.

THE SPEAKER: It was right to point out that this discussion was entirely irregular. Such an important motion should not be brought forward without notice.

MR. HARPER: The only excuse was that the Government had had the matter before them, and had done nothing.

THE SPEAKER: That did not alter the case as far as the rules of the House were concerned. If the House wished to have a discussion on the question, members could say so; but at the present the discussion was out of order.

On motion by the **PREMIER**, resolved that the discussion be allowed to proceed.

MR. QUINLAN (Toodyay): In seconding the motion, he had much pleasure in supporting the arguments of the mover, and hoped the Government would adopt some means of helping this industry. He had himself referred to this subject on more than one occasion in the House, and he regretted that the growers had not been able to arrange

with the Government for some means of granting support to this industry. By debating this motion we might be able to make some provision for a sum of £5,000 to be made available as a guarantee of interest on capital to be invested in the establishment of a central winery. There was power to do this until the sliding scale would operate under the federal system; but the wine-growers wished to make some provision beyond that period. If some steps were not taken to help the industry in its infancy, it would fall to the ground, and its loss would be regrettable, seeing that authorities in the East admitted this colony to be the best of the group for cultivation of the vine.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Then why did not wine-growing pay?

MR. QUINLAN: There was no market.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The market was in Europe.

MR. QUINLAN: Once the industry was established, there would be a local market.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): This matter had been for some time before the Government, who had contemplated submitting a Bill for encouraging local industries generally. The introduction of this measure, however, was prevented by the Commonwealth Act, which provided that no bonus granted since 1898 should continue after the establishment of the Commonwealth.

MR. A. FORREST: A State Parliament could not grant such bonuses in future.

THE PREMIER: But the Federal Parliament could.

MR. MOORHEAD: In that Parliament, Western Australia was in a minority of 5 to 70.

THE PREMIER: But the other 65 would not always be of one mind. No doubt when intercolonial duties were removed, our wine-growers would find competition severe, for they now received some 3s. or 4s. per gallon; whereas if wine could be imported duty-free it could be sold much cheaper than that, even though the freight from other colonies would be some protection. In other colonies, wine was produced in such large quantities that the vignerons could undersell ours even at a loss, so as to destroy the industry in this colony. There would, of course, be some protection here under the sliding scale, if the Legislature kept

faith with our producers and allowed our tariff gradually to disappear. A grant of money was, apparently, the only way of assisting the wine industry. Whether a direct grant of £5,000, placed in the hands of a board, would have the desired effect, he could not say; but it might suffice to pay interest on the cost of erecting a central winery. That amount would represent the interest on £20,000 for two years at 5 per cent.; but to permanently guarantee interest on a loan would involve interminable difficulty. Such direct gift was the only way of assisting viticulture, which was confronted with hard times after the abolition or partial abolition of the sliding scale; and for some time before the duties were abolished, people would cease to plant vineyards. The grant might be paid out of the Miscellaneous vote from loan or from revenue. Under free-trade, local vigneron would have much difficulty in competing with the Eastern producer, for his areas of cultivation were large, his soil was productive, and his vineyards were well established. In South Australia the wine industry had been built up by protective duties and bonuses. The motion deserved serious consideration.

MR. A. FORREST (West Kimberley) : This important question should have been introduced earlier in the session. The Government might build the winery, and hand it over to a board. A market-house had been built in Perth for the use of farmers; so why not assist the vigneron? Bonuses had been given for jam and for coal production, and public batteries had been provided; and if we could evade the Commonwealth Act by granting £20,000 or £25,000 to build a winery, we should be doing a good work, for which the country would be ever grateful to this expiring Parliament. This was the first result of federation; and for the future, on every important question, the House would be told we must go to the Federal Parliament. Members would get sick of the very name of federation, and the colony would try to regain its independence. We should be, under federation, an oppressed people; for many of our industries would be completely ruined, in order that a few men might be cast up into high places while the rest sank down to the lowest level.

MR. MORAN (East Coolgardie) : The suggestions in the motion were impracticable, as they would at once be questioned by the Federal Parliament as being contrary to the Commonwealth Act. The Premier's alternative suggestion opened up what must prove a fruitful subject of discussion—the question of what constituted an infringement of the Federal Constitution by a State. New railways, irrigation systems, State drainage, were direct forms of encouragement to industries, and were legal; but a cash bonus to an industry was forbidden by the Commonwealth Act; and a guarantee of interest was a most direct form of bonus, as it protected the manufacturer against failure. Was the State to cease doing socialistic work? Could a State in the Commonwealth erect a winery?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL : Certainly.

MR. MORAN : But the Inter-State Commission might not think so. If the State could erect a winery, why could it not grow the grapes? In this way all our infant industries might be taken over and worked by the State. If a State winery were legal, it would justify the expenditure of £30,000 or £40,000 of loan moneys to preserve this great wine industry, which would remain long after many other industries had disappeared. Let us do this thing, and let the Federal Parliament find fault if they chose. At all events, if the £5,000 offered by the Premier were available, let it be granted. Surely the Federal Parliament would not desire to crush the wine industry of Western Australia. By Section 91 of the Commonwealth Act, the Federal Parliament could permit a State to give a bonus to any industry. He would support any reasonable proposal of this nature.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. G. Throssell) : The motion would not have his full support. The Government were to some extent pledged to viticulturists, particularly to the small growers, men with from 5 to 20-acre vineyards. The Premier's suggested advance of £5,000 would be of little use, though the suggestion that the State should erect a winery might be practicable. Objection might be taken to that; but as the Government had already built market-houses for direct encouragement of the farmer, the cost of a winery with modern

appliances might be ascertained with a view to assisting the vigneron. It was contended that, under federation, we were not at liberty to do what neighbouring colonies had been doing for the last 40 years. That showed the anti-federalists had been right in their conception of the results of federation. We must endeavour to turn our lands to the best account, with a view of supplying not only the local, but the English market. There was a fallacious idea as to the profits derived from wine-selling. On good authority he had it that half-a-crown a gallon would be all that could be expected on the English market. The South Australian Government had refused to sell their London winery, established for the benefit of their vignerons. If it were legal for South Australia to have State wine-cellars in London, it would be equally lawful for this colony to establish a central winery here. No doubt the Inter-State Commission would remove these difficulties, and permit of the development of our wine industry. The mover had done right in bringing this matter forward, and he, as Commissioner of Crown Lands, had been led to the conclusion, from what had passed between the representatives of the wine growers and the Government, that some direct assistance should be given. Under the Bill for granting State aid to manufacturers, the Government had intended to grant aid to wine growers by guaranteeing interest on an expenditure of sums up to £100,000 at 5 per cent. In regard to this intention, it had been said the Government were favouring "socialism run mad"; but as against that we need only look to see what was being done in other colonies. Only this week Messrs. Burgoyne and Co. had approached the South Australian Government with a proposal to buy their central winery in London; but that Government had refused to sell, because they wished to secure for the wine growers in South Australia the best price for their wines in the English market. The Government of New South Wales also were considering a project for expending a large sum, from £100,000 to £200,000, in assisting the wine industry of that colony. It had been said of himself (Hon. G. Throssell) that he was inconsistent, because in his private capacity he was opposed to the

wine trade entirely, while in his public capacity he was willing to assist it with a grant of public money. His reply was that in regard to agriculture generally, if he were to insist on carrying his private ideas into his public actions as a Minister, he would not be fit for public life. He took it that his public duty as a member of this House was to deal with the law as he found it; and in regard to the wine industry, he thought that Parliament, in the interest of all parties concerned, should do something to assist this industry. If, therefore, the mover would place before the Government some definite plan for the erection of a central winery, the cost to be paid by the Government and the business to be worked by those interested in the industry, then something practical might result from the motion. If £10,000 were to be spent in the erection of a central winery on modern principles, and if a company formed by those engaged in the wine industry were prepared to pay 5 per cent. interest on that amount of capital, and to work the business on their own responsibility, the Government simply erecting the building on modern principles and the company working the business and paying 5 per cent. on the capital cost, this would be a way in which a practical outcome might be attained.

MR. EWING (Swan): Not having heard the beginning of the discussion, he understood the motion was for State assistance to the wine industry. It should first be shown that the wine growers would suffer by federation more than other producers in the colony; and he was not aware that this had been shown, nor had the hon. member put forth anything to convince the House that any great injustice was being done to the wine industry. If those engaged in that industry were entitled to protection against competition from wine growers in other colonies, then the same argument might be applied to the fruit growers and other producers in the colony. [MR. HARPER: No, no.] The speeches of the hon. member during the federation discussions were to the effect that almost every industry in the colony was to suffer from federation. If all the industries were to suffer, why did the mover single out this one industry in the motion? No

case for this special action had been made out, but, on the contrary, the motion was against the spirit of federation. If, however, assistance was to be given to wine growers, every other industry must also be assisted; and to do that would land us, as the result of a system of bonuses, in utter financial ruin. We could not vote money to assist every industry in the colony; and if we were not prepared to assist every industry, why pick out this one industry and assume that it was going to suffer specially? The wine industry had been fairly well treated in the past, for it had enjoyed a heavy system of protection.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member was himself a protectionist.

MR. EWING: While Western Australia was a province, he was a protectionist; but he held that we should not favour one industry more than any other industry in the colony, and certainly up to the present the wine industry had received more protection than almost any other industry. He said this, knowing that some of his own constituents were wine growers. We knew that the practice of those who wanted to protect industries was that they first asked for protection only for a few years, saying that then they would be prepared to have the duties removed, as the industries would be established; but in the case of the wine industry, it had been protected for many years past, not for the benefit of the colony generally, but at the expense of the colony for benefiting the few persons concerned in the industry. We had been paying heavy taxation for the benefit of this industry in the past.

MR. MORAN: It was a revenue tariff.

MR. EWING: The wine duties here were imposed for protection; and those interested in the industry were now howling because we were removing, not a revenue tariff, but a protective tariff. They had not shown that this industry would be seriously injured by federation more than other industries, and they had not shown any distinction between this and the other producing industries in regard to any injury that might result from federation. Therefore it was highly undesirable to affirm the proposal of the member for Beverley. Some of

his electors who were wine growers had asked him to support this motion. Finding they were free-traders, he asked how they could consistently ask him to support this motion against their own principle? Their reply was that the exigencies of the case required it. It thus appeared that so long as they had been getting the benefit of protection for themselves, they wanted to make the rest of the community free-traders. He opposed the motion because it would draw an unfair and improper distinction between this and other producing industries in the colony.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): The proposal had in it nothing definite. If passed, it would leave open to the Government during the recess to do anything they might choose in regard to this subject. We had heard incidentally that a certain company wanted a certain consideration to induce them to start central wineries; and one reason why the Bill (State Aid to Manufacturers) was opposed in this House was because of a suspicion of this character. We had had notice of the fact that the present head of the Government proposed to sever his connection with the Administration at an early date; and this meant that a Government would be formed during the recess at the will of the existing Government, and the Government so formed would have no mandate from this House, would be responsible to no one, and yet would have to carry out this motion if passed. It would be a great mistake to pass a motion of this character at this stage. If the mover could make a proposal having definite limitations, we might deal with that. The Commissioner of Crown Lands had suggested an expenditure of £5,000 by the Government in the erection of a central winery, a company formed among themselves to carry on the business, paying interest at 5 per cent. If the Government were to propose to guarantee 5 per cent. on a capital outlay of £20,000, this House would know how far it was going, and there would be some definite limitation; but to pass a resolution which would enable the new Government to do as it pleased under a motion of this kind would be unwise. He would like to help the industry if it could be done, but no doubt if we were going to

do so, in view of our relationship with the Commonwealth, we should know at least the exact amount, so as to have a limitation. There was nothing before us to prevent the Government from spending £100,000 on the project, if they thought fit; therefore to make the motion of any use, it ought to be made more definite by having some limit stated.

MR. WALLACE (Yalgoo): Although not a wine expert, he was a wine drinker, and he must say that much of the stuff that was produced in this colony and put on the market as wine was not fit to drink. He would support a motion to assist in getting on the market wine that could be drunk safely and without fear of consequences. He had tried every kind of wine produced in this colony, and he stood here to-day with a shattered constitution. (General laughter.) He really believed it to be the result of drinking West Australian wine; and when after this experience he wanted wine, he had to say, "Not West Australian, please." If the Government assisted this industry at all, it should be in producing a wine that could be offered to the public with safety; and his experience was that there were not half-a-dozen producers in the colony who did produce wine fit to be put on the market. The best protection the State could offer to any industry was open competition; and when those engaged in this industry found they must produce first-class stuff, they would take care to do it, even if they charged a little more for it than for inferior stuff. Until wine producers here produced an article fit to drink, they could not expect to be supported; and if the Government assisted this industry at all, they should make some stipulation that the wine produced should be fit for consumption. It was not right for this House to legislate in one direction only by assisting one particular industry; still he did not oppose the motion, because it would not be dangerous in its effect for the State to launch out in this direction with the condition he suggested. Therefore he hoped some assistance would be given to the wine industry of this colony.

MR. GREGORY (North Coolgardie): It had been proved that the very heavy duty on imported wine had not assisted the wine industry in this colony. In no

portion of Australia was the soil or the climate more fitted for wine growing than in parts of this colony; yet the industry was kept back by the fact that most of the growers were comparatively poor persons, who had not received any assistance from the Government such as had been given by Governments in other colonies, and our growers had not the help of large capital. In these circumstances it was the duty of every member of the House who had voted for the erection of public batteries to assist the gold-mining industry now to apply this principle to the wine industry by voting for some assistance to be given to it. No doubt gold-mining was our greatest industry, but the production of wine was also capable of becoming a great industry, and it should be assisted by the State. It was the duty of the Government without delay to assist this industry by the erection of wineries in suitable centres: say one in Perth, having the most modern machinery for the proper treatment of the grape, and other wineries at centres to be selected. These would be a great assistance to the growers, who might then start co-operative societies, and be able to store the wine and keep it for a few years until it matured for sale on the market. In the case of poor growers who must sell the raw product in order to produce returns for carrying on, it was necessary for them to push their product on the market before it had time to mature, and hence a good deal of the wine offered was no good. Good wine could be produced in this colony, and Parliament should endeavour to assist the wine growers in a practical manner. He had tasted good wine, the product of this colony, and it simply required maturing. He hoped the Government would give all the support they could to this proposal, and that during the next 12 months we would have a winery in our midst supported by the State, and managed in such a way as would enable the growers to form co-operative societies.

MR. HARPER (in reply) thanked the Premier for the sympathy he had expressed in regard to the wine industry, and trusted the Government would be able to see their way to recommend something that would be of real assistance. The question of building a winery or not doing so was one that might well be discussed; but he

would like the Government to inquire what was proposed to be done by the Government of New South Wales. The Commissioner of Crown Lands had informed us, and he (Mr. Harper) had heard it previously, that it was proposed in New South Wales to make a grant at once of £150,000 to be expended in the development of the wine industry of that colony, so as to enable the growers to meet the competition of the sister colonies under federation. If the Government here would ascertain the facts, they might assist in arriving at a conclusion in regard to what should be done here. Referring to the remarks of the member for the Swan (Mr. Ewing), it was not particularly creditable for that member to import his views into this discussion when he had not heard the motion or the remarks made in moving it. The hon. member had absolutely misrepresented statements which he (Mr. Harper) had made in this debate. As to what had been said on public platforms during the discussion on federation, he did not say that every industry in the colony would suffer by federation, and he must deny that statement *in toto*. What he did say was that many of our industries would suffer. One of the largest industries in this colony, the pastoral industry, would not suffer at all by federation.

MR. VOSPER: Would the legal industry suffer?

MR. HARPER: The member for the Swan had said we must first show that the wine industry would suffer more than any other. What he (Mr. Harper) had said was that the wine industry would suffer first, and that it might suffer extinction. This was his reason for moving in the matter now, for he believed that the wine industry was the one that would first go down, and was the one that would suffer most in this colony; therefore unless something was done to assist those who were now engaged in it, they must be ruined as far as this industry was concerned.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	5
			—
Majority for	15

AYES.
 Sir John Forrest
 Mr. A. Forrest
 Mr. D. Forrest
 Mr. Gregory
 Mr. Harper
 Mr. Higham
 Mr. Hubble
 Mr. Hutchinson
 Mr. Lefroy
 Mr. Locke
 Mr. Moorhead
 Mr. Moran
 Mr. Pennelfather
 Mr. Quinlan
 Mr. Sholl
 Mr. Solomon
 Mr. Throssell
 Mr. Wallace
 Mr. Wood
 Mr. Eason (Teller).

NOES.
 Mr. Ewing
 Mr. Illingworth
 Mr. Vosper
 Mr. Wilson
 Mr. Kingsmill (Teller).

Question thus passed.

CONSPIRACY AND PROTECTION OF PROPERTY BILL.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT.

The Legislative Council having returned the Bill with one amendment, the same was considered.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 7—Add the following paragraph: "Attending at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, or the approach to such house or place, in order merely to obtain or communicate information, shall not be deemed to be watching or besetting within the meaning of this section":

MR. EWING (in charge of the Bill) moved that the amendment be agreed to. He understood the Government's amendments were intended to bring the Bill into exact accord with the English Act. This, however, had not been done in regard to "besetting," and the Council's amendment would remedy the defect.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said he had been under the impression that the whole of the corresponding section in the English Act was included in the Bill; but if the clause were incomplete, it should be amended in accordance with that Act. The amendment, however, appeared unnecessary, because no man charged with "besetting" would be convicted, if he could prove his object had been to deliver a message.

MR. MORAN: Was there anything to prevent 10,000 men going to a place to get information?

MR. EWING: In the original Bill there was no clause dealing with "besetting," and the Council's amendment was a

corollary to the insertion of the besetting clause. It was not desirable that a man should be even arrested for simply carrying a message from one place to another.

MR. MORAN: Care must be taken that the amendment was in the English Act.

THE PREMIER moved that progress be reported.

Motion put and passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again the same evening.

At a latter stage, the Council's amendment was agreed to. Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL.

ADMINISTRATOR'S SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS.

The Legislative Council having disagreed to amendment No. 1 and agreed to No. 2, the first amendment was further considered in Committee; and on motion by the PREMIER, amendment No. 1 (relating to holidays) was not insisted on.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

BILLS OF SALE AMENDMENT BILL. COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

The Legislative Council having returned the Bill with two amendments, the same were considered in Committee, and agreed to.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

COLLIE COAL, REWARD FOR DISCOVERY.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. LOCKE, who had brought up the report of the select committee, now moved that the report be adopted.

MR. GEORGE (Murray): The Government had taken a party of visitors to Colliefields, and the Premier had then stated Mr. Arthur Perren to be the actual discoverer of Collie coal. Why was not Mr. Perren given the full amount of the reward? The evidence taken by the committee showed no reason why the reward should be divided.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie): Apparently, Perren had been the first discoverer of coal; but the first person to whom he showed the coal was Mr. Hay, who turned coal-mining into a

payable industry, from which Mr. Hay derived no profit during his life. Mr. Perren was living to-day and in good circumstances, while the family of the late Mr. Hay were poor; and as there had been an agreement between Perren and Hay to share the profits of the discovery, and this reward being the only profit likely to be obtained, therefore the proposed division was eminently proper.

Question put and passed, and the report adopted.

At 6-30, the SPEAKER left the Chair.

At 7-30, Chair resumed.

PERTH PUBLIC HOSPITAL INQUIRY.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

Debate resumed from previous sitting, on the motion of Mr. Hall for adoption of the committee's report.

MR. QUINLAN (Toodyay) expressed regret that the time occupied by the select committee in making this inquiry had not borne the good fruit which was expected by the member for Perth in moving for it. The first paragraph of the committee's report was complimentary to the Hospital and its management. So far as other portions of the report were concerned, with the exception of two recommendations, he entirely disagreed with the references made to the Hospital as an institution. The committee said there was a considerable degree of friction between the medical staff of the Hospital and certain members of the medical profession who were not connected with the Hospital. We knew the origin and reason for that statement. Only one member of the medical profession had had any friction with the Hospital Board or with the medical staff of the Hospital. He referred to Dr. Haynes. As to Dr. Paget and Dr. Thurstan, some members were aware that Dr. Paget belonged to Fremantle, and Dr. Thurstan was a partner with Dr. Haynes. And as to Dr. Haynes, whatever else he might be, he was known to be a first-class agitator; and when he (Mr. Quinlan) told the House that Dr. Haynes was the promoter of this inquiry and this waste of time and this expense to the country, the House would understand the position. The Hospital Board was referred to in

the report as a close corporation. That argument had been frequently used by the same medical man (Dr. Haynes), who had made himself somewhat obnoxious to the profession as a whole; and while he (Mr. Quinlan) admitted that at one time, when Dr. Haynes applied to be placed on the honorary staff of the Hospital, he was in favour of it, yet at that time he did not know Dr. Haynes so well as he did now, and therefore he now realised that other members of the board had been right in refusing that application from Dr. Haynes. The Hospital Board and all the medical men connected with the Hospital had worked with the greatest unanimity, and had the greatest confidence in one another. So far as concerned the applications for admission to the Hospital, they were dealt with as fairly as possible, not only by the board, but by the medical members on the board, some of them being members also of the honorary staff of the Hospital. When any application came before the board affecting a case under the care of any practitioner who was a member of the board, such member walked out of the room and left the board to deal with the matter; therefore there was no favouritism. Medical members of the board deserved the highest respect, and certainly were entitled to more respect than the creature, the individual, who had caused this agitation and this inquiry.

A MEMBER: Mind he did not get at the hon. member for slander.

MR. QUINLAN: That person was fond of law, and if he (Dr. Haynes) could get at him, no doubt he would like to get him in his clutches. That member of the medical profession had the same right to attend *post mortem* examinations in the Hospital as had any other member, because any medical practitioner could at any time, by the direction or permission of the coroner, hold a *post mortem* examination on any case of death occurring in the Hospital; so that when Dr. Haynes claimed to have a right to be on the board of the Hospital for this purpose, he had that right already to hold *post mortem* examinations. With reference to the third paragraph of the report, as to persons having been discharged prematurely from the Hospital, and some having been neglected on their first entry there, so far as the evidence before the Committee

showed, the only case mentioned was that of a poor woman who was found drowned in the Swan, having been previously an inmate of the Hospital and discharged. It was said she left the Hospital before she should have done; but on that point the doctor in attendance on the case was not called before the committee, and surely he was the proper authority to say whether that patient was in a fit state to leave the Hospital when she did. The Hospital Board had given the strictest instructions that at all times the utmost consideration should be given to patients; and from his own knowledge of Dr. Blackburn and Dr. Thompson, they were by no means likely to be cruel in that direction, and he did not believe the charge made in the report was true. Indeed, looking at the report as a whole, he could not help feeling that the members of the committee were merely prosecutors, for they did not hear a fair case, and they never heard the other side. For instance, they never heard Dr. Blackburn or other medical members of the Hospital staff. A letter was written by the chairman of the Hospital Board (Sir G. Shenton) to the chairman of the select committee, specially asking that three doctors of the honorary medical staff mentioned in the letter should be called as witnesses. Those medical gentlemen were not called, and it did not appear that this letter was ever read before the select committee. The chairman of the Hospital Board had informed him that Mr. Hall (chairman of the select committee) had said he received the letter but forgot all about it, and did not put it before the committee. Was that a fair thing, to have that letter in hand and not produce it at the meeting of the committee? He hoped this House would not tolerate conduct of that kind, and in his opinion the chairman of the select committee was not worthy of the position he occupied, when he flouted the wishes of the Hospital Board in that manner. The letter showed that the Hospital Board were desirous of placing a fair case before the select committee; but by the action of the chairman of that committee, they were deprived of an opportunity for their witnesses to be heard. Indeed it appeared that the chairman of the select committee actually had not acknowledged the receipt of the

letter to his own committee. The last portion of paragraph 3 recommended that the Hospital should be placed under the control of an elective board, by which means, the report said, "a direct public scrutiny could be obtained which would certainly prevent the recurrence of such complaints." He (Mr. Quinlan) would be satisfied if the public as a whole were contributing to the funds, that the Hospital should be under a board elected by subscribers; but when the funds were contributed by the Government and therefore by the whole colony, and seeing that the Hospital was supported and maintained for the treatment of those who were unable to pay for medical attendance, it did appear to him there should be some control over the funds on behalf of the Government; and he believed that a board such as that which now managed the institution would show more regard for the proper care of the public funds than would a popularly-elected committee. The Governor had a right to remove the present board or any member of it, on a grave charge; and it was preferable that the Government should be represented on the board, so as to exercise some control over the expenditure of public funds. Paragraph 4 referred to the case of the man Rodgers, on whose death a coroner's inquest had been held, and stated that the depositions at the inquest were taken in a most unsatisfactory manner, and that the recorded depositions were more calculated to mislead than to inform. The committee recommended that depositions taken at coroners' inquests should be written in *verbatim* form. He could say, as one who had during many years observed the manner in which evidence was taken at coroners' inquests and on other occasions, that it would be inconvenient to keep witnesses hanging about until the shorthand notes of evidence could be transcribed, so that they might hear the evidence read and sign it as correct. The shorter and more practical way pursued at inquests and in other cases was for the clerk to take down such evidence as he considered relative to the case, to read over to each witness the evidence as written, and to get them to sign it there and then. In this way they were not detained an undue length of time waiting for their evidence to be

written out. He contended that the statement in this paragraph was not founded on fact, in saying the evidence in this case was loosely taken, or that the depositions were not in accordance with what the witnesses said. The coroner's clerk took the evidence so far as he considered it material to the case; and hon. members would know that evidence was often given that was quite irrelevant to the inquiry, and the clerk in taking down evidence had to exercise a proper discretion as to what was relevant and what was not. As to interference with the verdicts of coroners' juries, as suggested in paragraph 4, Mr. Roe, the Police Magistrate of Perth, emphatically denied the imputation that he and the jury had any conversation before arriving at their verdict; and anyone who knew Mr. Roe would accept his assurance on that point. As to paragraph 5, saying that friendly societies complained of the management of the Hospital "inasmuch as their members were excluded from its benefits" and were "penalised merely because they were more thrifty than the majority," the Hospital Board had since received a letter, written on behalf of friendly societies, withdrawing the complaint formerly made, and acknowledging the fact that members of friendly societies were now received in the Hospital on their merits, without regard to their being members of a friendly society or not.

MR. VOSPER: How long had that been done?

MR. QUINLAN: During the last two years it had been so.

MR. VOSPER: Nonsense! Quite contrary to the evidence.

MR. QUINLAN said he must repeat that it was so.

MR. EWING: It was not so.

MR. QUINLAN: It was so, and it was like the hon. member's impudence to say it was not.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member had no right to tell another hon. member that he was impudent.

MR. EWING: What he had said was that the regulation, if made, was not carried into effect.

MR. QUINLAN: That was a different matter. The Hospital Board had carried the resolution, and had been receiving cases of this kind into the Hospital; but

of course cases in which patients were able to pay had to be treated accordingly, and those persons were asked to pay. Judging by the appearance of many persons who applied at the Hospital for medical attendance inside or outside, he did not think many of them were unable to pay, and he was sorry to say that he believed the institution was being imposed on by people who were able to pay but would not do so. The letter received by the Hospital Board to which he had referred, stated that no complaint had been made as to members of friendly societies not being received in the Hospital, but that much trouble had been caused in regard to the admission of such persons. Referring to paragraph 6, the report said "the hours of labour imposed on the nursing staff were too long, that the time allowed for recreation was too limited, and that the salaries paid were insufficient." With regard to the hours, the evidence taken by the committee showed that the hours were somewhat long; but as to the salaries, there were scores of applications by persons seeking to be employed as probationers or nurses, and this fact showed there must be some inducement, or persons would not apply in such numbers for employment at the Hospital. He was not aware personally of any instance of trouble or complaint having come before the board in regard to these points. In paragraph 7, the report said "it was not the practice to notify medical men of the occurrence of autopsies and operations" in the Hospital, and that members of the profession should be notified and invited to attend. He must tell hon. members that the medical men connected with the Hospital did not see the wisdom of that course.

MR. VOSPER: Did the hon. member think they would recognise wisdom if they saw it?

MR. QUINLAN said probably they had as much brains as the hon. member. The Hospital Board had abundance of letters showing that the greatest confidence was expressed by patients who had been treated in the Hospital, and showing their appreciation of the arrangements made for the comfort of patients. These letters were generally congratulatory of the management of the Hospital, and showed a belief and appreciation of the ability of the doctors; there-

fore he must say that beyond one or two cases mentioned in the report as the cause of this inquiry, there was nothing to show that the public had no confidence in the Hospital and its management, and in the skill of its medical staff. With reference to the recommendation that the Hospital should be brought under the control of an elective board, to be elected by the ratepayers of Perth, that course would be hardly fair or desirable so long as the Government provided the money for carrying on the Hospital; therefore he did not see why the ratepayers of Perth should appoint those who were to manage the Hospital, unless the ratepayers contributed to the funds. Elections by ratepayers did not always return the best men, and that might be so in the case of an elective board.

MR. EWING: That statement was questionable.

MR. QUINLAN: The majority of the Hospital board were opposed to their meetings being open to the Press, as matters unfit for publication were sometimes discussed.

MR. GREGORY: A board spending public money should admit the Press.

MR. VOSPER: Objectionable matter could be discussed in committee.

MR. QUINLAN: With the recommendation that doctors should have the right to attend patients they sent to the hospital, he entirely disagreed. As there was no home for incurables, incurable cases had to be retained in the Hospital; but that matter would doubtless soon occupy the attention of the Government. If the board had had a fair hearing before the select committee, it would have been seen that the life of the man Noble was saved by the operation performed by Dr. Tratman and others. Noble was charged only the nominal fee of £1 1s. a week, which he never paid, giving as a reason for non-payment that he had contracted the disease in the military camp at Karrakattu; a statement which the doctors could disprove. As to cooking, provision had been made for keeping food hot in the wards. Regarding the old portions of the Hospital, these were renovated some twelve months ago, and they could hardly require renovating now. He agreed that the baths should be made of enamel-ware.

Funds were not available for laying out the grounds in lawns and flower gardens.

MR. GREGORY: What efforts had the board made to get public subscriptions?

MR. QUINLAN: Several efforts; but the public would not subscribe, for they knew the Hospital was imposed on. If left to voluntary subscription, the burden would fall on the few, and the many would go free. The present system was by far the best, because all taxpayers contributed equally.

MR. GREGORY: On the goldfields, hospitals were supported by voluntary subscriptions.

THE PREMIER: For a time, yes; but ultimately the Government had to take them over.

MR. QUINLAN: Of Mr. Hancock, the Hospital secretary, who could have given valuable evidence, the report said he was somewhat reluctant; but this was disproved by the fact that Mr. Hancock had asked the chairman if there was any other information required.

MR. VOSPER: The report did not say Mr. Hancock was reluctant.

MR. QUINLAN: That had been stated by Mr. Oats.

MR. VOSPER: Mr. Hancock was reluctant on some points and not on others.

MR. QUINLAN: The secretary had been instructed by the board to give the fullest information; but the board were not heard, notwithstanding their written request for a hearing, handed to the chairman. When the member for Perth (Mr. Hall) first introduced this question to the House, he maintained that he had a number of cases to refer to. Dr. Thompson asked the committee for particulars as to the case of rupture mentioned; but no particulars were forthcoming, nor was any opportunity given the board to refute statements made regarding these cases. Such conduct was unheard of on the part of a select committee of inquiry. He had been informed that Mr. Coultas, a jurymen in the case of the man Rodgers, had not adhered to his oath. That statement had been made to him (Mr. Quinlan) by a member of the Hospital Board, who said Mr. Coultas had an animus against the board because his son was refused admission to the Hospital. It was due to Mr. Coultas to say that he absolutely denied that his son ever sought admis-

sion; yet the select committee did not call Mr. Coultas, junior, to clear up the matter, nor was other evidence sought regarding it. The point must be left to the House to judge, and it was admitted by Mr. Coultas that if he had brought in a straight-out verdict, it must have been one of manslaughter against Dr. Horrocks. Regarding Dr. Horrocks and Dr. Haynes, hon. members knew both gentlemen. He (Mr. Quinlan) would accept Dr. Horrocks's statement. In the evidence given, Dr. Haynes said his patient Rodgers was refused admission; but all that Dr. Haynes had to do was to ring up the Hospital and state that the man was a fit case. It appeared that Dr. Haynes did not give Rodgers the necessary certificate of admission. It was true Dr. Haynes was justified in refusing afterwards to give a certificate of the cause of death, and the result was this inquiry, in which it was conclusively proved that Rodgers, who went to the Hospital without any medical certificate, was not admitted there as a patient, though Dr. Horrocks did examine him. It was stated that the staff on that morning was short-handed because of the absence of Dr. McWilliams; but Dr. Horrocks distinctly maintained that Rodgers walked briskly when seen by him, that he presented no alarming symptoms, and after examination was dismissed with a simple prescription. Dr. Haynes, according to his evidence, expressed surprise at Rodgers not being admitted to the Hospital; and when Rodgers died, Dr. Haynes refused to give a death certificate. He also stated that he wished to say nothing against his professional brethren, but simply to speak against the Hospital management, and that his only object in the inquiry was to show there were not enough medical men at the Hospital. Dr. Haynes also complained of the marked bias shown by the coroner at the inquest, in trying to misrepresent the evidence. That was most unfair, and he (Mr. Quinlan) believed in Mr. Roe. Dr. Haynes further complained that the brain of the deceased was examined while he (Dr. Haynes) was absent, for the express purpose of upsetting Dr. Haynes. Surely no ulterior object could be served by taking such action. It was for the House to judge of the value of such evidence. Dr. Haynes further said: "I and other

medical men have offered our services, and they have been rejected." That was true. At one time he (Mr. Quinlan) had been the only member of the board in favour of Dr. Haynes being admitted on the honorary staff, and being in such a minority he refrained from enforcing the doctor's claim. Dr. Haynes referred to Dr. Horrocks as a young man, though the latter held higher degrees than the former. In answer to Mr. Oats, Dr. Haynes complained that mismanagement in the Hospital still went on, and said that at the recent election of medical officers it was understood all the medical men would resign. As a fact, they did resign; a fresh election took place, and Dr. Haynes was amongst the unsuccessful candidates. The doctor referred to the case of a woman who, he said, had not cancer, and who would have been alive to-day had he been allowed to operate on her. That was an unbecoming reflection on the medical staff, as Mr. Roe had remarked. Such wild statements as the following in reply to Mr. Oats would give an idea of the value of Dr. Haynes's evidence: "The woman is alive and walking about, a hale and hearty mother of six children." And further: "I am sure if you had a couple of gallons on your liver, you would find it out." Then Dr. Haynes referred to a patient who had to go to Melbourne for cure, which circumstance he said was not a credit to the medical profession. But why did not Dr. Haynes perform the cure? As to the complaint in regard to *post mortem* examinations, Dr. Haynes had now the right to perform a *post mortem* and to receive the fee. Regarding the alleged conversation between the coroner and the jurymen, Mr. Roe had said that was a deliberate lie.

MR. VOSPER: Then there must have been four deliberate liars.

MR. QUINLAN: Probably there was some misunderstanding, but he was confident Mr. Roe, with his vast experience, would not interfere with a jury in arriving at its verdict. The conduct of the chairman of this select committee was not becoming to a member of Parliament, and it was to be hoped the electors would remember it on a future occasion. The chairman (Mr. Hall) had actually kept in his pocket the

letter from the board asking for a further hearing, and had not produced it to the committee.

MR. HALL: That was a deliberate untruth.

MR. QUINLAN: The chairman of the committee (Mr. Hall) told Sir George Shenton that he received the letter, and the secretary to the select committee (Mr. Grant) informed him (Mr. Quinlan) that he handed the letter to the chairman. No contradiction from the hon. member (Mr. Hall) would be satisfactory in view of these statements; and in regard to that letter, the Hospital secretary had received no acknowledgment. Without going further into details, he asked hon. members to deal with this report as it deserved. It was regrettable that there were friends of his (Mr. Quinlan's) on the committee; and they had evidently been led to attach their names to the report by thinking the chairman had done his duty by calling all the evidence procurable.

MR. HALL: The report was unanimous.

MR. QUINLAN: Other members of the committee were as disgusted as he at the chairman's conduct.

MR. EWING (Swan): Generally speaking, it was most unwise to dissent from the report of a select committee. Notwithstanding all the valuable information given by the last speaker, the select committee had had the advantage of hearing the witnesses, seeing their demeanour, and judging of their truthfulness. Regarding Dr. Haynes's condemnation of his professional brethren, Dr. Haynes or any other witness was there to speak the truth, and to correctly describe facts, without reference to their effect on his brethren; nor was it obvious why the hon. member (Mr. Quinlan) should be so bitter against Mr. Coultas merely because the hon. member had been informed that Mr. Coultas had been guilty of the grave offence of perjury.

MR. QUINLAN: The statement as to the breaking of the oath, as he had said at the time, was made on information received.

MR. EWING: And the information seemed to have been that Mr. Coultas's son had upon one occasion been refused admission to the Hospital; consequently

the hon. member had concluded that Mr. Coultas had broken his oath. The root of the whole difficulty would be found in the hon. member's remarks regarding the representatives on the Hospital Board, when he said he did not consider the Perth ratepayers fit to elect persons to control the Hospital, and that they did not make a wise choice of their representatives for other positions. That was purely a matter of opinion.

MR. VOSPER: It was a matter of spleen more than anything.

MR. EWING: The electors of Perth had shown their wisdom in the choice of representatives; therefore, if the power of electing the Hospital Board were vested in the same body who elected the Mayor of Perth, that would be the best guarantee that suitable persons would be appointed. This House had not met to condemn Dr. Haynes or any other reputable citizen unheard, on the strength of the hon. member's unjustifiable remarks; and he protested against the hon. member condemning Mr. Coultas or any other man as a perjurer, without any evidence to support the charge.

MR. QUINLAN said he had not done so.

MR. EWING: The House had heard what the hon. member had said on a previous occasion. The hon. member had referred to him (Mr. Ewing) as impertinent, in respect of his remark as to friendly societies. He had interjected that members of friendly societies were placed in a worse position than ordinary people, and had stated that because they belonged to societies—which fact was a direct evidence of thrift—they were refused admission.

THE PREMIER: The Hospital was for people who could not pay.

MR. EWING: Then the right hon. gentleman would penalise a man for being poor.

THE PREMIER: A person should be made to pay his hospital bill if he was able to pay it.

MR. EWING: If a member of a friendly society were in such a condition that he could not afford to pay, and required treatment in the Public Hospital, the mere fact of his belonging to a friendly society prevented his admission to the Hospital. The hon. member (Mr. Quinlan) stated (presumably in ignorance) that the remarks on this point in

the report were absolutely untrue, and that members of friendly societies were admitted the same as other people. The Hospital Board might have passed the resolution, but it had not been carried into effect.

MR. QUINLAN: It was carried into effect.

MR. EWING: Only recently he had introduced a deputation to the Colonial Secretary, complaining that certain persons who had applied at the Hospital were not admitted because they were members of a friendly society.

THE PREMIER: Would not the friendly society pay for them?

MR. EWING: The Premier and the member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan) evidently did not know anything about friendly societies, or they would know that a friendly did not pay £4 a week, or whatever sum was necessary for treatment in a hospital.

MR. QUINLAN: The charge was only a guinea a week in the Perth Public Hospital.

MR. EWING: They had to pay three or four guineas a week if they required treatment in a private hospital; and if the rule which the Hospital Board had passed meant that any member of a friendly society, being impecunious, could be admitted the same as any other member, the rule should be altered.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie): After hearing the remarks of the member for Toodyay, one was not able to congratulate him upon his defence of the Hospital Board. As to members of the select committee being biased, it was a recognised maxim that when a person had no case he should abuse the other side.

THE PREMIER: Was that the hon. member's position?

MR. VOSPER: The right hon. gentleman and himself were excellent competitors in the art of abuse. The speech of the member for Toodyay was nothing but a long diatribe, full of evil and invective against the gross crimes and sins of the select committee which had been appointed by this House. We had been told that the committee were all biased, that the chairman had suppressed correspondence, that some of the witnesses were liars, and that the report was a useless document. If the select commit-

tee were biassed, that would only be in accordance with parliamentary practice, because it was laid down by such authorities as Todd and others, that it was preferable to have persons appointed on a committee of inquiry who were biassed on one side and on the other, because by having such persons appointed on a committee their bias caused the inquiry to be more thorough than it could be if all members of the committee were disinterested and unbiassed. It had been the custom in this House, in appointing select committees, to arrange a compromise between the Premier on one side and the leader of the Opposition on the other; and in the case of appointing this committee, as in the case of appointing the committee on Lunatic Asylums, such an agreement was made, but no sooner was it made than it was deliberately broken; the result being that the choice of members for those committees lay entirely in the hands of the Government. He (Mr. Vosper) came into this committee as a member at a later stage, after the member for Albany (Mr. Hassell) had retired; therefore any responsibility for the selection of this committee rested with the Government. When the members of the committee considered their report, it was read through paragraph by paragraph in the orthodox manner, and was adopted unanimously; therefore the responsibility for that report rested equally on all members of the committee.

MR. QUINLAN said he placed the responsibility on the shoulders of the chairman (Mr. Hall).

MR. VOSPER: With regard to a letter that was supposed to be missing, we had the statements of the secretary of the committee and the chairman of the committee; and while those statements differed they did not disagree. When it was said that because certain members of the Hospital Board were not summoned to give evidence, therefore the whole inquiry was biassed, he (Mr. Vosper) could prove that there had been no such bias.

THE PREMIER: None of the principal doctors connected with the Hospital were called.

MR. VOSPER: The committee called Dr. Horrocks, the most prominent physician who came under their notice,

and they called Dr. Thompson, the house surgeon. Looking at what the committee had done, he felt they might say, in the words of Clive, that they were astonished at their own moderation. The committee had toned down the report in many respects, and if they had shown bias, it was in the direction of cloaking facts rather than giving them as they actually came before the committee, for many of the facts might have been stated with much greater severity. With regard to the friction existing between the medical staff of the Hospital and members of the medical profession unconnected with it, he must say there was sufficient evidence to support the paragraph.

THE PREMIER: The select committee called all those who were disaffected, but did not call others.

MR. VOSPER: The evidence of medical men who did not go near the Hospital would be valueless. Dr. Haynes had complained that in regard to one *post mortem* examination he was not treated fairly, and that on other occasions he was not privileged to attend such examinations so that he might bring his knowledge up to date.

THE PREMIER: Fifteen out of 26 medical men were on the honorary staff of the Hospital.

MR. VOSPER: Dr. Haynes could not go into the Hospital and witness operations here, as he could if he went into an hospital in any other country; and this difference was because the Public Hospital here was under the direction of a close corporation. The hon. member (Mr. Quinlan) had pursued this matter with so much bitterness and so much vindictiveness, that it was almost a marvel how he managed to use language as strong as he had indulged in. His remarks against Dr. Haynes ought not to have been used in this House under cover of privilege. Referring to the case of the man Noble, who since he left the Hospital had not been able to pay a certain debt—

MR. QUINLAN: Which he was well able to pay.

MR. VOSPER: The hon. member had only one standard of virtue, and that was that a person must pay twenty shillings in the pound, and if he did that it mattered not where he got the twenty

shillings. Referring to the case of Mrs. O'Keefe (with particulars quoted from the evidence), it was shown that she was allowed to go out of the Hospital to a wretched home where there was nothing but abject poverty, while the poor woman was suffering from what was described as an incurable disease, for which continuous doses of bromide of potassium were administered to deaden the pain, and eventually she wandered down to the River Swan, and was found drowned, having apparently committed suicide.

MR. QUINLAN: That woman had been a tenant of his for years, and he knew she was not proper in her head at any time.

MR. VOSPER: Was it not the duty of the medical men to keep her in the Hospital, when they knew she was in a condition bordering on insanity?

MR. QUINLAN: She was not a lunatic.

MR. VOSPER: That was a fine distinction. If that woman was not turned out of the Hospital prematurely, then he did not know of any case which could be so described. The select committee had not made a long and severe commentary on that case, as they might have done according to the evidence, but they merely ventured to express a hope that such things would not occur again. The committee might have quoted a case in which a man who had been discharged from the Hospital went wandering about the bush in a semi-demented condition.

THE PREMIER: Was that in the evidence, too?

MR. VOSPER: No; that was in the documents which the committee examined. Some members of this House, who charged bias against the select committee, had shown bias themselves. The committee, in discharge of their duty, showed there had been complaints against the management of the Hospital, and showed also how these complaints might be prevented from recurring. Referring to the case of the man Rodgers, the committee had the unanimous evidence of the jury to the effect that the evidence as written in the depositions was not the evidence as given by witnesses at the inquest. Witnesses who had given evidence in the inquiry informed the committee to the same effect. The coroner's clerk admitted it rested entirely with him to decide whether any por-

tion of Dr. Haynes's evidence was or was not valuable. It also appeared that, at these inquests, one witness was being examined while the depositions were being read over to another witness; consequently, the witness whose depositions were being read had his attention diverted to the evidence then being given, and in these circumstances he would be likely to sign the depositions hurriedly, without due examination. There was also the plain evidence of the coroner's clerk that he could omit from depositions evidence which he considered irrelevant.

MR. QUINLAN: The coroner also took notes.

MR. VOSPER: But such notes did not purport to be complete, while the depositions did; and this young and untrained clerk, Bambrick, took down the evidence in the style adopted by a Judge of the Supreme Court. In the event of a verdict being reviewed, such depositions were worthless. The hon. member (Mr. Quinlan) had said members of friendly societies were not excluded from the Hospital; yet they were excluded by a printed rule produced by the Hospital secretary, which rule had never been revoked, but had been merely contradicted by a resolution of the board. That was the crux of the trouble; for what sort of discipline could exist when the printed rules were thrown aside? Mr. L. A. Nagel, chairman of the United Friendly Societies' Dispensary and member of the board of management, had stated that only about 15 members of local friendly societies were received as hospital patients during the twelve months; and there had been great dissatisfaction over rule 19, which forbade the admission of such members, the reason given being that they had their own lodge doctors. But a poor man receiving sick pay of £1 per week could not afford a trained nurse, and in a private hospital would have to pay £4 4s. per week. Such was the evidence of the chairman of the United Friendly Societies; and to what other conclusion could the committee come but that the rule did exist and was in operation? Therefore the committee stated they saw no reason why such persons should be thus penalised because they were thrifty and less likely than others to become a burden on the State. If a

man did not belong to a lodge, he would go to the Hospital and be received, and his wife and family would become a burden on the community; yet, because he was thrifty, he was arbitrarily excluded from the Hospital. Such was the reward of thrift in Western Australia! The committee had found the worst cases of sweating ever exposed in Perth more than paralleled in the treatment meted out to the Hospital nurses, some of whom worked from 65 to 90 hours a week; and even the matron received only £120 a year, the other nurses from £30 to £75.

MR. QUINLAN: The hours were controlled by the matron.

MR. VOSPER: For women to have to nurse the sick for 70 or 80 hours a week was downright slavery, and a disgrace to everyone concerned. It was most ungallant to place the blame on the matron, an executory officer under the board; but that was always the way in this colony. The matron was the victim of the system.

MR. QUINLAN: She had never complained. For a long time there had never been the slightest complaint to the board about the hours worked by nurses.

MR. VOSPER: No; because the only acceptable thing a nurse could do after complaining would be to resign. The committee had found it most difficult to get these girls to give evidence even as to the statements officially laid before the members by the Hospital secretary. It was evident they feared the consequences of giving evidence; and if they had not complained of overwork, it was time someone complained for them. The committee recommended that the medical profession should be notified and invited to attend autopsies and operations. There was a scientific reason for that recommendation. Cases of an extraordinary character had a tendency to occur in Perth as well as elsewhere, and when these things did occur (and they were generally discovered at the autopsy), they were the most valuable instruction for medical men. There was no reason why medical men should be excluded, and it was valuable to the public that they should be present. The report concluded with the remark that the Hospital was a heavy financial burden upon the State, and was likely to continue so if the existing system were maintained, as the

public appeared to have no confidence in the management, and would not subscribe to its maintenance. The mere fact that the public did not subscribe was put down to the lack of confidence they had in the administration of the institution. Numbers of testimonials were sent in by persons who had been in the Hospital, but no subscriptions were forwarded with those testimonials. In other colonies, in small places hospitals were maintained entirely without the assistance of the Government, except so far as the usual subsidy was concerned. The hospitals in Brisbane, in Sydney, in Melbourne, and elsewhere, depended on public subscription; and he could not believe that the people of Western Australia were so parsimonious that they would not subscribe to the Public Hospital. The Chinese population were the only people who subscribed to the Perth Hospital, and what was the reason? The unfortunate Chinese did not know enough English, they did not know sufficient of the Hospital, and therefore they subscribed. But the general public who read the newspapers knew too much about the Hospital to subscribe. The absence of donations was a standing vote of censure against the Hospital; therefore the select committee were justified in saying that this state of affairs would continue until the public were given some hand in the management. The committee recommended that for the first two or three years the ratepayers of Perth should elect the board. That was only suggested as a temporary expedient, to get a little public interest in the institution. A few men might be elected on the board who would take a live interest in the institution, and would go round asking for subscriptions, which was done elsewhere.

MR. QUINLAN: Why did not the hon. member do that?

MR. VOSPER: If he were to collect money from the public, he would hold himself in some way responsible to the public; and what account could he render to the public for the money subscribed? The public would not subscribe until they got some share in the government of the institution. The House should consider the report on its merits. The report was mildly worded, and did not bring down any severe censure on anyone. Mr. Roe, the coroner, was the person

most severely dealt with, and it was difficult to say what was exactly the truth in regard to his remarks to the jury in reference to the rider. The evidence was of a peculiar character. There was the evidence of no less than four persons who declared that the remarks were made outside the coroner's court, between the first and the second hearing. He (Mr. Vosper) declined to give his opinion upon the matter, but the committee suggested that in future the coroner should refrain from giving directions in regard to riders, and that riders should be accepted from the jury. Any interference on the part of the coroner inside or outside of the court was not right. It had been suggested that the four jurymen had sworn to lies.

MR. QUINLAN: That was not suggested by him.

MR. VOSPER: If that was so, then the four gentlemen must have conspired together to blacken the character of Mr. Roe. He did not pronounce any judgment on the report of the committee: he left it to the House. The report should be taken on its merits. If he had said anything that was regarded as being offensive he regretted it, because his desire was that the report should be considered calmly and on its merits. It would be found that the committee had done their duty, and had elicited a valuable amount of evidence. The committee had done honour to themselves, as well as to those who had elected them, and the report was worthy of acceptance. If the House should reject the report, the members of the select committee would have the consolation of knowing that if they had not the confidence of the House, they had the confidence of the public generally.

MR. HIGHAM: As the House had to meet again to-morrow, and a large number of members were absent to-night, he moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. GREGORY: If there was to be a motion for adjournment now, attention would be called to the state of the House.

Motion (adjournment) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	7

Majority for	4
--------------	-----	-----	---

AYES.
 Sir John Forrest
 Mr. A. Forrest
 Mr. Higham
 Mr. Hubble
 Mr. Lefroy
 Mr. Locke
 Mr. Morau
 Mr. Quinlan
 Mr. Sholl
 Mr. Wood
 Mr. Bacon (Teller).

NOES.
 Mr. D. Forrest
 Mr. Hall
 Mr. Hutchinson
 Mr. Illingworth
 Mr. Oats
 Mr. Vosper
 Mr. Gregory (Teller).

Motion thus passed, and the debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER moved that the House at its rising do adjourn until 3 o'clock to-morrow.

MR. VOSPER: Perhaps the Premier would say—

THE SPEAKER: There could be no discussion on a motion for adjournment of the House.

MR. VOSPER: This was not a motion for the adjournment of the House, but a motion that the House at its rising do adjourn until a certain hour to-morrow.

THE SPEAKER: That was a motion for adjournment.

MR. VOSPER: Would facilities be given for discussing the report of the select committee on the Fremantle and Whitby Falls Lunatic Asylums?

THE PREMIER: There would be half-an-hour to-morrow.

MR. VOSPER: That simply meant that this question would be left for another year.

MR. HALL: Was there any intention of giving him, as chairman of the Hospital Inquiry Committee, a chance of replying to the remarks made by hon. members on the report?

THE PREMIER: There would be an opportunity at 3 o'clock to-morrow.

MR. HALL: Of course the Government had a majority and could do as they pleased.

THE PREMIER: A long time had been given to the subject to-night, and if hon. members would speak for hours, no more latitude could be expected.

Question put and passed.

PROBATION ARRANGEMENTS.

THE PREMIER announced that His Excellency the Administrator would be prepared to prorogue Parliament at half-past 3 o'clock to-morrow, if the business of the House was sufficiently complete. He (the Premier) was informed the

Legislative Council had finished their work; therefore the session need not be continued any longer.

The House adjourned at 9:35 o'clock until the next afternoon.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 5th December, 1900.

Paper presented—Motion: Guano (Abrolhos), to permit export (withdrawn)—Complimentary Remarks, close of session—Prorogation: Assent to Bills; closing Speech

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: By-law, Coolgardie Municipal Council, 2, Blue Book, 1899.

Ordered to lie on the table.

MOTION—GUANO (ABROLHOS), TO PERMIT EXPORT.

Debate resumed from the previous sitting, on the motion by Hon. R. S. Haynes, "That it is unnecessary that the restriction on the exportation of guano from the colony should be further enforced."

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Members were good enough to adjourn the debate on the previous night, so that a snap division should not be taken. As the motion had been discussed, and as he had objected to the motion being put in a thin House last night, it would not be fair to ask that the motion be put in a thin House this afternoon; therefore he asked leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

COMPLIMENTARY REMARKS, CLOSE OF SESSION.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Mr. President, I am certain hon. members would not like to separate without some expression of the feeling of regard and esteem they entertain towards you for the manner in which you have presided over the deliberations of the House. Hon. members will all agree with me that you have done so with great care and consideration to them, and with strict impartiality, which has facilitated our discussions, when sometimes they have perhaps been heated. I think members will agree with me you have endeavoured to hold the scales fairly between the different parties in the House. I am also very pleased to think the business of the Council has been carried on for the benefit of the country, and that important measures have been passed after due care and deliberation. You have on all occasions exhibited a desire to give to each side an opportunity of dealing with the questions in hand, and I only hope that you may continue for many years to preside over this honourable Council with the same *éclat* as that which has characterised you during this session. My own connection with the House as leader will, of course, cease when the general election takes place. There will be no possibility of my again meeting members in this position, unless some unfortunate occurrence should arise necessitating the summoning of Parliament again before the dissolution, which we all hope will not occur; therefore in all probability when the House meets next year it will be under another leader as Colonial Secretary. I can only say I shall be very glad if the Government of the day—whoever they may be—can see their way to place two members in this House to represent them. I have sometimes felt my position to be extremely difficult. Not having had the benefit of a professional education, and having had to contend with "gentlemen of the long robe," I have sometimes been nonplussed by the arguments adduced, which of course have been very forcibly urged. I hope the Government will be able to place a member of the legal profession in this House to assist the leader, or to be leader himself. In conveying to you the sentiments of the House and the thanks of hon. members