

vision might cause a little expense, but it was very necessary in the interests of public safety.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY Subclause 3 was consequentially amended by striking out the words "or local authority," in the last line; also Subclause 5 was amended by striking out the words "and lodged with the local authority," in the last line.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 139—agreed to.

Clause 140—Inspection:

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY the clause was amended by striking out of Subclause 3 the words, "if he so think necessary" at the beginning of paragraph (b).

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 141—agreed to.

Clause 142—Regulations as to overcrowding, etc., in public buildings:

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY the clause was amended by striking out of line 1 the word "Commissioner" and inserting "Governor" in lieu.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 143, 144—agreed to.

Progress reported.

## ADJOURNMENT—CHRISTMAS HOLIDAYS.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved—

*That the House at its rising adjourn to Tuesday, 17th January, 1911.*

There was an unusual procedure this year in having to reassemble after Christmas, but of course that is a matter beyond the power of this House. However, I can assure hon. members that I do not relish having to sit after Christmas any more than do other hon. members. At the same time, as it has not been found possible to get through all the important legislation it will be necessary to meet again. I cannot of course, give any information as to how long it will be necessary to sit in the new year; it may be for a fortnight, or perhaps a month—that will largely depend on hon. members and another place. However, I take this opportunity of wish-

ing you, Mr. President, and also the Chairman of Committees, hon. members, and the officers of the House the compliments of the season.

Question passed.

*House adjourned at 8.45 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly, Wednesday, 21st December, 1910.

|   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Petition: Wongan Hills-Mullewa Railway Bill ... | 2593 |
| Paper presented ...                             | 2593 |
| Questions: Mr. J. G. Hay's claim ...            | 2593 |
| Fruit Export ...                                | 2594 |
| Esperance District, Land Selection ...          | 2594 |
| Geological report, Sandstone-Lawlers ...        | 2594 |
| Bill: Licensing, returned ...                   | 2632 |
| Annual Estimates, Votes and Items discussed ... | 2594 |

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

## PETITION—WONGAN HILLS-MULLEWA RAILWAY BILL.

Mr. S. F. MOORE presented a petition from the Midland Railway Company praying that the Bill to authorise the construction of a railway from Wongan Hills to Mullewa be referred to a select committee, and that the company be permitted to be represented by counsel and to call and examine witnesses before such select committee.

Petition received and read.

## PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Premier: Report of the Commissioner of Taxation to 30th June, 1910.

## QUESTION—MR. J. G. HAY'S CLAIM.

Mr. BATH (without notice) asked the Premier: Have any inquiries been made into the claim of Mr. J. G. Hay against the Government Labour Bureau, and, if so, with what result? Possibly the Premier could not answer offhand, but I will

be content if the Premier will let me have a reply within the next week.

The PREMIER replied:—The papers have been before me, but I have had to send them back to my colleague, the Colonial Secretary, for further information. I will endeavour to let the hon. member have a reply within the next few days.

#### QUESTION—FRUIT EXPERT.

Mr. TROY asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Have applications been called for the position of fruit expert in the Agricultural Department? 2, Has any selection been made from the applicants? 3, If not, what action does the Minister intend to take to fill the position?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Yes. 2, No, we do not consider, with the information at hand, that a suitable man is now available. 3, We will probably call for applications anew.

#### QUESTION—ESPERANCE DISTRICT, LAND SELECTION.

Mr. BATH asked the Minister for Lands: What number of conditional purchases have been taken up in the district between Esperance and Norseman during the past 12 months (a) under residence conditions; (b) under non-residence conditions?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: (a) Eighty-three; (b) Sixty-five.

#### QUESTION—GEOLOGICAL REPORT, SANDSTONE-LAWLERS.

Mr. CARSON asked the Premier: 1, Has there been a geological report made on the country between Sandstone and Lawlers? 2, If so, will the Premier lay the same on the Table of the House?

The PREMIER replied: 1, An examination of the district referred to has been completed by the Government Geologist, whose report is expected to be available by the 5th January. 2, Yes.

#### ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1910-1911.

*In Committee of Supply.*

Resumed from the previous day; Mr. Taylor in the Chair.

Department of the Colonial Secretary (Hon. J. D. Connolly, Minister), the Premier in charge of the Votes.

Vote—Office of Colonial Secretary, £8,429:

Item, Under Secretary, £600.

Mr. HEITMANN: Year after year the Estimates of the Colonial Secretary came in for a good deal of discussion, much of which was directed against the under-secretary of the department. This officer was receiving £600 a year, which was, perhaps, not too much for a good man. The salary had been increased within the last four or five years from about £450. It was to the under-secretary the Colonial Secretary had to look for the work done in the department. It appeared this officer had an idea that his own pleasures were the first consideration, and his duties to the State, in return for the £600 received, of but secondary importance.

The Premier: I do not think the hon. member ought to say that.

Mr. HEITMANN: We had officers in various departments who were receiving leave year after year on various pretences—he was not now referring to this particular under-secretary—and there were many highly-paid officers not giving a fair return for the money received by them. He had many times seen this particular under-secretary going towards the office between 10 and 11 o'clock in the morning.

The Premier: That might not have been his first appearance at the office.

Mr. HEITMANN: It was unlikely the officer would go out of the City on the Fremantle train in time to return again between 10 and 11 o'clock.

The Premier: He might have had a late night at the office the night before.

Mr. HEITMANN: The officer in question was generally carrying golf sticks under his arm, and it was improbable he would drag them about the town with him when on departmental affairs. If this officer were allowed to come and go just when he deemed fit, it could not but have a bad

effect on the subordinate officers of the department. The State should expect a fair return for the money paid these officers, from the highest to the lowest, and in this department in particular he did not think the State was getting it. He hoped this gentleman would pay greater attention to his office, and set a better example to those under him.

The PREMIER: An attack of this description against a deserving officer, who had spent many years in the service of the State, was to be strongly deprecated. It might be that the hon. member had seen this officer on, perhaps, one or two occasions in the street, or in the train between 10 and 11 o'clock in the morning with a golf stick in his hand.

Mr. Scaddan: Is there ever a social function without him?

The PREMIER: Was there anything wrong in this officer attending social functions?

Mr. Scaddan: Yes; during office hours.

The PREMIER: These remarks were most unjust to this officer. If Mr. North attended these functions purely for his own pleasure, to the detriment of the service and to the neglect of the State's affairs he should be reprimanded; but specific instances must be given in charging an officer of neglect of duty so that the matter could be rectified. Certainly all officers should give a proper return in service to the State, but it was not right to make a general statement that an officer neglected his duties. Mr. North was a good officer and gave good service to the State.

Mr. Heitmann: I do not think there is any department that comes in for more criticism.

The PREMIER: Was the criticism always justified? Any department could be criticised, and criticised justly, no matter what Minister or head of department controlled it; but wholesale criticism, so far as public servants were concerned, was not deserved. If the hon. member would give specific instances—

Mr. Heitmann: I told you the man does not attend to his office during the proper hours.

The PREMIER: Mr. North could always be found when wanted. It knocked the heart out of these men to have members constantly carping at them and criticising them because they were seen out of their offices during office hours, and it caused them to say, "What is the good of doing our best; we get no thanks for it; all we get is unjust charges against us, and we cannot reply."

Mr. Holman: That is unfair. Many officers are praised.

The PREMIER: Fair criticism was justifiable, but a general charge of neglecting duties should not be made unless instances were given into which inquiry could be made.

Mr. PRICE: A more extraordinary defence was never heard. The Premier did not attempt to deny that Mr. North spent his time attending social functions, but claimed members should not question this.

The Premier: I did not say so.

Mr. PRICE: According to the Premier, officers would not do their best if we criticised them.

The Premier: I said "criticised them unfairly," not fairly.

Mr. PRICE: Mr. North was to be allowed to attend social functions, yet the police did not deserve a holiday after 12 years' service. The higher the officers the more holidays they could have, but members dare not criticise them. If it was right for Mr. North to attend social functions, it was right for every officer to do likewise.

Item, Chief Clerk, £405.

Mr. SCADDAN: Had the Public Service Commissioner recommended that the office of chief clerk be abolished?

The PREMIER: The Public Service Commissioner recommended that the positions of all chief clerks be abolished.

Mr. SCADDAN: Did the Executive Council decline to adopt the recommendation?

The PREMIER: The Public Service Commissioner and the special Commissioner, Mr. McGibbon, at the end of last year recommended a general reorganisation, including the abolition of the office of chief clerk. Their report was voluminous.

ous and if adopted would mean considerable alterations in all departments. Whether it was desirable to carry them out he could not say at present. The papers were sent back to the Commissioners with certain memorandums from the different accountants making suggestions for the further consideration of the Commissioners. These papers were not yet returned from the Public Service Commissioner. When they were returned he (the Premier) would go into the matter carefully and come to a conclusion as to whether the report would be adopted or not.

Item. Office Cleaners. Night Watchmen, etc., £1,600.

Mr. GILL: The men who during the winter had to attend to the fires in the department, received only 7s. a day. They had to carry the whole of the firewood in bags on their shoulders from the ground at the back of the department to the top of the building. They should receive at least 8s. a day.

The PREMIER: It was not an extraordinarily hard job. The men made their own loads; there was no driving them. Seven shillings was considered a fair rate of wage. The rates paid were 7s. for woodmen, 8s. for night watchmen, and 7s. to 8s. for cleaners. Female cleaners received payment according to the work they did.

Mr. GILL: These woodmen worked harder than the Premier thought. The numbers were reduced some time back, and the work of those who were retained was increased. One man had knocked off work in the department preferring to go out in the streets and work with a pick and shovel.

The PREMIER: The matter would be brought under the notice of the Colonial Secretary.

Item. Inspection of Liquor: Chief Inspector. £350.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Could any reason be advanced why this position should not be abolished? How many convictions were secured during last year through the vigilance of this officer. Attention was drawn during the year to the vile stuff being sold as liquor in the South-West.

but no action was taken. Was it intended to go on merely securing convictions every six months in the metropolitan area where detection was easy?

Mr. Collier: The officer is a capable one, but he has the whole State to deal with.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: If we were not going to make a farce of the department, we should appoint further inspectors. The chief inspector had one inspector to assist him and if he had to control the whole of the State it was impossible to expect good work to be done. A few days ago an application for a license was dealt with at Pinjarra, where the strongest legal bar was engaged and there was evidence given there which surprised the Court and a number of people, but which was not surprising to him (Mr. O'Loghlen). The *South-Western Advertiser* published this brief report of some of the evidence taken:—

When Mr. Levi Green applied to the Licensing Court on Wednesday last for permission to sell Australian wines at Dwellingup, few of the general public in court were prepared for the sensational nature of the evidence brought forward by the opposition. Nearly every witness held some responsible position at Dwellingup or within a five-mile radius. Witness after witness went into the box and told tales of nightly debauchery; drunkards lying about the roads and having to be moved to permit of wheeled traffic; men lying in a state of stupor on the railway and in dust holes. But this was not all. The witnesses drew a picture of a neighbourhood "held up" after night-fall by men mad by "pinkie" of women and children, and even strong men, afraid to venture out of doors; of brawls and disturbances lasting until 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning.

This was not a new occurrence. He brought it under the notice of the Premier some eight or nine weeks ago. It was to be hoped that in the near future a State hotel would be erected there. That, however, was apart from the question. What he wanted to know was whether the Government proposed to assist this Inspector

by giving him a couple more assistants or else taking some of the work off his shoulders. It was monstrous, while attention might be paid to a few metropolitan publicans, that these people in the out-lying districts should be allowed to sell or serve a vile concoction. Not only was this the case at Dwellingup, but there were various other centres where similar stuff was being sold. Once more he brought under the notice of the Premier that poison was being retailed to the people and some of these people were being driven mad through drinking it and no action was being taken by the officer appointed, and it was understood that no action had been taken because the officer had too much work to do.

Mr. Piesse: Is the wine you refer to labelled?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It was not worthy of a label. It was manufactured somewhere around the district and some of it was being manufactured by Mr. Green himself, and evidence was given in this case where twelve barrels had been sent to another portion of the State by railway.

Mr. Heitmann: The analysts cannot state what it is.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Protests had frequently been entered by him against wine of this description being put on the market and in this way disparaging the good article. It was absolute poison; there was no other name for it. Reputable citizens had visited that place and taken only one drink and had then been unable to move from the place where they had consumed it.

The Premier: Do I understand that it is sold under a license?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The Licensing Act provided that the grower could dispose of his own wine, and that apparently was being done.

Mr. Troy: Who is he?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Levi Green. But it did not matter who it was: the fact remained that during the last six or eight months people had been driven off their heads, notwithstanding the fact that attention had been drawn to the matter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: With regard to the question of inspection, from evidence

which he had come across, he had every reason to believe that the inspector was a fairly good man, but it was absolutely impossible for the inspector to do anything like justice when it was remembered that he had to travel over a State like Western Australia. The inspector had to go right away to Hall's Creek once a year, and to go there meant a three months' trip. If the inspector went round the State once a year he was accomplishing fairly good work. It was absurd to adopt a system of inspection in a matter of this description which took place only once a year. Moreover, the inspector was under further difficulties inasmuch as he had not sufficient power under the law. The Attorney General promised distinctly that he would make provision in the Licensing Bill when it reached another place, giving the inspector wider powers. That provision, however, had not been made. The inspector worked under difficulties, inasmuch as he did not have sufficient power to bring about the punishment of offenders; therefore the money voted for inspection was practically thrown away. It was no use catching one here and there, and allowing others to sell poisonous drugs year after year, and seriously injuring the health of the people of the State. It was to be hoped that the Colonial Secretary's Department, which had one or two other things to do, would devote at least some little time to this work. The under secretary at any rate might put in an extra hour in a morning attending to this question.

Mr. GORDON: It seemed that the sale of this class of wine was restricted to one district, and the member for Pilbara said it had been going on for years. If that was the case the inspector was certainly not doing his duty. It was admitted that the quality of liquor in Perth at the present time had considerably improved, but if what had been stated by hon. members was correct there must be something deficient in the inspection. One member had stated that one glass of the wine which was sold at Dwellingup was sufficient to prevent a man moving from that locality. Was that not an absolutely ridiculous statement to make? If a man could only sell one glass of such a class of

wine, where would his profit lie? And, if that had been going on for years, he repeated, the inspector was lacking in his duty.

The PREMIER: The member for Pilbara argued that we should do away with inspections because they could not stop the sale of bad liquor, but with that argument he could not agree. It was obvious that it would be necessary to have an army of inspectors to carry out an inspection at every centre. We were never going to stop entirely the illicit sale of liquor, or the sale of liquor which was injurious to health, even if the number of inspectors were increased. The inspectors in this department had done excellent work; they had travelled throughout the State even as far north as Broome, and during 1909 they had made 1,950 inspections.

Mr. Underwood: How many licenses are there?

The PREMIER: Offhand he could not tell the hon. member. But these officers seemed to have visited nearly all the licensed premises, not once but several times. They had instituted 35 prosecutions and secured 35 convictions, and had recovered in fines and costs £212 10s. That was a very creditable record. In the report of the Chief Inspector it would be noticed that the prosecutions numbered only about half those for 1908. This was due to a marked improvement all round in the liquor trade. The Committee would see therefore that the work of this department was bearing good results. With regard to the member for Forrest's complaint that some concoction termed "pinkie" was sold, if "pinkie" was a cheap raw wine and was sold before it matured it could be understood that it would be hurtful, but surely if it had the tremendous effect upon a person that the hon. member stated, these people, as common-sense people, would not return to that place for more of the poison. Was there not some duty cast upon these people to protect themselves?

Mr. Scaddan: They do not know until they have sampled it.

The PREMIER: If this state of affairs obtained at Dwellingup—

Mr. Scaddan: That is not the only place. Ask Dr. Montgomery and he will throw some light on the subject.

The PREMIER: If it had the effect that the hon. member declared, would the hon. member go and take a second drink?

Mr. Collier: There are many who will.

Mr. Johnson: Any amount take a second drink of whisky.

The PREMIER: Perhaps half a dozen drinks of whisky would not have a harmful effect. In the case referred to by the member for Forrest, it was absolute poison which was sold, and one small glass rendered the man who drank it unconscious.

Mr. Walker: They reckon that a cheap drunk.

The PREMIER: It was true that the department was not overmanned and if we could afford to spend thousands where only hundreds were spent he might agree to have half a dozen inspectors. The two officers in the department were doing excellent work as was shown by the number of convictions and the samples which had been taken.

Mr. JACOB: Now that a charge had been made that certain people were engaged in the manufacture of bad wine, and in the adulteration of wine, he hoped that the Premier would have an investigation made. It was impossible to manufacture imitation wine without spirits, and he would guarantee to produce natural wine, equal to that sold in South Australia, infinitely cheaper than it could be produced artificially. The wine maker in buying his spirits for fortifying purposes was able to get his supply at a duty of 6d. per gallon out of bond, whereas the maker of artificial wine would not get the benefit of that duty, and would have to pay something like 14s. per gallon. That made the manufacture of artificial wine unprofitable, when good wine grapes could be bought as cheaply as they could be obtained in South Australia.

The Premier: How would you stop the sale of this stuff which is so injurious to health?

Mr. JACOB: It would be discovered that the cause of the trouble was not so much in the liquors as in the mixing of

them. If a man mixed a glass of whisky and a glass of wine he very probably would "drop in his tracks."

Mr. HUDSON: Do you approve of the Wines Act in Victoria, which says that all spirits used for fortifying must be distilled from grapes?

Mr. JACOBY: That was the Commonwealth provision, that all wine must be fortified with grape spirit, and the fortifying must be done in the presence of a customs officer. It was a very excellent provision, but it had had the effect of making grape spirit very scarce. He wanted to clear up another misconception as to young wine being injurious; it was no more injurious than old wine.

Mr. HUDSON: Do you mean young wine fortified or unfortified?

Mr. JACOBY: The reference was to young natural wine. In the wine-drinking countries of the world 95 per cent. of the people drank the wine before it was 12 months old. To persons not used to such wine the results would be very unpleasant, but by no means injurious. He hoped that steps would be taken to determine definitely whether any injurious wine was sold in this State. We had inspectors with full authority, and let them take samples and make a report, and let the offenders, if there were any, be punished, not only as a protection to those who used the wine, but also as a protection to other wine makers in the State.

Mr. MURPHY: It was important to everybody that we should get the purest of wines and spirits to drink, and surely if it was worth while to appoint inspectors of liquor, it was absurd to say that two inspectors could in any way adequately control or properly analyse the drink that was sold throughout the State.

Mr. HOLMAN: There is plenty of room for two inspectors in the metropolitan area.

Mr. MURPHY: That was just what he was going to say. The department had done good work, and owing to that fact the adulteration of liquor had decreased to a considerable extent, but the Government should at least consider the advisability of increasing the number of inspectors, and do everything possible to put

down that which the member for Swan seemed to deny, namely, the adulteration not only of imported spirits but of local wines. Perhaps that member, as a wine maker, did not descend to some of the tricks of the trade, but it was a fact that the residues, which were thrown away from first-class vineyards were, in others, bottled and sold; that was what the complaint was about. Having had eight years in the Customs Department, he could say that some of the stuff would kill any man at sight. Either the department should be abolished, or one or two other inspectors should be appointed to extend the good work now being done. At the most it would not cost more than £400 to have two additional inspectors; but even if it cost £1,000 the expense would be well worth incurring.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It was disappointing to hear the Premier hold out no assurance that the number of inspectors would be increased. The member for Canning had said that it was absurd to say that no one could take one drink of so-called wine and be unable to get away from the place.

The Premier: He stated that it would not pay the vendor to sell such stuff.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Whether it paid the vendor or not the stuff was sold. No doubt the member for Canning could carry away a hundred drinks, but others had not the same capacity.

Mr. GORDON: Do not flatter me.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: What applied to the member for Canning was not applicable to most people. He was sorry, indeed, that the member for Swan on every possible occasion seemed to defend those practices, because, while speaking for the wine trade he did not use that discrimination which members would like to see. That member had frequently stated that the wine-drinking people of the world drank wine less than 12 months old, and that there was no artificially-produced wine in Western Australia. If that was true, then God help the people of Australia if the wine trade was going to develop. He would sooner see the wine industry wiped out of existence altogether than have a continuance of some of the

scenes that had come under his notice during recent months. It was all very well for the Premier to say that it was people's own fault if they drank that kind of stuff.

The Premier: I said they must share the responsibility.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: They must share the responsibility, but the State should take steps to prevent the sale of such injurious stuff. If we were going to have inspectors of liquors it was only a fair thing that when complaints were made in the House the Minister should take some notice. It might not arise in the future, for the licensing bench might refuse to renew the license owing to the scenes which had occurred during the last 12 months. He (Mr. O'Loghlen) had raised his protest because months ago he brought the matter under the notice of the Premier, and no action had been taken.

The Premier: Under my notice?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The matter was brought under the notice of the Premier during the debate on the Health Bill, and if a complaint was brought before the responsible leader of the House it was his duty to acquaint the inspector of it. The Minister should see that some inquiry was made, for the desire was to prevent such practices being carried on in the future. If the wine trade of Western Australia was going to develop in the same way as it had developed in the district mentioned, then it would be a God-send to the country if the wine trade was wiped out.

Mr. FOULKES: This was not the first time that the matter had been brought under notice, for he found that on the 20th December last, when speaking in another place, the Hon. E. McLarty said—

The people now are disposing of wine by carting it about and erecting a shanty of a few sheets of iron where public works or railways are being constructed, and selling this wine to the employees on these works. The effect is that the people in the place are kept in a state of drunkenness and the police declare that they have neither control nor supervision. For instance, on the Pinjarra-Marradong railway a man has

put up a place some five or six miles along the railway line, and he carts the wine to this place, sells it, and at this locality there have been some disgraceful scenes. Men are continually getting drunk and knocking each other about, and hon. members know that this is brought about, to a very large extent, by so-called wine, which is only a mixture of soapsuds and vinegar; it drives the people mad and has the most disastrous effects. . . . The effect is also very bad on the butcher and grocer, because the men have no money with which to pay their bills. All this is taking place, to say nothing of the demoralising effect it is having on the men themselves. . . . I brought the matter under the notice of the inspector of police, and he told me that he was well aware of what was going on, but that he was powerless to interfere. The amendment of the Act, he stated, had taken the matter out of their hands, and the men could sell in these places with impunity.

In reply to the remarks, the Colonial Secretary said—

I will promise the hon. member that the law will be strictly enforced. I will see that the police will take notice of what has been said, and if the law is as it has been reported to be, I will bring the matter under the notice of the Government, so that such a state of things may be remedied when the Licensing Bill comes before Parliament next session.

The Licensing Bill did not affect the matter at all, because from his experience, and it was borne out by the report of Mr. Durham, there had been something like 50 convictions for selling adulterated liquor, or selling liquor the description of which was inaccurately stated. A certain amount of adulteration was going on, and it seemed to prove that a good deal of wine was not fit to drink. There was no provision in the Licensing Bill in regard to this matter, nor did it seem to be regarded as a heinous offence, that of adulterating liquor, for in not a single case in six or seven years had a licensee lost his license because of the adulteration of liquor. The benches did not like to have



charges of adulteration of liquor brought before them, and that was the reason why so many members were in favour of having the licensing courts elected. The inspectors laboured under great disadvantages. He knew that when the inspectors travelled along the railway lines in the country, the fact that they were travelling was telegraphed throughout the district, and it was found most difficult to do their work satisfactorily, and for that reason he appealed to the Premier to see if the number of inspectors could not be increased. The department had not cost the State a penny, because the amount of fines collected had been more than sufficient to pay the salaries of the inspectors.

The Premier: Only £206 was collected last year.

Mr. FOULKES: That might be the case last year, but it would be found that the total amount during the past six or seven years would be more than the amount of the inspectors' salaries during that period. When he (Mr. Foulkes) first proposed that inspectors of liquor should be appointed—that was about seven or eight years ago when Sir Walter James was Premier—there was a great deal of opposition to the appointment. It was said there was no need to have inspectors as all the liquor sold in the State was perfectly good. It was to be hoped the Premier would consider the appointment of an increased number of inspectors.

The Premier: I will consider it.

Mr. PIESSE: In the interests of the wine industry a searching inquiry should be made into the statement of the member for Forrest. He was pleased to know that these complaints were confined only to those districts represented by the hon. member for Forrest, and a late member of the Chamber Mr. McLarty. He was satisfied the member was not making the complaints without justification, and that what he had stated was sufficient to justify an immediate and searching inquiry into the alleged manufacture of artificial or impure wine, because if wine of this character was allowed to be manufactured and sold it was bringing the wine industry of the State into ridicule, and many growers had gone to great expense

in building up the wine industry. We had manufactured wine in the State which had taken important prizes in European and continental exhibitions within recent years, and he hoped in the interests of the wine industry an inquiry would be made and those responsible for the manufacture of such impure wine, or "pinky," as it was called, would be prosecuted. In Victoria there was legislation prohibiting the manufacture and the sale of impure wine, and he hoped if necessary similar legislation would be adopted here. It seemed that the complaints were more against the grower of the wine who sold without a license. He would suggest that the Premier bring this matter under the notice of the inspectors and request them to carry out a more rigid inspection at the wine cellars. The manufacturer of pure wine would have no objection to such an inspection. It was to be hoped something would be done by way of remedying the evil of the sale of impure wine, because it was seriously injuring the wine trade of the State.

Mr. SWAN: It was certainly to be hoped that the Premier would bring about the appointment of an increased number of inspectors. On a recent trip to the South-West he had heard many of the old settlers complaining of the inferior quality of the wine being sold at the various mills and pointing out the bad effects it had on the young men in the district. With regard to the question of the inspection of liquor generally, it was true, as the Premier said, we would not absolutely secure the selling of none but pure liquor even if we had hundreds of inspectors. But it was positively farcical to expect that two inspectors should carry on the whole of the work. Seeing the good work which had been done in the metropolitan district by the inspectors it was reasonable to assume that the appointment of additional inspectors would make a great improvement throughout the State. In view of the statements made by Mr. Foulkes in this House and by Mr. McLarty in another place, we could not expect much from the Minister controlling this department. It was to be hoped

the Premier would insist upon the appointment of additional inspectors.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Aborigines*, £16,515—agreed to.

Vote—*Charities*, £37,764.

Item—*Cooks*, £290.

Mr. SWAN: It was desired to call attention to the wages paid to these men. We all knew that outside the institution a first-class cook received a salary considerably higher than that set down for these men. It was well that such a wage should come under the heading of *Charities*, for it was absolutely inadequate for the work performed. The men employed were first-class cooks and had held positions in leading hotels.

The Premier: They would not leave leading hotels to go to this place?

Mr. SWAN: Notwithstanding the Premier's insinuation he (Mr. Swan) was making a statement of fact. He knew the men and knew they had been in leading hotels, and were to-day being paid £100 per annum in the Old Men's Home.

The Premier: What has brought them from leading hotels to £100 per annum?

Mr. SWAN: It was not his desire to argue that point. The position was that they were first-class cooks and were being paid £100 per annum. We knew the Premier was not an advocate of high wages, but it was to be hoped he would see that the men were paid a fair rate of remuneration?

The PREMIER: This was the ordinary wage paid to cooks in similar situations. They received £100 per annum and their keep. There was no occasion for the hon. member to look so fiercely at him.

Mr. Swan: I object to the hon. member accusing me of being practically a liar.

The PREMIER: There was no intention of accusing the hon. member of being any such thing or in fact of even insinuating that the hon. member had made a deliberate misstatement. What he (the Premier) had said was that these cooks would not voluntarily leave leading hotels to go into an invalid dépôt. If these men had left hotels where they would be receiving £6 or £7 per week to go to a billet of this sort there was certainly something behind it. This was not a first-class position.

Mr. Seaddan: No, any old thing will do down there.

The PREMIER: No, that was not correct, but it was to be remembered that there was no need for entrée dishes at the institution. All that was required was plain cooking, but it had to be good cooking at that. No hon. member would expect a first-class cook to take a position of that sort. The wage was, he understood, the ruling rate, and, with the keep of the cooks, was equivalent to £3 or £3 5s. a week, which was probably above the average for general work of this kind.

Item, *Engine-drivers*, Old Men's Home, Claremont, £287.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Did the Premier think it a fair thing to pay engine-drivers £2 10s. per week? It offered a striking contrast to the wage of the hall porter at the Public Works Department which was £3 10s. per week. The engine-driver had to go through a severe examination before he obtained his certificate, without which he could not be employed. Surely in these circumstances the Premier would not contend that £2 10s. per week was adequate remuneration for that man's services. He did not suggest that the hall porter's wage of £3 10s. per week was too much, but he thought the Premier would admit that £2 10s. was considerably below a fair thing for engine-drivers. He hoped the Premier would make a note of this and see that a qualified man was paid a decent wage.

The PREMIER: Would the hon. member tell him what was paid outside?

Mr. O'Loighlen: Something more than that.

The PREMIER: It was understood that this man was an assistant engine-driver.

Mr. Seaddan: He has the same responsibility.

The PREMIER: That was hardly so, because, of course, the chief took the responsibility. It should not be forgotten that there was a remedy for this. If the man was such a good man as the hon. member would have the Committee believe, he would not remain in his present position while there was employment at £3 or £4 elsewhere, and all would agree

there was plenty of employment at the present time. It was understood that this man received his keep in addition to his wages. If so, he was getting a fair remuneration; if not, the matter was worth inquiring into, and would be inquired into.

Item, Inspectors (State Children), £475.

Mr. SWAN: Provision was here made for an increase of £20. Would the Premier tell the Committee who was to get this £20?

The PREMIER: It meant that two female inspectors would each receive an increase of £10.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Would the Premier tell the Committee what were the duties of these female inspectors, and why we required so many?

The PREMIER: The inspectors looked after the State children who were boarded out in 177 different homes. These inspectors had to periodically visit these homes and see that the children were being properly cared for.

Mr. Scaddan: Who are the inspectors?

The PREMIER: One was a Miss Blackburn and the other a Miss Nesbitt.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It would not be surprising if it were found that these appointments were of the social order. We had many such in Western Australia, where it was the practice to give comfortable appointments to people of some social standing. He knew some State children who were not all well treated and who were in homes unfit for the accommodation of children. He had seen the treatment the children received in these so-called homes.

The Premier: These are children with foster-mothers.

Mr. UNDERWOOD knew the class of foster-mothers who expected the children to fear God and carry half a ton.

Mr. Johnson: That is all the more reason why we need inspectors.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The inspectors did not do their duty. The State should keep the children and not put them out. The money spent on these social appointments would go a long way towards training the children in a home and teaching them trades and sending them to techni-

cal schools. He had no sympathy with the system, or with the inspectors endeavouring to carry out the system.

The PREMIER: The hon. member knew nothing about the system. There was not a child above five years of age. Most of them were infants; yet the hon. member suggested sending them to technical schools. It was a physical impossibility for these babies to carry half a ton. There were 177 foster-mothers, and it was the duty of the inspectors to visit the houses where these children were boarded out to see the babies were properly attended to and looked after. If we could bring up safely a fair percentage of these infants we would help to build up the population of the State, and would be doing good work. The little expenditure put down was a mere bagatelle against the advantage we would receive.

Mr. SWAN: There was no exception taken to the increases provided for the lady inspectors, but the salary for the male inspector was too low and did not compare favourably with salaries paid in the Eastern States. He found it necessary to make inquiries to see how these officers were paid in the Eastern States, and the under secretary thought it necessary to complain about the officer having approached a member of Parliament in connection with this position. It did not follow that because inquiries were made at the Colonial Secretary's office the officer had approached a member of Parliament.

The Premier: Well, did he approach you?

Mr. SWAN: That is my business.

Mr. Scaddan: Supposing he did, does it matter?

Mr. SWAN did not propose to give information on demand. It was presumption on the part of the under secretary. But even had the officer approached a member of Parliament, it was his perfect right to do so. There was a grievance on the part of the department against this officer because he had challenged the department in the law courts to secure justice when retiring from the police force.

Mr. JOHNSON: There was no desire on the part of the Opposition to do away with these inspections. We should rather increase them. It was because of the gross cruelty shown in the case of Mrs. Mitchell that this branch was established, but it would be better to have all the children in one home directly under Government supervision and Government maintenance.

The Premier: They are under supervision now.

Mr. JOHNSON: But not as strict as one would like to see it. With but two lady inspectors and 177 homes to visit the visits were not frequent, and as the work had to be done in a systematic way a number of homes knew when the inspectors were going to call and made arrangements accordingly. It would be better to have the children cared for in a State institution.

Mr. HEITMANN: Then we would need 150 women to take charge of them.

Mr. JACOBY: More use should be made of the Waifs' Home at Parkerville. He did not favour the establishment of a Government institution, because there would be stereotyped attendance that would be far more removed from the ordinary attention of a mother than would be gained in small homes. It was different, however, at Parkerville, where the women took up the work for the love of it. The Government would have difficulty in getting people like that. It was remarkable how they succeeded at Parkerville with the number of children there. The children were always of a cheerful disposition and happy. He did not say a Government institution founded for the purpose would fail, but it was risky. On the other hand, at Parkerville we had something working satisfactorily, and the Government might increase the subsidy to the institution and let them take over the State children now arranged for under the boarding-out system.

The PREMIER: The system adopted was the result of inquiries made throughout the Commonwealth. It was found that this system, which was the South Australian system, was the best to adopt. The homes were utilised. A certain num-

ber of children were sent to Parkerville, and there were a number of infants at Subiaco awaiting suitable foster-mothers. The environment of the home was better than that of a public institution, and it was better bringing up for the infants to have them cared for by a woman who perhaps had one or two of her own to look after at the same time. The system was working well, and if members would take the time to make inquiries they would be perfectly satisfied with the good work being done.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

*(Mr. Jacoby took the Chair.)*

Mr. FOULKES: The Premier might give consideration to the advisableness of assisting the Children's Protection Society which had been established for a number of years in Perth, and which complained, and with justification, that they did not get assistance from the Government with regard to the work they were carrying on. The Premier would know that this society carried on work somewhat similar to that performed by the State so far as looking after children was concerned. It was quite true that they received £50 from the Treasury in aid of their crèche fund, but they would like some further assistance from the Government to enable them to carry on their work more extensively. The society raised at the present time something like £1,200 per annum towards paying for the boarding-out of a number of children, and they had no fewer than 57 homes which they inspected periodically, and they also had about 100 children to look after. The Colonial Secretary had refused to give them further assistance, but it was to be hoped the Premier would not agree with the attitude of his colleague.

*(Mr. Taylor resumed the Chair.)*

Mr. ANGWIN: The Premier might give some information regarding the mothers of children, and the assistance rendered to them to enable them to look after their own children. It was customary if a mother was left with several children that she was not able to maintain, to hand the children over to the State who boarded them out and paid

for their maintenance. But the State did not make it a practice of boarding the children out to the mother. If the State would do that they would in that way assist to keep the family together. The matter was one that the Premier might look into.

The PREMIER: With regard to the request made by the member for Claremont, he was aware that a number of ladies took an active interest in the welfare of the children, but he was not aware that a number of children were boarded out by that society. The Government had given some assistance to this society towards their crèche, and he believed this was a very admirable institution, and he was pleased to be able to give it some slight assistance. He doubted whether it would be advisable to assist the institution in the direction of carrying out work which was exactly the same as that performed by the State department. He would consult with his colleague, the Colonial Secretary, and see what he had to say about it. It seemed inadvisable to subsidise a private body who was doing the work that the State were doing. With regard to the matter mentioned by the member for East Fremantle, if a woman or a widow who was in destitute circumstances was left with children, she would receive outdoor relief to enable her to take care of her own children. If she were irresponsible, or bad, the children would be taken from her, and then they would become wards of the State, if the term could be used, and they were looked after in the same way as children who had no parents.

Mr. ANGWIN: If the woman was unable to look after her own children for want of means, she would hand them over to the State.

The PREMIER: She cannot do that.

Mr. ANGWIN: There were instances where children had been boarded out, and the people to whom they were boarded were allowed the full amount for maintenance.

The PREMIER: Only in the event of the mother neglecting them.

Mr. ANGWIN: This was done in the case where the mother could not maintain her children on account of the family

being too large. What he asked was that the department should look after these children and board them out to the mother who should be allowed so much per week.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Fisheries*, £1,685:

Mr. PRICE: The Premier was asked to indicate whether the Government would be prepared to alter the Fisheries Act in the direction of allowing settlers to secure fish for their own consumption, but he ridiculed the idea.

The PREMIER: I never ridicule anything.

Mr. PRICE: The Premier certainly did ridicule the idea when he (Mr. Price) mentioned that settlers should be given permission to obtain fish for their own consumption. The ex-Premier (Sir Newton Moore) when the matter was brought under his notice expressed himself as favourable to the suggestion, and if he had remained in office no doubt some steps would have been taken in the direction asked. It might be, of course, that the late Premier was more favourably inclined to give the settlers that advantage than was the present Premier. There also appeared to be an idea in the department that all that was necessary was to close the waters. The Perth waters were closed up, and what was the result? No city in Australia had a worse fish supply than Perth, simply because the Government were doing all they could to prevent the fishermen from catching the fish and placing them on the market. He wanted an expression of opinion as to whether the Minister was prepared to alter the Act in the direction he had indicated, for the benefit of the settlers along the banks of rivers.

The PREMIER: If the hon. member referred to net fishing in closed waters, there could be no promise that any alteration would be made. It would be idle to close waters against net fishing, and then to give special permits to particular people. If certain waters were closed against net fishing, no one should be allowed to have a license to catch fish with nets. If that were done the waters might as well be left open altogether. It would be in-

possible to confine a settler to catching only the fish which he required for his own consumption if he used a net. He might catch ten times more than he required, and naturally he would sell the surplus. All the fish the settler required for his own consumption he could catch with a line, but to allow any settler, because he happened to be close to closed waters, to drag the river with nets would be absurd and detrimental to the interests of the State as a whole. Perth water, for instance, was closed against net fishing, and surely because a man was living at Applecross, he was not to have the right to net in the river at all seasons. While he could not promise any legislation dealing with the matter, he would undertake to consult the expert officers of the department as to what they thought should be done. It was necessary to close the waters for some seasons against net fishing, and in some cases to prohibit net fishing altogether. Perth water and Melville water had been almost denuded of fish some years ago, and it had been necessary to stop net fishing in order that the river might become restocked.

Mr. PRICE: The Premier had cast an undue reflection upon the settlers in suggesting that if they were allowed a permit to catch fish for themselves they would catch more than they required and sell them, thus becoming law-breakers.

The Premier: If they use nets they are bound to catch quantities that they cannot consume.

Mr. PRICE: If the settlers were catching fish for their own consumption, and knew that if they attempted to sell them their permit would be withdrawn, they would not be likely to take that risk.

Mr. SWAN: It was impossible to get a satisfactory fish supply at reasonable prices in the city, and that was said to be largely due to the unnecessary restrictions placed on net fishing in the Swan river. Frequently fishermen, who were trying to make a living in the river, had been brought before the police court, and the magistrate had stated that he was bound to fine them although he did not regard the charge seriously. Whilst admitting

that it was necessary to prohibit netting for certain periods of the year, he considered that there was room for a relaxation of the present regulations in that regard.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Friendly Societies and Industrial Arbitration*, £3,405—agreed to.

Vote—*Gaols*, £28,237:

Item. Comptroller General of Prisons, £250.

Mr. HEITMANN: There seemed to be a large number of highly paid officials in the department. The Comptroller General was in receipt of a salary of £250 in addition to the £550 which he received as Sheriff. There was also a superintendent, whose salary was proposed to be increased by £45. Members should know what were the duties of these officers, and particularly of the one who appeared to be merely a general supervisor without anything in particular to do.

The PREMIER: The Comptroller General was like the under-secretary of a department and controlled the whole of the prisons in the State from Wyndham in the north to the far south. The superintendent was really in charge of Fremantle gaol and Rottnest prison. Both positions were highly necessary.

Mr. Heitmann: The Comptroller General holds two positions, and is his pay proportioned to the work he does in each?

The PREMIER: The salary of £250 was what had been allotted to the position of Comptroller General. As Sheriff Mr. Burt had to see that the orders of the court were carried out; he was in charge of all the prisoners throughout the State, and if a man was ordered to be hanged he had to see that that order was carried out. As to whether he was the right man in the position he did not wish to discuss. So far as he knew the present officer had always attended to his duties, and certainly the position was necessary.

Mr. Collier: Does he carry out the duties of Sheriff?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. Scaddan: No, he does not; he does not attend to hangings.

The **PREMIER**: Of course the Sheriff appointed a deputy to see men hung. Surely the hon. member would not drag the Sheriff out of bed to see every hanging. In no portion of the Empire was a sheriff compelled to personally attend executions. He was always allowed to appoint a deputy.

Mr. **ANGWIN**: The conduct of the Comptroller General was very unsatisfactory, particularly his actions of late. He believed that that officer had led the Minister astray in the past, and therefore he moved—

*That the item be reduced by £50.*

Mr. **BOLTON**: The amendment should be carried. This gentleman had been a nuisance ever since he had been in the position. He had caused a good deal of discontent amongst the gaol officials throughout the State. The Comptroller General seemed to consider it his duty to go to Fremantle, line the warders up, and talk to them like children. That was not the duty of the Comptroller General.

Mr. **SCADDAN**: He will not even allow the superintendent to come to Perth without getting his permission.

Mr. **BOLTON**: That was this gentleman's opinion of dignity. This officer was about due for retirement and the sooner he was retired and received a pension the better for the State.

Amendment put and a division called for.

Mr. **GORDON**: Before the vote was taken he would like to draw the attention of the Chair to the fact that a pair had been promised to Mr. Male during his absence, and the Opposition could only count twenty to-day according to the promised pairs.

The **CHAIRMAN**: No notice could be taken of pairs, he could only take notice of the division lists when handed up by the tellers.

Division resulted as follows:—

|                  |    |    |    |
|------------------|----|----|----|
| Ayes             | .. | .. | 20 |
| Noes             | .. | .. | 21 |
| Majority against | .. |    | 1  |

# AYES.

|              |                  |
|--------------|------------------|
| Mr. Angwin   | Mr. McDowall     |
| Mr. Bath     | Mr. O'Loghlen    |
| Mr. Bolton   | Mr. Price        |
| Mr. Collier  | Mr. Scaddan      |
| Mr. Gill     | Mr. Swan         |
| Mr. Gourley  | Mr. Walker       |
| Mr. Heltmann | Mr. Ware         |
| Mr. Holman   | Mr. A. A. Wilson |
| Mr. Horan    | Mr. Underwood    |
| Mr. Hudson   | (Teller).        |
| Mr. Johnson  |                  |

# NOES.

|              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Brown    | Mr. Jacoby      |
| Mr. Butcher  | Mr. Layman      |
| Mr. Carson   | Mr. Mitchell    |
| Mr. Cowcher  | Mr. Monger      |
| Mr. Daglish  | Mr. S. F. Moore |
| Mr. Davies   | Mr. Nanson      |
| Mr. Draper   | Mr. Osborn      |
| Mr. Foulkes  | Mr. Plesse      |
| Mr. Gregory  | Mr. F. Wilson   |
| Mr. Hardwick | Mr. Gordon      |
| Mr. Harper   | (Teller).       |

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. **HOLMAN**: Had an inquiry been held into the recent statement in this Chamber about the Comptroller of Prisons? It was shown that this officer, without doubt, had wilfully misled the Minister, and out of courtesy members should have received some explanation. When the motion dealing with Warder Wise was before the House it was stated, and proved to his (Mr. Holman's) mind, that this officer, without doubt, misled the Colonial Secretary; had any inquiry or information been sought on this matter, if not there had been neglect of duty, and one could only come to the conclusion that it did not matter what was done or said in the House, as long as it did not suit the Government to make inquiry, the matter was allowed to drop.

The **PREMIER**: One was not prepared to accept offhand the assurance of the member that the Comptroller of Prisons had misled the Minister, but he did remember that he had told the House that he had under consideration the appointment of a Commissioner, if he could get an expert in prison management, to inquire into the working of the management of the prisons of this State. He had on one or two occasions referred the matter to his colleague, who was now busy inquiring whether an officer, who had inquired into the Pentridge prison in Vic-

toria, and who was recognised as an expert, was available, in order to have a full and exhaustive inquiry into the management of the prisons here.

Mr. Holman: I referred to the recent Warden Wise case.

The PREMIER: If the Government could get hold of this expert officer——

Mr. Hudson: Why go outside the State, why not do something yourselves?

The PREMIER: The purpose was to have the whole system of prison management inquired into, and if he could get an expert officer, in whom we could have explicit confidence, then the inquiry would be held by that officer. He did not know whether the Minister had had any communication with the Comptroller General or any explanation from him with regard to the matter, but he was not prepared to accept the assertion that the Minister had been wilfully misled by the Comptroller General of Prisons.

Mr. COLLIER: If the Minister controlling this department would show a little energy and backbone there would be no need for half the inquiries which were held, but the manner in which this department was run was characteristic of the manner in which all the departments under the control of this Minister were run. He was such a putty man that he would accept the information of an office boy rather than do anything himself. The complaint about the gaols had been made year after year and the same old reply was received from the Premier that he would refer the matter to his colleague, or that his colleague contemplated making an inquiry delegating his duty to somebody outside. It was some years ago since complaint was made as to the way in which the officers of this department were treated when charges were laid against them. It was such a simple matter that required no inquiry from outside the prison. The practice of the department was one that prevented any accused person getting a fair trial. He (Mr. Collier) had before him a case where a matron was dismissed by Mr. Burt, the Comptroller General, and that dismissal was approved by the Colonial Secretary. The person concerned wrote a lengthy state-

ment to the Colonial Secretary saying that she had been unjustly dealt with and asking that she should have a further inquiry, and the Colonial Secretary, as usual, referred the matter to Mr. Burt, who generously consented to again hear the case. This woman stated that she wrote to the Colonial Secretary asking for an inquiry and the Colonial Secretary replied stating that an inquiry would be held. At once she engaged Mr. Penny, the solicitor, to conduct the inquiry on her behalf, and at noon on the date of the inquiry Mr. Penny notified her that Mr. Burt would not allow counsel to appear, so the woman proceeded to Fremantle alone. There she made application to be allowed to appear by counsel. Mr. Burt asked her where her counsel was as he could not wait there all day for the counsel. The woman replied that her counsel would have been there only he had been informed that he would not be admitted. The woman then asked that the resident magistrate at Fremantle, or somebody disconnected with the prison, should hold the inquiry, but Mr. Burt said that he himself intended to hold the inquiry. This was unfair as Mr. Burt himself retired her from the service and the issue was a foregone conclusion when he himself would hold the inquiry. The inquiry was held by Mr. Burt and the woman had no witnesses, not thinking the inquiry would be held. Afterwards she received a letter from the Colonial Secretary informing her that the decision previously arrived at was just and right.

The Premier: Does the hon. member say the decision was wrong?

Mr. COLLIER: It was an absurd inquiry.

The Premier: Have you satisfied yourself that it was wrong?

Mr. COLLIER: Whether right or wrong the method of inquiry was wrong and the principle was wrong. A person was dismissed by one in authority and the same person held an inquiry, it was subversive altogether of the principle of British justice. That was the way inquiries were always held in the prison, the appeal being to the person who had dismissed the appellant. For the information of the Premier he might say he had



made inquiries and so far as he had been able to ascertain the facts—admittedly he had not the whole of them—he was satisfied an injustice had been done in this particular case. In any event, as he had said before, it was not a proper method of inquiry.

The PREMIER: Presumably this lady—he was not acquainted with the case referred to—had been discharged by the superintendent of the gaol.

Mr. Collier: By the Comptroller General.

The PREMIER: Not by the Comptroller General in the first place. The superintendent would suspend and lay the charge, and then the Comptroller General, as an outside official, would come in and listen to the charge and confirm, or perhaps make the dismissal. The lady had complained of not having had a fair hearing and had gone to the Minister, who had said that if she had further evidence to bring forward he would grant her a further inquiry, and would ask the Comptroller General to sit again with the object of giving the lady a chance of bringing further evidence. And the Comptroller General had gone into that further evidence and at its conclusion declared that he could see no reason to alter his decision.

Mr. Heitmann: Naturally.

The PREMIER: It was not at all a case of "naturally," for the Comptroller General had no interest whatever in the matter, and if the further evidence had justified him in changing his decision he would have done so.

Mr. Collier: Do you approve of that system?

The PREMIER: Certainly, the procedure was a right one. In this case the Comptroller General was not the person aggrieved. Possibly not even the superintendent was aggrieved; it might have been one of the warders who was the aggrieved person. Did the hon. member wish to infer that we should have an outside tribunal to hear every case of this description?

Mr. Collier: In a case of dismissal, yes.

The PREMIER: It would be subversive of all discipline. Surely confidence could be reposed in the Comptroller General. If

not, the sooner we got rid of the whole system the better. He would strongly deprecate this continual bringing of personal grievances before the House. The hon. member had admitted not having all the facts in his possession, yet he had declared that the lady was unjustly treated.

Mr. Collier: I have taken the complete facts to the Minister at other times and received no satisfaction at all.

The PREMIER: Perhaps in those other cases there had been no justification for complaint. However, he would allow the hon. member see the papers in this case and go thoroughly into it for himself. He did not know the lady, but he understood there were many cases against her before this had come on. If the treatment of the case of Warder Wise month after month was a fair criterion of the way these matters were strung out, with inquiry after inquiry, all he could say was that the Comptroller General was too slow. When the Comptroller General came to the conclusion that an employee was not doing his duty by the State he should get rid of him. A commission of inquiry might have a salutary effect.

Mr. ANGWIN: Why should not these grievances be brought before the House? What were members here for but to pass the salaries of these officers who were not doing their duty? There was no doubt the Comptroller General was the wrong man for his position, and the sooner he was removed the better. If the Premier would but speak straight he (the Premier) would be found to be of the same opinion.

The Premier: I never said so.

Mr. ANGWIN: The Premier had said as much only a moment earlier.

The Premier: No, I did not.

Mr. ANGWIN: The Premier had said he would appoint a commission to inquire into the administration of the gaol. Would the Premier go to the extent of appointing a commission if he thought there was nothing wrong in the gaol? The dissatisfaction existing in the gaol had been brought before the Minister long before the Warder Wise case cropped up. The trouble over that case had been that Wise was a secretary of a number of men who desired justice, and to get over the diffi-

culty the Comptroller General had told a lie to the Minister.

Mr. Bolton: There is no doubt about it.

Mr. ANGWIN: It was a pity we could not reduce this vote by way of an instruction to the Government in regard to the Comptroller General, and by way of showing that in the opinion of the House this officer should be pensioned off entirely. It would be beneficial to the State if this were done. Other officers in the department trying to do their duty were condemned by this officer. The actions of this officer of late had been such that no matter what commission of investigation the Premier might appoint, the men employed in the gaol would not dare to put the true facts before the commissioner; because if they did so Mr. Burt would remove them. Unfortunately the Minister controlling the department happened to be situated in another place, and perhaps it was a good job for that Minister that he was. No other member of the present Cabinet was dictated so much to by his officers as was the Colonial Secretary. If a dummy man were put in the position of the Colonial Secretary he would do just as well.

Item, Superintendent (Fremantle prison), £450.

Mr. HOLMAN: Admittedly this officer had satisfactorily filled his position, but it would be interesting to hear from the Minister whether it was the intention of this officer to continue at his post, or whether the increase of £45 had been given him in order to provide a higher pension when he retired. He (Mr. Holman) had invariably been treated with courtesy by this officer when visiting the gaol, but, of course, he was not in a position to speak of the quality of this officer's administration. In any case, it was not a good policy to give large increases to highly salaried officers on the eve of their retirement.

The PREMIER: This officer, Mr. George, had been all his life a very faithful servant of the State.

Mr. Holman: We do not doubt that.

The PREMIER: It was not often the hon. member was generous enough to admit as much. Mr. George had been over 40 years in the service of the State. Many

times he had suffered bodily injury in pursuance of his duties, and of late had been very dangerously ill, in fact, his life was despaired of. It was understood Mr. George wished to retire, and if for no other reason—although that was not the reason why the increase had been given—than that he should enjoy the full benefit of his pension on the maximum of his position, he (the Premier) would have felt amply justified in granting this increase. Everyone who had taken the trouble to visit the prison had come away with the highest commendation for what they had seen there. He had in black and white the hon. member's appreciation of the work of this officer. The member for Murchison wrote this regarding the gaol—

I have inspected the prison to-day and found everything clean and in good order, and tasted the food, which is well cooked and of excellent quality, and I am pleased to place on record my appreciation of the efforts made to look after the prisoners' interests by teaching them trades. Having visited the prison before and having come to the prison again to-day without notice, I am satisfied everything is being done in the interests of good work.

The member for Mt. Magnet wrote—  
"We visited the prison without notice and are surprised at the general excellence." Mr. Needham on the 25th August, 1905, wrote that he had inspected the prison and found everything in first-class condition, the food excellent, and the sanitary arrangements perfect, and that the manner in which the prisoners were looked after, both from a spiritual and temporal point of view, had his highest appreciation; also that he had visited the prison without notice but, notwithstanding, found everything in perfect order. Then the leader of the Opposition wrote—

I find after several visits that every effort is being made by the officials to improve the conditions, and believe that there is little reason for complaints at the treatment of the men. The workshops are all well managed and kept scrupulously clean.

The member for Brown Hill wrote on the occasion of his first visit expressing his hearty appreciation of the cleanliness and

evident good order of the institution, that he was deeply interested and felt sure that the conduct of the prison reflected credit on the superintendent and officers alike. As an official visitor at a later date the hon. member wrote—

I have found the prison in its usual good order. I must express my pleasure at a printing office having been added to the number of workshops.

The Hon. B. C. O'Brien wrote on his first visit that the thorough manner in which he found everything was quite a revelation to him.

Mr. Price: What is the object of these records?

The PREMIER: To prove the prison was well and efficiently conducted and that the officers were doing their duty and were entitled to all the consideration the Committee were going to give them.

Mr. Seaddan: You must have anticipated an attack.

The PREMIER always anticipated that and was always ready to repel any attack. The member for East Fremantle on the occasion of his first visit said it was particularly pleasing to see not only the cells but also the grounds in such good order; that the workshops were splendid, for the reform of prisoners, and that great credit was due to the officers in their efforts to reclaim those who had taken a false step. Then the member for Guildford wrote expressing interest at the progress made in improvements, and that he was more than pleased at the efforts being made to make the prison revenue-producing or at all events self-supporting. Mr. Needham also, after an absence of eighteen months, spoke of the institution in the height of commendation, and the member for Cue on his first visit wrote, "Very much impressed, especially at the clean state of everything; everything appears to be in good order." The member for Mt. Magnet gave another testimony saying, "A visit to this institution is an education; I am pleased with the efficiency and order obtaining." The member for South Fremantle visited the institution in company with the superintendent and was more than surprised to witness the various works carried on and at the apparent good treatment of those

confined in the wards. The leader of the Opposition again on another occasion testified to the general good order and cleanliness throughout, and expressed his agreeable surprise to find that where so many men were kept the hospital was empty. The hon. member said the men appeared to be content and attributed it to their having light agreeable work in the shops. The hon. member was glad to hear that the new building for separate treatment was opened, as it was a much needed reform in prison work. The hon. member for Boulder in 1908 had "pleasure in stating that everything appeared to be in a high state of efficiency, while Mr. George was to be complimented upon his management, particularly in regard to the grading of first offenders." The member for Hannans, who would not record anything he did not honestly believe, wrote, "I am pleased to have had an opportunity of looking over the prison. Mr. George is to be commended upon the up-to-date appearance of the institution." And the member for Leonora could not speak too highly of the "order and cleanliness of the whole surroundings, which reflected high credit on the whole staff." The member for East Fremantle twelve months ago wrote that he was well pleased with the conditions and that the food was splendid, especially the bread, also that the condition of the prisoners was very creditable to the officers in charge. The ex-Premier, Sir Newton Moore, visited the institution at the early part of the year and recorded his appreciation of the manner in which the officials apparently carried out their functions; that the conditions generally were excellent, and the food wholesome, and that everything reflected credit upon the responsible officers. The leader of the Opposition again in June last recorded his appreciation of the manner in which the prison was conducted, "that it appeared even more orderly and cleanly than on any previous visit"; whilst the member for Boulder about the same time was impressed with "the order and cleanliness throughout." What more could we want than these testimonials? It appeared to be an ideal institution, and there should be no objection to the increase in the salary of the superintendent.

Mr. HOLMAN : The remarks made by him five years ago with regard to this prison were exactly what he said to-night. His opposition was merely to the bad system of increasing a man's salary on the eve of his retirement in order to increase his pension.

The Premier: After forty years' service would we not be justified in doing it?

Mr. HOLMAN: But the system was bad. No one could complain about the officer. Although there were complaints of disturbances having taken place, members could only speak of things as they found them. The time had arrived for some advanced work in connection with prisons, more particularly in regard to reclamation. In Japan the prisoners were treated better than we treated ours.

The Premier: That is not so.

Mr. HOLMAN: It was the case according to what one read. In America some very good work in the way of reformation was done, especially among young prisoners, and they were a long way ahead of this State. In spite of the good work which had been done at Fremantle there was room for much improvement. He would like to know why this officer had been kept in the service until the present time when he had completely run himself out. He should have been allowed to retire two years ago when he was anxious to leave the service. What had transpired showed that the criticism which had been levelled against the department had been fair.

Mr. TROY: The remarks of the members of the Opposition had nothing to do with the grievances of the officers in the prison. Members knew nothing of the conduct of the prison other than what they saw in regard to its cleanliness and its appearance and efficiency.

The Premier: Do you condemn the superintendent?

Mr. TROY: As far as that was concerned he would be the last to condemn the superintendent, and he had never uttered a word of condemnation against that officer. As far as the appearance of the gaol was concerned he had always been struck with its cleanliness and the order maintained in the prison. There

was nothing to condemn from that standpoint, but members were not discussing that. Whatever criticism there had been, had been levelled at the Comptroller General and not the superintendent. The Comptroller General deserved all the criticism.

Item, Religious instructors, £300.

Mr. HEITMANN: There were two religious instructors, one at £175, and one at £125, and the former had quarters, water and sanitation. He was not aware that there were resident clergymen at the gaol.

Mr. Bolton: Oh, yes, for many years.

Mr. HEITMANN: It seemed an extraordinary thing that a man should have to buy his religion.

The Premier: No one is buying religion: these religious instructors are being paid by the State.

Mr. HEITMANN: There was a matron at the gaol whose duties were, no doubt, arduous, and who was receiving £100, and there were others receiving £90, £80, and £75, whilst these religious instructors, whose duties would not take more than two or three hours a day, received £175 and quarters, and £125. There was no objection to paying a decent salary to these gentlemen, but he claimed that those who were doing the hard work should also be treated well. When it came to a man having to buy religion, or even when it came to forcing religion down a man's throat whether he liked it or not, it was pretty tough.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier might give some information in regard to the duties of these religious instructors; were they expected to visit Rottneest periodically, and did they hold services there, or did they merely take a trip to Rottneest to fish?

The Premier: They visit Rottneest and hold services there.

Mr. SCADDAN: Did they ever leave the "Penguin" when they went to Rottneest?

The Premier: Yes.

Mr. SCADDAN: If the Premier made inquiries he would find that that was not so.

Mr. Bolton: The Premier's information is not correct.

Mr. SCADDAN: One of these gentlemen was seen by him (Mr. Scaddan) going over to Rottnest on two occasions, and on neither had he left the boat.

The Premier: Perhaps he was so ill that he could not land.

Mr. SCADDAN: Could not land—any fish.

Item, Warders, £7,422.

Mr. ANGIN: In February, 1909, the Premier made a definite statement with regard to warders: they were to be allowed certain privileges, and among them sanitation was to be free, and the Premier declared then that they would be put on the same footing as from the 1st July following, and added that if the superintendent got services free so should the warders. If we looked at the footnote to the item it would be found that while the Superintendent got his services free the Premier had not kept his word with the warders, who were obliged to pay. This was equal to a reduction of their salary. The Premier should see that the promise he made was fulfilled.

The PREMIER: The promise would certainly be carried out, and he was only sorry that the member for East Fremantle did not bring the matter under his notice before.

Mr. Johnson: Will you make it retrospective?

The PREMIER: Certainly it would be carried out as from the 1st July of last year; instructions would be issued accordingly.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier might make a statement with regard to prisoners at Rottnest. In view of the fact that the island was being thrown open for tourists, was it proposed to keep white prisoners on this island, and was it desirable to allow them to roam about with their uniforms branded with the broad arrow. This brand might just as easily be placed on the inside as on the outside of the uniform. It was disgraceful anyhow to allow prisoners to roam about the island with these uniforms. It was a good conduct station and the practice should be stopped.

The PREMIER: As he did not have any definite information with regard to

the matter, he would have a conversation with his colleagues. He was aware, however, that it was the intention almost immediately to remove all the prisoners from Rottnest and leave only a certain number of aborigines there to carry on the improvement work. There were only about 20 white prisoners there and they would all come back to Fremantle.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier had taken no notice of the point in regard to the branding of the prisoners' clothing.

The Premier: I will inquire into that.

Mr. SCADDAN: It certainly should be put into effect before Christmas. They were good-conduct men, and the branding of the clothes inside instead of outside would make no difference. Would the Premier tell the Committee what was to be done in regard to the salary of the gaoler at Rottnest, an officer who was kept going from daylight till dark, and who had all sorts of duties to perform outside those pertaining to his position as gaoler? The salary he received was absurdly inadequate. The officer was acting as postmaster for the island and was, in addition, carrying on a large amount of valuable survey work.

The PREMIER: Certainly the gaoler in charge at Rottnest was a most excellent officer, and it was a pity he was not in a better position carrying greater responsibility. Admittedly the salary was not what would be paid to a foreman carrying on the work this gaoler was doing. At the same time this officer was the highest paid gaoler in the service although, of course, that was not saying very much. He (the Premier) would make a note of this, for there was no officer in a similar position whose services he appreciated more.

Vote put and passed.

(Mr. Foulkes took the Chair.)

Vote—Harbour and Light, £27,407:

Mr. BOLTON: Some years ago the signalmen now stationed at Arthur's Head were engaged under an agreement, the terms of which set out that the net salary should be £120, uniform £5, quarters £48, wood, water, and sanitation, £12, or a total of £185. For a few years the terms

of the agreement had been faithfully observed but about 12 months ago the quarters occupied by these signalmen were taken from them, and they were placed in some house rented by the Government. On the 23rd November he had asked the Premier the following questions:—

1. Are the men engaged at the Signal Station at Arthur's Head, Fremantle, provided with quarters? 2. If so, are they residing in State owned houses? 3. If not, from whom are the Government renting houses to provide accommodation for the above-mentioned men? 4. What amount of rent is being paid per week by the Government for each house so rented?

To those questions the Premier replied—

1. Yes. 2. No. 3. and 4. The accommodation is not provided by the Government, but by the Fremantle Harbour Trust, who rent three houses at 10s. a week each from Messrs. J. & W. Bateman, of Fremantle.

The quarters occupied by these men represented a reduction in salary of £22 a year, and this after all their years of service. It was nothing short of robbing the men of £22 a year, because under the agreement their quarters had been allowed at £48, whereas now they were occupying quarters valued at £26. These men had tried all channels of redress and could not get any definite information from the Minister. There was another grievance from the same men. It would be remembered that on the demise of the late King all members of the Public Service had been granted a day's leave, known as mourning day. These signalmen were probably the only servants of the State who were not given that leave, and when they applied for a day's leave in lieu of that particular day they received the following curt reply, signed "F. W. B. Stevens, secretary"—

I do not concur in the contention of the signalman and lightkeeper, that because they have to work on the day set apart as a day of mourning for the late King, and also upon the day of his burial, they should be given days in lieu thereof, or paid in lieu thereof. I take it that these days have been termed holidays only in a colloquial sense: that

these are not days set apart for people's pleasure, and if it so happens that a man, by force of circumstances, is obliged to do his mourning while at work, rather than while not at work, this should not make him any the less a loyal subject, or interfere with the depth of his grief. In our maintenance gangs here we have allowed those men whose presence on the works were not absolutely essential to go on these two days, but any man whose presence was essential has had to come to his work as usual, and has not received more than his ordinary time. I think the request made by the signalman and lightkeeper has been made under a misconception; they construed the word "holiday" into a day of leisure, whereas my reading of it is that it is something quite different to that.

That was a most ridiculous letter to send to men who were only claiming what all the other State employees had received, namely, a holiday where it could not be granted, or additional leave in lieu when they were taking their annual holidays. That, added to the loss of £22 a year, was something that the Premier should inquire into. The late Premier had promised to look into the matter, and it was revived now because the present Premier would surely admit that there was an injustice.

The PREMIER: These signalmen were under the Harbour Trust, and did not come under the control of the Colonial Secretary directly. If the hon. member would let him have a copy of that agreement, he would inquire into the complaint. Certainly if those men had been engaged under agreement, and that agreement had not been cancelled by due notice, they should have the terms of the agreement, no matter what they were. In regard to the holiday, it seemed rather hard to have to pay men for expressing grief at the demise of a sovereign.

Mr. Scaddan: That is just how you make disloyal subjects.

The PREMIER: It was not to be believed that subjects were made disloyal on that account. If a man had to be kept at his post on the day of mourning he doubted whether paying him extra money, or giving him another day off, was a wise

procedure. It was not a severe test of loyalty if we were going to pay the men who were put off their work on the day of mourning. He would have liked to have seen the men get the holiday on the day set apart, but if they could not be spared he doubted whether it was wise to give them an extra half sovereign instead of the leave they would have received.

Mr. Price: Was it the intention of the Government to assist as far as possible in the formation of harbour boards at the principal ports of the State?

The PREMIER: Where it was deemed advisable to have harbours placed under the control of such boards, he was quite prepared to assist in their formation. The hon. member referred, of course, to Albany. In an interview with the Mayor and councillors of Albany early this year, he had promised that he would consider a suggestion that a board should be appointed for that port. He was still prepared to give consideration to the matter, but he did not know that the handing of the control of harbours over to boards was an unqualified success. He was not going to say that the board at Bunbury was not a success, but he doubted if the advantages which it gave were as great as had been anticipated. It was therefore questionable as to whether it would be an advantage to Albany to have a board controlling the harbour there. However, he was prepared to consider the whole matter again. Perhaps the hon. member would interview the Colonial Secretary and see how far he had gone in the matter.

Vote put and passed.

*Vote—Immigration, Tourist, and General Information Department, £6,247:*

Mr. SCADDAN: It was due to the Committee that the Premier should make some statement in regard to the formation of this new department. There appeared to be a big increase in the expenditure, and considerable extension of the powers of the department.

The PREMIER: This department had been formed during the present year, and included not only immigration but also the tourist and caves boards, which were originally a separate institution. Whilst the estimated expenditure was set down

at £6,247 it was anticipated that there would be a revenue of £3,000 to set against that amount.

Mr. Scaddan: How do you make that revenue?

The PREMIER: The revenue would be provided by fees that were charged and the coupons for the tours which were organised and carried out. There would also be the rent of the Caves house, or the profits which accrued from the running of that establishment. Mr. Neville had been appointed by the Public Service Commissioner from the Colonial Secretary's Department to take charge of this new sub-department, which would also include Mr. Crawcour the Immigration Officer at Fremantle, who looked after the information bureau and met the boats on arrival from the Eastern States and England. The department was certainly one that was wanted in this State, but whether, as at present constituted, it was going to be the success that was anticipated, remained to be seen. There was not a very large increase of expenditure involved, because the amount of £6,247 included £1,100 previously charged to loan account, £750 previously charged to lands and surveys, and the item of Mr. Neville's salary which of course had been transferred from the Colonial Secretary's Department. The upkeep of the Immigrants' Home was of course a fairly large undertaking. There was accommodation for some 600 immigrants in three different establishments, and they would be all concentrated in one home for meals. A batch of 600 was expected to arrive very shortly, and those people would be accommodated for a few days at the home until they could be transferred to the branches of the home in the different country districts.

Mr. Johnson: Who gives them letters to the Government Railways to get jobs?

The PREMIER: No letters to the Government Railways had come under his notice. Would the hon. member supply particulars?

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Cavanagh in the railway yards says repeatedly to the men that he has to put them off because immigrants have to come on.

The PREMIER: If there were vacancies for which local men could not be found, and there were good new arrivals available, they would of course be taken on, but he was positive that no good men would be discharged to make room for immigrants.

Mr. Scaddan: I thought they all went on the land?

The PREMIER: The majority of them did go on the land. The expenditure for the whole of the department showed a total increase of only £854, because as he had already indicated it included several items transferred from other departments.

Mr. PRICE: Would the Premier give some information as to why the department had been established? Certainly some explanation was due to the Committee in regard to a very caustic criticism of the department by the officer who was first appointed to take charge of it, but subsequently resigned.

The Premier: I have seen his letter.

Mr. PRICE: Other members might not have seen it. It was a most interesting document showing the way in which the people were gulled and the way in which Ministers attempted to mislead members in connection with the intentions of the department. First of all an inspired paragraph appeared in the *West Australian* that Mr. Patten was resigning owing to ill health consequent on an accident. Mr. Patten was the recipient of a number of telegrams regretting the result of his accident and regretting that he had resigned, but he clearly indicated he was no party to the paragraph, and in a letter appearing in the *West Australian* on the 9th instant he said that beyond hastening his resignation the accident referred to had no more connection with his severance than the movements of the South Perth ferry boats had with the manoeuvres of the British Navy. Mr. Patten wrote—

I am neither accusing or condemning any individual in connection with the state of affairs that led up to my resignation, nor do I wish in any degree to place myself on a pedestal; my only desire is to show how impossible it was to continue occupying a position of re-

sponsibility without a corresponding degree of liberty. The creation of a tourist department was, I understood, an indication that this State seriously intended to keep abreast of other States in catering for tourist requirements, and my appointment to the position naturally led me to believe that my experience in these matters would be of considerable value to me in the organising of an up-to-date tourist bureau. I pictured to myself the enormous field this State offered and confidently undertook the work, hoping, if allowed sufficient liberty, to accomplish satisfactory results. My hopes immediately received a check, yet I hoped on. I hope no more. From the outset, regulations, which were framed before tourists' departments were thought of, had to be observed. There were no precedents to follow and none could be created. I had all the liberty of a man handcuffed and leg-ironed, and the very qualifications that must have gained me the position, I was never free to exercise. As a simple illustration, one out of many, I may mention that some two months ago I interviewed Mr. Rushton, of the Railway Department.

After interviewing Mr. Rushton he immediately drafted a letter which he handed to the typist to copy and forward. In this letter he signed himself as Tourist Officer, as he was the gentleman appointed Tourist Officer.

The Premier: Yes, under the other officer.

Mr. PRICE: Mr. Patten's letter went on to say—

That letter was never sent, but another one was in which a third person referred to as the tourist officer was mentioned. The whole sense of the letter was altered and it was signed by the secretary of the Immigration and Tourist Bureau. The reply received from the Railway Department was a flat refusal to entertain the proposal.

The Railway Department absolutely refused what had been practically arranged previously between the secretary to the Commissioner and the officer-in-charge of



the Tourist Department. The letter proceeded—

It would take too long to enumerate the many grievances which led up to my final decision, but the broad fact remains that I occupied a dangerous position, a position full of responsibility, a position pregnant with possibilities if allowed a free course; and yet, at the same time, a position shorn of all possibility of credit in the event of success. Why did we bring this department into existence? Was it simply a department where the officers were to be used as a buffer between the departmental heads and the public? Mr. Patten continued his letter—

I entered the service full of enthusiasm, continued in doubt and ended in despair.

He had not been broken into the ways of the departments controlled by the Colonial Secretary. He entered the department believing he could do something to earn his salary and justify his appointment. He was desirous of doing that which would justify his appointment and prove the department to be a necessary department, but was checked at every turn, and as a result, threw up his appointment in disgust in a few weeks. He was specially appointed on account of his knowledge in connection with tourist matters.

The Premier: Do you know him personally?

Mr. PRICE: No, but if this officer did not have the qualifications for the position, why was the appointment made?

The Premier: Mistakes are often made.

Mr. PRICE: If it was found the officer was not fit to fill the position, why was he allowed to resign instead of being dismissed?

The Premier: We are considerate.

Mr. PRICE: The department, if there was any justification for the stand taken up by it, should not sit down under the condemnation contained in that letter. As a matter of fact the department was to act as a buffer between the people generally and the Colonial Secretary, and to provide for the control of the caves in the South-West.

Mr. WALKER: Was it not a fact that as soon as Mr. Patten retired there were some shocking blunders in connection with the management of the alleged Tourist Bureau, more particularly in regard to the contract for running passengers to the caves? Was there not a loss to the department, bungling and mismanagement of a somewhat serious character, contracts entered into, new terms demanded, a special arrangement made and the department practically made a laughing stock to the people down in that direction?

The PREMIER: Mr. Patten resigned because he would not brook the control of his superior officer, Mr. Neville, the secretary of the department. Mr. Patten was the subordinate officer. If a subordinate officer wanted an absolutely free hand without any control and would not submit to control, there was only one course open, namely, to end the connection. Mr. Patten wanted to do everything himself, wanted to be head. He went to Busselton and made the unfortunate contract referred to by the hon. member over which the department suffered a small loss. He entered into a contract for £20 a week. That contract was expiring and a fresh contract was being negotiated on much better terms. The officer was an enthusiast in many ways and had very large ideas. No doubt he would have expended tens of thousands where it was proposed to spend tens. One could not say whether Mr. Patten was right or wrong over the letter to the Railway Department, but as long as we had a head of a department in whom we had confidence, we must stand by that head until we knew him to be wrong. The department was a new one under its present management. It was previously run by Mr. Robinson, of the Caves Board, a very efficient officer. It was proposed to extend the tourist traffic so that passengers landing from the boats could make a round trip to Perth at a moderate charge and still leave a margin of profit to the department. It was proposed also to arrange a trip to the gold-fields.

Mr. Johnson: All this was outlined years ago.

The PREMIER: The hon. member thought of it, but he never carried it out.

Mr. JOHNSON: The brains that thought it out got no compensation, and someone who does not understand it is now putting it forward.

The PREMIER: That often is the case.

Mr. JOHNSON: And you are assisting.

The PREMIER: And very few of us got what we deserved. Mr. Patten was a very good officer, and if he had unlimited money at his command would have done good work; he had not, however, proved himself a practical man, which was essential in conducting such matters economically.

Mr. PRICE: Was there any special reason, seeing that the department had taken steps towards providing these trips around Perth and the goldfields, for those in charge of the Tourist Department neglecting to indicate to tourists that they could land at Albany, travel along the Great Southern, and then proceed to the goldfields?

The PREMIER: The impression that he had was that this had already been done. If it had not been done the fact was probably due to the officer having resigned. The department was not in full working order, and seeing that the man who had charge of that special branch had resigned, nothing would be done until his successor got into harness.

Mr. Collier: Who has the position?

The PREMIER: Mr. Sutcliffe, who was previously an officer of the Railway Department.

Mr. Walker: I think things have got into a chaotic condition.

Mr. O'Loughlen: There will be no chaos when the Premier goes out.

The PREMIER: Everything would then be left in such perfect order that even the hon. member would be able to come in and control things successfully, and he would not find anything in arrears to pick up. The only thing that he would pick up would be his salary. Details of this description essentially required the personal attention of the officer in charge, and if that officer resigned they must fall into arrears, especially at the initial stage.

(Mr. Taylor resumed the Chair.)

Mr. JOHNSON: The whole cause of the bungle, he was inclined to think, must be on the shoulders of the Colonial Secretary. The man who outlined the possibilities of running a successful tourist department was Mr. Robinson, who opened up and did such good work in connection with the caves. Mr. Robinson propounded a scheme which was now advanced by Mr. Neville as something emanating from his own brain. If the Colonial Secretary had left his personal feeling or desire to push Mr. Neville forward out of the matter, and put a man in who understood the department, that department would now be in a flourishing condition. And instead of a department being created for the purpose of advertising Western Australia it was merely created to provide a snug billet for Mr. Neville. That was where the difficulty lay. What was wanted in that department was a man who thoroughly understood it, and not an officer put there simply because he was a friend of the Minister. If Mr. Robinson had been put in charge of the department, as undoubtedly should have been done, because he was the brains in connection with this matter, the whole thing would have been in a flourishing condition, and Western Australia would have profited by it.

The Premier: There is immigration as well; Mr. Neville was in charge of that.

Mr. JOHNSON: That did not reflect very creditably on Mr. Neville's administration either. There had been much criticism in connection with the immigration vote, and the method of administering it. A great deal more could be given to the public. As far as immigration was concerned, that was no recommendation to Mr. Neville. The whole trouble was due to Mr. Neville being pushed into this position when he was not capable of filling it, and he was now trying to carry on an organisation the policy in regard to which was outlined by Mr. Robinson, who was the man who should have been placed in charge.

Mr. FOULKES: Mr. Neville was a competent civil servant, but he had not the qualifications for carrying out this work. He had known Mr. Robinson for

some time, and he had the pleasure of acting as a member of the Caves Board for some years, and knowing Mr. Robinson to be a first class man for this particular work, and it was to be regretted that the Government did not select this gentleman to act as secretary not only of the Tourist Department but also of the Immigration Department.

Mr. Angwin: But would a man like Mr. Robinson take a position at that salary?

Mr. JACOBY: It was to be regretted that the matter was not arranged in such a way as to allow the officer who had undoubtedly done good service to continue in that department. Mr. Robinson, however, did not apply for the position. It was thrown open for public competition, but he did not apply because he felt that he could not work when the organisation was arranged in the manner that was done by the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. Johnson: He sacrificed the organisation for the individual.

Mr. JACOBY: Mr. Robinson had special knowledge of this particular branch of work, and it was a pity that matters could not be arranged so that the officer in charge of the Tourist Department might have been able to communicate direct with the Minister. Mr. Robinson's idea was that he could not make a satisfactory job of the work if he had to pass his recommendations to the Minister through another officer, and he felt that in doing this he would be working under disadvantageous circumstances, and, consequently, he did not apply for the position. There was no doubt, however, that the Government now had an exceedingly capable man in Mr. Sutcliffe, though he was not as experienced as Mr. Robinson, and it would, of course, take him some time to get the same grip of the work that Mr. Robinson had. It was to be hoped that the first consideration in the mind of the Minister in charge of this department would be the efficiency of the tourist work, and not so much the methods that might be obtained as far as departmental administration was concerned. It might be necessary in time to increase the staff, and he hoped that things would so shape themselves that the Government would

be able to offer Mr. Robinson some employment in the department.

Item, Maintenance of caves, accommodation houses, tourist agency expenses, £3,000.

Mr. BATH: Would the Premier state how much of this estimated revenue was expected to accrue from the caves, the accommodation houses and the tourist agency?

The PREMIER: Practically the whole lot would come from these items.

Mr. Bath: Was there not some revenue from the immigrants' home and the bureau?

The PREMIER: It was understood that this was about £400.

Mr. COLLIER: How did the vote compare with the amount of last year. A footnote explained that £750 was hitherto charged to Lands and Surveys. Was that the amount on the Estimates last year, and what was the amount expended?

The PREMIER: The details of the different items were not in his possession, but if the hon. member wanted the information it would be supplied to him. He had, however, the comparative expenditure of last year as against the Estimates. The salaries last year totalled £250, but this year the amount was altogether £1,447. Last year £412 was expended in connection with the passages of immigrants from the Eastern States, and this year the amount was estimated at £500. Last year the maintenance and upkeep of immigration homes was £845, and bureaux was £333. This was previously charged to lands. This year the estimated amount was £1,100. The item for maintenance of caves, accommodation houses and tourist agency was £3,400 last year, and although £750 was charged to Lands and Surveys, this year the amount was £3,000; incidentals totalled £200 last year, and the amount was the same this year, a total expenditure of £5,102 as against the estimated expenditure for this year of £6,247. The total revenue last year had been £2,709, leaving a net debit of £2,393. The total estimated revenue for this year was £3,000, leaving a net debit of £3,247, or an increased expenditure of £854.

Mr. Johnson: Do you mean to say, as member for the district, you do not know what is allotted to the caves?

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. Johnson: You are not doing your duty to the district.

The PREMIER: For his part he thought he was. He had every confidence in his colleague to see that everything necessary was done.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Lunacy*, £34,833:

Mr. ANGWIN: Would the Premier give the Committee some information in regard to the staff ball at the asylum to which the Auditor General had drawn attention. It was strange that when the staff residing on the premises had a ball they should require a special train.

The PREMIER: The total cost of the ball to the institution was £11 16s. 3d. That included the amount of £5 for the special train.

Mr. ANGWIN: The officials were to be complimented on their economy in holding so inexpensive a ball. It was surprising that, the amount being so small, the Auditor General should have thought it necessary to criticise it.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Auditor General had merely mentioned that the entire cost was charged to the lunacy vote, and had expressed doubt as to whether it applied. The Auditor General had not taken any other exception to the item. It was a commendable attitude on the part of the authorities that the attendants at the asylum should have some little entertainment at times. The pity was that more opportunities of a similar nature were not afforded.

Item, Senior Assistant Medical Officer, £395.

Mr. ANGWIN: There was disclosed a very great difference between the salary of the senior assistant medical officer and that of the Inspector General of Insane. This medical officer was the lowest paid in the service. If the Inspector General was worth £800 surely the first assistant was worth more than £395.

The PREMIER: Both officers were provided with free quarters, and enjoyed

certain privileges, obtaining their produce from the farm, and their stores under contract rates. The Inspector General was responsible for the whole of the institution, and there would always be found a big disparity between the salary of the man at the head of an institution and that of his senior assistant.

Mr. Johnson: What is the maximum salary for the senior assistant?

The PREMIER: It was set down at £405.

Mr. O'Loghlen: If the Inspector General went on leave would this officer be qualified to take his place?

The PREMIER: Yes, and according to the public service regulations he would get half the difference between the two salaries.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Then he is qualified?

The PREMIER: No doubt the officer was qualified, just as the chief mate was capable of taking charge of the ship if the captain fell overboard, and so it should be.

Mr. Angwin: If you want a good man you must pay a good salary.

The PREMIER: We had here a good man, who, apparently, was satisfied with his salary.

Mr. Draper: Is he an expert?

The PREMIER: Presumably he was an expert.

Mr. Draper: Does the Public Service Commissioner take that into consideration in the classification?

The PREMIER: Presumably, yes.

Mr. Draper: I should say not.

The PREMIER: In any case he (the Premier) could not be held responsible for the Public Service Commissioner's judgment. However, there was every opportunity for the officer to apply for a re-classification.

Mr. COLLIER: This item furnished another evidence of the impossible task the Public Service Commissioner had to perform. Here we had a layman called upon to classify an engineer-in-chief, a lawyer, a doctor, and other professionals.

The Premier: He calls evidence.

Mr. COLLIER: Even if the Public Service Commissioner were a genius it would be utterly impossible for him to

give satisfaction. We had instances of clerical men drawing higher salaries than were paid to specialists who had spent many years in qualifying for their profession. In consequence, we were losing our best officers, who were accepting more alluring inducements in the Eastern States. The officer in question was receiving very little more than a labourer's wage.

Mr. Scaddan: The secretary of the board of health receives £350.

Mr. COLLIER: Yes. A purely clerical officer was receiving within £40 of the salary of this specialist. The position was absurd, and unless the Government realised this we would have all the incompetents left in the public service, and all the good men would have gone elsewhere.

Mr. JOHNSON: Whilst admitting that it was a difficult task for one man to classify the whole of the service, the fact remained that we had a Public Service Commissioner, and he had to classify the service on the evidence brought forward. If we did not have a commissioner we would have to revert to the old political system. Perhaps it would be better to have other men assisting the Commissioner. There could be no question that a grave mistake had been made in fixing the salary of the second in charge at £395; it was absolutely ridiculous.

The Premier: I, too, think it is too little.

Mr. JOHNSON: If the Premier was prepared to admit that the salary was too low there was a possibility of justice being done.

Mr. SCADDAN: The difficulty of seeing that a proper salary was paid to a professional officer was not so very great, because on the Estimates the Government were increasing the salary of the Inspector General by £50 over the Public Service Commissioner's classification, and not one member of the Committee had complained. That could be done in the case of the second in charge, and the fact that the Commissioner had classified the position at £405 did not debar the Government from paying him a salary that was proportionate to the responsibility of his

position. The other States had realised the value of securing highly qualified officers, and Western Australia was the worse off for that fact. It was to be hoped that the Premier would take into account the repeatedly expressed opinion of members that the State should do all it could to get highly qualified officers and pay adequate salaries to keep them.

The Premier: The Government never accepted the classification in the case of Dr. Montgomery.

Mr. Scaddan: Then the Government could do the same with the other position.

Item. Junior Assistant Medical Officer, £300.

Mr. ANGWIN: This salary was hardly sufficient to pay for the officer's golf sticks. Here was a man with special qualifications receiving £300; he was worse paid than members of Parliament.

The Premier: That with board and residence is not a bad salary for a young man.

Mr. Johnson: Then the Premier's salary ought to be £500.

Mr. ANGWIN: The Premier's remark showed very clearly that he had not given the matter fair consideration. The officer filling that position should receive a higher salary than appeared on the Estimates, and he hoped that the Premier would take the matter into consideration, and realise the necessity for getting the very best men for important professional positions, and offering sufficient inducements to them to remain in the service instead of the State having always to change its most valuable officers.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Premier had said that the salary was quite sufficient, yet the State paid a district medical officer £600 and gave him the right of private practice. The medical officer at Coolgardie received £600; and at Wyndham, £480, and in other places high salaries were paid to the medical officers, over and above which they had the right of private practice; yet to a man whose whole services were claimed by the State, and who was expected to have special qualifications the paltry amount of £300 was offered. If we gave the officer as much again it would not be too much for the position

he occupied. This was worse than sweating, because no encouragement was given to men to do their work, and to remain in the service. The sooner these officers were more liberally treated the better it would be for the State and for the public at large.

Item, Hall Porter at £1 1s. 6d. per week, £57.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: If we were going to ask for a man's services exclusively, it was a fair thing to pay him a living wage. Could the Premier explain how it was possible for a man to keep himself, and perhaps a wife and family, on a salary of less than £2 per week?

The PREMIER: This was an old man over 60 years of age and his duties were very light. This old man was satisfied with the position. Did the hon. member want him turned out?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The taunt was always raised, if members tried to make things a little better, that the object was to turn these old men out of employment. He did not know this was an old man.

The PREMIER: The trouble is you jump to conclusions instead of making inquiries.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Surely one could make inquiries.

Vote put and passed.

Vote — *Medical and Public Health*, £89,516:

Item, Principal Medical Officer and President of Central Board of Health, £1,000.

Mr. HOLMAN: Why was this officer receiving an increase of £50? There were more complaints in connection with this department than in connection with any other department.

The PREMIER: When the officer was appointed to the position it was on the understanding that he would have his salary increased to £1,000. The officer was a very old officer of the public service and was full of energy. He had saved the department £18,500.

Mr. TROY: When the officer was appointed there was considerable opposition. It was considered his age did not justify the appointment. He was most conservative in his view in regard to medical facilities for those portions of the State where the people laboured under

great disadvantages. The saving of £18,000 was not in regard to general administrative costs, but was obtained by penalising hospitals in remote portions of the State and by compelling people to tax themselves to a greater extent than was justified for the upkeep of their hospitals. The more people taxed themselves the greater was the demand of this officer to cut down their subsidies. The Sandstone people had one of the most up-to-date hospitals in Western Australia; but because in one year they had a small profit, which they subsequently devoted to increasing the capacity of the institution, the Principal Medical Officer wrote and, though commending the committee, informed them he was cutting down their subsidy by £300. If we sent these officers into the back country for four or five years they would learn about the disadvantages under which people there laboured. This officer was entirely out of sympathy with the people in remote places, and asked them to bear responsibilities that the people in the City were not asked to bear. Those officers who lived in luxury on high salaries were entirely out of sympathy with the people living in remote places. The policy of starving the outback hospitals was the policy of the Principal Medical Officer. It did not matter whose policy it was; it was a policy which could not be upheld by any member. He did not ask that people out back should get greater privileges, but, at least, they should get the same facilities from the Principal Medical Officer.

Mr. ANGWIN: The hon. member was correct in saying that the hospital vote had been reduced year after year, and it could not be understood that a medical man should try to reduce a hospital vote unless he had been so instructed by the Minister controlling the department. The Premier had stated that the reason for the reduction was mismanagement in the past.

The PREMIER: To stop the waste.

Mr. ANGWIN: It was only the Premier's statement that there had been waste of money. The Chairman had been a member of a hospital board for many

years, and he knew that the hospital system had been curtailed for want of funds, and that it was a matter of impossibility to render the aid to-day that could have been rendered many years ago. In a prosperous State like ours with the revenue increasing, as the Premier stated, by leaps and bounds, the Government should go to the aid of those who were obliged to have recourse to this vote, instead of reducing the vote. It was his intention at a later stage to move for a reduction in order to test the feelings of the Committee on the question of those reductions which had been made by the Government.

Mr. HOLMAN: Would the Premier inform the Committee whether the present policy in connection with the inspection of factories had been initiated by this officer, and whether a saving had been brought about at the sacrifice of a large number of employees in Western Australia, and whether that saving had also been effected by this officer. If that was the case the sooner he was got rid of the better. Serious complaints had been made with regard to our factories, that a great deal of sweating was taking place, and that the sanitation of the factories was not of the best. Since the present Government had been in power it was found that the services of inspectors had been dispensed with, and that the expenditure had been curtailed in every direction. As far as he was personally concerned he would rather see another £18,000 spent on the maintenance of public health and the better inspection and supervision of factories, as well as the better administration of the industrial laws. This officer had become so fossilised with the old ideas which had been instilled into his mind before much progress was made, and they had got such a hold of him, that he had sacrificed the interests of the State in the hope of saving money. If we were going to sacrifice the health of the people in this manner—

The Premier: It is better to-day than it has ever been.

Mr. HOLMAN disagreed with the Minister. It had been brought about by sacrifices which had to be made by people in the back country, while in the metropol-

itan area the supervision of factories was worse than it had ever been.

The Premier: This officer does not administer the Factories Act.

Mr. JOHNSON: The Minister is right; he does not.

Mr. HOLMAN: The officer was supposed to administer the Factories Act, but he did not. Unwittingly the Premier had spoken the truth. In Perth there was a great deal more room for factory supervision, because many of them were carried on in a most unsatisfactory manner. All the Industrial Acts were absolutely neglected, and this officer had the administration of them. Year after year things were getting worse. A few years ago the laws were administered and the department was built up, but since this officer had assumed control we had drifted into a worse position. Nothing had been done except to cut down the hospital allowances, and the people in the back country had had medical conveniences taken from them. That was by no means satisfactory. He desired to know whether this officer was carrying out the Government policy or doing these things on his own initiative. If the officer had not been instructed to do these things he was deserving of the strongest condemnation. At the same time he hoped if the officer was carrying out the Government policy he would be given greater latitude in the future, because the matters under his administration were of the utmost importance.

The PREMIER: Of course, the Principal Medical Officer was carrying out the policy of the Government. On more than one occasion hon. members had accused the Government of extravagance in the administration of this department; more especially had this been the fashion four or five years ago. The Government had had to economise. There could not be the slightest doubt that extravagance had obtained in connection with the expenses of the various hospitals. Large sums of money which ought to have been collected had not been collected. The Government, to a large extent, had now remedied this without injury to the outback hospitals. He had it on the best authority that these hospitals were doing excellent work and

that no case of necessity was ever refused proper medical attention in any of the hospitals.

Mr. Underwood: Rubbish.

The PREMIER: The hon. member was just as polite as one expected to find him.

Mr. Underwood: And about as truthful, too.

The PREMIER: Yes. No case of distress had been refused admission by the hospitals in Western Australia. If any of those hospital committees who were loyally trying to carry out their duties economically showed to the department that the allowance made was not sufficient the department was quite prepared to consider their position and endeavour to help them. The hospitals had never gone wanting, and those hospitals, the committees of which had refused to carry on, had been carried on by the Principal Medical Officer and his staff, and that, too, within measurable distance of the estimated cost. Members ought to allow the system a fair trial. We gave in Western Australia very much more towards the providing of necessary medical comforts than did any of the other States in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Troy: And the people pay more taxes.

The PREMIER: In no instance whatever had any case worthy of treatment been refused in our hospitals. He had figures to show that the expenditure in Western Australia, even with all the economies, was far in advance of that in the other States.

Mr. Holman: The food supplies are 50 per cent. higher.

The PREMIER: Not 50 per cent.: they were in excess, admittedly: it might even be to the extent of 10 or 15 per cent. However, the figures showed that in New South Wales with 136 hospitals, State aid was given to the extent of £135,000; in Victoria, with 45 hospitals, the amount was £53,000; in South Australia, with 13 hospitals, it was £36,000; in Queensland, with 75 hospitals, it was £65,000; while in Western Australia, with 52 hospitals, it again amounted to £65,000. So we were paying the same as Queensland, where there was nearly double the population, and far more than South Australia.

In regard to the per capita contribution New South Wales paid 1s. 8d.; Victoria 10d.; South Australia 1s. 9d.; Queensland 2s. 6d., and Western Australia 4s. 9d., and this with all the economies that had been made. Surely hon. members did not want the Government to encourage extravagance in these departments.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The statement of the Premier that no one was refused treatment was one to which he took the strongest exception. A man had absolutely died at Marble Bar for want of treatment.

The Premier: Can you give me his name, and I will find out all about it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The name and full particulars could be found in the departmental files in regard to this man who had died at Marble Bar, while Dr. Triado was arguing with Dr. Hope as to whether he was an indigent patient or whether he should pay. The man had been sick at Cooglegong, and the warden at Marble Bar had ordered the police to bring the man into the hospital, and had provided a Government conveyance and horses for that purpose. When the man arrived at Marble Bar he was refused admittance to the hospital by the doctor. He was then placed, presumably by some accident, in the mining registrar's bough shed or camp, and was allowed to lie there for five days without medical treatment. Constable Strapp took him water with which to wash himself on or about the last day. It was five days before the argument was finished between Dr. Triado and the Principal Medical Officer as to whether the patient was to be treated as an indigent case or whether the doctor was to receive his fee. Eventually it was decided that he was to be treated as an indigent patient, and next day he died. That case was on the files, and the name of the man would be found in the report of the registrar of deaths. He had known of men being refused treatment in dozens of cases, but this was a particular instance.

The Premier: That might have happened if the vote had been £20,000 greater.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It would not have happened if there had been a reason-



ably humane man at the head of the department, but while there were men who did not care anything for humanity so long as they could make money, men could die as that man had died at Marble Bar. Further, the Minister for Mines could find in his files that the residents of Marble Bar had by ballot burned down the humpy in which the dying man had been placed. Whilst those cases occurred he protested against the assertion of the Premier that every man received admission to the hospital, and he had a right to say that the Premier was talking rubbish and rot when he made such a statement. Either the Premier was ignorant of the Estimates he was endeavouring to shove through, or he was making a false statement.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order in accusing the Premier of making a false statement.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The facts were there, and he was prepared to stand by them. He was in a position to say that the Premier was either ignorant of his Estimates or was making a false statement.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in making that statement.

Mr. Underwood: Well, I am not in order.

The Premier: Let him say what he likes; it does not matter.

Mr. Underwood: It is on your files; you cannot get away from it.

Mr. TROY: The statement that no person was refused treatment should not be allowed to pass unchallenged. There were hundreds of cases where men were refused admittance to Government hospitals. He had in mind the case of a man who had been found on the road between Pindar and Murgoo and had been brought to Geraldton. He had been taken to the hospital in the railway ambulance stretcher, and had been refused admittance with the result that he had to be taken to gaol. Some days later the man had been admitted to the hospital where he died; but had he received treatment in the first place he might have had a chance of recovery. He had seen the sufferer in the station yard at Geraldton, and there was

nobody there to look after him until the police took charge of him.

Mr. HOLMAN: Was it the policy of the Government that the Principal Medical Officer was carrying out?

The Premier: I said it was.

Mr. HOLMAN: It was all brought about by the wonderful forethought of the Colonial Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not discuss the general policy of the Government under the salary for the Principal Medical Officer.

Mr. HOLMAN was discussing whether the officer was worth the salary. The Premier gave the officer credit for that for which the officer was not responsible. Had the officer on his own initiative done what the Premier credited him with doing the salary should be wiped out. If his hands were tied by the Minister the officer could now take it that the view of members was that he could administer the Acts under his control, and show a little more consideration to the hospitals. A more heartless and incapable Minister one could not conceive, and we could sympathise with the Principal Medical Officer in having to receive instructions from a Minister who had no idea above making money.

Item, District Medical Officers, £10,081.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The Premier should give some reply to the statement made in regard to these medical officers on the Address-in-Reply, and on the general discussion on the Estimates, otherwise there would be need to reiterate what was already said.

The Premier: What does the hon. member want to have answered?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It would be necessary to go over the whole matter again. There was no copy of regulations under which the medical officers worked except in the *Government Gazette* of 1890, and these were out of date. There was dissatisfaction with the system under which these medical officers were appointed and paid by the State. What were the duties of the medical officers when there was no hospital? The Premier might give this information.

The PREMIER: The duty of these medical officers where there was no hospi-

tal was to provide medical attention for the indigent sick of the district. The right was also given to private practice. As far as the State was concerned the medical officers got a retainer in order that they should attend to the cases mentioned.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If the Premier would put that opinion into regulation there would be no cause for complaint.

The Premier: I will go into the matter and see what can be done.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: At Port Hedland there was a medical officer receiving £462 a year, and he was also resident magistrate, for which he received £200 or £300 a year, and for that amount of money he had to try an odd drunk, and he had to attend to the police force medically and to the civil servants. There was nothing about attendance on indigent patients. In several instances the medical officer at Port Hedland had refused to attend people because he had thought they could not afford to pay his fee. Men had died in Port Hedland for want of medical assistance. If the Premier would look up his (Mr. Underwood's) speeches on the Address-in-Reply and the general discussion on the Estimates—

The Premier: It was bad enough to have to listen to them, without reading them afterwards.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The trouble was that there was a good deal of unpalatable truth in them. The medical officer at Port Hedland had been summoned to attend one Michael O'Leary lying seriously ill. Some seven hours after receiving the summons the doctor had condescended to look in upon the patient and prescribe a potion, at the same time ordering the local policeman to see that O'Leary took it. It was a case of delirium tremens, requiring close nursing. In the circumstances the worst possible treatment was to irritate the patient in any way. In the face of this a policeman had been sent in to force the medicine down the sick man's throat. It resulted in the death of Michael O'Leary. The man's life could easily have been saved, and we had paid Dr. Brown £600 a year to save it. Again, for four trips out to Pipingarra station, a distance of 12 miles by train and four miles by special

vehicle sent to meet him and convey him on return to the railway, this same medical officer had charged Mr. Richardson 100 guineas, while for attending a child of Mr. Richardson's brought to his house, Dr. Brown had charged 10 guineas, and threatened to sue for the amount. When complaint was made to the Principal Medical Officer, Dr. Hope had replied that the resident medical officers had no contract as to what they should charge for private practice.

Mr. Horan: One of these medical officers charged 25 guineas for administering a dose of salts to a child in my electorate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If it had been Dr. Brown he would have charged 100 guineas and the child would not have got the salts after all. Another case had occurred at Broome, where Inspector Sellenger, of the police, had been taken to the hospital and a message sent to the doctor asking him to attend. The doctor was playing tennis at the time, and three subsequent messages were sent to him at the tennis court, notwithstanding which he failed to respond. Eventually Inspector Sellenger had left the hospital and proceeded to the residence of the Bishop of the North-West, where he was satisfactorily attended to by the Japanese doctor. Surely this case was worthy the consideration of any Minister with any pretensions to human feelings. In connection with this Japanese doctor it would be remembered that the member for Kimberley had protested against his being allowed to enter the Commonwealth. The member for Kimberley had no objection to the admission of an unlimited number of Japanese divers and miners, but when it had come to the admission of a professional man that hon. member had loudly protested. Besides his salary, the medical officer at Broome was receiving £5 per pearling boat for something like 400 boats, representing an income of about £2,000 per annum, and in addition he had the right of private practice. Yet it was found that he would not attempt to attend to a Government patient. As a matter of fact, Inspector Sellenger being in the police, was one of the few Government officers whom the resident medical officer

was supposed to treat free of cost, and on that account the doctor preferred to play tennis and take the risk of the State losing a reasonably good inspector of police. He would not have spoken on that matter at all had the Premier deigned to make anything like a reply to his previous statement. He protested most seriously against the idea that the great medical science, which had been handed down by the great thinkers and scientists of all the world for the benefit of humanity, should be grasped by the sons of a few rich men for their own special aggrandisement, and used to extort money from suffering humanity, and if they could not extort money—if an unfortunate individual had no money—he was to be allowed to die. While the State expended one penny in providing medical assistance for the people, no man should be allowed to die because he had no money to pay for medical attendance, and while there was one penny to expend on anything it should be spent in saving human life. That was the lesson which Dr. Hope and the Colonial Secretary had yet to learn.

Mr. COLLIER: Could the Premier give the Committee any information regarding the medical officer at Kalgoorlie? What services did Dr. Barber render for the sum of £300 and what were his duties?

The Minister for Works: His duties are the same as the duties of medical officers elsewhere.

Mr. COLLIER: The duties were not the same. What duties did the medical officer at Kalgoorlie perform for his salary of £300 a year?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was the duty of the medical officer at Kalgoorlie to attend to the patients in the hospital there, the prisoners, and indigent cases.

Mr. COLLIER: If it was the duty of that officer to attend to indigent cases how did it come about that this officer had been responsible for gaoling some of the patients who had been unable to pay him? No more unscrupulous man had ever obtained a position in the profession, judging from what one could hear of him, and scarcely a month went by with-

out his name appearing in the Press in connection with the prosecution of indigent patients. He had sold up their last stick of furniture and then sent them to gaol.

The Minister for Works: These are indigent cases treated in the hospital.

Mr. COLLIER: Because they had not paid their fees for operations in the hospital the doctor had pursued them for his fees. There was the case of a man who was injured and unable to work for 15 months. This man had a wife and two children who were starving, yet the doctor sent the man to gaol for two months. The doctor was notorious in that district and it was time the Government found some other medical officer. He was an utter disgrace to the medical profession. One who would send a starving man to gaol because the man was unable to pay his fees was not fit to draw any funds from the public revenue. With the object of indicating to the Government that some other medical officer should receive the appointment at Kalgoorlie, he moved an amendment—

*That the words "one at £300 (Kalgoorlie)" be struck out of the item.*

Mr. HORAN: Having knowledge of the person who occupied the position of resident medical officer at Kalgoorlie he supported the amendment. Many years ago this doctor claimed about £400 from the Government for attending to patients in connection with a railway accident at Broad Arrow, notwithstanding the fact that the Railway Department provided a special train to convey him from Kalgoorlie to Broad Arrow. This, according to medical men, was a deliberate attempt to demand from the Government a charge the Government should not be called upon to pay. Again in the case of applicants for employment in the Railway Department at Kalgoorlie, this doctor examined their papers and used to say that certain things were wrong with the applicants, but that on payment of a fee of £5 or £10 he could remove whatever difficulties existed in the way of the applicants securing employment. Needless to say, the examinees went to the doctor and were turned out successfully treated and deemed suitable applicants for positions

in the Railway Department. It was a most scandalous thing and he was glad the amendment was moved in order that he could tell members of these things. He was prepared to say what he said now before any royal commission or other body.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No one could object to hon. members making any complaint in regard to medical officers; this was the proper place and the proper time to do it; but having made a complaint in regard to an individual case, inquiry would follow, and no doubt if the allegations of hon. members were proved Dr. Barber would be dealt with. Nevertheless Kalgoorlie undoubtedly needed a resident medical officer, but the amendment if passed could have no effect but to abolish the position of medical officer at Kalgoorlie. As for giving an expression of opinion in regard to Dr. Barber, that was already given.

Mr. Scaddan: It will have no effect on the Government unless carried by a majority.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That was not a fair statement. Was there any charge made against this officer; was there any charge previously preferred to the head of the Medical Department against the officer? Had any opportunity been given to the Medical Department to show whether this officer had been satisfactory or unsatisfactory?

Mr. Collier: I have made complaints about this doctor to the Colonial Secretary and have supplied names and particulars.

*12 o'clock, midnight.*

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As far as that was concerned he was not aware of it. He was asking only for information in regard to what had transpired with regard to this officer before. The hon. member had made charges which absolutely justified serious consideration and it was on that account that he asked the hon. member not to press the amendment. No matter whether the officer was good or bad the item was required. He promised that inquiries would be made.

Mr. HEITMANN: The amendment should be carried. On the whole question

of medical officers the Government, not only the present Government but all preceding Governments, should have considered a different system of arriving at the conclusion that the system in vogue was altogether unsuitable for the requirements of the various communities.

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

|       |    |    |    |
|-------|----|----|----|
| Ayes  | .. | .. | 17 |
| Noes  | .. | .. | 17 |
| <hr/> |    |    |    |
| A Tie | .. | .. | 0  |

#### AYES.

|              |                  |
|--------------|------------------|
| Mr. Angwin   | Mr. McDowall     |
| Mr. Bath     | Mr. O'Loughlin   |
| Mr. Collier  | Mr. Price        |
| Mr. Gill     | Mr. Scaddan      |
| Mr. Gourley  | Mr. Troy         |
| Mr. Heitmann | Mr. Ware         |
| Mr. Holman   | Mr. A. A. Wilson |
| Mr. Horan    | Mr. Underwood    |
| Mr. Hudson   | (Teller).        |

#### NOES.

|              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Brown    | Mr. Layman      |
| Mr. Carson   | Mr. Mitchell    |
| Mr. Cowcher  | Mr. S. F. Moore |
| Mr. Daglish  | Mr. Nanson      |
| Mr. Davies   | Mr. Osborn      |
| Mr. Gregory  | Mr. Plesse      |
| Mr. Hardwick | Mr. F. Wilson   |
| Mr. Harper   | Mr. Gordon      |
| Mr. Jacoby   | (Teller)        |

The Chairman gave his casting vote with the Ayes.

Amendment thus passed.

Mr. Holman: I think progress ought to be reported now.

The Premier: No.

Mr. HOLMAN: I move—

*That progress be reported.*

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

|                  |    |    |    |
|------------------|----|----|----|
| Ayes             | .. | .. | 15 |
| Noes             | .. | .. | 20 |
| <hr/>            |    |    |    |
| Majority against | .. | .. | 5  |

#### AYES.

|              |                  |
|--------------|------------------|
| Mr. Angwin   | Mr. Hudson       |
| Mr. Bath     | Mr. McDowall     |
| Mr. Collier  | Mr. O'Loughlin   |
| Mr. Gill     | Mr. Price        |
| Mr. Gourley  | Mr. Ware         |
| Mr. Heitmann | Mr. A. A. Wilson |
| Mr. Holman   | Mr. Underwood    |
| Mr. Horan    | (Teller).        |

AYES.

|              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Brown    | Mr. Monger      |
| Mr. Carson   | Mr. S. F. Moore |
| Mr. Cowcher  | Mr. Nanson      |
| Mr. Dagllsu  | Mr. Osborn      |
| Mr. Davies   | Mr. Plesse      |
| Mr. Gregory  | Mr. Swan        |
| Mr. Hardwick | Mr. Troy        |
| Mr. Harper   | Mr. F. Wilson   |
| Mr. Jacoby   | Mr. Gordon      |
| Mr. Layman   |                 |
| Mr. Mitchell | (Teller).       |

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. PRICE: Having heard the case of Inspector Sellenger related by the member for Pilbara he thought the allegations sufficiently serious to call for some statement by the Minister. Surely the Minister would afford some explanation before asking the Committee to proceed any further with the passing of the Estimates.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was quite impossible for a Minister to make a statement in regard to a case of which he had only heard to-night.

Mr. Price: The Premier treated it with contempt.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: After sitting here for hours the Premier had been compelled to leave the Chamber. Having been ventilated, the matter would be thoroughly inquired into. He was not aware as to whether there were any papers in existence in regard to the case, and the only officer whom he had had an opportunity of consulting had not previously heard of the case. However, if the facts were as stated, drastic action was bound to follow. An inspector of police would himself have full opportunity of lodging a complaint, and his position in the Government service would secure a large amount of attention being given to that complaint.

Mr. HUDSON: It was his intention to deal with Item 11.

The CHAIRMAN: Nothing in item 11 above the amendment just made by the striking out of, "one at £300 (Kalgoorlie)" could be dealt with. Hon. members could not go further back than that.

Mr. HUDSON: It was his intention to discuss item 11.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member would be out of order in discussing item 11 above "Kalgoorlie." That was the rule, and he could not permit the hon. member

to depart from it. The hon. member could discuss anything in item 11 below "Kalgoorlie," but nothing above it.

Mr. HUDSON: The Chairman had not yet heard what it was proposed to discuss in item 11. If the Chairman was going to shut him up in that manner he would sit down.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. HOLMAN: It was his desire to bring under the notice of the Minister an action on the part of the medical officer at Karridale.

The CHAIRMAN: If any other hon. member desired to discuss any portion of item 11 above "Karridale" it behoved him to do so now before the hon. member proceeded; because once "Karridale" had been disposed of hon. members would not be permitted to discuss anything in item 11 above "Karridale."

Mr. PRICE: First of all the Chairman had told the member for Boulder that he must move a reduction of the total item. Subsequently the Chairman had stated he would take a motion to strike out "one of £300 (Kalgoorlie)." We had done that at the last moment, and consequently no member had had the opportunity of discussing the other sub-items, because the motion was accepted as a reduction of the total, and at the last moment the Chairman had agreed to take a motion by striking out "Kalgoorlie."

The CHAIRMAN: The statement was not quite correctly put. As a matter of fact nothing had been done at the last moment. The member for Boulder had asked which would be the better way of dealing with the item as an expression of the Committee in regard to the particular medical officer. He (the Chairman) had then thought that to reduce the item by £300 would cover the reference to that medical officer. Subsequently he had pointed out that it would make it even more specific if the hon. member moved to strike out the special item "one at £300, Kalgoorlie." That was the clear position, and he was sure the member for Boulder would hear him out in this. He had no desire whatever to take any advantage of the Committee or of any member thereof.

Mr. Price: Unfortunately that has been the effect.

Mr. Collier: If my first method had been adopted the whole discussion would have been shut out.

Mr. HOLMAN: A few months ago a man had been killed at Karridale and left a widow with four children. The man's life had been insured for not more than a few pounds, and the insurance company had sent down for a medical certificate. The widow got her brother-in-law to write to the medical officer, who however, did not reply to the first communication. The doctor was written to again, and this time returned a reply that he would not send along any certificate until his fee of one guinea was forwarded to him. That had prevented the widow from getting her life insurance money, because she had not the guinea. If that was the class of men we appointed as medical officers the sooner we changed them all the better, for instead of this being maintained as one of the most honourable professions we found from illustrations given to-night that we had in the service nothing but a blood-sucking lot of spongers who used their positions for the purpose of extracting the last possible penny out of the sick and needy. He was quite sure of his facts in this case, for he was glad to say that through his instrumentality the insurance company had paid the insurance money to the widow without any medical certificate, and so the medical officer had been done out of a fee.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: An officer could not be prevented from charging for outside unspecified duties in regard to attendance, and whether he chose to give a certificate in a case like that mentioned by the hon. member must depend on his own generosity. Surely in a case like that, all that was wanted was a certificate from the registrar of deaths.

Mr. Holman: All that was wanted was a certificate that the doctor had seen the death.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: A certificate from the registrar would have met the case without going to the doctor at all.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Government should see that officers of that character

were not appointed to Government positions. It would be better to have no doctor at all than to have men of that kind, because they were a menace to the public. Instead of cutting down the medical and public health votes in the miserable way in which the Government were doing, it was time that the Government saw that every individual got medical treatment, no matter in what part of the State he was living. If the State could not get doctors to go into those districts and act like men, the sooner the State paid higher salaries and provided the whole of the medical treatment the better it would be for the people.

Item, Government hospitals and quarantine stations, provisions, bedding, clothing, etcetera, £17,500.

Mr. ANGWIN moved—

*That the item be reduced by £100.*

He took that action as a protest against the policy of the Government in again reducing the hospital votes this year. In his opinion, the Government had been almost starving the hospitals. Government hospitals, as well as assisted hospitals, had had their votes reduced. The vote for the Perth public hospital had been reduced, according to the report, on account of the removal of the children to the Children's Hospital; and on account of that reduction it had been necessary to restrict the admission of patients from country hospitals. On several occasions he had pointed out that the Perth Public Hospital was used by a large number of people from the country districts, and although the cost of the hospital was heavy it was not altogether due to sickness in the metropolitan area. The grants to assisted hospitals also had been reduced by several hundreds of pounds. The Government had adopted that policy contrary to the opinion of Parliament. Last year a motion had been carried protesting against the Government's action in reducing the vote, but instead of giving effect to that opinion the Government were further reducing the votes. He asked members of the Committee to again show by their votes that they were in favour of the hospitals being assisted by the Government, so that there might be

no occasion for those in charge of hospitals to refuse admission to any patients.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The item could not be reduced by a nominal amount for the purpose of getting an expression of opinion in favour of an increased vote. He intended to oppose a reduction of the amount because the sum provided was absolutely essential.

Mr. Bath: We want to deal with the question as to whether more is essential.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Then the mover was wrong in his method; if he required a larger vote he could not reduce an item by a small amount for the purpose of showing that the item should be increased, although in past years members had been allowed to move for a reduction of the vote in order to get an expression of opinion, as to the adequacy or otherwise, of it. He hoped that the amendment would not be persisted in. So far as Government hospitals were concerned those institutions had to be maintained, and if the vote provided was not sufficient the Government would have to provide further money. The Perth hospital was not one of those covered by the item, the maintenance of that institution being a separate item.

Mr. PRICE: Would it be in order to move a reduction of the total vote with the object of impressing on the Government the protest of members against a general reduction in the amount for hospitals?

The CHAIRMAN: On many occasions it was permitted in the Committee to move to reduce an item as a protest against something. It was immaterial whether the hon. member moved to reduce the item or the vote, but if the vote was dealt with hon. members could not revert to the items. The vote was already reduced by £300.

Mr. ANGWIN asked leave to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Item, Grants-in-aid of maintenance and buildings of assisted hospitals, £7,500.

Mr. PRICE: Evidently it was intended to discontinue the basis of 15s. in the pound subsidy. What system was to be adopted in allocating the subsidies? We

could not allow the Minister to spend £7,500 as he liked without any explanation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The basis on which distribution was to be made was not within his knowledge, but he could give the amounts to be allocated to the different hospitals. These were—Bulong £100; Broad Arrow £200; Busselton £200; Black Range £400; Bridgetown £150; Beverley £200; Davyhurst £200; Greenbushes £150; Jarrahdale £50; Katanning £300; Kanowna £300; Kookynie £200; Laverton £400; Leonora £500; Meekatharra £300; Mornington £52, with 25s. per week for each indigent patient; Moora £150; Malcolm £250; Mt. Magnet £200; Mt. Morgans £400; Nannine £200; Newcastle £150; Norseman £250; Peak Hill £150; Ravensthorpe £100; Sir Samuel £200; Wagin £300, and Wiluna £200.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It was unjust to reduce the Jarrahdale subsidy by £50. That institution was indebted to the Perth hospital to the extent of £150 owing to an unfortunate epidemic last year which necessitated 40 patients being sent to Perth for treatment.

Mr. TROY: Some hospitals had heavier obligations than others. The Black Range hospital was reduced by £200, though it served not only the town of Sandstone but a district with a radius of 70 miles, embracing Youanme, where there were 150 men working. It was shameful to treat a locality in this way.

Mr. ANGWIN moved an amendment—

*That the vote be further reduced by £100.*

He moved this as a protest against the Government in reducing hospital grants.

Mr. TROY: The Government claimed to have saved £18,000 in the hospitals vote, but it was done by starving the hospitals and compelling the people in the localities to impose extra taxation.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Instead of making a saving on medical and health matters the Government were expending £2,500 more than last year. It was recognised generally to be an advisable thing to encourage local people to maintain their hospitals. Effort was being made in Perth and Fremantle to do that. There was a diminution in one or two

items, because a certain proportion of the cost of treating infectious cases had been thrown on the local authorities, the charge being transferred from a tax on the general community to a tax on property holders in local governing districts. These infectious cases were treated at the general hospitals.

Mr. Angwin: And you want to put on increased taxation indirectly.

1 o'clock a.m.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the hon. member thought that property should not pay he was entitled to his opinion. The amendment it was to be hoped would not be accepted.

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

|      |    |    |    |    |
|------|----|----|----|----|
| Ayes | .. | .. | .. | 17 |
| Noes | .. | .. | .. | 13 |

Majority against .. 1

#### AYES.

|              |                  |
|--------------|------------------|
| Mr. Angwin   | Mr. McDowall     |
| Mr. Bath     | Mr. O'Loughlin   |
| Mr. Collier  | Mr. Scaddan      |
| Mr. Gill     | Mr. Troy         |
| Mr. Gourley  | Mr. Underwood    |
| Mr. Helmsman | Mr. Ware         |
| Mr. Holman   | Mr. A. A. Wilson |
| Mr. Horan    | Mr. Price        |
| Mr. Hudson   | (Teller).        |

#### NOES.

|              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Brown    | Mr. Mitchell    |
| Mr. Carson   | Mr. Monger      |
| Mr. Cowcher  | Mr. S. F. Moore |
| Mr. Daglish  | Mr. Nanson      |
| Mr. Davies   | Mr. Osborn      |
| Mr. Gordon   | Mr. Plesse      |
| Mr. Gregory  | Mr. F. Wilson   |
| Mr. Hardwick | Mr. Layman      |
| Mr. Harper   | (Teller).       |
| Mr. Jacoby   |                 |

Amendment thus negatived.

Vote (as reduced to £89,216) put and passed.

Vote—*Observatory*, £2,511—agreed to.

#### B.I.L.—LICENSING.

Returned from the Legislative Council with requested amendments.

#### ADJOURNMENT — CHRISTMAS HOLIDAYS.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson) moved—

*That the House at its rising do adjourn until 4.30 p.m. on Wednesday, 4th January, 1911.*

In moving this motion I desire to extend to yourself, Mr. Speaker, the members on both sides of the House, and the officers of the House, my heartiest good wishes for the approaching festive season, and I hope that they may have a pleasant Christmas and a happy New Year. I trust that when we meet again on the 4th January we will be able to settle down to business and finish our duties a few weeks later.

Mr. SCADDAN: On behalf of the members on this side of the House I desire, with the Premier and the members supporting his Government, to extend to you, Mr. Speaker, and the Chairman of Committees, whom the Premier overlooked for the moment, the officers of the House, and the attendants generally connected with the Assembly, my hearty good wishes for a merry Christmas and a prosperous New Year. I trust that a few days respite between the present time and the 4th January will enable members to recuperate their health somewhat, and that they will be able to return, particularly the members on this side of the House, prepared to fight for their lives, which are at present in jeopardy owing to the proposals of the Government.

The Premier: I thank you.

Mr. HOLMAN: I do not see any reason why we should adjourn until 4th January. I think it would have been better if the Premier had decided to adjourn until the following Tuesday, 10th January. There will be nothing to gain by meeting in the middle of the week. By adjourning to the 4th we shall meet immediately after the holidays and, in fact, the holidays will hardly be over. I maintain it is absurd to do so and I do not see any reason for it. There are members who are living in the country, and I do not think it is right that we should call them from their homes the day after New Year's Day in order to be here on Wed-



nesday. I reckon that the Premier has not shown the consideration he might have done in calling the House together on the 4th January. I would ask the Premier now to alter the date and make it the 10th January, so that members might have a little longer spell.

The PREMIER: I am afraid I cannot fall in with the hon. member's suggestion. We have a pretty big programme to get through, and my desire is that we should complete it as early as possible. I know that hon. members want to help to finish the session as quickly as possible. I mentioned this a few days ago, and if the hon. member had desired to take exception to it that would have been the proper time, not now at the last moment. I made the suggestion then and the majority of members fell in with it.

Question put and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire on behalf of the Chairman of Committees, the officers of the House, and myself, to express my thanks to the Premier and the leader of the Opposition for their kind wishes for a happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year. I reciprocate most heartily the feelings so kindly expressed.

*House adjourned at 1.13 a.m. (Thursday).*

## Legislative Assembly, Wednesday, 4th January, 1911.

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Papers presented .. .. .   | 2633 |
| Questions—Sitting hour, Fridays .. .. .                                  | 2633 |
| Coal Mining Industry, Government supplies .. .. .                        | 2633 |
| Bills: Payment of Members Amendment, Message, 1R. .. .. .                | 2634 |
| Public Library, Museum and Art Gallery of Western Australia. 1R. .. .. . | 2634 |
| Redistribution of Seats, 2R. .. .. .                                     | 2634 |
| Annual Estimates, Votes and Items discussed .. .. .                      | 2634 |

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

## PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier: Report of the Commissioner of Police to 30th June, 1910.

## QUESTION—SITTING HOUR, FRIDAYS.

Mr. HORAN (without notice) asked the Premier: Whether it was intended to continue to sit at 10.30 a.m. on Fridays as had been arranged some time before Christmas.

The PREMIER replied: Yes, it was proposed to sit each Friday from half-past ten in the morning.

## QUESTION—COAL MINING INDUSTRY, GOVERNMENT SUPPLIES.

Mr. A. A. WILSON asked the Minister for Railways: What is the amount of the Government coal order allotted to each of the Collie coal companies for the months of November, December, January, February (separately) for the years 1907-8-9-10 (separately)? 2, Is the Government taking the same amount of coal per week from the local coal companies for the six weeks ending December 17th, 1910, as they took for the six weeks ending December 18th, 1909. If not, why not? 3, Taking into consideration the fact that no fires in the agricultural belt were reported to have taken place when Collie coal was being extensively used during the harvest season of 1909-1910, and when the Newcastle strike was on, will the Government consider the advisability of further augmenting the present Government order so that the miners may be able to get more than three days work per week?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, See attached statement marked "A." 2, See attached statement marked "B." showing that the Government took 13,047 tons in 1910, as against 11,642 tons in 1909. 3, The Government are anxious to give all possible assistance to the local coal industry, having due regard to the protection of the agricultural areas.

A.

(1.) Statement showing Government Coal order allotted to each Collie Mine for months of November, December,