

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. G. Bellingham
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. J. W. Hackett	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. W. Kingsmill	Hon. R. Laurie
Hon. W. T. Loton	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. G. Randall	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. Sir G. Shenton	Hon. J. A. Thomson
Hon. F. M. Stone	Hon. J. W. Wright
Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom	Hon. Z. Lane (Teller).
Hon. C. E. Dempster (Teller).	

Question thus passed, and the Assembly's amendment adopted.

Nos. 2 and 3 (consequential)—agreed to.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 5:46 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

## Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 5th November, 1903.

	PAGE
Questions: Minimum Wage, Water Pipes ...	1905
Notices (one day only) insufficient ...	1905
Criminal Influx, to prevent ...	1905
Return, etc., ordered: Liquor Licenses in Municipalities ...	1905
Tobacco Export, terms of engagement ...	1906
Bills: First readings—Election of Senators, Supreme Court Act Amendment ...	1905
Merchant Shipping Act Application, in Committee, reported ...	1906
Lunacy, second reading concluded; in Committee, reported ...	1906
Annual Estimates, debate on financial policy (fourth day) concluded; Estimates in detail to Crown Law Department, general remarks on public service and classification, progress ...	1912

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

#### PRAYERS.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Aborigines Department, Report for 1902-3.

By the TREASURER: Inspection of liquor and licensed houses, Report containing portion of the information moved for by Mr. Foulkes.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

#### QUESTION—MINIMUM WAGE, WATER PIPES.

Mr. DAGLISH, without notice, asked the Minister for Works: What is the minimum wage specified in the contract of Messrs. Hoskins and Co., Ltd., with the Goldfields Water Supply Department for the supply of pipes.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: I know that this contract does not specify any definite rate of wages. It states simply that the employees engaged on the contract shall be paid the ruling rate of wages current in the trade.

#### QUESTIONS—NOTICE INSUFFICIENT.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS made a general request to members, supported by the SPEAKER, that more than one day's notice should be given when the House met at 2:30 o'clock.

#### QUESTION—CRIMINAL INFLUX.

Mr. HASTIE asked the Premier: Whether it is his intention, during this session, to introduce a measure for the prevention of the influx of criminals, similar to the Act now in force in New South Wales.

THE PREMIER replied: The matter is being considered; but I am not quite clear as to the constitutionality of the measure.

#### ELECTION OF SENATORS BILL.

Introduced by the PREMIER, and read a first time.

#### SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the PREMIER, and read a first time.

#### RETURN—LIQUOR LICENSES IN MUNICIPALITIES.

On motion by Mr. DAGLISH, ordered: That a return be laid upon the table, showing—1, The number of licenses of each description issued under the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sales Act in each municipality. 2, The number of licenses of each description issued under the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sales Act in each roads board district. 3, The estimated population in each municipality or roads board district.

PAPERS—TOBACCO EXPERT,  
ENGAGEMENT.

On motion by Mr. DAGLISH, ordered: That there be laid upon the table of the House all papers relating to the engagement of Mr. Heinrich Schmidt, tobacco expert, by the Agricultural Department, and the termination of such engagement.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT APPLICA-  
TION BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Application of Part II. of 57 and 58 Vict., c. 60 :

MR. PIGOTT: Since the last sitting he had gone through Part II. of the Merchant Shipping Act, and found no objection to the application of it in Western Australia.

Clause passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

LUNACY BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from 3rd November.

MR. F. ILLINGWORTH (Cue): This is a desirable measure; but what we require more than a Bill is an asylum, a building. The great pressing want of the State is a suitable building in which persons afflicted with insanity can be protected and have their health attended to. I observe that the Government are making progress, and I hope the day is not far distant when we shall see a building erected which will at least have some of the modern appliances for the purpose of coping with this great disease, which is a calamity that may befall any of us, and this phase of the subject must not be overlooked. There has always been a tendency in the past to look upon a lunatic asylum as somewhat of a gaol, and to treat not only the building itself but also the inmates as if there were a taint of criminality about them. I think the modern feeling is that there is no such taint. One of the first duties of the State is to make provision for the management of buildings of this character, and also for their establishment. There is one thing I am disposed to take exception to in this Bill, which I hope the Committee of the House will seriously

consider, and indeed I would earnestly ask the Government to reconsider their proposals in this regard. Next to the calamity of being stricken with insanity, and perhaps even a greater calamity, would be the incarceration of a sane man in a lunatic asylum of any kind. It is proposed to establish practically private lunatic asylums, and I think there is no demand for these institutions, and no provision is required, nor, as a matter of fact, should any provision be made. The one thing we should set ourselves studiously against is the possibility of any individual being incarcerated in an institution which is private. The abuses of past decades are sufficient to prove the necessity of very great care in this direction; but in a limited community such as ours, at present we have not even a lunatic asylum of an up-to-date character and of an efficient nature. To permit any private persons to establish a lunatic asylum is going in the wrong direction. It is a dangerous procedure, and may perhaps lead to very serious consequences. If we are to have an up-to-date lunatic asylum properly managed in this State, we shall require to have it not only of the size but of the efficiency necessary for curative purposes. Fortunately, the number of insane persons is not too great for one institution to cope with. It is not as though there were such a demand for hospital accommodation of this character that the State could afford, or at any rate should be called upon, to make any provision for private institutions. An asylum is of all things an institution which should be entirely under the control, examination, and immediate purview of the officers of the State. It would be quite possible for a man to be incarcerated upon the certificates of two medical men whose certificates were procured perhaps for a comparatively small sum of money. [Dr. Hicks: There is the third one.] That is so; but it is possible for certificates to be obtained. They have been obtained in times past, when men were just as honourable as they are to-day. It is quite possible for such a thing to occur, and the bare possibility of that happening to one individual in the State is to my mind a sufficient reason to prevent the establishment of any

such institutions. If persons well-to-do desire to have special accommodation for their friends, such accommodation could and ought to be provided in the public institution. The system could be largely of the cottage character, and it would be quite easy to establish paying wards in a lunatic asylum where persons could have such special attention and accommodation as their friends deemed desirable, by the payment of the extra cost. I contend that would be a step infinitely more in the right direction than the establishment of private lunatic asylums. As a matter of fact we might license half-a-dozen institutions in the State which, notwithstanding the safeguards of this Bill, would be practically without control. They are institutions that might be used for the basest possible purpose, and, consequently, as the time has not arrived for increasing the number of institutions, my contention is that the purposes of this Bill should cease with the establishment of an up-to-date lunatic asylum, with proper management, and possibly some provision by which special privileges could be given to patients in cases where people were prepared to pay the extra cost. But I deprecate and oppose, as much as it is possible for an individual to do so, the establishment of any private lunatic asylums in this State, and I hope the Government will see their way clear to eliminate that portion of the Bill, which I consider is fraught with difficulties and dangers all round. In other respects I have every pleasure in supporting the Bill, and I shall give the Government all the assistance I can to make it as perfect as possible.

MR. W. M. PURKISS (Perth) : I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading of this Bill, because it seems to me from my knowledge, limited as it is, that this an honest effort to bring our lunacy laws up to date with the legislation in other States. Speaking generally, I see nothing to object to on a broad view of the question with reference to the various provisions. I suggest to the Government that a few clauses should be embodied with reference to inebriates. In many States, probably wealthier than our own, they have been able to establish such an institution in connection with every asylum. But an up-to-date asylum

means money; it means the erection of a building which would cost a large sum, and the installation of a staff which would require an annual draft on the consolidated revenue. In one State of which I can speak from practical experience, there is ingrafted in the lunacy Acts a series of sections in reference to dedicating a portion of the ground to the purposes of an asylum for persons suffering from dangerous effects of alcohol. Upon the application of any dipsomaniac himself to a Judge, and upon the evidence of two medical men taken before a Judge, a dipsomaniac—that is a person suffering from the dangers of alcoholism—may be committed to that portion of an asylum dedicated to the particular purpose, where we will say a cottage has been erected for the treatment of these people, who are kept altogether apart from the system appertaining to the treatment of lunatics. Of course this is to get over the very great expense of erecting costly buildings for the purpose of an inebriate asylum. The world generally has recognised the utility, the necessity, and the wisdom of having inebriate asylums. In many places where there is wealth, inebriate asylums have been erected, and efficient staffs have been appointed for the treatment of what is recognised as a disease; but of course in a State like this, as in most of the Australian States, in view of the expense some other course has been necessary. No man can be admitted to a lunatic asylum suffering from alcohol; and the consequence is that we have no place to which we can send such a man. In the State I mentioned, a portion of the lunatic grounds is set apart for this class of patients. My experience is that it is invariably the sufferer himself who makes application to be admitted to these retreats. The application is made to a Judge, and great precautions are taken before a Judge will take any steps. After the Judge has clear evidence that the patient is suffering from dipsomania, he commits him for a period not exceeding twelve months to one of these retreats, and is empowered to make the patient or his friends pay the cost of treatment and maintenance. The system has worked admirably. We know that floating about society there are many men and women who would only be too glad to avail them-

selves of the shelter of these institutions and of the treatment supplied, in order to be protected against themselves. If they seek the services of a doctor or go into a private hospital for treatment, they can be about again within six hours and the treatment is absolutely nugatory; but when they are committed by a Judge to a retreat they have to remain in it for the period for which they are committed. I know of an instance of one of the descendants of one of Australia's finest families, a young man who went into one of these retreats on his own motion. The time was really so pleasant when he was there that he most reluctantly left the institution. He had a relapse and went in again for twelve months. Since he came out the second time he has been an absolute abstainer, and one of the most worthy members of society I know of. This happened twenty years ago. The expense necessary in building a retreat is forbidding; we are hardly big enough as yet, because of our small population, to undertake such a work; but where there is an asylum with such a large reserve as is provided in this State, we could set apart an acre and erect a nice little cottage in the grounds for this purpose. The patients would have the services of the medical officer of the asylum, and the services of one or two members of the staff could be utilised, and as it is incumbent upon those who enter the retreat to pay for their own maintenance, we could attain one of the most charitable objects I know of at very little expense to the country. I merely put this forward as a suggestion to the Government, in view of the great expense that would be incurred in erecting an inebriate asylum whose beneficial purposes are recognised all over the world. These asylums exist in the wealthier communities of Great Britain and the United States, but the expense is a bar to our Government unloosening the purse strings. The same benign ends can be achieved at a cost which is absolutely nothing, and when the Bill is in Committee I shall bring down a transcript of the sections which are found in the law of another State in respect of which I have seen the practical working. I must say my experience has been one that must commend itself to every right-thinking man in the community.

DR. J. S. HICKS (Roebourne): I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. I have read it through carefully, and am forced to the conclusion that it is drawn up by one who understands the nature of lunacy. I intend to speak only on one or two points where there have been departures from the present Lunacy Act. The first departure is with regard to the removal of the Lunacy Department from the Medical Department, and I think it is a good departure. The Lunacy Act should be administered by an expert in lunacy, and we have at present in Dr. Montgomery a man who is thoroughly up to his work, and the best possible man we could have. When the work has had to filter from him to the present head of the department, there have been on several occasions severe leakages, first in the office, then with the head of the department, and then in delays occurring. With regard to making the Inspector General the superintendent also of the lunatic asylum, that may be allowed at our present stage; but the time must come when we must have an Inspector General who will be distinct from the Superintendent of the Lunatic Asylum. At the present time in New South Wales this is done, but simply for the reason that they have several hospitals there, and one man simply could not devote all his time to the scrutiny of lunacy matters. With regard to licensed houses, I do not quite fall in line with the member for Cue. I believe that licensed houses under proper precautions are among the best things we could have. In times gone by no doubt abuses have been discovered, but I think with all the precautions set out in this Bill there will be no chance whatever for similar abuses to occur. There must first be two medical certificates before a person can be put into a licensed house; then we have a medical superintendent there, and we have justices visiting every three months. In addition the licensed houses are regulated, and we will have an Inspector General, so that we will have the safeguard of at least six persons to see that no abuses are carried out. I propose to move an amendment to this clause, in order to make it more stringent, to require that in case of a death in a licensed house an inquest should be held, or at

least a *post-mortem* examination. That will, I think, obviate cruelty. I can hardly understand the member for Cue with regard to licensed houses. I quite agree with him that the State must provide not only for the indigent sick, but also for the indigent mad, and I think the same policy should be carried out with regard to payment for the insane as holds good with regard to ordinary sane people ordinarily sick. We know that in our medical arrangements by allowing patients to pay a partial amount of the cost of their treatment in hospitals, a great abuse has arisen. I maintain the same will occur when we allow people to pay for their friends in asylums. Let the Government provide for the indigent poor, for it is the duty of every State; but where people can afford to pay, the State should not come into competition with private practice. Referring to the number of certificates necessary before a person can be put into an asylum, I do not think there is any occasion to have the two certificates with regard to pauper cases. There is no incentive to put a pauper inside an asylum. In the event of a person very well placed in this world there is every necessity to have two certificates to guard the man against his friends; but I do not see why the State should, in the case of a pauper, provide the expense of two certificates where one will do. The law at present is that only one is necessary, and I think it should remain so. Of course it is a very minor point hardly worth speaking about. There is one matter I would like to have seen introduced into the Bill. We know perfectly well that inmates of an asylum will frequently get near a wall and get into conversation with people outside, inducing the people outside to give them matches. In several cases this has led to fires in asylums, and I think some provision should be made to make it penal for people outside to give inmates any dangerous articles. There is another point, with regard to the number of patients which must be in a licensed house before there must be a resident medical officer. I think the Government would do very well to reduce the number from fifty to ten. Another matter might very well be introduced into the Bill. Recently in this State there was occasion to appoint trustees for the management of the

affairs of a person of unsound mind under control. There was great difficulty in obtaining the services of one trustee owing to there being no payment. The trustee had to enter into a bond of a considerable sum amounting to thousands, and because there was no payment he would not act. I think something should be done to allow the Master of the Supreme Court to order payment to trustees.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

MR. HARPER in the Chair; the PREMIER in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Any person to be received into hospital upon a request in writing together with statement and two medical certificates:

MR. ILLINGWORTH: To establish licensed houses for the reception of lunatics was entirely wrong. He moved:

That the words, "or a licensed house," in line 2, be struck out.

This would test the question. No person should be detained as a lunatic in any place but a Government institution. For the treatment of paying patients, a portion of a Government asylum could be set apart, in which they could have all the conveniences possible in a private asylum. We knew what had happened in the past in licensed mad-houses; and humanity had not altered since. No provisions for inspections would prevent abuses in such institutions.

THE PREMIER: Some reasons should have been given for the amendment. The statement as to past difficulties and abuses was beside the question; for these had not arisen under a system similar to that provided in the Bill.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: They were arising now in Victoria.

THE PREMIER: Licensing and inspection did not exist in days gone by. We had constantly to make licensing laws and inspection laws more stringent, for the purpose of overcoming difficulties and preventing abuses; but the existence of abuses was not a reason for abolishing licensing and inspection, but for making them more efficient. He was tired of hearing what happened in Victoria.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** The system was still abused there.

**THE PREMIER:** Under an entirely different law. The provisions of this Bill for supervision and inspection had never been abused in Victoria, because they were not in force there. Let the hon. member consult the Lunacy Acts of Victoria, and convince himself. There were different kinds of inspection; and the question was, were the provisions in the Bill sufficient? Insanity is a disease. Why should all insane patients be compelled to enter public asylums when people sick in body only could go to private hospitals? Why should not a man have the right to give his insane relative the best treatment obtainable?

**MR. BATH:** Private asylums conduced to fraud.

**THE PREMIER:** Were there not equal opportunities for fraud in private hospitals? This was provided against by supervision. Did the provisions of the Bill indicate that supervision would not be efficient? The member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth) suggested the setting apart of private wards for paying patients in public asylums. Surely the State had enough to do in looking after non-paying lunatics without incurring additional expense for private wards. All knew the difficulty of securing efficiency when paying and non-paying insane patients were attended by the same staff. Paying patients in asylums could by giving "tips" secure better attention and accommodation.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** So could paying patients in public hospitals.

**THE PREMIER:** No. The general rule of public hospitals was to take in none but non-paying patients. In an ordinary hospital a patient was only treated for a week or two. Insane patients were, as a rule, permanent and not temporary inmates; and, if wealthy, were better able to exercise influence which tended to distract attention from non-paying patients. It would be grossly unjust by the amendment to prevent persons from placing under efficient medical treatment friends mentally afflicted; yet this was suggested merely because in Victoria abuses had arisen under a different system and different laws. The Bill was modelled

on the legislation of the old country and the New South Wales Act of 1898.

**DR. HICKS:** No abuses were heard of under the New South Wales law; nor yet in the old country, where there were probably five private asylums to one public asylum. People were prone to tell fibs about insanity. None would acknowledge that their relatives were either consumptive or insane; hence people preferred putting such relatives into private homes, and for this opportunity should be given.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** The Premier, in his remarkable speech, said there were practically no paying patients in our public hospitals.

**THE PREMIER:** Non-paying patients were the rule. Patients were not apparently supposed to pay.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** In every case, the first question asked was whether the patient was able to pay.

**THE PREMIER:** Few of them paid.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** Then the Premier said abuses had not arisen under inspection. True, the kind of inspection provided in the Bill might not be that provided in other countries; but in spite of inspection private lunatic asylums in other States had given rise to abuses; and he (Mr. Illingworth) would not assert that this State possessed better qualifications for pure administration than any other State possessed. The Premier's inference was that none but this State could administer the law. Abuses would arise in private asylums in spite of all the clauses of the Bill. They had arisen in Australia, in England, and on the Continent, in spite of as much inspection and as much care as the Bill could possibly insure.

**THE PREMIER:** That was not so, because it was notorious that on the Continent of Europe the lunacy laws were quite different from those in force in the old country.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** It was known that abuses had occurred in the past, and the clauses of the Bill, notwithstanding the restrictions surrounding them, would not be sufficiently strong to prevent abuses arising here. Notwithstanding what the Premier had said, he (Mr. Illingworth) was quite satisfied as to the correctness of his statement. We

ought not to legislate for private lunatic asylums to be established in this State.

DR. HICKS: Although informed there were no licensed private asylums in Victoria, he had recently attended a patient who was at one time in a sort of licensed house in Victoria. Where there was a demand for any requirement, someone would supply that demand; and it appeared that the patient who came under his (Dr. Hicks's) notice was in a private home in Victoria that was not licensed. The member for Cue stated that abuses might arise, but why could not abuses arise in connection with a public hospital for insane? One might just as well get a medical officer to do certain things by giving him a substantial fee.

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

Ayes	...	...	10
Noes	...	...	15
Majority against			5

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Moran	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Oate	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Reid	Mr. Holmes
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Ullingworth (Teller).	Mr. James
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Purkiss
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Throssell
	Mr. Higham (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived, and the clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 42—agreed to.

Clause 43—Resident medical practitioners:

DR. HICKS: Although he had stated that there should be a medical practitioner to every 10 patients in a private asylum, that number might be too small; the number should be 25.

THE PREMIER: Fifty seemed rather a large number, and he would promise to recommit the clause if the hon. member would consent to its being passed now.

MR. DAGLISH: Presumably an alteration made in this clause as to the number which would require a resident medical officer would also govern the number for which visiting medical practitioners would be required.

THE PREMIER: Yes.

MR. DAGLISH: Twenty-five was too large a number.

Clause passed.

Clauses 44 to 59—agreed to.

Clause 60—No person to be detained in any reception-house, etc., longer than 14 days:

DR. HICKS: One did not know exactly how this would act in the tropics, where there might not be more than one medical officer. The clause provided that no insane patient should be detained in any reception-house, prison, or public hospital beyond 14 days unless the medical officer thereof certified in writing that such person was not in a fit state to be removed therefrom, or would be benefited by remaining therein, in which case the removal of such patient should be suspended until the visiting medical officer certified that the patient was fit to be removed.

THE PREMIER: The decision as to whether a patient was fit to be removed would rest with the medical officer.

Clause passed.

Clauses 61 to 82—agreed to.

Clause 83—Inspector General to have no interest in licensed house, nor sign certificates except in the case of the criminal insane:

DR. HICKS: Why should the Inspector General be allowed to sign a certificate in the case of the criminal insane?

THE PREMIER: The Inspector General was prevented from interfering directly or indirectly regarding the admission of persons other than the criminal insane, on account of the possibility of inducement being held out by persons who had means or desired to place an outside person in an asylum. Such reasons would not apply in the case of the criminal insane. One could not imagine a case where a prisoner or his friends would use direct or indirect influence upon the Inspector General for the admission of such prisoner into an asylum; and if the prisoner were admitted into the asylum he could not remain there indefinitely. *Prima facie* he would be removed at the expiration of his sentence, and it would be open to his friends to call for a release. An order could be issued calling on the superintendent to produce any inmate.

Clause passed.

Clauses 84 to 98—agreed to.

Clause 99—Allowance to be made to friends for maintenance of patients:

DR. HICKS: What was the intention as to making allowance to the friends of a patient to take care of him?

THE PREMIER: The object was to enable the superintendent of the asylum, if he found a case in which a patient could be dealt with by placing him under the care of friends, to afford assistance in the cost of maintenance. This might apply to a harmless case such as required careful attention, in which case the superintendent might discharge the patient from the asylum and allow to his friends a certain amount for maintenance of the patient.

MR. TAYLOR: Would that be a good precedent?

THE PREMIER: It would in such cases, because the more homelike the surroundings of a patient mentally afflicted could be made, the better prospect there was of curing him. The great difficulty with doctors in treating patients in an asylum was to create in the patient a sense of freedom and not of confinement. To prevent abuse, the subclause provided that the payment for maintenance should be made only on a certificate that the patient had been properly cared for; and if such certificate was not produced, or if the medical practitioner attending the patient was not satisfied with the care bestowed on the patient, the permission could be revoked and the patient taken back into the asylum.

MR. TAYLOR: Would the Government be disposed to pay in helping patients to get treatment outside an asylum other than that provided in the asylum? If so the system would become very expensive.

THE PREMIER: The only allowance would be to help the friends in maintaining the patient. Replying to Dr. Hicks he (the Premier) said that where the case was one needing the personal supervision of a hospital doctor, it would not be a case which could be placed outside under the care of friends.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 100, 101—agreed to.

[Sitting suspended for ten minutes.]

[MR. ILLINGWORTH took the Chair.]

Clauses 102 to 182—agreed to.

Schedules (18)—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1902-3.

#### DEBATE ON FINANCIAL POLICY—FOURTH DAY.

Resumed from the previous Tuesday; MR. ILLINGWORTH in the Chair.

MR. H. DAGLISH (Subiaco): I desire to make a few remarks in regard to the condition of affairs as disclosed by the Treasurer's Budget speech, and in doing so I have pleasure in indorsing the congratulations to that gentleman on the manner in which the speech was delivered, as well as the matter which it contained. I do not think there is much to be said in the way of criticism at the present juncture on the financial policy as disclosed by the speech, nor do I think the present is altogether a proper time to take into consideration questions affecting the general administration of the Government. I am glad to know, as the Treasurer has informed us, that all our natural industries are thriving at the present time, that we have had bountiful results in every direction; but at the same time I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that in our artificial industries, which are likewise of considerable importance to the State, we have been considerably hindered by the effect of Federation, and I feel afraid that as the sliding scale is reduced and those industries have to struggle even more severely with the industries of the Eastern States, we shall find that some of them instead of progressing will be almost entirely killed by the operation of federal free-trade. However, it will not be of much use to discuss that matter now, seeing that we are for all time committed; and I refer to it to express my regret that at the present moment in the cities and large centres several of our industries, which promised well a few years ago with the help of small protection, are now in a languishing condition, and are likely to be farther affected as the sliding scale vanishes. I was much surprised to hear the reference by the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth) to the Commonwealth taxation contributed by this State. The hon. member, who is usually particularly accurate in his figures, quoted the State as contributing



£11 per head to the Commonwealth revenue, whereas, according to the figures, our local contribution is exactly half of that amount. I simply point this out because I feel we have reason to complain as a State that the extent of our taxation is continually, from various mistakes of one sort or another, overstated, and I think we do ourselves injustice if at any time we make our taxation appear greater than it really is. Our contributions to the federal revenue undoubtedly are considerably greater than those of any other State, and they must be so for some time; but their tendency is a downward one, and they must decrease as our products increase and as Australia herself becomes more self-contained. Both of these results are gradually coming about. The death of the sliding-scale will affect us beneficially in that respect, even although it may act injuriously in the manner I have already pointed out.

MR. PIGOTT: Do you think it will reduce the cost of living in this State eventually?

MR. DAGLISH: I do not think we have seen any sign as yet of that reduction coming about, and we can only argue from the experience of the past. The ultimate success and growth of our agricultural industry will to some extent reduce the cost of certain articles of food. I am quite willing to concede that, whilst at the same time there will be a corresponding reduction, according to the extent of production, in the amount of duties contributed through the customs, I think it will hardly be expected that when the bookkeeping period comes to an end the Federal Parliament will distribute the excess revenue on a population basis. I am one of those who feel satisfied that such an iniquitous proposal could not be entertained by the Federal Parliament. We contribute so much larger a proportion of taxation per head to the federal revenue than the people of the other States that it would be entirely unjust to limit the return to us to a population basis, and I have enough faith in the honesty of the politicians of Australia to believe they would shun such a flagrantly dishonest act.

MR. PIGOTT: The position may be just the reverse in 20 years.

MR. DAGLISH: Of course; but we have not now to look 20 years ahead. We have, in dealing with this matter and considering the termination of the bookkeeping period, to look two years ahead, and the hon. member should give some reasons for assuming there will be a great change in 20 years; reasons which I fail to find in the speech he delivered on this question the other night.

MR. PIGOTT: Do you not think it right, from a federal aspect, that the distribution should be on a population basis?

MR. DAGLISH: From a federal aspect, I do not think so.

MR. MORAN: What are you basing your beliefs on?

MR. DAGLISH: Simply on the existing returns of customs revenue.

MR. MORAN: We are talking about federation. From whence do you get the idea of unequal distribution? You should have seen that beforehand.

MR. DAGLISH: I contend that the very figures provided in the Federal Treasurer's Estimates are justification of the position I take up.

MR. MORAN: Justification for parting from the first rules of federation?

MR. DAGLISH: I contend that if this community had understood there would be any danger of a distribution of customs revenue on a population basis, we would not have entered into federation.

MR. MORAN: That would not have altered one vote. The period of insanity had to run its course.

MR. DAGLISH: That is entirely a matter of opinion, and my opinion differs from that of the hon. member. Unfortunately there is no way of proving which of us is correct. At the same time I would regard any attempt to introduce the distribution of the surplus on a population basis as a robbery of Western Australia to enrich other States of the Commonwealth. I feel satisfied that the bulk of the community would look at the matter in the same light. At the same time, the possibility of that course being adopted would make it incumbent on the Treasurer to look for new sources of revenue; and as far as I am able to judge, these new sources can be got only from taxation. I do not know of any direction in which we can reduce largely our expenditure; there-

fore we must find some new sources of revenue to provide for the loss of income which must come about to some extent from the increase of local productions and from the loss of customs revenue returned to us by the Commonwealth; and I can see no way out of the difficulty except that of increasing our taxation in the form of direct taxation in some shape. I do not know of any more ready means available than by imposing a land tax that shall apply to country and town lands alike. The member for Kanowna has already introduced a proposal of that nature for the consideration of this House.

MR. MORAN: We might have a window tax or a poll tax, for instance?

MR. DAGLISH: I am trying to suggest something practical. If our borrowing policy is continued, even if limited to £750,000 a year as has been suggested, we have to bear in mind that for every new loan we raise, in addition to meeting the interest we must provide a sinking fund, and year by year the burden of the sinking fund and interest will grow heavier until we may have great difficulty, without new sources of revenue, in meeting the demands on us for keeping abreast of our ordinary requirements. I do not see that there need be any fear in regard to the future borrowing of this State, if we can only say that every work entered on and to which loan money is applied will pay from the outset both interest and sinking fund. I do not think the question of the debt per head of population need worry us at all, because in State borrowing as in individual borrowing the assets of the borrower should be looked to rather than the number of persons who are effecting the loan. I do not see why the practice which applies to individuals should not equally apply to the State; for our assets are so great in comparison with our population that we need not worry over the question whether we should borrow to a larger extent per head of population than do other States of the Commonwealth, those other States having a larger population, but their potentialities not being larger if as large as those of this State. We have to induce the lender to consider our assets, and in that respect we have to make our future borrowing subject to the condi-

tion of the money market, and have to consider the ability of this community to pay interest and sinking fund on each work undertaken if it will not from the outset provide a sufficient return for this purpose. If the Government can at any time put before Parliament a work that we are satisfied will pay interest and sinking fund from the outset, we can safely raise a loan for that work, apart from the consideration of our existing liabilities; but public works that will not be immediately reproductive, even if the limit of our total expenditure be £750,000 a year or less, must be embarked on with the greatest caution. In this connection something might be done by the Government in the way of issuing State notes in repayment for deposits in the Savings Bank and in payment for certain small Government works; but these notes would certainly have to be redeemable on demand, and I have not had an opportunity of going into this question so closely as to enable me to suggest to the Treasurer any particular scheme. I understand however he is looking into the matter, and I believe it is possible the State by this means can obtain a certain floating loan without interest. If so, we shall be taking a departure that will be advantageous in the highest degree to the Government and the public. Of course there may be objections from the point of view of persons interested in private enterprise; but I cannot see that if you have Government notes issued and made payable on demand, and if due provision is made for meeting those notes on demand, there need be any objection to the issuing of such notes. The matter is well worthy of consideration, with the object of seeing whether a practical scheme can be devised. In regard to the public service, we have still a very unsatisfactory position. For the last three or four years the public service has been in a state of unrest. It is found on every hand that many of the drones in the service have been promoted or have received large increases of salary, and many of the good men have been kept back such length of time that they have in this way been forced out of the service. Two years ago we were promised a Public Service Commission that should remedy this. We have had a commission, and

one that was eminently unfitted for the task; a commission of which no member had previously had any experience of the West Australian public service. The only member of it who was suggested as having had such experience was one who had been confined most of his time in the port of Esperance, and for a short period he was head of a department the members of which might be numbered on the fingers of one hand. In addition to him who was supposed to represent local knowledge, there was a prominent public servant imported from South Australia and another from Victoria. We have had, as a result, a series of voluminous reports presented, which have been found by the Government to be not worthy of consideration. I take that to be the case because the Government have not adopted any one of those reports, and have not acted on more than a few of the recommendations made. In regard to those recommendations that have been acted on, the Government had, before the commission sat, enough evidence in their possession to enable them to take the steps they have since taken, without appointing a commission at all. What we wanted was a commission that could go through the public service with some degree of commercial knowledge, with some degree of ability to assess the value of the various works rendered. We did not want a public service commission composed entirely of public servants; but a commission with some public servants on it, and someone on it having local commercial knowledge. It might have been justifiable to bring in from outside either a public servant or a gentleman of commercial experience, and we might then have got a satisfactory classification. We have not got that, but we have the unrest in the public service increased enormously by the results that have attended the reports which the commission has presented. When the successive reports on the various departments were presented, there was intensification of the dissatisfaction that had prevailed in the past in the public service; and now that no effect worth mentioning had been given by the Government to the recommendations of the commission, we find that the feeling of unrest is farther increased. The public service has had farther ground of complaint in the fact that the increases of salary on the Esti-

mates before us are not general, that they are not made to apply to all departments of the service, and not to members of the particular grades in the public service. Some members are selected for increases and some are selected to be left out of the increases; some are selected to suffer decreases of pay, and some who have received promotion in position find that it is unaccompanied by any increase in pay. I contend that the Government have not realised our anticipations in regard to the public service; and I believe that subsequent to the receipt of some of the commission's reports, a special committee of departmental officers was appointed to make a new classification of the public service. This classification, like that made by the commission, has likewise been set aside. At the present time we find there are many officers underpaid who are not receiving any increase of salary, that there are many officers highly paid who are receiving large increases of salary, while there are other very responsible officers already receiving what may be called substantial salaries, but far below the value of the work they are doing, and who are denied any consideration whatever. I think it is reasonable that this House should expect the Government to bring forward at an early date some classification scheme and a reorganisation of the public service, in performance of the promise that has been made; to gradually reduce the number of officers in departments that are over-manned, and give stability of position to those whose services are required, so that men in the service may know precisely the positions they hold and what these positions are worth, and be able to feel that they have some security of tenure in their respective offices. The Government, by adopting this scheme, would insure a greater economy of administration than up to the present has been attained. I said a few minutes ago that when references were made to taxation in this State, they were almost invariably over-stated. We have had in this House time after time references such as those made by the member for Perth (Mr. Purkiss), to the effect that here we are paying in taxation about £20 per head of population. In looking at the returns presented by the Treasurer to this House, I find that for last year the revenue received was in

round numbers £3,600,000. That is generally taken by those dealing with the question of taxation as the basis by which they arrive at the taxation per individual. Now I find that a large number of items included in the revenue are not in any way the result of taxation, and I except from the heading of taxation items such as land revenue £156,000.

MR. MORAN: Why?

MR. DAGLISH: Because a great proportion of that sum is paid in the direction of obtaining the fee simple of Crown lands.

MR. MORAN: A great proportion of it is also an annual charge.

MR. DAGLISH: Yes; but it is not a tax. I contend that the rent charged by the Crown to an individual for land of which he has the use cannot be called a tax on the community.

MR. MORAN: Then we could not possibly have a land tax.

MR. DAGLISH: I cannot follow the hon. member's conclusion. My argument is that the member for West Perth, though he pays a rent to the Crown, is in no sense paying a tax any more than he would be paying a tax if he paid a similar rent to a private individual. He is getting a *quid pro quo* for the money he pays.

MR. MORAN: So you do for all taxation.

MR. DAGLISH: It is not a direct taxation.

MR. PIGOTT: If we increased the rents 100 per cent., would we not be putting more taxation on the land?

MR. DAGLISH: We would be imposing a tax on the landholder by increasing the rent just to the same extent as my landlord, if I had one, might increase the tax I have to pay him. I want to point out that it is not reasonable to measure taxation per head by the money realised by the State where the State gives a direct return for the money collected. The member for West Perth and myself do not contribute to this land revenue, and we have no right to state on a public platform that we as individuals are taxed £20 per head because certain persons in the possession of Crown lands are paying to the Crown a small rent for their land and so making up the revenue. I wish to specify the items I would exclude from what might be called the general

taxation of the community. Mining revenue could be fairly excluded, because there a direct return is given to the man who pays it to the State. It is a question of buying a lease or buying a license, just as is the case with the settler who pays us a rent every 12 months or by proportionate annual payments obtains the fee simple of the land he occupies. Then we come to railway receipts, tramway receipts, water receipts and dividend duties. The dividend tax is of course a direct tax, but is not a tax on the people of Western Australia, and therefore it cannot be included in any statement relating to our general taxation. The total amount to be deducted from this £3,630,000, adopting the figures I have mentioned, is something over £2,000,000, leaving a total amount in taxation paid by the general community of £1,600,000. I think, when we are stating the amount of taxation we pay, we ought to state it fairly. If the view of the member for West Perth is right, that because land revenue yields a certain return to the State the public of this community are paying a tax to that extent, it is just as fair to argue that the whole of the railway revenue is taxation.

MR. MORAN: Who used that argument?

MR. DAGLISH: It was used by the hon. member. I have taken the items, and while there may be an amount of argument in regard to the one item to which the member for West Perth has referred, I point out that the greater proportion of this land revenue is derived from persons buying the fee simple, and that the amount of rents is after all only a small portion of the aggregate. Even if the arguments referred to are correct, it would be a very small percentage of the £156,000 received through the Lands Department that would have to be deducted. In conclusion I want to say I am not altogether satisfied that the condition of the State is as healthy as we all might reasonably hope it should be. During the last twelve months we have had a certain amount of poverty, distress, and lack of employment in all our large centres, and at the present moment in the centres I believe there is, unfortunately, a large amount of want of

employment, although we publicly hear nothing about it. I wish to point out this serious fact, that this year the amount of money per investor in the State Savings Bank is lower than it has been for the past three years. The amount per investor in June, 1901, was £41 2s. 9d., and in June, 1902, £41 17s. 7d. In June of this year it had fallen to £40 8s. 6d., and in September it had fallen still lower, to £39 13s. 5d. The Savings Bank might be called the barometer of the poorer classes of the community. I only wish to draw attention to this matter so that we shall not paint too brightly the picture of the present, and that we shall not have too glowing hopes for the future. At the same time I conclude, as I commenced, by congratulating the Treasurer on his Financial Statement, and personally I wish to express my regret that we have reason to fear that it will be his last.

MR. W. ATKINS (Murray): I must say that the Treasurer's Financial Statement was very clear, and I understand it thoroughly, which is saying a good deal; but, in following the last speaker's line, I think there is one point on which I perhaps want information. If I am right, I think there is something wrong in regard to the cost of regulating the spending of our revenue. Our total revenue last year was £3,600,000, and it is estimated to be £34,000 less this year. We have, therefore, no more money estimated to be spent this year than we estimated to be spent last year. Why then are the salaries of the staffs required for spending so much less to be increased by about £75,000 more than last year? For instance, taking the estimate of last year and the estimate of this year, there is an excess of £57,881, estimated to be paid in departmental salaries, more than was estimated last year, though we have heard for the last two or three years that we were going to make great savings and reductions in the cost of the government of the country.

MR. MORAN: Who said that?

MR. ATKINS: The Government.

MR. MORAN: You must be making a mistake.

THE TREASURER: The civil servants say that, notwithstanding the big advance in the Lands Office estimates, we are paying £15,000 less than last year.

MR. ATKINS: I am not a book-keeper, but I have got enough common sense to get pretty near to this. Taking the expenditure of last year, I find that in salaries we expended £17,076 less than we estimated to expend. Therefore, I suppose, it is fair to add the difference to this year's expenditure.

THE TREASURER: Oh no.

MR. ATKINS: If it is not so, the Treasurer knows more than I do; but if it is the case, to manage the business of the country this year we propose to expend £75,000 more than last year, though the estimated revenue is £34,000 less than last year. I cannot see any retrenchment in this, and I cannot see why it should be necessary. Surely we do not want to increase the cost of the government of the country?

THE TREASURER: I explained that £48,000 went to the Lands Department alone for salaries and surveys, to bring it up to date, the whole going into administration.

MR. ATKINS: I am speaking of nothing but salaries. I have carefully excluded from my calculations everything except salaries, because I knew all these things would be said about the figures; and I want to get hold of something I think I understand and about which there can be no cavilling. The estimated salaries in the Attorney General's department for last year show a net increase of £674, in the Colonial Secretary's Department a net decrease on last year's estimate of £214, in the Education Department a net increase of £12,805, in the Mines Department a net increase of £59,000, in the Lands Department a net increase of £250,984, in the Public Works Department a net increase of £42,083.

MR. RASON: No; there is a big decrease.

MR. ATKINS: In the railways there is a net decrease of £15,242 in salaries.

MR. MORAN: I doubt that.

MR. ATKINS: In public works there is an increase of £38,000.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: A decrease of £13,000.

MR. ATKINS: There it is!

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: No.

MR. ATKINS: In railways there is an increase on salaries and wages of £6,000, and a decrease on contingencies

of £21,000. In the Treasurer's Department salaries increased about £4,000, and contingencies decreased about £30,000, consequently there was a net decrease of £26,000. In the Attorney General's Department the salaries as estimated for 1903-4 show an increase on the estimates of 1902-3 of £749, but the actual amount paid in salaries in 1902-3 was £1,034 less than the estimate, so that alters the other to a certain extent. The salaries of the Colonial Secretary's Department as estimated for 1903-4 show a decrease of £7,052, but taking in harbour and light previously charged to this department they are £1,500 above 1902-3 Estimates. Last year the department spent on salaries £989 less than the estimate. In Education the estimates for 1903-4 show an increase of £1,382 over 1902-3 for salaries. Last year £72 more than the estimates was spent. In the Mines Department the estimates of 1903-4 show an increase over 1902-3 of £13,820 in salaries and wages, of which £8,000 is for battery wages. Last year this department spent £2,631 less than estimated for salaries. In the Lands Department the salaries estimated for 1903-4 show an increase over 1902-3 of £16,039, but the department spent £3,762 less than estimated last year. Therefore, that money and all these moneys, I presume, are carried forward this year. The salaries estimated in the Public Works for 1903-4 show an increase of £3,269, but the department spent £1,660 less than the estimates in 1902-3. Of this saving no less than £1,375 appears to have been made in the Agricultural Department, and I cannot understand that. There was very little saving in the Railways. In the Treasurer's Department the salaries estimated for 1903-4 show an increase over 1902-3 of £4,000. Last year's estimates were about right, only £415 not being paid away. That makes the hon. gentleman's branch £3,600 more costly this year than last.

THE TREASURER: That is news; but it does not matter.

MR. ATKINS: As far as I can understand, the total increase in salaries estimated for the year 1903-4 is £57,881 over the Estimates for 1902-3, leaving out the Colonial Secretary's Department, which shows a decrease of £7,052 by

transferring the saving in the Harbour and Light Department. Therefore, as in 1902-3 the Government spent £17,076 less in salaries than was estimated, either the present Estimates appear high or else it is intended to expend a total of £64,957 more this year.

MR. PROCTOR: Over and above that spent last year.

MR. ATKINS: Over and above that spent last year. For all practical purposes the increase may be accounted for in the Education, Mines, and Lands Departments, which take £44,000 of the extra estimates. If the saving made last year is taken into account, and the present Estimates are correct, £50,300 more will be spent in salaries and wages in these three departments than was spent last year. The remaining departments show increases amounting to £13,000 between them. This may be all wrong, but it is the only conclusion I can come to from these Estimates, and if the Government are doing all right I am only too glad, but if this is correct they are not making any saving. One of the few things I said to my constituents in the Murray electorate when chosen was that I would try and persuade the Government to see if they could be more saving.

THE TREASURER: They say we are starving the services now.

MR. ATKINS: Because you have the services too big. As a man said the other day in that insurrectionary meeting—what do they call it, the Civil Service meeting—a large number of the men did the work and the rest did the loafing. That has been my opinion all the time, that about two-thirds of the men in the Government service do the work, and work well, whereas the rest do the loafing, and I personally know plenty of them who do not do a day's work in a week. They are heads of departments, and it has been urged that they do not get very much and that they have been so many years in the service without having a rise. If one has been five or six years in the service and has not been good enough to get a rise, such person should get the "Irish rise." The Government have given the best man they have in the country the "Irish rise." I refer to Leslie. It is a jolly shame the way Leslie has been

treated, and another man no better than Leslie has been put into a place where everybody knew he was not wanted. He was put there just temporarily until they got something better for him, and his screw was not reduced. Leslie was offered £200 a year less than he had been receiving, and because he would not take it he was allowed to go. Is that fair play? What is wrong is that there are a lot of cats who do not catch mice. With regard to the Phillips River copper, it appears that the Government are spending or proposing to spend £4,250 on the buying of 1,500 tons of copper. Between salaries and plant and one thing and another that amounts to £2 16s. 8d. a ton to buy copper. Would any private individual spend all that money to buy 1,500 tons of copper, besides having all the other expense?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Fifteen hundred or fifteen thousand?

MR. ATKINS: I understood 1,500.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Oh, no; 15,000.

MR. ATKINS: I am wrong there. I thought it such a terrible thing to spend £2 16s. per ton in buying copper.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: It would be.

MR. ATKINS: I am wrong, and I am glad to apologise. Still, £4,250 is a good deal to spend on copper.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: No.

MR. ATKINS: It is a bit of risk buying copper.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: I am safeguarded.

MR. ATKINS: I was one of the members of the Coolgardie Water Scheme Commission, and I am satisfied that Mr. Leslie was head-and-shoulders above any other man who was on that job. He did the best and the cheapest work, and his work is there to be seen. He has done good work, and certainly it was the cheapest because it was done for a reasonable price, and all the other work was done both badly and expensively. One man was made a scapegoat, and it served him right. Leslie was a better man than the rest, but instead of his getting on, another man is helped.

THE TREASURER: You see the difficulty when you try to get rid of a man.

There is always someone to champion him.

MR. ATKINS: That is what you do. You get rid of a good man and do an injustice, and you advance a bad man and it is all right. The whole of the men on that job, except Leslie and those who were with him, have been advanced, including the men who knew of the swindle that was going on. Leslie did the best work in the country. He put in all that dam of concrete for 35s. a yard, and if those other men had done that work it would have cost £3 10s.; yet Leslie is left out in the cold. He and his foreman and men got the "run," and are now doing little bits of road contracts. Is that the way to treat a man who has served the Government better than any other man on the job? I say it is unfair. Other men on the pipe track have been put on to maintenance jobs and all sorts of things, and have been advanced, whilst Leslie and his crowd, who undoubtedly did the best work, twice as good and twice as valuable as that of others, and did their work more faithfully than any of the others, are to be left out in the cold.

MR. TAYLOR: It was the best work done on the whole scheme, was it not?

MR. ATKINS: The best work. It was as good as any contractor could do, and as cheap. Because Leslie would not take £200 a year less than he had been getting, they got rid of him.

MR. MORAN: The Harbour Works?

MR. ATKINS: They put him there temporarily.

THE TREASURER: The hon. member should not make these statements.

MR. ATKINS: Because he could not get on with the Harbour Works, they let him go.

MR. T. H. BATH (Haunans): I have no desire to make lengthy remarks; but there is one point to which I would like to refer, namely the utterances made by members, and especially the member for Perth (Mr. Purkiss), on what he is pleased to term the exorbitant taxation exacted from the people of Western Australia. The taxation per head must always be taken in a comparative sense; and in comparison with the average income of the population, and looking at it in that light, also eliminating those items that

are not clearly taxes in their nature, such as payments for public services and conveniences provided by the State, we find that the average amount of income per head in this State compares favourably with that of any other State in the Commonwealth, and compares more than favourably with that of any other country in the world. The policy in the past of Australian politicians, a policy by which some of them have climbed into power, was to tell people they were too heavily taxed; and by thus playing on the susceptibilities of persons who were anxious about their pocket, these politicians have climbed into power. As a natural corollary of that state of things, politicians of that kind say we should go in for a vigorous loan policy, and place some of the burden on posterity. In the Eastern States the present population are really the posterity of a previous period, and they find that they have inherited a heavy burden of debt without corresponding assets to show for the money expended. Even in the case of railways the money borrowed has been expended in such a way that practically additional sums had to be borrowed and expended in many cases to reconstruct the railways, or provide new rolling-stock, or for maintenance and upkeep; so the people who have inherited this burden of debt in the Eastern States find practically that the burden is doubled by the amount which has been borrowed and expended for relaying the track, renewing the rolling-stock, or other such purposes. This is true also of the expenditure of loan moneys on what could not by any possible stretch of imagination be termed reproductive works. It is a good thing for this State that we have reached the stage when people look askance at the doctrine of a "vigorous loan policy," and when the politicians in power are trying to stem the tide of political opinion and saying we must place some limitation on farther borrowing. In a State such as this, it must be recognised that it is difficult to abstain entirely from farther borrowing; but if we continue in the course of restricting the borrowing on lines laid down by the present Treasurer, we will be doing a very good thing for ourselves and for posterity. Western Australia being a newer country than the Eastern States, we have not the same difficulties here to deal with; for we have

only to review the situation in Victoria to see that a borrowing policy must in the long run be detrimental to a community. The member for Perth also compared the taxation in Western Australia to that of New Zealand, pointing out that for a much larger population the amount raised in taxes is considerably lower in New Zealand than in this State. But I would point out that in New Zealand a considerable portion of the amounts borrowed in the London market are expended on roads and bridges, and on other works of that kind; and New Zealand therefore is not in the same position as we are, and cannot say that for the amount borrowed an overwhelming percentage is expended on works that are really reproductive in their nature. I call attention to this point because it is not often enough said that when we borrow we should take care to borrow for works that are absolutely reproductive.

Question—that the first item in the Estimates, "His Excellency the Governor," be agreed to—passed, and the vote agreed to.

[Estimates discussed in detail, first generally on the vote as a whole, then on items.]

*Executive Council, £110—agreed to.*

*Legislative Council, £2,693 :*

MR. JOHNSON: The item of "assistant clerk and usher of black rod" showed an increase from £225 to £250. This must be questioned, and he (Mr. Johnson) would question every increase in the Estimate on a salary over £200 a year. There were too many instances in these Estimates of increases given to public servants who were receiving over £200 a year, while there were many public servants, married men and others, who were getting hardly sufficient to keep body and soul together, certainly not sufficient to maintain a wife and family in a proper manner. Right through the Estimates he intended to question any increases over £200 a year.

MR. PIERCE: But the hon. member wanted to increase the salary of £200 a year to members of Parliament.

MR. JOHNSON: That was a different case altogether, because persons in the



public service receiving over £200 a year were not called on to incur expenses, as were members of Parliament. The cases could not be compared.

Item—Chairman of Committees, £400 (increase £100):

MR. MORAN: In referring to this item he wished to give members an opportunity of acting consistently in opposing any increases of salary until a proper classification of the civil service was provided. The Chairman of Committees in the Council would be well paid at £300 a year. He moved that the item be reduced by £100:

THE PREMIER: This item had nothing to do with the classification of the civil service. The Chairman of Committees in the Council must be paid the same amount as was received by the Chairman of Committees in the Assembly, this being provided in the Constitution Act; and inasmuch as this House increased the salary of the Chairman of Committees in the Assembly last year to £400, it followed as a consequence that the salary of the Chairman of Committees in the Council had to be increased to the same amount. The Constitution required this to be done.

MR. MORAN denied that until it was proved.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member's denial did not alter the fact. The increase to £400 did not mean that the member filling this position would also receive £200 a year as a member. He would receive £200 a year as a member and £200 for performing the duties of Chairman of Committees, making £400 altogether. If members wished to reduce the salary of the Chairman of Committees in the Assembly they could in that way reduce the salary of the Chairman of Committees in the Council.

MR. JOHNSON: If the new Constitution Bill would amend that, this increase might stand over.

THE PREMIER: Effect could not be given to any change in the new Constitution Bill before about March next. If this Chamber fixed the amount for the Chairman of Committees in the Assembly, it must follow accordingly that the amount for the Chairman in the Council must be the same.

MR. JOHNSON: Last year the Premier did not increase the item of the Chairman of Committees in the Council, when an increase had been made for the Chairman of Committees in the Assembly.

THE PREMIER: The fact that the Constitution required a consequent increase for the Council was not then in his mind; but in fact the Chairman of the Council drew £400 last year.

MR. JOHNSON: Why was it not shown on the Estimates?

THE PREMIER: The hon. member would find it on the last list supplied.

MR. JOHNSON: The Chairman in the Council was to have received £300, but he was paid £400. Why was it left to the Premier to explain how he had paid more than the House voted? There was no comparison between the work of the Chairman of Committees in the Council and the work done by the Chairman of Committees in the Assembly. We should rather pay the Chairman in the Council £200 and the Chairman in the Assembly £400. However, he (Mr. Johnson) would support the amendment to reduce the item by £100.

MR. HASTIE: What difference would it make if the salary was reduced?

THE PREMIER: There would be no difference unless the salary of the Chairman of Committees in the Legislative Assembly was also reduced.

MR. HASTIE hoped the Committee would support the amendment, not on a question of classification, but because by voting the money we were not properly serving the interests of the public. Only the other day the Upper House threw out the Machinery Inspection Bill on the ground that it would require a lot of inspectors. The House should not assist the Government in wasting public funds.

MR. TAYLOR: The item should be reduced. The Chairman of Committees in the Council had only occupied the chair for about 15 hours this session, for which it was not fair to pay £400 a year.

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

Ayes...	...	...	...	7
Noes...	...	...	...	16
				—
Majority against...	...	...	...	9

AYES.  
Mr. Hastie  
Mr. Holman  
Mr. Johnson  
Mr. Reid  
Mr. Taylor  
Mr. Wallace  
Mr. Moran (Teller).

NOES.  
Mr. Atkins  
Mr. Bath  
Mr. Butcher  
Mr. Daglish  
Mr. Diamond  
Mr. Ewing  
Mr. Ferguson  
Mr. Gardiner  
Mr. Gregory  
Mr. Hopkins  
Mr. James  
Mr. Oats  
Mr. Pigott  
Mr. Rason  
Mr. Throssell  
Mr. Higham (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Item—Assistant Clerk and usher of black rod, £250 :

MR. JOHNSON moved that the item be reduced by £25.

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

Ayes...	...	...	...	8
Noes...	..	...	...	15

Majority against... .. 7

AYES.  
Mr. Daglish  
Mr. Hastie  
Mr. Holman  
Mr. Johnson  
Mr. Reid  
Mr. Taylor  
Mr. Wallace  
Mr. Moran (Teller).

NOES.  
Mr. Atkins  
Mr. Butcher  
Mr. Diamond  
Mr. Ewing  
Mr. Ferguson  
Mr. Gardiner  
Mr. Gregory  
Mr. Holmes  
Mr. Hopkins  
Mr. James  
Mr. Oats  
Mr. Phillips  
Mr. Pigott  
Mr. Rason  
Mr. Higham (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.  
Vote put and passed.

Legislative Assembly, £9,670 :

Item—Chairman of Committees, £400:

MR. WALLACE moved that the item be reduced by £100. Having moved a similar amendment last year and failed, he anticipated the same result now. The position did not merit the salary. We had a Chairman and two Deputy Chairmen, but the Chairman did not remain in the House longer than any private member. Mr. Illingworth, as a private member, occupied the Chair for a longer period than the Chairman of Committees. A salary of £300 was quite sufficient; but he would not call for a division because it would be futile; so he simply moved the amendment by way of protest.

MR. MORAN: There was much consistency in what had been said by the hon. member, but one was glad he was

not going to call for a division, because the real fight would take place when we came to the increases of officers in high places.

Amendment negatived.

Item—Clerk Assistant, £250 :

MR. JOHNSON moved that the item be reduced by £25. The Government were too much inclined to give increases to those already receiving £200, and to give little or no consideration to men getting under that amount. The Government paid a number of employees £150 and expected them to keep honest and respectable, to be married men, and to bring up families respectably on that amount, yet to those men they gave little or no consideration. Wherever an increase was proposed to a civil servant getting over £200 per annum he would move for a reduction.

THE PREMIER: We heard a great number of crude views from the Labour bench, and none more crude than those just expressed by the member for Kalgoorlie. He had no hesitation in saying the hon. member was actuated by a desire to secure votes.

MR. MORAN rose to a point of order. Was the Premier in order in imputing to the member for Kalgoorlie motives that were not disinterested?

THE CHAIRMAN: The remark made was not out of order, because it was not a personal attack on the hon. member.

THE PREMIER: The member for Kalgoorlie really said we must not give increases to men receiving over £200 a year until every man in the service received £200 a year. That was the logical conclusion.

MR. TAYLOR: That was not the hon. member's argument.

THE PREMIER: The argument was that no man receiving over £200 a year should have an increase until every man in the service received £200.

MR. JOHNSON: That was not his argument, but the Premier's.

THE PREMIER: That was the logical conclusion. If an obligation had to be imposed on the Government to pay every man employed sufficient to keep a wife and family, one would like to know the size of the family we were to provide for. There was a great tendency on the part of some hon. members to think that no

man was worth £200 a year except members of Parliament, who would be in favour of having £300 themselves. Our difficulty was that we paid too little for brains; too little for men who had to work hard. We should look at the value of the services rendered. The Clerk Assistant worked day and night, and not eight hours a day such as unions talked so much about, nor was he allowed payment for overtime. Moreover, he was called upon to exercise certain special knowledge from which all members benefited. They went to the Clerk or Clerk Assistant to ask how certain things were to be done. We were paying the most miserable salary in Australia to a man occupying the position of Clerk Assistant, and we should not support the amendment of the hon. member.

MR. DAGLISH: The amendment did not meet with his approval, for it was the duty of the Committee to as nearly as possible assess the value of the work done and allow an adequate payment for it; and anyone who carried out the duties of Clerk Assistant in this Chamber, with the long hours the work involved, was fully entitled to the recompense provided on these Estimates. One could not, however, help expressing regret at the manner in which the Premier had attacked the member for Kalgoorlie for moving this amendment.

THE PREMIER: It was the spirit in which the hon. member did so.

MR. DAGLISH: The member for Kalgoorlie had a right to do what he believed to be his duty to his constituents, and the leader of the House should not be the first to set an example of personal attack on anyone who happened to differ regarding any little item. He hoped that the Premier during the rest of the term the Estimates were under consideration would rather encourage a good spirit in the debates than do the exact opposite.

MR. JOHNSON said he did not take much notice of the attack of the Premier, which was characteristic of him. The Premier was right when he said we worked our servants in this Chamber too long hours. Those servants should receive more consideration, but the hon. gentleman ought to carry his consideration past the Clerk Assistant

and give a little consideration to the messengers. There was no increase of the salary for the chief messenger and other messengers, yet they had to work the same hours and possessed a certain knowledge of Parliamentary duties. If the hon. member would give an increase all round, to the Clerk Assistant, the chief messenger, and other messengers he (Mr. Johnson) would agree with him.

MR. MORAN: It was unfortunate that the item was one affecting an officer of this House. The member for Kalgoorlie could be liberated from the charge of endeavouring to seek popularity. Every man in this Chamber who attempted to open his mouth on public matters sought popularity and lived on it. One would not be here otherwise. In the past the Premier never missed an opportunity of pandering to the working people, but now the hon. gentleman changed, and was pandering to the aristocracy, the pocket boroughs of Western Australia. The Government came into power with a policy of retrenchment and financial and administrative reform, but the Premier was simply following the course of keeping the items as they were.

THE PREMIER: No; knocking off increases in the case of salaries over £200.

MR. MORAN: The policy of the Government themselves was to avoid increases in this haphazard way by Ministerial favouritism. We needed classification in this country, and an independent civil service board, and that, he thought, had been the policy of the Premier all his life. If the hon. gentleman denied that assertion, he (Mr. Moran) would quote the Premier's own speeches on the subject. He did not suppose there would be a division on this item, but we should come to big increases for which there was no justification.

Amendment negatived.

Items (2) — Librarian £150, Sub-librarian £50:

MR. DAGLISH: Could not these two amounts be put together, and the salary made up to £200 a year for a librarian?

THE PREMIER: The two items of librarian and sub-librarian appeared in the Estimates in view of the removal to the new Parliament buildings, where he hoped a far more satisfactory library

would be provided than was the case in connection with these Houses. As to putting the two sums together and making one salary for a librarian, the intention was that the present officers should continue to do the work; but if this was found not to be satisfactory after trial, it could be put right.

**Item—Messengers, £400 :**

**MR. DAGLISH :** Could not the wages of messengers be increased? The messengers for this House ought to be more highly remunerated than at present.

**THE PREMIER :** The payment for messengers in connection with the two Houses of Parliament was not distributed by the Government, but was made on the recommendation of the Speaker or the President as the case might be. He understood from the Speaker that there would be an increase in the pay of messengers for this House, and that this had been arranged for.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

**ATTORNEY GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT**  
(Hon. Walter James).

*Crown Law Offices, £5,798 10s. :*

**MR. MORAN :** In the estimates for this department there was an item on which he wished to test the feeling of the Committee.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL :** If the hon. member would permit him, he would make some general observations on the estimates of this department.

**MR. MORAN :** But in referring to this department, he (Mr. Moran) intended to speak generally on the estimate.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL :** Perhaps the hon. member, as a matter of courtesy, would allow him as Minister to speak first. Members would see that the Crown Law Department was placed more immediately under the direction of the Attorney General than was the case with any other; and taking the Crown Law Offices, it would be seen that the vote for last year was £5,595 and for this year it was £5,798 10s., showing an apparent increase of about £200; but against this increase must be set some savings. As a setoff against the expenditure, about £500 was estimated to be received. In the past the practice had been for the

Crown Solicitor to receive all fees that were recovered in cases which he personally conducted for the Crown in connection with the Supreme Court, the Local Courts, or the Police Courts. That practice had been unsatisfactory, and he (the Attorney General) had now arranged that the salary for the Crown Solicitor should be increased, and that all fees recovered in connection with cases conducted by him or his assistants should be paid into the Treasury as revenue, and in this way it was estimated that about £500 would be received in the course of the year, this estimate being based on what had been received during the past three or four years. Therefore, although the figures appeared to show an increase, there was really a saving. The previous practice was that where the Crown Solicitor did not conduct the case personally, those officers who did conduct it received the fees recovered for the Crown. All such fees would now go into revenue. There was also a sum of £750 received from the Federal Government for work done by the Crown Law officers of this State for the Federal Government. The staff not only did the State work but the Federal work also, and it was estimated that an annual recoup of about £750 would be received by the State. This meant that the £750, altogether with the £500 of recoup already mentioned, would amount to about £1,250 as a total recoup for the year, against the estimated expenditure of £5,798 10s. Then as showing the work done in the Crown Law offices, he would quote a few figures, and would first express his thanks to the Under Secretary of the Crown Law Department, Mr. H. G. Hampton, whom he believed to be one of the most efficient and most deserving officers in the public service, also one of the most thorough-going officers. Every member of this House who had come in contact with Mr. Hampton would appreciate the justice of that observation. In the Crown Law Department, on the civil side the number of actions had increased both for and against the Government, and actions brought by the Government. Taking the notices of actions received and given, and the notices of actions taken by the Government, these amounted in the year 1901-2 to 216, and in the year 1902-3 they amounted to 342, show-

ing a distinct advance. On the criminal side, being the matters conducted by the Crown Law Department in the various courts, the number in the year 1901-2 was 456, and in 1902-3 the number increased to 548. For the year 1901-2 the magisterial cases numbered 280, and the amount received for costs in connection with those cases was £378, whilst for the year 1902-3 the number of cases was 276 and the amount received was no less than £800. Of this sum £160 odd was for costs, and this amount would, under the new system, be a recoup to the department in the way he had explained. In matters of departmental administration there was also a very large increase during the past year. In connection with the accountancy of the department an improvement had been effected by carrying out a suggestion made by the Colonial Treasurer by which all matters of accountancy in connection with the several branches of administration under the Attorney General would come under the immediate notice of the accountant. One practical illustration of the good result of this change of system was that substantial sums had been saved, particularly in the payment of moneys to jurors; there being closer supervision and a substantial saving made by having the accounts under the control of one accountant whose duty it was to look into the expenditure.

At 6-26, the DEPUTY CHAIRMAN left the Chair.

At 7-30, MR. HARPER took the Chair.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (continuing): While he did not wish to tire members by referring to figures, it was desirable to show that in the Attorney General's Department there had been a distinct saving in expense and a very considerable improvement in administration, due not to the Ministerial head but to the departmental head. The Civil Service Association, in the course of a recent deputation, expressed satisfaction at the estimates so far as the Attorney General's Department was concerned, and said this was the one department where some attempt had been made at a classification. Last year the estimated expenditure of the department was £66,000; this year it was £67,000, an increase

of merely £500. The department had undertaken increased obligations. The cost of cleaning the Supreme Courts, amounting to £450, was now debited to the Crown Law Department, and this item alone almost accounted for the excess over last year's vote. In addition a clerk had been appointed to the Arbitration Court at a salary of £250. The department had also taken over new magistrates whose salaries amounted to £1,860, these salaries having previously been paid by the Minister for Mines. The retiring allowances this year amounted to £268, and the half share paid by the department of salaries of district medical officers acting as magistrates amounted to £1,170. These items totalled £3,998 4s. 11d. If members bore in mind that the department received fees amounting to about £500 which previously went into the pockets of the Crown Law officers, and that the department paid the additional items just enumerated, they would see that there had been a distinct and substantial saving. In addition there had certainly been no diminution of work in any one of the departments controlled by the Attorney General. The savings were entirely due to the closer and better administration brought about by the energy and ability of the Under Secretary, Mr. Hampton. There was no hesitation in saying that the department to-day was more efficiently administered than it had ever been administered in the history of the State. People could bring law proceedings against the Crown with less difficulty than in the past. In our Crown Solicitor (Mr. Sayer) and Assistant Crown Solicitor (Mr. Barker) we had two legal professional advisers who stood high in the opinion of the profession in the State. We might compare what was done in this State with what was done elsewhere, because a lot of general statements were made as to what was done elsewhere in regard to cost. We should take the salaries in connection with Government work for magisterial, judicial, and Crown law work in various States. In 1901 the total cases heard in New South Wales, criminal, civil, inquests, Supreme Court and District Court cases were 87,719. The salaries in 1902 were £108,000, an approximate cost per case of £1 4s. 7d. In Victoria for 1901 the cases were

75,499, the gross cost being £74,816 or 19s. 9d. per case. In South Australia there were 18,000 cases, costing £17,854 gross, or 19s. 2½d. per case, in Western Australia 26,597 cases—8,000 in excess of South Australia—at a cost of £27,000, or a cost per case of 19s. 4d. When this comparison was carried out we came in cost next to South Australia; and bearing in mind the heavy expenditure we were put to by reason of the large territory in which law had to be administered and the difficulties in connection with the conduct of cases, no one could say the cost per case of 19s. 4d. was high as compared with the 19s. 2d. in South Australia, and 24s. 7d. in New South Wales.

MR. MORAN: Was the Minister sure he was taking an exactly parallel case?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: In this comparison he was taking the magistrates bench, the Supreme Court, and the Crown Law Department. He was not taking the police cases in either instance, but the judiciary machinery, as it were, in each case: so the comparison was distinctly in our favour. The amount of work which passed through the Crown Law Department in this State was altogether out of proportion to our population as compared with the Eastern States, because so many new cases cropped up. In 1901, for instance, the number of persons per thousand of the population charged with offences was, in New South Wales 41·92, in Victoria 22·88, South Australia 18, Queensland 43·86, Tasmania 24·86, New Zealand 30·20, and Western Australia 90·30. In Western Australia there was, in proportion, more than double the work.

MR. DAGLISH: How many of these cases were petty cases?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said he could not tell.

MR. DAGLISH: Police cases only involved work for clerks of Courts.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Whatever work they involved, the comparison was fair, and if he took the comparison suggested by the hon. member it would tell still more strongly in our favour, because we had a larger percentage of criminal cases coming before our Courts than the other States, and also a larger percentage of civil cases.

MR. TAYLOR: Were there more criminals here per thousand of the population than in the other States?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes.

MEMBER: There were more adults here.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: That was the reason. We found population and work increasing, and to-day we had an increase of £500 on this year's Estimates as compared with last year's. He could point out three items, each of which almost equalled that £500, and one of them was three times as much. He thought he could present a good case when he said that in the administration of these departments due economy had been shown.

MR. MORAN: The policy was to have been one of economy, retrenchment, and administration. In reference to administration, there was widespread dissatisfaction in the whole of the civil service, and a state of complete unrest in the Railway Department. As to economy, the bounding revenue which had given the Government another half-million was insufficient for them to pay their haphazard rises of large salaries to those in high office and to carry out and manage public works. The whole surplus was made up of unexpended items. The Committee passed in connection with works £157,000 which had not been expended, and that was pretty scandalous.

THE TREASURER: There were obligations for £170,000 odd to be entered against that £157,000.

MR. MORAN: The Committee passed a number of items for necessary public works, and scores of those items had not been dealt with. That was not treating Parliament properly. Coming to the Crown Law Department, he was told that the secretary was not a lawyer and had never served a day to the study of the law.

MR. DAGLISH: We did not want a lawyer for secretary.

MR. MORAN: If we wanted a Crown Law Department and could get a man who was highly qualified, which man should we take?

THE TREASURER: An administrator.

MR. MORAN: Matters did not look too serene ahead in the way of finance, and was it unfair to ask the Government to stick to the policy they were returned

by the people to carry out? We had in this branch an under secretary who had been a comparatively few years in the service of this State and whose rise had been meteoric.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** That officer deserved it.

**MR. MORAN:** Every year there had been a substantial increase to this officer, and it was now proposed to give him an increase of £100. We had a department in this State which was doing a tremendous business—the Savings Bank—in which some £600,000 was paid out and a like sum taken in; therefore over a million of money was handled in that institution. Officers there worked overtime from March to September, and they were now engaged in overtime on a special task. The Estimates showed £200 or £300 to be divided among 17 clerks for last year's overtime. The chief clerk in that institution, who had evidently more work to do, and more responsible work, than the gentleman to whom it was proposed to give £550, received £210.

**MR. DAGLISH:** It was the usual custom in Ministerial departments to give to officers closely in touch with Ministers large increases. That had always been the policy of Governments in Western Australia. When an officer was removed from the Minister and the Minister knew nothing about the work done, such officer invariably was left unbenefited by increases. This year's Estimates in every department would corroborate that statement. He was pleased to see increases given, but they were too great. The proper plan for the Government to pursue would be to classify the civil service and fix a maximum and a minimum, and let an officer go by steps from the minimum to the maximum of the class in which he was. The pay of the officer should be the average between the maximum and the minimum, and as an officer's service extended he should get, when at the maximum of his class, a certain amount of consideration for lengthy and meritorious service.

**THE TREASURER:** Why make a maximum at all in those circumstances?

**MR. DAGLISH:** There was no way of establishing a classification without having a maximum and a minimum. The State could not go on paying increases to officers

as had been the practice. It was not known what was the maximum of any class in the service. We did not know the maximum of the heads of departments. The Under Secretary of the Attorney General's Department had been getting £450 a year; some under secretaries had been getting £550 or £600 a year, others again had been getting £650 and others £700 or £750 a year—the principal under secretary used to get £750, therefore one was justified in quoting that salary. There should be a maximum to each of the classes, and when any officer was under the maximum he should not proceed by one jump to that maximum, but should should go thither by equal steps extending over a certain number of years. It was not necessary to give large increases of £100, and the increases should not always go to the heads of departments. Why should not the same principle extend to the lower grades in the service, where there were many officers underpaid? There were two managing clerks in the Crown Law offices at the present time getting £800 a year, to whom it was proposed to give £840 a year, or an increase of £20 a year to each officer. Then there was the Assistant Crown Solicitor to whom, as well as to the Under Secretary, an increase of £100 was given. The accountant was to get an increase of £60, and there were eight clerks the aggregate of whose increases appeared to be £257. It was impossible for members to decide how that amount was divided. In the Patents and Trade Marks office, which he would take as an example, as it was an office under the Attorney General, there used to be three clerks; that number had been reduced to two, one receiving £180 and another £150 a year. Last year there were three clerks who got a total of £570, now the amount was reduced by £240, so apparently an officer getting £240 or thereabouts had been retired and it was found unnecessary to replace that officer. It was also found unnecessary to give any substantial proportion of the salary to the man who succeeded him. The two officers were still doing the work that had been done all along, and until this department was taken over by the Federal Government the State ought to pay a reasonable salary for the work done.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** These two clerks were getting slight increases.

**MR. DAGLISH:** There had been promotion necessitated by the departure of the chief clerk, who was receiving £240 a year. A second clerk who was receiving £170 was to get an increase of £10 for doing work which was paid £70 a year higher for previously, and the next clerk was to get a small increase. That was the difference in a Ministerial office and in a small subordinate office. He would like to see the amount of the large increases reduced; he did not want to see the increases struck out. The Government should fix an amount of increase that would be the maximum paid to any officer not promoted to a higher position.

**THE TREASURER:** Supposing an officer was receiving too much for the work he was doing and that officer left, should another officer be put on at the same salary as the man who left?

**MR. DAGLISH:** Nothing of the sort could be assumed until there was a classification of the work. He had gone very carefully through the details of one classification that had not been accepted, and he believed there was a second classification not published nor accepted. He assumed the Government last year did not vote any inordinate excess salaries, but that the Treasurer brought down a fair estimate.

**THE TREASURER:** No one got an increase last year.

**MR. DAGLISH:** The Government should fix a maximum increase of salary and allow no officer of the service, be his rank what it might, to get more than that increase unless promoted to a higher position.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** The question of classification was most difficult to deal with.

**MR. DAGLISH:** It had been settled everywhere else.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** It would not be settled by members saying that the Government should state what the classification was. Nothing was simpler than to suggest a certain classification, but that was not the way to overcome the trouble, for difficulties only appeared when one applied the classification. Dissatisfaction cropped up when broad lines of a classification were laid down. The Government had done their

best to apply classification, but one got tired of these things when faults were being found and attacks made on Estimates because of the increases. Strangely enough those who had made complaints in the past did not make any complaint against the department under notice. Members had said this was the only department where an attempt had been made to apply classification.

**MR. MORAN:** There was more discontent in the service over this increase of £100 than over anything else.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** This officer was one of the best in the service, and whilst he (the Premier) occupied his position he would support that officer, who saved the country hundreds of pounds a year by administration. This officer was working night after night; and if Ministers knew that a man was doing his duty and was worth more than £450 a year, then the Government were justified in asking Parliament to pay that amount to the officer. In every State the Crown Law Department had a departmental head, but there was no State where the departmental head was paid £450. The Government asked that the head of this department should be paid £550: that was as low as any salary paid to any under secretary in the State. The accounts which passed through this department amounted to £170,000 a year. The position was worth the money, and the man was worth it too. He wished that in the public service there were more such servants. It was the duty of a Minister to deal with the salary of an under secretary, for that officer could not deal with it himself. An under secretary was the one officer the Minister must deal directly with; beyond that the recommendations were largely controlled by the under secretary. There was no better under secretary in any Crown Law Department in Australia than the one we had. The member for Subiaco had referred to the Patents Office—he did not know if that threw much light on this matter—but there was a reduction there because one clerk retired. It was only right to say the value of the work did not quite represent the salary which that officer had been drawing. Of the officers left, one was receiving an increase of £40 a year and the other an increase of £10 a year. But



that department would soon cease to exist, as the Federal Government would take it over. Substantial savings had been effected in the Crown Law Department; its administration was efficient; and he asked for support in bringing before members the case of the Under Secretary, who by merit alone had attained his present position. The departmental report was eminently satisfactory, and showed that the Under Secretary thoroughly understood his work. Moreover the officer came in contact with other Ministers, all of whom could testify to his value.

**THE TREASURER:** Having been accused by the member for West Perth of being the hardest man to convince that officers were entitled to increases, he must say that possibly no Minister came so much in contact with the Under Secretary of this department as did the Treasurer, and it was undeniable that the Under Secretary was one of the best officers in the service. That service contained some men whom any private employer in a large way of business would be glad to employ. Let us pay good men good wages. Was not that the principle unanimously enunciated by the House last year? If the State was to have good officers, pay them well, judge them by the work they did, and dismiss any whose work was unsatisfactory. Let any member visit the Crown Law Department and catechise the Under Secretary; and if that officer were not found to be capable, he the (Treasurer) did not know a capable man when he met one.

**MR. PIGOTT:** Much of this trouble would have been avoided had the Estimates been framed in their usual form. All could see from this item that the Under Secretary had been set down for an increase, and this was plain in a few cases; but where several officers' salaries were lumped together, none could ascertain from the Estimates whether a particular salary had been increased or decreased.

**THE TREASURER:** The Estimates were in the same form as those of other States.

**MR. PIGOTT:** True; but our civil service was not in the same form as theirs. It was not classified: if it were, the Estimates would be comprehensible by anyone. As it was, none could understand them. In many instances, we found

groups of eight or ten officers receiving varying salaries. How could we ascertain whether one of these had an increase? The sum total might show an increase of £200 for the lot; but all of this or more might be given to one officer, the salaries of the others being reduced. The Treasurer said Ministers could give information as to details. Did he wish every salary to be queried? If he wished the Estimates speedily put through, he should report progress and redraft them. This was not a threat; but if the suggestion were not accepted, every item of salary would probably be queried.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** That might be desirable.

**MR. PIGOTT:** It might; but it would tremendously prolong the session. During the first session of this Parliament we were promised some finality as to the civil service, and some classification. Three years had elapsed, and what was done? The Public Service Commission were appointed; but that appointment was simply a blind. Civil servants entitled to increases were told by the Government "We will do nothing until the Commission report." Interim reports had since been coming in, and apparently had not been acted on. In this the Government might have been right. One of the Commissioners retired months ago; and the Government took no action, but allowed the Commission to go on. When it was to cease no one seemed to know, neither the House nor the country having had any information.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** A reckless statement.

**MR. PIGOTT:** If the Government would promise to bring about a classification, their word might be accepted; but no Minister had said his department had been classified or that its classification was intended. No satisfaction would be given until the service was classified so that each officer knew the maximum salary which he could attain if he behaved himself, and the minimum beyond which his salary could not be reduced. Under proper classification officers would be satisfied; for other services had been classified satisfactorily. Surely the Commonwealth classification satisfied its servants? [THE PREMIER: No.] True, there were isolated complaints; but there

were no mass meetings to protest against the classification. [A MINISTER: Wait for another year to see how it worked.] Our Government should have either disbanded the Public Service Commission or improved it so that its reports could be adopted. He (Mr. Pigott) did not know whether this Under Secretary deserved the increase of £100; nor would he ever move to strike out an increase unless he knew that the officer was unworthy of it. If as the Premier said this officer were worth the money, he should be paid it; but the Government ought to state their intentions as to classifying the service; and to get the opinion of the Committee, he (Mr. Pigott), not with the idea of decreasing this officer's salary but to ask the support of members in demanding from the Government a full statement of their intentions, moved :

That the item "Under Secretary" be reduced by £100.

MR. CONNOR: These items were not numbered progressively. How were they to be distinguished?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: This was "Under Secretary."

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That the Government decided to change the form of the Estimates was most unfortunate. The change had its advantages; but these did not compensate for its disadvantages. It was truly said that the form was the same as in other States; but in other States the civil service was classified. In such of our departments as were to some extent classified, as in the Education Department, where salaries were fixed, there was no need to give particulars on the Estimates, nor had these been ever given. This proved that under a general classification detailed Estimates would be unnecessary; but now it was essential to have the Estimates in the form to which we were accustomed. He was a member of the Ministry which had appointed the Civil Service Commission; and the Ministry did so very reluctantly and against their own judgment, but at the distinct command of the House. Hence it was with an ill-grace that members complained of the existence of an institution of their own creation. The Government were prepared to deal with the classification system, but they were hindered by the vote of the House. The Commission had done good work,

whatever might be said about it. No commission ever yet brought down a recommendation which would be indorsed as a whole, but the work of this Commission would be exceedingly helpful to the Government, and had already been helpful, because some of the changes in the Estimates were for the better. What would have been the attitude of the House had the Government taken up the work of classification before the work of the Commission was completed? Members would have been the very first to complain against the Government if such a step had been taken. The Government were bound to be between two fires, and would be burned either way. If the House had trusted the Government the matter of classification would have been settled some time ago, because it had not been settled the House was to blame. The officer whose salary was under review deserved the advance given to him. One complained, however, that in the same department other officers equally deserving had not received advances, officers who worked hard for the State and who saved large sums of money through their energy.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The position and intentions of the Government were well known. The report of the recent deputation of the Civil Service Association had to some extent shown what they were. The main desire was to secure classification, and it was natural that the members of the Public Service Commission as they passed through the various departments would acquire a knowledge of departmental detail that was necessary when applying the basis of any classification they arrived at. Some months ago he asked the members of the Commission to get through their work as soon as possible so that time would be allowed to take steps to fix the classification. In their first reports the Commissioners did suggest one method of classification; but the difficulty was not so much in devising a scheme, but in applying it to classify the various officers, for in that lay the test of the accuracy of the scheme.

MR. ATKINS: Did the Premier mean a personal classification?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: Why were the officers not classified?

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** A man might be called an accountant who was not an accountant. There was one instance in the Attorney General's department of an accountant who only had to look after departmental accounts, which work an ordinary clerk could do. This officer was not an accountant at all. The House would not tolerate having two commissions going through the public service at the same time; so that nothing could be done with a classification scheme while the present Commission was at work. The Government had relieved the Commission of one or two departments with the object of letting them get through quickly. Their report should be complete on the 21st November, and then a little time would be available in which the Commissioners could discuss the question of their method of classification. With their personal knowledge they might be able to devise a classification and submit some scheme to the Government and Parliament. There had been no attempt at classification through a number of years, and when the Estimates came on this year no classification was available, nor did the Government have the full reports of the Commission. The Government would have been well justified in taking up the attitude they took up on a previous year, that as no classification had been adopted no increases should be given. The Government, however, were anxious to assist the service by anticipating the classification. It was found that the scheme suggested by the Commission was entirely unsatisfactory, but the consideration of the proposals caused a delay of some weeks. The Under Secretaries were then asked to prepare a classification. These officers did not approve of the scheme suggested by the Commission, and suggested another.

**MR. MORAN:** They dealt with their own salaries, which the Government agreed to.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** Not one of them did so. When the Government came to apply the scheme suggested by the Under Secretaries it was found that the application of it would have resulted in such increases that the House would not have supported it. After this, even if Ministers could have prepared a scheme to the entire satisfaction of the

House, there was not sufficient time in which to prepare one. Ministers went into the scheme suggested by the Under Secretaries as closely as they could, and they were satisfied it would not pass the House. The Estimates were kept back to this point for the sole and express purpose of endeavouring to overcome the difficulty of classification, or to meet it as far as possible. Otherwise the Estimates would have been down within three weeks of the meeting of Parliament.

**MR. TAYLOR:** The opinion was expressed that the Estimates were kept back until Parliament got tired.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** That opinion was entirely unfounded. The Government went into the recommendations made, but could not adopt all of them, and said that whatever was done would be entirely provisional and could not be final, and that they hoped during the year to adopt some course by which a classification could be settled. Nothing could be done while the existing Commission was sitting. The final report of the Commission would be due about the 21st November. The position was not free from difficulty.

**MR. PIOTT:** What procedure did the Government intend to take?

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** That was not settled.

**MR. PIOTT:** It was what the House desired to know.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** It was difficult to foretell what should be done. One of the Commissioners had already returned to Victoria; another desired to return to South Australia after December; and Dr. Black would be the only one left. It was the intention of the Government to meet the Commissioners and see if they could assist in the direction of classification. If this could not be done, the Government would then try to devise some means by which classification could be dealt with. The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) must know that there was no more unpleasant work in a Minister's career than when the question of settling salaries came on. In an endeavour to meet the civil service to some extent the Government had recommended increases. The only result was to create dissatisfaction, because some who received increases considered they had not got enough, while others who did

not receive increases thought they ought to have received advances. The Government would rather give increases than let the men remain at the salaries they were receiving. Ministers only desired to do justice to the various claimants. No one, however, was blind to the fact that every man had an idea of the value of his services which was not the idea of the paymaster. The difficulty was to make the two ideas agree. Sometimes the paymaster was wrong, and sometimes the servant was wrong. If we could devise a method of settling this difficulty—as far as he could see it would have to be by the appointment of some board—so much the better; but he looked with a certain amount of apprehension upon having the civil service, which had been stirred up during the last 12 months by this Commission, again stirred up by the appointment of another board to inquire into the question of classification.

MR. DAGLISH: The civil service had not settled down.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: No; and the sooner we could give them an opportunity of settling down the better. If we could devise some simpler method than the appointment of a board which would be satisfactory we should adopt that, and if members would throw out a suggestion he would be glad to entertain it.

MR. DIAMOND: It was somewhat startling to find that of the total increases of £200 given to under secretaries, the Under Secretary for the Attorney General's Department was to get £100. It might appear that the Attorney General, being the Premier, was the dominating figure in the Ministry, and that this gentleman might have been favoured; but the principal of a large business took the advice of the heads of the departments as to the position of the men in those departments; and until it could be shown that there was anything like undue favouritism he (Mr. Diamond) was compelled as a business man to take the advice of the heads of departments. If the Premier as Attorney General told him that this officer was underpaid and deserved another £100 a year, one was in duty bound to vote for the increase recommended.

MR. MORAN: If the member for South Fremantle had anybody in his electorate who thought himself not very well paid, that hon. member probably would not be content to take the opinion of the Minister.

MR. CONNOR: It was absolutely unfair that certain people should be picked out for favours in connection with increases. We had in the employ of this country a short time ago one of the ablest men in Australasia, who gave the best of his life to Western Australia, and as far as ability was concerned was a long way above anyone we had in the department which that officer was put out of. Rank injustice was done to Mr. Leslie, who ought to be our Engineer-in-Chief. It was a disgrace to this country that a man who had been of such service should be treated in the shabby manner Mr. Leslie was, simply because he bumped up against one of the Ministers. That man was responsible for the building of the Mundaring Weir.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Mundaring Weir was not under discussion. A member was in order in alluding to it, but not in discussing the merits of that case.

MR. CONNOR: We would discuss the action of the Government in regard to favouritism, and in relation to a servant not willing politically to bow to the head of his department.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Who was the Minister that officer bumped up against?

MR. CONNOR: We were not, he believed, allowed to be personal. If he were to state which Minister it was, the hon. gentleman might think him personal.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS said he would not object.

MR. CONNOR: One wished to keep away from personalities. For the reason he had given he was prepared to vote for the amendment, not because he thought the Under Secretary unworthy of the increase, for he did not know whether that officer was so or not, but he wished to affirm a principle. At Fremantle there was favouritism in the Railway Department which was unprecedented, untold, unfair, and absolutely sufficient to turn out of power any Government in Australasia, if it were brought to light and the public would take an interest in it.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** The hon. member was the last man who ought to complain of favouritism in the Railway Department.

**MR. CONNOR:** In the Railway Department at Fremantle, injustice had been done to certain classes of people. He had brought the matter before the Commissioner a dozen times, and he believed he had brought one or two little things under the Minister's notice. It was a howling disgrace that such things should be allowed to occur as took place every day at Fremantle.

**MR. TAYLOR:** The amendment would be supported by him notwithstanding the explanation of the Attorney General. The civil service of Western Australia was in a state of unrest. At the meeting of civil servants, which was attended by at least 400, and was very orderly and intelligent, the argument used by speaker after speaker was that they desired a classification, and had no wish for any increase pending that classification. These increases were being made, and it was anticipated at that meeting that such would be the case. Those who were in high positions in the service were able to get the ear of the Minister.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** The Estimates were published before the meeting.

**MR. TAYLOR:** Those who spoke at the meeting said the increases invariably were made to those who could reach the ear of the Minister, and the Estimates bore out that statement. If the Premier desired to get the civil servants into a state of rest again, no increases should be made until a classification was adopted. He was satisfied that at the meeting of civil servants there was material that would have made a splendid organisation, and he claimed to have organised as many working men as anyone in the State. If no increases were made until a classification was adopted, and the increases then decided on were made retrospective, that would stop the unrest in the service. If the civil service did not get fair treatment there might be a repetition in the civil service of what happened in the Railway Department two years ago. Those at the meeting of civil servants were reasonable and calm in their deliberations, they knew exactly what they were doing, and the grievance under which they were suffering; they

also knew the injustice of the increases. It was unfair that increases should be made to already highly paid officers while those receiving small salaries got no advancement. During the first session of this Parliament he supported the Government because of the promises of economy and efficient administration; but he was sorry to say those promises were as far away to-day as when he entered the Chamber. He advised the Government to let civil servants remain at the salaries they were drawing last session and re-classify the service. The increases in deserving cases could be made retrospective. The board which classified the service could make such recommendations as were necessary.

**MR. DIAMOND:** Remarks had been made by the member for East Kimberley in reference to an officer, and he (Mr. Diamond) felt as strongly about another officer; but he did not know what the injustice done to one officer had to do with an increase to another deserving officer.

**MR. PIGOTT:** It was surprising to hear that the member for Cue intended to vote against the amendment because this officer's salary should not be reduced, for that member knew perfectly well that if the amendment were carried that would not necessarily mean that the officer's salary would be reduced. He (Mr. Pigott) moved the amendment to get the opinion of the Committee on the increases and the classification.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** Did the hon. member make it a test vote on a question of confidence.

**MR. PIGOTT** said he did not mind. It was to get the opinion of members that he moved the amendment. The Premier stated that the classification of the civil service would be settled by-and-by. We had been waiting ever since Parliament sat for a settlement of the matter, and we were likely to wait a long time yet. It was regrettable that the work of the Civil Service Commission was for the most part to be considered worthless, and that a new board was to be appointed to try to put the service on a satisfactory basis. The Premier stated that Parliament would never have approved of the Government having two boards working at once, which convinced him that as soon as the present Royal

Commission had finished its labours another board would be appointed. The Premier had twitted members with not having put forward some suggestions as to a system of classification; but it was not the duty of members to do this. A proper form of classification was first to classify the work and then appoint officers to the positions. If that basis were worked on, a decent system could be arrived at. It might be said there would be too many officers in one particular class, but anomalies existed in any particular classification when first introduced, though anomalies would die out. Promotion might be provided first through a class by progressive steps, and also on account of good service and on account of the term of service. The minimum and maximum for each class should be stated, and no officer should get above the maximum. No officer should be passed from one class to another until vacancy occurred. The civil service knew what a classification meant, and under such a system as he had outlined a civil servant might rise to a certain position. Take the case of an officer, say in Class D, the maximum for which would be £250. An officer might have to remain in that position and at that salary for five or six years. The civil servants were willing to take that chance, but they wanted something definite done. Officers desired to understand their position; they did not wish promotion to be made entirely on length of service; they were willing that merit should be the first consideration. If these matters were taken into consideration, any Government worthy of the name could form a system of classification which would prove satisfactory. If the Royal Commission had not done their work properly it was the duty of the Government to know that. He asked members to give their opinion on this question, and let the public service know what was the opinion of the Committee by voting for or against the amendment.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** So much had been said about civil servants and classification that it was due he should make some remarks. It had been said that an officer who was formerly under his (Mr. Rason's) control had been very badly treated because the officer refused to "kow tow" to the head of the

department for political reasons, and because the officer bumped against the Minister. One was anxious to ascertain who the Minister might be, and so far it had not been possible to discover who was the alleged guilty party. With whatever had been said in commendation of the officer referred to, he (Mr. Rason) entirely agreed, and in case it might be imagined that whatever the officer suffered was in consequence of having bumped up against him as Minister, he could say without the slightest fear of contradiction that if the officer referred to was asked who was his best friend, the officer would say without hesitation the Minister was. That might remove any wrong impression created. Because one officer was said to be a good servant, that did not imply that the rest were bad; for he was glad to say there were many other good officers in the public service to-day, many good officers in the Works Department, and the officer referred to was one. The officer was in receipt of a salary of £400 a year when at Mundaring. There was an opportunity of appointing a resident engineer for Fremantle, and that officer was selected for the position at an increased salary. Then came the formation of the Harbour Trust, and naturally an engineer was required for the trust. This officer was lent to the Harbour Trust, and it was thought in course of time he would become the engineer to the trust. For reasons one could not explain it was not thought fit, or the Harbour Trust did not see their way to accept Mr. Leslie as engineer to that trust.

**MR. MORAN:** The Minister had an idea on the subject.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** It was not his business to have ideas on matters which did not concern him. He had enough troubles of his own.

**MR. MORAN:** The Government had the confirmation of those appointments.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS** said he was dealing with his department which had been attacked. Failing that appointment, it was obvious it would be impossible to have two positions at Fremantle, a resident engineer paid by the Government and an engineer paid by the Harbour Trust. This officer was therefore thrown back on

the Works Department; he could not be given a position at the salary he had been receiving, and was therefore offered the only vacancy suitable to his ability, an appointment as engineer at another port, at the salary he had received when at Mundaring. Not seeing his way to accept that salary, he resigned. The officer would doubtless admit that he had not been unjustly treated.

MR. MORAN assured the Minister that the officer did consider himself unjustly treated, though apparently he did not blame the Minister.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: That was so far satisfactory; but other people had inferred that the Minister was to blame. By whom had the officer been ill-used if not by the Minister? [MR. MORAN: By the Government.] It was nonsense to say that Mr. Leslie's case was singular. Many other good officers of considerable ability had been retrenched. He (the Minister) was sorry to lose them; but there was no work for them and they had to go. So in this case, there was no appointment vacant at the salary Mr. Leslie had been receiving; he was offered the next best vacancy, which he did not see his way to accept. What was the Minister to do? Should the Government have created a position for Mr. Leslie?

MR. MORAN: Why did he leave the Harbour Trust?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Ask something easy. Members had said that the Public Works Estimates showed this year a considerable increase and no attempt at economy. These were the figures—

MR. MORAN: Members had listened patiently to a speech on a matter not under discussion. Was the Minister in order in dealing now with the estimates of the Works Department?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Who raised the question? This was characteristic.

MR. MORAN: The Minister for Works had made his personal explanation in reference to a matter which had no bearing on this vote; and he now proposed to give details of retrenchment in the Works Department. Was he in order?

THE CHAIRMAN: An attack had been made on the Works Department by the member for the Murray (Mr. Atkins),

and the Minister was in order in replying to that attack.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for the Murray spoke generally of the total of the Public Works estimates.

MR. MORAN: The Minister had no right to traverse his own estimates when replying to a speech made on the Crown Law estimates.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Minister wished to institute comparisons between one officer and another.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Minister was not out of order.

MR. MORAN disagreed with the Chairman's ruling. Had the Speaker gone home?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MORAN: Then the ruling need not be challenged.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for the Murray attacked the expenditure of the Works Department, saying that the estimates showed a considerable increase for this year. As a fact, they showed a saving of £19,852 in salaries in respect of revenue and loan expenditure. He (the Minister) hoped the salary of the Under Secretary to the Crown Law Department would not be reduced. It was said such increases were granted because the officers benefited were able to gain the ear of the Minister; but no Under Secretary could gain the ear of all Ministers, and he (Mr. Rason) would not be doing his duty if he did not bear testimony to this officer's ability. This was one of the best under secretaries in the service, and it was a pity there were not more officers like him.

MR. CONNOR said that in discussing Mr. Leslie's retirement he had not made a personal attack on the Minister for Works; but Mr. Leslie had done the State great service, had written a report with which the Premier was so pleased that it was printed and laid on the table; and it seemed strange that the Minister for Works should support an increase to the Attorney General's Under Secretary when a better man in the Works Department had received the noble order of the sack. The country would want to know the truth of this, for such incidents bred distrust in the service. If the appointment of harbour trust com-

missioners was a political sop, that should be remedied. Mr. Leslie had been unjustly treated. After the late C. Y. O'Connor, he was the best engineer in the State; and why had he been ignored? The Minister tried to put the blame on the harbour trust. [THE MINISTER: No.] Then who was to blame for the retrenchment? An injustice had been done to Mr. Leslie, and a graver injustice to the State, which had lost the service of a valuable officer.

MR. QUINLAN protested against such a large increase as £100 to the Under Secretary. An increase of £100 was too much to be given in one year; and however good this officer might be, some professional men in the service received much smaller salaries. With the exception of this item the maximum increase this year seemed to be £50. Though he (Mr. Quinlan) sat in Opposition, the Government knew they had no better supporter as to administration, so long as they adhered to their declared policy; but to this increase he could not agree, and he would support an amendment to reduce it by £50.

MR. HASTIE moved that progress be reported. This had become a general discussion, and some members had not heard it.

MR. MORAN: This had been fixed up to save the Government from defeat. The leader of the Labour party had been squared.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	13
Noes	...	...	...	11

Majority for ... 2

AYES.  
Mr. Ewing  
Mr. Ferguson  
Mr. Gardiner  
Mr. Gordon  
Mr. Gregory  
Mr. Hastie  
Mr. Hopkins  
Mr. Isdell  
Mr. James  
Mr. Phillips  
Mr. Rason  
Mr. Reid  
Mr. Higham (Teller).

NOES.  
Mr. Butcher  
Mr. Connor  
Mr. Daglish  
Mr. Diamond  
Mr. Holman  
Mr. Johnson  
Mr. Moran  
Mr. Pigott  
Mr. Quinlan  
Mr. Taylor  
Mr. Atkins (Teller).

Motion thus passed.

Progress reported.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved "that the Committee have leave to sit again on the next Tuesday."

MR. MORAN: The debate might just as well be adjourned to Tuesday fortnight. It was now only 9.30 o'clock, and some of the most faithful of the Government supporters were away in the country. It was only fair that the Government should have time to look up their supporters, and that they should not have to call up men to the House to save the Ministry from a most humiliating position. When the leader of the Opposition moved that the item under discussion be reduced by £100, the Attorney General said across the House that he would make it a vote of no-confidence; and the leader of the Opposition then said his principle was that there should be a classification, and no rises until the classification was brought about. He (Mr. Moran) desired to draw marked attention to the fact that, although the fight was to give increases and justice to those in the lower ranks of the service, the Government were saved by the vote of the leader of the Labour party.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Not at all. The hon. member was defeated, as he always would be defeated.

MR. MORAN: It was unprecedented to report progress at 9.30 o'clock on a motion by a member who had been most of the time out of the Chamber. There had been a conference about the matter, and the Government were saved from having their hands forced to classify the service, which was the object of the motion by the leader of the Opposition. The Government's policy of classification in 1901 was shown in *Hansard*.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The question was one of adjournment.

MR. MORAN: Yes; but in order that we could consider the matter at leisure, and show what ought to be done in the way of classification, he would read what the then Treasurer (Mr. Illingworth) said in his Financial Statement:—

The Government propose to go in for classification of officers, to place them in a position of merit and qualification. I do not think we can for ever go on giving increments to officers because the years are going by.

That was the policy of the Government three years ago. We asked for it to-night. The leader of the Opposition favoured it, and the House would have had its way and some attempt would have been made at classification but



for the conference which had taken place, and but for this extraordinary move by the leader of the Labour party in allowing himself to be made a tool of. One saw Ministers coming and going in and out of the House, for they discovered that they did not have sufficient supporters in the Chamber.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** The hon. member should confine himself to the truth.

**MR. MORAN:** To confine himself to the truth, he would not always live in the same place as the hon. member. The debate should be adjourned for a fortnight, though he would not move in that direction.

**MR. HASTIE:** What the member for West Perth had said about him was absolutely, maliciously, and deliberately untrue.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member should not use those expressions.

**MR. HASTIE** could use no other words that would express his feelings.

**MR. MORAN** insisted on a withdrawal.

**MR. HASTIE:** Of what words? If the hon. member mentioned the words they would be withdrawn. Could the word "untrue" be used?

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** "Characteristic" was close enough.

**MR. HASTIE:** None of the words of the member for West Perth were true. No conference had taken place, and there was no talk between him and the Attorney General. His object in moving to adjourn the debate was that, after listening for a quarter of an hour hearing members talking about the Public Works Department and all sorts of departments, he saw that the member for West Perth was deliberately wasting the time of the Committee and that some other members were deliberately backing up the hon. member.

**MR. TAYLOR:** The Minister for Works wasted time.

**MR. HASTIE:** The Minister only replied to some statements made.

**MR. MORAN:** Was it in order to accuse any member of the House of deliberately wasting time?

**THE CHAIRMAN:** This was not a point of order, but a personal explanation.

**MR. HASTIE:** What he said was absolutely true. What was said about him was maliciously false.

**MR. MORAN:** Those words should be withdrawn.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member should withdraw the words.

**MR. HASTIE:** Until outside the House he would do so.

**MR. MORAN:** Could he have the police to protect him?

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** In justice to the member for Kanowna, there was absolutely no foundation for the remarks about a conference. Had the member for Kanowna not explained, he (the Attorney General) would have replied to the remarks of the member for West Perth, which otherwise should have been treated with silent contempt.

Motion passed, and leave given to sit again on the next Tuesday.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9.42 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

### Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 10th November, 1903.

	PAGE
Questions: Railway Water Haulage, Great Southern .....	1938
Midland Company's Lands .....	1938
Bills: Audit Bill, further amendments, Assembly's Message, procedure .....	1938
Mining Bill, first reading .....	1939
Dog Bill, Assembly's amendment .....	1939
Constitution Act Amendment, select committee's recommendations considered, reported .....	1939
Electoral, select committee's recommendations considered, progress .....	1937

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### PAPER PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Fremantle Hospital, Annual Report.

Ordered, to lie on the table.