

next important item in the Schedule is that of £200,000 for the Fremantle harbour works. I think it a great mistake that these works were ever undertaken, and if I could see any way of striking out the item I should do so, because these works will be a sink for money for many years to come. I do not begrudge a reasonable amount being spent at Fremantle, but I think the whole scheme too huge. If there was traffic for steamers they would come into almost any harbour. I do not think I can support the Donnybrook-Bridgetown railway at present, because I think there are works of far greater importance which should be undertaken first. As to the Coalfield line, I do not think we have sufficient information before us to warrant our passing it just now. When we get into committee I shall deal with each item in a broad spirit and in the interest of the colony as a whole, and I hope every other hon. member will do the same.

**THE HON. F. M. STONE:** I move that the question be now put.

Question put and passed.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time.

Put and passed.

#### SCAB ACT—REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

**THE HON. R. G. BURGESS** brought up the report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the working of the Scab Act, and moved that it be received.

Question put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at twenty minutes to eleven o'clock, p.m. adjourned until Thursday, 4th October, at half-past four o'clock p.m.

## Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 3rd October, 1894.*

Petition of John Sutherland—Yilgarn Railway revenue and freight rates—Increase of Salaries of Judges of the Supreme Court—Cost of upkeep of the Governor's Establishment—Closure of Street in Busselton Bill: third reading—Roads Act Amendment Bill: in committee—Droving Bill: consideration of Committee's report—Estimates, 1894-5: further considered in committee—Message from the Legislative Council: Removal of Colonial Prisoners Bill—Adjournment.

**THE SPEAKER** took the chair at 4.30 p.m.

#### PRAYERS.

#### PETITION OF JOHN SUTHERLAND.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH** presented a petition from John Sutherland, praying that the House would set aside the decisions of the Warden of the Murchison goldfields, in respect of certain mining matters in which he (Sutherland) was concerned.

Petition received and read.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH** moved that the petition be printed.

**MR. SIMPSON:** I am one of the last in this House to object, at any time, to a petition being received or printed; I think it is the duty of this House at all times to listen to the grievances of every man who has a legitimate cause for appealing to Parliament for redress; but, in this case, I have an intimate knowledge of the present petitioner's doings, in connection with mining, for some years past. He is commonly known on the goldfields as the "Duke of Sutherland"; and I can say, from my own personal knowledge of him extending over three years, that he has done no work on the Murchison goldfield, where he has been during that time. I would be sorry in any way to interfere with the action of the hon. member who presented this petition on behalf of one of his constituents; but I am sure he will excuse me if I say I have a little more knowledge of this gentleman than the hon. member has. In addition to this petition, I believe the Commissioner of Crown Lands has received another petition from the same man, praying for the removal of the Warden. His connection with the goldmining industry has been one of continuous and incessant

complaint against the action of Wardens, for the last three or four years; and, so far as I have been able to discover, he represents on the Murchison goldfields a magnificent party of One, and if that party were asked for its signature it would be "John Sutherland." I think this House would be going to unnecessary expense if it ordered this petition to be printed, and trespassing unnecessarily on the resources of the Government printing establishment. I would be very sorry to oppose the printing of any petition, the consideration of which I thought would be of the slightest value to the public or to the individual, if that individual had any real grievance, but, if I am in order, I beg to move that this petition be not printed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. member need not move that; he can vote with the noes. I should like to suggest to members who may have a petition to present that they should let the Clerk see it before they present it to the House. Sometimes there are irregularities in these petitions, and it is very desirable that the Clerk should see them before they are presented. The other House, I believe, have a standing order requiring all petitions to be lodged with the Clerk before they are presented, and the Clerk has to certify that they are in conformity with the Standing Orders. I think it would be as well if we had a similar rule here. In the absence of such a rule, I would suggest to members who may have petitions to present, that they should first show them to the Clerk, to see that there is nothing irregular about them.

**Question**—That the petition be printed—put and negatived.

#### YILGARN RAILWAY—REVENUE AND FREIGHT RATES.

**MR. MORAN,** in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways,—

1. Upon what basis is the revenue of the Yilgarn railway for the next year estimated?

2. According to the differential distance freights, what was the comparative difference between the revenue as earned from hauling a ton of stuff from Fremantle to Northam, and for hauling a ton, for the same distance, at the end of the Yilgarn Railway?

3. Whether, in the Estimates, the Eastern Railway was not credited with all the stuff that passed over it to Southern Cross, according to the higher freight for shorter distances?

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS** (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied, as follows,—

1. On the traffic done, both in goods and passengers, during the first nine months after the Yilgarn Railway was opened by the contractor.

2. The comparative rates in the different classes, as between Fremantle and Northam and for Northam and Yilgarn, for the same distance, say 78 miles, are as follows:—

Classes.								
		A. 6/2	A. 0/-	B. 10/3	1 18/-	2 18/10	3 31/10	4 44/10
		Per ton.	Includes chaff, four, and machinery. Minimum 5 tons, at per ton.	Includes chaff, four, and machinery. Minimum 5 tons, at per ton.	per ton.	Per ton includes machinery.	per ton.	per ton.
Fremantle to North- am—78 Miles								
Similar distance on Northam-Southern Cross Railway—78 Miles.		12/4 per ton.	18/- per ton.	21/4 per ton.	27/- per ton.	23/3 per ton.	47/10 per ton.	67/3 per ton.

3. The Eastern Railway is only credited with the freight carried over for 78 miles, according to the general classification sheet for that distance.

#### INCREASE OF SALARIES OF JUDGES OF THE SUPREME COURT.

**MR. LEAKE,** in accordance with notice, asked the Premier, if it was the intention of the Government to increase the salaries of the Judges of the Supreme Court?

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied: I am of opinion that questions of this kind by members who are practitioners of the Supreme Court, especially when they have important cases in Court in which the Government is concerned, are to be deprecated. The Government has had the question under consideration, but no decision has yet been come to in regard to the matter.

#### COST OF THE GOVERNOR'S ESTABLISHMENT.

**MR. R. F. SHOLL:** In rising to move the motion standing in my name, I would like to bring before the House the facts, very shortly. Very probably, by effluxion

of time or other means, we shall be having a change of Governors in this colony before long, and it has struck me that this would be the time for this House to express an opinion as to whether the Government should not decide to have a stated and fixed salary for the Governor, without any allowances whatever. It may be in the recollection of those members who were in the old Legislative Council before the introduction of Responsible Government, that there was considerable discussion over the salary of the Governor, when it was raised from £3,000 to £4,000. The House was then told distinctly by the then Colonial Secretary that the £4,000 would include all extras, and that in reality the increase only amounted to £400 odd, as all allowances would then be done away with. But we find that instead of these allowances being done away with they have been considerably increased. [THE PREMIER: I don't think so.] Yes, they have. Not only do we pay £4,000 to the Governor as his salary, but there is a considerable increase in the extra amounts voted for him. [THE PREMIER: I don't think so.] Members will see from the Estimates that the amount is considerably increased under the first item, the "Governor's Establishment." Then, if we turn over, we find an extra amount of £400, which has a regular place on the Estimates under the head of "Government House, Domain, Rottneest, and Fremantle Cottages"; and there is another item of £200, I think, for furniture for Government House. And that is not all. I believe that the Governor, when he visits Rottneest, has a steam launch at his special service to take him over and bring him back at the expense of the country; and when he has visitors on the island, this steam launch, at the expense of the country, takes them over and back again. The Governor can order this steam launch as often as he likes, and does so, apparently. On another occasion, when he visited Albany during what is called the "Albany week," it cost the colony something like £90 or £100 to pay the Governor's expenses and his stay for the week. Then again, a part of the return I am asking for will, if it is possible to arrive at it, show the value of all the goods imported by the Governor, under the 60th section of the Constitution Act, free of duty, and the

amount of rebate he has been allowed on account of goods locally purchased. Under the Constitution Act the Governor is allowed to import his goods free of duty, but I believe he is not satisfied with that, but gets a rebate on the goods he purchases in the colony; he has them carried to his door, and sends in his claim to the Treasury for a drawback. [THE PREMIER: No.] It is what I hear; that is according to report. I want this return so that we may see whether it is so or not. I am also informed that, in addition to these votes, a considerable sum is expended for any alterations that may be required at Government House when a ball is given, or entertainments of that kind. I have even been told that waiters are employed at the expense of the State. [THE PREMIER: No.] I think it comes under the Works Department when alterations are made for a ball, so that the work is done at the expense of the colony and not at the expense of the Governor himself. [THE PREMIER: It is all charged in the Estimates.] Another item is that of fuel and light. It was never intended—and we were led to believe it would not be so—that when the Governor's salary was increased to £4,000 he was to be allowed fire and light; in fact, I think there was a great fight in this House over the item during the first session of the new Parliament, and the item was rejected by the House. But it appears that the Government scout the opinion of Parliament, and these allowances go on just the same, notwithstanding the adverse vote of the House. I have taken a few figures showing the cost of the Governors' establishments in the other colonies, and they show that we pay more in proportion in this colony than any of the other colonies do for the privilege of having a representative of the Imperial Government. I may say I think it is necessary we should have a representative of the Imperial Government; at the same time I do not think we should pay too much for that privilege. Under the old form of Government the Governor was a very hard-worked man, very poorly paid; but under the present form of Government the Governor has very little to do, and it appears to me he is paid considerably in excess of what the Governor received under the old Constitution. I

find that in New South Wales the Governor gets £7,000, and the Acting-Governor £3,500. There is a private secretary at £400; an aide-de-camp at £351; a clerk at £770; and a messenger, &c., bringing the cost of the establishment to about £1,550. In New Zealand the Governor gets only £5,000—a large colony, too—and out of that £5,000 he pays for his own private secretary and his aide-de-camp. In Queensland they pay their Governor £5,000, and £400 is allowed for a private secretary, and £300 for an aide-de-camp, or £700 for the staff. In South Australia the Governor gets £5,000; and the private secretary is paid £400 and the aide-de-camp £250, or £650 for the staff. [THE PREMIER: You don't know how much more, I suppose?] That is the amount put down in the Colonial Office List. In Tasmania they pay their Governor £3,500, and allow £250 for a private secretary, and nothing more. In Victoria at present they allow the Governor £10,000, but he has to pay the whole of his staff, and I believe that future Governors are only to receive £7,000. Here in Western Australia we pay £4,000, and the total establishment costs £1,446, without the private secretary, who is on the Civil List, and gets £300. Apart from the establishment vote, there is £200 for furniture, and there is fuel and light, and another £400 for the upkeep of the domain and the Government cottages at Rottnest and Fremantle. So that members will see that we are paying a considerable amount more than really appears on the Estimates under the head of the Governor's Establishment. [THE PREMIER: No, no; I deny that.] I say that we pay a great deal more than appears on these Estimates under the head of the Governor's Establishment; and that is the reason I am moving for this return, so that we may know really what we are paying. [THE PREMIER: How?] The Premier says "How?" The return asked for will probably show how; that is what I want it for,—how much we lose by the Governor getting his goods duty free (which is not allowed in any other Australian colony), and also how much rebate, if any, is paid by the Treasury in respect of goods locally purchased by the Governor. Then there are other items, such as the expenses of

the Governor when he travels. [THE PREMIER: They are all in the Estimates.] Of course this return, when it is supplied, will show what the Governor actually costs the colony. I don't know whether the Estimates show the cost of the upkeep of the Governor's railway carriage, when he travels over the Land Company's line. [THE PREMIER: They don't charge.] It costs something to run it over our own lines, and the upkeep of the carriage must cost something; and if all these items are shown in this return we shall be able to arrive at some idea of what the Governor is costing us. I do not propose, myself, nor suggest that we should interfere at present with existing arrangements, though I think the Governor has taken advantage, and the Government have allowed him to take advantage, of more allowances than ever was anticipated when the salary was raised. But I do not intend to interfere with existing arrangements; though I think now is the time to consider this matter, whether we should not have a fixed salary for the Governor, without any allowances, and let him pay for all extras himself. I know that this would necessitate an alteration in the 60th section of the Constitution Act, under which the Governor is allowed to import his goods duty free. But I think it would be much better to have a definite fixed salary, even if it were found necessary to pay the Governor more, so that we might know what the Governor was actually costing the colony. It would be better even for those who take up the position of Governor to know exactly what they are to receive, and certainly it would be more satisfactory to the colony. I beg to move the motion standing in my name,—“For a full and exact Return showing the total annual cost (since the introduction of Responsible Government) of the Governor's Establishment, including Governor's salary, and all other details of expenditure or allowances of any nature whatever. The Return to include the value of all goods imported and subject to the provisions of section 60 of the Constitution Act, as regards duty, as well as the amount of drawback refunded by the Treasury for and on account of all goods locally purchased.”

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I quite agree with the hon. member in

one part of his observations, and that is that it is very desirable both in the interests of the colony and in the interests of the Governor himself, whoever he may be, that we should have a clear understanding, before another Governor is appointed, as to the emoluments of his office, so that there can be no dispute afterwards. It is very undesirable and unpleasant for Ministers to have to enter into controversy with the Governor of the colony, whoever he may be, or whoever the Ministers may be, with regard to his personal emoluments; therefore I have always thought that when the next change of Governors takes place it should be clearly laid down, for the information of the Colonial Office, what the emoluments of the Governor consist of, so that no possible dispute should arise on the arrival of the Governor in the colony. Members will recollect that was not done in the case of the present Governor, for a very good reason: we were at the time in a sort of interregnum, on the eve of a change in the Constitution, and the Governor was appointed before the change took place. We all recollect that there was some difference of opinion—and the question was thoroughly discussed in this House—as to what the exact emoluments of the Governor were. That was in 1891, just about the time we entered upon the present form of Government, and there has been no reference to the matter since. The question of what a Governor is to receive is of course a matter of agreement between the Executive Government of the colony and the Governor appointed; and when that agreement is made, no one would desire to interfere with it until some new arrangement is made. I must take exception to one observation made by the hon. member, when he said the Governor had taken advantage of his position to get more than he expected to get when he took office. So far as I know, that has not been the case. The scale of allowances was laid down, and it was well understood what he can charge for and what he can not; and there has been no difference of opinion and no disagreement, to any extent, between the Government and the Governor on the subject. I may also inform members that no rebate has ever been paid to the Governor, nor has he ever applied for any rebate,

upon anything bought in the colony, except spirits, or wine—and beer, I suppose; but I know that, as regards spirits or wine, if he buys it from a merchant in Perth, it is always I think (or, if not always, almost invariably) bought in bond, and he gets it without paying any duty, and I presume there is no objection to that, any more than if he imported it direct. [MR. SHOLL: Hear, hear.] With that exception, no rebate has ever been allowed. The whole of the payments to the Governor, with the exception of the rebate of duties, is shown on these Estimates. The Governor's establishment, it will be seen, is estimated to cost £1,446 next year, the actual expenditure last year being £1,160 15s. 8d., and the only increase is in the items for postage and telephone rent, and foreign telegrams. The travelling expenses, and the incidental expenses referred to by the hon. member for the Gascoyne, are all included under the head of "Contingencies," as shown in item No. 10, on the Estimates; and the object we have in view in framing these Estimates in this way is that everything should be shown as clearly and fully as possible for the information of members. When the hon. member referred to the upkeep of Government House and the domain, and furniture for Government House, I do not suppose for a moment the hon. member expects the Governor of the day to keep the domain in order, or to furnish Government House at his own expense. I do not think it would be a good arrangement even if it were made. These are Government properties, and, as such, it is our duty to see that they are kept in good order and repair. I should be sorry indeed if the gardens, and Government House and its furniture, were to be entrusted for six years to be kept in order out of any Governor's private purse. The result would, probably, be that the whole of this fine property would be allowed to fall into disrepair. Whatever we do, whatever arrangement may be made in the future, this property, which belongs to the State, must be taken charge of by the State. But, if you leave out this £600 (£400 for Government House and domain, and £200 for Government House furniture), all the expenses of the Governor and his establishment are included on these Estimates,

with the exception of his salary, and that of the private secretary, which are included in the Civil List. I do not believe I shall be able to give the hon. member the information he seeks as to the amount of rebate of duty to the Governor; I have communicated with the Collector of Customs to-day, and he says that no separate account has been kept against the Governor any more than against any other individual importing goods free of duty.

**MR. SIMPSON:** The drawback cheques have gone through the Treasury, I presume?

**THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest):** The amount of drawback is simple enough to get at. As I have said, it only applies to wine or spirits bought in the colony; but, as to free goods coming into the colony from England, the Collector of Customs says that no separate account has been kept against the Governor any more than anybody else, and that to get at the amount would necessitate an examination of some 80,000 vouchers. I have, however, given instructions to the Collector of Customs that he shall keep a separate account against the Governor hereafter, so that it may be easily referred to. I do not suppose the duties amount to much, taken altogether; I do not suppose they reach more than £200 a year. [**MR. LORON:** Less than that.] I dare say it is, because the Governor does not import much into the colony, except wines and spirits, that is liable to a high duty. I estimate that the total cost of the Governor's establishment, including his salary and everything, amounts to about £6,000 a year. [**MR. SIMPSON:** £3,000 too much.] Of that amount, the Governor himself of course only receives £4,000; and, as to the other items, I do not expect you could save very much, no matter how you screwed; and, although they may add to the Governor's comfort, they do not add anything to his pocket. Therefore, whatever reductions it may be considered necessary to make in the future, or that members may suggest, it must really be in connection with the salary of the Governor, rather than in connection with these other items, because whoever is Governor he must have a staff, and Government House must be furnished, and the domain must be kept up. Of course if members

think they are strong enough and willing enough to reduce the salary of the Governor, well and good. That is not the point we are dealing with now, but the emoluments; and in dealing with this matter—it is a somewhat delicate and personal matter—it would be a good thing to deal with it on general grounds, leaving out altogether the question of who is Governor, and steering clear of all personal offence. [**MR. SHOLL:** Hear, hear.] The only objection I take to the hon. member's remarks is his saying that the Governor has taken some advantage. I do not think he has. I have had a long experience of the present Governor, and been brought into close communication with him, and I think he would be the last man to try to take any advantage. He has merely carried out what has been the rule in this colony. We certainly know what we are spending at present, which is more than we ever knew before. It is now all before members, on these Estimates, where they can see the whole of the expenditure in connection with the Governor's establishment.

**MR. JAMES:** I hope that the motion will be carried, and that we shall ascertain as exactly as possible what it does cost us to enjoy the necessary luxury of a Governor. I, myself, am utterly opposed to the present system of allowing what you may call perquisites to the Governor. It would be infinitely better to provide a fixed salary, which shall carry with it all allowances, whether that salary be £3,000, or £5,000, or £10,000; but no perquisites. Even if a Governor is above suspicion, and the Ministry is above suspicion, it always causes a certain amount of irritation, a certain amount of doubt or suspicion that advantage is being taken of the somewhat flexible powers given when you are permitted to make allowances; and I am glad to hear from the Premier that when the term of office of the present Governor has expired, and a new Governor appears on the scene, some different arrangement will be arrived at. I hope that arrangement will be in the direction I have suggested, that a certain amount of salary be paid but no perquisites, so that we may know once for all how much our Governor costs us. I think all these incidental expenses which are now borne by the taxpayers of the colony should be

paid by the Governor himself. I do not mean that we should expect him to keep Government House or the gardens in repair, but there are many items which I think should be borne by the Governor which are now borne by the public, and which should be included in his salary. I am not quite certain when the term of office of the present Governor expires, but I hope that the arrangements proposed to be made with the incoming Governor will be laid before the House, and that we shall have an opportunity of discussing them. Some of us may think that if in Tasmania, with a larger population than we have, they can only afford about half what we are paying, and that an important colony like New South Wales is paying practically less than we are paying for the luxury of maintaining a Governor's establishment, and the same with other colonies, and these colonies are able to secure what, apparently, we in Australia dearly love, a lord or a titled nobleman to rule over us; if those colonies are able to get all they want at a comparatively less cost than we are, some of us may think it is becoming a serious question whether we also cannot attract to our shores an efficient Governor, titled or otherwise, at less cost than we are paying at present. I shall support this motion because I should like to see exactly what this Government House establishment does cost us, and because we are in a better position at present than we shall be hereafter to deal with the details of any new arrangement that may be entered into with the incoming Governor.

MR. SIMPSON: I hope the House will think well to support this motion. I think the time has arrived in the development of this colony when we should deal with this question in a practical manner. The Premier, in his remarks, was good enough to say he hoped none of us would look at the matter from a personal point of view. I hope it was not necessary for the hon. gentleman to have made that suggestion; I imagine this House looks at the motion now before us simply in its relation to the future administration of the colony. At present we have occupying the position of Governor a gentleman with whom a certain contract or agreement has been made; and repudiation is a word that

has never yet been whispered within these walls, and, so far as I am able to gauge the tone of the House, is not likely to be heard. Perhaps I may be looked upon as a bit of a faddist—I am prepared to accept that responsibility—but I am one of those who think that the days of the appointment of a Governor from Downing Street to this colony have gone by. I am democratic enough to consider that an allowance made to either the Chief Justice of the colony or the Premier of the colony, for the purpose of entertaining distinguished visitors who may favour us with their presence would accomplish all that is necessary in the way of gubernatorial functions. I know there is a certain halo of respectability attached to invitations to Government House, and that it is supposed to confer a certain amount of social distinction. I must confess I have no sympathy with that feeling at all. I have occasionally been graced with these marks of social distinction, but I must again confess that I have not felt myself one bit more respectable after I received them than I was before. Still, I am one of those who have the strongest affection for the great mother country, and I have the heartiest wish, during my time at any rate, and as much longer afterwards as I could arrange it, to preserve unbroken the crimson thread of fellowship and brotherhood that links us to the great nation that gave us Australia. [MR. A. FORREST: Oh, don't!] I thought that was beyond the intellectual grasp of the hon. member for West Kimberley. But I imagine that more public good would be accomplished, as I said, if an allowance were granted annually by Parliament, either to the Chief Justice or the Premier, for entertaining distinguished visitors, and the office of Governor were abolished, and that magnificent fabric known as Government House were converted into a Parliament House, to accommodate both Chambers, and that those charming and extensive grounds that surround it were laid out as public gardens for the benefit of the public. That is my opinion on this subject, and I am not at all timid in expressing it, because, if it were acted upon, I believe it would be both useful and advantageous to the colony. I am not referring to the *personnel* of the present occupant of this high office; I am simply speaking of

the position. What are the functions of a Governor in Australia now? We know perfectly well that in the other colonies, Victoria and New South Wales particularly, those colonies are simply regarded as a sort of happy hunting ground for the scions of aristocratic families in England to gain information that will be valuable to them hereafter in the Colonial Office. I believe that has come to be recognised as part of the policy of the British Government with regard to these colonies in the selection of Governors,—to enable the scions of noble or wealthy families, statesmen in embryo, and Ministers *in posse*, to gain experience and information concerning these colonial dependencies of the Empire, which may hereafter be turned to good account in the Colonial Office or in Parliament. The position is so regarded by the Imperial authorities, and it is so regarded by those who accept it. But we in this colony are in a different position. So far, we have not become the happy hunting ground of the scions of noble houses; nor do I think that our aspirations are strongly in that direction. We are at present paying six thousand golden sovereigns annually for a gentleman to hold a certain representative position in our midst—a position which, so far as maintaining the connection between the colony and the British Crown is concerned, could just as efficiently be filled by the Chief Justice of the colony, or the Premier of the colony; and, of the two, perhaps it would be better to leave out the Premier, because he is necessarily the head of a party—I will not say a faction—in the State, and to confer this position upon the Chief Justice for the time being, who should be the connecting link between the British Crown and this part of Her Majesty's dominions. Beyond forming this connecting link, the functions of a Governor are simply of a social order, and I imagine they could be equally as well performed by the Chief Justice as by a Governor. Yet we are spending £6,000 a year to keep up a Governor's establishment, which I submit is more than any other colony of the group is paying, compared with its population or its revenue. In South Australia, with a revenue of £3,000,000, they pay less than we do. In Victoria, with a revenue of between £6,000,000 and £7,000,000, they only pay a little over

£10,000 a year. In New South Wales, with a revenue of between £8,000,000 and £9,000,000, they pay less than Victoria; while we in this colony, with our small community of less than 80,000 people, and a revenue of about £850,000, pay no less than £6,000 a year for maintaining a Governor's establishment. We are spending these six thousand golden sovereigns, contributed by the people of the colony, to keep up this glittering idea of being linked to the British Crown. I say we do not want a picturesque figurehead, decked in blue and gold, at £6,000 a year, to maintain that link, so long as every heart in the country throbs with ardent loyalty for the great country we have sprung from.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I should like to say a word or two in reply to what has fallen from the head of the Government. As to the existing agreement with the present Governor, I think the House fixed the salary and emoluments, and that all the Imperial Government insisted upon was a provision in the Civil List for the Governor's salary of £4,000, and the private secretary's salary, at £300. I take it the Governor must have known that was all he could expect; instead of that we are providing him with an aide-de-camp and a clerk. I only mention these things, in order to revive them, in view of the approaching appointment of another Governor. They have been allowed to slumber too long. As a rule members do not care to take up questions of this kind. Unfortunately, there are only one or two members in the House who care to tackle such questions. As to Government House and domain, the Premier says if we did not provide for the upkeep of these buildings and grounds, they would go to ruin. I quite agree with him; but, I think, the suggestion of the hon. member for Geraldton is a very good one. There is too much ground attached to Government House altogether, and the upkeep of that ground costs too much. And for the benefit of whom is it kept up? For the benefit of the Governor, to run a few cows in. It would be much better if the Government cut off a certain portion of this ground, and threw it open as a public park, for the recreation of the citizens. It would then be laid out and taken care of properly, and be of some use as well as an ornament



to the city, instead of simply remaining a grass paddock in the most valuable part of the town. I am sure the Government will do all they can to furnish this return, and let us know exactly what it costs the country, directly and indirectly, to maintain the Governor's establishment—not with the view, as I have said, of interfering with existing arrangements or with the present occupant of the office, but in order to enable us to decide what fresh arrangement should be made with the next Governor. I think it is out of all proportion that the Governor of a colony like this should cost the country £6,000 a year, when I believe the President of the United States of America only gets £10,000 a year.

Motion put and passed.

#### CLOSURE OF STREET IN BUSSELTON BILL.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

#### ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 10 inclusive:

Put and passed.

New clause:

MR. LEFROY moved that the following new clause be added to the Bill: "No track which has been in general use by the public shall be fenced across or otherwise blocked up, unless the Roads Board shall have recommended such a course to the Governor, and that it shall have received his approval, which shall be published in the *Government Gazette*." He said this was a clause that appeared in the old Roads Act of 1871, and he thought it was very desirable it should be revived. At present there was nothing to prevent an individual from fencing across these old tracks, which were of great convenience to the public in many cases. It gave rise to a great deal of irritation and ill-feeling amongst neighbours, and it would be much better to leave the power of deciding whether a track should be closed or not in the hands of the district Board. He had been chairman of a Roads Board for the last 20 years, and he ought to be some authority on this subject. He knew how the present Act worked, and where the shoe pinched, and he was sure it would

work better if this clause were added to it.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) did not know that there was any serious objection to the clause, though he should have liked to have had an opportunity of considering it. It was a significant fact that the clause was repealed many years ago, and he presumed there must have been good reason for repealing it.

MR. LEAKE thought the object of the hon. member was to assimilate the law as to tracks with the law as it now existed as to roads, and give the Roads Boards the power to close these tracks instead of leaving it to private individuals to decide whether a track should be closed or not.

MR. CLARKSON said this clause opened up a very serious question as to what constituted a public track, and it required a great deal of consideration. He hoped the House would be very careful before it interfered with these old tracks.

MR. LOTON said the clause, it appeared to him, did not go any further than the existing Act, which vested a similar power in the Roads Boards. If any individual chose to fence a track across that had been in use by the public for many years, and the public were aggrieved, they would still have their remedy by referring the matter to the Board.

MR. RICHARDSON said if they were going to accept the idea that because a track existed the owner of the land through which it ran was to be prohibited from fencing across it without permission of the Roads Board, he did not know where they were going to end. He could not see what more power these Boards wanted than they already possessed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) believed that what the hon. member for the Moore desired was already law. That law was framed after a considerable amount of consideration, and after a commission had sat upon the question; and he thought the law was right enough as it now existed.

MR. LEFROY said he had simply moved the clause in the interests of the public. He thought it would prevent a great deal of irritation and a great deal

of litigation if this power were left in the hands of the Boards.

Mr. PIESSE hoped the hon. member would not press the clause. If they were to provide that everyone had to apply to the Roads Board before he could fence across a track it would lead to lots of trouble and delay, and he thought the law had better be left as it stood.

Clause put and negatived.

Preamble and title:

Agreed to.

Bill reported.

### DROVING BILL.

On the Order of the Day for the consideration of the report of the committee on this Bill, the debate was resumed, on the following clause moved by Mr. RICHARDSON:—"Every drover, before allowing any travelling stock to approach within twenty-five miles of the head station or homestead on any run, or the headquarters of any person in charge of stock on any part of a run, shall give the occupier of such run, or person in charge as aforesaid, not less than twenty-four hours', nor more than three days', notice of his approach, by leaving such notice at such head station, homestead, or head-quarters, as the case may require, and such notice shall specify by what route such stock are about to be driven across such run. Provided further, that such notice shall not be necessary in case of horses, camels, or cattle *bona fide* used for saddle, packing, or draught, or where the number of horses shall not exceed twenty."

Mr. RICHARDSON said, as to the question of distance (25 miles) he was not at all sure that it was the right distance, and he believed some members would prefer to see it 20 miles, or even shorter. Of course, it was very difficult to frame a clause that would meet all contingencies, though he thought the present clause went a long way in that direction.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) was inclined to think that the distance was too great, and also the time too long for giving the required notice. He thought it would be a hardship to have to send a man 20 or 25 miles with a notice to the head station, when, perhaps, the manager or shepherd was close by, and could act

just as well as the owner or occupier. He thought they might reduce the distance to 10 miles. It would increase the expense of travelling stock considerably if you had to keep a man riding backwards and forwards 25 miles to deliver these notices, and to no purpose, perhaps, in many cases.

Mr. A. FORREST thought the difficulties of droving cattle from the Northern districts were quite sufficient without adding to them the difficulties that would arise out of this clause. Twenty-five miles was absurd in a country such as that between here and the North.

Mr. LOTON also considered the distance was too great. Under this Bill the drover had to travel five miles a day with his stock, and that would mean he would have to give notice five days ahead. He hoped the hon. member would reduce the distance.

Mr. CLARKSON thought a few hours notice would be quite sufficient. The clause in its present form would entail too great a hardship on the drovers. The distance also could be lessened.

Mr. RICHARDSON hoped it would be remembered that this clause was an improvement on that in the Bill, which did not limit the distance. At the same time he was willing to fall in with the wishes of hon. members and reduce the distance to 15 miles.

Mr. CONNOR thought the tendency of the clause would be to increase the price of meat, by imposing unnecessary difficulties and expense upon the owners of fat stock. He would rather see the limit increased to 50 or 100 miles, if that were possible, so as to compel owners to ship their stock to the Southern markets instead of travelling them by road.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) thought that ten miles and twelve hours' notice would be quite sufficient, as the stock would even then be two days off the headquarters of the person on whom the notice was to be served.

At 6:30 p.m. the SPEAKER left the chair.

At 7:30 p.m. the SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. SOLOMON moved, as an amendment in the proposed new clause, that the

words "twenty-five" be struck out of line 1, and the word "ten" be inserted in lieu thereof.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. CLARKSON moved, as a further amendment, that the words "twenty-four" be struck out of line 4, and the word "twelve" be inserted in lieu thereof.

Further amendment put, and division taken. No member voting for the further amendment, it was declared negative. The names in the division, being on one side only, were not recorded.

New clause, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON explained that, in moving to strike out Clause 6, he had not intended to strike out the penalty contained in sub-section (2) of the clause.

THE SPEAKER said the House had agreed to strike out the whole clause; but if it was desired to reinstate the sub-clause containing the penalty, that could be done on recommittal of the Bill.

Mr. A. FORREST suggested that, before the Bill came into operation, copies of the Act should be sent to the Resident Magistrates and to the known drovers.

Amendments made by the Committee in Clause 8 agreed to.

Report, with further amendments, adopted.

#### ESTIMATES, 1894-95.

##### IN COMMITTEE:

Consideration of the Estimates resumed.

*Medical, £22,117 15s. (continued):*

THE CHAIRMAN said that when this vote was last under consideration, some confusion had arisen as to whether the debate was on general lines or on specific items. In consideration of that confusion, he was willing now that the debate should be taken on Item 1; but he could not allow this to be a precedent for the future, as it was the duty of hon. members to acquaint themselves with the Standing Orders.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH, referring to Item 32 (Fremantle Asylum, officers and salaries), expressed a hope that the reforms which had been announced by the Premier, on the previous Monday, would be made as thorough as possible. The inmates should have more accommodation and better attention than had been provided in recent

years. The annual reports sent in by Dr. Barnett had shown, over and over again, that there had been a considerable amount of neglect in not attending to the appeals for providing a better system. The inmates were not criminals; they were suffering from brain maladies, and they ought to be treated as humanely as possible. It could not be said that the asylum at Fremantle had received that attention which its importance demanded. He was strongly in favour of removing the asylum from Fremantle to a suitable place in the country—in the hills, if possible, with suitable conditions. Many of the patients were curable; but, under such conditions as existed at Fremantle, it was too much to expect that cures would take place, or that the necessary care and nursing would be given there. He hoped the Government would not commit themselves to any permanent improvements or further expenses that would hinder the removal of the asylum.

Mr. RANDELL said it had been satisfactory to hear the Premier intimate on a previous evening that the asylum might have to be removed from its present site. The expense of removal would not be great, in view of the large value which might be realised for the land at Fremantle; therefore the cost of erecting larger buildings in the country might be recouped to some extent. A committee of this House had recommended the removal, and he hoped the removal would take place soon, so that all the newest appliances and best means might be used for restoring patients to soundness of mind. He had heard of such institutions in other countries being fitted up nicely with such conveniences as were not possible in Fremantle. The present enlargements would doubtless enable some of these conveniences to be supplied.

Mr. R. F. SHOLL said he had been pleased to hear the Premier's statement that the Government were considering the advisableness of removing the asylum from Fremantle. It would have been better if the Government had already decided on the removal instead of going on with the present enlargements, for he desired to see grounds properly laid out for the purpose, with all the modern appliances. According to the annual reports of the Surgeon Superintendent, there was not sufficient accommodation

in the asylum to separate the curable from the incurable patients, and this state of things was deplorable in a civilised community, and did not redound to the credit of the Government or of Parliament. He did not think any member of the community would object to the necessary taxation for alleviating the unfortunate condition of these inmates. Some years ago he visited the asylum as one of a committee, and he then came to the conclusion that if a curable patient went into the asylum and mixed with the incurables, there would be very little hope for that patient ever coming out with reason restored. The place was a Bedlam, to all intents and purposes, and he never felt so much upset as he did in going through the asylum. He would not go there again if he could possibly help it. He had been surprised at the remarks made by a candidate, in addressing the electors at Fremantle, to the effect that he would oppose the removal of the asylum from that town because it caused the expenditure of a great deal of money there. If that was a sample of the people who aspired to legislative honours, God help the country! The present site of the asylum was valuable, and might be utilised for a better purpose. The question concerned the whole colony, and if the Government were prepared to propose an expenditure of £50,000 or £60,000 for a new asylum, he did not think any hon. member would vote against it. It was a proper thing to arrange that Dr. Barnett should devote the whole of his time to the asylum; but as new quarters were going to be built for the doctor, that fact did not indicate that the Government were looking out for a better site for the asylum in the country, but that the present makeshift system was to go on for many years longer.

MR. CLARKSON said this subject was brought before the House every year. Vested interests appeared to come in again, as in the case of the locomotive workshops at Fremantle. Would it not be possible to take advantage of the liberal offer which had been recently made by Mr. Morrison, in proposing to give a suitable piece of ground on the Darling Range?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We are going to get that land.

MR. CLARKSON suggested that buildings should be erected there first for the curable patients, and the Surgeon Superintendent might attend to both asylums, having the convenience of the railway. A more beautiful or more suitable place than the Darling Range, for curable patients, could not be found.

MR. LEAKE said he would gladly support a vote for any sum of money that might be proposed for the relief of these unfortunate inmates. Nothing could be more pitiable than the condition of those in the asylum at Fremantle; and sad as was the description which Dr. Barnett gave in his annual report, it conveyed no idea of the real state of things. To view those patients as they were herded together in that wretched place was a picture of abject human misery—he might almost call it a home of depravity. It had been his misfortune to visit the place last summer, and, difficult as it was to shock him, he confessed it was with absolute sorrow that he viewed the condition of those people all herded together, in prison clothes, with no comfort, no attempt to separate them, no attempt to improve them—drivelling idiots, hopeless maniacs, and curable patients, all herded together. Let hon. members imagine, if they could, a patient, in a lucid interval, suddenly brought face to face with the unfortunate creatures who were, of necessity, placed together in the same small yard. There he saw persons whom he had known in better circumstances, who had at one time moved in society, dressed in prison garb, fed on prison fare, and herding with others like a pack of wild beasts. He hoped the Premier would not treat the matter lightly. This was a public sore which must be laid bare; and the only remedy would be a liberal expenditure of money. The island of Rottnest would be salubrious, and, in many ways, admirable as a site for this asylum. The inmates could be allowed to go outside the precincts of the asylum, without risk of their getting away from the island, so that anyone escaping within the island could be easily recaptured.

MR. SOLOMON said the land at present available for the asylum in Fremantle was about twenty acres, and would be serviceable for a considerable time, although he thought the time would

come when the asylum must be removed from the present site. After a new site had been selected, a considerable time would be required for erecting the new buildings; therefore not a day should be lost before doing the necessary work for making the present asylum adequate in the meantime. The appointment of a resident surgeon was highly desirable, for without this change there would be no benefit. Classification had been urged as a necessity during many years past. This matter had lately been inquired into by the Civil Service Commission, and his own opinion was that the present classification was something horrible—Malays, Chinese, blackfellows, and Europeans of all classes huddled together. This state of things was simply disgraceful. He agreed with the suggestion that Rottneest would be a suitable place for the asylum. He was pleased to learn that the salaries of the matron, the chief warder, and some others had been increased, their duties being very arduous.

MR. PEARSE was glad to find the Government intended that in future the Surgeon Superintendent should devote all his time to the asylum, and that some officers were to have increases of salary, but he regretted that the nurses were not also to have some increase, as they had onerous duties to perform. He agreed with the remarks of the hon. member for South Fremantle.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Government intended to expend £4,000 upon improvements at the asylum. The feasibility of removing the asylum to another site had been considered, but the expenditure for that purpose would necessarily be large, and for the present the Government thought it was better to enlarge and improve the existing buildings. He thought also that the increased area which was to be added would greatly improve the accommodation. He remembered visiting the asylum some years ago, and even if the condition of the place had continued the same now, he thought that some of the remarks made in the present discussion were somewhat exaggerated. He could not think that an experienced man like Dr. Barnett would allow things to be in such a terrible state. For his own part, he confessed he had not visited the place for 10 or 12 years, so that he could not speak from experi-

ence. He knew the desire of the Government was to do all that was possible for these unfortunate people, and he believed the additions to the buildings and the enlarged area of ground, when completed, would greatly improve the accommodation. There were some 20 coloured male inmates from the Northern parts of the colony—Sharks Bay and other places—and he had tried his best to induce the Government of Hong Kong or Singapore to receive them, the Government of this colony offering to send them and pay for their maintenance; but these proposals had not been accepted. The Knowle Asylum, occupying a beautiful site, had been lately fitted up for curable patients, and those least affected had been placed there. When the other extensive improvements then in progress were finished, the intention was to remove the curable patients back to the enlarged building, and the Knowle could then be used for some other purpose. The Government had not been so overburdened with means as to feel justified in proposing an expenditure of £30,000 to £50,000 in providing an asylum on a new site.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: You can find the money when you want it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the hon. member had previously suggested that money should be put on the Estimates for removing the asylum; but the hon. member, like some others, though ready with his sympathy, had not done much himself. How much had he or the others given? The Government were just as desirous as the hon. member for Albany to provide properly for these inmates, although they did not do so much shouting about it.

MR. LEAKE again regretted that the Premier could not treat this matter as seriously as it deserved; and why the Premier should accuse him of shouting about a matter of this kind he could not understand. The Premier had told them he had not been in the asylum during the last twelve years; and what took him there then was that he was comptroller of the convict establishment, and he visited the asylum because it was a prison. It was a prison still, or no better than a prison; therefore he blamed the Premier for not having visited the place during the last twelve years, particularly after the hon. gentleman's attention, and that

of the Government, had been directed to the state of the facts, particularly by the reports of the Surgeon Superintendent. This was evidence that the Premier did not think fit to read the reports of his subordinate officers, and it was evident he had not read the last annual report, dated January 2nd, 1894. (The hon. member read the report to the committee.) When hon. members referred to these facts, and commented on them, the Premier told them they might as well put their hands in their own pockets to assist in alleviating the condition of these unfortunate people.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): That is what people do in England.

MR. LEAKE said it was a pity the Government had not abolished some of the "whims" proposed in the Loan Bill, and put this item in their place.

MR. ILLINGWORTH regretted the attitude of the Premier in asking hon. members what they were willing to spend out of their own pockets in providing for these inmates. As the whole institution was sustained out of public funds, he supposed those members on the Opposition side of the House who had been referred to had paid their full share in that way. If the appeal to feelings of humanity was not sufficiently strong, then he would appeal on the mere question of economy; for if they could succeed in placing a number of these afflicted persons in a condition in which they would cease to be a charge on the State, that result would be worth consideration. In Victoria the cottage system had been most successful in the treatment of the insane. These inmates should not be treated as criminals. He affirmed, on the authority of clergymen who visited the asylum, that its condition was an absolute disgrace to the colony; and his informants were prepared to sustain what he had said. The matter should not be turned aside in the way the Premier had attempted to treat it on this occasion.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said if the Premier had visited the asylum oftener, he would not have shown such a lukewarm interest in it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I deny the lukewarm interest. How much interest have you shown?

MR. R. F. SHOLL said if the Premier had given as much attention to the

asylum as he had, it would have been to the Premier's credit. Dr. Scott had brought this matter before the Assembly in 1891; a committee was then appointed, and it made a recommendation; but nothing had been done since. What could members of the House do by putting their hands in their pockets?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): You think about it once a year, when you come here, and that is all.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said if there were not about thirty agricultural halls to be built in different parts of the country, there would be no necessity for hon. members to put their hands in their pockets for this purpose. The Surgeon Superintendent of the asylum had been bringing this matter under the notice of the Government year after year during the last ten years, and yet the Government had done nothing. Let the Government put a substantial sum on the Estimates for removing the asylum to a new site, in order to make proper provision for the unfortunate inmates.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he was sorry to hear any hon. member get out of temper over this subject. The hon. member for the Gascoyne would lead the committee to believe the Government had done nothing whatever; but it was not true to say the Government had taken no action upon the report of the select committee which inquired into this subject in 1891, because a considerable sum had been since spent on the asylum in providing for temporary requirements, until a large scheme could be undertaken. The Government had not been able to launch into a large scheme at present; but, in addition to what had lately been done, they were about to spend £4,000 more in further temporary improvements. When the hon. member said the Government, and particularly the Premier, took no interest in this matter, the hon. member must have known the Premier was, above all men, the last against whom such a charge could be made. That remark, indeed, was altogether uncalled for, and would not be listened to patiently by anyone in this House or in the colony. Members of the Government were not so blind to the dictates of humanity as to overlook this subject; for

they had selected a site for new buildings, and taken advantage of an offer of a piece of land given by a gentleman for the asylum. The project was in the mind of the Government. Personally, he was strongly opposed to the idea of the asylum remaining in its present position, and hoped to see a new building started at a place near Greenmount, before many years were over—not at Rottneest, because the island was unsuitable. He could sympathise with the feelings expressed by some hon. members, after he had visited the asylum as a member of the committee in 1891.

MR. SIMPSON said the Premier had stated that he had not visited the asylum for twelve years; and yet he also cast a doubt on the sympathy of those members who had spoken about the asylum, because they had not put their hands in their pockets to help in ameliorating the condition of these inmates. Perhaps the Premier would be kind enough to suggest through what channel that private aid could have gone. That remark of the Premier was ill-advised. The Director of Public Works had just told hon. members that the Government had been considering the matter since the select committee reported in 1891. Fancy the condition of these poor idiots during these four years of official consideration! He would not impugn the sympathy of the Ministers, but he must say their action had been extremely laggard. A grant of land had been offered, yet the Government had not come to any conclusion as to what they would do with it. The sympathy of the Government was largely a lip service.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that, in regard to Item 65 (medical officer, West Kimberley), the Government hoped to be able to obtain the services of a medical officer soon. The salary was available.

MR. R. F. SHOLL asked what was the object of removing the medical officer from Broome?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the medical officer formerly at Broome had desired to be moved.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said the Government should not subsidise a medical officer where there was a large population, as in the case of goldfields, where many persons were treated as paupers, although

able to pay for a doctor's services. The medical arrangements at Coolgardie were costing the Government about £2,000 a year. With regard to the medical officer lately removed from Broome to another place, he was receiving £725 a year from the Government as medical officer and resident magistrate, and had private practice as well. This expense was too much.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the same medical officer had been paid at the same rate all along.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said this officer was over-paid. He noticed that at West Kimberley the resident magistrate received £500 a year and allowances. Why not have a medical officer who could also combine the magisterial duties? Unless a medical officer received something for other duties, an efficient man would not take the position in such a place as West Kimberley, the medical subsidy being only £200 a year. He did not wonder at the medical officer who was lately at West Kimberley having desired to be removed to Broome.

MR. CONNOR said the Government were rather to be commended for having arranged to continue the duties of medical officer and Resident Magistrate at Broome, and, as ships from the East made their first call at Broome, it was necessary to have a competent medical man there.

MR. KEEP said it was still necessary to have a competent medical officer at Derby, in addition to one at Broome, because Derby was the first port of call for steamers coming from Singapore, and a great deal of trouble had been caused in this colony through the quarantine regulations not being properly carried out at the first port of call.

MR. MORAN, referring to Item 66 ("Murchison, Resident Medical Officer, £300") asked why this salary should be £300, when only £200 was paid to the medical officer at Coolgardie?

THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. member must not refer again to Coolgardie, as that item had been passed.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said that, although it was necessary to provide medical attendance for persons too poor to pay, yet the tendency was to make these State medical salaries too high in places where a large amount of private practice was obtainable, as on the gold-

fields. Private practice was growing, and the subsidies should be reduced. He would support a motion for reducing the amount of Item 66 to £200.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said that where there was enough private practice to induce medical men to settle, the Government subsidy should be withdrawn. The subsidised doctors were virtually competing against private practice, especially on the goldfields, where several doctors were settled. He did not think the people at Cue had sufficient confidence in the Government medical officer there.

MR. MORAN said that in Guildford, eight miles from Perth, and in any of the little tin-pot villages in settled districts, the Government subsidised a medical officer; therefore why not subsidise a medical officer at Coolgardie? More sickness, misery, and hardship were to be found on the outlying goldfields than in agricultural villages, for many of the men on goldfields had no relations or friends to help them in sickness, and they should be cared for by the State.

MR. A. FORREST said the hon. member wanted the diggers to be fed with a spoon.

MR. JAMES moved that Item 66 be reduced in amount by £100. He said Cue was now one of the most lucrative centres in which a doctor could obtain private practice. A medical officer residing at Guildford had not half the chance of obtaining private practice that a doctor would have on a large goldfield. The subsidy system was vicious, as the recipient took the salary, but generally forgot the object for which it was given.

MR. MORAN opposed the reduction, and argued that the amount of £800 should also be paid to the resident medical officer at Coolgardie.

THE CHAIRMAN again cautioned the hon. member, saying he would be obliged to suspend the hon. member if he offended again by referring to Coolgardie.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that when the resident medical officer at Cue was transferred to that place, the arrangement was that he should receive £300 a year. His private practice there was not very lucrative. If a fresh appointment at Cue were now being made, the Government would not offer

more than they were paying to the officer at Coolgardie. The bargain had been made, but he did not know why it should continue for ever. The amount was really a retaining fee, and the ordinary amount of the fee in the colony generally was £100 a year, although at a small port like Carnarvon the Government had to pay £250 in order to induce a medical man to reside there. A Hospital Bill was before Parliament at present, and, if it passed, the effect might be to alter the present system altogether.

MR. RANDELL said the medical officer at Cue should have had some notice before his salary was to be reduced, and to do it in the mode proposed in the motion would be a breach of faith. As to the practice elsewhere, he knew that in England the local governing bodies paid subsidies to medical officers in out-districts, the medical officer's particular duty being to attend to the poor. He believed the same practice prevailed in Victoria in the sparsely-populated districts. He thought that in large centres of population the medical officers were able to provide for themselves.

MR. LEAKE asked whether the resident medical officer in a district was required to attend gratuitously those persons who were in the service of the Government.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the resident medical officers in the Northern districts had to attend free the police, the public officers, the aborigines, and persons without means, also all prisoners; in fact, everything which the Government had to provide, in the way of medical attendance, these officers had to supply without charge. Therefore, if no medical salary were paid, he did not think the Government would save expense by a change of system, because the charges which medical practitioners would have to make against the Government, for rendering such services, would amount probably to more than the salaries paid at present. Quarantine officers were required at ports for visiting ships, and in many places it would be practically impossible to get on without medical officers. In some places nearer to the centre of Government the public officers did not now get medical attendance free. No one entering the service in Perth now got medical attendance free.



Mr. A. FORREST said these salaries to medical officers ought to disappear, and if the hon. member (Mr. James) had moved that the reduction should apply to medical officers at Coolgardie and other goldfields, he would have supported the reduction.

Mr. MORAN asked whether the last speaker was in order in referring to Coolgardie?

The CHAIRMAN said the hon. member who raised this point of order should bear in mind that he did scarcely anything but thrust Coolgardie forward, and that was the reason why he had to be prevented from referring to it on every possible occasion.

Mr. A. FORREST deprecated a reduction of salary in one particular district, and suggested that the motion might be withdrawn, in the expectation that next year the Government would make a reduction all round, in places where there was sufficient population to support a doctor with private practice. This medical vote had been going up about £4,000 a year in recent years.

Mr. COOKWORTHY supported the item, and said the subsidy generally was really a payment for medical attendance in the cases of aborigines and persons without means, so that if the payment were to be made on the basis of work actually done, the amount would be more than at present. A medical officer had told him, recently, that he had to make up an immense quantity of medicine for people who were unable to pay.

Mr. MORAN said the life of a man was worth a certain amount to the State, and prevention was better than cure. By attending to a patient in his first symptoms, very often death was prevented, and a life was saved to the State. Surely the life of a man already in the colony was worth as much as the life of a man who was being brought here; therefore he hoped the Government would always see the wisdom of subsidising medical officers on goldfields.

Mr. H. W. SHOLL asked whether a resident medical officer in the North had to attend all the natives who might need attendance in his district, or only the natives in prison? In his own experience, he had paid a good sum for medical attendance to natives while in his service.

Mr. LEAKE said he had been told that all the railway employes in Perth and Fremantle were entitled to medical attendance, free. He asked whether that was so.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that matter was being inquired into.

Mr. MORAN said a portion of the pay of the railway employes was kept back for the purpose.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said there had been some misunderstanding, but the matter was being inquired into.

Motion put and negatived.

Mr. R. F. SHOLL, referring to Item 76 (Southern Cross resident medical officer, £200), asked what was the arrangement.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the same officer received £200 a year as medical officer, and £200 a year as warden of the Yilgarn goldfield; he also held all the other offices that were usually held by resident magistrates. Besides the salary of £400, he received £50 for forage allowance, and free quarters were provided. The arrangement was made with Dr. Black at the time when the Coolgardie goldfield was proclaimed, and some economy was effected by it, as the expense previously had been £600 a year.

Mr. R. F. SHOLL said he noticed there was forage allowance for the warden, and again there was forage allowance for the resident magistrate, in the Estimates, at page 37, these allowances making together £100 a year for the same person.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he would make a note of the matter, and inquire into it.

Mr. MORAN said the population at Southern Cross was not half as large as the population at Hannan's or Kurnalpi; and there was also railway communication to Southern Cross. If there was a medical officer at Southern Cross, why not at Hannan's, where there were 2,000 men? Also, why not at Kurnalpi, which was still farther out? The medical allowances throughout the colony were not on a just basis, and they should be made so in reference to the goldfields, on the score of humanity.

Mr. R. F. SHOLL said the forage allowances required attention, because

when a question of the retirement of an officer arose, there would be so much more claim for pension on that account. In many cases forage allowance was claimed, and paid, although no horse was kept.

MR. MORAN said that in outlying districts the cost of keeping a horse would be four or five times more than in other districts, yet only the same amount was allowed for forage in these cases. There ought to be a scale of allowances for horses.

MR. PIESSE, referring to item 113 (resident medical officers' allowances for supplying medicine to Government officers, hospital patients, paupers, and pensioners, £650), said that he knew that in country districts this allowance was altogether inadequate, only £12 being allowed in many districts. He asked whether the medicine and attendance required by aborigines should not be paid for out of the sum administered by the Aborigines Protection Board. Also, in the case of natives, a medical officer could not give much attention to them if only £12 was allowed for all the medicine he supplied in that district. He knew that the poor blacks were sometimes turned away because the resident medical officer could not afford to supply medicines to them.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said application should be made to the Aborigines Protection Board, as suggested by the last speaker. The Government, in dealing with the question of medical attendance for railway servants, should introduce some system of insurance, or should arrange for an insurance fund to be available in case of sickness or death. Officers should be required to insure on entering the public service.

MR. MORAN said a medical officer had suggested to him that a medicine chest should be provided by the Government for use on outlying goldfields. At Coolgardie, for instance, there was a medical officer; but at another important centre, 24 miles away, there was no medical officer representing the Government, yet some provision ought to be made there, and if a medicine chest were provided at that place, the medical officer at Coolgardie might visit it in his rounds, and attend to sick cases. There should also be a small room available as a surgery

in such a place, to be used by the travelling medical officer. He hoped the Government would consider these suggestions.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the drug allowances ranged from £10 to £30 a year; in some cases perhaps a little more.

MR. JAMES, referring to Item 114 (provisions, washing, for patients, &c., in hospitals, £4,600), said this item showed an increase of £1,100 as compared with the amount voted for the previous year. He said the way in which provisions were supplied to patients in the Colonial Hospital (Perth) was scandalous. The provisions were of the coarsest kind, and were served to patients in the roughest and coarsest manner. It might be the misfortune of people to be poor and unable to pay for treatment in a private hospital. He hoped the increased amount of this item represented an improvement; but he would watch its operation during the year.

MR. SOLOMON said that, in a recent inquiry, the provisions were considered to be satisfactory, but the arrangements as to bathing were in a disgraceful state at Fremantle.

MR. WOOD said that, from some of the remarks made that evening, one would think this colony was the worst of all places to come to; but he did not hear the same opinions expressed outside the House. One gentleman who had been under treatment in the Colonial Hospital told him, after coming out the other day, that he could not imagine better treatment anywhere than he had received in that institution.

MR. JAMES said the hon. member was talking of a "gentleman," but the kind of patients he had referred to were the common cabbage-garden people.

MR. PEARSE said the hon. member for East Perth must be referring to a state of things in the past. From what he had himself seen, he could confirm the remarks of his Fremantle colleague (Mr. Solomon).

MR. PIESSE, referring to Item 117 (medicines and surgical instruments for hospitals, £350), said this sum seemed small for the purpose, and he knew that surgical instruments were not sufficiently provided in country hospitals, some necessary instruments not being obtainable in

such places. A country hospital was, in case of such deficiency, like a ship sent to sea without a rudder. The instruments which medical men had brought out with them were, in some cases, not of the latest or best kind for particular purposes. He knew of instances in which life could have been saved if the instruments required in critical operations had been available in a country hospital.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said the Government built hospitals in some places where there were no patients to put into them, and it would be a pity to provide expensive instruments where they would not be wanted.

MR. WOOD, referring to Item 121 (vaccination fees, £250), asked to whom the fees were payable.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the fees were paid to all medical officers who were appointed public vaccinators.

MR. R. F. SHOLL, referring to Item 122 (incidental expenses, including travelling expenses, £300), said he noticed that more than the amount of this item had been spent last year.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said there were probably some extraordinary expenses on account of the small-pox epidemic last year.

Vote put and passed.

Police, £58,275 12s. 11d.:

MR. ILLINGWORTH said the police had no Sunday off duty. It was too much to expect policemen to be on duty every day of every year, their rate of pay being only 7s. a day. In Perth and Fremantle, if not also elsewhere, arrangements could easily be made for allowing to each man a Sunday off periodically. He did not think that in any other part of Australia the same state of things existed; and he hoped the Government would give an assurance that the men should have some relief on Sunday.

MR. WOOD said another grievance was that the policemen were compelled to wear their uniform whether on or off duty, wherever they went, and they were never able to get rid of that badge of service. He hoped the Government would see their way to alter that.

MR. RANDELL said it should be practicable to allow constables to have one Sunday off out of two, or one Sunday

out of three. This ought to be a paramount consideration. And, in regard to the uniform, he said one could hardly conceive the necessity for a constable being obliged, when off duty, to wear his uniform wherever he went.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said these remarks were news to him. He had never before heard the complaints which had been mentioned. As to Sunday duty, he was inclined to think it was made as light as possible. The mounted constables must of course attend to their horses. If there were any hardship, the Government must have heard something about it before. As to uniform, the soldier must always be in uniform wherever he went; and his own opinion was that it was a good thing for a constable to be always in uniform. He did not think the men had ever complained about it. He did know, however, that men were anxious to get into the police force, and there were many applications at present from strong, up-standing men; therefore he inferred the service was not unpopular. He did not think the committee need be bothered about the discipline of the force, for unless there was strict discipline, such a force of men could not be managed. He had no doubt the Commissioner of Police had good reasons for making the regulations which had been referred to; but he would inquire into the matter.

MR. LEAKE said that any indulgence consistent with discipline would be well merited. He had happened against a good number of members of the force, and he knew their many trials and troubles. It had always struck him that the police were under-paid; and it would add to the efficiency of the force if regard were had not only to the physique but also the intelligence of those who were admitted. He thought it was desirable to have a more intelligent class of men than those in the force at present, because, when constables were placed in responsible positions in the outlying districts, they had to exercise not only force, but tact and intelligence. The intelligent constable was not so likely to make mistakes as the man of mere muscle. But what man of intelligence, or anything approaching education, would remain in a force which was paid only at rates ranging from 5s. to 7s. 6d. a day?

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): They have also clothing and lodging.

**MR. LEAKE** said the men had to pay for their uniform clothing out of their allowance. In a recent police court case, the constable concerned said the Government did not pay for his uniform. Out of this small pittance, a constable had to keep himself and family respectably. Although there might be many applicants for admission to the force at present, yet the difficulty was that men would not stay in the force, for directly they saw a better opening, away they went; the result being that the force was not characterised by the efficiency and intelligence which were desirable.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Question.

**MR. LEAKE** said it was "question," and "question," and "pooh, pooh, pooh." But with better pay there would be a better class of men, and the duties would be discharged in a more efficient manner. He would like, if practicable, that the police force should be recruited from the militia or volunteer ranks; so that, if high discipline was desired, the recruits would have been trained in a service where discipline was practised. Not only was it desirable to get good men into the force, but also to keep them in it.

**MR. CLARKSON** said a first-class constable got 7s. 6d. a day, and had to provide his own uniform. Many a labouring man could earn better wages, and he thought the police were under-paid.

**MR. RICHARDSON** said the amount of this vote showed an increase of over £10,000 in the year. As to increasing the pay of constables, the question was when was the limit of a constable's pay to be reached, and how long could the colony stand the increases?

**MR. JAMES** said the gentlemen who got big "screws" were able to get them made bigger, but that was not the case with constables. He understood that the constables were provided with uniforms, but the inspectors and sub-inspectors had to pay for their own, the cost to these officers in the first year being £45 to £50. If, however, the State insisted on these officers wearing expensive uniforms, the State ought to pay the cost. His opinion was that constables were inadequately paid. It was essential that constables should be efficient. It made

a great difference as to whether a constable had a good temper or a bad one. For such a duty 7s. 6d. a day was altogether inadequate. These men ought to be something more than mere labourers, and should certainly be good-tempered men. He agreed that recruits should be drawn from the militia, or should form part of it. He hoped the Government would consider the absolute need of paying these men a fair and adequate wage.

**MR. RANDELL** said that, in a newspaper of that morning, a letter called attention to the conduct of the police at Marble Bar, and their alleged officiousness in interfering with the diggers there, almost culminating in a riot. Inquiry should be made. While the police were expected to do their duty, they should not be too officious.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he would inquire into the report about the police at Marble Bar. As to the pay of the police force, the rates did strike him as not being very high, but there was also a lodging allowance of some £25 a year, besides a ration allowance in some districts. There was also a travelling allowance. Judging by the number of applications, the position of a constable was not considered undesirable. There had been no complaints from the constables, so far as he knew, and the probability was that the men generally were satisfied with the conditions of the service. Speaking as one who had travelled about the colony a good deal, he thought the police were a very efficient body. Wherever he had been he found the men smart, well disciplined, and ready to do their duty. On the goldfields, also, whatever was required to be done the police were ready and willing to do it, and he was glad to be able to give this testimony from his own observation, although he had seen statements to the contrary in the newspapers. He was speaking of the ordinary police force, not the detective branch.

**MR. RANDELL**: Are the constables paid for seven days or six per week?

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I think they are paid for seven days.

**MR. SOLOMON** said the pay of the higher officers had increased, while the men in subordinate positions were kept at a very low rate. A better inducement might be given by establishing something

like the cadet system, which would be a great benefit. A person high in the police service had stated, in evidence, that a cadet system, which would enable the men to have proper tuition in their duties, would be a great advantage.

Mr. JAMES, referring to Item 19 (detective branch), said 10s. a day was a small payment for the head of the detective department, and he questioned whether that amount was enough to secure efficiency. There might be some reason for saying the duties of the detective branch were not carried out so satisfactorily as they ought to be. The detectives had to spend some money in secret service, and he was told they did not always get it back. He knew that detective constables had complained of their having to spend many small sums of money which they were not able to get refunded. There should be some provision for encouraging constables to make extra efforts for obtaining promotion, and they should not all be kept at the same dead level.

Mr. SOLOMON, referring to Item 267 (travelling expenses and transport, including travelling of special constables, £3,300), said the constables travelling in the goldfield escorts received only 5s. a night as travelling allowance, and this was not sufficient for such responsible service.

Mr. A. FORREST said he understood the gold escort constables were paid specially. He was told, however, that constables on the goldfields received only the same travelling allowance as was paid to constables travelling in the coast districts, whereas the goldfields were most expensive places to live in. There was no finer body of men than the police at Coolgardie; nearly all were the sons of gentlemen or men of good standing; and they were so superior that the look of them was enough. He hoped the Commissioner of Police would consider the hardship which the constables on goldfields had to undergo, and the expensiveness of the living in such places, so that their pay might be increased proportionately, as he understood it was only about 7s. a day, the same as was paid in the coast districts. The charge for a meal on the road was 3s. 6d. and 7s. 6d. for a bed. Constables on goldfields should be paid considerably

more than those in the coast towns, and this was particularly necessary for preventing them from deserting in the new rushes to gold finds.

Mr. MORAN said if the gold escort men got only 5s. day as travelling allowance, this rate of pay was very inadequate in comparison with the expensiveness of travelling down to Perth and back. The travelling allowance should be 10s. a day.

Vote put and passed.

Gaols, £17,647 15s.:

Mr. JAMES drew attention to what he called the absolute and scandalous need for improving the accommodation at the Perth Lockup, there being only two narrow cells, and sometimes a dozen persons jammed into them.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH said there should be provision for some kind of lockup on the goldfields. At the Magnet, when he was there, a man made some disturbance; the offender was arrested by a policeman, who chained him up to a mulga bush all night; and that offender had to be taken fifty miles to a magistrate, his offence being only a small one. If that man was convicted on arriving at Cue, it would then be necessary to send him all the way to Geraldton to serve a sentence of, perhaps, fourteen days' imprisonment, and while in custody at Cue the offender would be chained. There should be a lockup on the goldfields, instead of chaining an offender to a bush at night, in all sorts of weather. It was a reasonable thing to ask that an offender convicted at Cue should not be sent 300 miles to Geraldton as the nearest place where he could be imprisoned.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he believed a lockup had been built at Cue. He knew the expenditure was authorised.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH said that if a man were the greatest of criminals, it was not right to chain him to a bush at night for want of a lockup. Positive barbarisms were going on there which he would be ashamed to bring before the House.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We want to provide these things as well as you do, but we cannot do everything at once.

Mr. MORAN said he would oppose the building of gaols on goldfields, while more urgent works were wanted there.

It was well known that a digging community required less police protection than other communities, and that diggers were more law-abiding. As soon as a policeman went on a goldfield, his presence was the beginning of disorder. Diggers had their own methods of dealing with unruly characters. There was a waste of sentiment in the talk of the hon. member for Nannine, for as long as there were only common diggers on goldfields, no gaols were required there.

MR. A. FORREST did not see much harm in chaining up a man who had misconducted himself. Offenders, when convicted, had usually to work on the roads, and a lot of good work for the public was done in that way.

MR. JAMES supported the argument of the hon. member for Nannine, as it was barbarous to chain up offenders.

MR. LEAKE hoped that when gaols were built on goldfields they would not be made too attractive. The Government should inquire as to what extent the present prisons were houses of correction or havens of rest for thieves and vagabonds. He thought the present prisons would be found to be havens of rest. In particular, he referred to remissions of sentence in cases of penal servitude. The Attorney General had stated that when an offender was sentenced to a long term of penal servitude, he was, as a rule, let loose at the end of seven years. Such criminals, who had by a "fluke" escaped the rope, should not escape punishment in so short a time. In England there was a vast difference between hard labour and penal servitude work, but in this colony no distinction was made. The prison discipline of this colony needed looking into. It should be seen that an offender sent to prison should be punished severely, and should not be allowed to escape in a far shorter time than was contemplated by the judge who sentenced him. The Attorney General ought to carry out the promise made, in reply to a question put to him in the House a few weeks ago, and look into this matter. If he (the hon. member) thought this matter would not engage the attention of the Government during the recess, he would move for the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the administration and discipline of prisons. A class of men known as

"speilers" were coming to this colony, and the sooner they were provided with prison work that would have a corrective effect on them the better.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said he agreed with many of the statements made by the hon. member. This question had been occupying the attention of the Government, in the Colonial Secretary's Department; and he took such interest in it that he was able to say the question was in a condition to be disposed of, after the rising of this House.

MR. LEAKE said the thanks of the House were due to the Attorney General, for the manner in which he had attended to this matter.

MR. PIESSE said the gaol officers of the lower rank were badly paid. There was a great difference, for instance, in the pay of the chief officer and the one next below him.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

# COLONIAL PRISONERS REMOVAL BILL.

## FIRST READING.

Received from the Legislative Council.  
Read a first time.

## ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11.7 o'clock p.m.