

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

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

Question put and passed.

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

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

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

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

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

## PAPERS PRESENTED.

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

## QUESTION—SITTING HOUR, FRIDAYS.

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

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

## QUESTION—COAL MINING INDUSTRY, GOVERNMENT SUPPLIES.

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

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

A.

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

January, and February for each year from 1907 to 1910. Coal is ordered weekly, and periods are therefore given for each four weeks as shown:—

## 1907-1908.

Four weeks ended	Mine and Tons ordered.				
	Proprietary.	Cardiff.	Co-operative.	Scottish.	Total.
30th Nov., 1907	2,023	1,191	1,191	1,190	6,495
28th Dec., 1907	2,678	1,092	1,092	1,091	5,953
25th Jan., 1908	2,554	1,042	1,041	1,040	5,677
22nd Feb., 1908	3,190	1,301	1,300	1,298	7,089
	11,345	4,626	4,624	4,619	25,214

## 1908-1909.

28th Nov., 1908	3,703	1,508	1,508	1,511	8,230
26th Dec., 1908	3,426	1,394	1,396	1,398	7,614
23rd Jan., 1909	2,530	1,143	1,320	1,320	6,313
20th Feb., 1909	2,898	1,373	1,677	1,677	7,625
	12,557	5,418	5,901	5,906	29,782

## 1909-1910.

27th Nov., 1909	3,048	1,443	1,765	1,764	8,020
25th Dec., 1909	2,889	1,368	1,674	1,674	7,605
22nd Jan., 1910	2,954	1,399	1,711	1,711	7,775
19th Feb., 1910	3,581	1,696	2,073	2,074	9,424
	12,472	5,906	7,223	7,223	32,824

## B.

(2.) *Collie Coal Ordered and Supplied.*

Mine.	Six weeks ended 18th Dec., 1909.		Six weeks ended 17th Dec., 1910.	
	Ordered.	Supplied.	Ordered.	Supplied.
Proprietary ..	tons. 4,370	tons. 4,404	tons. 4,993	tons. 4,480
Cardiff ..	2,069	1,963	2,365	2,478
Co-operative ..	2,531	2,723	2,889	3,288
Scottish ..	2,530	2,552	2,890	2,801
Total ..	11,500	11,642	13,137	13,047

# BILL—PAYMENT OF MEMBERS AMENDMENT.

## *Appropriation Message.*

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purpose of the Bill.

## *First Reading.*

Introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

# BILL—PUBLIC LIBRARY, MUSEUM, AND ART GALLERY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

## ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1910-1911.

### *In Committee of Supply.*

Resumed from the 21st December; Mr. Taylor in the Chair.

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

Vote—Police, £116,885;

Mr. HOLMAN: Only a day or two ago we had seen by an announcement in the Press that the Commissioner of Police had received a high and distinguished honour, which had been bestowed upon him for the improvements he had brought about in the Police Department. Possibly the Premier would be able to explain what those improvements had been. It was generally known that the police on the goldfields were forced to carry out their duties clad in heavy serge tunics, and heavy helmets, with collars closely buttoned up under their chins; and this in sweltering weather. On the other hand, on any day in the week the Commissioner of Police could be seen in the streets of Perth coolly garbed in white clothes. Surely some mistake had been made in the dispensing of honours, for if credit was due to anyone for the work done it was to the men in the ranks. The police force of Western Australia comprised some of the finest men that could be got together, and it was a matter of surprise that so many good men should remain in the force under existing conditions. It was absurd to ask the police to wear heavy uniforms through our summer months, and it was to be hoped the Premier could announce that provision would be made to provide the police with a reasonable summer uniform. The mounted police also were forced to wear heavy corduroys when riding about, but material of a very much lighter make should be used in the summer months. He desired a statement that that matter would be rectified in the near future.

While the Commissioner of Police might be congratulated on receiving a high honour, a good many people in Western Australia would like to know what he had received it for.

The PREMIER: In regard to the complaint as to the uniform of members of the police force, information bearing on that subject was contained in the annual report of the Commissioner of Police, which had just been placed on the Table. The report stated:—

A new material (Garbicord) for uniforms has been adopted for wear in the tropical divisions of the State, and also a suitable pattern of felt hat for bush work, and an improved helmet for town wear. The new articles of clothing should tend to greater comfort, besides being more adapted to the rough class of work frequently performed in the North. The new pattern helmet will be made available for general summer wear throughout the State. New clothing contracts are also being arranged, which, it is anticipated, will prove satisfactory to the needs of the department.

It would be seen, therefore, that every effort was being made to overcome the disability under which members of the police force had laboured so far as clothing was concerned. With regard to the Commissioner of Police, that gentleman had held very important positions in the State for many years, having joined the service so far back as 1880. He was Inspector of Police in 1883, and became secretary to the then Governor, Sir Frederick Broome in 1884; he was Government Resident in East Kimberley, and sub-collector of internal revenue at Wyndham in 1886; resident magistrate at York in 1887; acting private secretary to His Excellency the Governor, and clerk to Executive Council in October, 1887; acting Government resident at Albany, chairman of quarter sessions and collector of internal revenue in March, 1888, and warden on the East Coolgardie goldfields in February, 1897; and was appointed Commissioner of Police in 1900. From that date he had filled that important position satisfactorily, and there was no doubt that, although the

Commissioner was not very much in evidence, he worked strenuously in his department to the distinct advantage of the State and the force under his control. The expenditure in connection with the department was less this year than in 1906-7 by £10,000, although during the same period increased emoluments aggregating nearly £5,000 had been granted to members of the force. Members would see, therefore, that the position of the members of the force had been improved considerably and the rate of pay had been increased.

Mr. Angwin: Do not say anything about the pay; it is scandalous now.

The PREMIER: The rate of pay was very far from being scandalous; in fact, it was very creditable. Under the new classification payment was graded by the length of service, and men had not to wait for vacancies on account of others leaving the service, or dying, or becoming invalided. After five years a constable received 8s. per day, and after 10 years' service 9s. per day.

Mr. Angwin: But they work seven days in the week.

The PREMIER: The men worked for seven days in the week, but they had one Sunday off every month and three weeks annual holiday, which was better treatment than was given to other branches of the public service. The rates of pay would compare very favourably with the payments to the police in other States. Constables of under five years service could claim a minimum of £3 2s. per week, and rose to a maximum of £3 19s. 5d., those rates of remuneration being equal to £156 and £206 per annum respectively; after five years service they received a minimum of £3 3s. 8d. and a maximum of £4 2s. 11d., equal to £166 and £216 per annum respectively; after 10 years service they claimed a minimum of £3 10s. 8d. and a maximum of £4 9s. 11d., equal to £184 and £234 per annum respectively. Those figures did not include an amount of £2,050 which was disbursed last year in travelling expenses, but, of course, it included the special allowance for the North-West or the goldfields, as the case might be. In comparison with the earnings of the ordinary

wage earner on the goldfields those rates of pay were very favourable, and members would see that the Government were endeavouring to do what was right and just to the force.

Mr. Collier: They do not compare favourably with the ordinary labourers' wages on the goldfields. Give us the labourers' figures.

The PREMIER: The ordinary labourers' figures were not in his possession.

Mr. Collier: But you asserted that the rates of pay compared favourably with the wages of the ordinary labourer.

The PREMIER: Taking the miner at 13s. 4d. per day and the constable at £4 9s. 11d. per week, the comparison was very favourable.

Mr. Collier: What would he get after five years' service?

The PREMIER: After five years' service a man would get £3 3s. 8d., rising to a maximum of £4 2s. 11d. Those figures justified him in saying that the wages compared favourably with the workers whom he had just mentioned.

Mr. Collier: Seven days a week for £3?

Mr. Horan: Was that the rigmarole you submitted to Downing-street in order to secure Captain Hare the decoration he received the other day?

The PREMIER: The Government had had no communication with Downing-street on that subject. He repeated that despite the increase in salaries, which had been considerable during the last four years at any rate, the department was now being run at a cost approximately £10,000 per annum less than previously. Surely the Government could claim credit for economy in administration in matters of that sort without being charged with parsimony. When they showed that there had been not only a reduction in the costs of the department in the aggregate, but that improved conditions had been given to members of the force, it was idle for members to sneer at those statements and say that the Minister and the Commissioner had done nothing. Credit must be given where credit was due, and the Commissioner having given his best service to

the State, members ought to rejoice with him in the fact that the King had thought fit to honour him with that medal. To his mind, the State had been honoured by that decoration, which was well deserved by the recipient.

Mr. HOLMAN: There was no apparent reason why the honour was deserved. Would the Premier state that no communication had been sent from Western Australia in regard to that decoration?

The PREMIER: The hon. member must know well that those honours were recommended to the Governor and not by the Premier direct to Downing-street; the Governor then exercised his own judgment.

Mr. HOLMAN: Members knew that the recommendation was made by the Government, and they desired to know for what reason. If the Commissioner got his due for his work in connection with the tram trouble he would have stripes of a different sort. He was pleased that the Commissioner's report contained even a tardy recognition of the claims of the police situated in the back country. It was stated that they had secured new material for uniforms, and he desired to know whether provision had been made to supply those uniforms this year.

The Premier: This month, I understand.

Mr. HOLMAN: It was gratifying to hear that the uniforms would be available this year, but it was regrettable that the Commissioner had not ordered the uniforms earlier, because the matter had been brought under his notice fully 18 months ago. He hoped it would be remembered that the foot police had very arduous duties to perform in the back country and that they would be treated with the same consideration as the mounted police; also that in the City the same class of uniform as was now supplied to the men doing point duty would be given to men performing other duties. Did the Premier consider it reasonable to ask men to work in the same clothes in summer as they wore in winter? The Commissioner showed a tendency to consider that the police were more servants

than they should be. As a matter of fact, the police were men who should be treated with every consideration. They had most important duties to perform, and it was time for the Commissioner to educate the police to the fact that it was not their only duty to track down criminals; but rather that it was their duty to prevent crime on every possible occasion and keep people from becoming criminals. That would be better than giving them stripes for tracking down criminals. The system had worked out well in other countries and could be adopted here. The Commissioner should be congratulated on receiving his high distinction, but one failed to see why all the recommendation should go to the Commissioner while the officers and a good many of the force received no recommendation at all.

Mr. WALKER: One could well understand how the Commissioner received this honour. It was because he was always on the side of those who were now in a position to make a recommendation, and seldom on the side of the struggling masses.

The Premier: That is rather ungenerous.

Mr. WALKER: It was absolutely correct. One could read the Commissioner's comments on members of the House who had dared to criticise him; one could refer to the *contretemps* in regard to the Commission on the North-West during the Daglish regime; one could show the Commissioner's autocratic disposition and sympathy with the strong and powerful; how these were such as recommended him to the good graces of those now in a position to confer these honours. From the point of view of an ordinary citizen the Commissioner's administration of the Police Department was not too commendable. He placed altogether too much responsibility and labour upon his faithful officers. A little while ago there were three constables at Broad Arrow and Paddington, but now there was only one mounted constable employed to attend not only to Broad Arrow, Bardoe and Paddington, but also to Ora Banda, Siberia and Black Flag. It was necessary for the constable to be constantly on the move, so that if a disturbance took place at

Broad Arrow or Paddington there would be no one to attend to the preservation of the law. Complaint after complaint was made about this, but there was no improvement. True, the population of Broad Arrow and Paddington was not what it was a few years ago; but still there was the district to cover, and one man could not attend to that enormous area and fulfil his duties. The officer was poorly paid for one who had scarcely a day out of the saddle, and who never knew what night or holy day he might be called out from his natural rest. Again, there was the tendency to utilise the police for almost every conceivable purpose. They were tax collectors, compilers of statistics and general inquiry agents; they were utilised for vote collecting. There was scarcely anything that was not put on the policeman.

Mr. George: What vote collecting do they do?

Mr. WALKER: The taking of the names of those entitled to go on the rolls and the making of inquiries as to those who should be struck off. No doubt they were very good for that purpose; they were reliable men and less perturbed by party influences than any other class of citizen; but that was only one part of their multifarious duties. The Commissioner recognised in his report just presented to Parliament that there was too much work placed upon his officers. Hardly an Act of an administrative character was passed but more work was put upon them without any extra recognition from the proper quarter.

Mr. Angwin: They are also vaccination officers now.

Mr. WALKER: The police were everything, but their primary purpose was the maintenance of peace, yet what did we find? Instead of being peace-preservers there was too often a tendency on the part of the department to force them into being peace-breakers, using the term in-offensively. Any man unfortunate enough to get a glass of beer beyond his capacity to carry it was made a criminal. The police were compelled to waste their time running-in drunks to swell the coffers with fines; and they were doing it syste-

matically. Only the other day a certain woman was convicted for over the hundredth time. It should not be the duty of the police. Scores of people suffered from an infirmity, an absolute disease, but the police were employed to construe it into a crime. Attention was repeatedly called to this and the demand made for different treatment for these inebriates, but there was no movement in the direction of affording a remedy. What the police were doing was not the preservation of the health of the community; it was adding degradation to misfortune, brutalising the force and dulling the finer feelings of humanity all through the country. It was a dark blot upon our civilisation. Yet there was no recommendation upon this question in the Commissioner's report. There was need for alteration in regard to police protection for the mining fields which were not as populous or as prosperous as they were, and also in regard to giving these policemen multifarious duties without any extra recognition in the shape of pay, or promotion, or any comforts, or pleasures, or rests additional to what they got after performing the ordinary services of the police force. These things required the attention of the department and the attention of Ministers. One thing was prominent in this State, that Ministers left everything to the heads of departments or were incapable or unwilling to supervise, criticise, analyse or amend, simply acting as their officers directed them. Hence from month to month and year to year these evils dragged their length along.

Mr. PRICE: There were certain strictures passed upon the Commissioner of Police by the Auditor General. We heard much about the gratifying manner in which the Commissioner carried out his duties, but the Commissioner had no compunction in breaking the law when it suited his department. The Auditor General said, on page 144 of his report:—

Special constables are appointed and the rate of pay fixed by the Commissioner of Police, although the Police Act requires that the appointment shall be made by justices of the peace and the rate of pay fixed by the Minister. The

Commissioner of Police contends that owing to the exigencies of the service it is difficult to carry out the law.

The man appointed to administer the law told us that because it was difficult he must break the law! We should get from the Premier some information as to why the Colonial Secretary allowed the Commissioner of Police to do things directly contrary to the law and apparently made no attempt to check it. Later on, writing of another matter in connection with the same branch of the public service, the Auditor General took strong exception to payments made for secret services. The Auditor General in his report wrote—

Generally speaking, payments for secret service in connection with the Police and Criminal Investigation Branch were not supported by discharged vouchers or sufficient detail to enable the accounts to be checked. Some of these have been passed on the approval of the Governor-in-Council under Section 45 of the Audit Act—the others have either been queried or disallowed.

Next came a most extraordinary statement by the Auditor General, which showed to what extreme limits Ministers were prepared to go in allowing the Commissioner to do exactly as he desired in connection with the department.

Recently an open authority was obtained from the Governor-in-Council under Section 45 of the Audit Act in regard to all these accounts, but this could not be accepted in the Audit Office, as the specific sum required by law was not mentioned, and under present conditions to place the vouchers in order they will have to be periodically put forward for the proper approval.

In other words Cabinet had allowed, or desired to allow, the Commissioner of Police to spend what sum he liked in making payments for secret services. The Auditor General refused, and rightly so, to allow anything of that kind to be done. That officer rightly considered that the Commissioner of Police, although he might stand high in the good graces of Ministers, should be amenable

to law just as the ordinary constable in the force. The Commissioner when it suited his own ends did not hesitate to break the law, but, when it was a case of an ordinary member of the police force, it was found that he was a great stickler and he showed what he could and would do when the circumstances gave him the opportunity. This was instanced in the report of the Auditor General who wrote—

A constable engaged on police duty was injured and work was found for him in connection with the Police stores, which were subsequently taken over by the Stores Department, when the officer retired. He was subsequently re-employed in the stores and paid from an item created from the Treasurer's Advance under the Police Department, but the Commissioner for Police, the departmental head controlling the vote, would not sign the form in connection with the appointment, stating as his reason that as the stores branch was no longer under his control he could not say whether the officer's services were required. Another official signed the form, but this cannot be considered as a compliance with the law. The Minister approved of the appointment.

The Commissioner did not hesitate to break the law when it suited him, but in this case he refused to sign the voucher for the payment due to that constable.

Mr. Collier: And that man had to go three months without his salary.

Mr. PRICE: This unfortunate constable had to wait as the hon. member for Boulder declared for three months before he received the salary due to him, just because the Commissioner desired to adhere very strictly to the letter of the law. On that occasion the Commissioner was dealing with an underling, and this was the Commissioner who, standing high in the good graces of the Premier, and other Ministers, was recommended to His Majesty the King for an honour. Yet, when he came to dealing with underlings, it could be seen how small and narrow and bitter this officer could be. The Premier should give an

assurance that the Commissioner would not be allowed any longer to take into his own hands duties which devolved upon other individuals, especially payments to special constables, and their rates of payment. These were matters which should be decided by the Minister in charge. Members had often heard that the Minister had no control over the department, and it certainly looked like it.

Mr. Holman: They keep no papers in connection with these matters.

Mr. PRICE: If members were to ask for papers they would find there were none in existence, and that matters of this description had been fixed up through the telephone. With regard to payments for secret services, members would agree that not even the Commissioner should be allowed to flagrantly break the Audit Act as he evidently had been doing during the past twelve months.

The PREMIER: With regard to the payments for secret services, it was absolutely impossible to get a proper receipt from the class of people who gave the information to the police force. These were very often criminals who, at the time of giving the information, might be incarcerated in gaol.

Mr. Price: You do not pay for information when it is received from a prisoner in gaol.

The PREMIER: Information when it was given under those circumstances was paid for. If it was found to be authentic, and the police acted upon it, these people were paid, and it was not possible to get a receipt from them; they would not put their hands to paper, let alone sign a receipt. It was necessary that there should be payments for secret services of this description.

Mr. Collier: What check is there upon the payments?

The PREMIER: The only check was that of the inspector himself, and the Commissioner. If it were permissible for the Commissioner to give a receipt, that could easily be obtained. It might be pointed out that with regard to the Police Department there were 75 reports by officers of the Auditor General's De-

partment on out-stations, and 74 were reported on as satisfactory, and one only was reported as being fairly satisfactory.

Mr. Price: That is another branch of the service.

The PREMIER: All the reports would be given. In connection with the head office there were four reports from officers of the Auditor General's Department; two were regarded as satisfactory, and one fairly satisfactory, and, in connection with the payment of special constables to which the hon. member referred, that was queried. That was not a very bad return. Out of 79 reports there was only one queried, and only two were given as fairly satisfactory.

Mr. Price: These reports all refer to out-stations.

The PREMIER: Reports referring to all the stations had been given. There were four reports in connection with the head station. With regard to these payments for secret services, hon. members knew that this was done in every country without proper vouchers being obtained. As far as the payment of special constables was concerned, the matter would be inquired into, but, as far as he was advised, they were appointed by justices of the peace, and, as for the rates of pay, the approval of the Commissioner had to be obtained and then the Minister confirmed it.

Mr. Bolton: With a rubber stamp by the head of the department.

The PREMIER: Did the hon. member suggest that the Minister should inquire into the capabilities of all these special constables? It was absurd. The Minister had to depend upon the permanent head, at any rate to make recommendations to him as to whether a certain man would be worth a certain payment. If there was something extraordinary about it, the Minister would query it. The question of the payment and the fixing of the rate of pay without the Minister's approval, was raised. That must be fixed by the permanent head, and the Minister subsequently approved of it. In 99 cases out of 100 the recommendation of the permanent officer could be taken.

Mr. Price: What about the case of the officer who had to wait three months for his salary?

The PREMIER: I do not know anything about it; that is easily explained, but it is not excusable.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: In rising to make a few remarks on the subject of the police vote, he wished to draw attention to the report of the Commissioner. Having come into contact with a good number of members of the police force, he was able to say that he believed there was a good deal of dissatisfaction amongst them, particularly in the country districts. It had been contended by members of Parliament, and by many of the outside public, that too much power was placed in the hands of the superior officers, the Commissioner and the Superintendent, and justice was not meted out to the constables who had to do most of the work. It could not be said that he (Mr. O'Loghlen) was looking for popularity, as was said of the member for Boulder when he spoke on the question some time before, because there was only one constable in the whole of his electorate. It was to be regretted that the appearance of the report of the Commissioner had been delayed. Members had only just received it, and had not been given the opportunity of considering it thoroughly before discussing the vote, consequently members were not in a position to analyse the results of the past year's work. In dealing with the laxity of the Government in not passing an Act to prevent the influx of criminals, the Commissioner had served up the strongest indictment possible against the Ministry not only on this question, but on other matters as well. The report stated—

For several years I have been endeavouring to have legislation adopted dealing with the influx of criminals into this State, and also with regard to the treatment of habitual criminals in the passing of the "Indeterminate Sentence Act." Up to the present nothing has been done, and Western Australia remains the dumping ground for criminals from the Eastern States and



elsewhere. Quite recently a noted criminal left here for New South Wales, but, on arrival in Sydney, he was immediately arrested and ordered to leave that State. He was met at Melbourne, where the police told him he would be arrested should he land in Victoria. He, therefore, passed on to South Australia, where he was similarly dealt with, ultimately arriving in this State, where no legislation existed to prevent him landing. I am also aware of another case where a dangerous criminal left this State for South Australia; he was arrested and ordered to leave; he did so, and later on was seen in a certain town in this State. In neither of the cases mentioned were the criminals natives of Western Australia, but, with the law as it stands at present, this State has to maintain them in prison.

No stronger indictment could be brought against a Government. Surely the paragraph warranted some reply from the Premier. The report also stated—

The existence of such legislation as I have referred to elsewhere, causes criminals who have completed their terms of imprisonment in Western Australia to remain here, fearing, as they do, penalties likely to be inflicted on them should they either commit themselves, or be found in the Eastern States, and its absence here encourages criminals from other parts of the Commonwealth and elsewhere to make Western Australia their happy hunting ground.

If, as the Commissioner stated, this matter had been brought under the notice of the Government year after year the Premier should be in a position to make an announcement in regard to it. Again, the Commissioner had stated—

Street betting is still carried on, and will continue until legislation so frequently asked for and in force in the other States finds a place on our statute-book.

In regard to the drink traffic the report stated—

Another serious aspect of the drink traffic is that relating to the practice whereby large quantities of grog are

conveyed to the workers' camps on the goldfields wood lines, and similarly to the timber workers on the mills in the South-West. The means employed are such that I am in doubt as to whether any evasion of the law could be established.

The Commissioner had pointed out that the police officers were powerless to obtain a conviction. Surely in such circumstances, where a responsible officer was pointing out so serious a defect, the Government of the day should pay some heed to repeated requests and bring in the necessary legislation. The question of Sunday trading and bona fide travellers also received some attention from the Commissioner, who had pointed out many difficulties, some of which in his (Mr. O'Loughlin's) opinion would not be overcome until we adopted a system under which people would be able to obtain liquor during certain hours on Sundays. The member for Kanowna had pointed to the omission in the report of any reference to the necessity for the establishment of an inebriates' home. It was of no avail sending people to gaol for drunkenness for the hundredth time, or even for the fiftieth time. With such people the habit was chronic and, as had been done in Adelaide, we should establish a home to which they could be sent. It was degrading to be sending these people to gaol for the hundredth time as we were doing. On the other hand, in certain districts of the State drunkenness was regarded altogether too seriously by those in power: thus one magistrate, for a first conviction for drunkenness, had sent a man to gaol for 14 days. Surely, during the holiday season at least, we should not regard drunkenness as among the serious offences. Another point was the laxity displayed by the Police Department in regard to hawkers. Some months ago, as the result of a promise by the Premier to make inquiries in respect to hawkers, the Commissioner of Police had submitted a report stating that there were, perhaps, half a dozen hawkers, Afghans and Hindoos, doing business in certain parts of the State, but that they were carrying on their calling as buyers of sheepskins.

The report had gone on to state that two of these hawkers had been convicted and that there was now no hawking going on. As a matter of fact one could find 20 of these hawkers in almost any district, openly carrying their packs all over the country. He knew several reputable white men who would like to engage in hawking, but who did not care to take the risk of breaking the law. Yet we had large numbers of Asiatics hawking all over the State, and we were not getting any fees from them. Even if we had a Hawkers Act he, for one, would not like to see Asiatics licensed. However, in view of the existing circumstances he hoped the Premier would state the intention of the Government in regard to stopping all hawking by Asiatics. It was scarcely possible for the Government to reorganise the whole of the Police Department, but he would appeal to the Premier to give some consideration to those men who had long years of service behind them, and who were receiving very small remuneration. In the case of these officers either their remuneration or their travelling allowances should be increased. He was referring more particularly to those men stationed in the outlying portions of the State where the travelling allowances were very small indeed, and where the police were frequently called upon to make long journeys. Some of those officers had been in the service for 13 years, yet, owing to the policy adopted, of rewarding seniority as against merit, those officers had but little hope of promotion. The rise given a short time ago of 1s. a day was scarcely adequate. The Commissioner in his report had stated—

Arrangements have been completed and are in force, following on Cabinet's approval, for the granting of a good conduct badge or stripe to constables of not less than 10 years' service. An officer is entitled to receive the badge on completion of the term of service specified, provided he has a clean record for a period of five years prior to the issue of such badge. Evidence is already forthcoming which justifies me in the belief already held that the mark or distinction introduced will be a direct in-

centive to constables to persevere in maintaining their good conduct record. After all a badge did not do much towards filling the empty stomachs of a large family, and it would be more satisfactory if some slight increase of remuneration were made to accompany the badge. He trusted that in any future classification the Minister would take into consideration the good services and excellent records of some of the police officers who were to-day awaiting deserved promotion: and he would appeal to the Premier to show some consideration to those officers who were carrying out their duties amidst unc congenial surroundings and for very small remuneration.

Mr. ANGWIN: The statement of the Premier that the police were well paid would find but little confirmation. The pay started at 6s. 6d. a day, and after six months was increased to 7s. 6d., at which wage a policeman remained until he had five years service, when it was increased to 8s. a day; then after he had served another five years his pay was increased to 9s., where it remained. That was scarcely high remuneration for a man who had done his duty faithfully for 10 years. He was quite in accord with the remarks of the member for Forrest in regard to sending a man to prison for drunkenness. To him it had always been a mystery why we should charge one man a fee for selling intoxicating liquor and send another man to prison for drinking it. Sometimes, of course, it might be expedient to lock a drunken man up for a night for his own protection, but, as a matter of principle, he (Mr. Angwin) was altogether opposed to sending a man to prison because he had taken a little more intoxicating liquor than was good for him.

Mr. Scaddan: And thereby inflicting punishment on his wife and family.

Mr. ANGWIN: There was no doubt that the police carried out their work splendidly. Amongst their extra duties they had to attend to old-age pension claims, immigration inquiries and collection of moneys, inquiries and collection of moneys for Charities Department and Labour Bureau, the same for the Medical

and Public Health Departments and Perth Public Hospital, also Taxation, Immigration Restriction Act, customs and excise inquiries, besides which the police were acting as clerks of court, mining registrars, bailiffs, and so on throughout the State. In addition, another duty had been placed upon them in making them inspectors under the Vaccination Act. Considering all those duties it was remarkable that the State was kept as orderly as it was and that there was not a great deal of crime in the country. There was provision for a good conduct badge, but that badge depended on what the Commissioner or the inspector considered good conduct. It might be considered good conduct to arrest a number of persons. A policeman had recently told him that he intended to apply for a removal because he had been in the district for a few months and had only effected three arrests. It was to be hoped that the good conduct of a policeman would not be reckoned according to the number of arrests which he made, but rather according to his own good conduct and that of the district of which he was in charge. The force contained an excellent class of men, and it was a crying shame that the Government should offer them 6s. 6d. per day to start with, and then after 10 years' service give them 9s. He hoped that the Government would see the necessity of giving further increases to that splendid body of men.

The PREMIER: With regard to what the member for Forrest had said concerning travelling allowances, the department paid from 6s. to 8s. per day travelling allowance, according to the district, and 12s. per day for gold escorts as against 5s. in New South Wales, 3s. 6d. in Queensland, 6s. in South Australia, 5s. in Tasmania, and 1s. 6d. in Victoria. From 6s. to 8s. a day did not seem a bad allowance.

Mr. O'Loughlen: They are out of pocket on it.

The PREMIER: Eight shillings per day for a man on horseback ought to be sufficient. Complaint had been made as to the Government not bringing down certain legislation. That the Government were most anxious to do, and if Parlia-

ment could do with less talking and more work more legislation would be passed.

Mr. Walker: If you brought down better stuff you would get it through.

The PREMIER: The Government brought down the very stuff which the hon. member had been talking about, a measure dealing with the influx of criminals, indeterminate sentences, and other matters. Unfortunately, the Government were not able to get all their measures passed. He had had a new Audit Bill on the stocks ever since he had been Treasurer, but had never been able to find an opportunity of getting it through. The Roads Bill was another measure that had been under consideration for three years, and he was now thankful that the leader of the Opposition had agreed to pass it *pro forma*. He understood that members on both sides interested in roads matters had arranged the clauses which were to be considered, with the approval of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Scaddan: No; I did not know that they had decided on the matter.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition had been understood to say that he had approved of the arrangement.

Mr. Scaddan: I said I would refer it to the members interested, but I have not heard the result.

The PREMIER: The Roads Bill was a large measure of 300 clauses, and it would be impossible to discuss every clause of a measure of that nature.

Mr. Hudson: You cannot prevent us.

The PREMIER: The Bill would not be proceeded with if the hon. member intended to delay its progress in that way.

Mr. O'Loughlen: That is an admission of weakness.

The PREMIER: Not at all. The Government were just as anxious as any members to pass Bills through as rapidly as they possibly could, but there were difficulties and obstacles in the way very often. With regard to the prosecution of hawkers, Imperial interests were involved, and it was a difficult matter to deal with. We could not discriminate between Indians and white hawkers.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why not prosecute them?

The PREMIER: They were prosecuted at every opportunity, but he had not heard of any hawkers going about the country from house to house with packs on their shoulders.

Mr. Walker: I have heard of an instance within the last few days.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I can give you 20 such instances.

The PREMIER: If hon. members would give information to the department action would be taken. The police could not be expected to watch every person who was going about this very large country, and they must have assistance from the residents.

Mr. TROY: It was not necessary to advise the department in regard to hawkers because the hawkers were going about the country every day and must be seen by the police. He had seen them in the Greenough district.

The Premier: Then why not lay an information?

Mr. TROY: The Premier had an infernal cheek to ask him to go about the country telling the police their duty. The hawkers were trading in localities where the police could not fail to notice them, and that fact should be sufficient. With regard to the payment of the force, if the police were a good and reliable body of men it spoke volumes for them, because their pay did not place them above the level of temptation. While he did not desire to make any charges, he heard that some policemen were rather more than they should be.

Mr. Heitmann: Guns.

Mr. TROY: Whether or not the rumours were true—and they only applied to a few individuals—he was told that in one or two instances the police resorted to certain practices which were neither creditable nor honest, but which brought them in additional revenue. He might be asked to give particulars to the Police Department, but although he was reliably informed, the people who had advised him of these doings would not be likely to give further particulars when called upon. He had no objection, however, to informing the Colonial Secretary, because when there was a rumour that the police were doing something dishonest

the rumour should be inquired into. If a member of Parliament was informed that something was being done detrimental to a locality or to the people the member should inform the Colonial Secretary, but only that there might be an inquiry, though it was doubtful whether inquiry would be made by the Commissioner.

The Minister for Mines: You would not ask for an investigation before a charge is made.

Mr. TROY: The Minister knew the difficulty. The Colonial Secretary himself told of an instance of asking for an inquiry into the case of a policeman he had seen drunk, yet at the inquiry the Minister's informant swore the policeman was not drunk.

The Premier: How can you convict under those circumstances?

Mr. TROY: It was impossible, but when serious rumours were heard the Colonial Secretary should make inquiries. There was an inquiry on one occasion but it was not conducted by the Commissioner in such a way as to get at the truth. The policeman was a despot in a town, and could compel people to pay him for allowing them to carry on nefarious practices. This was due to the fact that the policeman's salary was so small. The policeman was the only man in a district who could allow gambling to go on, or drinking at all hours, or Sunday trading, or allow houses of ill-fame to exist. He could allow these things or disallow them.

Mr. Heitmann: Very often if he disallows them he is shifted.

Mr. TROY: One could not say that. He never heard of an instance of a policeman being shifted for doing his duty, but a policeman could easily say it was impossible to catch people at sly-grog selling. In order to protect the people in places where policemen were all powerful, we should pay our officers well to put them above temptation. No civil servant was subjected to the same amount of temptation as a policeman. People told him and swore that what they said concerning certain constables was absolutely true, but when asked would not follow it up by making complaints. If he thought

a policeman's conduct was bad and to the detriment of the people of the locality, his course would be to ask the Colonial Secretary to make an inquiry, but only for that reason would he say a word. The rumours he heard affected only one or two policemen. The great majority of the police were square and honourable and above-board. We should increase their pay to put them above temptation.

Item, Commissioner, £750.

Mr. TROY: The Commissioner possessed a free tramway pass which he received from the Perth Tramway Company. No civil servant had the right to take any such concession from a body outside a public department, because it brought into our service the American system of graft, in which the principal feature of bribery was the receiving of free passes and sums of money from private corporations.

Mr. Monger: Does not every policeman get a free pass from the tramway company?

Mr. TROY: That mattered not. The Commissioner had no right to take this free pass. One could not take a free pass from any party without being under an obligation to that party, and he (Mr. Troy) would refuse to be one to allow the Commissioner of Police or a police magistrate to take a free pass from any corporation outside the public service.

Mr. Draper: Do you say it is a bribe?

Mr. TROY: No, but it could be a bribe. The Commissioner of Police could aid the company or could act to the detriment of the company as he chose, yet he accepted a concession from the company. If the Labour party were in power and they allowed the Commissioner of Police to take a free pass he (Mr. Troy) would not support them. Another gentleman, one who sat on the bench and adjudicated on cases in which the company were concerned, possessed a free pass from the same company. This giving of free passes would introduce into our service the American system of graft which could not be too strongly condemned. It was a curse in America and would become a curse here. The Commissioner of Police was as well able to pay his tramway fares as any other man.

Why did he get this pass that was denied to thousands of other people in the State?

Mr. Scaddan: Ministers of the Crown should not accept free passes either.

Mr. TROY: They should not. He would never accept one. In order to emphasise his objection to the Commissioner accepting this free pass, he moved an amendment—

*That the item be reduced by £50.*

Mr. HEITMANN: No public servant, particularly one in receipt of a good salary, should be in receipt of a gift from any private company. It was possible that even members of Parliament in receipt of gifts from private companies might have to decide between these companies and the public, and it was well known that when the Commissioner of Police had to take certain action recently he was called upon by the tramway company for protection for certain of their employees. Anyone in receipt of a gift from a particular company or individual would deem himself under an obligation to that company or individual. If the Commissioner of Police had not accepted the free pass as a bribe one could venture to say the pass was given by the tramway company as a bribe for some future favours perhaps. It was wrong for the Commissioner to be under an obligation to any private company. It allowed others to believe the pass was given as a bribe, and public servants should be above suspicion in this regard. It was said one of our magistrates was in receipt of one of these gifts. It was a wrong course. These gentlemen should recognise it in that light.

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

Mr. TROY: It was due to the Premier to let the House know whether he championed the conduct of the Commissioner of Police in connection with the tramway company. The Premier as head of the Government should give his opinion on the matter to the Committee.

The PREMIER: Every member of the police force travelled free on the tramways.

Mr. Walker: At whose expense?

The PREMIER: At the expense of the company.

Mr. Troy: On duty?

The PREMIER: On duty, and off duty, and there was no reason why the Commissioner should not also travel free on the tramways if the company wished to extend to that officer that courtesy. He (the Premier) had held a free pass on the tramways ever since he had been a Minister of the Crown, and in fact every member of the Ministry had a pass, and among others who held free passes were the mayor and the chief magistrate of the City. In 1904 or 1905 when the Labour administration were in office, he believed that the members of that Ministry also had passes over the tramway system. It was idle and it was childish to infer that anyone would sell his honour and integrity for the price of a free pass over the tramways of Perth, and it was surprising that the hon. member should indulge in opinions such as those which he had expressed earlier in the afternoon. If the hon. member had not directly asked for an opinion with regard to the matter, he (the Premier) would certainly have allowed the matter to pass.

Mr. WALKER: It was surprising to hear the tone adopted by the Premier. There could be no question whatever that a company which was lavish in its perquisites to officialdom was likely to receive more favourable consideration.

The Premier: Not at all.

Mr. WALKER: It was likely; it was human nature.

The Premier: Not at all.

Mr. WALKER: It was human nature everywhere.

The Premier: Purely the hon. member's imagination.

Mr. WALKER: It was a fact, and whenever this company had come into conflict with the people, the Government had stood for the tramway company as against the people.

The Premier: Have they?

Mr. WALKER: There was the proof that whenever this company required to

be defended they had been defended from the Government benches.

The Premier: That is not so.

Mr. WALKER: That was absolutely true.

The Premier: The hon. member knows it is not true.

Mr. WALKER: It was true, and *Hansard* would bear him out.

The Premier: The Government will always support law and order.

Mr. WALKER: In every instance the Government gave their support to the monopolist and helped to assist those who had wealth, and had ever neglected those struggling for a mere pittance. Was it not a fact that—

The Premier: No.

Mr. WALKER: If the Premier wanted to make a farce, as he ever tried to do, of what was being said or done—

The Premier: The hon. member is making the farce.

Mr. WALKER: Some truths were being told which the Premier did not like to hear.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee was the reduction of the item.

Mr. WALKER: It was in answer to the arguments against the reduction of the vote used by the Premier that he was speaking, and at the same time he was trying to parry the foolish insults to the Opposition side of the House.

Mr. Troy: And the repeated interjections.

Mr. WALKER: And those interjections should be as much noticed by the Chairman as any slight dereliction from the Opposition side. He was saying that it had ever been recognised as a principle in all British countries that favours should be accepted by no one who happened to dispense justice in any form. It was only human nature that where a kindness was shown there was a tendency for the *quid pro quo*; that was to say, to return the kindness in some form or other, and it was not the value in kind, or the pass, it was not the cost of a tram ride that did it, but this courtesy, this favour granted was the matter which would tell, or else human nature had

changed its character. It would have its influence wherever a favour could be done in return, and it would be done or else human nature was worse than he thought it. It was a scandal that the Government of this great country should be dependent upon the charity or favour, whatever one liked to call it, of the tramway company for the transit of its policemen through the public streets. It was iniquitous; it was a wrong principle to go upon that this little nation should take its perquisites from a tramway company. We had given that tramway company concessions, and that there might be no cry about these concessions on the part of the State, or a cry for municipalisation, or the nationalisation of the tramways, and in order that such movements might be checked, the tramway company in its worldly wisdom had lavishly distributed everywhere to mayors, to Ministers, to heads of departments, and the chief of police, and the policemen, these free passes.

Mr. Monger: Not to members of Parliament.

Mr. WALKER: Members of Parliament had no right to free passes, and neither had the Government any right to them. We had made a contract with the tramway company to allow them to use our public streets, and had given them other concessions, and in return they were to give a tramway service. It was a plain business agreement, and it ended there. Was it thought that this company or any other trading or business concern gave free passes for nothing? Had they not some motive or purpose in doing it? Ministers could not claim these free passes as a right, and neither could the Commissioner of Police. Why then were these passes accepted? These passes were a gift, and an insidious form of bribery, which should be checked in the name of pure government. Above all the chief of police should not accept a free pass. The chief of police was our servant, and were we to proclaim to the world that we were too poor, or too mean, to buy him a pass over the tramways? If we were not too poor or not too mean it was our

duty to see that we did not impose upon a private company. We were imposing upon the company, and the Government were guilty and the country was guilty of an imposition, and it was our duty to avoid even an imputation of such a thing. This tramway company, in their generosity, had thrown free passes around *ad libitum*, and a noticeable feature was that those who could do the company the greatest injury in times of trouble were the holders of passes. The time might come when the chief of police, the magistrates, or the police themselves might have to deal with some trouble, and how could they do it with the same freedom if they had been recipients of free rides on the tramways. It was absolutely scandalous that we should be dependent for the purposes of the duties of the police upon the charity, or the benevolence, or favours, or whatever name one would call it, of the tramway company. At the present time there must be suspicion in the minds of the public that these passes had been granted for a purpose, and that this company was no more generous than any other company, and that it had no money of its shareholders, if the vulgar term might be used, to "chuck" away. It could not even pay its employees a decent wage, and under such circumstances for the chief of police to accept a gratuitous pass was a reflection upon the manliness of the State. Would it be tolerated in England; would high officials there be allowed to accept favours from any public company which at any time the Government might have to correct or harshly deal with? Not for a moment would this be allowed. Why then, should it be tolerated to-day in Australia? Issues were arising in which this company would have to stand before the bar of public opinion, and in the meantime criticism was hushed by paltry bribes of free passes to premiers and commissioners of police.

Mr. TROY: Miserably enough the Premier had excused his endorsement of this policy of taking free passes from private corporations by the allegation that when the Labour Government were in power they had done the same. The Premier

was in the habit of pointing to the Labour Government whenever he wished to excuse anything he himself was doing. Apparently, all things that the Labour Government had done were excusable in the eyes of the Premier; yet, when the Labour Government were in office, the Premier and his supporters of to-day had not had a single good word for that Government. The supporters of the present Government were all bought by concessions. When a member on the Ministerial side showed a desire to think for himself he was immediately purchased. That was the prevailing policy, and, presumably, it would continue while the present Ministry remained in power. We had been told it was absurd to take exception to this principle of free passes; yet even in America it had been declared to be a vicious principle for a politician to take free passes from private railway companies. Was not the system of free passes equally vicious in Western Australia, where it was indulged in, not only by politicians but by public servants, by high officials who controlled large and important departments? There might be some excuse for an ordinary policeman in the course of his duty jumping on a tramcar, but it was not the duty of the Commissioner to go around the streets attending to the preservation of law and order. That officer, presumably, went straight from his home to his office; and in any case the Government provided the Commissioner of Police with a drag and four horses and with a motor car in case it was necessary for him to move about anywhere. Why, then, was it necessary that the Commissioner of Police should run the risk of selling his liberties to a tramway company by the acceptance of a free pass? Did the Commissioner for Railways also have a free pass from the tramway company; did the Judges possess free passes? No. Like the Commissioner for Railways the judges could give no *quid pro quo* and, consequently, they had no free passes from the tramway company. The only people who possessed free passes were the Commissioner of Police and the Police Magistrate of Perth, both of whom in their judicial capacity had been brought into close as-

sociation with the tramway company during the recent strike. Whether or not the Commissioner of Police had then felt under an obligation to the tramway company it was impossible to say, but we knew that during the course of that strike the Commissioner of Police had sent out numberless mounted troopers into the street, who had done more than anything else to disturb the citizens. Those troopers had ridden over innocent people and had pushed down the wife of the member for Murchison. It was impossible not to suspect that in this attitude the Commissioner of Police had been largely influenced by the recollection of his obligations to the tramway company. We had been told the giving of free passes was a mere courtesy; but were not all bribes given as acts of courtesy? The Commissioner of Police was decidedly under an obligation to the tramway company, and the Government also, by the acceptance of free passes, had put themselves under a like obligation, which, however, they had fully discharged by prosecuting persons for assisting the strikers in the recent industrial trouble. It was necessary that we should make a stand against this sort of thing. If the Commissioner of Police had a spark of manliness in him he would not have accepted a free pass from the tramway company, and if he (Mr. Troy) were the Colonial Secretary he would insist upon the immediate restoration to the company of that free pass.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	15
Noes	..	..	..	22

Majority against	..	7
------------------	----	---

#### AYES.

Mr. Bolton	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Collier	Mr. Price
Mr. Gill	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Swan
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Troy
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. McDowall	(Teller).



## NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Layman
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Carson	Mr. Monger
Mr. Daglish	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Davies	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Draper	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Osborn
Mr. George	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Gregory	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Harper	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Hayward	(Teller).
Mr. Jacoby	

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. GORDON moved—

*That the Committee do now divide.*

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

Ayes	..	..	..	22
Noes	..	..	..	15*

Majority for .. .. 7

## AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Layman
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Carson	Mr. Monger
Mr. Daglish	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Davies	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Draper	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Osborn
Mr. George	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Gregory	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Harper	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Hayward	(Teller).
Mr. Jacoby	

## NOES.

*Mr. Angwin	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Price
Mr. Collier	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Troy
Mr. Heltmann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnson	(Teller).
Mr. McDowall	

\* See Point of Order later.

Motion thus passed.

Mr. McDowall: Did you, Mr. Chairman, announce in the last division that the Noes were 15, because 16 members voted?

The Chairman: I accepted the tellers' signed statements on both sides.

Mr. Scaddan: I would draw attention to the fact that the Standing Orders provide that when a mistake has been brought under the Chairman's notice, and he is satisfied that a mistake was

made, the division must be taken over again.

The Chairman: I could not be satisfied that a mistake was made. I accepted the tellers' signed lists.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	22
Noes	..	..	..	17

Majority for .. .. 5

## AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Layman
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Carson	Mr. Monger
Mr. Daglish	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Davies	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Draper	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Osborn
Mr. George	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Gregory	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Harper	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Hayward	(Teller).
Mr. Jacoby	

## NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bolton	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Collier	Mr. Price
Mr. Gill	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Swan
Mr. Heltmann	Mr. Troy
Mr. Holman	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnson	(Teller).

Vote thus passed.

## Point of Order.

Mr. Scaddan: On a point of order. I desire to draw attention to Standing Order No. 203, which reads—

In case of confusion or error concerning the numbers reported, unless the same can be otherwise corrected, the House shall proceed to another division.

Then No. 204 states—

If the numbers have been inaccurately reported to the House, the House, on being afterwards informed thereof, shall order the *Votes and Proceedings* to be corrected.

For the purpose of satisfying yourself that the numbers reported to you were inaccurate. I would suggest that you should read out the names recorded in the previous division, and any member who was present but whose name is omitted,

can draw attention to it, and the necessary correction can be made.

The Chairman: I would point out that the tellers hand up signed lists with the numbers, and I accept them as being correct. It is not my province to count the members of the Committee, but since the question has been raised it is within the power of the Committee to have the voting list corrected. If any member's name was omitted a correction can be made.

The Premier: The result of the division had been declared and the doors had been thrown open before your attention was drawn to the mistake. I submit that you cannot make a correction after the doors have been thrown open, and other members have had an opportunity of entering the Chamber.

Mr. Scaddan: Will you quote the Standing Order?

The Premier: I give that as common-sense.

The Chairman: After the division was declared we proceeded to put the vote, and during that procedure my attention was called to the mistake. In the meantime the doors had been thrown open. The Standing Orders give power to rectify the error, but as I pointed out then it was too late, and I proceeded with the next division. If the Committee desire to have included the name of the member who was omitted from the list I am prepared to do that.

Mr. Walker: I respectfully submit that if at any time afterwards an error is discovered, it may be corrected, and that it is not now too late to do that. The Standing Orders say, "If the numbers have been inaccurately reported to the House, the House, on being afterwards informed thereof, shall order the *Votes and Proceedings* to be corrected."

The Premier: Some member can declare that his name has been omitted.

The Chairman: I know the hon. member whose name was omitted. On looking over the division list I find that the member for Murchison, who was in the Chamber, was left out.

Mr. Holman: I was not in the Chamber; I came in after the division.

Mr. Scaddan: I would draw attention to *May* on the question—

The division paper is handed to the Speaker, who declares the numbers, and states the determination of the House. If two tellers differ as to the numbers on the side told by them, or if a mistake regarding the numbers be discovered, unless the tellers agree thereon, a second division must take place, when the numbers will be correctly reported by the Speaker. If a mistake is subsequently discovered, it will be ordered to be corrected in the journal.

I am simply asking that the Chairman shall discover the name of the member omitted from the division list.

The Minister for Works: That can be done by reading out the Noes.

Mr. Scaddan: That is exactly what I was asking when the Premier intervened. I asked that the Chairman should read out the names. Then the member whose name is omitted can state the fact and the omission can be rectified.

The Premier: I do not object to that.

The Chairman: The Premier merely raised the point that it was late, just as I had previously done. I then pointed out the method by which the error could be rectified in the journals. To get over the difficulty I will read the names on the list signed by the teller for the Noes. [List read.]

Mr. Angwin: I was present during the division and my name has been omitted.

The Chairman: Then the name of the hon. member will be inserted in the division list.

#### *Committee Resumed.*

Vote—*Public Gardens*, £1,789—agreed to.

Vote—*Registry*, £8,015—agreed to.

Vote—*Rottnest*, £650:

Mr. BOLTON: There were certain cottages on Rottnest Island furnished to entertain Ministers of the Crown and their wives and families, and until recently they were restricted to Ministers.

Mr. Scaddan: Why look at me?

Mr. BOLTON: Because the hon. member was foolish enough to break the

monopoly. Why was it necessary to furnish a certain number of cottages for Ministers? It was not known there were so many cottages available at Rottnest for Ministers only. It was said of course that any member of Parliament could occupy one of the cottages if it was convenient. At one time charges were hurled against the Labour Government for having a Government cottage which was not furnished by the Government and for which rent was charged to those occupying it, but the Labour Government were not guilty of furnishing cottages at Rottnest and having a caretaker at their beck and call and restricting the privilege to Ministers of the Crown.

The PREMIER: One would imagine the hon. member had struck something very reprehensible. These Government cottages at Rottnest had been in existence for the last nine or ten years. There were three of them, and Ministers had the first call on them. If they were not utilised by Ministers there was no reason why members of the House should not use them.

Mr. Bolton: Have they ever been vacant?

The PREMIER: Yes, for months. They were even utilised by servants of the Government on more than one occasion.

Mr. Bolton: Is it fair that lady folks should occupy them for five or six months at a stretch?

The PREMIER: One did not know to whom the hon. member referred. It cost the country nothing. The cottages were furnished and had better be occupied than be empty. There was nothing wrong about it. He would be very pleased to extend the privilege to anyone that could be conveniently accommodated.

Mr. MURPHY: There was a salary of £150 for a caretaker. Who got this money? The man who looked after the island and who was responsible for making it so popular that last Christmas there were 600 people camped there was paid a salary of £194 as a warder under the gaols vote. Then who got this £150? Certainly not the man by whose energy and brains and organisation there were

40 miles of road on the island and the ideal camping ground of Australasia.

The PREMIER: The official who received the £150 was one of the warders named O'Donoghue. The item was transferred from gaols and charged up against Rottnest. The bulk of the expenditure was for contingencies, £500, being provided to supply camps and carry out further improvements. There were 24 camps provided at rents ranging from 6s. to 10s. a week. Several hundreds of people were camped on the island during the Christmas holidays, and the total revenue collected in this direction was £94 10s. It was a very fair return. The water was laid on to the camps, and they were supplied with firewood and cooking utensils, and sanitary conveniences. The gaol authorities also supplied bread and meat, and it was delivered in a cart, from which it was purchased. There had been quite a rush to the island, and some of the camps had been booked weeks ahead. A number of people who had come down from the goldfields were taking advantage of the opportunity of getting to the island. It was a capital institution, and it was hoped to make it increasingly popular.

Mr. HUDSON: The idea was certainly one that should be commended, but the Premier might state whether it was a fact that in spite of the advertisements that the whole of the island was available to visitors those visitors who engaged tents were limited to a certain area of the island, and were not allowed to go on the back beach or to the swimming pool, and that the area to which they were restricted was mostly sand. It was not wise to advertise the advantages of the island and then restrict visitors to a small area.

The PREMIER: It was generally known that no one could enter the penal portion of the island without a special permit; that was obvious to everyone. The other day, in addition to the number of people who had camped at the island, some 1,200 excursionists were landed there, and these people could not be permitted to overrun the penal part of the island. The hon. member was mistaken

when he said that the campers could not go to the back beach. It was hoped that within a short time it would be possible to make arrangements to throw open the whole island. At the present time there were about 50 prisoners there—30 whites and 20 natives. It was intended to dispense with the white prisoners as early as possible, and continue the work of improving the island with the aborigines. By next summer it was hoped to have the whole of the island available to the public.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It would be just as well to make the island either a penal settlement or a pleasure resort; it was not suitable for both.

The Premier: It is being improved.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: While agreeing that it might be more economical to make the improvements with prison labour, it should be the object of the Government to entirely remove those prisoners from the island if the object was to make the island a pleasure resort.

Mr. MURPHY: Everything that the Premier had stated was borne out by those who had visited the island during the present season. The member for Dundas had remarked about the ordinary camper not being allowed to wander over every square foot of the island at his own sweet will.

Mr. Hudson: I said nothing about "every square foot of the island."

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member should know why it was necessary to obtain permits to the penal settlement.

Mr. Hudson: Why advertise that the whole of the island would be open if only a portion of it is to be made available?

Mr. MURPHY: The Premier had spoken in laudatory terms of the good work which had been done at the island, and the facilities given to holiday makers to enjoy themselves there, but what the Premier forgot to tell the House was that the whole success of Rottneest was due to the man who for the past few years had been in charge of that island, and who had been classified as a warder. That was said without discounting in any way the work which had been done by others. It had yet to

be learned that it was part of the duty of the particular warder to whom he had referred to plan out and improve the appearance of the island.

Mr. Angwin: The surveyors were there first, and he is merely carrying out the work which they started.

Mr. MURPHY: This officer carried out the work of improvement long before the surveyors went there. Over 20 miles of roads were made there by this officer. Mr. Paterson, before the surveyors were at Rottneest, and yet he was classified as a warder, and he was not given the reward to which he was entitled.

Mr. Scaddan: And it was promised to him.

Mr. MURPHY: And as the leader of the Opposition said, it had been promised. The excuse which had been made to this officer when he as a Government servant failed to get the position of Superintendent of the Old Men's Home which was given to a new chum, was that the Government would find something better for him at Rottneest. It would be interesting to know who the three warders were over there.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order in discussing warders in connection with the Rottneest Island vote.

Mr. MURPHY: What he desired to know was that if Mr. O'Donoghue was classified as caretaker of the island, who were the three warders?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order in referring to the warders.

Mr. ANGWIN: The officer in charge of the prisoners at Rottneest was no doubt a good man, but we could not get away from the fact that there were warders who were not over there, and who had to carry out work, and who had carried out work, which was perhaps of greater importance.

Mr. Murphy: Not one.

Mr. ANGWIN: There were several whose names could be mentioned who had ability to carry on this work. The amount which was down for Rottneest was in his opinion rather excessive. He realised the necessity for a caretaker, and the necessity for someone to be there to

prevent any damage being done. If there were to be no future works carried out there, and the prisoners were to be removed, why was there any necessity to increase the vote this year? It was pleasing to hear that the island was becoming popular as a holiday resort, though personally he would rather remain on the mainland where there were equally good attractions at the various beaches. The work which had been done at Rottnest no doubt had been beneficial, and it was pleasing to know the Premier had enjoyed his holiday there, but it might be stated what it was intended to do with regard to further improvements, and whether it was intended to withdraw the prisoners from the island.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: With regard to the vote, he was in entire sympathy with the member for Fremantle in the attempt to improve the condition of the warder in question, but that member's attitude was in striking contrast to the attitude he adopted a little while ago when members of the Opposition were trying to improve the position of hundreds of men who were receiving 6s. 6d. a day. When, on the Estimates of the Police Department, hon. members had tried to voice certain grievances the Government whip had moved the gag and blocked all discussion. But, apparently, the Government whip knew his duty well and whom to serve, for there was no appearance of him just now.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member would have to discuss the item.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Like others, he had every sympathy with this particular officer at Rottnest, but he would venture to assert that the member for Fremantle in looking for recognition of this officer's services would only get it from the Opposition. Beyond that he (Mr. O'Loghlen) would only say he was absolutely disgusted with the action of the Government in applying the gag.

Mr. Murphy: You ought to go to New South Wales.

Mr. HARPER: The remarks of the member for Fremantle met with his hearty approval. The officer under discussion had displayed great energy and

ability and was deserving of an increase of salary.

Mr. SCADDAN: So good an officer was Mr. Paterson that, manifestly, his services were simply being wasted at Rottnest.

The CHAIRMAN: It was necessary to point out that he had allowed discussion on this subject under the misapprehension that Mr. Paterson came under this department. It now seemed that Mr. Paterson's position had been dealt with under "gaols," in the Estimates, and that the officer represented in the item under discussion was the caretaker, Mr. O'Donoghue. Therefore, he could not allow the discussion to proceed any further, except by way of explanation.

Mr. SCADDAN: It was necessary to draw the attention of the Chairman, or of those prompting him in the matter—

The Premier: I do not know whether the hon. member is alluding to me when he speaks of prompting.

Mr. SCADDAN: Yes.

The Premier: I was simply answering a question put by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Having confused the discussion on the vote for Rottnest with that for the gaols, he had asked the Minister in charge of the Estimates whether Mr. Paterson was the caretaker referred to, and the Premier had explained that Mr. Paterson's position had been dealt with under "gaols." Finding this was so, he (the Chairman) had ruled the discussion out of order, and he could not now allow it to go any further.

Mr. Holman: Seeing that the caretaker is directly responsible to Mr. Paterson the discussion must hinge upon Mr. Paterson.

Mr. SCADDAN: The discussion was on Rottnest generally, and item No. 2 had reference to improvements and incidentals, £500. He would like to know how much of this money was handled by Mr. O'Donoghue. Was it not a fact that Mr. O'Donoghue, as caretaker, was merely paid from the Rottnest vote as a subterfuge, that Mr. O'Donoghue was nothing more or less than a warder attached to the Fremantle gaol, but that in order to lessen the expenditure of the gaol he was

paid his salary as caretaker on the island from this vote? The Premier himself had pointed out that the caretaker was paid his salary from this vote in order to lessen the burden on the gaol, and that it was a fair charge against Rottnest. The point was that Mr. O'Donoghue was a warder of the gaol, and that the item of £500 was really in the control of Mr. Paterson, who was the superintendent at Rottnest. In his (Mr. Scaddan's) opinion, the services of Mr. Paterson were in a large measure wasted at Rottnest, for that officer could be more advantageously employed elsewhere. Notwithstanding what the member for East Fremantle had said, Mr. Paterson had himself designed and carried out most of the improvements that had been effected at Rottnest. Again, it was due to the members of the House that they should at times have a call on the cottages at Rottnest, and he would suggest that the Premier arrange a week-end trip to Rottnest for members, in order that they might see for themselves the amount of good work done on the island. The majority of the people utilising Rottnest to-day were residents of the coast. If the people of the inland districts knew more of the advantages offered by the island as a holiday resort they would freely apply for the camps provided; and in his opinion they should have first call as against the people living the whole year round on the coast, if not actually at the seaside. It was not proposed to abolish the gaol at Rottnest, although it was intended to remove all the white prisoners, leaving only some blacks to make further improvements. That was a wise course, and he was entirely in favour of the project of popularising the island in order that visitors from inland might there find recreation without the necessity of going beyond the limits of the State.

Mr. ANGWIN: It should be made clear that he had said nothing derogatory to Mr. Paterson. What he had said was that that officer was as well paid as other officers of equal ability. If it was true, as the leader of the Opposition had stated, that the caretaker of Rottnest was not the person whom the Premier said he was, then the Committee had been wrongly informed by the Premier. Either the

leader of the Opposition was right and the Premier wrong, or the reverse was the case.

The Premier: We are both right.

Mr. ANGWIN: It might even be that the gaoler there had taken on himself the position of caretaker without instructions. The Premier had said this item was for Mr. O'Donoghue and not for Mr. Paterson.

Mr. Scaddan: That is correct, but I say it is a subterfuge.

Mr. ANGWIN: No doubt in time to come Rottnest would be popular with those who wanted a rest, though never, perhaps, with those who were looking for enjoyment. He desired to know what the £275 increase represented.

The PREMIER: That amount of £500 was to pay for improvements on the island, tents for camping purposes, and other things.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported.

## BILL—REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from 20th December, 1910.

Mr. DRAPER (West Perth): The time since the House last met seems to have been taken up with fishing at Rottnest and holidaymaking there, and as it is 10 days since we discussed this measure perhaps the House will not regard it as offensive if I remind them what is the principle of the second reading, namely, whether there is to a redistribution of seats or not. When no opposition was made to the pre-session addresses which were delivered in the country on more than one occasion announcing a Redistribution of Seats Bill, and when we find the Attorney General introducing the Bill and the leader of the Opposition getting up and stating that he agreed with a redistribution of seats, it is somewhat surprising that in these circumstances any acrimony should be imported into this debate.

Mr. Scaddan: I did not say we should pass this Bill.

Mr. DRAPER: We have had this Bill very ably explained by the Attorney General and, in addition, we have figures before us which no one has ventured to contradict and which, therefore, must be taken as correct. Yet in spite of that, we have three members in succession on the other side of the House giving us figures, choosing certain combinations to suit their arguments, and making charges against the Government of a serious nature in connection with the introduction of this Bill. I do not blame members of the Opposition. It is unfortunately one of the recognised principles of party Government that it is the duty of an Opposition to oppose, and in opposing a Bill the Opposition no doubt feel justified in taking hold of any argument which will suit their purpose. It is not a difficult matter for anyone, who will consider for one moment how many possible combinations there are in a matter of this kind, to make up a different combination to prove his case. We have 135,000 electors, and we have 50 electorates, and I need not remind members that the number of possible combinations in those figures is almost infinite; therefore, the argument which is brought forward by members on the other side on the basis of figures of their own choosing, and the charges against the Government, carry no weight with anyone acquainted with Parliamentary practice. No credit was given to the Government for the difficulty of introducing a Redistribution of Seats Bill, to which it is admitted on both sides of the House we cannot apply the only logical principle; I refer to the principle of a redistribution of seats on a population basis. Unfortunately, in the circumstances of this State, where we have a scattered and very often sparse population, where we have a climate which extends from comparatively cold in Albany to the heat of the tropics, and industries varying in proportion to the climate, and population varying also according to the climate, it has to be admitted that we cannot at present adopt the only logical basis, viz., a redistribution on a population basis.

Mr. Scaddan: It is not admitted.

Mr. DRAPER: I understand that it was. Three charges have been brought against the Government. One was by the leader of the Opposition, whose speech, I admit, was in many respects fair, yet on every occasion, inside this House and outside of it, he describes this Bill as pure gerrymandering.

Mr. Scaddan: Hear, hear. I stand to that.

Mr. DRAPER: We have another charge brought forward by the member for Kalgoorlie who, I regret, is absent. That the Government have sunk to the lowest depths of political degradation. We have still the further charge made by the member for Brown Hill, when he described this Bill as the most shameless and dishonest piece of political jobbery ever perpetrated.

Mr. Heitmann: Very mild.

Mr. DRAPER: That is the kind of criticism which is not entitled to very much weight in the country. One would expect at any rate, when we have charges of this kind made, that they would be substantiated from the Bill itself and not from fanciful figures and fanciful combinations, which members on the Opposition side may make from those figures to suit their own purposes.

Mr. Johnson: It is easily done from the maps.

Mr. DRAPER: The maps show nothing. They show nothing in any way contrary to the principle of the Queensland Act, which has been advocated by members on that side of the House. Let us take firstly the charge of the leader of the Opposition that the Bill is pure gerrymandering. The instance which he gives is that of the alterations to the Collier and Sussex electorates. When we have a Bill described as pure gerrymandering, and when we have that charge repeated on every possible occasion, one would expect to find that in no single case throughout the measure have the Government done anything which could possibly be of any advantage to the Opposition. If members could prove that they would substantiate their charge of gerrymandering.

Mr. Heitmann: It is not necessary to go that far.

Mr. DRAPER: The Bill is described as pure gerrymandering throughout.

Mr. Heitmann: Yes; and if you gerrymander one electorate it is pure gerrymandering.

Mr. DRAPER: I will take the instance of the Collie and Sussex boundaries. We had some member on the Opposition side of the House stating that the Labour party have no right to the full representation in the Federal Senate, and that it was not fair that those who were not members of the Labour party should be practically unrepresented. That is a fair and commonsense statement to make, and one which is strictly in conformity with what was advocated by the leader of the Opposition, namely, proportional representation. Let us apply that. At the present time we have Collie returning a member of the Opposition, and Sussex returning the leader of the Government, and because, in order to obtain community of interest the Collie seat is made certain for the Opposition—

Mr. Bolton: It was already certain.

Mr. DRAPER: Because the Collie seat is made certain for the Opposition member and the Sussex seat is said to be made sure for the leader of the Government, the Bill is called pure gerrymandering. That is not gerrymandering at all. The principle of this Bill is that there should be community of interest, and community of interest is a totally different thing from community of class. No difference whatever is made in the representation of either side. It would be absurd and unfair if, in drafting a Bill founded on community of interest, it were provided that those who were employed in the agricultural districts should be put in a position to be out-voted by those engaged in the mining and timber industries. Another instance is that of North Perth, the seat for which is at present filled by a member of the Opposition. It has not been suggested for one moment that the effect of this Bill will be to deprive the present member of his seat, but it has been said by more than one member that the result of the alteration to the North Perth district will be to make both Canning and

East Perth safe seats for the Opposition at the general election. Yet in face of that the Government are accused of having drafted a Bill which is pure gerrymandering throughout.

Mr. Seaddan: Your seat is not too safe either.

Mr. DRAPER: That is immaterial. If gerrymandering had been the object of the Government, why should they cut out the Wellington seat altogether? It has never been suggested that the Government cannot hold the Wellington seat, but the Government, instead of retaining that seat as they would have done if they had desired a pure gerrymandering of seats, have abolished it altogether. Now, what suggestions have been made by the Opposition as to what the Government should have done in this particular instance?

Mr. Underwood: We have suggested that they should act honestly.

Mr. DRAPER: What suggestions have they made that should be adopted? They have pointed out three. One was that there should be a conference; and another was that the distribution should be on a population basis, and the third was that the principle of the Queensland Bill should be adopted. Let us take the first, namely, that there should be a conference. I would remind the House that the leader of the Opposition is now in favour of proportional representation; but there must be many members of the House who recollect that not very long ago, about two or three years ago, there was an Electoral Bill before the House which was opposed tooth and nail on every occasion and which, I think, during the Committee stage obtained, if not the record, at any rate the second record sitting that has taken place in the House. And what was the reason for that opposition? The sole reason for it was that members of the Opposition desired to prevent Clause 143 of that Bill being passed—

Mr. Underwood: We had not reached that clause.

Mr. DRAPER: That is to say, they desired to prevent proportional representation in this State.



Mr. Scaddan: That is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. DRAPER: Hon. members know perfectly well from the history of that Bill what was the reason for the opposition to the Bill. They know perfectly well that before we came to that clause a conference took place to see if the difficulty could not be got over and the sitting, which had become inordinately long, cut short. And how was the sitting shortened? Simply and solely because the clause providing for proportional representation, now advocated by the leader of the Opposition, was dropped.

Mr. Scaddan: You are absolutely unfair.

Mr. DRAPER: Therefore, what is the value of a conference with members of the Opposition when we find they now advocate as an alternative measure to the Government proposal the very same principle they so strenuously opposed two or three years ago.

Mr. Collier: It is not so sudden as your somersault on the land tax.

Mr. DRAPER: Another suggestion has been made that the distribution of electorates ought to be adopted on a population basis. I would be prepared to go as far as the leader of the Opposition would go in supporting the principles of distribution upon a population basis, but there has been no practical attempt to deal with the principle except from the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Keenan), and that hon. member took as his basis not the district rolls, but divided the electorates up into groups comprised within the provinces of the Upper House. No doubt it suited the hon. member's purpose to do so. With 50 electorates and 135,000 electors one could get any number of groups to suit one's argument. It suited the hon. member's argument to use these particular groups for his distribution. If the leader of the Opposition now says that he does not advocate proportional representation I would like to point out to the House that theoretically it is undoubtedly a fair basis and the only logical basis of distribution, but it is one that at the present time, at any rate, cannot possibly be applied to the whole of

this State. As I pointed out just now, we have an enormous territory. The northern portion of it is one which differs not only in population but in industries and climate most materially from the rest of the State, and it would be undoubtedly grossly unfair to the people of the northern portion to have no effective voice in the government of the State by reducing their representation through adopting a population basis. In fact it is on account of the problems with which the Government are faced in the northern portion of the State that distribution upon a population basis becomes impossible.

Mr. Horan: I am not aware that anybody ever advanced such a ridiculous proposition.

Mr. DRAPER: But, leaving out the North, if the question had been discussed at the elections, if there had been any hint given to the general public that there was a possibility of redistribution so as to secure proportional representation, then, leaving out the North, no doubt the boundaries could have been so adjusted or grouped that proportional representation could have been obtained practically throughout the remainder of the State; but it is a radical change, and I venture to think that the very first persons who would have raised the greatest howl at the Government for introducing a different principle in the election of members to that which was in vogue before would be the present opposition. If the Government had introduced a Bill containing that principle, the Opposition were bound, in order to be consistent with their previous attitude on the Electoral Bill two or three years ago, to oppose it tooth and nail; yet now, when the Government do not bring it down, they throw it in the face of the Government that they ought to have done it, and that because they have not done it the Government have sunk to the uttermost depths of political degradation. The other course which has been suggested is that the Queensland Bill should have been adopted. There is one principle in the Queensland Bill of which no mention has been made by the Opposition. The very first principle to

occupy the attention of the commissioners in redistribution in Queensland was not only community of interest, but also diversity of interest; and the second one was means of communication, which the member for Brown Hill contemplates as merely being applied to distance from the metropolis; while the third was physical features, and the fourth the area of the proposed districts not comprised in any part of a city or town. So in Queensland the principal things were community or diversity of interest and also the compactness of any political electorate. It is somewhat strange that we should find the member for Brown Hill, in objecting to electorates on the Golden Mile being slightly under the quota of the electorates of Perth, overlooking the argument of compactness and arguing that these electorates should be considerably less in their quota than the metropolitan districts and should be on a par with the agricultural districts because of their distance from the metropolis; whereas on the other hand the hon. member recognises the principle of compactness of electorates when he deals with agricultural electorates; because he complains that Woodanilling is taken away from Katanning and put into Wagin, saying that Woodanilling should naturally be with Katanning because it would be a more compact electorate. Apparently when it suits the hon. member he adopts the argument, but he abandons it when he compares the electorates of the Golden Mile with the electorates in the metropolitan district. I submit that throughout the Bill the Government have succeeded in performing a most difficult task in bringing a measure before the House for which there can be no logical provision applicable to the whole, and in bringing before the House a measure practically guided by the principles laid down in the Queensland Bill, which the Opposition would support.

Mr. Horan: You know perfectly well that what you say is not true.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not make that accusation.

Mr. Horan: I wish to say it is incorrect.

Mr. DRAPER: I do not propose to take any notice of what the hon. member says: it is immaterial. I desire to point out that community of interest, which is the principle adopted by the Government, is a very different thing to community of class, as advocated by the leader of the Opposition. Let me point out what the hon. member says community of interest is. He says community of interest is community of wage-earners: that community of occupation is not community of interest. If community of wage-earners is to be considered community of interest then, according to the statement of the hon. member, there can be no complaints made by anybody that the Labour party at the present time monopolise the whole of the representation in the Federal Upper House. It is idle to put forward the claim that community of wage-earners is community of interest. Does the hon. member expect us to forget what took place in Perth a few months ago? Does he expect us to dismiss from our minds what we have heard, and what we have heard members of the Opposition practically supporting? Does it escape the hon. member's memory that at the time of the tram strike there were two conflicting parties among the wage-earners, one party being unionists, and the other being described as blacklegs? But both parties were wage-earners. Yet the hon. member would have us believe that community of interest is only community of wage-earners. It is remarkable if that be so, that each of these parties, who are wage-earners, accuses the other of attempting to blow up the tramway plant with explosives. Yet the hon. member would have us believe that community of interest can only exist where there is community of wage-earners. I have very little to add. A great deal of abuse has been levelled against members on the Government side, abuse not founded on any logical argument, but purely because it is the duty, no doubt, of the Opposition to oppose; and in this particular instance the Opposition have gone beyond criticism, and their criticism has become simply individual abuse. In these circumstances, what

they say cannot be regarded as any argument by any member of the Government side of the House, nor would it be any argument to the electors of the country if they properly understood the position. It is admitted on every side that a redistribution of seats is necessary. That is the sole principle now before the House upon the second reading of the Bill, and I shall certainly vote for it.

Mr. SCADDAN: I desire to make a personal explanation. I have looked up *Hansard* in connection with the accusations which the member for West Perth has made against me, and I find that I did not speak on the second reading of the Electoral Bill to which he referred, and that the clauses he referred to were not dealt with at all by the Committee; they were dealt with by a select committee of which I was not a member, and I had nothing to do with them. I made no reference to proportional representation; I did, however, privately express an opinion in opposition to these clauses, because they did not provide for proportional representation as I have advocated it. I have advocated proportional representation on a population basis, one vote one value, which I consider is advisable and desirable. The hon. member for West Perth might have been fair enough to look up the debates before making wrong statements to the House.

The Minister for Mines: Was he referring to you?

Mr. SCADDAN: In reply to the interjection by the Minister for Mines I might state that I am the only member on this side of the House who has advocated proportional representation in connection with this Bill, and as no other member has yet referred to it, the remarks of the member for West Perth would only apply to one member, and that is myself. If he is fair, as he ought to be, he will retract the statement he has made.

Mr. DRAPER: I certainly desire to be fair. I never for one moment stated that the leader of the Opposition was a member of that select committee, but I must state that the views he advocates in this House as leader of the Opposition must be regarded as the views of his party.

Mr. SCADDAN: When I spoke on this Bill I distinctly stated that the opinions I was expressing on the question of proportional representation were my own personal opinions, and were not expressed on behalf of this party.

Mr. WALKER: As I was a member of the select committee, I may be permitted to add a word of explanation. That select committee consisted of members on both sides of the House, and there were on it the late Mr. Price, the then Minister for Works, and Mr. Male, and neither was in favour of proportional representation. The proportional representation as advocated by the former Attorney General was thrown out by the Committee because it was not proportional representation, but electorates as they now stand, and it was found to be impracticable, and that with compulsory voting it was made impossible for the Opposition to accept it in that form, and it was because the clauses were in that form that the division of the Bill dealing with that subject was rejected by the select committee.

On motion by Mr. Jacoby, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.35 p.m.*