

transmitted to the Assembly, with a view to removing a difficulty in the way of the Assembly considering the Message; also stating that should a conference be agreed to by the Council the Assembly would be represented at such conference by three managers.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister) moved—

That the consideration of the Message be made on Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: The tenor of the Message was not quite clear. It appeared that the Legislative Assembly wished to confer with the Legislative Council not as to the Bill, but as to the removal of certain difficulties in the way of the consideration of the Council's Message, and, he understood, of future Messages of a like character. He would like to be clear on that point before voting for the consideration of the Message at the next sitting.

The PRESIDENT: I think it is a conference on the matter of the Council's Message.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: If that was so he was agreeable to the motion. If it was not so, he most certainly could not support the motion because the Message would not be a proper answer to the Message sent to the Legislative Assembly.

RESOLUTION—STATE GOVERNOR.

Message received from the Legislative Assembly requesting the Legislative Council's concurrence in the following resolution:—"That this House is of opinion that the Colonial Office should be petitioned to reconsider the appointments of State Governors, with a view to permitting the duties of the office to be performed by a citizen of the Commonwealth."

House adjourned at 10.8 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 27th November, 1912.

	PAGE
Question: Mail Contract, North-West ..	3920
Bills: Victoria Park Tramways Act Amendment, 3a.	3920
District Fire Brigades Act Amendment (No. 2), 1a.	3920
Employment Brokers Act Amendment, 1a.	3920
Industrial Arbitration, Council's pressed requests	3947
Pharmacy and Poisons Act Amendment, 2a.	3948
Leave of Absence	3921
Motion: State Governor	3921
Papers: Chief Warden, Fremantle Prison ..	3948
Papers presented	3957

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—MAIL CONTRACT, NORTH-WEST.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (for Mr. Male) asked the Premier: 1, Is it a fact that under the new North-West mail contract recently given to the State Government for carrying mails from Fremantle to Port Darwin, the port of Wyndham is being absolutely isolated from Darwin? 2, If this is so, will he confer with the Federal postal authorities and take the necessary steps to get this remedied, and see that an equally good steamship connection between these ports be maintained as exists at present?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No; the arrangement is in accordance with the conditions of the contract as supplied by the Commonwealth authorities. 2, Mr. Sudholz, the manager of the State steamship service, who is at present visiting the North-West, has been instructed to make inquiries into the matter and report to the Government upon his return to Perth, when the subject will be further considered.

BILL — VICTORIA PARK TRAMWAYS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, District Fire Brigades Act Amendment (No. 2).

2, Employment Brokers' Act Amendment.

(Introduced by Hon. W. C. Angwin, Honorary Minister).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. FRANK WILSON (for Mr. Layman) leave of absence for two weeks granted to Mr. George on the ground of ill-health.

MOTION—STATE GOVERNOR.

Mr. TURVEY (Swan) moved—

That this House is of opinion that the Colonial Office should be petitioned to reconsider the appointments of State Governors, with a view to permitting the duties of the office to be performed by a citizen of the State.

He said: Hon. members will remember that a few evenings ago I moved a motion dealing with the upkeep of Government House; but on that occasion the rules of the House did not permit of discussing the mode of the appointments of our State Governors, and the Minister in charge of the House that evening assured members that an opportunity would be given to discuss this broader question; hence this motion to-day. At the outset I desire to make it clear that I intend in no way reflecting upon the present occupant of the position of State Governor. I think it is agreed by all that that gentleman has carried out the duties with credit to himself and to the State, and I do not think any hon. member desirous of supporting me in this motion would in any way wish to reflect in the slightest degree on the present occupant of the position. But I think the time has arrived when some change should be made in the manner of making the appointments to the position. We know that in the past the position has always been filled by the Home authorities, I understand by the Secretary of State for the Colonies; and it is clearly to be understood that in moving this motion I have no desire at the present time to suggest for one moment that the appointment should be taken out of the hands of the Crown. Still I think the time has arrived when the position should be one which may be filled by our most distinguished citizens of the State. I think

it is one which men who have done yeoman service to their State should be able to fill. It should be a position of honour, a position to which, indeed, men who, perhaps, have devoted much of their lives to the political affairs of the State may retire and do honour to themselves and to their State. I know perfectly well the argument will be advanced that because a man has allied himself in politics with one party or the other, therefore he must naturally be biassed. I think it is time that cry was dropped. If that cry be subscribed to we will prevent any man from taking active part in public affairs. We know the cry is used in respect to positions of lesser degree at the present time. The Government are accused of appointing a partisan; they pick out the man who, perhaps, has the best qualifications for some post, but simply because he has at some time or other allied himself with a particular political party it is urged that therefore he should not be given the appointment. I know that that argument will be advanced in connection with this motion to have the duties of the office of Governor performed by a citizen of the State. But no matter what activity one may have displayed, even in connection with politics, I have sufficient confidence in those gentlemen who are active in our public life to know that when they are appointed to such honourable positions they are not going to carry out the duties of their office in a biassed manner so far as political parties are concerned. I believe during the early periods of colonisation it may have been a wise provision that an Imperial officer specially qualified to direct and advise the administration of the Government should fill the position of State Governor. But the conditions have materially changed. There need be no request from the State to be consulted on the choice of a Governor. The power of appointment could rest as it does at present with the Crown.

The Premier : Who would recommend?

Mr. TURVEY : Who recommends at the present time?

Mr. SPEAKER : The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. TURVEY : I realise that our Federal Constitution does not permit of the same system as prevails in Canada. There the Governor General of the Dominion is appointed directly by the Crown, and he has the appointment of the Governors of the Provinces, but the Canadian Constitution differs in that respect from the Federal Constitution of Australia. We have no power to have our State Governors appointed by the Governor General. With the direct representation of His Majesty the King in the Governor General, I hold there is every justification for dispensing with the provision we now have that the State Governor must be an Imperial officer, and further that, with the increased cost of Federal Government, and the maintenance of the Governor General and the upkeep of his establishment, the people naturally expect that the burden of taxation will be reduced. In fact that was one of the pleas at the time of Federation, instead of which the burden has been steadily increasing. I know there are those who will say that by the appointment of a citizen of the State we are weakening the strength of the State. The old "State righters" are bound to loom on the horizon. The same objection was raised when the Canadian system was introduced. The "State righters" got to work there in the same manner as I suppose they will in connection with this motion. I am aware that at the Brisbane conference of State Premiers a resolution was passed in opposition to any interference with the present system, chiefly because such interference would tend to lowering the position of the States. But various States have since then carried resolutions in support of the proposition that a citizen of the State should occupy the position of State Governor. I believe a resolution was carried in the South Australian Parliament, and also in the Victorian Parliament in 1909, and I understand that a motion almost similar to the one I am moving was discussed in this House on more than one occasion. Reference was made the other evening to the fact that the South Australian Government petitioned the Sec-

retary of State for the Colonies with a view to having the position of Governor given to a citizen of that State, and the Premier, in reply to a question asked by the member for Leonora (Mr. Foley) read to this House part of the despatch received at that time by the late Mr. Price, the then Premier of South Australia. In that despatch the Secretary of State informed the South Australian Premier that the proposition could not be entertained in any case unless it was to be applied to all the Australian States and not to one alone, and until public opinion in Australia is demonstrated to be overwhelmingly in its favour. May I say that one of the reasons for this motion is to demonstrate that public opinion in this State, at any rate, is entirely in favour of the position of State Governor being held by a citizen of the State. In reply to the petition from South Australia the Secretary for State further pointed out that the proposal, as presented to him, was one which would leave the appointment of a Governor to be made, as now, by His Majesty the King, but it was clear that the person selected would need to be one fully acceptable to the Ministry of the day. I do not think it follows that by appointing a citizen of Western Australia to the position of State Governor the person selected would need to be one acceptable to the Ministry of the day. When the Canadian Dominion was established it was provided that the federating provinces should be under Lieutenant Governors appointed by the Governor General in Council, and I would point out that in Western Australia on more than one occasion the gubernatorial position has been well filled by Lieutenant Governors. If that be so, and the position can be so well filled by citizens of Western Australia for many months at a time, I hold that it can be filled for a longer period. I know there are those who will say that to take such a step as is suggested by this motion would, perhaps, be an indication on the part of those supporting it, that we desire to "cut the painter" and do away with that link which connects us with the Mother Coun-

try. But I would point out that in my opinion the fact that we have a direct representative of His Majesty in the Governor General is a sufficient connecting link so far as Australia is concerned. Under the old system of colonial Government in Western Australia the functions of Government were centred wholly in the Governor, and it was necessary, more so than it is now, that the position should be filled by one who had a keen knowledge of constitutional methods. To-day the position is altered. Whereas in the early days the advisers of the Governor were nominated by the Crown, and were not held responsible for their advice, to-day they are held responsible for the advice they give to the occupant of the gubernatorial position, and gradually certain features of the form of colonial Government have undergone modifications, and as time has progressed there has been a diminution of interference on the part of the Imperial Government with the self-governing colonies. So that the argument cannot now be advanced that it is necessary that we should have an Imperial officer well versed in constitutional methods. I do not hold that the duties of the Governor are merely the laying of foundation stones, the holding of levees, and similar functions. I realise the responsibility that is cast upon our State Governors, but I believe we have citizens of Western Australia well equipped to take upon themselves that responsibility and to carry out the duties of the position with credit to themselves, to the people of Western Australia, and also to the Imperial authorities. I do not desire to take up the time of the House at any great length in connection with this motion, because I know from reading the debates that have taken place in this House in past years in connection with a similar proposal, that a majority of members of the House are quite in accord with the spirit of the motion. Therefore, I think it would be only wasting the time of the House to make any lengthy speech on the motion. I have no doubt that hon. members on both sides of the House, who in the past have shown a desire to move in this direction, will give their support to

this motion. I wish, in conclusion, to state that I am of opinion that if the motion is given effect to, and a citizen of the State becomes in future the occupant of the position of State Governor, it will not lessen the bond of union that exists between the Mother Country and this State or between the Mother Country and Australia. I believe that we have in Western Australia patriotic citizens who, together with the general community of the State, are ready at all times to show their devoted loyalty to the Empire, as they have shown it in the past on many occasions; and I for one will not believe that because we endeavour to have the duties of Governor carried out by a citizen of the State, it is going to mean a loss of dignity to the State, or is going to show in the slightest degree any lack of loyalty on the part of our people. I have very much pleasure in moving the motion.

Mr. CARPENTER (Fremantle): I second the motion.

Mr. FOLEY (Leonora): I desire to support the motion, and in doing so to emphasise the fact that I am influenced by no personal motives whatever. I believe we have in the position of Governor of the State a gentleman who has ability and a desire to do his work in a manner that will be creditable to himself, and that this State will find in years to come that his work has been creditable to Western Australia also. But I believe, and have believed for some time, especially since Federation, that a great saving can be brought about by each State reducing the cost in connection with the State Governors. The mover of the motion stated that there was nothing personal in his remarks and he has endeavoured to show that his desire is to benefit the State, and with that object he has brought the motion forward. When Federation was about to be accomplished Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, one of the greatest men of the day in England, was consulted on this question, and the various prominent men in Australia at that time were thoroughly convinced that when Federation was brought about, the cost to the States for the upkeep of the offices of State Governor would be lessened. When the matter was

brought before the Victorian Parliament by Mr. Towtcher, the member for Ararat, all the leading authorities on constitutional matters were consulted, and Mr. Irvine, who held a very high position in that Parliament, quoted the words of Mr. Chamberlain, and they were practically a suggestion to the various States that they should abolish the offices of State Governor. Up to the present time no alteration has been made, and as one who believes that the Government, no matter what phase of politics they believe in, should make the safeguarding of the finances one of the first essentials of good management, I consider much of the money expended for the upkeep, not for the personal benefit of the Governor, but everything that pertains to the office, could be put to better use in every State of the Commonwealth. Some people have stated that little money could be saved, but I believe if a referendum were taken in every State of Australia the people would speak with no uncertain voice in the direction of abolishing the present system. As to the question of who would take the position, that would be a matter of opinion, and I think the various Governments having been put into the position of looking after the affairs of State, would be called upon to suggest who should be appointed to the office. I do not agree with many in this State that the office should be open only to the gentleman holding the position of Chief Justice. If the motion is carried there are other men who might be chosen for the position and the choice should not be limited to one branch or to one small coterie of men, but each and every individual in this and every other State should be given the chance to attain the highest possible position in the State. During the debate on this question to which the hon. member referred, I was credited—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member had better not refer to that debate.

Mr. FOLEY: I have been credited with saying—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not allude to that debate.

Mr. FOLEY: Very well, I will just say that—and this is nothing in connec-

tion with the debate—I have been credited outside with saying that the appointment of a State Governor was a rubber stamp appointment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member could not be credited with saying anything unless it had a reference to a debate which took place in this Chamber, and I hope he will not allude to anything in that connection.

Mr. FOLEY: I bow to your ruling. I desire to support the motion because I believe it will give the various States of Australia a chance of putting men into the position who will take an interest in their affairs, men who have done a great deal for Australia, whether it be politically or socially, or in any walk of life, and it will also save to the various States a great sum every year. If we are the means of accomplishing this, we shall have done the State a good service. I trust that everything the Government can do will be done to bring about the desire and wish of the people of Western Australia on this question. The Premier has stated that until each and every State in the Commonwealth arrives at a conclusion that they do not desire any further appointments under the present system, nothing can be done, but I trust that the Government will place before the authorities the fact that at least Western Australia wants some change and if this State can do anything to lead the other States to view the matter in the same light, not only Western Australia but every State will be benefited. At present it is costing over £100,000 for the upkeep of the various Governors and Government Houses in Australia. The capital cost of one Government House alone in one part of Australia is £170,000. That being so, members will understand that there is yearly placed on the people an incubus which to a very great extent might be removed. In my opinion the cost can be lessened. If an Australian is called upon to fulfil the position of Governor, I do not think he should be paid at the same rate as the present Governor. When a Lieutenant-Governor was appointed in Victoria that gentleman was paid exactly the same amount of salary as the Governor whose place he was filling.

If the present system is abolished and Australians are appointed, there will be no benefit if that same course is followed. We desire that the interests of the State should be safeguarded to this extent, that the office and the upkeep of Government Houses in Australia will be lessened.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan): On behalf of the Government I desire to inform the House that we have no objection to the motion as submitted by the hon. member with the exception that I propose to move an amendment to strike out of the last line the word "State" and insert "Commonwealth." May I explain that my reason is that I think it will possibly be desirable not to restrict the home authorities by confining an appointment even under these conditions to within the State, because it might be to the advantage of the State and of all concerned that a person should be appointed from some other State and thus the Governors might be interchangeable. A person who was removed from party strife might be appointed and might fulfil the office as well as those Governors from other parts of the Empire. I think the hon. member will appreciate the reason for the amendment. On the general ground I think the people of this State almost unanimously agree that the time has arrived when Australia has sufficient prominent men who could take the office, and although they might have been attached to some political party, they could hold the office and by doing so hold the scale of justice between contending parties with equal poise. We should give the opportunity to our prominent citizens to fill this office. It must be remembered that whatever the nature of the appointment might be, it must always remain with His Majesty the King to decide at any moment to dismiss any person occupying the office. Under the conditions suggested by the motion it might be found that some time or other the occupant of the office, while having perhaps the support of the Ministry of the day, might do something that was detrimental to the interests of the Imperial authorities within the State, and it would be essential that they as an impartial body should be able to step in and immediately

dismiss him from office. That of course will probably cause friction, but I suppose the same thing will apply as in the past that we shall have to find methods for overcoming these difficulties when they arise. The point I desire to make is that as far as the office of Governor is concerned, we have always held the view that this is a post which should be open to our prominent citizens, and the objection we have taken to a previous attitude adopted by the Chamber is that while the present conditions prevail and we are in the meantime trying to get an alteration in the direction desired by the people, as the executive power in the State representing their views, we should accept the position and do our utmost by way of complying with their wishes and of doing justice to the occupant of the position for the time being. Even when a change takes place I am not one who thinks that an Australian should be treated differently from anyone else. If we have a prominent citizen appointed to the position, I hope we shall always find it wise to see that his residence is kept as well as under the conditions existing at the present time, and that he will have the same facilities for governing in the interests of the State and the Crown as anyone who is sent from another part of the British Dominions has at the present time. That is the objection we have taken to an attempt on the part of some members to get an expression of opinion in an indirect manner which is not desirable and which is not likely to bring us credit, but as a matter of fact is likely to bring us discredit, though the feeling of the House as a whole is against the present method of appointment. Let me say again that if this change takes place, if it ever does, and I hope it will shortly, the cost to the State will not be such a great deal less unless we expect the occupant of the office to have considerable private means, and I am sure the hon. member does not desire to restrict the occupants of the office to persons of private means, but to embrace those with a reputation for their impartiality and general good work done for the State, whether they have private means or not. Either the State will be calling upon

a person to fill an office which does not carry a salary which will enable him to fulfil the position with dignity to the State, or else it will have to provide him with sufficient salary, and when the time comes it will be found that the salary paid to-day is not more than sufficient for fulfilling the office of Governor. As regards the question of the upkeep of Government House, and also the providing of the staff, I want to say that the present occupant of the position of Governor has not been over-staffed by any means nor have we expended a great amount of money for the upkeep of the grounds and the beautifying and general repairs of the building. We have not expended any more than was essential, and in fact I want to say that most members if they took an opportunity of looking at Government House would agree that it is not kept in that condition in which it ought to be kept. It requires the expenditure of a large sum to make Government House just what we would desire it should be for the vice-regal residence had we the wherewithal, and I say we have been very economical in the direction of providing for the proper upkeep of Government House. The statement made so frequently by all and sundry in different parts of Australia at the time we were fighting for Federation that it would bring about the abolition of the present large expenditure by the various States for salaries of Governors and the upkeep of Government Houses, was only so much birdlime, used as such at the time, and nothing else; because they knew that as long as the States remained sovereign States they must have some persons acting as governors, whether it be local citizens or men from other parts of the Dominions, and that we would have to provide them with salaries and also with staffs.

Mr. Foley: They reckoned it would reduce the cost considerably. Every public man said that.

The PREMIER: Of course, and I am pointing that out; they used it as birdlime for the purpose of inducing people to vote for Federation. In years to come the hon. member will approve of these remarks. I have yet to learn that any

person in the State who objects to the present method of appointing a person to the position of Governor is desirous that, when the time arrives that a citizen of the State shall be appointed, he must be a man of private means, or a person who has to hold some other office carrying with it a magnificent salary, or that he shall be a man living in obscurity in a six-by-eight tent in the hills. Our duty is to uphold the dignity of the position.

Mr. Foley: It can be done at a great deal less cost.

The PREMIER: I am not so sure it can be done at a great deal less cost while we are a sovereign State. I only desire to place the true position before members. We have absolutely no objection to the motion so long as the choice is not restricted to a citizen of the State itself, and so that we may have, when the time arrives, when this is put in operation, an interchange of citizens in all parts of Australia. If we find any citizen in any part of Australia removed from party jealousies and party interests, one who can occupy the position with dignity and impartiality, we should have the opportunity to appoint him. We may find it may be thought necessary that some citizen of Western Australia should be Governor of Victoria, and we would not object to see some citizen of Victoria becoming Governor of Western Australia.

Mr. Underwood: We have some to spare.

The PREMIER: The trouble is that they would not perhaps accept in the other States men we could spare for the time being, even as Governors. The Government are prepared to support the motion and to ask also that it be submitted to another place so that we can submit to the Home authorities a petition on behalf of the Parliament of Western Australia, expressing what it would undoubtedly be, the opinion of the majority of the people of the State that our feelings may be given consideration to and not kept back simply because some other States are not prepared to agree with us at the present time. We are a sovereign State and should have our views con-

sidered from our point of view, and not from the point of view whether Victoria or Tasmania agreed with us. That is why I have always objected to the statement of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that the Home Government could not accept our views until all the other States were in agreement. We can only continue to make representations, and adopting the motion amended in the direction I suggest will be another opportunity of pressing on the Home authorities the views of the people of the State. I move an amendment—

That the last word "State" be struck out and "Commonwealth" inserted in lieu.

[The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Holman) took the Chair.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): I oppose the amendment. After all, I think it is only just widening the issue and getting away from the vital point, which is that we want to appoint a Governor in Western Australia. I am here to say that if Western Australia cannot produce a Governor she ought to go without one. There are only one or two things I would like to say in reply to the Premier. He says that while existing conditions prevail we must go on. Of course, while existing conditions prevail we must go on; but there have been political parties for hundreds of years desiring to change existing conditions, and we have been elected to this House to endeavour to alter this existing condition. If it is necessary to just let existing conditions prevail then we should appoint a few civil servants and let them run the country. In regard to the bird lime that was used when the vote was taken to decide whether we would federate, the Premier might have used it as birdlime, and many others may have done so, but there were tens of thousands of Australians who voted on the full and clear understanding that it was really good building lime, and not birdlime at all, that it was lime we were going to use and lime that was going to be useful for Australia. Of course it is quite easy to say it was birdlime, particularly those who are using birdlime. In regard

to the method of appointment, it is not altogether a question of appointment; it is a question really of cutting down the expense. It is recognised throughout Western Australia that we expend a considerably larger sum than we can afford upon mere frill and ostentation of government. We are not concerned so much as to who makes the appointments so long as we get a good man at a considerably less cost than at present. The Premier speaks about the necessary dignity, which is a commodity that many of us on this side of the House, and some on the other side, have, though not in any great quantity—in fact some of the members on the other side have none.

Mr. Foley: I saw your name in the *Sunday Times* the other day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If we are prepared to pay for dignity and the upholding of dignity let us say so, but the members of the House who object to paying £7,000 a year for the upholding of dignity should vote to indicate it, and those who are opposed to the expending of the people's money for the upholding of this dignity should have the right to say whether they approve of it or not. I have to say on behalf of Pilbara that I am not prepared to expend this money for the upholding of the due dignity of the position. What the people of Pilbara want is a man to carry out the constitutional functions of the position, and that can be done without any frill whatever. If we paid a man £1,000 a year to do it we could get any amount of first-class men at the present time.

Mr. Dooley: Would you take it on?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I would take it on at £500, and, as I said about the clerk's position, I would do it well, and Western Australia would have a good man. I do not believe that Western Australians are prepared to continue this expenditure of money for the upholding of dignity, or for upholding or maintaining these various social functions. After all, the great bulk of the money is expended on entertaining a few people who live in the immediate vicinity of Perth, while the rest of Western Australia have to pay their share towards it. I believe that the peo-

ple of Western Australia generally do not approve of that, and I hold that a man can carry out all the constitutional functions of a Governor and, if his health demanded it, live in a six-by-four tent and still do the work well. The great houses that we have all throughout Australia as residences of Governors are absolutely unnecessary for the proper fulfilling of the constitutional functions. When we come to social functions, when we want to invite the *bon ton* of the towns to garden parties and dinners and buy them wine, of course we want the money and the houses, but if we require a man to carry out constitutional functions these are not necessary. I contend it is the constitutional functions Western Australia is prepared to pay for. Those people who desire social functions and desire this dignity and all that, should spend their own money on it, and not the money of the people of Pilbara. There has been some talk of a man being incapacitated from filling the position of Governor because he has been a politician. It is absolutely absurd. Those making the statement cannot have thought over the position. If it is impossible to appoint a politician—and all politicians are party politicians—it would be impossible to appoint a Speaker. When we come to realise that we can elect a man from our own House, taking him right out of the battle of party politics, and place him in the Chair; when we realise we can get a man who is impartial, not one but dozens of them, if we want them, then we must realise that we can get a Governor. When we want an Agent General it is the same. Would the Premier say—I know he will not suggest—that the late Liberal leader, Sir Newton Moore, is not impartial towards liberalism in his position as Agent General? We know that Sir Newton Moore is absolutely impartial in dealing with this State, no matter whether it is a Liberal or Labour Government. The same applies to Sir George Reid, or Mr. Kirkpatrick, of South Australia: in fact almost every appointment we have made demonstrates that men who have been politicians are quite capable of being impartial when put in the position of

dealing with questions where impartiality is necessary.

Mr. Dooley: What about the High Court bench?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It is not necessary to give any further details. Besides I want to leave something for the hon. member for Geraldton. There are many members on this side of the House who are absolutely sincere about this. The motion is more an academic discussion, an expression of pious hope or pious wish, and the giving effect to it to some extent depends on how it is presented; but this is the position I take it, that we are in earnest about this, and that we have to show the authorities in London that we are in earnest. The best way to show people that we are in earnest is to go at them financially. A man can tell a fairly good tale, and one can believe all about it until he comes at one wanting a loan and then it is realised he is in earnest. We were in earnest the other night when we cut down the upkeep of Government House by £1,000. The *West Australian* newspaper claims that that was a snap vote. There will be no snap vote this afternoon. The vote, I hope, will demonstrate that this Parliament absolutely favours an alteration of the system. If the motion has no effect we should continue the method of reducing salaries. We cannot reduce the actual salary of the Governor, except by an amending Bill, which would have to be passed by the Legislative Council. But this House has absolute control of that item on the Estimates, and if this protest has no effect I will be prepared next year to vote for the entire deletion of that item and, if it is the only way of getting what we desire, letting Government House and the gardens go to ruin, to strike the item right off as though we meant it. I hope the amendment will not be carried, but that members will vote for the motion. As far as sending men from the Eastern States is concerned, we have any number of suitable men in Western Australia. The fact of somebody whom we do not know, and who knows nothing about us, being sent from Queensland or Tasmania, would not improve matters. I believe this State

is competent of producing men capable of filling the position, and I believe we should give the position to some citizen of this State.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): I am rather in accord with the amendment the Premier has moved to the motion. I do not think, if we are to have our Governors appointed from Australian citizens, that we should confine the appointments to citizens of our own State entirely. I am of opinion that already the power rests with the Home authorities to make such an appointment if they deem it desirable. I do not know of anything to prevent a citizen of Australia, or even of Western Australia, being appointed at the present time. I do know, however, that it has been customary for one reason or another to send out representatives from the Motherland, and I think that practice has been a good one up to the present time. Indeed, so far as I am concerned, I have no very strong feeling either one way or the other in respect to the alteration of this system. I am quite prepared to say at once there are many very estimable citizens in Australia who could fill these positions equally as well, from a colonial point of view, as the gentlemen sent out from time to time from England. But we have to take into consideration the fact that men who are sent out from the old country, after perhaps having proved themselves in the service of the King and their country, are more likely to be in touch with the opinions and views of those who rule affairs at Home for the time being, than is the average Australian citizen. And the Governor of any Sovereign State is, we must not forget the direct representative of His Majesty the King. This being so, I say that, so far as I am concerned, I have little fault to find with the present system. To say that the motion moved by the member for Swan (Mr. Turvey) might, through any line of argument, be considered a reflection on the present occupant of the office is, of course, absurd. We know quite well that the present Governor has fulfilled his

duties in a manner satisfactory to every one. We know that his predecessors did so also. I think we can say that of every Governor who has been appointed to that high position in Western Australia. They have all carried out their duties according to their judgment and the directions they have received from time to time, in a satisfactory manner, and therefore on that score there can be no reason for asking for an alteration of the system. Reference has been made by the mover to the system obtaining in Canada. On several occasions I have myself referred to that system and expressed disapproval of it. I do not think it is conducive to the well-being of Sovereign States, such we have in the Commonwealth, to have our governors appointed by the central authority, and I hope that system will never be adopted here. To have the power vested in the central authority for the time being—represented of course by the Governor General, acting on the advice of his Ministers—to appoint the governors of the different States, would be extremely objectionable. In Canada it goes much further, because the central Government have the right to veto the legislation of State Houses. So we cannot hold up Canada as an example which can be profitably followed by Western Australia, or any other State of the Commonwealth. The idea that we must have biased men if we appoint them from our own country is, I think, equally absurd. It stands to reason that wherever a man is prominent in the affairs of his country, if he lives in one of the States of the Commonwealth, he must at some time or other have been closely connected with the political fortunes of one party or the other. This applies equally to the appointees from Home as it does in Australia. Naturally the retort will be made that Home politics do not concern us out here. That is quite true to some extent, but the fact remains that all the important positions right through the British Empire are made from one shade of political thought or the other, and of course they are well made, and the positions well filled, and the idea of the party leanings in the gentlemen who are appointed from time to

time to these positions has never entered into the heads of those who have made the appointments as being detrimental to the due fulfilment of their duties. Indeed, I go so far as to say that a man who has been intimately connected with the political well-being of his country is likely, in my opinion, to be able to fulfil the functions better than another who has had no similar experience. A man can always rise above his political faith in administering a position which does not call for any special political beliefs, and therefore on that score I say at once we can safely have gentlemen appointed, not only from Australia, but from Western Australia, who, although they have been in the thick of the political turmoil of their country for years, would rise to the dignity of the position and fill it well as Governor of the State. I am sorry to think the sole argument, so far as I can gather, put forward by hon. members who are supporting this motion, is one of economy. They want to see the expenditure in connection with Government House and the Vice-regal establishment cut down, and I presume cut down to some considerable extent. It is refreshing to notice the different attitude of our friends when in power and when in Opposition. I remember full well that when hon. members who now occupy the Treasury bench occupied this front Opposition bench they had not words strong enough to express their disapproval of the alleged wilful waste and expenditure in connection with the Governor's establishment, and the salary which he drew. To-day, however, we find the Premier, with that sense of responsibility upon him which his office, of course, naturally brings, voicing the opinion that the Governor is not overpaid, that the position is not unduly expensive so far as the State is concerned, and that even if a local man were selected for this position, he, for one at any rate, cannot see how this expenditure could be curtailed. I commend that view to hon. members opposite, more especially to my friend (the member for Pilbarra (Mr. Underwood) who is so anxious to take on the work at the magnificent remuneration of £500 per annum. I think it would be a pity to de-

prive the electors of Pilbarra of their splendid representative in this House in order to reduce him to the position of Governor of the State. I believe in economy being practised in reason in all departments, and I think the Governor's establishment is a fitting establishment in which to economise in a reasonable way. I do not, however, agree with this wholesale condemnation of expenditure in connection with Government House, nor can I approve of such action as was taken the other night in connection with the Estimates, when that expenditure was reduced by the sum of £1,000. I know that hon. members on that occasion wished to voice their opinion in the direction of this motion. It seems to me, however, to be a poor way of getting at what they require, to cut down expenditure which must of necessity be incurred in order to uphold the dignity of the State itself. After all, we have some pride in our institutions, and surely if we claim the right of a sovereign State we must have some pride in the dignity of the office of the gentleman who represents His Majesty the King in this State. We are either patriotic to the Motherland or unpatriotic, and so long as we have Governors let us not be niggardly in voting the necessary funds to maintain the position. We must have Governors in Western Australia unless we wish to be absorbed by the central power, by the Federal Government and Parliament; unless we wish to become a nonentity in the political life of Australia as a whole I maintain we must have a representative of the King to preside over the destinies of the State. The member for Pilbarra was very facetious in his remarks in connection with the expenditure. He wants to see Government House gardens go to wreck and ruin. He is going to insist that no gardener shall be employed, and that the grounds shall be allowed to grow wild in order to demonstrate that we are determined to have our way in this direction. The Governor's duty is not only to preside over the Executive Council meetings and to give his authority when necessary on behalf of the Crown in connection with legislation and other matters pertaining to the well-being of the State. The

Governor has an equally necessary duty to perform in representing social affairs in the State and extending hospitality to distinguished visitors who come to our shores, and this part of his duties cannot be overlooked. Even as the Premier and his colleagues have to spend considerable sums every year in their way to entertain distinguished visitors to our State, so the Governor has to spend large sums in a similar direction. We cannot get away from the responsibility of the position, and it is idle to think we can sit back as a president or secretary of a trades union might do and say we are only going to carry out the exact functions delegated to us for our payment, and not to go one step beyond. It is wider and broader in every respect than the private positions or semi-public positions which members fill. It is a position that requires the support, the combined support, of all shades of political opinion in order that the King's representative might be properly housed and be able to keep up the position in the State over which he presides. I am hardly in accord with the plea put forward by some members that because certain advocates of Federation said State Governors would probably be abolished, or at any rate the expenditure would be largely reduced, therefore we are bound to follow them in this direction. I do not remember that it was ever made a very strong cry in this place.

Mr. Lewis: It was urged that the cost of government would be reduced.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If it was, it was an expression of individual opinion by individual speakers advocating Federation, and I venture to think that the £1,000 or £1,500 or even £2,000 that could be saved in altering the system existing at the present time would be money, shall I say, wasted, at any rate it would be money that would be badly saved in my opinion, so far as our State is concerned. I do not think that we can improve our position very much. I believe myself in having a direct representative from the motherland, one who is entirely free from, shall I say, Australian bias, who is entirely free and comes here with a broad view of his duties as representing His

Majesty the King, and one who has had experience of the old country and of the leaders of thought therein. But my feelings in this direction are not so strong that I can take exception to an Australian, a worthy Australian, being appointed to a position of this sort. As I believe I am right in contending that the authorities have full power to appoint any citizen throughout the British Empire to the position, I think every good purpose will be served by adopting the amendment the Premier has moved and letting the Government make their representations to the Home authorities and say if the Home authorities are prepared to accept an Australian for the position of Governor in Western Australia, the Government are quite prepared to accept such a one if appointed. I support the Premier in his amendment. It seems to me that we ought not to attempt for one moment to confine the selection, if it is to be confined at all, to our State, but rather we should be broad-minded and Federal enough in our views to say that as we are an integral portion of the Commonwealth, and Australians are one to-day, we shall have a selection made from Australia and not from our own State of Western Australia alone.

Mr. HARPER (Pingelly): I intend to oppose the amendment and also the motion. I do not think for one moment that we will be going in the right direction if we appoint anyone from the Eastern States to become Governor of Western Australia. We have heard a great deal about being one people with one destiny, but so far as Federation is concerned, I have not, to my knowledge, seen anything of a practical demonstration of a Federal sentiment towards Western Australia, and I think the appointment of a Governor of Western Australia from the Eastern States would be simply ridiculous. It would be very difficult indeed for anyone to give up his home in the Eastern States and make a home in Western Australia. Also I think the people in the Eastern States would think a very long time before selecting anyone from Western Australia to be Governor in any one of those States. It would be almost a preposterous

idea to have local Governors appointed because it is impossible to secure Governors in Australia who would be free from the trammels of previous political opinions and who would start under unbiassed conditions as a Governor from the old country would. I think it is one step towards breaking the ties with the Empire to which we are all so proud to belong. The expense is certainly a small matter. It works out at only 4d. per head of the population of Western Australia. I think it would be a very lamentable state of affairs if we could not afford this expense. I think we would find it extremely difficult to secure men in Australia who have taken no part in political matters and party politics.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Does not the same apply to imported Governors?

Mr. HARPER: Not to the same extent because imported Governors have not been in touch with any party politics in Australia previous to their arrival here, and for that reason I think we should stick to the system in vogue at the present time. I agree with the member for Swan (Mr. Turvey) in economising in every possible way, especially in a young State like Western Australia. At the same time I do not see any way of improving the present state of affairs. I suggest that to break away from the present system and to appoint a Governor from the Eastern States would be another step towards unification.

Mr. Green: That will come all right.

Mr. HARPER: And as everyone in this House knows we have dearly paid for our experience of Federation. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) has spoken of the birdlime which was freely used during the campaign in the advocacy of Federation. Unfortunately that was not the only birdlime used on that occasion. A great deal is available very much to the disadvantage of Western Australia at the present time, and although I may be classed as a "States righter" or a "States frighter," I think the only black spot on the political history of Western Australia is the submitting of the referendum to the people at that time. To appoint a Governor from any other State in Australia would be simply ridiculous. It has been

proved that the people in the Eastern States have not shown any sympathy with us in any shape or form, as we have paid very dearly for our experience of Federation. To break away from the present system of the Imperial authorities appointing the State Governor would be to sever the ties of the Empire, and we have a great deal to be proud of in belonging to the Empire.

Mr. Foley: And the Empire has a bit to be proud of in owning Australia.

Mr. HARPER: We should be proud of the protection of the British Empire; at any rate without the Empire the Australian people would not very long be the free people and independent subjects that they are to-day. Although I appreciate to a great extent the views expressed by the member for Swan as regards economising in every way, I say there are other ways in which we can economise sufficiently to meet the amount involved in the upkeep of the office of State Governor, and although I have not very much sympathy with fetes such as are held at Government House for the select few, still I hold broad enough views to believe in sticking to the present system of the appointment of governors by the Imperial authorities, of being one nation, and of being loyal to the Empire. I think it would be a weakening of the link of patriotism that exists and that ought to be strengthened if anything can be done to strengthen our admiration for the British nation and flag. Anything we can do in that direction would be to the advantage of the people in this isolated part of the world. We are called upon at the present time to be more patriotic than ever before. A great deal can be said on that point, and I would like to urge on hon. members the great necessity for strengthening the ties of Empire as much as possible.

Mr. CARPENTER (Fremantle): I would like to congratulate the member for Swan for the moderate and dignified form in which he has framed this motion. Too frequently when this subject is being discussed it is made ridiculous by extreme statements as to the utility or

otherwise of having a Governor at all. Only those who have given serious attention to the subject know that under our present method of government a Governor is indispensable and the only question we are discussing this afternoon is whether the office of Governor should be filled by someone locally resident or someone from over the seas. It is often asserted from the public platform that in this free and enlightened country of ours the humblest individual may rise to the highest position in the land, and that is generally true, but it has this one exception. At the present time, no matter how deserving a resident of this State or Australia may be, he cannot occupy the position of governor of his State and from this point of view there is something to be said for the motion, and I take it that is chiefly the purpose for which the member for Swan has moved the motion. I do not attach much importance myself to the financial aspect of the question. I would like to say with reference to the argument that the leader of the Opposition has dealt with at some length, that is the upkeep of the social side of the Government institution, that there is an artificiality about the style of living, not only in our own Government House but in all Government Houses, which, in my opinion, has no good effect on the public mind. In Australia we are advocates, at least I am, of simplicity of living. I do not want to see anything like they have in the older countries: opulence, extravagance, and luxury on the one hand with abject poverty on the other. I want to wipe out the millionaire and the pauper. Anything that tends to set up an artificial style of living has a tendency to the least thoughtful of the community to follow others and perhaps go one better.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What is there artificial about Government House?

Mr. CARPENTER: I am just dealing with that question. If anyone by his efforts can attain to a position of comfort and enjoy the best things of life, I have no objection to his doing so, but there is an objection to the setting up of members of the community who

hold and maintain a scale of living which is out of touch with the rest of the community, and I repeat, so long as that exists there is always the temptation that somebody else wants to imitate or go one better if possible. So we have this false standard which may not have a good moral effect on the community. I am aware that when Federation was established there was a general opinion that we should do away with, not only some of our State Governors, but some of our State Parliaments as well. Some people who ought to have known better voted for Federation to my knowledge in the belief that it would mean one Governor-General and one Parliament House for the whole of Australia.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): A very few.

Mr. CARPENTER: There may not have been a great number, but a considerable portion voted for Federation because they believed it would bring about economy that would be considerable when the abolition of the State Governors and their establishments were considered. But when Federation was established and we began to readjust ourselves to it and a somewhat opposite feeling crept into the minds of the representatives of the State Governments, they thought they were likely to be overshadowed by the Commonwealth and they began to reassert themselves. I remember distinctly with the appointment of the first Agent General for South Australia, after that State came into the Federation, a proposal there which found common acceptance for some months before that the Agent General of the State would lose a lot of the honour and glory of the office, and that he would become a sort of State agent and would be dwarfed by the representative of the Commonwealth; but when a proposal was made in the State Parliament to dub him State Agent, the whole Parliament rose against it and cried out that they were losing their dignity by altering the title of the man whom they were sending to London to represent them. So there has been a general feeling since and it does apply in the minds of some people to the question of the appointment of the State Governor.

There are others who hold somehow, I do not quite know how, that if we do not have a Governor appointed from the old country very much less dignity would be attaching to the office than at the present time. I am not going to say that as between the citizen of the old country or the United Kingdom and the citizens of Australia that we need draw comparisons at all, but I believe that certainly, so far as ability is concerned and deserts are concerned, we can find men in Australia fully qualified and capable of fulfilling that position. What are the duties of the office? I suppose, put briefly, they are simply to maintain the power, authority and prestige of the Imperial Government in our Australian affairs.

The Attorney General: No, more than that, it is necessary to the machinery of the Constitution.

Mr. CARPENTER: I am covering that. I understand under the Constitution we are part of the British Empire and the Governor stands in place of His Majesty the King for the time being in our Executive Council, and the only question that can be raised is this, whether the citizens of Australia would be as fully seized of the high and important duties of that position in relation to the British Empire as the Britisher is to-day.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): There is nothing to prevent an Australian citizen being appointed to-day.

Mr. CARPENTER: I am not so sure about that, but if it be so what need for the motion? This motion infers or implies that the Australian citizen has no chance. If he has the right to be appointed I say the duties of the office are such that I believe any worthy citizen of Australia if appointed to the position would be as fully seized of his duties and anxious to fulfil the functions of that office as anyone who could be brought from another country. As a matter of fact, the occupant of the office to-day, no matter where he comes from, should be in close and full accord with the expressed opinions of the Australian people. I do not remember that we have had, certainly not in recent years, in Australia,

any conflict between the State Governor as representing the Imperial authority and the State Parliaments. Some years ago, in New Zealand, I think there was a case where the Governor of New Zealand found himself in conflict with his constitutional advisers and there was some unpleasantness, and as a result shortly afterwards that Governor left New Zealand. Since that time no case of a serious conflict between the Governor and the Government of the day has arisen. All the Governor is supposed to do is that if anything be done by legislation which may bring about a conflict between the Imperial authorities and some other country the Governor holds that legislation back pending the expression of His Majesty's pleasure. Surely that is something which any Australian citizen with ordinary intelligence and experience of public life could do equally well. I am not at all surprised that the Colonial Office, having upon its shoulders very heavy obligations in maintaining not only the peace and harmony of the Empire itself but also having to keep in view at all times its relations with foreign countries, I am not surprised, I say, that the Colonial Office does not regard a proposal of this character with very much friendliness. And yet, judging by past experiences, we know that the British Government and in particular the Secretary of State for the Colonies, when he finds in any part of the British Empire public opinion has expressed itself clearly and strongly on any matter affecting their own Government, the Colonial Office has found ways and means of acquiescing in the wishes of the people. But I say I am not at all in accord with the suggestion of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, as reported in the House by the Premier a few days ago that this change or any similar change cannot take place until the whole of the States of Australia have expressed themselves favourable to it. For the very reason that the Secretary of State asserts, namely, that we are a sovereign State. I hold if any one State has fully made up its mind that it wants one of its own citizens appointed as Governor it has the right to have that done if there is no Con-

stitutional reason against it, irrespective of what the other States may think. I am hoping, in fact I think the Premier has given us to understand, that the Government are taking further steps to make representations to the Colonial Office in regard to the wishes of this State without reference to what is done or said in the other States. The question as to how the Governor would be appointed if the appointment is to be made from the local citizens is one that we should have to face. The mere appointment must be made, as has been stated, by the home Government, but I take it it must be done and would be done on the recommendation of the Government of the State concerned. I could imagine no other body having any power to make the recommendation.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): It would be rather dangerous.

Mr. CARPENTER: Will the Honorary Minister suggest who should have the authority to make the recommendation? There is no other power in the land which would have the right to make the recommendation as to who should be appointed State Governor, and as to the danger of it, that has been discussed by a previous speaker. We appoint our Agent General through the agency of the Government of the day, and when that Agent General gets to London he forgets that he was at one time a party politician. It does not matter to him which Government holds office, he does his duty to his State and fulfils the functions of his office irrespective of what his particular views may be, and the same thing would happen in reference to the office of Governor. If we have any fear about that we have no right to support a motion of this kind. I do not believe there is any danger whatever, no more in fact in appointing a man who has been active in politics in Australia, than there would be in appointing a man who has been active in politics in the old country, and we know that in the old country appointments are made from the ranks of men who have been most active in party politics. Of course when out here they have never given the least indication of what their views might have been.

The Attorney General: They are men trained for that kind of office.

Mr. CARPENTER: If that be so, it is a further reason why we should have Australian governors. I do not like a professional governor. I do not say that the man who is trained to fill this office cannot and does not perform his duties well, but the very fact that some men are selected and trained so that they might simply fill this office is rather a condemnation of the present system. If the highest and best offices of the land are worth anything at all, they should be given to men who have rendered some service to their country, and I can conceive of no better reward being given to a good Australian, who might have his efforts crowned by one day being appointed to the position of Governor of a State. Therefore, I very much prefer to see the position filled by such a man rather than have what is known as a professional governor from the old country.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): The man who is properly trained would have an advantage over any other.

Mr. CARPENTER: I hold that the man who has had years of experience of public life in Australia and who has some constitutional knowledge as well is better fitted for the position than the man who has been trained in a school so that he might some day become a professional governor.

The Attorney General: They change them about.

Mr. CARPENTER: I understand that, but we know that men have been sent to Australia who have been altogether unfitted for the office. An English country gentleman is an admirable man as a country squire riding through the village in his own carriage, receiving obeisances from the villagers, but when he comes out here, he finds himself out of touch with that young and progressive life of this country, and the result is rather disappointing to them as well as to the people of the country. I have known that to happen more than once.

The Attorney General: The chief point is whose servants shall they be; the ser-

vants of the Commonwealth, or the servants of England?

Mr. CARPENTER: The servants of both. He holds the balance when necessary between the Imperial Government and the Government of the State, and in doing that he has high and important functions to perform. The present position is so hedged around constitutionally that there is almost no danger of conflict simply because when questions crop up which might cause complications, all the Governor has to do is to say to his advisers—"This may cause some trouble; I am going to reserve it and get an opinion from the old country upon it." As to what effect this will have upon the State or upon our relations with the Empire, I do not need to discuss. I do not think it will have any harmful effect. I believe our connection with the Empire is altogether too broad to be affected by any small change of this kind. As to the amendment proposed by the Premier, while I sympathise with it, in some way I wish the Premier could have added the word to the motion, rather than strike out the other, so as to replace it. I do not want to see any reflection cast upon our own State. I do not care whether the man is appointed from this State, or whether from the Commonwealth, but in striking out the word "State" and putting in the word "Commonwealth" it seems to me that we are confessing that we have no men in the State capable of filling the position. If the Premier will make his amendment read "State or Commonwealth" I think I can support the motion as amended, and then I do not think anyone will take exception to it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Is not the State in the Commonwealth?

Mr. CARPENTER: Yes, but by striking out "State" and inserting "Commonwealth" it seems to me to be raising the question that we are afraid we have no capable men here. I shall support the motion as amended if the Premier will agree to my suggestion.

Mr. DWYER (Perth): I would like to address myself briefly to the subject matter under discussion. This country has been extremely fortunate in getting

the services of a gentleman like Sir Gerald Strickland as its Governor. He has been a great success indeed. In that high office he has given satisfaction to all members of the community, of every class and every creed, and I believe he has given entire satisfaction to the various Governments he has acted with. I think, however, this question ought to be discussed, and I intend to discuss it, quite apart from the person who happens to occupy the position at the present time, or who has occupied it in the past, or who may occupy it in the future. There is no doubt whatever that the Governor of this State or any State has very high and important duties to perform. He holds a very high office here in being the representative of His Majesty the King, and in exercising the royal prerogative. It is of course quite true that he is bound down to constitutional custom, and that in most matters, even in matters in which he is supposed to exercise a personal discretion, it has become quite customary for the Governor to consult and to seek the advice of the Ministry in power for the time being. Even apart from that in the matters that are by letters patent reserved for the royal assent, and in distinguishing these from other matters, he still has high functions to perform, because after all whenever any Bill comes before this Parliament he has to decide whether it comes under one category or another, and he frequently has to weigh the evidence as to whether he should grant a dissolution or whether he should seek to form a Government from the members of Parliament then existing. I do not wish to decry the high office or the high functions the Governor has to perform, but I do say there is no reason that any one can advance why this office and powers and functions should not be performed by a citizen of the Commonwealth, trained in the Commonwealth, or indeed by any other British subject. This should cost us a great deal less than it costs us at the present time. I think while many members who have spoken on this subject have been prompted by a most patriotic and praiseworthy desire so far as Australia is concerned, the fact re-

mains that whether the gentleman occupying the position is a citizen of Australia or of the old country, the duties and functions he will have to perform will remain as before, and boiled down to hard facts the question comes down to what the person occupying the office should receive by way of salary for the duties he has to perform. Only a few minutes ago I looked up in *Whittaker* the salaries paid to the lieutenant governors in the provinces forming the Dominion of Canada. I find that in Ontario, with a population of 2,519,000, the Lieutenant Governor receives £2,000 per annum; in Quebec, with a population of 2,697,000, he receives £2,000 per annum; in Nova Scotia, with a population of 589,037, he receives £1,800; in New Brunswick, the population of which I have not ascertained, the salary is £1,800; in Manitoba, with a population of 464,691, the salary is £1,800; in British Columbia, with a population of 362,768, the salary is £2,000; in Alberta, with a population of 500,000, the salary is £1,800; in Saskatchewan, with a population of 453,508, the salary is £1,800. In Newfoundland, which is outside the Dominion, and where the Governor is appointed by the Crown, as here, the population is 234,588, and the salary is £2,000.

Mr. Dooley: What is the upkeep of the establishments?

Mr. DWYER: I have not been able to ascertain that information, but still when we compare the salaries and take into consideration the various populations of those provinces with our own of 300,000, we see how much higher the salary is that we pay.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Salaries generally are higher in Australia than in Canada.

Mr. DWYER: Our Governor receives exactly twice the salary of the highest paid governor of any of the provinces I have quoted, and in addition, there is a private secretary who receives £350 per annum, and there is the upkeep of the establishment itself, which last year cost £3,184. If we add £3,184 to £4,350 we have a total of £7,534. It seems to me that in view of what is paid in Canada

for a Lieutenant-Governor we might have our Governor and the gubernatorial establishment conducted at a much smaller cost to the State and the difference devoted to other purposes, education for instance. I think with other members who have spoken that if a reduction in the salary of the office of Governor was effected the probability is that we would have some person in Australia appointed. After all, what does it matter whether he is a resident of Western Australia or Queensland, or any other State? I think any man in Australia should be able to say, as was said of Napoleon's soldier that he "carried a marshal's baton in his knapsack," that it is competent for him to attain the highest position in any State in Australia. While there is a large salary and other emoluments attaching to the office, there is no doubt that the Governor will in the future as heretofore, be appointed from England. While the member for Fremantle was speaking there were certain interjections made with reference to the training required for the Governorship. It is a matter of common notoriety that Governors have been appointed here and in other States who have not had an hour's training for the position, and whose qualifications were simply that they were nominees of the party in power in the British House of Commons. It is true that the present holder of the office has received special training, but we may make the general statement that Governors usually have had no special training for the position, and in most instances have been appointed without any qualifications other than social or political qualifications which commended them to the party in power in the British House of Commons for the time being. I therefore say that some change in regard to these appointments can be made. I do not think it would be desirable that the nomination of these Governors should emanate from the Government of the State, but I think by the reduction of the salary of the office we would in future have persons appointed in Australia, persons with a knowledge of constitutional law, persons who have not been connected with any

of the political parties in the State to which they are appointed, and persons who would give just as much satisfaction to the State and the Empire as a whole as those appointed under the present system.

Mr. DOOLEY (Geraldton): I am very pleased that the member for Swan has brought this motion forward this afternoon, for the reason that it is a question that has been exercising the minds of every portion of the Commonwealth for many years past, and has cropped up even in the Commonwealth Parliament within the last few weeks. I have listened very carefully to the debate, and I must confess that so far as the main object sought, economy in administration, is concerned, we have not elucidated anything in that direction. Although this is one of the planks of the platform to which I am pledged, I think it would be better while we are considering the question of reforming this position to see if it is not possible to abolish it altogether. While we are about it and while the Government are considering this change, they should endeavour to see if it is not possible to combine the office of King's representative in the State with that of Governor-General. Personally I do not see any obstacle in the way. I have looked up information in regard to the functions of State Governors, and, so far as I have been able to discover, those functions can be performed by the Governor-General. That being so, I think it is desirable that something should be done in that direction, because I am satisfied that the administrative powers of the State are extending, and consequently we are building up a fair case in that respect. All Governors who come into power entail some extra expense in administration. We are continually building up new departments, and I contend that all those appendages to administration which are unnecessary should be reduced, as far as possible, and that this is one that could easily be dispensed with. I do not wish to be misunderstood in this matter. On many occasions when this question has been raised, particularly by persons representing the same political opinion as members on this

side of the House, it has been said that this is an attempt to "cut the painter" and break off from the Motherland. As a representative of that party I say that it is sheer madness to talk or think anything of the kind. The extension of the British Empire must be upheld, and so long as we get the fullest freedom of expression and complete exercise of our powers of Government there is nothing to fear. We have every reason to be satisfied, and I am in hopes that by extending that principle we will bring the day nearer when we shall be able to settle our international differences by a more rational means than force of arms. That is what I see in the extension of the Imperial idea. But I wish it to be understood that we want the fullest freedom in the extension of our political institutions.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): We could not combine the two.

Mr. DOOLEY: I maintain that we could. I could quote from the *Commonwealth Year Book* the functions of a State Governor, and I am sure they could be embodied in the duties of the Governor-General. The essential point is to have a direct representative of the Crown.

The Premier: For what purpose?

Mr. DOOLEY: As a medium between the outlying portions of the Empire and the Home authorities. That is the link.

The Premier: That is not the function of a Governor.

Mr. DOOLEY: We all know what the functions of a Governor are. He has to see that no Acts of Parliament are passed which are likely to create international trouble. He has power to reserve Bills for the Royal assent, and he has to attach his warrant to the expenditure of money. But the *Constitution Act* or the ordinances existing between the Imperial Government and the State could be amended so as to place that responsibility on the Governor of the day, and were the Treasurer to expend money outside of the *Constitution* it could be held to be an offence almost as serious as if he was using it for his own personal requirements. The Auditor General could control that. I know these functions cannot be dispensed with just now, but if we are going to

make a radical alteration such as is proposed, why not consider this question with a view to economising? This £7,000 odd that is being spent yearly in the upkeep of Government House could be well expended in other ways.

The Premier: What would you do with Government House?

Mr. DOOLEY: Abolish it completely.

The Premier: Where would you put the Governor then?

Mr. DOOLEY: The Premier misunderstands me. I say that the position of State Governor should be absolutely wiped out, some of the functions he is called upon to perform eliminated by an amendment of the Constitution, and others could be performed by the Governor General without any restriction of our rights as a State. I contend that if attention was given to that aspect of the case that could be done, and we would save a good deal of the heart-burning and bickering in connection with social cliquism.

The Premier: Why the Governor General?

Mr. DOOLEY: My contention is that while the Empire exists we must have a representative of the Home authorities in the outlying portions of the Empire, and I say that instead of having six or seven Governors let us have one who can carry out all the functions of a State Governor, which are merely formal. We talk about the Royal prerogative, but that is only a relic of past ages. Why could not the Royal prerogative be vested in the Attorney General?

The Premier: Parliament is a relic of past ages, and you do not want to abolish it, do you?

Mr. DOOLEY: It is a relic of the past ages, and I will admit that it is fairly obsolete at the present time; it is not abreast of the times. But the Premier wilfully caught me up wrongly when I made that remark. The exercise of the Royal prerogative in His Majesty's representative is a relic of the old despotic days, and if it comes to a question of reviewing a criminal case after all the evidence has been exhausted and clemency is to be exercised, then I say that prerogative could easily be vested in the Cabinet of the day.

Mr. Dwyer: But that is the case now; the Governor acts on his Ministers' advice.

Mr. DOOLEY: I know, but those hon. members who support the necessity of having State Governors say that is one of the reasons why we want a State Governor here, to exercise these powers.

The Premier: But you merely suggest deputing these powers to the Governor General.

Mr. DOOLEY: No, I do not wish to be misunderstood in that case. When we are about to make any alteration in the method of appointing a State Governor I say we should consider the question of eliminating these unnecessary, as I call them, functions, and bring the whole position up to date. I contend it is the only point in the whole matter. Being part of a vast Empire with its central government in the motherland, we must have a direct representative of the motherland in the outlying portions of the Empire, and I say we want to reduce that situation into as fine and practicable a minimum as possible. That is why I say that the functions that may be indispensable so far as a sovereign State is concerned may be embodied in one central head or viceroy and then we can eliminate the others entirely. I have listened to the debate this afternoon to find out whether this is impossible. Every hon. member who has applied himself to the question this afternoon from the Government side of the House has spoken against the cost.

The Premier: Do you understand what it means if your suggestion is carried out? It will mean an amendment of the Federal Constitution?

Mr. DOOLEY: I do not see that it is impossible. Surely portions of the Empire can co-operate in these matters and bring forward a reform or an idea without anticipating that it will be treated hostilely and lead to international or inter-State complications and war. We have put the matter forward purely as a reform with the object, as I have already stated, from my point of view of saving money. The £7,000 could well be spent in Geraldton.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): It would not save £7,000.

Mr. DOOLEY : If the position was abolished the money could be saved. If we abolish the State Governor altogether as a State institution and vest in the Governor General those functions that may be deemed necessary, money may be saved to the State; but if it is to be spent, then let it be spent on freezing works at Geraldton or in the extension of the education system.

Mr. Underwood : What about Port Hedland ?

Mr. DOOLEY : I think Port Hedland is very well looked after; it has a splendid representative, and I think it has a fair amount of money.

Mr. SPEAKER : Order ! This is out of order.

Mr. DOOLEY : That is all I wish to say.

Mr. Carpenter : Would you abolish the Governor-in-Council ?

Mr. DOOLEY : Certainly not.

Mr. Carpenter : How would you get the Governor General there ?

Mr. DOOLEY : If the Executive Council means the Cabinet with the Governor acting as chairman, I say, "Yes; I am prepared to do away with the Executive Council." However, that is all I wish to say. If we are to have a State Governor, I agree with the Premier.

Mr. Foley : What is wrong with wiping out State Governments and State Parliaments altogether ?

Mr. DOOLEY : I am not a unificationist. I do not believe in giving up the rights of the State to govern itself. The territory of Western Australia is too vast at the present time for anything of the kind. I want to economise as much as I can, and that is the reason why I make these suggestions.

The Premier : One of the reasons for a claim for unification is that the State is too vast.

Mr. DOOLEY : I maintain that, instead of unification, owing to its vast territory it warrants the creation of another State.

The Premier : More Governments, and more Parliaments !

Mr. DOOLEY : It will lead to better administration. If the establishment of

an extra Government assists in the greater productivity of the country, I would not be against the creation of an extra State Government if it is going to assist our economical administration or increase our wealth; but I say we are burdening ourselves with an unnecessary institution in having a State Governor, consequently I think this is the point to which we should address ourselves. If we simply change from the method of having a Governor appointed by the Crown coming from the motherland to a method of appointing an Australian citizen, we should keep him in a decent position so far as his establishment is concerned, and give him a decent salary. I shall vote for the motion because I think it will be no time before the matter will be brought up again, and the few questions I have mentioned will be brought under consideration.

Resolved, that motions be continued.

Mr. GREEN (Kalgoorlie) : I have much pleasure indeed in supporting the motion. It is not my desire to detain the House very long, but I feel that I cannot give a silent vote on this question, because it is one I have been considerably enthusiastic on for several years. I compliment the member for Swan (Mr. Turvey) on having the courage to bring forward the motion. I also compliment the leader of the Opposition for his speech to-day. In his opening remarks he displayed a judicious calm. He was not very particular whether we had a State Governor or had the Governors appointed within the State or appointed from the other side. Later on he veered round and said "We are Australians, we are federalists, we should have one appointed from the whole of the Commonwealth. Then later on he went on to say that we must have a direct representative of the King. His sense of loyalty evidently struck him at the moment and he was brought to his knees with reverence for things over the sea. He further said "We must be careful in obtaining an Australian Governor for what we have to guard against"—to use his own words "is Australian bias." What I claim we have to guard against is English bias. We have

seen in the past, and unfortunately have had a very recent manifestation of it, where a gentleman has come here from overseas to be Governor of a State in the Commonwealth and has gone to the old country and defamed Australia. We had a reference to this in the cables not a week ago. There is no man more likely to do credit to the position of Governor, so far as this State is concerned, than one who has had experience in the State and one who has fought politically for the State for many years. There is not the slightest question of any bias from a man being taken from the turmoil of political bias to that position. The member for Pilbara has shown clearly how in the most heated party politics we have here, in the House, a man has been taken from the floor of the House and made Speaker—not once but many times—and has acted with complete impartiality. We claim that as a great instance to prove that an Australian appointed as State Governor would be absolutely fair, and moreover he would have worked to gain his position, which a foreign representative could not possibly do. The member for Pingelly (Mr. Harper) has taken up one of the usual attitudes characteristic of him. He is against the appointment of a federal member. He says, on the other hand, it is impossible to have a local resident as Governor because we could not possibly get him free from bias. He said federation was bad; in fact he said it would be preferable if we were away from the Eastern States; but in the next breath he was afraid of “breaking the ties of Empire.” I recognise we owe loyalty to the old country, but the loyalty we owe to the old country is because of what the master minds in literature and science have given to us, and what we desire to break away from the old country in is the poverty that has dogged our forefathers in the past which we do not desire to see transplanted to Australia. The Imperial spirit is good in its way, but our first duty as Australian citizens and as representatives of the people in this Chamber is loyalty to Australia, and I very much regret to find an hon. member expressing disloyalty to the Commonwealth. I re-

joice he is not an Australian born. With regard to my own reasons for favouring the motion, I want to say that the present system is absolutely unfair, because it bars Australian citizens from taking the position of Governor. If it were possible for a man to be taken from any part of the Empire and given a position as Governor, I might be more favourably inclined to the present system.

Mr. Dwyer: That can be done.

Mr. GREEN: It has never been done, and consequently if it can be done and has never been done it shows that a considerable amount of bias has been shown against the appointment of Australian Governors!

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Nonsense!

Mr. GREEN: The Honorary Minister has been Home recently and has evidently caught the spirit of prevailing Imperialism so rampant in the old country. There is a new spirit so far as Australia is concerned.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Very few Australians have your spirit.

Mr. GREEN: The Honorary Minister is taking up a safe attitude, so far as this is concerned, and it is a matter entirely for his own concern. When I rise to speak I wish to express my own opinions.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): You should express the opinion of the people you represent.

Mr. GREEN: I trust the Honorary Minister will contain himself. No doubt he will have an opportunity of speaking on the matter in due course. The present system is absurd from the Australian standpoint. We know that around this Government House, as in respect to every Government House in the Commonwealth, we have these absurd vice-regal trappings with which Australians have nothing in common. We recognise that it is a prolific cause of dividing the people into objectionable castes. We recognise that, whilst we have over £7,000 to pay for the upkeep of this vice-regal representative, as far as the vast majority of the people of Western Australia are concerned they have no possible chance of joining in any

social festivities which may be promoted in St. George's-terrace. On the contrary this place is made a chamber for the select few, where a certain few can be specially invited and thus shown that they are superior people. The common herd have no possible chance of attending any of these Government House functions.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): It shows the smallness of your mind.

Mr. GREEN: The Honorary Minister shows himself in a most unfavourable light this evening, and as a loyal supporter of the Government I regret to see the Honorary Minister in such a turmoil, when he can probably get up afterwards and shatter my arguments. The Honorary Minister no doubt is still impressed with William Shakespeare's idea that "there's such divinity doth hedge a king." But as far as I am concerned, and as far as the general democratic spirit of Australia is concerned, we have done away with that idea long ago. We are loyal to the Empire, we are determined to fight for the Empire if necessary, but we are loyal to Australia first. We recognise that these vice-regal houses in different parts of the Commonwealth have created a snobocracy in Australia altogether unworthy of the democratic spirit of the times. We recognise that the institution is costly out of all proportion with the services rendered, and I make bold to say that no Governor of a State should get more money than the Premier of that State. The Premier works harder than any governor can possibly do. It is really a silly business proposition—and I know that when I point to the business aspect of the case the members of the Opposition are at once converted—it is a bad business proposition to pay a man seven thousand odd for doing work the equal of which is done more satisfactorily by the Premier for about one-fifth or one-sixth of the sum. I am pleased indeed that the member for Swan (Mr. Turvey) has brought forward the motion, and I give it my hearty support.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): It was not my intention to speak to this motion because on a previous

occasion I voted in favour of governors being appointed from the citizens of Australia; but at the same time I cannot see for the life of me why a governor, because he has come from the British Isles, should be termed a foreigner. I think I will be quite safe in saying that there are very few people in Western Australia, or indeed in Australia, who hold the same opinions as the member for Kalgoorlie.

Mr. Dwyer: On that point.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): On many points.

Mr. Green: You will be over on the other side before long.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): I can only say that when I get to the other side the hon. member will either follow me or be outside the Chamber?

Mr. Green: Then I will be outside the Chamber.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The occupant of the position of Governor should be able to deal fairly by both political parties in regard to the administration of the State. There is not the least doubt that it would be considerably better to have for the position a man who had not at any time mixed in local politics. It has been pointed out here that no fear is ever entertained of securing an impartial man for the post of Speaker, that the Speaker acts fairly by all parties. Why, it was not long ago, even in this Chamber, when it was said that the Speaker was biassed on behalf of a certain party. The same thing might apply in the appointment of a governor. Of course there are exceptions, we know. We might appoint to the position of governor a man who would carry out his duties admirably, but the very next appointee might be so biassed as to be detrimental to the Executive of the day, from whom he is supposed to take his advice. It has also been said that the Chief Justice of the State should hold the position of governor, for the reason that once a man reaches the high pedestal occupied by the Chief Justice, he is removed entirely from politics. But have we not had an instance, this session, of the Chief

Justice taking action in regard to the proceedings in Parliament?

Mr. McDowall: He advocated the appointment of a layman as president of the Arbitration Court.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): No, he did not. Anyhow, I do not desire to discuss the Chief Justice. I am only mentioning this as showing the possibilities, even in the event of our going to the Supreme Court bench for a governor. I disagree entirely with the member for Pingelly (Mr. Harper) when he says that by getting away from the present system of appointing State governors we would be breaking the ties of Empire. That is a matter of impossibility. I am confident that now we have the Federal Parliament there is no possibility of breaking the ties that bind the Empire. This is the point at which the arguments of the member for Kalgoorlie fail. He says we are all for the Empire, but that Australia comes first. Can the two be separated?

Mr. Green: Yes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): No, they cannot. The hon. member said we would fight for the Empire, that we were part and parcel of the Empire, but that some persons in the Empire were foreigners, and consequently he had no time for them.

Mr. S. Stubbs: That was a slip on his part.

Mr. Green: You were treated as a foreigner when you went there: they would not allow you into the House of Commons.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Yes, they did.

Mr. Green: Well, you told me they did not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): I did not. The hon. member alluded to me as a Cornishman. I am not ashamed of the work done in Australia by Cornishmen. There is no doubt they have played a great part in the upbuilding of Australia, and I feel confident that we could even to-day get from Cornwall a governor who would carry out the duties of the post with entire satisfaction to the West Australian people. I certainly think the

post of governor could be filled from among the people of Australia. It may be that the power to do this already exists, but in no instance of which I am aware has the position been offered to an Australian, and, therefore, we have come to believe that an Australian cannot hold the position. But we have to-day Australians holding leading positions in the British navy and others holding prominent positions in the British Army; yet, while Great Britain throws open those positions to Australians, we find that Australians, or the few represented by the member for Kalgoorlie, object to any position in Australia being thrown open to a person from England.

Mr. Green: I did not say that.

The Premier: You object to foreigners at any time.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): I think we have to look very carefully for the purpose of ascertaining which is likely to be the greater loser by the proposed change, Australia or Great Britain. There is no doubt in my mind that our having a British Governor appointed by His Majesty the King gives confidence to those at Home who provide the money for the advancement of Australia. Some of us deprecate the borrowing of money, but there is no getting away from the fact that without money we cannot carry out the works we so much desire, and for many years to come London is going to be the purse of Australia. We should not do anything that would have a tendency of driving away the confidence of those people to whom we have to apply for capital to carry on the public works of Australia. There is no doubt the appointment of a governor from England serves to give greater confidence to the English moneylender. We saw the criticism the other day in connection with the action of New South Wales towards the Governor General, and we know that subsequently New South Wales went on the money market in London. Is it not possible that the comparative failure of their loan was directly attributable to the action they had taken in regard to the Governor General? I want to point out in conclusion that if hon. members consider they are going to effect a great

saving by appointing a governor from within Australia, they are making a very great mistake. There is a possibility of their saving £1,000 a year, and, according to the member for Perth (Mr. Dwyer), it may even be £2,000 a year, but I want to say that for the most part the advantage to be gained is merely sentimental.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. S. STUBBS (Wagin) : It is not my desire or intention to occupy the time of the House at any great length in speaking to the motion moved by the member for Swan. The temperate language he used in moving the motion commends itself, I think, to both sides of the House, but I failed, in listening to the arguments of the mover and other speakers, to see any reason for departing from the long established custom of the appointment of governors by the Imperial authorities. No sound argument, other than on the score of economy, has been adduced that, to my mind, would warrant any such drastic change as is advocated by the mover of the motion. To my mind, not only has the present occupant of the office, but, in almost every instance, all past governors of the State have given entire satisfaction to the very large majority of the people of the State, and when the system has worked so well in the past, and no arguments that carry any very great weight have been adduced to support the contention that the appointment of governors by the British Government should not be continued, why is it necessary to make a change? The position as it appeals to me, and I think I am echoing the sentiments of a very large number of persons, places Western Australia very prominently on many occasions before Great Britain and the English-speaking world, and when we in Western Australia are dependent to such a large extent upon the people of England to supply us with money to work to the best advantage the possibilities and capabilities of this huge tract of territory, that warrants the House in taking a very serious view of the motion. The Premier in a

temperate speech immediately followed that of the mover of the motion desired to delete the word "State" and insert "Commonwealth." In my humble opinion, if the House carried the amendment and it became a substantive motion, we would be no nearer a solution of the difficulty, as is desired by some members, than we are at present. If the appointment of a State governor were made to apply to the Commonwealth, and a gentleman from the Eastern States, who possibly had never seen Western Australia, were appointed to the position, the appointment of such a gentleman, be he ever so capable, would not make Western Australia one bit better off than it is under the present regime. If it is necessary to change the method of appointment so that a colonial can occupy the office, some person in Western Australia, surely can be found who is capable of filling it as well, if not better, than any gentleman from the East would be. For that reason I am against the motion, and against the amendment, because there has been no sound reason advanced for the change, and I agree also with the remarks which have fallen from the previous speakers regarding the good work and capable way in which the present occupant of the office has fulfilled his duties, and I regret that his early departure from this State to take up a high position in the Mother State of New South Wales will leave a gap that will be very hard to fill, but I hope that neither the amendment nor the motion will be carried, because it will be a step in the wrong direction to make any change on the lines indicated and desired by the member for Swan.

Mr. MONGER (York) : I happened to be absent during the debate this afternoon, and I do not know whether it is a case of complimenting the member for Swan upon his motion or whether I should adopt the opposite position, but I do say this, and I say it as a West Australian in the first instance and as an Australian also, that I hope the time is far distant when we are going to sever the few ties which associate us with the mother country.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Hear! Hear!

Mr. MONGER: I suppose my learned friend from Pilbara will make his usual interjectory interjection—

Mr. Underwood: I never said a word.

Mr. MONGER: The hon. member will interject when one tries to hie to a greater sphere than the element with which he has evidently been associated. I understand that the member for Pilbara has offered his services—

Mr. Underwood: What have I to do with the amendment?

Mr. MONGER: I say with every possible respect that I hope the time has not come when we, as a Parliament in a portion of Australia, will ever agree to a motion of this kind to dissociate ourselves from the old country, which we are all pleased occasionally—

The Minister for Mines: This is not the motion.

Mr. Foley: There is about twelve million pounds to wipe off; that is a good tie.

Mr. MONGER: I do not know the actual reasons—

Mr. Underwood: Why do you not come and ask me?

Mr. MONGER: I hope this House will not at this late hour of the session—

Mr. Green: To break the crimson thread of kinship.

Mr. MONGER: It does make me smile when an intelligent individual talks like that, especially when it comes from the learned member for—what does he represent?

Mr. Underwood: Wayback.

Mr. MONGER: It will be wayback if he and his crowd are allowed long to represent the intelligent workers in those parts. It will indeed be in the far back. He is doing his best at the present moment as a wrecker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not make such remarks. In the first place he must withdraw the word "crowd," and he must not speak of an hon. member as a wrecker.

Mr. MONGER: I thought I was referring to my friend the member for Kalgoorlie in the mildest terms.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw.

Mr. MONGER: I withdraw. This question has been frequently debated and no one would be appointed except the person who had approved of every plank of the platform of the party opposite. If that be the desire of the motion then let it be tabled in a different form. I congratulate my friends opposite, especially the member for Pilbara upon having placed upon the Notice Paper a motion of this kind. I am sure it is not the desire of the people that the Governor should be appointed from among the gentlemen who are sitting opposite. With every respect I suggest that we might well leave the situation as it now is.

Mr. TURVEY (in reply): I have listened with interest to the various speakers on this motion and as I anticipated in moving the motion there have been considerable references during the debate to the old parrot cries of cutting the painter, and severing the crimson thread of kinship. I thought I made my position clear to the House that I had no such motives in view. Neither did I suggest anything of the kind. Further, some of the speakers referred to the necessity for the abolition of the position of State Governor. I have not suggested in connection with this motion that any such course should be pursued, neither have I suggested that in the event of this motion being given effect to, any lesser salary would be paid to the occupant of the gubernatorial position should he be a citizen of the State. I have previously in the House given an indication of my opinion in that respect. I believe that the cost to this State of the upkeep of the position is altogether too great, whether the position be filled by an Imperial officer or by a citizen of the State. Last year the cost to the State amounted to close upon £8,000 and we find that the cost is steadily increasing. I am glad to know that in moving this motion I have the support of the member for Greenough (Mr. Nanson) who has consistently year after year advocated that the position should be filled by a citizen of the State.

Mr. Nanson: I am quite with you.

Mr. TURVEY: I am glad to know it because I have admired the hon. member's consistency in that direction. The member for Wagin (Mr. S. Stubbs) suggests that because in the past the position has been held by an Imperial officer that that should be continued, but I want to make the position quite clear, that whereas in the earlier days the responsibility of government rested almost solely on the shoulders of the Governor, to-day the position is much altered. I do not agree with those who hold the opinion that because of my desire to have the position filled by a citizen of the State there is any evidence of disloyalty.

Mr. S. Stubbs: I did not say so.

Mr. TURVEY: No; other speakers did. This State in common with the Commonwealth has always been ready to show evidence of its loyalty to the Empire, but I am of opinion that there are gentlemen in this State who have rendered distinguished services and occupied prominent positions, gentlemen who have done yeoman service to the State and who have given proof already of their ability and their administrative powers, who are eminently fitted to occupy the position of Governor with credit to themselves and to the people of the State, and certainly without any spark of disloyalty to the mother country.

Mr. Dooley: Do you not think it is possible to abolish the position altogether?

Mr. TURVEY: That is another matter. On many other occasions during the temporary absence of State Governors the position has been filled by local gentlemen with conspicuous success, and further I believe that to make the post one to which our distinguished citizens could aspire would be indeed to give an additional stimulus to their loyalty to the State and Empire generally. I regret that reference has been made by the member for Kalgoorlie, some disparaging reference, to the fact that in the past the position has been occupied by Imperial officers. I think it was, may I say, a *lapsus linguae*. I do not think the hon. gentleman meant those remarks to be taken seriously. I

have in my mind three or four gentlemen in this State who would do honour to the position and that is not including the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood)—

Mr. Underwood: I admit that there are others.

Mr. TURVEY: Who would carry out the duties creditably. In fact I have no doubt that the Premier in offering his support to the motion has in mind, that some day in the dim and distant future when he retires from his present position, he may become the occupant of the gubernatorium. With reference to the contention that it is necessary to still continue the practice of having imported men to fill the position, if such is the case, I wonder if those gentlemen who are advocating that would be found advocating that we should import men to fill other high offices in the State. I think not. If any attempt were made to do such a thing they would be the first to cry out. I want to point out in conclusion that I do not think that it would in any way tend to weaken the bond that still exists, or at any rate to weaken the loyalty or even to suggest that we are lacking in loyalty in the slightest degree to the Empire by appointing a citizen of the State to the position of Governor. May I say that I do not think the amendment moved by the Premier is necessary in so far as I think that if we are going to make the position open to other than Imperial officers, I certainly think it should be given to men who have performed distinguished services in the State. I do not hold with the Premier in his amendment wherein he suggests that the area should be widened so as to make the choice open to citizens of the Commonwealth. I trust that the motion will receive the favourable consideration of the House.

Amendment (to strike out "State") put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	25
Noes	14

Majority for	11
--------------------	----

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Bath	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Broun	Mr. A. N. Plessee
Mr. Collier	Mr. Price
Mr. Dooley	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Green	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Holman	Mr. Swan
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Male	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. McDowall	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Moore	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Munsie	(Teller).

NOES

Mr. Carpenter	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Foley	Mr. Monger
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Harper	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Underwood
	(Teller).

Amendment thus passed.

Mr. Monger: Would I be in order in moving the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has already spoken.

Amendment (to insert "Commonwealth") put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	29
Noes	11
				—

Majority for 18

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Bath	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Dooley	Mr. Price
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foley	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Swan
Mr. Green	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Holman	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lewis	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. McDowall	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. A. N. Plessee
Mr. Harper	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Male	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Monger	Mr. Layman
Mr. Moore	(Teller).

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

Ayes	29
Noes	11
				—

Majority for 18

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Bath	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Dooley	Mr. Price
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foley	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Swan
Mr. Green	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Holman	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lewis	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. McDowall	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. A. E. Plessee
Mr. Harper	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Male	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Monger	Mr. Layman
Mr. Moore	(Teller).

Question as amended thus passed.

On motion by Mr. TURVEY resolution transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION.

Council's pressed requests—Money Bills Procedure.

Message from the Council received pressing certain requested amendments which the Assembly had declined to make.

Mr. SPEAKER: In reference to this Message I have to take the same objection which has been always taken in this House on similar occasions. The Bill is one which according to the Constitution Act must originate in the Legislative Assembly, and therefore is a Bill to which amendments cannot be insisted on or pressed by the Legislative Council. In connection with the Agricultural Bank Act Amendment Bill of last session I took the same objection, and I suggested to members on that occasion that they might take such action in respect of the Bill as they deemed most expedient. I make the same suggestion so far as this Bill is concerned.

Amendment thus passed:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved—

That the consideration of the Message be deferred until after a conference with the Legislative Council on the subject of the Industrial Arbitration Bill has been held or the Legislative Council has further considered Message No. 38.
Question passed.

Request for Conference.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL further moved—

That a Message be transmitted to the Legislative Council acquainting the President and members thereof that there is a difficulty in the way of the consideration by the Legislative Assembly of Message No. 38 in which requests are pressed, and requesting a conference with the Legislative Council or further consideration of the Message transmitted to the Legislative Assembly with a view to removing the difficulty in the way of the Assembly considering the said Message.

Question passed.

On further motion by the ATTORNEY GENERAL resolved, that the Assembly managers consist of three members.

PAPERS—CHIEF WARDER, FREMANTLE PRISON.

On motion by Mr. CARPENTER (Fremantle) ordered, "That all papers in connection with the recent appointment of chief warden of the Fremantle prison be laid on the Table."

BILL—PHARMACY AND POISONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 13th November.

Mr. HEITMANN (Cue): I must confess at the outset that I am somewhat surprised at the father of this little Bill having brought it before the Assembly again. I certainly thought that, after the disclosures in the report of the Health Department on the trade which has been proved to be common on the part of chemists in this State, it would have been sufficient for the hon. member to have sought some other method of

arriving at what he desires in this Bill. Nevertheless I shall at this juncture say that, so far as the desire of the Bill goes, I am at one with the hon. member; in fact, I would go further than the Bill; I would make it that it would be absolutely impossible for the number of frauds, quacks, thieves and rogues who are now dealing in drugs of various kinds in this State, those who come under the heading of quacks, to even exist in the State and follow their course.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You can amend the Bill.

Mr. HEITMANN: Before I conclude I shall state my intentions. I shall give hon. members the opportunity of giving their views on the question. I quite understand that, Mr. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must address the Chair, and not the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HEITMANN: It was only in reply to an interjection. I have no other desire in dealing with the quack portion of this measure than to, if anything, strengthen it. If one only looks up the records in various parts of the world, particularly those parts dealing with quack medicines and quackery in all its forms, one can arrive at the extent to which quackery will go. Only to-day I was handed a cutting from *Lloyd's Weekly* giving a report of the committee appointed by the House of Commons to inquire into patent and proprietary medicines, and it is no doubt that not only will these quacks bleed their victims white, but when they have completed that operation, they will actually sell the letters they have received from these unfortunate people to a new quack who will possibly come along with a new remedy. Of course the hon. member will understand that I am referring to the "quack."

Mr. Thomas: Thoroughly.

Mr. HEITMANN: In this report before the House of Commons, it was shown that these letters were received in every confidence from people who, perhaps in despair, as the last resort want to these quacks in the hope of

gaining some benefit. They were invited throughout the world through the newspapers and by various other methods to have confidence in these quacks and to write stating their ailments and symptoms, and they were assured that everything was thoroughly confidential, but we find that not only are individuals making a living out of this quackery, but there are certain people making a living from the sale of these particular letters.

[The Deputy Speaker (Mr. Holman) took the Chair.]

Mr. Hudson: There is a member of the Pharmaceutical Society advertising that.

Mr. HEITMANN: I am not acquainted with the individual, but after the report of last night I am not altogether surprised. I can assure hon. members that I will do everything possible to wipe out of existence quackery in all its forms. I may be asked why I should oppose the Bill which is brought in with that very object. In the first place, I think the Bill is very badly framed; and, considering the fact that the hon. member proposes to cut out certain clauses of it, it seems to me the better way would be to defer the Bill for a little while, at all events, until a thorough inquiry and expert knowledge can be brought to bear on the question and a comprehensive measure may be brought down. I am going to give members an opportunity of saying whether they believe that the people who are asking for this power are worthy of it being given to them. I read that report last night which was received from the Public Health Department, and it seems certainly to be conclusive and to prove beyond all doubt that the morals of the pharmacists of this State have certainly degenerated very much. It is possible that custom has grown in the community, not only with the chemistry profession, but on all sides, that makes it something not uncommon to deal with the drugs of this description, on the part of the public to buy and on the part of the chemist

to manufacture or sell. To-day the members of this Chamber were circularised by the registrar of the Pharmaceutical Society, and the way he endeavoured to excuse the sale of these abortifacients was to treat the matter very lightly. He pointed out there were certain mixtures which were commonly used and which were necessary to our women-folk. The circular speaks of many drugs both direct acting and indirect acting. The hon. member has stated himself that there is no such thing as a direct action in the use of these particular drugs. It is proved beyond all doubt, as far as the hon. member has gone and as far as the medical profession has gone, that these are ineffective in bringing about the regulation which is desired, that is in a direct form. It has been proved and stated by the hon. member, I believe when he moved the second reading of this Bill, that there is no known drug that will act directly on the particular organ concerned. Therefore there appears to be little value in the opinion given by the registrar of the society in the circular distributed among members to-day. One can read many authorities on it; one can get information from the men in the medical profession in Perth, men in a very fair standing whose word on ordinary matters can be taken with every confidence. I have sought the advice of the medical profession in regard to this, and it bears out what I say, that what they call the direct enmenagogue does not act directly, it is simply one of its indirect actions on the organ that has the desired effect. One tells me it cannot possibly bring about the regularity desired. At certain periods in the life of a woman it will assist after the commencement of a certain performance, but as to bringing it about it is incapable of doing it. In my opinion the profession asking for this power is not worthy of consideration. I stated last night that I believed they should have paid greater attention to the practices which were common among the members of their society. The hon. member himself said on one occasion that the Act of Western Australia was

similar to the Victorian Act, but I find that can not be the case, because in Victoria the society has power to institute proceedings in various ways. There was the case of Dr. Williams' Pink pills; because poisons were proved to be contained in that particular pill they sued, but lost on the particular point that proprietary medicines did not come within the Poisons Act of Victoria. I still hold that hon. members should think twice, leaving out all personal feeling entirely, about giving increased power to a body of professional men who seem to have had an idea that life, in a certain stage at all events, was of very little value. This is a very strong statement to make, but I know that in the actions taken by the prospective mothers and the persons who purchased these goods, as well as the chemists or other tradesmen who provided them, there is, for some reason or other, a lack of appreciation that wrong is being done. This exists, I know, in the community in general, as well as among the chemists; but I think that men who have had the training of chemists, men who know the result of the use of certain dangerous drugs, I think we should expect more from them in the direction of educating the ignorant public than we have experienced from the chemists. In the analysis made by the hon. member last night it appeared to me he ridiculed the idea that certain drugs discovered in these abortifacients purchased were not harmless. In looking up the results of the use of some of these drugs I find such is not the case. Ergotin, for instance, was mentioned by the hon. member last night as being a common drug, and he led us to believe that there was very little danger attaching to its use.

Mr. Thomas: That statement is not quite correct.

Mr. HEITMANN: It is proved by the analysis in Beale's report that at times it is a very dangerous drug. Moreover the drugs discovered in these abortifacients sold have been placed on the list of poisons by the hon. member himself, who was one of the board appointed under the Public Health Act

to lay down standards for drugs. And in that list, which appeared in the *Gazette* of the 1st November, I find a few drugs mentioned in the poisons schedule. Therefore it appears to me there was no defence last evening which would stand, in the endeavour on the part of the hon. member to prove that these were harmless. But even were they harmless, the fact that they were sold for that specific purpose proves that a trade which is not creditable to the profession is being carried on. I am opposed, therefore, to giving the chemists the power they ask for, much as I would like to see the quacks generally abolished. I am inclined to think the best method of dealing with the whole question would be for the Government to bring down a comprehensive, well-thought-out Bill bringing chemists under the direct control of the Government, including their registration, and also abolishing all quacks. I desire, therefore, without going into the matter at any further length, in order that the Government may have an opportunity of bringing down a Bill, and in order to express my disapproval of granting pharmacists of this State the power they desire, and also my disapproval of the trade which is being carried on, to move—

That the word "now" be struck out and "this day six months" added to the motion.

Mr. Thomas: I thought you promised to support the second reading?

Mr. HEITMANN: No.

Mr. THOMAS (on amendment): I have no intention of replying to the statements made by the hon. member. I think we had quite sufficient of that particular debate last evening. I only desire to say I consider this matter is of some importance. I appeal to hon. members that even if they are opposed to a big proportion of the Bill, they should allow it to pass the second reading that we may discuss it item by item; and if there is in it something which appeals to hon. members, it may be carried. I am prepared to sacrifice most of the clauses of the Bill, indeed all of them of any benefit whatever to chemists. My only object is to carry

sufficient of the Bill to do away with fraud and quacks. It is all very well for the hon. member who moved the amendment to say he is in sympathy with me, and at the same time take the most effective means of preventing my carrying out my desire. However, I do not wish to infuse any feeling whatever into the debate. I only appeal to hon. members to allow the Bill to pass the second reading stage so that it may be debated in its various clauses. I am satisfied, if that is allowed to be done, some portion of the Bill will be carried into effect which will be of use to the people of Western Australia.

Mr. Hudson: What portion?

The Premier: The Title.

Amendment (six months) put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	7
Noes	29

Majority against	..	22
------------------	----	----

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Moore
Mr. Broun	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Harper	Mr. Hellmann
Mr. Hudson	(Teller)

NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Price
Mr. Foley	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Green	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Walker
Mr. Male	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. McDonald	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. McDowall	Mr. Layman
Mr. Mitchell	(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Perhaps the object of the member for Bunbury in introducing this Bill on behalf of the Pharmaceutical Society has been characterised by the best of intentions to protect members of that society, but to my mind this Bill—

Mr. Dwyer: And to protect the public.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Perhaps in some instances. In the first place it is impossible for any person whatever to supply drugs or medicines of any kind without being licensed by this society and if any person desires to employ a duly qualified dispenser, he also is refused permission by this Bill to supply any drugs. One of the principal objections to the Bill is that it includes every hospital in the State as a private hospital, whether Government or assisted. It is true the words used are "other than an institution wholly supported by the State," but there is not a hospital in the State from one end to the other that is wholly supported by the State, and consequently every public hospital will come under the provisions of the measure. Again, it prohibits friendly societies from supplying medicines to anyone outside of their own members or relatives of members. It is known that in various parts of the State medical funds have been established under the Friendly Societies Act. Dispensaries have been established, duly qualified dispensers are employed and if any person wishes to have drugs of a high standard I maintain that the dispensaries of the friendly societies are the principal places where they can be obtained. Yet under the Bill such societies are prohibited from having the right to dispense medicines to any person except members or relatives of members. No doubt the hon. member intended that by the passing of this measure a good many of the drugs which are dangerous and which are being sold would be prevented from further sale in future, but the greatest difficulty we have to contend with to-day is not in regard to persons who sell or dispense the drugs, but with regard to the drugs which are offered for sale, and I maintain when we are able to bring into force the present Health Act as amended this session a number of those drugs which the hon. member wishes his society to prevent from being sold will be thus prevented by the Health Department. Already a protest

has been entered because Parliament has decided that a formula of patent medicines shall be deposited with the Commissioner of Public Health. Legal authorities have been consulted to ascertain whether there is a flaw in the Act whereby it might be possible to upset the decision of Parliament. It is pointed out that very few patent medicines will be sent to Australia if it is necessary to disclose their contents, and I would be very pleased if we could debar all these medicines and rely on our qualified men to supply the drugs required. Very wide powers are given in that it is provided that drugs and other compounds shall not be sold by certain persons unless they are licensed. No person would be able to sell a bottle of embrocation, hair wash or many other requisites which are not injurious in any way but which can be purchased in many of our stores, without going to a registered shop for the express purpose of getting them.

Mr. Turvey: And purchase them much cheaper at the stores.

Hon. C. W. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Yes, I maintain that this Bill will bring about a close monopoly. The measure is not broad enough. If it is possible for persons to obtain the articles from their grocery store, which they do in many parts without any danger whatever—and in future there will not be the same danger as in the past owing to the passing of the amended Health Act—I think we should be very cautious in granting the powers asked for under this measure. I was pleased to hear the hon. member state that he intends to allow as far as possible the moving of amendments and I trust that Government hospitals will be excluded, that friendly societies will be excluded, and that if any person desires to employ a duly qualified man to carry on a business he shall have the opportunity of doing so.

Mr. THOMAS (in reply): I desire to say that most of the matters to which the last speaker has taken objection will be removed from the Bill when the measure reaches Committee. The clause dealing with storekeepers, one on which

I have been attacked considerably by some sections of the Press, I promised long ago would be struck out altogether, so that there will be no interference in that direction and although I propose to debate some of the clauses which relate to the pharmacists directly as we come to them, as I have already promised, I do not propose to press any clause of the Bill which is of direct benefit in any way to the pharmacists themselves. I make that promise because I am desirous of carrying the one point in this Bill, the great essential of the whole thing, and that is to do away with those frauds and quacks who are victimising the public to such an extent.

Mr. Hudson: What part of the Bill does that?

Mr. THOMAS: Clause 10. I wish to make only this brief explanation and to ask the House to approach the Bill in a reasonable manner and deal with it as it seems best. If the clauses are not acceptable I will raise no objection to them being deleted and if given fair consideration, sufficient of this Bill will be retained to effect a very valuable purpose in this City.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. McDowall in the Chair; Mr. Thomas in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

Mr. HUDSON: Regarding the definition of "duly qualified medical practitioner" would the hon. member give some idea of the qualifications required by a chemist to become registered in this State? Under Section 16 of the principal Act it was in the power of the board to recognise by regulations certain qualifications. As far as he could ascertain these regulations had not been laid on the table of the House as required by the Act and he was at a loss to know what people would be admitted to the ranks of the pharmaceutical chemists. One gentleman in the State whom he understood had high qualifications from the University of Christiania would not,

he believed, be registered under the present regulations.

Mr. THOMAS: The Western Australian Society, the same as others in Australia, registered those practising pharmacy at the outset. Since then a certain standard has been set for new comers.

Mr. HUDSON: That is for local candidates. I want to know about the others.

Mr. THOMAS: Western Australia had entered into reciprocity with the other States on condition that their standard of examinations and conditions were at least equal to the local ones. All the States after many years of correspondence had come into line and if there was not already reciprocity between Australia and Great Britain the chemists were on the eve of ratifying it. The result was that a fairly high standard had been set to which every Britisher and Australian had to conform, and the only conditions exacted were that anyone desiring to become a member of the society in Western Australia should at least hold qualifications equal to those held in Western Australia. He knew nothing of the individual who claimed to possess qualifications from the Norwegian University, but if they were up to the standard to which Australians had to conform, no doubt he could be registered.

Mr. HUDSON: Were there any societies recognised outside the Australian States? He had been unable to find out although he had searched the records of the House, and regulations that should have been prepared in this connection were not recorded.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) moved an amendment—

That in line 10 after "wholly" the words "or partially" be inserted.

The effect of the amendment would be that in the definition of "private hospitals" institutions wholly or partially supported by the State would be exempt.

Mr. Thomas: Why make a difference between State and private hospitals?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The hon. member had made a difference in the Bill. No doubt his intention was that the Government

hospitals should be exempt; by the wording of the clause, however, they were not. It was necessary, so far as the hospitals of the State were concerned, that they should have the power in regard to dispensing medicines, which should not be given to private hospitals.

Mr. DWYER: What he would like to know was whether all hospitals supported partially or wholly by the State were in charge of duly qualified medical practitioners, and if so whether these practitioners personally supervised the dispensing of prescriptions?

Mr. Thomas: They never do.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): There was one hospital only where there was not a duly qualified dispenser. Clause 3 of the Bill, however, dealt with that. Every Government hospital, whether assisted or not, was in the charge of a medical practitioner.

Mr. THOMAS: Whether it was a Government hospital or not did not appear to make very much difference. If it was desirable that we should have a registered pharmacist to dispense medicine for a private individual, it was necessary that there should be one in Government hospitals. Medical men never interfered, nor supervised, nor even went near the dispenser.

Mr. Dwyer: Why do you want to exempt them at all?

Mr. THOMAS: That was overlooked in the drafting of the Bill. He did not think that Government Institutions should be exempt. However, he would leave it to the House to decide the question. If it was good under one condition to have a qualified man to dispense medicines it was good in another.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member brought forward this Bill as an innocent little thing simply to prevent Indians, Asiatics, and others from selling herbs or putting up signs as herbalists and selling medicines, but since we had started to go through it, it had taken in the whole of the medical affairs of the State. The hon. member had given an assurance that he was prepared to write down all but one clause but he could not even attempt to press that one.

Mr. DWYER: If in hospitals generally they required a qualified person to be in charge of the dispensing, how much more so was a qualified person needed in charge of the dispensing in such large institutions as Government hospitals were? He would move an amendment later on to strike out of the clause the words "other than an institution wholly supported by the State," which exempted the hospitals supported by the State, with a view of inserting at the end of the clause "and includes Government hospitals."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): When we considered the hospitals at places like Port Hedland, Wyndham, and Carnarvon, and then went down the other way to Wagin and such places in the South-West, where there were hospitals partially supported very often prescriptions were prepared by the direction of the medical practitioner. The hon. member had recognised the necessity for exempting these larger hospitals and the Committee should agree that the assisted hospitals should be placed on the same footing.

Mr. HUDSON: There were places such as Marvel Loch where there was not a hospital at the present time, but it was hoped to have a small casualty ward there where the sick or injured might be taken, and if the clause were given effect to the doctor, if he found it impossible to do the whole of the dispensing, would not be able to leave directions to the nurse to carry out the duties of dispensing any kind of medicine for the unfortunate sufferer, and they would be compelled to call in a chemist registered by the society. It was going too far. The clause had been drafted without regard to the condition of affairs obtaining in the outlying places on the goldfields.

Mr. THOMAS: It was provided in the original Act that so long as a qualified man supervised the operation, dispensing could be carried on by an unqualified person. Hon. members need not be afraid on that particular point. The purport of the provision in the Bill was that dispensing could not be carried on in the absence of a pharmaceutical

chemist or doctor. If this were struck out any person would have power to dispense in the absence of either a medical man or a chemist.

The PREMIER: Before the hon. member asked the Committee to pass this clause he should give some evidence that the present law was operating to the detriment of the public. Not a single complaint had been heard from the public or from any source except from the chemists themselves that any harm had arisen so far as the dispensing of medicines at Government or private hospitals was concerned.

Mr. Thomas: Do you desire to wait until two or three people are killed?

The PREMIER: Not at all. He knew of persons who had nearly lost their lives through the action of chemists in dispensing wrongly, but that would not warrant him in coming forward and asking the House to make a drastic provision that might be to the detriment of the hospitals in country districts. How did the hon. member propose to deal with the dispensing of medicine at small hospitals in country districts? Would the local chemist be called upon on all occasions to go to the hospital and dispense medicines, or would a messenger be sent to his place for the medicines? If there was not a chemist in the locality, the hospital would have to keep one on the premises, although he might not be engaged for more than an hour a day. If the chemist and the doctor were acting together, and there was between them, what was called in other professions, an honourable understanding, the doctor would refuse to dispense any medicines, and require the hospital on all occasions to call in the chemist, and the hospital would be absolutely at his mercy. That was a monopoly which did not exist in any other profession, not even in the medical profession. A doctor could be compelled to attend a case, but a chemist could not be compelled to dispense medicines except at the rate he chose to charge. Could the hon. member give any evidence at all that the existing conditions had been detrimental to the welfare of the public? If not, he was not justified in asking the Committee to pass the clause.

Mr. THOMAS: It was not his intention to press his objection any further. He did not think the amendment would be wise, but if the Committee desired it well and good. Whilst he could not provide evidence of persons having been killed by unqualified persons, still there always remained the risk that the public were running. He was not in favour of close corporations, but he believed that, where human life was at stake, consideration should be given, even if it was not given elsewhere.

Mr. HUDSON: The hon. member should give some reasons for the inclusion of this clause if he wished the Committee to support it. Mr. Thomas had not answered the remarks which had been made in regard to the conditions that obtained in out-back portions of the gold-fields where there was no hospital.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and negatived.

Clause 3—Medicines dispensed for private hospitals:

Mr. HUDSON: The definition of "private hospitals" having been struck out, this clause should be consequential'y deleted.

Mr. THOMAS: The previous amendment did not affect this clause. The clause merely said --

No person shall dispense or compound any medicines for use in a private hospital, unless he is a registered pharmaceutical chemist or a duly qualified medical practitioner.

The Premier: But what is a private hospital?

Mr. THOMAS: A hospital that was privately run. He suggested that the clause should be left as it was, and, if necessary, it could be dealt with in another place.

Mr. Dwyer: You will have heaps of litigation over it. Add a definition clause later on.

Mr. Thomas: Yes, perhaps that can be done.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: In view of the previous amendment, there was no necessity for the clause. The dispensing at

hospitals partially supported by the State was, in nearly all instances, done by a medical practitioner. The definition of private hospital having been struck out, this clause would have to go also, and then anybody would be allowed to dispense in a private hospital.

Mr. Dwyer: The deletion of clause 3 will leave the law as it is at the present time.

Mr. Thomas: I have no objection to it being struck out, so why discuss it?

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 4—Effect of failure to pay subscriptions:

Mr. THOMAS: There had been difficulty at times in collecting the fees from various members of the Pharmaceutical Society, and the only object of the clause was to compel members to pay within a reasonable time. If they did not pay, they were struck off for the time being, but they could be reinstated by paying their arrears of subscriptions and a fine of £1. For his own part, he had been occasionally in arrears, and if any member desired to strike out the clause, he would not oppose him.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): It might be advisable for hon. members to follow up this clause in another direction. If a clause of this kind was put in the Trades Union Act, and a person was compelled to discontinue following, say, the occupation of a carpenter, if he did not pay his subscription to the union, there would be a big outcry. If this clause was passed, he would expect the support of every member of the Pharmaceutical Society in future when proposing compulsory unionism.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 5—Repeal of Sections 36 and 37 of the principal Act:

Mr. DWYER moved—

That the clause be postponed.

Motion put and negatived.

Clause put and negatived.

Clause 6—Unregistered person may not represent himself to be a chemist, etcetera:

Mr. HUDSON : This clause was practically the same as Section 37 of the principal Act so there did not seem to be any necessity for it, especially as the Committee had intimated by striking out Clause 5 that Sections 36 and 37 of the principal Act were not to be repealed.

Mr. THOMAS : The clause was necessary. It simply provided protection against any individual who pretended to be a chemist or used any of the terms mentioned in the clause.

The Premier : What is the object of the alteration ?

Mr. THOMAS : To make it more complete.

Mr. HUDSON : The difference between the principal Act and this clause was that the words in the principal Act, "Unless such business is conducted by and under the personal supervision of himself or of an assistant who is a pharmaceutical chemist or a legally qualified medical practitioner" were omitted. There must have been some object in this.

Mr. THOMAS : There was a subsequent clause dealing with company pharmacists, and in order to render that clause possible it was necessary to repeal Sections 36 and 37 of the principal Act. But since those sections were to stand there was no use in retaining Clause 6.

Clause put and negatived.

Clauses 7, 8—negatived.

Clause 9—Every shop to be kept by a pharmaceutical chemist :

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

Ayes 18

Noes 18

A tie 0

AYES.

Mr. Angwin
Mr. Bath
Mr. Carpenter
Mr. Dooley
Mr. Dwyer
Mr. Green
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Lewis
Mr. Munsie
Mr. O'Loghlin

Mr. Scaddan
Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Thomas
Mr. Turvey
Mr. Walker
Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Helmann
(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Foley	Mr. A. N. Plesse
Mr. Harper	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Swan
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Male	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Layman
Mr. Moore	(Teller).
Mr. Mullany	

The CHAIRMAN : In accordance with the usual custom I give my casting vote for further consideration. I vote with the ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 10—Unqualified persons not to sell drugs :

Mr. THOMAS : In this clause was contained the most important question of all. The carrying of the clause would settle the fate of the Bill. If members desired to take steps to do away with quackery it was necessary to carry the clause and deal with the herbalists, palmists, faith healers and others who had been posing before the people for so long.

The Premier : You make provision for licensing the sale of drugs.

Mr. THOMAS : That provision would be struck out. They could carry on as they had always done under the Act.

Hon. J. Mitchell : You will have to alter this clause because it is provided that only licensed persons can sell.

Mr. THOMAS : The clause did not in any way conflict with the rest of the Bill. When we came to the question of a license it could be made nominal.

Mr. HUDSON : The hon. member had previously expressed an intention of not pressing for the inclusion of Clause 11, because it would affect so many people in the country who sold patent medicines. However, as the hon. member did not now propose to consent to the deletion of Clause 11 it became necessary to amend this clause under consideration. He moved an amendment—

That in line 9 the following words be struck out:—"Provided that this section shall not be construed so as to prevent any person licensed as hereinafter men-

tioned from selling any patent or proprietary medicine which does not contain any of the poisons mentioned in the fifth schedule of the principal Act."

The object of the amendment was to protect the public. It might safely be taken that it was not the intention of the Committee to trust the policing of legislation of this kind to the Pharmaceutical Society. It was the duty of the State to protect the public from quacks. Power was given the State to do this, and we should not set up dual authority by giving the Pharmaceutical Society additional power in the same direction. Indeed he did not know why we should have a Bill like this brought in at all, and the time of the Committee wasted.

Mr. GREEN: An amendment which he proposed to move should come prior to the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. HUDSON: In that case he would ask leave to temporarily withdraw his amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. GREEN: At the present time it was impossible for a chemist's assistant to sell even a bottle of linseed during the dinner hour, notwithstanding which the practice was regularly followed. The chemist's assistant should be allowed to compound drugs for sale. He moved an amendment—

That after "chemist" in line 2 the words "or chemist's assistant in a shop in the charge of a pharmaceutical chemist" be inserted.

Mr. THOMAS: It was impossible to withhold admiration of a peculiar kind for the member for Yilgarn (Mr. Hudson) who in persistent and malicious fashion was attempting—

Mr. Hudson: I object; I ask that the hon. member withdraw and apologise.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member would be required to withdraw and apologise.

Mr. THOMAS: In the circumstances he would withdraw and apologise. The hon. member had very adroitly succeeded in his designs; he had studied this matter very carefully with an object best known to himself.

Mr. Underwood: He has a right to study it, has he not? Have you any desire to sneak the thing through?

Mr. THOMAS: Would the Chairman request the hon. member to withdraw that expression?

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member had said something offensive he would be required to withdraw it.

Mr. Underwood: I did not say it; I was merely asking a question.

Mr. THOMAS: It was not intended to proceed any further with the Bill at the present time, but rather to report progress. Hon. members with more legal knowledge than his own had in some measure succeeded in their purpose.

Mr. HUDSON: There was no necessity for the amendment. If a chemist had two shops could his assistant run one of the shops? He would like to know if that would be permitted under the amendment.

Mr. GREEN: No. It was his wish simply to give a chemist's assistant a chance to learn the business.

Progress reported.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Lands: By-laws of Kalgoorlie Roads Board under the Health Act, 1911.

House adjourned at 10.2 p.m.