

tracts for longer periods, and though this clause was somewhat like closing the door after the horse had been stolen, still it was only right something should be done.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 286 to 288—agreed to.

Clause 289—Council may contract for water supply:

HON. R. S. HAYNES: This was a new clause taken from the Local Government Act of Victoria, giving the council power to contract for any period not exceeding three years with the owner of waterworks, or any other person, for the supply of water.

HON. J. M. SPEED: This clause gave power to the Council to contract for any period not exceeding three years with the owner of any waterworks or with any other person, for the supply of water. He moved that the word "but," in line 3, be struck out, and there he inserted in lieu, "and may so contract for a period exceeding three years, providing that."

Amendment put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 290 to 294, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 295—Council may construct pounds and abattoirs:

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The clause that stood previously as 295 had been struck out by the committee.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 296 to 298, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 299—Council may erect weigh-bridges:

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The words "within the municipality" were necessary, and had been inserted.

Clause put and passed.

On motion by HON. R. S. HAYNES, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9-22 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 17th October, 1900.

Referendum Irregularities at Kalgoorlie, Removal of a J.P.—Question: Special Train between Geraldton and Northampton, Cost—Question: Chief Mechanical Engineer, etc., Railways—Perth Electric Tramways Lighting and Power Bill, Select Committee's Report—Land Act Amendment Bill, third reading—Circuit Courts Judge Bill, third reading—Payment of Imperial Courts Judgment Bill, first reading—Kalgoorlie Tramways Bill, first reading—Leederville Tramways Bill, first reading—Papers: Publican's License, Kookynie—Petition (Railway), Claremont Residents—Motion: Eight-hours System on Railways, Division—Procedure on Motion in absence of mover, Remarks by the Speaker—Council's Resolution: Railway towards Norseman, Remarks by the Speaker—Motion: Government Printing Works, Minimum Wage—Papers: Resident Magistrate at Boulder—Motion: Fremantle Lunatic Asylum, the mad assault—Paper presented, Railways Report—Truck Act Amendment Bill, second reading, in Committee, reported—Motion: Payment of Members, further debate, Division, Amendment passed—Administration (probate) Bill, second reading—Conspiracy and Protection of Workmen and Property Bill, second reading—Dividend Duty, Petition for Repeal, negatived—Slander of Women Bill, second reading, in committee, reported—Compensation for Accidents Bill, second reading, in committee, reported—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

REFERENDUM IRREGULARITIES AT KALGOORLIE.

REMOVAL OF A J.P.

THE PREMIER: I beg to inform the House that, in accordance with a resolution of the House passed on the 10th instant, "That in view of the unsatisfactory replies to the inquiries made by the Government in connection with the improper use of voters' certificates at the recent referendum, further steps be taken," His Excellency the Administrator, by virtue of Section 9 of the Justices Appointment Act 1895, has prohibited Mr. William Robert Burton, a justice of the peace for the magisterial districts of East Cooagardie and Esperance, from acting as such justice.

QUESTION—SPECIAL TRAIN BETWEEN GERALDTON AND NORTHAMPTON, COST.

MR. MITCHELL asked the Commissioner of Railways: Whether he had any statement to make in regard to the charges made by the Railway Department for a special train conveying a doctor from Geraldton to Northampton and back on

the 3rd inst., particulars of which were handed him a week ago?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. B. C. Wood) replied: The charge made was in accordance with the regulations, namely 8s. per mile each way; but in consideration of the train being required in an urgent case of sickness, he was prepared to reduce the charge to £17.

QUESTION—CHIEF MECHANICAL ENGINEER, ETC., RAILWAYS.

MR. GREGORY asked the Commissioner of Railways: 1. Who appointed the Chief Mechanical Engineer, Mr. Rotherham? 2. When was the appointment approved by the Executive Council? 3. What salary was Mr. Rotherham appointed at? 4. Was Mr. Rotherham appointed for any specified term? 5. If so, how long? 6. Were any conditions attached to Mr. Rotherham's appointment, such as the given reduction in the cost of working his department within a specified time? 7. Who authorised the appointment by Mr. Rotherham of Mr. Triggs as Chief Clerk? 8. On what date and at what salary was the appointment approved by the Minister?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. B. C. Wood) replied:—1. The Governor-in-Council. 2. 10th May, 1900. 3. £1,000 per annum. 4. Yes. 5. Five years. 6. The only condition asked by Mr. Rotherham was that Mr. Triggs be appointed as his Chief Clerk. There was no condition of the nature mentioned in the question. 7. The appointment of Mr. Triggs as Chief Clerk was approved by the Commissioner of Railways, and confirmed in the Executive Council on the 11th July, 1900. 8. (a), 23rd June, 1900; (b), £375 per annum.

PERTH ELECTRIC TRAMWAYS LIGHTING AND POWER BILL (PRIVATE).

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. MOORHEAD brought up the report of the Select Committee on the Bill.

Report received, read, and ordered to be printed.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

CIRCUIT COURTS JUDGE BILL.

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

PAYMENT OF IMPERIAL COURTS' JUDGMENTS BILL.

Introduced by the PREMIER, and read a first time.

KALGOORLIE TRAMWAYS BILL.

Introduced by the COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS, and read a first time.

LEEDERVILLE TRAMWAYS BILL.

Introduced by the COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS, and read a first time.

PAPERS—PUBLICAN'S LICENSE, KOOKYNIIE.

MR. GREGORY moved:

That all papers in connection with the refusal of a publican's general license to E. Cooke, of Kookynie, be laid upon the table of the House.

This was a formal motion to which he understood there was no objection. Mr. Cooke considered he had been badly treated, and one wished to see the papers.

Question put and passed.

PETITION (RAILWAY), CLAREMONT RESIDENTS.

On motion by Mr. WILSON (for Mr. Morgans), ordered that the petition of the residents of Claremont and the surrounding district, recently presented to the Hon. the Commissioner of Railways, be laid upon the table of the House.

MOTION—EIGHT HOURS SYSTEM ON RAILWAYS.

MR. GREGORY (North Coolgardie) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, all workmen employed by the Commissioner of Railways should be brought under the eight hours system where practicable, and where eight hours per day is not practicable, forty-eight hours shall constitute a week of six days, exclusive of Sundays.

It is a recognised system throughout the colony that eight hours shall constitute a day's work; we have also the assurance of the Premier that the Government are desirous of having the eight-hours system adopted wherever possible. We only desire the eight-hours system on the railways at places where it can be possibly

carried out. There are many small stations along the line where a train goes through at an early hour of the day and again very late at night: the work at these stations is very light; there are no arduous duties to perform, and it may be necessary for an employee to be occupied for ten or even twelve hours a day at such stations. In such cases we do not desire the eight-hours system to apply; but in all the large stations such as Perth, Fremantle, Kalgoorlie, Coolgardie, Menzies, and places where there is a large amount of labour required, I think wherever it is possible the Government should institute the principle. It is a right and proper principle, and has been agreed to by the Premier himself. One good reason why we should try and not overwork the drivers, the cleaners, and guards on the railways is that we should take care to protect the travelling public on the lines. If a man is worked continuously for a very long time it is impossible for him to thoroughly attend to his duties. The Railway Department of the colony have lately been making some innovations, and these innovations tend to increase the time that the men are kept at work. To show members how badly the men are treated, I may say that the men employed as drivers, firemen, and guards on the Eastern railway line have to make the run from Fremantle to Northam, and the return journey, making 160 miles. In Victoria a run of 100 miles is considered a day's work for any driver, but in that colony the eight-hours system has not been established in its entirety. I have a telegram here from the secretary of the association in Victoria, which says what a day's work is:

Nine hours when paid by hours, but we have mileage basis, one hundred miles being day's work. Suburban averages about eight and a half hours. Overtime commences when equivalent earned mileage hours.

THE PREMIER: Is that an official telegram?

MR. GREGORY: This is an unofficial telegram. I only want to show that a driver on a train in Victoria, when he has once travelled 100 miles, is granted overtime if he goes further. I am not going to advocate overtime here; I do not want to see it established where it can be helped, but I want to see the

eight-hours principle instituted as far as possible on the railways. The Government have wired to the various colonies, and here is a telegram from the Premier of Victoria:

Re hours of work of railway employees, eight hours is the standard day for about 73 per cent. of the staff of our railway department, outside the head offices and administrative staff. Drivers and firemen are paid on the nine-hours basis, or, if they prefer it, on the trip system per 100 miles run. When the hours for grades, other than enginemen, are over eight, the duties are either light or not continuous.

I do not wish to interfere with the men employed at smaller stations, but I think the eight-hours principle should apply to those employed at large stations. Therefore in Fremantle and Perth and at other large stations men would only work eight hours. What is done in this colony? In the first place the drivers from Fremantle to Northam would have to do the trip of 160 miles; whereas according to the Victorian system that would be one day and three-fifths. In Western Australia men get paid one day for that distance. Then a driver has to travel from Northam to Southern Cross, about 170 miles; that in Victoria would count as one day and seven-tenths of a day. These are very long times. But from Southern Cross to Kalgoorlie the distance is 138 miles; yet the department is not content with the driver doing that journey: he is compelled after reaching Kalgoorlie to run out to Kunowna and back to Kalgoorlie to make up his day. That makes the day very arduous. I contend that if a man travels all the way from Southern Cross to Kalgoorlie on his engine he has done a very fair day's work, even if he has not put in the full eight hours. All other employees, the cleaners and others, work nine hours. The porters work nine hours in some places, and men have to work even up to twelve hours a day. But in such places where there are long hours, the work is not heavy or continuous, and the department must employ men longer than eight hours in those places. At the big stations, I think, as far as possible, the Government should adopt the eight-hours principle. In regard to engine-drivers, I believe it was the practice some time ago that a man should work 48 hours a week and then he had to clean his own engine, which took him six hours,

making 54 hours a week. But now the department compel the drivers to work 54 hours, and then they have to get labourers to clean their engines. We all know that locomotive engine-drivers are proud, or they should be, and I think I can say they do take pride in their engines. I do not think any other person should have a right to interfere with a man's engine. He is the man who should be responsible for the working of the engine, and therefore should see that the whole work was done in connection with the cleaning of it. It was the practice for a man to clean his own engine; now engine-drivers are compelled to work 54 hours a week, and the cleaning has to be done by labourers. We ought to make the system as far as we can a thorough eight hours system on the railways, where the system can be carried out without being inimical to the department. I know it will mean greater expense; I feel no doubt about that. But if we can afford to give the General Manager an extra £250 a year, and employ a mechanical engineer at £1,000 a year, we can afford to make the hours of the drivers as near as possible eight hours, and have as little overtime as possible. Under the new management there have been certain alterations made. At Southern Cross, for instance, where a large number of men are employed on the railway, the new Mechanical Engineer has insisted on some of them being dismissed, and they were dismissed under protest. I understand those employed there work six days' overtime in every fortnight. This is a bad principle, and shows something is going wrong in this department, with a view of reducing labour. I hope the House will pass the motion, not perhaps in its entirety, for I have no desire to embarrass the Government, but I wish to do all I can, not only for the welfare of the men employed in the railway service, but for the travelling public.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Speaking in the temporary absence of the Commissioner of Railways, and seeing that other members do not desire to continue the debate—

MR. ILLINGWORTH: We thought you would not oppose the motion.

THE PREMIER: It would be almost a scandal for the House to pass a motion

of this sort without discussion. The mover has introduced the matter in a moderate manner, but for all that the motion requires much more consideration than the member for Central Murchison seems desirous to give it. To pass this motion would mean an extra expenditure of money to start with, and I hope the House will not deal with this matter without discussion. No one expected the motion would be allowed to pass without discussion. It must be recollected that what the mover seeks to introduce is not in force fully in any colony in Australasia, and that fact alone should make us careful, and we would be unwise to pass the motion at the present time in the absence of fuller information. In Victoria, drivers and firemen are paid on the nine-hours basis, or, if they prefer it, on the trip system per 100 miles run. The communication we have received does not say how much the men get for the trip.

MR. GREGORY: The trip is counted a day of eight hours.

THE PREMIER: There are many places on the railway where the work is light or not continuous, such as at country stations, where men work more than eight hours a day; but the motion does not say anything about that, for it applies to all workmen employed by the Commissioner of Railways. I cannot say off-hand how this eight-hours system would affect the railways generally. The Commissioner, if he were here, would be able to inform us as to the effect and the cost. In Brisbane (Queensland) the eight-hours day is not in force on the railway system, and in Wellington (New Zealand), in a colony which we all know is supposed to be the most democratic in Australasia, the 48 hours a week or eight hours a day provision is not in force on the railways, and we are informed in the communication that it would be impossible to apply the system to all servants on the railways, but that where advisable the 48-hours system obtains. But so it does in this colony, where the Government are the employers, as on the railways and in carrying out public works, the eight-hours system prevails; and the Government are just as much in favour of it as is any person in the colony, and in fact the Government were the first to introduce it here.

MR. GREGORY: Porters and cleaners at big stations in this colony work 58 hours a week.

THE PREMIER: In New South Wales the eight-hours system is not in force. In South Australia the 48-hours system is in force in the locomotive and permanent way branches at several of the large stations, and whenever practicable where the work is continuous and laborious. From these communications we have received as to the practice in other colonies, there is a great difference of opinion as to the application of the eight-hours system; therefore we should have more information before we come to a decision on the motion. The Government have no desire to make anyone work longer than is necessary, and my desire is to shorten the hours of labour if it can be done, but we know that all persons employed on the railways are not engaged in laborious work, and that even on engines the men are not always going, as there is a good deal of standing about in yards and places. We should be careful in what we do on this question, especially as the Commissioner of Railways now here in his seat informs me that to apply the system would cost in this colony an immense amount of money.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: £80,000.

THE PREMIER: If it will cost anything like that amount, we must think the matter over carefully. I thought before the Commissioner arrived that the adoption of this principle would mean an additional cost of, perhaps, £10,000 a year; but £80,000 a year—really we ought to have a select committee to deal with the matter. The railway employees have never asked for this, so far as I know. We all know the desire of every person working for wages, whether employed by the Government or otherwise, is to get as much as he can for his labour, and I do not think any one blames him for that.

MR. D. FORREST: And do as little for it as he can.

THE PREMIER: Yes; that is the tendency. If we can discuss this matter it will do some good, but I cannot agree to pass such a motion at present. Perhaps the mover, when he knows it would cost the country something like £80,000 a year, will be satisfied with having

brought the subject under notice, without pressing it.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. B. C. Wood): We all sympathise with the hon. member in his desire to secure eight hours as a working day for all employees in the railway service; but it is almost impossible to make such a change as he proposes this year. I am quite in accord with the views expressed in the motion, and I think that now as far as practicable the men in the loco. shops are paid for eight hours' labour, and also in the Public Works Department. If this motion is carried, it will mean that the whole of the Estimates for this year will be upset, for I do not think the principle could be carried out because of the great increase in cost.

MR. HARPER: It would increase the rates, to make up for the extra cost.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: I am informed by officers in the department that to apply the principle of this motion would mean an additional expenditure of between £70,000 and £80,000 a year in the railway service; and if that is so, the rates would have to be increased as suggested in order to make up for the extra expenditure involved, because this great difference must be made up in some way. It would certainly mean an increase of railway rates, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw the motion, and leave it to be dealt with by the next Parliament. This would be a first-class election cry for the hon. member.

MR. HARPER: Putting up of rates—a very good cry!

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: No; not putting up the rates, but putting down the hours. So far as I can learn, the railway men in this colony are not dissatisfied, and in fact they seem to be about the best looked after of any class of workers in this colony. As the Premier has said, workers in all classes of trade want to get shorter hours, and to do as little as they can for as much as they can get. We cannot blame them. If the hon. member will postpone his motion, I shall be glad, so that we may be relieved of the responsibility of dealing with it at the present time; because, as members are aware, the Estimates for this year are on the table, and have been framed on the present basis of working the railway

system; therefore it would be impossible to carry out the motion this year.

MR. A. FORREST (West Kimberley): Perhaps the mover will inform the House what pressure has been brought to bear on the hon. member to induce him to move this motion.

MR. VOSPER: We do not wait for pressure.

MR. A. FORREST: It seems to me that the ambition of some members is to fill up the Notice Paper with motions.

MR. GREGORY: Is the hon. member in order in asking what pressure has been brought to bear on me?

MR. A. FORREST: Certainly, I am in order. When a motion of this sort is placed before hon. members, we want to know the reason why. Now that the Estimates are on the table, it would be impracticable to alter them to a great extent for this year, more especially as hon. members are going to the country in a few months. This would be one of the trump cards of the member for North Coolgardie (Mr. Gregory) to play, that he had tried to carry the eight-hours principle through this House.

MR. VOSPER: Another trump card would be that you opposed it.

MR. GREGORY: It would not affect the hon. member's electorate.

MR. A. FORREST: When the Commissioner of Railways informs us that it will cost £80,000 a year to carry out this principle, I think it is time for members of this House to, at any rate, pause and consider where they are. Of course, the Government cannot spend £80,000 a year on the railways unless they get a corresponding increase in freights. As we have left little to the hon. member for use at the next election, and as we are going to pass his other motion for the payment of members, there will be practically nothing left for the hon. member to go to the country on, if we pass this motion also. I would advise him to withdraw it, and in the next session, when the new Parliament assembles, the hon. member—if he be here, as he probably will, and perhaps be then sitting on this (Ministerial) side of the House—he will be able to submit the motion then, although he will probably be more cautious when sitting on this side in asking the House to pass a motion involving an increased expenditure of £80,000 a year.

MR. GREGORY (in reply): I have no intention to withdraw the motion, although I would not mind an adjournment of the debate, so that the matter might be more fully ventilated; but when we have from the authorities simply an assertion that the application of this motion is going to cost £80,000 a year extra, and are told in the same breath that as far as possible the eight-hours system is adopted, whereas nearly all railway employees work nine hours a day, I say this is improper; and that, where men are employed on continuous duty, eight hours are sufficient, and should be sufficient after the boast we have heard from the Premier that he believes in and desires the eight-hours day. There has been no pressure brought to bear on me to introduce this motion. The member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest) need not have tried to make such an insinuation; and I can assure him that I shall not give him the name of the person who asked me to move this motion; because, possibly, if I did, that person might have the same treatment meted out to him as was meted out to the officer who gave certain information concerning frauds on the railway department to another member of this (Opposition) side of the House, namely dismissal.

MR. A. FORREST: What I meant to say was, what great body of people had asked you to introduce the motion?

MR. GREGORY: The information was given to me, to a certain extent, by men working for the Railway Department. I was asked to move this motion because I have always taken a great interest in all matters appertaining to the goldfields of this colony, and have tried to see that men who worked underground were not employed for more than eight hours per day. It is quite sufficient for me to be able to show that, after boasting that they believe in the eight-hours system, the Government are not prepared to enforce it on the railways. I am quite agreeable to an adjournment of this debate, but I shall certainly not withdraw the motion.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie): I cannot understand the kind of logic which tells us in the first place that this eight-hours system is already in vogue, and in the next place that to adopt the system would cost £80,000 a year

If it be already in vogue, no such extra cost will be entailed.

THE PREMIER: It is not universal.

MR. VOSPER: One very important argument in favour of this motion which does not seem to have occurred to hon. members is a consideration entirely exclusive of the claims of the labour party: that the public safety demands that men who are employed in responsible positions as engine-drivers, guards, porters, and so forth, on the railways, shall not be employed for any undue length of time. I do not know whether this applies to signalmen; I presume it does; and I have been recently told that sometimes signalmen are employed on our railways ten and twelve hours at a stretch. Now, the work of signalmen is of a very responsible and important character, requiring the utmost vigilance; and if such men are employed for these inordinately long hours, they must sooner or later become lax in attention to their duties, and the public safety will thereby be placed in jeopardy; and surely it is better to spend even £80,000 in preventing accidents than to have, perhaps some of these days, great loss of life, and to have to pay that or some similar amount in the way of damages. There can be no doubt that in some divisions of the railway service the men are worked inordinately long hours, and it is only a matter of time, after the Railway Association and the Engine-drivers' Association feel their feet, that pressure will be brought to bear on the Commissioner to find a remedy. It is surely better for the Government to grant that remedy at once than to wait until pressure is brought to bear upon them, because the fact of pressure being brought to bear on the Government through these associations means friction; and that friction may mean a serious loss to the public, and considerable inconvenience to the railway traffic. I therefore commend the action of the hon. member (Mr. Gregory) in refusing to withdraw, and should he press his motion to a division, I shall most certainly vote in its favour.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	11
Majority for	1

AYES.

Mr. Ewing
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hall
Mr. Holmes
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. James
Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Oats
Mr. Solomon
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Vosper (Teller).

NOES.

Sir John Forrest
Mr. D. Forrest
Mr. Harper
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Locke
Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Monger
Mr. Pennefather
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Wood
Mr. Higham (Teller).

Motion thus passed.

PROCEDURE ON MOTION, IN ABSENCE OF MOVER.

REMARKS BY THE SPEAKER.

THE SPEAKER: I should like to draw the attention of hon. members to a question which recently arose with regard to members not having been in their places when motions, of which they had given notice, came up for consideration. I do this the more willingly, because I stated on that occasion that if such member requested another member to move for him, the latter could do so; and in so ruling I had in my mind the South Australian Standing Orders, from which ours were taken. But I find that our own Standing Orders preclude a motion being put at all in such circumstances. The words are as follow:

And if a member be not in his place when the notice of motion given by him is called on, or fails to rise and move the same, it shall be withdrawn from the Notice Paper.

I hope hon. members will understand that in future; and I think it is a most excellent rule, that when a member does give notice of a motion it shall be his duty to be in his place and move it.

COUNCIL'S RESOLUTION—RAILWAY TOWARDS NORSEMAN.

REMARKS BY THE SPEAKER.

Message received from the Legislative Council, transmitting resolution in favour of a railway from Coolgardie 25 miles towards Norseman to be constructed.

THE SPEAKER: With reference to this message, perhaps it is advisable I should say this is a matter which has already been discussed and decided by this House, and there is no doubt the resolution passed in another place is simply an attempt to bring in, by a side-wind, the question of the construction of a railway to Norseman.

THE PREMIER: I move that this message be taken into consideration on Tuesday next.

Motion put and passed.

MOTION—GOVERNMENT PRINTING WORKS, MINIMUM WAGE.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the minimum rate of wages paid in the Government Printing Office be not less than that paid in the ordinary printing establishments in Perth.

He said: I may say, in moving this motion, I have before me a question put in this House yesterday by the member for the Swan (Mr. Ewing), and the reply given him by the Premier:

Whether the Government intended to comply with the request of the Typographical Society that the minimum rate of wage paid to the employees at the Government Printing Works be £2 15s. per week. Sir John Forrest replied as follows:—Employees in the Government Printing Department have 18 days more holiday, on full pay, than employees in private printing establishments, and taking this into consideration the lowest rate paid ranges from £2 14s. to £2 17s. per week of 47½ hours. The Government is unable to promise to make any alteration at present, but the matter will receive further consideration.

That is a very excellent question, and perhaps a still more excellent answer; and the only fault about the answer is that it does not happen to be true. I do not wish to say that is a common fault with Government answers, but it certainly applies to a number of those recently given. The statement is substantially misleading, and the person who supplied the Premier with the information must have known full well—

THE PREMIER: It was the Colonial Secretary.

MR. VOSPER: The person who supplied the information to the Minister responsible cannot but have known full well that statement was not correct.

THE PREMIER: That is very uncalled for, and very rude, also.

MR. VOSPER: In the first place, I will prove my point before I finish.

THE PREMIER: You must not attribute improper motives.

MR. VOSPER: I only say that the person who supplied that information to the Minister responsible for that department must have been well aware of the

fact that the answer in that form was misleading; and I propose to prove that allegation before I sit down. With regard to the 18 days' longer holidays being given by the Government Printing Office than are given by private printing offices, that is incorrect.

THE PREMIER: That was last year.

MR. VOSPER: As a matter of fact, the number of extra holidays which employees in the Government Printing Office get, as compared with ordinary printers, is 12; and even that rule does not apply to those men who come under the classification of temporary, but only to the permanent staff and to that portion of the staff which is included on the estimate laid on the table under the heading of "Provisional and temporary"; and I shall show presently that division includes a very small number of the total staff employed in the Government printing works. Then again, this statement that the lowest rate of wages is £2 14s. to £2 17s. for 47½ hours is also misleading, because that rate also applies to the provisional and temporary staff and to the permanent staff, and is obtained by classifying together the permanent hands and those on the provisional staff, while the great body of the compositors, the men who are entitled "extra labour," are not included at all. Here is a letter from one of the printers engaged in the Government Printing Office. I shall not mention his name, but the facts stated by him can be verified, and have been stated in this House by me on a previous occasion. This man writes:

I notice in this morning's paper Sir John Forrest, in answering Mr. Ewing's question re the wages in the Government Printing Office, gave a very misleading answer. He said the men were being paid from £2 14s. to £2 17s. That is true as far as some are concerned. There are about 200 men employed here, and about 60 of them are on the permanent staff and what is called the "Provisional and temporary." The others are called "extra labour," although they have been here for years.

This statement was substantially admitted the other day, when the Public Service Bill was before this House.

I would like to point out to you, sir, that the wages here are from £2 5s. to £2 11s. per week, and the majority are getting the latter wage, with the exception of the men I mentioned above, that is the permanent staff and the provisional and temporary staff.

That indicates the real state of affairs. The bulk of the men are employed on extra labour, and the number on the permanent and temporary and provisional staff is very small indeed. It is only a question of bringing up figures to show that the Premier's answer cannot apply to the majority, because the sum total given on the Estimates would not be sufficient to cover the cost of paying the men the amounts stated. We find on the Estimates the total number of hands, including the machinists, the bookbinders, the compositors, overseers, the superintendents, and the Government Printer, and everybody included in the permanent, the temporary, and provisional staffs is 67. But when we come to the next item there is £11,000 set down for extra labour, which includes everybody else. There are 67 persons receiving wages amounting to or above that stated by the Premier, whereas there are 200 men who are paid less than the rate in Perth at the present time. By way of further illustration I may point out the way in which the men are treated as compared with the way in which the printers are treated in the Government Printing Offices in the Eastern colonies, and in the private offices about Perth.

THE PREMIER: Most of those in private offices work at night.

MR. VOSPER: Not in the majority of cases. As a matter of fact there are only two offices in Perth that are night offices, they are the two daily newspapers. There the men are paid extra for doing night work. The two newspaper offices have adopted the linotype machine, and the men are paid on an altogether different scale.

MR. A. FORREST: The linotype men get £300 or £400 a year.

MR. VOSPER: They are doing work of a certain character with a machine, and are not compositors in the strict sense of the term. All the private printing offices in Perth, with the exception of the two daily newspaper offices, employ men on day labour only.

THE PREMIER: They prefer the Government printing office, though.

MR. VOSPER: Some may do so. That may be because they do not have to work so hard there. If that is the case I cannot say much for the superintendence in the Government Printing Office, because

the people in this colony have a right to expect that they shall receive good labour and good results at the Government Printing Office. I believe in men being worked to their fullest possible extent, but I believe in paying them a reasonable wage. I do not want to help the Government in assisting men to shirk their work, but I want to see full duty performed for reasonable pay. We will take Western Australia. We find the lowest rate of wages paid by outside offices is £2 15s. per week of 47½ hours. When we come to the Government Printing Office we find that there are 57 extra compositors employed, 11 at 9s. a day and 46 at 8s. 6d. As far as the hours are concerned they are the same as in private printing offices—47½ hours per week. With regard to the men employed on extra labour, there are no rules whatever as to sick leave and holidays, whereas the permanent staff are allowed holidays and sick leave. The men affected by the grievances, the men who have been the means of getting this motion before the House and belonging to the Typographical Society, do not get holidays, and more than that, they have no rights in regard to holidays at all. They may get them but they have no rights in respect to them.

MR. MONGER: They are about the only Government officials then who do not get more than their fair share of holidays.

MR. VOSPER: I suppose when the Government Printer gets a holiday he allows his hands to get a holiday also, because it would not be much of a holiday for him if he did not. But these extra men have no right to the holiday. When we look at New South Wales we find that the temporary hands, the lowest class of labour employed in the Government Printing Office, receive 9s. 4d. per day and work 46 hours a week: the outside wage is £2 12s. a week. In Victoria the lowest grade, the supernumeraries are paid 9s. 6d. a day, and they work 48 hours a week. In Queensland the occasional hands, that is again the lowest grade, receive 10s. a day and work 47 hours a week—that is during the session—and 42 hours during the recess; the standard rate outside is £2 16s. In South Australia the temporary hands receive 9s. 3d. a day for a week of 45½

hours; the wages ruling outside are £2 15s. per week, the same as here. The lowest class of compositors in the Government Printing Office in South Australia are paid more and work shorter hours than the next higher grade are paid in this colony, because, we find, the extra labour here is divided into two parts.

MR. MONGER: Let them go back again.

MR. VOSPER: Let them all go back and leave the country to the hon. member for York (Mr. Monger) to promote civilisation. There are 11 men who receive 9s. per day, and 46 of an inferior grade receiving 8s. 6d. a day. In South Australia the lowest class of compositors employed are paid 9s. 3d. per day; whereas the higher class of extra compositors here receive less than that amount, and in South Australia the compositors are expected to work only 45½ hours. The standard rate of wage outside is the same in the two colonies.

THE PREMIER: Do they get the holidays there too?

MR. VOSPER: The standard rate of wages in the two colonies is the same, but the hours are shorter and the wages are higher in South Australia than they are here. I need not inform the House that a man can live cheaper in South Australia than he can live in this colony.

MR. A. FORREST: They have 30 per cent. too many men here.

MR. VOSPER: Then why not "sack" all surplus hands? I quite agree that it is necessary to employ only those hands who can do full and legitimate work; but I think they should be paid properly. What is the use of getting men to idle about and pay them at a pauper's rate of wage. We do not want to run the Government Printing Office as a charitable institution. As to the holidays in New South Wales, the hands get all the gazetted holidays and two weeks' annual leave on full pay after twelve months service, and sick leave up to two months' on full pay, provided that if such leave extend to one month annual leave shall not be allowed. An extension of leave on half-pay for another month may be granted. In Victoria the staff hands receive all gazetted holidays and three weeks' annual leave on full pay. Supers, after twelve months' employment, receive gazetted holidays. Sick leave, for service of one to four years, one

month full, and one month half; from four to eight years, two months full and two months half; from eight to twelve years, three months full, three months half, and three months a third; twelve years, four months full, four months half, and four months a third.

THE PREMIER: These are permanent hands.

MR. VOSPER: Yes.

THE PREMIER: They get leave here, too.

MR. VOSPER: In Queensland the permanent and supernumerary hands—

THE PREMIER: But you are referring to the temporary hands here.

MR. VOSPER: I am referring to the temporary hands more than the others, but I am saying now that in Queensland the permanent and supernumerary hands receive all gazetted holidays, with two weeks' annual leave on full pay. Sick leave—full pay for two weeks. Reference to be made to Minister for any extension. In South Australia they get all public and gazetted holidays. Permanent hands with two years' service receive two weeks' leave on full pay. In regard to sick leave, if leave has been taken, fourteen days with full pay are granted. If leave has not been taken, twenty-six days are granted. In Western Australia all the gazetted holidays are given to all and sundry; annual leave to staff hands only, and sick leave to staff hands only. The temporary men get no sick leave or permanent leave; whereas in all the other Australian colonies, with the exception of Victoria, where the Government grant leave only to the permanent hands, the temporary compositors get leave. I suppose the answer which is in review was sent to the Colonial Secretary by the Government Printer. It is curious that he should send an answer of that kind to his Ministerial chief, when I find that before the Civil Service Commission which was appointed to inquire into the service in 1894, the Government Printer said:

If the Government decide to increase the rates at which the men should be paid, I will be only too glad. My sympathies are with the men, but at the same time it is my duty to employ men at the wages provided for them. If Parliament provides more pay, no one will be more delighted than I will. The rate of wages must be decided by the Government.

You see there he throws the whole responsibility on the Government, and I suppose the answers which he gives to the Government are made to order. The Civil Service Commission of 1894, in reporting on this question, said :

Finally, in connection with this Department, it is suggested that due consideration be given to the representations made in the course of his examination by Mr. Hornby on behalf of a section of the printers employed in the Department respecting the rates of wages ruling here in comparison with other places. Whilst fully recognising the necessity of economy in every department of the Public Service, we venture to submit that it is not unreasonable that persons employed in any capacity in the service should be at least as well remunerated as those similarly employed in private establishments; and the State should be able to command the services of the most efficient men by offering the inducement of remuneration equal, at any rate, to that obtainable elsewhere in the colony.

That is not the state of things at the present time. Comments have been made occasionally about the length of time taken to get work done at the Government Printing Office, and it is not surprising so long as men are paid at the rate of £2 9s. per week, while outside offices pay £2 15s. per week. Of course, the outside offices must get the best men; whereas the inferior men gravitate to the Government Printing Office. A man who cannot get the full rate outside goes to the Government Printing Office, and inferior pay leads to inferior labour. If the Government want to economise in connection with the Government printing office they should immediately raise the rate of wages. I have no hesitation in saying—the remark I am about to make does not apply to the majority of men—there are some who will hang on to Government billets because it gives them an opportunity of loafing on the State, and in this way the men become pauperised. That being so, if the Government want to save money in connection with this establishment, they should get the best men and pay the best rate of wages. In that way they are certain to get good men, and will recruit their staff from private offices. The Government should save any friction in the future, because the next Parliament will no doubt bring this question up again as it has been raised before. I think this is the third occasion on which

I have made an appeal in regard to this grievance which exists, and as long as it does I shall earnestly bring the matter forward. I earnestly beg the Government to take the matter into consideration now, and do their best to bring about a radical change in the Government Printing Office. I shall simply press this motion to a division, because it is time the House came to a decision on it.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I would ask the hon. member to agree to an adjournment of the debate, in order that I may look into the facts he has put before us. I shall be glad to provide an opportunity to resume the debate at an early date. I move now that the debate be adjourned.

Motion put, and passed on the voices, Mr. Vosper objecting.

Debate adjourned.

PAPERS—RESIDENT MAGISTRATE AT BOULDER.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie) moved :

That all papers and correspondence in connection with the appointment of a resident magistrate at Boulder city be laid on the table.

He had received a letter stating that the matter had been in negotiation for some time, and it was desirable the House should know what had been done.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. W. Pennefather): The suggestion that a resident magistrate should be appointed at Boulder townsite was submitted to the Resident Magistrate at Kalgoorlie, for his report as to whether such appointment was necessary. His opinion was that the time had not arrived at which such appointment ought to be made; that all the magisterial business at Boulder could be carried on by the available magistrates, assisted by the Resident Magistrate at Kalgoorlie. Certain gentlemen in the vicinity were anxious to get this appointment; but of course the applications made by them had to be refused, because the Government could not see their way to make this appointment at the present time.

MR. JAMES (East Perth): It was to be hoped the Government would maintain that position, because it was undesirable to split up magisterial districts and make them small. It did seem

to him that the adjoining districts of Kalgoorlie and Boulder could be satisfactorily worked as one magisterial district, and the Government would thus be better able to pay a good salary to one resident magistrate, rather than pay smaller salaries to two resident magistrates of less ability.

MR. VOSPER (in reply): Certain applications had been sent in to the Government, as he had heard, for appointment to this position; and that being so, it was desirable to know who these persons were who had applied.

THE PREMIER: The applications were made in a conversational way.

MR. VOSPER: Even then it was desirable to know who were the applicants.

Motion put and negatived.

MOTION—FREMANTLE LUNATIC ASYLUM, THE MAD ASSAULT.

MR. VOSPER (North - East Coolgardie) moved:

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the condition and conduct of Fremantle and Whitby Falls Lunatic Asylums. It will be in the recollection of hon. members that a week or so ago I moved the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to the case of one Catherine Clifford, a patient in the Fremantle Lunatic Asylum, who had died under peculiar circumstances. Since that time a number of papers have been laid on the table of the House, relating to the case, and I am not sure as to the extent that the papers have been perused by hon. members. The most important paper among them is a report by Dr. Lovegrove, the Chief Medical Officer, in which he sets forth his view as to the cause of the death of this patient. That view is that Catherine Clifford died, not from any effect of injuries caused by the patient Isles, but that she died from general debility resulting from the mental disease from which she was suffering. I am not going to quarrel with that view, especially as the papers relate that the woman Clifford was seriously scratched on the face by the woman Isles; and I say that if this violence did not precipitate the death of Clifford, it would not do anything towards saving her life. There are many discrepancies in the evidence contained in the papers which would be well worth the attention of

the House, and would doubtless receive justice at the hands of a select committee for which the motion asks. If the select committee took the view that Dr. Lovegrove was right in his report as to the cause of the death of Catherine Clifford, there would be no harm done in having appointed a committee of inquiry; but if the committee came to the conclusion that the evidence was not of a trustworthy character, the inquiry would do good. Dr. Lovegrove's suggestion in his report that two extra nurses should be appointed, and that a tell-tale clock not hitherto provided should be placed so as to show whether the nurses did their duty through the night, will be sufficient indication of the necessity for an inquiry into the general management of the Asylum. The evidence is somewhat conflicting, but I rely to some extent on the evidence as to the condition of the patient Isles. She is described by Dr. O'Meara as being incoherent in her conversation, violent in her conduct, and unable to take care of herself; also her husband had told the doctor that she wanted to throw herself into the blue (meaning the river), and that she believed some one was about to murder her baby. Dr. S. Jool, of Bunbury, from which place she was sent to the Fremantle Asylum, says that while she was under his care as a patient she was incoherent in her conversation and at times violent in her conduct; also that her husband informed him she was so violent in her conduct that she had to be tied down, and would not take food or other nourishment. Such was the character with which the patient Isles was taken into the Asylum, and now we are told by Dr. Lovegrove and other officers of the Asylum that at a later date she had become so weak that she was incapable of committing an assault of a serious nature. If the patient Isles was weak, it will be seen from the evidence in these papers that Catherine Clifford was a great deal weaker, for all the witnesses show that Clifford was scratched about the face, and that she had strength enough to break loose from the linen jacket which had been put on her to restrain her limbs. The fact that she did break loose shows that she had more strength than the doctors gave her credit for.

THE PREMIER: The doctors say the jacket was to restrain her from throwing the clothes off.

MR. VOSPER: Yes; but she must have had a considerable degree of strength to enable her to throw off the jacket. The theory set up by the doctors is —

THE PREMIER: No theory at all; it is what they saw.

MR. VOSPER: Well, what they say is that this woman was in the habit of throwing the clothes off, and they put this jacket on her to prevent her from doing that.

[THE PREMIER interjected a remark.]

MR. VOSPER: This sort of objection is simply senile. Something seems to affect the right hon. gentleman's mentality. This woman appears to have been in the habit of throwing off her clothes; consequently the linen jacket was provided so as to confine her arms, and as long as her arms were confined she could not throw the clothes off; but immediately the jacket was taken off she threw the clothes off. And, in spite of the strength of the jacket, she did get her arms out of it, and she used her fingers in scratching the face of the patient Clifford. So, if there was strength enough to break out of the jacket, there was strength enough to commit the assault. Dr. Lovegrove congratulates himself on the fact that the record of Isles has been faithfully kept from day to day; yet in the papers this record is kept in a most peculiar way. For the year 1900 the only entries are six, as follow:—On March 10, will eat very little, and that only by close supervision. March 12, very noisy at night. April 30, troublesome. June 13, falls about, hurt her wrist; she also "assaults patients, who retaliate." July 17, had an epileptic fit; falls about and hurts herself. August 10, very troublesome. September 20, has not much improved. These are the entries; and this woman died on the 30th September, ten days after the last entry was made. We have no entry from the 20th September to the 30th, when she assaulted Catherine Clifford. It is admitted also that Clifford was covered with bruises, but it is said she suffered from a fall in the yard, being too weak to stand. The scratches on her face are attributed to Isles, and the bruises are attri-

buted to her fall in the yard. If the fall took place, it indicates a lack of supervision; and if Isles had strength enough to escape from the strait jacket, she might have had strength enough to inflict these bruises as well as the scratches. Evidently a violent and dangerous maniac, who only a month before was restrained by having a strait jacket put on her to restrain her from assaulting other patients, was put in a room with a patient who was in a dying condition; and the doctor must have known her to be in that condition. This woman escaped from the strait jacket at a time when the nurses were not in the room, and she appears to have attacked the dying patient and scratched her face, and soon after that the patient Isles died. As the woman has been buried for some time and there is no use in exhuming her, I do not propose to ask for any further inquiry in that direction. I want to caution the House against accepting the specious theories set forth by doctors and officials at the Asylum as to the cause of this woman's death. There seems to be an *esprit de corps* among them which induces them to defend each other; but I think the evidence shows that this woman met her death owing to some neglect in the Asylum. I do not base this motion on that set of circumstances alone. We know assaults are committed in asylums, and that it is almost impossible to prevent their occasional occurrence. I should be the very last indeed to harshly blame anybody connected with an asylum for unwittingly allowing such an event to take place; but it must be obvious to all hon. members who have visited the Fremantle Asylum that a radical reform is necessary. We know that an arrangement was made whereby patients were allowed to go about in the Fremantle Park for the benefit of their health. This practice, it appears, has been stopped because a warder cannot be spared to look after the patients; consequently the health of these unfortunate people is sacrificed to the economical ideas of the Government. I know also, and everyone who has been there will confirm my statement, that the rooms in which the insane are confined, more particularly on the male side of the building, are of the worst description possible. We find on the Estimates various items

of improvements, among which the most important is a sum of £300 for the erection of refractory cells. Now refractory cells are, in the scientific treatment of the insane, things of the past; but padded cells, which I suppose are intended, are very badly needed indeed at Fremantle, because the horrible dungeons in which the refractory patients are now confined would be a disgrace to a seventeenth century bedlam. The visitor goes into the dormitories on either side, and finds that they are large rooms with long narrow windows, having diamond panes of glass covered with dust, which exclude the light, and the light is still further prevented from entering by iron bars outside. The windows look into a yard, which presents the appearance of a veritable abomination of desolation—a more cheerless and hopeless looking place it would be impossible to conceive. The wards themselves are dark, stuffy, and ill-ventilated; and I was recently told by a clergyman that they were positively reeking with urine. Of course, I do not blame the warders for that: they have dirty, filthy imbeciles in these wards, whom it is impossible to keep in a cleanly condition. The ventilation is bad, the lighting is worse, and the whole aspect of the place is as cheerless as it could well be. I am glad to see the Government are spending some money on the Whitby Falls Asylum, and I have no doubt that will relieve the Fremantle institution in some degree; but what I am trying to obtain is the total abolition of the latter establishment. Its retention is not even economical, because the land in itself is too valuable to be used for such a purpose; it could be used for far better objects, and it would be better in every way if the whole of the patients were removed to Whitby Falls, instead of being kept in the Fremantle institution. There is another point. The gentleman in charge of the asylum, the acting medical superintendent, is Dr. Hope. I have nothing at all to say against Dr. Hope. My experience of him has been, on the whole, of a satisfactory character, and I have no word of blame to attach to him in any shape or form. But it is well known that Dr. Hope is as thorough-going a pluralist as any clergyman of the old established church of Ireland could ever be. He holds, perhaps, more offices

than any other man in this colony, unless we include some of the resident magistrates in the small towns in the extreme north, and the duties of several of their offices are merely nominal. Dr. Hope looks after the gaol, the Rottmest establishment, and goodness knows what else. On a former occasion, I believe I mentioned the whole of his offices, and I say it is impossible for any man in his position to give more than a perfunctory attention to so many different establishments. I believe Dr. Hope does his best, and, being a conscientious man, does not shirk any portion of his duties; but I say it is absolutely impossible for him to give to the insane confined in that asylum the attention which the nature of their affliction requires. What is wanted is a new asylum, a new building on an altogether more suitable site, with a first-class scientist in charge of those unfortunate people. The percentage of cures of really serious cases of insanity—without counting the casual drunk, who is discharged as cured in a few days, as soon as sober—is beneath that of any other asylum in the known world. This is a most undesirable state of affairs, because these patients are chargeable to the State, and if the State can cure and discharge them, so much the better for the State. In any case, it is our duty as a people not to make these unfortunate wretches miserable, or to make their position worse than it would be in another asylum, but to do all we can to alleviate their sufferings, to make their lives as happy as possible, to give them some interest in life, although their intellects may be clouded. And so as to see that no unnecessary expense is incurred, and that this House may not work in the dark; so that we may see exactly where changes are required in the management, and what structural alterations are needed; so that we may have expert evidence on the subject; I am moving this motion that a select committee be appointed to inquire into the condition of these asylums. I am not so particular about the Whitby Falls institution, and shall be willing, if desired by the Premier, to withdraw it from the motion; but I think with regard to Fremantle this inquiry is essentially necessary, and I earnestly hope that the Premier will not, for the mere sake of

opposition, oppose my proposal. I do not desire to do any harm by this motion, but to do something towards alleviating the sufferings of the most hopeless and helpless class in the community.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison) : I rise to second the motion. I have spoken upon this question a good many times in this colony, and the time has arrived when the lunatic asylum must be removed from its present site at Fremantle. The building and all its surroundings are hopeless.

THE PREMIER : You said the same thing before.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : Yes ; and I will say it again. It seems to be necessary to keep on saying it until the work is done. As far as cost is concerned, I have no hesitation in saying, if the Government would remove the asylum building and sell the land, they could, with the money thus raised, put up all desirable accommodation on a suitable site elsewhere. I also wish to emphasise a point mentioned by the mover of the motion : the absolute necessity of having a medical man whose whole time shall be devoted to the patients. We may have a receiving office in Perth or Fremantle, but we certainly ought to have one lunatic asylum, and one medical officer at least in charge, whose whole time and attention can be given to this work. I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) : I have no objection to a select committee on this matter, if we can get hon. members to take an interest in the subject. It has not been alleged by anyone that the asylum at Fremantle is altogether what it ought to be ; and after all, the matter of altering the building has, I must confess, been before us for a long time. The reasons for the delay may have been, to some extent perhaps, financial, and there have been other reasons. The change would cost an immense amount of money ; but of course I do not wish to urge that consideration as against the advisableness of making a change, for all will admit the necessity for removing the asylum to the Whitby Falls. I think the hon. member (Mr. Vosper) might have surmised that the Government would not oppose the appointment of this select committee. I

really think the hon. member has not impressed us, and certainly he has not impressed me, with his own suitability to be one of that committee, for he seems to have made up his mind already.

MR. VOSPER : Then you had better leave me out of the committee. You generally manage to keep me off committees, as a rule.

THE PREMIER : And I suppose the reason is because the hon. member takes that line of conduct. That is why. He seems to have some feeling in the matter, and therefore is not particularly well fitted to sit in judgment. I think there is no doubt about that. The hon. member deals a good deal in sensationalism, as we know. I do not wish to say anything in any way offensive to the hon. member ; I wish to be most courteous to him ; at the same time, he must admit that he deals largely in sensationalism both inside the House and outside. That being so, and he having spoken strongly on this matter, and gone into details, and seeming to have come to a decision upon it, no one can say that he is the best person to sit in judgment. That is the reason why I think persons who feel so strongly, and speak so strongly, before matters are investigated, are not the best members to sit on select committees.

MR. VOSPER : I have given no judgment. I have not said a word in condemnation of a single officer.

THE PREMIER : I think you have said a good deal, both on former occasions and on this, and especially with regard to applications to this House for select committees. Those who apply for select committees have to state the grounds on which the request is made, but I think they should not say anything to lead us to believe that they have prejudged the matter in any way. The Government never, or rarely, refuse an investigation ; they have no desire to refuse an investigation into any of the departments ; that is, if people will give the necessary time and attention to investigate, and will not prejudice the matter before the inquiry is made. I have no objection to this select committee.

MR. JAMES (East Perth) : I think the mover was fully justified in bringing this matter before the House, and I am glad indeed the Premier is prepared to

accept the motion. I do not entirely agree with the right hon. gentleman as to the position occupied by the hon. member (Mr. Vosper) who brought this motion before us. We quite realise in theory that every member on a select committee should go there with a perfectly clean mind, as it were. If we had an ideal state, we might pick out members who never heard of the matter before, who knew nothing whatever about the doctors concerned, or of the institutions, and were therefore perfectly clean-minded. But we are human after all, and that ideal state of affairs is one to which we in this House cannot possibly attain. In these matters, all of us have our opinions, not convictions: we may not have definitely made up our minds, but we have an opinion that certain things demand inquiry. I think we all realise, too, that before a member brings up a matter like this a certain amount of inquiry is needed, and he must, to some extent, form a *prima facie* opinion as to whether the matter should or should not be brought under the attention of the House. In making such inquiry a member is bound to form an opinion, to a certain extent, on the question at issue; but I think that a member who goes to the trouble of looking into such matters, hunting up evidence and having at his fingers' ends the relative facts connected with the subject, is the very man who ought to be on the select committee, because he is placed there to bring out all the evidence he can elicit. It is always to be borne in mind that, after all, a committee is appointed simply for the purpose of collecting evidence and reporting to this House. This House is the tribunal which comes to a decision on the question, and the more evidence that can be got, so much the better; and unless we have some man on the committee who takes a personal interest in the matter, I do not think we are likely to have a full inquiry on a question of this sort. On previous occasions I have expressed the opinion that the manner in which the Fremantle Asylum is conducted is a standing disgrace. We cannot hide from ourselves the fact that the building was constructed in the old convict days, according to convict ideas, and according to ideas which have long since been entirely exploded in the mother country.

I know the ideas which prevailed when that asylum was built, in reference to the treatment of lunatics; and such ideas have long since been exploded in England. New systems and new ideas have been brought in; but the very nature of the building itself, which was erected in accordance with those old ideas to which I have referred, seems to have forced the retention of those ideas themselves.

THE PREMIER: We have spent a good deal of money on it.

MR. JAMES: No one doubts for a moment that the Government realise these facts as much as any hon. member in the House, and I know from my personal experience that the Premier realises the gravity of the situation, and that he has been anxious to obtain, for the care and conduct of this asylum, some man fully qualified and with special practical experience, such as we ought to have in that position. Realising that fact, I do not for one moment charge the Premier with being blind to the real gravity of the situation. There are, no doubt, difficulties in connection with the removal, but I do feel that the administration of our lunatic asylums requires a radical alteration. At present we have no man in the Government service who has had any experience in the conduct of lunatic asylums. Our principal medical officer knows nothing about the subject; it is not in his particular line; and so far as that goes, we have no man in the country who has that special knowledge. I think the Premier acknowledges that, and is willing to get an expert if he can obtain one. A select committee will do good in ascertaining the truth of the allegations, and the public mind will be relieved.

MR. SOLOMON (South Fremantle): I was very sorry to hear the hon. member (Mr. James) say the asylum was conducted in a disgraceful manner. I do not think anything of that kind will come out at the inquiry.

MR. JAMES: I am sure we shall hear it is not true.

MR. SOLOMON: I am a constant visitor to the asylum.

MR. JAMES: What do you know about the question? You have never seen another asylum in your life.

MR. SOLOMON: As far as administration is concerned, I do not think greater care could be bestowed on anyone in an asylum than at Fremantle. It is the building that is at fault: the place is not suitable for the classification of patients, and it is necessary in an establishment of this description to have classification; therefore I say that is the foundation of any maladministration if there has been any. The medical officer, Dr. Hope, has had a great deal of experience, notwithstanding what the hon. member (Mr. James) said. He has for a number of years been over, not only asylums but prisons, and therefore he has had a great deal of experience. I think there should be a resident man at the asylum. I feel sure those concerned will only be too glad to have an investigation as to what has been going on there. I do not think there is anything to hide. The institution has been carried on similar to other institutions; but at the same time, not from any want of feeling on the part of those at the head of the administration, but from the fault of the building, the asylum is not all that can be desired.

MR. VOSPER (in reply): I do not know why the Premier should have gone out of his way to state that I was acting with animus in this matter. I think hon. members will bear me out in saying that I was careful in regard to what I said about Dr. Lovegrove, and my idea is based on evidence different from that which that gentleman possessed; but on professional matters I am willing to bow to his special knowledge of the question. As to Dr. Hope, I spoke in eulogistic terms. I did not speak with animus at all, but I am charged with having an animus. This is similar to all the reckless charges which are brought against me by the Premier, who seems to make me a special victim for that class of castigation. I know that whenever my name is proposed as a member of a select committee by members on this side of the House, it is very carefully vetoed by members on the other side, and I have no hesitation in saying that the general interpretation to be placed on that class of action is that the Government do not want to have the inquiries as thorough as I intend to make them. If I am in charge of an inquiry, or if I am

a member of a select committee, I shall see, as far as I can, that the investigation is thorough.

THE PREMIER: You have not had much experience.

MR. VOSPER: I have had some little experience, but I must admit it has been short. As a member of this committee I shall go into the matter impartially. The only strong feeling I have is a feeling of sympathy with the unfortunate persons who are in the asylum, which sympathy I think the right hon. gentleman shares.

MR. EIGHAM (Fremantle): I intend to support the motion, not because I think the administration of the department is bad, but because I think those in charge of the institution have not had proper facilities for doing their work. I believe the present medical officer in charge of the asylum and the other officers have done all they possibly could to look after the inmates of the place under their charge. But in the asylum proper classification cannot be carried out. The asylum is unfit for the purpose for which it is used. It is impossible for either the medical officers or the staff to do their work properly. I think the time has arrived when we should have a proper building for the unfortunates sent there, and we should have a thorough expert in lunacy to control the institution. I hope the select committee will be granted and that we shall soon have a better system than obtains at present.

Question put and passed.

A ballot having been taken, the following members were elected a committee:—Mr. D. Forrest, Mr. Higham, Mr. Locke, Mr. Rason, with Mr. Vosper as mover; to report this day fortnight; also with leave to sit during any adjournment of the House.

RAILWAYS REPORT PRESENTED.

By the COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: Government Railways, annual Report of General Manager.

Ordered to lie on the table.

At 6-30, the SPEAKER left the Chair.

At 7-30, Chair resumed.

TRUCK ACT AMENDMENT BILL. SECOND READING.

MR. KINGSMILL (Pilbarra), in moving the second reading, said: After

a short explanation of the provisions of this Bill, I think no lengthy argument will be needed to commend it to hon. members, nor do I anticipate that this House will offer any opposition to a measure which I think is logically and badly needed. This Bill proposes to amend the principal Act, under which it is possible, and has been the case in many instances on the goldfields and elsewhere, that mining companies and others have been in the habit of deducting from the wages of their employees various sums ranging from a shilling downward per week, which sum was formed into a medical fund. The deduction of this money from the wages was practically compulsory, nor can I hear of any instance where the employees had the control of the administration of the fund. I think this position is absolutely illogical, for it represents a system which I have heard members in this House say has been too much in vogue in this colony, taxation without representation; and it is with the object of removing this bad state of affairs that this short Bill has come down to us from another place. I do not think it will have the effect of doing away with the creation of a medical fund for relieving the distress of those employees of mining companies who fall ill, because it will always be open to the men to do for themselves what is now being done for them by their employers, and I think the men are sufficiently intelligent to know what they want, and to be the arbiters of their own affairs. I do not think any opposition can be offered to the Bill on this score. Again, I would point out that many miners and other wage-earners who are subject to this compulsory deduction from their wages are members of friendly societies, and under the rules of those societies are in the habit of paying in an amount for a similar purpose as that for which their wages are now docked; so paying a double tax for the one advantage received. This Bill has been introduced into another place at the express wish and by the request of numerous labour organisations and friendly societies; and I hope hon. members in this House will not think it wise to take the stand suggested by one hon. member (Mr. Monger), and throw out the Bill because it is introduced by other people. I beg to move

that the Bill be now read a second time.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I have pleasure in supporting the second reading; for however desirable the system which this Bill is intended to check or prevent may have been years ago, I do not think there is much reason for it now. The absence of medical skill was very much felt on the goldfields years ago, and this plan of making the employees contribute to the expense of obtaining a medical man may have been useful. But it has seemed to me that it was not altogether satisfactory even then, because those persons who contributed the money had no voice whatever in the way it was expended. If this money stopped from wages had gone to a fund which was to be administered by a committee of the wage-earners, then perhaps the objection would not have been so great; but that was not the case. The money was stopped from the wages under an agreement entered into when the employees were first taken on, and the men had no voice in its expenditure. I do not believe the hardships have been so great under the system as has been represented. It is not likely they would be. People generally exaggerate, as we know. I think there has been exaggeration in this case, as in others. I believe timber companies are the only body of employers this Bill will affect adversely, as they have not the same opportunity as have people on the goldfields for obtaining medical skill. Still a medical man must be provided in some way, and the end perhaps may be that this House will have to provide medical attendance in some of these cases, because voluntary contributions to obtain something desired by any class of people do not flow in readily. There is always an objection to being directly taxed. We do not mind indirect taxation so much, because we do not realise it; but direct taxation is not very agreeable to anyone. I think the time has arrived when this Bill should pass, and I cannot see how we can do anything else but pass it. The friendly societies have always been strongly opposed to the stoppage of money for medical attendance, because it very much affects their interests; for people who paid directly, by stoppage out of their wages, for medical attendance, were unwilling to join

friendly societies as well; and a good deal of the opposition to this system—I think I may say the greater part of it—has come from the friendly societies. I have never had many representations from the people themselves; the people who paid the money have not made so much to-do about it directly; but the friendly societies, who no doubt represent a great many of the men, have been very loud in their objection to the system. The original Truck Act contains an exception which I think was very good for the purpose for which it was intended.

MR. KINGSMILL: Very good then.

THE PREMIER: I think it would work very well under ordinary conditions, but it does not work well on the gold-fields, where the largest number of wage-earners are living. I think, perhaps, we shall be acting wisely in amending Section 19 of the original Act, as is proposed by this Bill; and if it be found necessary to legislate for another portion of the people in the colony whom the repeal of this particular section will affect, we shall have to legislate as may be necessary in order to meet the particular circumstances.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): I am much pleased to find the Premier intends to support this Bill. The alteration required in Sub-sections 2 and 7 of Section 19 of the original Act are very small; but they affect a large number of workers on the fields. Not only have these men to subscribe large sums of money—because in the case of large mines the total sum subscribed is great—but the men subscribing have no control over the funds thus raised. And another phase of the subject presents itself: the men have no voice in the selection of the doctor for whom they pay. Not only are they compelled to subscribe money for a medical man whom they do not require—because they have medical men engaged by their own friendly societies, whom they are also paying—but they are compelled to subscribe to support a doctor, in whose selection they have no voice. No doubt, in the early days, when there was simply a mine, and no settlement near it, some such provision was necessary, and this was perhaps the best that could be made; but now that we have more settled conditions in the principal mining districts, I think it

well this Bill should pass. Men should be left to subscribe as they choose, and to direct the expenditure of the money by selecting whatever medical man they desire. I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill passed through committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

MOTION—PAYMENT OF MEMBERS, TO LEGISLATE.

Debate resumed from 10th October, on the motion by Mr. Gregory in favour of payment of members and immediate legislation, and on the amendment proposed by Mr. Mitchell to strike out "future Parliaments" and insert "Parliament" in lieu.

MR. MONGER (York): I have been hoping for the last five minutes that the member for East Kimberley (Mr. Connor) would appear in his place, either to support or oppose the amendment now before the House. As it seems the hon. member is not likely to be present this evening, I cannot allow even an amendment which has emanated from the member for the Murchison (Mr. Mitchell) to pass without showing my disapproval. As a rule, I am always only too pleased to support any suggestion emanating from that hon. member's active brain, but on this occasion I think I should be wanting in my duty if I were not to challenge the amendment he has submitted for our consideration. He asks us quietly and calmly to vote for payment of members, and to vote payment for our own services rendered during this session. I am sorry to see the bulk of those hon. members who, at the hustings, were opposed to payment of members, are not here in their proper places this evening to show their disapproval of the amendment. There are members who have been in the House for several years, and who, on every occasion when they addressed their electors, distinctly stated they were opposed to the principle.

MR. MITCHELL: Who are they?

MR. MONGER: They are absent from their seats, and I am sorry they are not here to listen to what I have to say, and

to follow the style of language which I intend to adopt this evening. I am sorry to think so many of them are missing, and I am certainly inclined to the opinion that the pairing must have been arranged on a most liberal scale; because here, when the opportunity is offered us of voting something towards ourselves, these members who have been opposed to the principle for years past, or the bulk of us, the bulk of my friends elected upon the very same platform as myself—that of opposition to payment of members—are, I am sorry to say, found wanting from their places to-night. Whether this arises from the fact that I am speaking against the amendment, and therefore they keep outside, I cannot say: but it seems strange if it be so, for when I saw this order on the Notice Paper I had no intention of being the first speaker on the question. These other hon. members must have held somewhat similar views, and when they found that the member for East Kimberley (Mr. Connor), who moved the adjournment of the debate on the amendment before us, was absent from his place, they might have been here to give expression to the sentiments on which were based the opinions they held when they were returned to this House. I am sorry I have to oppose the amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Mitchell), because nothing gives me greater pleasure than to support any reasonable suggestion coming from him. On this occasion I shall be on the side of the House opposite to him when the division bell rings.

MR. MITCHELL: Then you will be on the wrong side.

MR. MONGER: However, I have very nearly finished with the question; but I wish to have it placed upon the records of *Hansard* that there are, or were, a number of gentlemen returned to seats in this Parliament, who, when distinctly asked this particular question on the hustings, gave out distinctly to their constituents their intention to always oppose payment of members; and I wish it to be known to the people of Western Australia that the bulk of those gentlemen who made opposition to that principle one of the main planks in their platforms, are absent, or are likely to be absent, when this question goes to a division. As far as I am concerned, I intend to oppose the amendment, and if necessary I shall ask

for a division, even if I happen to find myself in a minority of one.

MR. RASON (South Murchison): I wish briefly to explain the vote I have to give on this question. I think the Bill introduced by the Premier, providing for a referendum to the people of the country on this question, is a faithful carrying out of the understanding agreed to by all sides of the House, and which gave satisfaction to everyone in the House at the time the arrangement was entered into. My own position is this. The question of payment of members was made one of the leading questions at the time I was seeking election to the House. I said to my electors I should never do anything of my own accord to introduce payment of members, but if it was introduced I should feel bound to give it my support. Therefore the position I find myself in as to carrying out the distinct pledge I gave to my electors is that I am bound to vote for the amendment of the member for Murchison (Mr. Mitchell). I think also the Bill providing for a referendum to the people of the country is, if I may be allowed to say so, hardly a satisfactory solution of the question, because as far as I am concerned I believe that a vast majority of the people of the country have already spoken their opinion on the subject. I believe a vast majority of the electors are distinctly in favour of payment of members. That may be only a matter of opinion, but as to my own district I have not the slightest doubt on the question. My electors certainly are in favour of payment of members, and have been so for a considerable time past. There is also this difficulty which presents itself to my mind about a referendum taken at a general election. In some cases there may be a walk over; there may be no election at all really, therefore, we should not arrive at the opinion of the electors in that portion of the country where there was no election; also that as long as there is plural voting I do not think we shall have a perfect referendum in any sense of the word, because a referendum to the people should be the people voting once only, whereas under a referendum of the kind suggested it is quite possible for one man to vote, say, thirty times on the question of whether it is desirable to have payment of members or not. For the

reasons I have given I am bound to vote for the amendment of the member for Murchison.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): When this question was before the House some time ago we were all, I think, fairly well satisfied to accept the suggestion which came from the Premier to refer this question to the electors at the next general election. That seemed to me at the time the very best solution we were likely to arrive at. It is not exactly what one would have desired, because the first time I came into the House I was prepared myself to vote in favour of payment. But at the time I refer to there was a feeling amongst those anxious to see the question decided in some form that we could not carry the motion in the way it was before the House, and we were pleased to accept what we could get, at any rate a distinct prospect of obtaining what we desired at a reasonable date. But since that time I confess I have changed my mind on the question of the referendum and largely for the reason that has already been expressed by the member for South Murchison. If there is to be a referendum on the question we want to arrive at the opinion of the people in the colony. At the last election there were 17 seats uncontested—I think I am right in saying that—consequently, if we may have a similar state of things at the next election, there is no reason why there should not be 17 electorates expressing no opinion at all on the question. That did not strike me at the time, in fact it did not strike me until it was expressed in another place by one of the members for the Central Province: I refer to Mr. Drew. This seems to me an almost insurmountable difficulty in referring the question to the people under a referendum. I do not like the referendum principle on minor subjects, but it seemed to me, at the time, a good way of getting the question settled. Another matter which very materially changed my opinion was in connection with the referendum on the Commonwealth Bill. Payment of members is placed distinctly as one of the leading features of the democratic principles of that Bill, so that if we recognise the principle that the greater includes the lesser, the people who accepted the payment of members

principle on the referendum for the Commonwealth Bill can hardly go against the principle of paying their own members in their own Parliament. It seems to me the Commonwealth referendum for all practical purposes settled the question for us; we had no anticipation at the time that the question would have been put in the way it was. Take my own case: I was asked the question in 1894 if I was in favour of payment of members, and I answered "yes"; and at every succeeding election it was only a question, not an issue. When I went through the Murchison district speaking on the Commonwealth Bill—I spoke eight nights in succession—I found at every meeting, large meetings I held; some very large, that as soon as I mentioned the Commonwealth Bill contained the principle of payment of members, that announcement was most heartily cheered in every centre. Consequently I came to the conclusion as far as that district is concerned, the question of payment is entirely in accord with the voice of the people. I noticed also that at the great meetings held at Perth and Fremantle and other places, that as soon as payment of members was mentioned, the announcement was heartily cheered in every place. Therefore I think the referendum on the Commonwealth Bill has, to a large extent, settled the question for us, and that a referendum on the question is now superfluous. Taking that view, there is an absolutely impassable barrier of arriving at the voice of the people in the way suggested—it will be impossible to take a referendum of the whole of the people, and it is not likely that anyone will suggest we shall go to the same extent and trouble as on the Commonwealth Bill; it was intended simply to ask the people when casting their vote for a member whether he was or was not in favour of payment of members. I suggest that a large number of seats will not be contested at the next election, therefore the electors in those places will not have an opportunity of expressing their mind on the question. Believing that under the Federal Bill the people have accepted the principle, and cheered that principle, wherever it was expressed, I conclude the people are in favour of payment. A large majority are in favour of payment of members, and it was because I had made this

change in my view, in consequence of the circumstances to which I have referred, that I was disposed to support the hon. member on a previous occasion when the matter came up for discussion. I think the House ought to decide the question by vote, and at the next election the people should clearly know whether members are going to be paid or not. One principle involved in payment of members is that the people should have the fullest opportunity of obtaining as a representative anyone they desire, and that the mere fact that a man is poor should not exclude him from the halls of legislation. And because of that it is the more desirable that the people at the next election should know distinctly whether the principle is to be carried out in the next Parliament or not. They may desire to send a certain man, say A B, to Parliament, and they may go to him and say: "We wish you to be our representative." A B may not be in a position to go into Parliament unless he is paid; and because it is uncertain whether he is to be paid or not, that electorate is to be excluded for the time being from the choice of A B as their representative; whereas if we decide the question for the next Parliament, I think we shall be setting the question at rest, and placing the electors in a proper position. If we admit the principle that every adult should vote, as a sequence every adult has a right to vote and sit in the House, and there should be no barrier against him. With the amendment itself I am not in harmony. I said when the question came up before, that Parliament was elected with the distinct understanding that the members were not to be paid.

MR. GREGORY: Not at all.

MR. HUTCHINSON: No.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I am only saying that is what I said, and members therefore cannot say "no" to that, because it is in *Hansard*. Since that time I admit a number of elections have taken place for another place, and some for this place. The hon. member (Mr. Hutchinson) interjected that he was returned on a distinct understanding in favour of payment of members, and Mr. Hassell, the member for Albany, also declared that he would support the measure. Therefore it may be argued, and properly argued, that if the people

are in favour of payment of members at any time they are in favour of payment of members now, and this Parliament has just as much right to be paid as any future Parliament. That is a good argument, I admit. Speaking from my own view of the question, I say the members here who were elected in 1896 were elected with the knowledge that the Parliament was not to be paid.

MR. GREGORY: There was a majority of the House in the first session in favour of payment of members.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: There was a majority, as the hon. member says, who approved of the principle, but we deferred the question of actual payment on the ground that it should be referred to the people at the next general election by taking a referendum on the question. That is how the matter stood until the question was raised this session. There does not seem to be a very great difficulty—personally I express my own feeling—I cannot see my way clear to vote to pay myself or to pay members of this Parliament at present. I see a way, however, distinctly to vote and support the motion of the member for North Coolgardie (Mr. Gregory) to establish the principle and settle the question that future Parliaments should be paid, also to fix the character of that payment. In order to do that we must pass a Bill to come into operation for the next Parliament. That is how it looks to me. If the House chooses to support the amendment now before hon. members, I must admit there is no very serious principle involved, because, as I have said, if the country is in favour—and I believe it is—of payment of members at any time, it ought to be in favour of payment of the present House. Personally I cannot see my way to support that view, because as a matter of fact in a few weeks we shall be terminating our labours, and we have done for the last four years without payment. There has been no desire to pay ourselves, yet there has always been a large majority in favour of the principle. This question ought to be settled now by the House. On the Notice Paper the Premier has a Bill for a referendum on this question, but I hope to see the Government abandon that proposal. Let us have a Bill brought in settling the question that

Parliament shall be paid, and fixing the rate of payment, so that people will know at the next election just where we are. That is the view I take, consequently I am supporting the member for North Coolgardie in the motion before the Chair.

MR. QUINLAN (Toodyay) : I rise to support the amendment of the member for the Murchison (Mr. Mitchell).

MR. HUTCHINSON : You are as good a man as any one who may be elected in the next Parliament.

MR. QUINLAN : If it is good for a future Parliament, it is equally good for this Parliament; but while I probably would not accept payment myself, still I believe in the principle of some provision being made for members. More especially am I convinced of that by the division which took place before tea this evening, when a very important matter was before the House and which may involve the country in a sum of £70,000 or £80,000. Hon. members were not here to protect the taxpayers and their own pockets; to vote as I think they should have voted, to save us from that taxation. I am a most regular attendant in this House, probably next to the hon. member opposite (Mr. Illingworth) and the members of the Government; at any rate I am very regular; and it does not suit my taste to see members so lax in attendance. Therefore I think if there were payment, members would be here more regularly. They would be here to vote and to save the country in cases similar to that which occurred this evening, and to which I have referred. I do not believe in a fixed salary by any means, but in compensation, because I believe there are members in the House to-day from very distant parts, who I consider attend to their duties very regularly. It must be very costly for them to attend, therefore I think they are entitled to payment for their attendance. The necessity for the Bill exists in the fact that we should know what is going to be paid. Whatever the Bill may be I am in favour of some provision being made, because I believe we shall get good legislation. When I was the member for West Perth some years ago, I was opposed to payment of members, because I believed it would be the means of returning members who would act not in the best

interests of the country, but who would study their pockets in so far as payment was concerned. I am satisfied that democracy has gone so far that there is no fear whatever of payment extending democratic legislation beyond the views which have been expressed in this House. There is no doubt payment will be a costly item to the House, as well as the matter which was dealt with before tea. I have been informed, and I hope it will be a guide for this House in the future, that in Victoria, when the Assembly or the Parliament of that colony was in favour of retrenchment to a very extensive degree, the proposal made to reduce members' salaries was not agreed to. The member for Central Murchison may put me right if I am wrong.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : They did, and they reduced their salaries to £240.

MR. QUINLAN : I am told on one occasion that a proposal was made in the House to reduce salaries in view of the retrenchment and the cost to the country, but members would not agree to it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : They did so, but returned to the £300 afterwards.

MR. QUINLAN : I am glad to hear it. According to my informant members of Parliament in Victoria did not do what they thought should be done with regard to the civil servants of the country in the matter of retrenchment. However, I am glad to hear the statement contradicted.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : There may have been such a vote, but eventually the salaries were reduced.

MR. QUINLAN : I was informed that it was not so, and that was one of the reasons why I held the view that payment of members was not good for any country. I am convinced from a long experience now that it is desirable that some provision should be made that would be the means of forcing members to attend more regularly to their duty. We should not then have a recurrence of what took place to-day. I intend to vote for the amendment.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) : This matter has been before the Assembly on several occasions, and we have heard all the arguments to-night for payment of members, but have not heard so many in favour of members not being paid. We have heard the member for Central Murchison tell us again that

payment of members will allow the electors of the colony to send into Parliament representatives they particularly desire; but, on the other hand, we know there are many persons who are more anxious to represent the people of the colony than the people of the colony are anxious for those persons to represent them. It is not a fact that people are running about all over the place trying to induce some suitable person to represent them in Parliament. The fact is the other way, that many ambitious persons who think they can serve the country in Parliament, are trying in all directions to win the favour of electors; and notwithstanding our attendance here as representatives is such a great burden to us and a terrible expense, and altogether is surrounded with difficulty in the performance of our duties, still we know we are all anxious to be members of Parliament. We also know that when there is a vacancy there are many persons anxious to be elected, even under a system in which members are not paid; and the reason for this general desire is not far to seek. The reason why so many persons desire to be members of Parliament is that it is a high and noble position which lifts them above their fellows; and human nature, which has always been the same, likes and desires to be lifted up and to occupy prominent places in the community. The reason why payment of members is popular with the masses of the people is because it gives a better opportunity for themselves to become members of Parliament. Where there is no payment, the position of legislators is reserved for those who have made something for themselves or have inherited something, and are able to bear the expense attached to the position. We know that persons working for daily wages cannot afford to leave their homes and families, and come here as representatives of the people in Parliament, however much those persons may desire to do so. It is curious to hear the arguments of some hon. members, especially those of the member for Central Murchison, for he seems to think we are not a dying Parliament now, as he told us we were at the beginning of the session, but that we are full of life and vigour, at any rate on this question, because we are competent to deal with an important measure as to whether this

Parliament, or it may be the next one, shall be paid. There is no doubt that when the present Parliament was elected there was a majority of this House in favour of the principle, but there was also a strong expression of opinion at the time that only the principle should be insisted on, and that it would not be desirable to bring payment of members into operation at that time. Well, the Government took no action in regard to that resolution, which was carried by 20 to 11 in a division taken on the 20th November, 1897. That matter was brought up again last year, and we all know that a resolution was passed that the matter should be referred to the people at the next general election, by a referendum, and that proposal met with a chorus of approval all round the House. I believe there is a majority of people in the colony who are desirous of payment of members; but, for all that, it appears to me that however much I believed it at the time, and I shall be glad if this is the opinion of the House now, that however much we think that the people desire payment of members, we should at any rate give them the opportunity of saying so. We may feel sure now that the people are in favour of the principle; but we will not be going far wrong, notwithstanding that belief, in asking them to signify their opinion in some definite way. As far as the Government are concerned, the resolution which was passed last session unanimously, without a division and with a chorus of approval, the Government are bound to carry out; because not only was it proposed from this Treasury bench, but it was carried by the House unanimously; therefore we will be altogether wanting in our duty if we do not carry out that pledge. I think we have some cause for complaint—I have some personally—against hon. members opposite, and perhaps against hon. members generally who are in favour of payment at once, in that they made no excuse or scarcely any—and I think the member for Central Murchison was the only one who has made any excuse—for going away from the compact arrived at last session. There has been no explanation. The member for North Coolgardie (Mr. Gregory), when introducing the motion, made a speech which would have sounded quite

as well if the matter were being introduced for the first time, for he made very little reference to the compact arrived at last year.

MR. GREGORY: I drew special attention to that.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member did not quote from it, and did not refer to the chorus of opinion and the congratulations which were given to the Government last year on the settlement which the House then adopted. That congratulation was expressed not once but several times; but now, without any warning, the mover has started afresh as if nothing had happened. I may say I am convinced that both this House and the other branch of the Legislature are at the present time largely in favour of payment of members; and as far as I am personally concerned—I think I may speak also for my colleagues, although perhaps they will speak for themselves—we have no desire to thwart the wishes of this House in regard to a matter of this sort. I may point out, however, that it is a big principle we are adopting, at the end of a Parliament; that it is a principle which has been a vital one in every part of Australia, and has not been carried in a thin House and with very little debate, as seems to be what is intended here. It is really a big principle; although I know very well that history and precedent are in favour of payment of members, because in most Legislatures of the world payment is made, the only great example to the contrary being the Parliament of the mother country, the great Parliament at Westminster. We must remember, too, we shall be putting a great financial burden on the people of the colony.

MR. GREGORY: They are very willing to bear it.

THE PREMIER: Yes; they are very willing, but you are not going to ask them in such a way as to bring the burden home to them. You are not going to explain to them that the adoption of the principle means £16,000 a year added to the expenditure of the colony; and you do not explain to them that this £16,000 would pay interest on half a million of money which might be expended usefully on public works.

MR. GREGORY: Another Parliament might save that.

THE PREMIER: This £16,000 would pay interest on a loan of half a million of money, and that is a large matter. The hon. member talks about the next Parliament saving. Possibly some great geniuses will arise in the next Parliament, who will be so able and so clever that they will save anything and everything.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You do not think so.

THE PREMIER: No; I do not think so. I think this is as good a Parliament as you will have next time, perhaps better, notwithstanding the great boast of an extended franchise. If anyone tells me you are going to get a more intelligent Parliament, and one more desirous of doing its duty, or that the next general election will give us a Parliament more desirous of expending the revenues of the country to the greatest advantage, I do not believe it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It will be more representative of the people, at any rate.

THE PREMIER: That may be; but if, as the hon. member says, half the members are to be returned without opposition to the next Parliament, I do not see how it will be more representative of the people. I am quite convinced that in this House and also in another place, as we know by a division taken there, the majority are in favour of members being paid. Whether they shall be paid now or in the next Parliament seems to be a question in which there is no practical difference; for if we have the right to vote payment for other members, I cannot see why this same right should be denied in regard to voting payment to the present members. It will be a little nicer, perhaps, if you vote money for someone else and not for yourselves; but if the people of the country are so anxious to distribute £16,000 among the members of Parliament, if they are longing to see this money going into the pockets of members of Parliament—for that is what the member for North Coolgardie will tell us, that the people are longing to pitchfork £16,000 a year into the pockets of members of Parliament—then I say there will be very little harm in pitchforking the money into the pockets of the present members. I do not think the people of the country are so anxious to do it, and the least we can do for them is to ask their leave

before we vote the money. I do not believe there is any instance on record, though I do not speak with authority on the point—scarcely any instance where a Parliament has paid itself.

MR. HUTCHINSON: New South Wales did.

THE PREMIER: My friend from Geraldton seems to be on safe ground, for he has come here for the express purpose of paying himself. His constituents want to see him paid; and if so, why do they not pay him themselves? No; they won't do that; those constituents who are so eager to pitchfork this money into the pockets of members of Parliament will not pay it out of their own pockets. Let the hon. member ask the people of Geraldton to contribute £200 or £300 a year to enable him to come here and represent them: then we know how much he will get; but so long as the people can pay the money out of the public purse, which they think is so big and full of gold, then it is all right.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Victoria passed it for the succeeding session, not for the current session.

MR. GREGORY: No; the Act was to take effect immediately on the ending of the then current session.

THE PREMIER: Probably that would not be the last session of the Parliament, otherwise the Act would have said the "next Parliament." I think we shall be acting more wisely if we take the course which was proposed and approved last year, which would have been an easy one; and as to the objections raised by the member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth) about persons voting more than once on the question in the referendum, that could be put in the Enabling Bill by providing that no one should vote on the question more than once. If we had followed out that course, we should have stood on firmer ground and been acting more in the interests of the people of the colony; and I think we should not pass a Bill like this, until a clear and full expression of the views of the people, the taxpayers of the colony, has been unmistakably given.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (in explanation): By permission of the House, I would like to explain, in reply to the remarks of the member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan), that the Act passed in Victoria

in 1895, providing for a reduction in the amount payable to members, stated expressly that the particular section should be read and construed as if for the words "three hundred" there were substituted the words "two hundred and forty"; the effect of that being to reduce the amount payable from £300 to £240 per year, from the commencement of the Act until the end of the present Parliament and no longer. I may add that the Parliament of Victoria has now reinstated the £300 a year.

MR. GREGORY (in reply): The Premier has stated that he could not believe any better Parliament could be elected. I quite agree, because it would be hard to see that a better Parliament could be elected than the one that has supported the present Premier in the manner this Parliament has done. It has also been said it would be impossible for any Parliament to have voted for itself any reimbursement; but in reply to that I point to the Victorian Act of 1886, which contains the words "this Act shall take effect on the ending of the present session of Parliament."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I think they came in on that cry.

MR. GREGORY: Many members came here in 1897, determined to be paid. I was in favour of payment of members, but when I sounded other members I found it was impossible to get a motion carried at that time to the effect that we should be paid; so we got a motion passed affirming the principle. Then we went a little further. We tried to get another motion carried, but again we had to consider the temper of the House; and when we were promised a referendum on this question we thought we had gained two objects: we were satisfied that the country would speak in its favour, and we thought we should gain a referendum on a big question. But now, immediately before the general election, I saw an opportunity of having this motion carried, so that members might go before their constituents after having voted here in favour of payment of members. But some of those hon. members who had expressed themselves in favour of the principle either kept out of the road, or voted against this question on previous occasions, and I perceived that in the last session it would be necessary for them to

take some decided stand. Now we find that unless we allow the present Parliament to be paid it is impossible to get my original motion carried, and I accept the amendment before us with great pleasure, because I have no false hypocrisy about me. My constituents consider I should be paid; I was elected on that understanding; and I think, had we, three or four years ago, passed a resolution affirming the necessity for immediate payment, we could have got an Act passed, and might have been receiving our salaries all along, no objection whatever being made by the country, in fact, some hon. members are in favour of passing a Bill for the payment of three or four years' arrears of salaries. The member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth) seemed to think it would be indecent for us to pay ourselves. I cannot see why. I think members should state distinctly whether they are or are not to be paid for their services. I think every member of Parliament should be paid, and I do not like the hypocrisy of certain members of this House. We have the Premier himself drawing his £1,200 a year, and yet, when he was serving his country as a delegate at the Federal Convention, did he put his £2 2s. a day back in the Treasury, or retain it for his own use? I consider that hypocrisy. This House voted £2 2s. a day to each delegate, representing a very large sum in the aggregate; and yet those delegates accepted the money. Why should not members of this House accept payment? I am sure the country does not know how members of this House are treated. A little while ago I was elected a member of a select committee. We sat on Fridays, from 4 till 10 o'clock, on a Saturday from 2 till 11 p.m., and again on Monday. We sat whenever the House was not sitting; we sat for very long hours for some 14 or 15 nights; and we had to work exceedingly hard. Outside people think we are paid for such services. I know that our "chit" bills were a great deal higher than usual; and that was all the satisfaction we had out of it. We had to do a great deal of work, and in no shape or form did we receive any payment. It is the same with telegrams. We have to a large extent to look after the correspondence of our constituents; we have to wire them in regard to public works; and

this expense we have to pay for out of our own pockets. I think it is about time hon. members stood up for themselves and said that they must be paid. The Premier has stated that all he can say is payment of members may attract a large number of candidates, and that the candidates are always sufficiently numerous; but is it a fair thing to see our country districts unrepresented except by residents of Perth? Why should not those districts have the same chance of sending in local members as have the city constituencies? The whole of the representation should not be in the Perth and Fremantle people; and there is too great a proportion of metropolitan people in the House at the present time. I say the country districts should have the power to send local men here, and should have the least restricted choice it is possible to give them; and the only way in which we can give the electors a free choice is to allow them to elect any person whom they like. By providing payment of members we give the constituencies a right to elect whom they choose, and if we look at those countries where payment of members obtains, we shall find, in nearly every instance, that the constituencies are to be fully trusted. I have seen no deterioration in the *personnel* of members of Parliament after the introduction of payment of members in the sister colonies, nor have I learned of any scandals arising amongst paid members, especially amongst members who desired payment. The scandals in Melbourne during the land boom did not arise amongst the labour men, or other parliamentarians who advocated payment of members, but amongst those who were supposed to lead society, and to show an example to the public; amongst those who, both on the hustings and in the House, had said they did not care for payment, because it would lead to deterioration in the people's representatives. This House has spoken, and spoken strongly in 1897, when by a majority of nine votes—20 to 11—we decided that members should be paid; and I consider that any referendum would be incomplete; and, moreover, we desire to see this matter settled now, so that every candidate who comes forward at the ensuing general election may know exactly whether he is or is not to

receive payment. How can labour candidates be expected to come forward unless they are assured that, if elected, they will be paid? Some may be elected with the idea that the next Parliament will carry a Bill for their payment; but the same objection may arise again. Some hon. members of the next Parliament may say: "Oh, it would be indecent for us to pay ourselves"; and the thing may be postponed for three or four years. That is what the Premier wants. He knows that is the way to keep together his big majority. Of course, we cannot but admire the manner in which the Premier has beaten us on this question time after time. I know that a large number of Government supporters favour the principle, though they do not care to say so. They see the growth of public opinion on this question, and, moreover, perceive that, on our joining the Commonwealth by such a large majority on the referendum, we became part of federated Australia, and that one of the principles of the Commonwealth Act is that every member of the Federal Parliament shall be paid a salary of £400 per annum. I say the feeling of the people is shown by that instance alone, without any other referendum. Then we have also the late bye-elections. The member for Geraldton (Mr. Hutchinson), the member for Albany (Mr. J. F. T. Hassell), the member for North Murchison (Mr. Moorhead), and even the Commissioner of Railways (Mr. Wood), all these members, at their recent elections, said they were in favour of payment of members. And, further than that, we have had recent elections for members of the Upper House, and a vote recently carried in that Chamber. All these circumstances show a distinct feeling in the country that members should be paid. The Premier has asked in one breath: Are we going to make seats secure for other members? and in the next breath he says we desire to make snug seats for ourselves. I do not think that fair. And if we cannot secure payment for the next Parliament without securing payment for this one, I say we should do both; and for my part there shall be no hypocrisy. There is one consideration that has been omitted by most speakers, namely, the rate of payment. I favour a salary of £250 a year. During

the late elections I say the country has spoken, and spoken unmistakably; so I think there should be no objection to the present House allowing this motion to go through, and we can discuss the question fully when the Bill is brought down.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. H. B. Lefroy): The views of hon. members and of the country generally, with regard to this question of payment of members, have, during the last few years, changed considerably. I know as a fact that four years ago, when this question was before us in 1896, there was a very large majority against the principle. We then had a general election; a new Parliament came in, and a motion was brought before us again, asking us to affirm the principle; and I notice the principle was affirmed on that occasion by a majority of two to one, or very nearly so. [MR. GREGORY: Twenty to eleven.] When I first came into Parliament, and I think for many years past, hon. members attended to their duties very much better than they do now. The House was generally full; our division lists generally contained the names of a very large majority of the members of the House. But there seems to be something wanting now; there seems to be some power or stimulant required to bring hon. members up to the point, to bring them here to vote on all occasions when divisions take place. I believe it quite possible that if members be paid in this House, a great difference may result: payment may make them feel more responsible, and that they should do something to earn their salaries. Hon. members are fully aware that I am not in favour of payment of members as long as we can get the best men in the country to come forward without payment; and I think for many years we were able to get the best men to represent the different constituencies, and they had to do it gratuitously; but there seems to have been a great change of opinion in the country, and there is not the slightest doubt a very large majority of our colonists are now in favour of members of Parliament being paid. Moreover, the Federal Constitution, under which we shall all have to live, has affirmed the principle, and it seems to me rather an anomaly that members attending the Federal Parliament as representatives of

Western Australia will be paid, and that members of the State Parliament, perhaps doing more work, will receive no remuneration. In these circumstances I am not at present prepared to oppose the introduction of a Bill for payment of members of future Parliaments. A Bill embodying the principle of this motion would not be opposed by me at present, because I think we have now come to the end of a Parliament; we shall not be voting salaries for ourselves, and it will be for the electors at the general election to say whether they approve of that Bill or not. The electors can then say whether they favour payment of members; they can if they choose return a majority of members opposed to the principle; and as soon as such members meet in this House, they can repeal the Act passed this session. If the principle is to be affirmed, it would be well that at the next general election candidates presenting themselves should know exactly the position in which they will be placed if successful. I think the time has arrived when everyone should have the opportunity of obtaining a seat in this House, and that there are many people in this colony who do not exactly belong to what is usually called the working class, who would be suitable candidates for this House. Of course, it is said payment of members is introduced simply to enable representatives of the workers in this colony to obtain seats in Parliament. Well, we are all representatives of the working people. I think we are pretty well all workers in Western Australia; in fact, we have to be workers in a new colony such as this; consequently there are many persons who, though not accustomed to manual labour, may at the same time be persons of wide knowledge and considerable education, but without the means requisite to take a seat in this House, because they are unable to leave their business unless they get some remuneration. I think it will meet the cases of both the real manual worker, and of many of those persons who, perhaps, have the necessary knowledge and education to enter Parliament, and be a credit to their country and to their constituents. In these circumstances, as there is throughout the colony such an unanimity regarding this matter, I think

the time has arrived when no opposition should be given by myself to a measure such as is proposed in this motion.

MR. MONGER: Shall I be in order in moving further amendments?

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot speak again now.

MR. MONGER: I was only asking if I should be in order.

THE SPEAKER: No.

Amendment (Mr. Mitchell's, applying the principle of payment to present Parliament) put, and passed on the voices.

Motion (Mr. Gregory's) as amended put, and a division called for.

MR. VOSPER: I think there was only one voice.

THE SPEAKER: I cannot tell whether there was one or more.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Only one voice.

MR. MONGER: The division bell has started to ring. I do not think you can stop the division.

THE SPEAKER: Of course, if on one side of the House there be only one member calling for a division, there cannot be a division.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	19
Noes	5

Majority for ... 14

AYES.
Mr. Ewing
Mr. D. Forrest
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hall
Mr. Harper
Mr. Holmes
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. James
Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Moran
Mr. Oats
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Solomon
Mr. Vosper
Mr. Wallace
Mr. Wood
Mr. Rason (Teller).

NOES.
Sir John Forrest
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Pennefather
Mr. Phillips
Mr. Monger (Teller).

Question thus passed.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I would like to state to the House that the vote shows unmistakably what the feeling of hon. members is in regard to this question; and although I wished the matter deferred to next session, I shall at once prepare a Bill and introduce it for the consideration of hon. members.

ADMINISTRATION (PROBATE) BILL.
SECOND READING.

MR. JAMES (East Perth) in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to consolidate the law relating to probate and administration. It is very largely based on the Act which was passed in New South Wales last year, or the year before. The only provision in the Bill that is new is Clause 14. That makes an alteration which is entirely new, and which perhaps it would be wiser not to adopt at the present time. Therefore I propose when in Committee to move that it be amended. Clause 14 as drawn provides that in cases of intestacy, where the net value of an estate is only £500, and if there be a widow, the whole of that £500 shall go to the widow. That is a wise provision for a small estate which it is inadvisable should be cut up and divided. Sub-clause b. provides that in cases of intestacy, where the estate exceeds £500 the widow shall be entitled to £500 and half the residue. As the law now stands, she is only entitled to one-third, and perhaps it would be advisable to keep to the existing law. Beyond that alteration the Bill is a purely technical one, providing the terms and conditions under which estates shall be administered, and containing provisions which are usually to be found in Bills of this nature. Part 1 deals with ordinary administrations of probates and administration; part 2 with foreign probates and administration; and part 3 with the Curator of Intestate Estates. That part somewhat extends the powers of the curator to obtain administration under conditions which he cannot do now. At present he deals with estates which are unprotected, but under this Bill he deals with other estates where he is requested to do so by the executor or administrator of those entitled to probate or administration. I propose in Committee to endeavour to add a clause to entitle the curator in some estates to obtain probate and administration at a nominal fee. It is suggested in small estates, where the widow or the person claiming under the will has a right to do that work, that they may call on the court officials to do it. At present it is competent for a person to take out probate themselves in small estates, but it is thought that the administration of those

estates should go through the hands of the curator to protect the parties concerned. The second schedule is somewhat new and affects the Curator of Intestate Estates, that is the Government, and deals with the amount to be allowed as commission where the curator has dealt with an estate. He is entitled to get certain commission not exceeding the amount mentioned in the second schedule. As at present, the amount is five per cent., but here, following the Victorian Act, I think that in cases of large estates the amount should go to the extent of ten per cent. The five per cent. mentioned covers all estates up to £20,000. I do not think ever an estate has been dealt with by the curator here where the amount has reached more than £2,000; but even if the curator takes up the management of estates exceeding £20,000, there should be an increased percentage in consequence of the increased responsibility, taken by the Government, through the curator. We have taken the rules that are under the Act in force in New South Wales, and inserted them because we have no rules at present in this colony. The rules we have are under the old English law, some of which are not applicable to this colony. By rule 59 on page 28, a scale of costs is provided, which, roughly speaking, represents the costs now charged in obtaining grants of probates and letters of administration.

		Guineas.
Where the net value of the estate does not exceed £500	...	8
Over £500 but not exceeding £1,000	...	12
" £1,000 but not exceeding £2,000	...	15
" £2,000 but not exceeding £5,000	...	20
" £5,000 but not exceeding £10,000	...	30
" £10,000	...	40

I think we may put in a smaller sum than that, and say that in the event of the value not exceeding £300, three guineas should be charged. I think beyond these matters the Bill is purely a consolidating measure, and I commend it to the attention of the House.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. R. W. Pennefather): This Bill, as the hon. member has mentioned, is a consolidation of the statute law at present, which is scattered over half a dozen Acts of Parliament. Certainly, it is advantageous that all the laws on the subject should be included in the four corners of one Act. I may say the hon. member has

devoted a great deal of time in the preparation of this Bill, and as far as I can see he has done his work admirably and well. The rules will be a great relief to practitioners, and also to the courts, because instead of having to refer to the English practice to find how much is applicable, the rules have been arranged in convenient form and attached to the statute itself. The hon. member has drawn attention to the new provisions which he has introduced into the existing legislation, and one or two of them are worthy of consideration. Therefore, I commend the Bill to members of the House. But I would like the hon. member to defer the consideration in Committee to some future date, so that I may bestow some consideration on the new clause.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

CONSPIRACY AND PROTECTION OF WORKMEN AND PROPERTY BILL.

SECOND READING.

MR. EWING (Swan), in moving the second reading, said: I do not think it will be necessary for me to say very much on this Bill. Doubts have arisen as to whether the old statutes in force long ago in the old country with regard to combinations of workmen are in force in this country, and those statutes provide for serious consequences for certain offences under them. The law of England has undergone a considerable amount of change, the result being that we have the law of England as it existed a considerable time ago, without the advantage of any of the amendments that the Parliament of the old country has seen fit to graft on its legislation. In order that a person may belong to a trades union or an organisation of that kind, and that he may know the responsibilities he incurs, I am submitting the Bill for the consideration of the House. The Bill provides, amongst other things, that a man will not be liable to be punished merely by reason of the fact that he belongs to a trade organisation such as a trades union, and he will not be punished merely because such an organisation, according to the law, is deemed a restraint of trade. There is also a provision that with regard to water supply and gas—and I think it might be well in Committee to

add electric light—employees are not allowed to leave their work without giving seven days' notice. The object of that is manifest, because the community depends to a great degree on water and light. Therefore this Bill will prevent employees from depriving the community, except on reasonable notice, by means of a strike, of the supply of water and light for cities and the country generally. There is a clause dealing with persons giving up employment. A man giving up employment may cause danger to life or property, and I have provided in the Bill where the consequences involve danger to life or property a workman shall not be entitled to leave his work except on seven days' notice. Then the next clause makes trades unions lawful. There is a further clause which provides that a master must supply for his apprentices and servants the necessary clothing, etc., in accordance with his contract, otherwise he is liable to a penalty and punishment. A further clause deals with offences by persons who form an organisation of any kind, and this is an important portion of the Bill. It provides here that no person shall use violence to, or threaten with violence, such other person, or his wife or children, or injure his property, real or personal; or hide any tools, clothes, or other property owned or used by such other person, or deprive him of, or hinder him in the use thereof; or follow such other person, with two or more other persons, in a disorderly manner in or through any street or road. These provisions are substituted for the old law, and are closely in accord with the existing law as it is in England. A further provision of the Bill deals with appeal, and there is one other clause which seems to be of importance. In the event of a trade dispute no person who is master, owner, or part owner, or manager in a similar trade or occupation as that in which the trade dispute arises shall be allowed to sit either as a juror on the trial of any offence arising out of that dispute or as a magistrate in the hearing of such a case. I submit the Bill to the consideration of the House with every confidence. Practically it is the law of England to-day, and I ask leave to substitute it for that which was the law of England many years ago, and which the legislators in the old country have seen

fit to substitute for provisions similar to those in the Bill I now submit to the House.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. W. Pennefather): Much of the legislation contained in the Bill is, as the hon. member has informed the House, the law in the mother country; but I observe one or two clauses in which I think there are modifications of the existing law in the old country. There is a sub-section following those taken from the original Act which also specifies what the offence of a person is, namely for annoying or causing any intimidation to any person when there is a trade dispute on; and I think in Committee it would be wise to insert that clause here.

Watches or besets the house or other place where such other person resides, or works, or carried on business, or happens to be, or the approach to such house or place.

The object of that is to prevent persons being constantly shadowed by any person with whom there is a trade dispute existing. That undoubtedly might lead to a breach of the peace. I think in Committee, if the hon. member will take my suggestion, that would be a very salutary provision to insert, so as to make it exactly in accord with the English Act. I notice the clauses of the Bill do not contain marginal notes showing the references to the English Act. Perhaps that is an error. Clause 5 deals with trades unions, making them lawful here. That is absolutely necessary because we have no statute law here at present on the subject. But Clause 13 is one which is open to debate. That is an original clause, as stated by the hon. member, preventing a person who is engaged in a similar trade or occupation to that of the person engaged in a dispute adjudicating in court. That is a very wide disqualification to enact, and it may be open to doubt whether it should be allowed or not. I can quite understand there is very good reason for the inclusion of such a clause, because when there is a trade dispute people are heated, and it is absolutely necessary that nothing should be done on one side or another, but that persons engaged in the same trade should abstain from taking one side or the other. As to whether I recommend hon. members to accept the clause I have not made

up my mind, but on consideration I shall have no doubt about it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

DIVIDEND DUTY, PETITION FOR REPEAL.

Debate (resumption) on the motion by Mr. Wilson, "that the prayer of the petition be granted" (petition of commercial companies).

Question put without further debate, and negatived.

SLANDER OF WOMEN BILL.

SECOND READING.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison), in moving that the Bill be read a second time, said: This is a small Bill which comes to us from the Legislative Council. There is nothing in it that requires consideration, for the measure is simply to correct an error in the existing law.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. W. Pennefather): I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill, and it is a pity this amendment of the law was not made long before. The provision exists in most countries, and it is most desirable in the interests of women that it should be passed in this colony.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

COMPENSATION FOR ACCIDENTS BILL. SECOND READING.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison), in moving the second reading, said: This is a Bill which has come down to us from the Legislative Council, and the object is to remedy a defect in the existing law. When an accident takes place whereby a person is injured, the person or persons who may apply for compensation are required to do so within six months after the accident. It happens that in case of the death of the injured person, the executor may neglect to make the necessary application within the six months; and this Bill is intended to enable the legatees of the deceased, in the event of the executor failing to make

the necessary application within the time, to make it in their own interest. This is a necessary amendment of a defect in the existing Act.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Money paid into Court may be paid in one sum, without regard to its division into shares; if not accepted, defendant entitled to verdict on the issue:

THE PREMIER: Was it intended by the Bill that while only six months should be allowed to an executor, other persons were to be allowed to bring an action at any time without limit?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The statute, known as Lord Campbell's Act, would come in, limiting the period to six months to other persons.

THE PREMIER: It seemed unreasonable to restrict the executor to six months, and allow other people an unlimited time in which to bring an action.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: This Bill has been carefully considered in the Legislative Council, and was introduced by a legal member (Mr. Moss).

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL suggested that the preamble ought to be put in the margin to the first clause; also the reference to the English Act should be put in correct form. In regard to Clause 2, now under discussion, the marginal note needed correction; as after the word "it" should be inserted the words "sufficient and," to read "if sufficient and not accepted, defendant entitled to verdict on the issue." He offered these suggestions as to marginal notes.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Preamble and title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9.35, until the next day.

Legislative Council, Thursday, 18th October, 1900.

Papers presented—Question: Government Schools, Female Teachers—Question: Municipal Institutions Bill, Cost of Printing—Question: Canning Jarrah Mills, Water Pollution—Municipal Institutions Bill, in Committee, Clause 300 to end, reported—Distillation Bill, in Committee, reported—Registration of Births, etc., Bill, Assembly's Amendment—Public Service Bill, Assembly's Amendments, progress—Land Act Amendment Bill, second reading—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Government Railways, Annual Report of General Manager.

QUESTION—GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS, FEMALE TEACHERS.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, How many Government Schools throughout the colony are in charge of female teachers. 2, How many female teachers in the Government Schools are married women. 3, Is the employment of married women in Government Schools in accordance with the Regulations. 4, Are any wives of school teachers employed in Government Schools; if so, how many. 5, Have women so employed passed all necessary examinations.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied:—1, Seventy-nine, of which 48 are Provisional Schools. 2, Eight head teachers and 16 assistants; one monitor and 31 sewing mistresses, four of whom are also monitors. 3, Yes; regulations 69 and 76. 4, Four assistants on supply; one monitor on supply; 27 sewing mistresses, four of whom act also as monitors; one head teacher, just married, and holding school temporarily. 5, Yes.

QUESTION—MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS BILL, COST OF PRINTING.

HON. M. L. MOSS asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Has a record been kept of the cost of the printing and reprinting of the Municipal Institutions Bill introduced into Parliament in 1899 and 1900, including in such cost the printing of all amendments made by select committees