

spirit. While proposing what we conceive to be far-reaching and beneficial changes in the existing law we have endeavoured to avoid bringing forward proposals which, while they might meet with acceptance from a small section of the community, would be in advance of the general wishes of the people, and would not, therefore, have as their foundation the enduring sanction of the popular will. Nor again has the measure been conceived in a party spirit, and we have no desire that it shall be received or considered from the party point of view. We welcome suggestions from whatever part of the House they may come as much from our friends opposite as from those who sit beside us. I do not say that everything that may be suggested we are prepared to accept. In a subject which presents so much room for diversity of opinion that would be to evolve a Bill which would be an amazing mass of contradictions, logical only in its absence of logic, harmonising only in its want of harmony. But to every suggestion we are prepared to give full and fair consideration, and if the Bill is received, as I am sanguine enough to believe it will be, by hon. members in the spirit in which it is offered, the House will, I am convinced, be able to congratulate itself on having passed a measure of reform which, if not the final word, represents at least a distinct advance towards a sane and practicable ideal. That at any rate will be something accomplished, something won, and we shall all of us have our reward in having been instrumental in placing on the statute book a measure which will not be merely a pious expression of opinion, but will make for the wellbeing of Western Australia, for the prosperity of her people, and for the strengthening of those forces by which a nation is exalted, its vigour maintained and its progress assured. More we cannot expect; less should not content us. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Bath, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 8th September, 1909.

	PAGE
Questions : Coal Mines Accident Fund (2)	209
Mines Regulation, Ore passes	210
School Teachers' Increments	210
Mining and Foreign Labour, North Star Mine, Sons of Gwalia Mine	210
State Hotel, Improvements	210
Railway Project, Leonora-Lawlers	210
Midland Junction Workshops, Labourers Employed	211
Public Works Department, Particulars as to Works	211
Chairmen of Committees, Temporary	211
Leave of Absence	211
Bills : Trade Disputes 1R.	211
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 2R., Com.	229
Vaccination Act Amendment, 2R., Com.	232
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 2R.	243
Licensed Surveyors, Com.	247
Papers : Mr. F. M. Behan's case	211
Papers presented	218
Motions : Friendly Societies Act and Administration, to inquire	211
Immigration System, to inquire as to effect	218
Resolution : Pharmacy and Poisons Law, to compile	231

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

QUESTIONS (2) — COAL MINES ACCIDENT FUND.

Case of G. A. McGowan.

Mr. A. A. WILSON asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Did the secretary (A. A. Wilson) of the Coal Mines Accident Relief Fund Committee apply by letter to the inspector of mines, Collie, for an inquiry to be held into the case of Geo. A. McGowan, in relation to his claim for accident relief pay, previous to September, 1908? 2, What was the date of the letter received by the inspector of mines, Collie.

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, No; 2, Answered by 1.

Mr. A. A. WILSON also asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Did the secretary (A. A. Wilson) of the Coal Mines Accident Relief Fund Committee apply by letter or by deputation to the Minister for an inquiry to be held into the case of Geo. A. McGowan, in relation to his claim for accident relief pay, previous to September, 1908? 2, What was the date of the letter received by the Minister? 3, What was the date the Minister received the deputation?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1 and 2, No record of any application previous to September, 1908; 3, There is a record that Mr. A. A. Wilson

had an interview on the subject with the Minister for Mines on December 3rd, 1908.

QUESTION—MINES REGULATION, ORE PASSES.

Mr. SCADDAN asked the Minister for Mines: 1, On what date was the regulation under the Mines Regulation Act, 1906, dealing with the clearing of ore passes, published in the *Government Gazette*? 2, Is he aware that Section 63 of the Act provides that all regulations shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within fourteen days of such publication if Parliament is in session, or if Parliament is not in session, then within fourteen days after the commencement of the next session? 3, Has this provision been complied with? 4, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, On the 7th February, 1908; 2, Yes; 3, Yes; 4, Answered by 3.

QUESTION—SCHOOL TEACHERS' INCREMENTS.

Mr. JACOBY asked the Minister for Education: 1, Have the Government given further consideration to the question of reinstating the annual increments to school teachers? 2, If so, will the Minister inform the House of the decision arrived at?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, The matter is now under consideration; 2, When the matter has been decided the House will be informed of the decision arrived at.

QUESTIONS (2)—MINING AND FOREIGN LABOUR.

North Star Mine.

Mr. HEITMANN (for Mr. Gourley) asked the Minister for Mines: Does the Minister intend to instruct the inspector of mines for the district to obtain a report showing the number of British and foreign workmen working on the North Star Mine, Malcolm, as on the 31st day of July, 1909?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: A report has been obtained, which is available for the honourable member if he so desires.

Sons of Gwalia Mine.

Mr. HEITMANN (for Mr. Gourley) also asked the Minister for Mines: Does the Minister intend to obtain a report showing the number of British and foreign workmen working on the Sons of Gwalia Mine as on the 31st day of July, 1909?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: There is no power vested in the Minister or inspector of mines to demand this information, nor is there any obligation cast upon the manager under the Mines Regulation Act to supply such information, except in case of foreigners being employed who are not conversant with the English language (Section 42), but if such be desired by the House, the Minister would be prepared to request the manager of the mine in question to supply the information desired.

QUESTION—STATE HOTEL, IM- PROVEMENTS.

Mr. HEITMANN (for Mr. Gourley) asked the Minister for Mines: 1, What improvements does the Minister intend to make this year at the State hotel at Gwalia? 2, What is the estimated cost of such improvements? 3, Will the improvements provide for a library and reading room?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Septic tank, and necessary alterations in the sanitary conveniences; alterations in fencing, tree-planting, etc.; 2, £508; 3, No.

QUESTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, LEONORA-LAWLERS.

Mr. HEITMANN (for Mr. Gourley) asked the Premier: Does the Premier intend to carry out the promise made by him at the close of last session that a more permanent survey of the Leonora to Lawlers railway would be made this year?

The PREMIER replied: When the permanent survey of the several railways included in the last Loan Appropriation Act are completed, any additional data required will be obtained.

QUESTION—MIDLAND JUNCTION WORKSHOPS. LABOURERS EMPLOYED.

Mr. SWAN asked the Minister for Railways: What is the number of junior and of adult labourers employed in the Midland Junction workshops?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: Junior labourers, 34; adult labourers, 123.

QUESTION—PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Particulars as to Works.

Mr. SWAN asked the Minister for Works: 1, From what source and by what method is the Public Works Department obtaining broken metal for concrete purposes in connection with the construction of the Fremantle dock? 2, Is it a fact that the Public Works Department was the first employer to reduce the wages paid to men engaged laying and jointing pipes on the sewerage reticulation works of Perth? 3, Is it a fact that at present the Public Works Department is paying 10s. per day to Monier pipe layers in Fremantle, whilst private employers are paying 12s. per day?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No broken metal is being obtained in connection with the construction of the Fremantle dock; 2, No sewerage reticulation work has been carried out by the Public Works Department. The upper end of the Mt. Eliza main sewer, however, has been laid with stone-ware pipes, wages for layers and jointers on this work having been 10s. a day; 3, The layers of Monier pipes have always received 12s. a day, the jointers 10s. to 11s. At Fremantle the laying is being done by the foreman who receives more than 12s. per day.

CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES, TEMPORARY.

Mr. SPEAKER nominated Mr. Foulkes (Claremont) and Mr. Taylor (Mt. Margaret) as temporary Chairmen of Committees.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Gordon, leave of absence for one fortnight granted to Hon. F. H. Piesse (Katanning) on the ground of ill-health.

On motion by Mr. Bath, leave of absence for one fortnight granted to Mr. Troy (Mt. Magnet) on the ground of urgent private business.

BILL—TRADE DISPUTES.

First Reading.

Introduced by Mr. Heitmann, and read a first time.

PAPERS—MR. F. M. BEHAN'S CASE.

On motion by Mr. Daglish ordered: That all papers containing the evidence taken, and the report made by the Public Service Commissioner upon the case of Mr. F. M. Behan, formerly trade instructor at the Fremantle prison, be laid on the Table.

MOTION—FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AND ADMINISTRATION, TO INQUIRE.

Mr. DAGLISH (Subiaco) moved—

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into the provisions of the Friendly Societies Act and its administration with a view to ascertaining to what extent the Act may be liberalised or the administration improved in the interest of such societies.

He said: It is not necessary, I think, in bringing this matter under the consideration of hon. members that I should point to the good work the various friendly societies are doing. There has been for a considerable time past a complaint that

the administration of the Friendly Societies Act, if not the Act itself, does not afford facilities for extending and liberalising the benefits granted by a large number of these friendly societies. I do not desire this inquiry because of any specific complaint that has been made against the department or the administration, but I desire it rather in the nature of an investigation to find to what extent the work of the societies can be helped. And I think an inquiry will be particularly useful at the present stage, when a new registrar is undertaking the duties of controlling the work. It will provide useful information for his guidance, and will, perhaps, enable us to improve the existing Act, so as to help the friendly societies in the useful work they are doing from a public point of view. I do not desire to make any elaborate remarks in advocacy of this motion, to which I think there can be no reasonable objection offered by any hon. member.

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion. No doubt by the appointment of a select committee a great number of the grievances of the various branches of the friendly societies would be removed through the recommendations made by the committee. It is realised that the friendly societies of Western Australia have been going ahead enormously; their funds have been increasing to a large degree; in fact they amount to hundreds of thousands of pounds; and when we realise the assistance the societies render to their members it is necessary that some assistance should be given to them.

The Premier: In what direction?

Mr. ANGWIN: This motion is for the appointment of a select committee to make suggestions.

The Minister for Works: What are the grievances to which you refer?

Mr. ANGWIN: There are several that could be brought before the committee. There is the grievance some of them have in regard to their management fund. Where it is necessary that the sick and funeral fund should be loaned out at interest, or in any other manner, so as to increase the fund, all the expense of

doing this has to be borne by the management fund. In many instances it is necessary to levy a special fund for the purpose of carrying on the management of the society, though the sick and funeral fund is increasing enormously every year. In fact it is almost now a matter of impossibility, unless anything serious should happen, whereby the societies would be called upon, not only in Western Australia but in any part of the world, to use the large amount put by for the time of sickness. I certainly think members should agree to the motion for an investigation by a select committee in regard to the working of the Friendly Societies Act.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore): I do not think there is any great objection to the motion, but I would like to point out that a new registrar has just been appointed. This gentleman comes with excellent qualifications, and it is questionable whether it would not be wiser at present to allow him to get a full grip of the duties connected with his position before a select committee is appointed.

Mr. Angwin: He should have known all about this matter before he was appointed.

The PREMIER: The task of making a valuation will take him at least twelve months, and this committee will be appointed while he is undertaking that work. I admit there have been complaints against the late registrar in regard to certain of his rulings; but if inquiry is made into them it will be found that as a rule the registrar has given his rulings with the view to safeguarding the interests of the members of the societies generally. Very often higher contributions to the benefit fund are required than the actual funds will allow, and complaints have been made, I believe, to the late registrar in that regard; but I am a member of a friendly society and I have not heard any great complaints in regard to the administration of the Act by the late registrar. However, I understand that the gentleman who has just been appointed is to make an actuarial valuation of all the societies, which means that he will be

taking stocks and investigating accounts and the working of the societies, and if he is given an opportunity of applying his experience to the societies on the completion of this investigation, I think it would then be more opportune to have a select committee than now. But, as I have said, I have not had an opportunity of going into the question thoroughly, and I thought we would have heard further evidence of the need for the appointment of a select committee before I had the opportunity of speaking on this motion. It is anticipated that the valuation will take more than a year to complete, and, as I have said, it is questionable whether it would be wise to at all harass the new registrar by suggesting any alteration of the Act until he has had an opportunity of completing his investigation. This gentleman has had a large experience indeed in one of the most extensive friendly societies in the world, the membership of which is approximately 200,000. However, I have no feeling in the matter other than that I would like to ask the House to consider the point as to whether it would not be wiser to allow this gentleman to get fairly settled down to his work before an investigation by a select committee is commenced.

Mr. JOHNSON (Guildford): I am of opinion that the appointment of a select committee would not harass the newly-appointed officer, but on the other hand would assist him. The committee would get evidence in connection with the complaints that the friendly societies have been continually voicing against the administration of the Act. I believe it was about 12 months ago that one of the largest friendly societies in Western Australia had a conference, the outcome of which was that they appointed a committee to interview the Colonial Secretary, and bring under his notice the necessity for the Act being amended, or for the registrar taking a more liberal view in his administration.

The Premier: Is not the trouble that they always try to encroach on the funeral fund?

Mr. JOHNSON: The trouble is that the sick and funeral funds are increas-

ing out of proportion to the requirements of the members of the societies if we view it from the position of the societies some five or six years ago, but on the other hand, while the one fund is increasing out of all proportion the societies find that owing to the increased membership it is difficult to carry on the management with their management funds, the consequence being that the management funds are always in a semi-state of bankruptcy, while the sick and funeral fund is always in affluent circumstances.

Member: They have money to lend in plenty on the one fund, while on the other they have not sufficient to carry on their work.

Mr. JOHNSON: They brought this under the notice of the Colonial Secretary 12 months ago, and the Colonial Secretary's reply was that an actuarial valuation was being made by the then Registrar of Friendly Societies with a view to seeing whether an alteration could be made, but nothing further has been done, and now we are told that another valuation is to be made. I think it is about time we reached finality, and while I am not prepared to say that the new registrar will not be able to do the work, I think he can be assisted by the appointment of a committee. For years past the friendly societies have brought this prominently before members of Parliament. It has been a grievance for some years with them, and they have been constantly endeavouring to get a more liberal administration of the measure; so I think it is time we took some action, and the action proposed by the member for Subiaco will not harass the new officer, but on the other hand will assist him. Consequently I hope the House will approve of the investigation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): I have not been impressed with the utility of select committees. My experience is that there is a considerable waste of energy and time in connection with select committees, and that little good has ever come from the time occupied. A number of members of Parliament call witnesses, put the witnesses on oath, and then the witnesses give their opinions.

An opinion given on oath often appears to me to be something very like perjury. I think we can do with considerably fewer select committees than we have had in the past. In regard to this question of friendly societies, I have had some experience of them, and my experience is that they are able to look after themselves. If there is anything wrong with the Act under which they are working, I believe they are quite competent to frame amendments and have them brought forward by members of the House. I believe the majority of members of the House are members of friendly societies, and if the friendly societies have had conferences and lodge meetings, and have considered the matter, and if they cannot fix up the thing for themselves, I am satisfied a select committee will not fix it up for them. I intend to oppose the motion.

Mr. BOLTON (North Fremantle): I intend to support the motion. The member for Pilbara has evidently not had much experience of select committees. A select committee's recommendation is not limited to one man's opinion, nor to the opinions of witnesses. This select committee will get documentary evidence to prove that an alteration is needed. And that is what has been the fault. It has been impossible for the friendly societies to convince the registrar that an amendment was necessary; and if this select committee can collect sufficient evidence, as I believe it will, the new registrar, while naturally he may not act up to the recommendations, will, at least, attach weight to them. There are provisions in the Act that need alteration, which the late registrar would not allow any alteration to. The sick and funeral fund may be loaned out at interest, but the cost of lending it is debited against the management fund, and although the interest earned goes into the fund from which the principal is taken, the cost of raising or fixing up the loan cannot be taken from the interest so earned, but must be taken from the management fund. So it hardly pays some friendly societies to loan out their moneys. It has been conclusively proved by friendly societies that there is not a sufficient proportion allowed for the manage-

ment fund. The more expense to which the management fund is put the less the societies have for management. Some of the friendly societies, the Druids for instance, have altered their mode of contribution, doing away with the contribution to the death and benefit fund and saving at least 5d. per week. They found it necessary to do that. In this State whatever the contribution is, it is allocated by the registrar as so much for the management fund and so much for the sick and funeral fund, but not sufficient is allowed for the management fund, which is proved by the fact that the death and benefit funds of societies are increasing yearly. When the societies lend their money out at interest, the interest earned is added to the death and funeral fund, so that this fund is all the time reaching bigger dimensions, but the societies are not allowed to touch it for any purpose, except lending it out at interest, other than for sick and funeral purposes. I believe it is necessary to safeguard the sick and funeral fund, but I think that if the select committee is appointed it will collect sufficient evidence to show that an alteration is required when the sick and funeral fund has reached the height it has reached, so as to allow more for management expenses. An alteration may, perhaps, be acceptable to the new registrar, but it has certainly not been acceptable to the one who has occupied the position.

The Premier: The management fund is simply to carry on expenses and pay the doctors.

Mr. BOLTON: There is actually nothing for the management fund. It is merely a fund in name. It is always in debt.

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill): I do not intend to offer any opposition to the appointment of the select committee, but it seems to me that some members are under a misapprehension in regard to increases in the benefit funds—the sick and death funds. It is true that in the case of some friendly societies the fund seems to increase at an abnormal rate; but it must be remembered that the membership increases and, therefore, the liability increases also, while the longer the friendly society is in existence the greater will be

the ultimate liability. While the members are young and vigorous there will be perhaps but a small proportion of demands on the death fund. There is no great demand on the benefit fund at the commencement of a society, but it must be borne in mind that just as in the case of an insurance company, as time goes on there is an ever-increasing proportion of members making inroads on the fund. It is not the immediate present the societies have to make provision for but for the future, when there will be an accelerated increase in the demands from the fund owing to members dying. In these circumstances we have to be careful, when desiring to make what might perhaps appear a laudable effort to relieve the friendly societies at the present time, to do nothing that will seriously jeopardise the solvency of the institutions at a later date.

Mr. Angwin: You do not run that risk by appointing a committee.

Mr. BATH: I am not opposing the committee, but am pointing out to members the danger we may run of injuring the societies under the plea of giving them a benefit. It is essential that we should have an officer in the position of Registrar of Friendly Societies who not only has the professional skill but is also a man whom we can trust. Having secured such a man we have to place a good deal of reliance in his reports and upon his actions which, in his view, are necessary to preserve the solvency of the friendly societies. This is a very serious matter, for it must be remembered that there is a very large proportion of members of friendly societies to whom the weekly contributions represent a very considerable amount, a considerable proportion of their earnings, and to whom any injury or any danger that at a later date the fund will be insufficient is a matter of very grave concern. I hope the committee, if appointed, will not be induced to do something that may appear necessary now, but which later on may jeopardise the position of the friendly societies in the State.

Mr. McDOWALL (Coolgardie): I desire to support the motion largely on the

grounds the last speaker has mentioned. There is no desire in this investigation to impair the solvency of the friendly societies. It is quite the reverse, for the desire is to get an inquiry into the finances of the different friendly societies, and see that their solvency is assured. It is, to a large extent, an actuarial inquiry. We know perfectly well that a large number of friendly societies in this State are working on an improper basis. We know that some societies invite people to become members without the payment of an entrance fee, and that the Friendly Societies Act is being flouted in every possible way. In consequence, some inquiry is necessary. The committee, I take it, will look into everything in connection with the administration of friendly societies. The registrar or actuary, who has just been appointed, will certainly inquire into actuarial matters. I for one am thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the remarks of the member for Brown Hill (Mr. Bath), when he pointed out how necessary it is that we should provide for the payment of moneys which would eventually become due. I am also well aware that it is a popular notion that because the sick and funeral fund seems large, it can be used for management purposes. That is a mistake, for, as in life assurance, a certain reserve, calculated by actuarial science, must be set aside. That is done in properly managed societies. As the interests of the people are so bound up in these friendly societies, as so many of us are members of them, it behoves us to do everything we can to see that the funds are properly administered. A select committee is necessary and advisable, and the House should support the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret): I have no desire to oppose the motion, but I would like to hear something more said in favour of the appointment of a committee of this House to inquire into the position of the friendly societies. I take it that the friendly societies which have been so long in existence—some of them are among the oldest institutions in Australia—are quite capable of placing their views before the Government re-

garding the Act under which they are constituted. The value of this argument is accentuated by the fact that, as has been shown by members who have already spoken, there are many members of this House who belong to friendly societies. If the friendly societies had made an application to the Government to alter or amend the Friendly Societies Act, because there was something in it which prevented them from carrying on their societies financially and in the best interests of the members, and the Government had refused to amend an Act which was militating against the best interests of the societies, then the House would be justified in bringing pressure to bear on the Government to alter the Act. Every endeavour should be made to ensure that the friendly societies should become prosperous, and thus be able to give the best facilities to their members. I have not yet heard that the friendly societies are desirous of having the Act amended. So far as the statement of the member for Coolgardie (Mr. McDowall) is concerned, to the effect that the committee will inquire into the solvency of the large friendly societies, I am not aware that these societies would be pleased if a committee of this House, or any other committee, inquired into their solvency or otherwise. I am not a member of any friendly society, and am absolutely free in that particular; but I have been a member of other organisations which were operating under Acts of Parliament, and were formed to promote the best interests of their members in a similar manner to friendly societies, and when they found they could not operate they brought the matter before Parliament and tried to get things remedied. The friendly societies should have made some appeal themselves rather than that the matter should have been introduced by a member of the House. Perhaps it would be unfair to say that the hon. member who introduced the motion is a member of a friendly society which is not working smoothly and that the present motion is the result. To my knowledge no friendly society has made overtures to this House to alter the Act, and I hope the

House will not appoint a committee to probe into the finances or to inquire as to the solvency of the institutions concerned, from which we have had up to date no complaint. There is nothing in the reports of the Registrar of Friendly Societies to show that the societies are not carrying on in accordance with the Act.

Mr. Angwin: You are not mixed up with them.

Mr. TAYLOR: Perhaps if I were there would be no grievance. I can understand that trouble might arise where the member for East Fremantle is; but perhaps I shall join a society and thus put a stop to grievances, and so relieve the members of the proposed select committee from a very arduous task and the State from some slight expenditure.

Mr. Bath: If you join they will make you pay very high fees now.

Mr. TAYLOR: If that is a fact we should have two select committees. I do not see any necessity for the committee, and unless further arguments are advanced in support of the proposition I will oppose it.

Mr. SWAN (North Perth): Not in the hope of providing the arguments required by the member for Mt. Margaret, but because I believe there is a necessity for something in this direction to be done, I will support the motion for the appointment of a select committee.

Mr. Taylor: What do you base your belief on?

Mr. SWAN: I will tell you. In the first place I am in the same position as the hon. member to this extent, that I do not belong to a friendly society. Notwithstanding that, however, representations have been made to me by officers of friendly societies that there is an absolute need for some amendment of the Act. In that respect I differ from the Premier, who says he has heard no complaints. I have heard of a number.

The Premier: It is only a question of the registrar protecting the societies against themselves.

Mr. Bolton: Trouble was caused by the obstinacy of the ex-registrar, who had not all the evidence before him.

Mr. SWAN: I have heard quite sufficient to convince me that these people are suffering under a difficulty, and that we should try and assist them out of it. I can understand, to some extent, the reference of the member for Pilbara to the lack of success achieved by select committees in the past. I have noticed the way in which reports of select committees have been dealt with by this House, and it is a great pity that sufficient attention is not paid to the result of their deliberations. The work of select committees would be most valuable if they went to their work seriously, and with a desire to assist in securing better administration or legislation, and if their reports were carefully and considerably dealt with by the House afterwards. I hope this committee, or any appointed in the future, will receive better consideration at the hands of members when they produce their report than has been the case with reports received in the past. I intend to support the motion, and will in the future try and see that the reports of all select committees are carefully considered.

Mr. DAGLISH (in reply): I do not intend to take up any time in replying to arguments which have not yet been adduced. An argument does not need very serious attention when it has not been brought forward, nor does the complaint made by the hon. member for Mount Margaret, that good reasons have not been given for this motion. One reason has been supplied by the objection to the motion, that is, that hon. members have very little knowledge in regard to the work, the expenses, and the methods of the working of friendly societies. The motion has been brought forward by me in consequence of a promise which I gave to a gathering of the United Friendly Societies held in my district about five months ago, and it was, therefore, made practically at the request of the representatives of all those societies. I think there were two societies not represented, and there were altogether eight different orders represented at the gathering where the promise was made. Hon. members will therefore understand that a request has been made not by one society or two,

but by practically all the societies that Parliament shall give some consideration, first of all to the administration of the existing Act and then to the question whether it can be improved.

The Minister for Works: Why did they not approach the Government?

Mr. DAGLISH: I do not know what approaches have or have not been made, but I do know that it is a most unusual thing for an hon. member of this House to complain because Parliament is asked to redress any grievance that may exist, and it is strange that the member for Mount Margaret desires that the Government shall be approached through some other channel than through a member of this House. Surely if any section of the community have a grievance the proper method to adopt to get the grievance removed is to approach Parliament itself.

Mr. Taylor: If you want to alter an Act, you bring forward a motion.

Mr. DAGLISH: I want to supply the hon. member with information in regard to the working of friendly societies and the need for amendment, and I contend this very debate has indicated that hon. members do require more information. I did not give a long dissertation when moving the motion, because I always like to attain my purpose with the waste of the least possible amount of time, and I thought that the motion would commend itself, more particularly to those members who know least about friendly societies. It seems, however, to have had no effect. There has been one point raised, and that is the question of expense. I desire to say that a committee like this will sit only in Parliament House, will require to hear no witnesses except those who can be found within a stone's throw of this building; it will not require to pay witness expenses because the members of the different friendly societies will be glad to come forward and supply information. The whole cost of the investigation, therefore, will consist of the cost of printing and placing before hon. members whatever information may be obtained. Surely, therefore, the raising of that question is utterly unwarranted on an occasion when

an inquiry of this description is brought forward. I say that even if no inquiry had been asked for, the importance of friendly societies to this State, especially to the poorer members of the community, is so great and the work they are doing is so valuable, that if Parliament could have devised means of extending that work and increasing its usefulness, it would have been our duty to do so. For that reason alone I would have been amply justified in introducing the motion for the consideration of hon. members.

Question put and passed.

Ballot taken, and the following appointed a select committee, namely:—Messrs. Bolton, Foulkes, Jacoby, McDowall, and the mover (Mr. Daglish) with power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, and to report this day four weeks.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier: The Public Service List, 1909.

By the Attorney General: Land Titles Department—Annual Report, 1908-1909.

MOTION—IMMIGRATION SYSTEM.

To inquire as to effect.

Mr. DAGLISH (Subiaco) moved:

That a Select Committee be appointed to investigate the effect of the present immigration system upon land settlement and upon the condition of workers in the towns of the State.

He said: In submitting this motion I desire to express the opinion that very frequently members of this House take a lot too much for granted, and show too little regard for personal investigation in respect to various matters affecting the government and the welfare of the State. I believe it would be advantageous to the community if Parliament itself took a larger share than it does take in the control of the State. Too often, I think, matters are neglected because of the conflict between opposing parties; and Ministers themselves have not that amount of time, and sometimes have not the necessary

opportunity, to enable them to inquire into and gain personal knowledge of the details of the administration of the individual departments. This is, I think, particularly the case in respect to work of a routine character, such as the work done in connection with the introduction into the State of nominated immigrants. The bringing of nominated immigrants to the State has been going on for a large number of years, and there are very few Ministers who have had a chance to make full inquiry into the effect of the system. During the last few months, when there has been a large amount of depression in the metropolitan area, and a deadness and dullness, particularly about the building trade, this matter perhaps has received more attention from the actual workers in Perth, Fremantle, and the suburbs than it has at any previous time. This of course is because of the fact that in an overstocked labour market any new competition must speedily make itself felt. To my personal knowledge very many complaints have been made by town workers in various occupations, and more especially those engaged in the different branches of the building trade, of the competition to which they have been subjected, and the employment they have lost because of the introduction of immigrants from outside the State, in some cases directly by means of the Government policy of providing portion of the expense, or the whole of the expense of nominated passages. I know that in my own locality there are working at the present time in trades that are very dull, men who have been brought from England to this State at the expense of the State. Necessarily these men when obtaining employment have done so by forcing out of employment the very tax-payers whose money has helped to provide for their passages. Complaint has been made repeatedly to me by those all along resident in this State, that in some of our Government departments newly introduced immigrants have obtained preference of employment. This has been repeatedly alleged in regard to the Government workshops, and more lately in regard also to the employment of attend-

ants at the Asylum for the Insane at Claremont, where I believe there are to be found employees who have been brought to this State, partially, at all events, at the expense of the community. Now I am wholly in favour of, and sincerely anxious to assist in urging on, the introduction of those who will suitably people our vast State. I recognise that the prosperity of Western Australia depends upon the establishment, as quickly as possible, of a large population in the State. But that population, I think we all recognise, should not be a population that will drift into our various large towns. Western Australia has nothing to gain by, and no opportunities to offer to, those who come merely to struggle for casual employment with the workers already in our towns. The lot of those earning their living in the various centres of population is already sufficiently hard, and must be rendered much harder by the introduction of new competitors. But apart from that, especially in a country where there are no manufactories, those who live in our towns must be to a large extent living on the efforts of those in the country; must be living by positions in the Government service or as agents of exchange. The country cannot gain by introducing those who will have to follow one or other of these lines of livelihood. Even now the labour market is overstocked, and any increase means the forcing out of those people already in employment; and that too, by the use of funds provided by the latter when paying their taxes. No section of the community asks for that. No section asks that we should import at the State's expense domestic servants for a favoured few. At the present time, I believe, there are to be found in some of the houses in the neighbourhood of Perth, imported domestic servants who are simply throwing out of employment the local girls.

The Premier: Throwing out of employment—is the local girl prepared to do household work?

Mr. Johnson: Perhaps not at the salary the immigrants get.

Mr. DAGLISH: I know it is very often said that colonial girls are not wil-

ling to undertake household work; but at the same time there is a very important qualification that should be added to that statement, namely, not at the price some employers see fit to pay for the work. It is all a question of wages, and a question of conditions of employment, and I myself should be very sorry to see many of our girls willing to work at an unduly low wage, or under unfair conditions. At all events, if it be impossible for certain people in this community to find the domestic servants they want in the State, then certainly they should be at the expense of importing that service when its importation is necessary. As a taxpayer I am prepared to object very strongly to contributing my quota in any shape or form to the cost of bringing out domestic servants for anyone else in the community, and I venture to say that the average taxpayer holds the same opinion. As a taxpayer I am willing to assist in providing funds to enable us to get people willing to settle on our lands. And I recognise that the Government are doing great service to the community in getting these lands settled by competent persons—competent both in regard to knowledge and ability, and competent at the same time in regard to capital—by getting these lands settled by persons from outside the State or from inside the State, because with every settler the State is getting a new asset, not only as a taxpayer but a new asset in the shape of a new wealth producer. Therefore, the more of that class of immigration the Government can get the better, I contend, it is for the State. However, during recent months it has come to my knowledge that many immigrants have been introduced who have simply, when here, elbowed long-established residents and old taxpayers out of the occupations they have followed.

Mr. Angwin: Are you referring to assisted immigrants?

Mr. DAGLISH: Yes, I am referring to those immigrants of whom the hon. member spoke so glowingly, and I am, to some extent, censuring the selection by the Agent General and his officers in England that the hon. member praised.

Mr. Angwin: I praised the system they had in vogue.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Did you support the amendment moved last session to reduce the immigration vote?

Mr. DAGLISH: I did not; and so long as that vote is spent in introducing a proper class of immigrants I will not, and I am willing to make it far larger than it has been in the past few years; but what I am anxious about is to find to what extent that vote is being applied to useful purposes from the State standpoint, and to what extent it is being used as a means of injury to a section of the community who help to provide their share of it. That is, in a few words, the object I have in moving for this select committee. I believe that every member is anxious to assist the settlement of our lands. I believe the majority of members are willing to provide funds to assist in introducing immigrants who will settle our lands. I believe also that nine-tenths of the members of the House are anxious to prevent the introduction of immigrants who will simply compete with our town workers for a livelihood. Without further comment I beg to move the proposition I have already read.

Mr. JOHNSON (Guildford): I second the motion.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore): I had hoped that some other member would have followed the member for Subiaco. In the first place I would like to congratulate the hon. member on the fact that apparently he has spare time on his hands, for if this motion is carried he will be the chairman of two select committees, and if he proposes to investigate this question to the same extent as he has outlined in his speech I think he will be kept very busy.

Mr. Daglish: It needs to be done by someone.

The PREMIER: There is no objection to obtaining any information possible in regard to this important matter. I think members are aware of the fact that the Government have adopted every reasonable precaution with a view to securing as immigrants only those who are fitted for agricultural life. In regard to the

hon. member's references to its not being desirable to import girls who are prepared to go into domestic service I hardly agree with him.

Mr. Taylor: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: The experience I have gained is that if any girl is prepared to work she can get at least £1 a week in any respectable family. There is a great dearth of domestic servants at the present time. A most careful scrutiny is being exercised in the old country. The Agent General and Mr. Ranford have had explicit instructions in that regard, and the member for East Fremantle who, I thought, would have spoken after the member for Subiaco, in a recent interview gave a free and unbiassed opinion on the method of selection which is being adopted in the old country. Praise coming from such a quarter is valuable indeed and carries a considerable amount of weight, inasmuch as we recognise that it certainly would not be unduly biased in favour of the Government policy on immigration. That hon. member in the course of his interview said—

"I went into the matter thoroughly, and I am quite convinced from my own observations that everything possible is being done by the Agent General's office to secure fit and proper immigrants for this State. As evidencing the care which is exercised in the selection of immigrants for this State, I might mention that last year over 12,000 applications for assisted passages were received, and of these Mr. Dolley, after personal interviews with 1,600 applicants, selected about 1,060. That indicates, to my mind, that great discrimination is being exercised at the London office. In regard to applications received from the country, where it is impracticable to interview the applicants personally, references have to be furnished indicating that they have been engaged in farm work."

In connection with the discussion that recently took place at the Premiers' Conference on the question of immigrants, one of the conditions I made to the State's joining in a united scheme with the Federal authorities was, that the State

should have the last say in regard to the selection of immigrants, because we realise that, while in some of the manufacturing States, such as Victoria, artisans may be able to obtain employment, in the present condition of Western Australia we have really no room for any immigrant from the old country other than a man prepared to select land, or to utilise his labour in connection with agricultural employment.

Mr. Underwood: You have no land to select.

Mr. Swan: It is a pity the Government did not realise that earlier.

The PREMIER: I do not know that there have been many mistakes. The other day I had a conversation with Mr. Gooch of Gingin, an old colonist, who has employed four immigrants who recently arrived, and he told me that he was completely satisfied with the men and was only sorry that he could not obtain more of the same stamp.

Mr. Bath: What is he paying them?

Mr. Taylor: I suppose they are colonial experience men.

The PREMIER: They would not stay very long with Mr. Gooch unless they could give some evidence that they had a practical knowledge of what was required. But I just mention what Mr. Gooch told me as evidence that the men being imported were suitable. The member for East Fremantle, in his interview, also said:—

“Misrepresentation to immigrants with the object of enticing them to settle in Western Australia does not emanate from the Agent General’s office. Of that I am convinced. I have perused correspondence received from applicants, and have seen the copies of letters sent to them in reply by Mr. Dolley. In those replies it has been clearly emphasised that the only persons acceptable in Western Australia are those who are prepared to go on the land and put up with a certain amount of hardship for the first few years after their arrival. There could be no mistake with regard to the general tenor of those letters, and as a result many people who have desired to come out

have realised that they would be unsuitable, and have stayed at home. The strict supervision of the Agent General’s office minimises the possibility of imposition, and the result is that we secure a better class of immigrant than other States. During the time I was at Home, however, I neither saw misleading advertisements nor heard of misrepresentations being made. The immigrants for Western Australia by the ‘Orsova’ are a fine class of people.”

That gentleman had an opportunity of making an independent inquiry into the matter and that is the result of his investigations.

Member: The committee can call him to give evidence and can cross-examine him.

The PREMIER: The hon. member would make a most excellent member of the committee, or, if not a member of the committee, would be a most valuable witness. I do not intend to detain members, except to say that the Government have no desire to hide anything so far as their immigration policy is concerned. If, in the wisdom of the House, it is thought advisable that such a select committee should be appointed the Government will not raise any objection, and will, at the same time, be prepared to place before the committee every information possible in regard to their policy of immigration; while, if any suggestions can be made which on investigation are found to be valuable the Government will have no hesitation in adopting them.

Mr. HEITMANN (Cue): I certainly think a select committee should be appointed to inquire into the methods of the Government in their immigration proposals, because I am of the opinion that the class of people coming here at the present time, those assisted by the money of the people of the State, are altogether unsuitable. I have met men in the back country districts—I met a friend of the late Minister for Works recently on the railway construction works from Mount Magnet to Black Range. This was an individual who was sent up by the late Minister for Works with a letter to the engineer or someone in charge of the con-

struction work, saying that he must be placed on the works even to the extent, so it was understood by the engineer in charge, of having someone else discharged if that were necessary. That was one of the immigrants, one of the settlers.

The Honorary Minister: Did you say that I sent an assisted immigrant knowing he was an immigrant.

Mr. HEITMANN: I say you sent this individual to the engineer in charge of the construction on the Mount Magnet-Black Range railway.

The Honorary Minister: Knowing he was an immigrant?

Mr. HEITMANN: He was an assisted immigrant. I do not know whether you knew it or did not, but you had no right to send him to the engineer. I believe that the father of this immigrant when out here for nine months was sent up to the North-West as a protector of aborigines. I have met two men on the Nallan wood line, some of these farmers who come out here. We know that at present we have hundreds in the State looking for work, and I suppose thousands of pounds were spent by the Charities Department last year in fares to send the unemployed to different parts of the country looking for work. Viewing it from the Lands Department standpoint, it seems to be the object of the Minister for Lands to place people on the land, particularly immigrants; and we find that different treatment is meted out to the immigrants from that meted out to Australians. Under the present system of settlement of land the department are prepared to treat one who has come from beyond the seas better than an Australian.

The Minister for Lands: That is not so.

Mr. HEITMANN: It is so, and I defy the Minister to deny it.

Mr. Angwin: Read a letter I got the other day.

Mr. HEITMANN: Certain concessions are granted to immigrants which are not given to Australians. If we want to settle our lands there is plenty of chance to do so, and by a better class of man than we are likely ever to get from the old country. As I have said before, if the

Minister for Lands would agree to set aside some 50,000 or 60,000 acres of land, I could settle it for him in a very short time.

Mr. Taylor: Yes; you would settle it.

Mr. HEITMANN: Members know well what I mean. There are very many persons anxious to get on the land, but they are unable to obtain suitable selections. Only this week I met in the street a man from Day Dawn who can place his hands on about £1,500, and wants to take up land. He told me he could get plenty of land 50 miles from a railway, but that was no good to him. Yet we find the civil servants and immigrants having the pick of the land. It is useless for the Minister for Lands to say he cannot get people here to settle on the land, for if he would give the opportunity there are thousands in Western Australia who would be only too glad to become settlers.

The Minister for Lands: I am giving the opportunity.

Mr. HEITMANN: I know of three men who are now prepared to go on the land and are only too anxious to become settlers, provided they can get selections within a reasonable distance of a railway.

The Honorary Minister: What do you call a reasonable distance?

Mr. HEITMANN: Anything up to 20 miles, and then, of course, it should be decent land.

The Minister for Lands: Come along and you can get it.

Mr. HEITMANN: I have been along too often, and have been sent out 40 miles from a railway. The only hope offered such settlers is that if a certain number of them go on the land in that locality, they may expect to have a railway in the future. Notwithstanding the difficulty there is to obtain suitable land near a railway, along the Great Southern there are miles of land fenced, but improved in no other way. I am against the present method of inducing immigrants to come here. It is not fair to take the money from the working people of this country to help to increase the number of unemployed, as we are doing at the present time. The Minister must know that to foster an immigration scheme

of this kind cannot be doing any great amount of good. If one could be satisfied that the immigrants would go on the land, and were suitable for that work, well and good; but I guarantee that not 20 per cent. of the men who come here go on the land. In speaking on this question previously I referred to one batch of 50 immigrants, of whom only one contended that he had any experience of land settlement, and it appeared that his experience had been merely the purchasing of products of the land. In that batch of immigrants there were blacksmiths, watchmakers, pawnbrokers' clerks, and others of that kind, and it was suggested that they would make good settlers on the land. One man arrived with but £2 10s. in his pocket, and the others to whom I have referred before arrived with practically nothing, and one of them was sent up to the Black Range railway.

The Honorary Minister: That is not correct. The father of that man had held land in this State for some time.

Mr. HEITMANN: He had been in the country for 12 months, so I am informed.

The Honorary Minister: He had been holding land north of Perth.

Mr. HEITMANN: Anyhow, I am informed that the engineer of the line was forced to give him work. The man was tried on several jobs and did not succeed and, as a matter of fact, he was not good enough to carry sweat away from a decent navy. They tried him at muck work and in a clearing gang, and he finished up at Black Range as the only man of the gang who was arrested for being drunk. This is one of the immigrants, and it is suggested that these men are all carefully selected before they leave England. It is a well-known fact that many immigrants who have been selected for their so-called farming experience, have received all their agricultural knowledge in the streets of London. I am opposed absolutely to the money of the country being spent to assist immigrants here to swell the already heavy ranks of the unemployed.

Mr. JOHNSON (Guildford): I wish to utter but a few words in supporting the motion. As will be seen by the Notice

Paper, there is a motion in a similar direction to the present one which I tabled. I find, however, that the motion of the member for Subiaco practically covers what I desire to investigate and, therefore, I support his motion willingly.

The Minister for Mines: Do you think one committee will do for both motions?

Mr. JOHNSON: Yes. I do not intend to proceed with mine. I am one of those members who have constantly made complaints about the present immigration system, and the unsatisfactory state of the policy of the Government. I have said that immigrants induced to come here are not a credit to the country they come from, and are of no value to Western Australia. Many of the immigrants who come out should never have been selected to come to the State. The Premier says that since Mr. Ranford went to England a great deal more care is exercised, and the Government would like us to believe that none are selected except those who are well qualified to become agriculturists, and men who have had agricultural experience. I will give members one case that came before my notice a week ago, and I will get this statement sworn to and have it placed before the committee, if one is appointed. The man was an iron-turner in a large foundry in England. He had been in the foundry for 10 or 12 years, and was one of the leading hands. He was in receipt of a wage of either £2 2s. 6d. or £2 5s. per week. Mr. Ranford went to the town where this man was employed, and painted a very glowing picture of the possibilities of Western Australia for an immigrant. The man went to Mr. Ranford and asked him particularly whether he could get work in Western Australia if he came out here, and was assured by the Government officer that there was no possibility of doubt on that question, and that all the would-be immigrant had to do was to come out here, and success must follow his efforts. That man had a wife and family. He sold his home in order to get sufficient money to bring him out here, and to leave enough to keep his wife and family in England until he got thoroughly settled.

Mr. Angwin: Did he pay his own fare?

Mr. JOHNSON: I think he was assisted. Anyhow he had to sell his home to get capital to come out, and support his wife and family for a time. He came out and found that he could not get work at his trade. He is not in a position to take up land; he is stranded, and he came to me to see if I could show him a means of getting assistance to tide over his immediate difficulties, and to help him to get back again to England, so that he might return to the foundry he was encouraged to leave by the lecturer we pay.

Mr. Foulkes: Did he call at the Agent General's office before coming out?

Mr. JOHNSON: He had a discussion with Mr. Ranford. It is not in the power of that official to make complete arrangements, for would-be immigrants are referred to the Agent General, who makes the final arrangements; consequently he would go to the Agent General's office in the ordinary routine.

Mr. Angwin: Not if he were not assisted.

Mr. JOHNSON: I do not care if he were assisted or paid his own fare. He was strongly induced to come out here where there is no room for him as a mechanic. This case can be applied to a large number of others, where mechanics come out here and try to compete in a market already overstocked. I want to see a committee of inquiry appointed to settle, once and for all, whether Western Australia can afford to continue the immigration policy of the present Administration.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): I am pleased to think the member for Subiaco, while not believing we are getting the very best results from the money expended in connection with the immigration system, thinks that with a good system it is a wise thing to do all we can to continue to draw as many people to this State as possible. In a work of this sort, there is not the slightest doubt that on occasions we may have persons selected who are not the very best for the purpose for which they are needed. It is only natural that if we introduce a large number of immigrants, there will be included among them

certain worthless persons. Mistakes must occur in the selection of the class of men sent out here. It is quite possible that in connection with the case just mentioned by the member for Guildford, Mr. Ranford may not have recommended that man to come here as a tradesman; but, in reply to his question as to the possibilities of a future in Western Australia, might have referred to the general resources and prosperity of this State.

Mr. Johnson: What?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I am sorry the hon. member does not agree with me.

Mr. Johnson: I agree as to the resources but not as to the prosperity.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If Mr. Ranford believed that the man was a good worker, had plenty of grit, and would be a useful settler in the State, then he was quite right in telling that man that Western Australia was one of the best places in Australia to come to. I do not agree with the remarks of the member for Subiaco as to servant girls. There is room here for a large number of young girls, and I hope we shall have a continuation of that policy. So far as the attitude of the Government is concerned, the instructions given to the Agent General time after time have been that in connection with the immigration policy, the Government desire he should only send out people desirous of settling on the land, either as farmers or farm labourers. There may be instances where artisans come here, but that is not, and never has been, and I hope never will be adopted as a general practice but only taken in very special circumstances. That should be the desire of any Government that might be in power. We want farmers and farm labourers, and we have given instructions to the Agent General to that effect. Complaints have been made, and questions have been asked in the House recently, with regard to the employment of immigrants in the Government workshops. This is shown also by the motion now under discussion, and that of the member for Guildford. The latter, however, I understand will not be

proceeded with, as the adoption of the present motion will carry out all he desires. It has been stated, however, that the Government had given instructions, or that it was assumed the Government had given instructions, to those in charge of the Government workshops at Midland Junction that employment should be given to immigrants. When that question was asked here I felt somewhat surprised on having to announce to members that out of the 239 men who had been recently employed, 16 were recent arrivals from Great Britain. I wrote to the department with regard to this, pointing out that it had been said the Government had given instructions for these new arrivals to receive employment, and added that if there had been any desire on the part of any of the officers to give these men employment, they must desist from it in the future. As a result of my queries and communication I received a lengthy report from Mr. Evans, the works manager at Midland Junction, giving the full facts in connection with the employment of certain immigrants. I want to make this report public, for it should be distinctly understood that so far as the Government are concerned they had not the slightest knowledge that in connection with the employment of additional workmen at the shops those persons had been taken on.

(Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.)

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Before the tea adjournment I was referring to a report I obtained from the works manager of the Midland Junction Workshops with regard to complaints made to the effect that the Government had instructed, or at least had tacitly agreed to the appointment of men to the workshops who had recently come from the old country and who had come as assisted immigrants to the State. Having had a question to answer in the House I showed that there had been a certain number of these men recently engaged, and I demanded a report from the department in connection with their appointments. I have the report here, and I would like to

read it to the House. The works manager says he regrets that the Minister should take the view he does on this question, and then goes on to say:—

"Let me state at once that I have received no instructions or intimation of any kind that immigrants should be given preference or employment, or that they should not be employed. Those who have been engaged either had some special qualification or experience which it was desirable to secure, or a question of urgency. This demonstrates itself from the fact that out of 239 employees put on, only 16 of them were more or less recent arrivals from Great Britain. Only one of these was assisted to come here and work on the land. He is a married man, and has his wife and one child with him. He endeavoured to secure work on arrival through the Labour Bureau and failed. He then went to Narrogin, and failed. He returned to Perth Labour Bureau, and not being successful there he applied here. On this day I received instructions to repair a number of old ballast hoppers for P.W.D. stores manager; this was urgent boilermaker's work, and I could not undertake it with my own staff. I therefore put this man on with others as he was a good hammer man. I was not, however, aware that he was an assisted immigrant.

a pattern-maker, and , a fitter, were started as being the most suitable tradesmen offering. I was not aware that they were immigrants. They now tell me they were nominated by a friend, Mr. Chamberlain of Greenbushes and came out to assist him on his land. When they arrived here he had left the district and gone to the Murchison, and in consequence they were stranded and had to seek work. , a fitter, was started also being the best offering, and, further, as he served his time in Sheerness Dock Yard, he was on that account specially desirable. He was nominated by a Mr. Martin of Greenbushes, and on arrival here was unable to find suitable land, and states he was advised by the Under Secretary for Lands to apply here for work. ,

a lifter, was employed on account of his experience of this work on the London and South-Western Railway, England. I required men of his qualification, none being available here, and it would take three or more years to train one. He was nominated by his brother of Claremont, but was not spoken to about going on the land by anyone—(see his signed statement). The other men were not assisted or nominated. They were only given preference here as being the best and most suitable offering. They have all been engaged expressly to deal with the new and additional work in hand, and not on account of our ordinary maintenance. As you are aware, I have recently taken in hand the following new works:—

10 "ACL" cars at £1,600—£16,000.

50 "D" vans—£10,500.

250 "Ge" wagons—£32,092 14s. 2d.; ironwork for 250 "Ge" wagons to be built by Westralia Ironworks—£6,300.

5 class "O" engines to reconstruct—£13,085.

13 new boilers for locos.—£13,550.

Extra repairs on account of next harvest traffic—£14,000.

All but the last item of this work has been taken under the ordinary conditions of a contractor, and if I am to be debarred from taking on the best labour offering, the cost of the work will certainly be increased. I do not want new chums or strangers about me at any time in preference to men who have proved their qualifications, and I am only too anxious to give suitable or retrenched or local men the first opportunity, and there is plenty of evidence in all directions that this is my regular policy. We advertised for tradesmen, both fitters, turners, and boilermakers, and I have not nearly obtained the number required. Many have been here who are obviously unsuitable—some have been started and proved themselves unsuitable, and we are fortunate that these men were available when we badly required them. Until this question was raised it had never occurred to me to ask tradesmen

applying here for work if they were assisted immigrants. First, because the class of men we employ do not usually travel about under false pretences, and secondly that they would almost to a man resent such a question being put to them. I am decidedly of opinion that the men do not think that the Government has given instructions that preference should be shown for immigrants from the fact that I have asked the secretaries of the two largest unions here, viz., Fitter Barker of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, and Boilermaker Brain of the Boilermakers' Society, to find me suitable men. They have tried and both have failed to get the requisite number. The statement is, I believe, founded on the remarks of some disappointed applicant. I do not know what the men think of course, and am therefore not in a position to refute the statement, but at the same time I do not believe it, but I can assert that the men here know and can see that quite the contrary is the case."

I wanted to read that statement because this motion and the one which follows it on the Notice Paper might lead to the belief that some effort had been made on the part of the Government to introduce immigrants to the State for the purpose of interfering with the local labour market. I can assure hon. members that no such thing is the case. Instructions have been given to the Agent General to secure farmers and farmers' assistants, and in no case have we ever had any desire to induce artisans to come to the State. This report will show that while in one instance there has been an assisted immigrant engaged, and in four other cases nominated immigrants have also received employment, these are the only five persons out of the 239 new appointments made at the workshops. Members will also recognise that every effort was made by the workshops manager through the local unions to get suitable persons to carry on the new work he has in hand. At the present time there is more new work being carried out at the Midland workshops than has ever been the case in the history of those workshops. We

have had a large amount of work which has required the engagement of specialists such as boilermakers and fitters and the works manager has not been able to get the number of men which he required. This report which I have just read was written on the 9th of last month. At the time the manager wrote it, and for some time before, he found it exceedingly difficult to get a sufficient number of men to carry out special work in the way of construction. So far as the Government are concerned with reference to the appointment of a select committee, I can assure the House, that in regard to the workshops, we will court the very fullest investigation. The department assure me that they have never had any desire whatever to appoint strangers to positions in the workshops. At the same time there is no room there for a man who will not work or for the waster, and men who think they are going to get employment there merely because they are local residents are much mistaken. The officers engaged in the workshops recognise that they have to carry out the work entrusted to them as well as it is done outside, and therefore, we must give them the fullest latitude, and the manager of the workshops has the fullest latitude in connection with the engagement of the best class of workmen that he can obtain. We welcome any inquiry into the class of men selected, and so far as the appointment of the committee is concerned, we will welcome the fullest investigation into the workshops.

Mr. GILL (Balkatta): Like the member for Pilbara I have not a great amount of faith in the utility of select committees, still I think the select committee under discussion may answer a good purpose, in fact, I believe it will answer a good purpose in showing that the Government in the past have been spending money in a manner which has not been to the best interests of the people of the State. I believe the select committee will be able to show that we have brought immigrants to the State and spent money in connection with them that could have been put to better use than by bringing people here to displace workers already

in the State. I believe the committee will have that effect. I believe also, in fact I feel confident about it, that the committee will be able to get sufficient evidence to prove the statements made in regard to preference having been given to new arrivals in the State.

Mr. Angwin: We were all new arrivals at one time.

Mr. GILL: I do not object to new arrivals getting employment in this State, but I do object to preference being given to them. The Minister has just read a statement with regard to the workshops. I made a statement some time ago with reference to the men there and the works manager took exception to it. I said that while a great number of workers had some few months previously been thrown out of employment because of retrenchment and absence of work, they were given to understand then that they would have the first opportunity of re-employment. While this promise was made, when work became available they were not re-employed, but preference was given to strangers, and I make that statement again knowing it to be true.

The Minister for Mines: If you have the opportunity of proving it that will be much better.

Mr. GILL: The only matter worth noticing in the report read by the Minister is that dealing with fitters and boilermakers. With regard to the latter it is absolutely correct; there were not any of these men available when they were wanted, but with regard to the fitters the statement is quite incorrect. Fitters were available; they went there to secure employment in response to an advertisement which appeared in the *West Australian*, and they were told that they were not wanted, and that the advertisement was published simply to see whether there were any fitters in the State.

The Minister for Mines: The advertisement was for fitters' labourers, not fitters.

Mr. GILL: I know the circumstances well. I sent some men myself: I advised them to go from the Labour Bureau, and I know what I am talking about. A statement also appeared in the *West Aus-*

italian in connection with the same thing; I could have produced it, but I forgot the date. A complaint was made at the time, and a reply was sent to the paper by the Minister or the workshops manager to the effect that they merely published the advertisement to see whether there were any fitters in the State who might be available.

The Minister for Mines: You misread the statement.

Mr. GILL: Fitters' labourers were available, and always have been available; but, generally speaking, the complaint that has been made in regard to employment has not been in connection with fitters' or boilermakers' labourers but labourers generally. I know of several instances of labourers who applied for work in the Midland Junction workshops but who were refused, while a day or so afterwards others were taken on who had just arrived in the State. And that not only applies to the Midland Junction workshops, but to the railways generally, I know of a case in the goods sheds, that of a checker who had been on the door for a number of years and who was placed on the wheel-barrow and reduced by 6d. a day; while a new arrival who had been but three days in the State was put in his place.

The Minister for Mines: Can you give me his name?

Mr. GILL: I have not got his name just now, but I can give it to you tomorrow. I know of another case, that of a man in the Perth goods office, where they retrenched a number just recently; this was an unfortunate who had returned, a cripple, from South Africa. Gibney, who had just arrived in the State, was put in his place, collecting freights and fares with regard to certain goods. These are the things I complain about; and knowing as I do—and the Minister also knows it—that the labour market has been over-stocked for some time I think our money could very well have been put to some better use than it has been. Although the select committee, if appointed, may well make a report which, if carried into operation would be in the best interests of the State, the

trouble is, will the Ministry adopt it? I know that last year the House reduced the vote as a protest against the introduction of immigrants while there were so many unemployed in the State. And what has been the effect of that? If I am correctly informed the effect, instead of curtailing the immigration vote, has simply blocked the bringing into this State of families from the Eastern States, families whose husbands and fathers are already in this State and who desire to bring them over here. I am informed that that is what has happened as the result of our reducing this vote. It did not prevent the introduction of immigrants from other lands, but simply the introduction of relatives of our own people from the Eastern States.

Mr. Bath: That is a pretty bad policy.

Mr. GILL: If this be the policy that the Government are going to adopt in regard to instructions from the House I have not a very sanguine faith as to what will happen as the result of the report of this committee. There are many matters I could touch upon in respect to the question of immigration; however, there will be further opportunities for so doing. I hope the select committee will go particularly into the question of giving preference to immigrants, and I feel confident that they will be able to bring forward evidence to show that there has been a considerable amount of preference given to new arrivals.

The HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. J. Price): Like other members of the House I think it most undesirable that at this juncture immigrants other than agriculturists should be assisted to come to the State. Referring to the interview which the member for East Fremantle recently gave to the Press, in which it was shown that while visiting the London office he discovered that of 1,200 applications for assisted passages to this State only some 1,060 had been accepted—

Mr. Angwin: I did not say that.

The HONORARY MINISTER: At any rate that is how my memory serves me.

Mr. Angwin: I said 1,060 out of 1,600.

Mr. Collier: That statement appeared in the Press, but it was a mistake and the hon. member wrote and corrected it.

The HONORARY MINISTER: At all events the hon. member seemed to be perfectly satisfied that a reasonable and careful scrutiny was being exercised in London in so far as concerned the qualifications of these immigrants. Out of 1,000 assisted to this State, is it not reasonable to expect that there would be some who, by misrepresentation, had been accepted as suitable to follow agricultural avocations whatever checks are instituted in London? The question is, are we, because some few undesirables are liable to secure assistance, to drop all action in regard to immigrants? I venture to think no one in this House would advocate such a course.

Mr. Heitmann: I would, I would stop these assisted passages altogether.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I venture to think that while immigrants are assisted to come here, whoever has the control of affairs, some, by misrepresentation, will escape the scrutiny in London and be landed in this State. The only alternative to running that risk is to stop the system of assisted passages altogether. I for one do not believe that that would be a wise policy at all. We know that in this State, with its immense area and tremendous possibilities, we have untold scope for a great number of people—a far greater number than we have at the present time. And, without going into the domain of Federal politics, I think every man who is in favour of the White Australia policy will agree that the only possible chance we have of keeping the State white is by the introduction of a large white population. The real question is, are the Government making every effort at Home to secure that only immigrants suitable for agricultural avocations shall come out here? I venture to think that is the case. The hon. member for East Fremantle is a perfectly impartial judge in this matter; at all events he is not in any way biased in favour of the Government.

Mr. Collier: You did not always think so well of him.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have never doubted the hon. member's good faith at any time. Nor can any man find an instance where I have taken that course. If the hon. member, who has been in London recently—if he is able to endorse the Government's methods, then I do not think there can be much wrong with them.

[Speech unfinished.]

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt, but under Standing Order 214, unless a motion be moved it is necessary that the Orders of the Day should be proceeded with.

The Minister for Works: We have made arrangements with the Leader of the Opposition to go on with the Orders of the Day. We had better let this debate drop for the present. However, we might give the hon. member an opportunity of finishing his speech another time.

Debate interrupted by Standing Order 214.

BILL—LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. DRAPER (West Perth): I did not intend to address the House upon this measure; but since the adjournment, or since the motion for the second reading I have had an opportunity of speaking with those who are promoting the Bill. It has been stated to the House that this measure is founded upon the New South Wales Act; that, however, is not quite correct. The portion of it, and it is the material portion of the Bill, which relates to the admission of managing clerks is founded upon the practice which prevails in New South Wales and upon the rules of their Supreme Court relating to the admission of practitioners. This Bill, however, goes somewhat further than the New South Wales rules and contains what I consider are objectionable clauses, objectionable because they relate to the admission of individual persons, rather than of any general class, who may be quali-

fied as managing clerks. Now, the second clause of the Bill is the one which contains the real object of the Bill; and with reference to that, I do not think much exception can be taken to it; because the principle of admitting genuine managing clerks who have served some portion of their lives in acquiring a practical knowledge of the legal profession has been recognised, not only in New South Wales but also to a more limited extent in the old country. The New South Wales practice, however, requires that managing clerks should pass other examinations than those mentioned in the Bill introduced by the Leader of the Opposition. But those provisions after all are not, I think, of very much importance, because the final examination which it is proposed to ask managing clerks to pass is really a very ample test of their legal knowledge. Clause 3 of this Bill has no general application, but it has, I am informed, a somewhat peculiar history. I am told that it was not in the original Bill introduced some two years ago, but that it was inserted by a member of another place at the instigation possibly of one of his constituents who desired to be admitted to the ranks of the legal profession. The gentleman whom it was then sought to have admitted to the legal profession has left the State and there is really no reason whatever why this clause should be embodied in the Bill. I think it should be sufficient reason to reject any clause in the Bill that was especially put in in order to admit some particular individual, and not of general application. Now this clause dealt not so much with the admission of managing clerks, but with the admission of clerks, and a clerk in a legal office does not of necessity have anything whatever to do with an efficient knowledge of law. A man could be described as a clerk in a lawyer's office if his duties consisted simply of posting the letters and stamping them.

Mr. HEITMANN: Or making out accounts for 6s. 8d.

Mr. DRAPER: Also, as the hon. member suggests, of rendering accounts charging 6s. 8d., and otherwise. Now a know-

ledge of accounts may be of extreme use and is no doubt very useful to members of the legal profession; but I hardly think that the hon. member who interjected would suggest seriously that that knowledge is useful to the public; and it is after all, the knowledge that is useful to the public we have to consider in this particular case. There is another reason why a man who is occupying the position of clerk as distinct from that of managing clerk should not be admitted. Unless managing clerks or members of the legal profession have to act more or less on their own responsibility, they cannot really acquire any knowledge which can be regarded as safe in the interests of the public. It is only that responsibility which really qualifies them for the exercise of their profession. The mere passing of examinations is really of little worth. The knowledge of law itself may be of value to the individual; but until he has associated with it a knowledge of the practice itself, I submit in the interests of the public a knowledge of that kind should not be considered to be a qualification for the legal profession. In addition to that we have also Clause 6 of the Bill, which I am informed was introduced into a measure two years ago in order that two gentlemen might be admitted as practitioners in this State. One of these gentlemen has left the State and is now in Queensland, and the other gentleman has, by reason of the interval that has elapsed since the last Bill was introduced, become eligible for qualification under another clause of the Bill. I mention this so that those who are interested in the Bill and interested in the profession may have an opportunity of considering any steps which I intend to take in Committee to reject certain of these clauses. If the Bill were confined solely to the object mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition when introducing the measure it would be open to little objection, and so long as the Bill is confined to that object, and to that object alone, and is not used as a measure to admit individuals rather than a class, I shall not oppose it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair; Mr. Bath in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Qualification of managing clerks for admission as practitioners:

Mr. DRAPER desired that a protest be recorded on this Bill. We had only heard one side of the case, while the Barristers' Board that dealt with the legal profession had had no opportunity of considering the measure.

Mr. Heitmann: They had all last year.

Mr. DRAPER: The Bill was only laid on the Table of the House at the last sitting.

Mr. Scaddan: What are you speaking on?

Mr. DRAPER: On the second clause.

Mr. Scaddan: On the second reading!

Mr. DRAPER: In the circumstances a measure which might seem unimportant to some members might be of great importance to others.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not debate the measure.

Mr. DRAPER: These reasons were advanced because he desired that progress should be reported.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member move that?

Mr. DRAPER: Yes.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	18
				—
Majority for	3

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Male
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Monger
Mr. Draper	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. George	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Price
Mr. Hayward	Mr. P. Wilson
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Layman	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Bath	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Boltou	Mr. Swan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Gill	Mr. Walker
Mr. Goutley	Mr. Ware
Mr. Holman	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Horan	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Hudson	(Teller).
Mr. McDowall	

Motion thus passed; progress reported.

RESOLUTION — PHARMACY AND POISONS LAW, TO COMPILE.

Message from the Legislative Council asking concurrence in the following resolution:—"That the Pharmacy and Poisons Act, 1894, and its amendments be compiled in accordance with the Statutes Compilation Act, 1905," now considered.

Mr. HUDSON (Dundas): I desire to move concurrence in a resolution which has been adopted in another place under the provisions of the Statutes Compilation Act. The idea is that an effort should be made in furtherance of the Statutes Compilation Act passed in the year 1905 for the consolidation of our Statute Law for the purpose of simplification. The Pharmacy and Poisons Act has been chosen by an hon. member of another Chamber as one in which it is desirous that compilation should take place because it is an Act which has several amendments of a complicated nature and somewhat difficult to understand not only by the legal practitioners but also by those laymen who have to administer the Act. The motion was made in another place at the request of the Pharmaceutical Society, and I think that in a general sense it should commend itself to the House. It is, I think, desirable that the whole of our Statute Law should be consolidated, and at an early date. We have now about 18 volumes which contain our Statute Law, and there are many difficulties and dangers besetting those who refer to them. The provisions of the Statutes Compilation Act provide that if a resolution is carried in both Houses of Parliament, it forms a direction to the Attorney General that, after the close of the

particular session in which the resolution is carried, he shall have the particular Act, with its amendments, compiled into one measure. The Act is then certified to by the Attorney General as containing the law as it exists, without alteration, but in one measure, and a certificate being attached to the new Act, the measure is then brought before the House. No danger can arise in this particular instance in passing the resolution. It merely has the effect of being a direction to the Attorney General to compile the Act from the three measures. I have, therefore, pleasure in moving—

That the House concur in the following resolution conveyed in Message No. 3 from the Legislative Council, "That the Pharmacy and Poisons Act, 1894, and its amendments, be compiled in accordance with the Statutes Compilation Act, 1905."

Mr. HEITMANN (Cue): I second the motion.

Question put and passed.

BILL—VACCINATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Mr. BOLTON (North Fremantle) in moving the second reading said: In once again moving the second reading of this Bill I appear in a happy position that few members have occupied in this House—happy from the fact that the arguments of both sides of what is admittedly a controversial subject, have been pretty well exhausted. I am not perhaps happy in having to introduce this measure session after session and Parliament after Parliament, but am again happy in the knowledge that the measure will be passed by a greater majority this session than in any previous Parliament. The first time I had the honour and pleasure of introducing the Bill to this Chamber was some years ago. There was considerable discussion and considerable delay, and a division was taken on the question on the second reading. Only eight members of this Chamber then voted against the question. I wonder am I too sanguine

in hoping that those of the eight members now remaining in Parliament have altered their minds, or at least know that the people desire the reform. Whatever may have been the arguments used before in this respect, they will not be used in the future. The measure was introduced by me again last session, but it will be remembered that the session was a very short one, and there was no time left to debate the Bill any further. No division was taken, although I believe a large majority of members were favourable to the reform. As on a former occasion, the measure that year became one of the slaughtered innocents. I do not think it is at all necessary for anyone to advance any medical testimony in favour of this reform, or even to advance from the other side medical testimony advocating the continuance of compulsory vaccination. Members will understand that I am now not advocating the abolition of vaccination but only the abolition of the compulsory clauses, believing that those who desire to have their children vaccinated should have the right to do so, but also believing, even more strongly, that those who object from conscientious reasons should have the right to refuse to take their children to be vaccinated. If a parent or guardian is prepared to sign a declaration that he has conscientious scruples against vaccination, then he should have the right to refuse to allow the child to be treated.

Mr. Underwood: Why sign a declaration?

Mr. BOLTON: I remember that when introducing this measure on the first occasion the suggestion was made by the member for Pilbara that we should repeal the Act, and have no declaration to sign. I have given some attention to this measure, and realise it is easily possible for a member having superficial knowledge to argue that the Act should be repealed; but this question of compulsory vaccination is mentioned in so many clauses in the Health Act, that it would not be an easy matter to repeal it altogether. There are certain necessary provisions in the Health Act, the existence of which would be essential in the case of an epidemic,

and, therefore, it would not be wise perhaps to repeal the Act.

Mr. Heitmann: You admit vaccination would be necessary in the case of an epidemic?

Mr. BOLTON: Again I am misunderstood by one with superficial knowledge. I believe in the right of those who approve of vaccination, whether in the event of an epidemic or not, being able to have their children vaccinated, but I ask that those who do not approve of it should not be under compulsion.

Mr. Scaddan: What about the protection for the man who believes in vaccination?

Mr. BOLTON: He can be protected by being vaccinated himself. A man who believes in vaccination is of opinion that he will be safe from incurring disease. If a man thinks vaccination will do him good and prevent him from getting, say, smallpox, by all means let him be vaccinated, but do not insist that the man who does not believe in it at all should be vaccinated. If the reform suggested is carried out the choice will lie with the man himself.

Mr. Hudson: Does it not lie with his parents?

Mr. Foulkes: What if he has no parents?

Mr. BOLTON: One becomes accustomed to a little levity, and candidly I prefer it to a too serious demeanour in members. I am hopeful that this Bill will go through within a very short time, and that another place will then have the opportunity of dealing with it. Western Australia is not the first place in which the reform has been mooted. In South Australia, New Zealand and, I think, New South Wales, the same reform exists. There is no such thing as compulsory vaccination in those States. I go further, and can extend my remarks even to the country in which I was born and which is always termed a conservative country, namely, England. There, where there are towns and slums thickly populated, where houses are built almost on top of one another, whose ports are open to vessels from all parts of the world, Parliament has accepted word for word the amendment which I seek to introduce by the

measure now before members. Surely if a place like England agrees that compulsory vaccination is unnecessary we, living as we do in what is known as a freer country, might well adopt it also. In the House of Commons on May 27th this amendment was passed, and those opposing it only numbered 14. Certainly there was not a full House, but on the division 122 members voted for the amendment and 14 against. The reform was supported by the Government, and I am pleased to say that most of the individual members of our Government supported this Bill when it was last introduced to the House. The same right to enforce vaccination in the case of an epidemic will apply here. The Vaccination Act deals with children up to the age of four months. There are people who would rather go to prison than have their children vaccinated, and the feeling is so strong with regard to it that local bodies in the metropolitan area have, in nearly every case, carried resolutions supporting this measure and have, in addition, without any pressure, signed a petition containing some 1,400 names. I do not desire now to present that petition, but will leave it for members to peruse. This shows that the question is not a fad of the member for North Fremantle, but is a reform greatly desired by the people. The present law will apply in the case of an epidemic, but the conscience clause will allow a parent or guardian to refuse to take a child to be vaccinated, without running the risk of incurring penalty thereby. What appears to make the present measure ridiculous is this. Last year, from June, 1908, to June, 1909, there were 7,750 births in the State, while there were only 616 children vaccinated. It seems to me a ridiculous law to stand on our statute book, and it is more ridiculous when one knows that there is only one compulsory officer for the whole State. That one gentleman is, I believe, in his opinion doing his duty. Probably at times he does more than his duty. Anyhow, he can only travel over a very small area, and there are places within a few miles of the City that have never been visited by him. Why should one suburb suffer as against another? Possibly the compulsion clause

is now being pushed with greater vigour than ever before because of the introduction of this measure. It is significant that invariably it is the poor people who are proceeded against. The head of the family is compelled to take a day off in order to defend the action brought against him in court. I have been brought into close contact with these cases, for on several occasions I have heard the trials, and I have seen many men who have had to take a day off to defend their case for, even supposing they had been forced to have their child vaccinated before the case was heard, they were summoned just the same. It means a considerable amount to the poor man, for although the fine may be only 2s. or 3s., he loses his day's pay and runs the risk of losing his job as well.

Member: How many of the elite have you seen prosecuted?

Mr. BOLTON: There are none. And I venture to say that many members, including myself, would find it a very inconvenient question to answer if they were asked whether they had their children vaccinated in compliance with the Act, when it is a well-known fact that they have not done so. I have been told on reliable authority that even the grandchild of the compulsory officer has not yet been vaccinated. This child is a year old, and the Act specifies that the vaccination shall take place before it is four months old. I daresay that those members who desire to speak on this Bill, with perhaps one exception, I refer to the hon. member for Murray whose views I do not know yet, have heard the arguments on both sides. I have not heard nor do I intend to weary hon. members by giving them medical opinions on this subject. I think it is wise not to do so.

Several interjections.

Mr. BOLTON: It is simply marvellous that the interjections are coming from those who have no interest in a Bill of this sort.

Mr. Collier: But they might have some day. All hope has not yet been lost.

Mr. BOLTON: It may be that some members will rise in their places and say that there has been no good reason for the introduction of this measure. This may be said by the member for Mount Mar-

garet. I do not often appeal to him, but I do hope he will not raise the stock argument that no good reasons have been advanced. I know he is opposed to the Bill and I honour him for his opposition. If it is genuine he has a right to it, but I want to make a special appeal to hon. members, and it is that this being the fourth occasion on which the Bill has been introduced into this House, the third time by myself, and having been fully discussed both by medical members who were in the Chamber on former occasions, I sincerely hope that the members present will take the present opportunity of discussing the measure, and not seek to adjourn it, thus putting it back for a week or a fortnight. I appeal to hon. members in all earnestness, if they desire to oppose the measure, to oppose it to-night. Let us settle the question to-night. I have no fear of the result, but I ask them not to resort to tactics which will have the effect of putting the Bill back for a fortnight or three weeks. I am hopeful, however, that hon. members will act generously in regard to the Bill. I shall have the opportunity of answering those who may raise objections, and I shall do so with the greatest of pleasure. It will be noticed that I have several volumes before me, none of which I have yet opened. If it will assist members I shall be glad to refer to them. I have much pleasure in moving—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle): I sincerely trust that hon. members will deal with the Bill this session. It is only trying to bring into force an Act of Parliament which exists at the present time in England, and, I believe, in some of the other States. It contains merely a conscientious clause which will not affect the hon. member for Mount Margaret who has interjected so much. There is not the least doubt that there is great opposition throughout the State to vaccination. We cannot get beyond the fact that a large number of people conscientiously object to it.

Mr. Horan: How many have been convicted?

Mr. ANGWIN: I cannot say, but I know some have been convicted, and I

know this, that those who have been convicted, some on more than one occasion, refused to comply with the provisions of the Act for conscientious reasons, and I certainly think that we should only follow the practice of other countries and pass such a Bill as this. There is another matter which I notice was referred to in one of the newspapers the other day, and of which the member for Ivanhoe has just reminded me. It is necessary that we should make an effort to get all the population we can into the State, especially in view of the financial agreement which was recently arrived at by the State Premiers with the Federal Government. I noticed in the newspaper that a man who was fined 1s. for refusing to have his child vaccinated said that he would send his wife and family out of the State because of the vaccination laws, and as under the agreement I have just referred to we are to receive 25s. per head of our population, it will be seen that the removal of a man with his wife and family from the State will mean a loss. I think that when people who have conscientious objections to having their children vaccinated prefer to leave the State rather than comply with an Act such as that at present in force, and which they believe to be an injustice, I think it is our duty to remove that injustice. I trust that hon. members will get the Bill sent quickly to another place so that it may speedily become law.

Mr. FOULKES (Claremont): There were two arguments used by the member for North Fremantle in introducing the Bill. One was that he had already submitted the measure to the House on three occasions and the other was that all the members of the Ministry had supported it.

Mr. Bolton: Oh, no! I did not say that.

Mr. FOULKES: That was the argument used.

Mr. Bolton: The member for Fremantle, who was Minister for Works, opposed it.

Mr. FOULKES: I regret to notice that he refrained from mentioning the fact that the member for Mount Margaret, who acted as Colonial Secretary for some time, had offered the Bill most strenuous opposition, and not only that, but that he had

repeated the reasons against the passage of the measure which had been advanced by the medical member of Parliament we had here, Dr. Hicks, who too was a strenuous opponent of the measure. I submit that no one in the House is really capable of passing an opinion with regard to the Bill; that is, an opinion that will carry weight with the majority of the people in the country. I am one of those who believe strongly in the necessity for every person being vaccinated, but still I do not shut my eyes to the fact that there are a large number of people who have strong conscientious views with regard to the necessity for vaccination. I want to call the attention of the member who moved the second reading of the Bill to the fact that I think he has made a mistake with regard to the law as it exists in the old country. I know there are a great number of people there who are strongly opposed to vaccination, and a Bill has been passed, unfortunately I have not got it here before me, which provided that where a person had a conscientious objection to vaccination, he could obtain relief from his anxieties of having those depending upon him vaccinated. I want to call attention to the second clause of the Bill which provides that any person who makes a declaration that he conscientiously believes that vaccination would be prejudicial to the health of a child shall be released from the liability of having that child vaccinated. In the old country, I am speaking from memory now, it is provided that any person who has a conscientious objection to vaccination can go before a magistrate and make a statutory declaration.

Mr. Bolton: That is an old law.

Mr. FOULKES: Yes, but it has been in existence for a number of years. I recognise that there are many people quite prepared to make a statutory declaration, in fact many will make a statutory declaration about any subject; they do not attach much importance to what they are doing in such circumstances. I would suggest to the hon. member who is in charge of the Bill that he should agree that such a statutory declaration should be made before a resident magistrate in the district.

Mr. Bolton: It is impossible.

Mr. FOULKES: Any way I would not allow a declaration to be made without a certain amount of care being taken to see that the people who made it did not do so merely to save their children from being vaccinated.

Mr. Bolton: It is not a lazy parent you are asking that for now.

Mr. FOULKES: There cannot be much objection in those places where the population is large and where there is generally a resident magistrate who may easily be got at. Take Perth, Fremantle, and Kalgoorlie, three large communities which make up half the population of this State; I do not think there would be any objection on the part of the people in those places to go before a resident magistrate.

Mr. Bolton: Take the way-back places.

Mr. FOULKES: Anyway I would recommend the hon. member to consider that aspect of the case, and I hope he will not press the Bill to the Committee stage this evening.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): I have been accused to-night of offering very strong opposition to this measure on a previous occasion. I did so, but not without having considered the value of the parent measure, that dealing with compulsory vaccination. I am in that happy position to-night that I can speak absolutely as an uninterested person, and in speaking I shall do so in the interests of the community as a whole and not for myself. We have been reminded by the member for Claremont that when this Bill was before the House, I think the last time or the time before, we had a medical man here representing Roebourne in the person of Dr. Hicks. That gentleman is a practical man with experience and training which no member in this House possesses, and he not only gave his own views in opposition to this measure, but he addressed himself to the subject at some length and brought forward the opinions of scientifically trained brains in connection with the matter. He pointed out clearly and distinctly, from the very inception of compulsory vaccination in the old country, how the death rate applied with reference to the vaccinated and unvaccinated when attacked with an epi-

demic of small-pox. Now, these figures alone should convince any lay minds that vaccination must be a safeguard against small-pox. So far as I have gone into the matter I have yet to learn that if you vaccinate a child you wholly immune it from small-pox—it only makes the attack on the vaccinated person less severe.

Mr. Bolton: That is very questionable.

Mr. TAYLOR: I will read the speech delivered by Dr. Hicks, or at least the portions of it pointing out—

Members: No, no!

Mr. TAYLOR: The hon. members who are in favour of this Bill fear arguments and fear proof against it.

Mr. Scaddan: What about the child?

Mr. TAYLOR: It is not a matter of the child, it is a matter of the State. The unvaccinated child, if it catches small-pox, is absolutely certain to get it in a more violent form, which of course means increased risk of contagion. Thus the unvaccinated are permitted to destroy the safeguard for the vaccinated person. For we know that vaccination does not prevent their catching of small-pox, but only enables them to resist attacks, while the possibility of cure is greater by. I cannot say how much without referring to the statistics.

Mr. Scaddan: You do not hear of grown-up people being vaccinated; but because the baby cannot object you wade into it.

Mr. TAYLOR: It has been proved beyond doubt that it is necessary that vaccination should be; and the hon. members who are in favour of doing away with vaccination would, I am perfectly satisfied, if an epidemic were to break out in this State to-morrow, be the first to rush off and get vaccinated.

Mr. Bolton: I would never be vaccinated.

Mr. TAYLOR: Well, it has always been my experience that the person who says he is capable of holding out is the first, as soon as he is squeezed, to give way.

Mr. Bolton: Well, why squeeze the child?

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not know what I may do when I get a bit of age on my side, but I am rather too young yet to go

round with a pram. But let that be as it may, this conscience clause is absolutely a farce. Vaccination is either good or no good, and those hon. members in this House who believe that vaccination is no safeguard and of no value ought not to be content with this half measure, this conscience clause. Under this conscience clause those who do not wish to have their children vaccinated will simply go and make a declaration in accordance with this measure, and they will be exempt from vaccinating their children; but that will be destroying the safeguard of those who are vaccinated. You might as well say that if people do not believe in keeping their sanitation in order they should not be compelled to do so. Fortunately, however, the people know that any neglect in this respect would endanger the health of the whole community, and consequently the sanitation officer goes his rounds and insists upon the service.

Mr. Bath: If you made them keep their places clean there would be no necessity for vaccinating children.

Mr. TAYLOR: Well then, perhaps, instead of considering this Bill, it would be better to leave the question until we have the Health Bill before us. We have people coming to our shores who are under no necessity to look to their sanitation in their own country, and these people bring disease here with them. Small-pox is a disease not peculiar to Australia; it is brought here and is a highly dangerous disease. I have discussed the question with many medical men and they have told me that they so far believe in vaccination that if they were about to leave Australia and go to other climes where small-pox is more generally in evidence they would be immediately vaccinated. (Interjection.) I do not know how they administer the law in Great Britain, but evidently it is being administered in this State with a rigour sufficient to raise the ire of some hon. members.

Mr. Heitmann: Are you vaccinated?

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not know whether vaccination would teach an hon. member the rudiments of decorum in this Chamber; if so, I would suggest that the hon.

member himself be vaccinated. Apart, however, from side issues, I have consistently opposed this measure on grounds which I have previously given to the House. Now I will give to the hon. member for North Fremantle a few of those grounds as related by Dr. Hicks to the House. The hon. member will see then if vaccination is of any value or not. We find that the number of cases of small-pox in Leicester was 320 out of 1,220 contacts. Of these 320 there were 78 vaccinated children under 10 years of age, of whom two contracted small-pox, but neither of whom died. Of the unvaccinated children of 10 years of age there were 283 contacts; of these there were 100 cases and 15 deaths. The incidence of the attack of small-pox on the vaccinated children under 10 years of age amounted to 2.5 per cent. with no deaths, whereas the incidence of the attack of small-pox on the unvaccinated children under 10 years of age was 35.3 per cent., and the death rate 5.3. The percentage of death rates compares favourably; but the comparison of 2.5 per cent. against 35.3 per cent. of attacks shows that vaccination is a very good protection.

Mr. Horan: The mortality arose from different causes.

Mr. TAYLOR: The member for Roebourne did not put that view forward, and I can only repeat what the hon. member said in the House. The member for Yilgarn can assume other things if he pleases, which I am not prepared to do. I can only give the facts which Dr. Hicks, as a medical man, gave the House. I am not, I may say, going to offer the resistance to this Bill which I have done on the last three occasions it has been before the Chamber. I was prepared to block the measure and was successful. The few members in this House who did oppose the measure were successful on three occasions, and I must take my share of the blame which the member for North Fremantle has placed on my shoulders to-night, for I opposed it strenuously: so much so that in common with other hon. members I am responsible for the killing of the measure, for the keeping of it down on the Notice Paper and not allowing it

to show its head. The utility of bringing the Bill forward, in the opinion of the Government was absolute nonsense, and the Bill never reached a prominent place on the Notice Paper.

Mr. Bolton: It passed the third reading, as you know.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not going to offer the same opposition now. If the House believe in a conscience clause they can have it, but I, for my part, do not believe in it. As far as I am concerned, I believe I have done my best to protect the people against this measure, and if it is the opinion of the majority of the House that a conscience clause should be in the Bill, I have said all that I intend to say on the matter.

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill): I have supported the Bill in the past and I intend to support it on this occasion. Not because I do not believe that vaccination is a somewhat clumsy and cumbersome expedient for minimising, to some extent, the effect that an epidemic might have in this or in any other community; but I support the Bill because I believe that in the past and at the present time a measure of vaccination has been and is only a scheme devised as a sort of insurance to obviate the necessity for property owners carrying out that regard to cleanliness which would make a Bill such as this utterly impossible in any civilised community. Small-pox is a disease bred in dirt and filth, in the Asiatic lazarets, and in the abodes of filth in Eastern communities: and it only gets a footing in any other community because the filth is there also, and the germs find the filth in which to germinate. If we kept our places clean; if we insisted that property owners should observe the laws of health, and carry out those laws and regulations which we prescribe from time to time; then small-pox, or any other epidemic would have no opportunity of breaking out in our midst. You have only to turn to the canal zone in Central America. For centuries the West Indies, the Northern part of South America, and Central America have been decimated by the curse of yellow fever. But when the United

States Government found it essential, if ever the canal was to be made a success, that they should have there a body of workmen to carry on the undertaking they were faced with the necessity, from a commercial point of view, of obviating the possibility of epidemics decimating the ranks of their workers. What did they do? They got their medical men, with the necessary scientific knowledge, and gave them absolutely a free hand; placed funds at their disposal, and said, "We want you to make this canal zone as healthy as it possibly can be made." These men had the money and the full power, and to-day, or during the past few years, there has not been one death from yellow fever in that canal zone, where in past years the disease carried off its thousands and, indeed, its tens of thousands. And it is time, if we desire to be regarded as a civilised community, that we should do away with this expedient, this insurance against the results of neglect, which the owners of property and vested interests impose upon us. It is time we got away from the expedient of poisoning the blood of young children, and set our minds to work to take the proper remedy, and that is to make our places clean, to enforce all the laws of cleanliness, and to make it impossible for this disease of dirt and filth to find a resting place in our midst. That is the reason why I support the Bill moved by the hon. member.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): I oppose this Bill because I am convinced that vaccination is a preventive to small-pox, though I would be perfectly satisfied if a majority of members passed it. Every time the Bill has been brought before the House we have been shown good reasons by the proposers for retaining the Act as it is. To-night the hon. member introducing the measure told us that he would not repeal the Act because there may be an epidemic, in which case he wants all the material for vaccination at hand.

Mr. Bolton: You are wrong there.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Well, we will have a look at *Hansard* to-morrow, but

at any rate I understood the hon. member to say that he would not repeal the Act because it might be useful in the case of an epidemic.

Mr. Bolton: I said that I would not prevent any person who believed in vaccination having his child vaccinated, and that at the time of an epidemic, as there might be some who believed in vaccination, they could be vaccinated; but that is very different.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: At any rate I have heard arguments used by other members that they would not repeal the Act because if there were an epidemic the provisions of the Act would be useful for keeping down small-pox. But the very Bill shows that those who propose this measure are not convinced of its utility. Otherwise they would not attempt to have a conscience clause. I have pointed out again and again that if vaccination is no good we ought to do away with it, but that if it is good then we should all be vaccinated; and I have pointed out again and again that the fact that a person has to go before a Judge or a magistrate or a justice of the peace claiming that he has conscientious objections, is foolish in the extreme and a proposal unworthy of Parliament. There is another point well worth consideration, and perhaps it would be well if the Ministry took a little interest in the question. The hon. member assures us that there were 7,750 children born last year, while only 616 were vaccinated. That means that something less than 10 per cent. of the children born were vaccinated. I have previously complained of the administration by the Government. It seems to me that almost everything they do is administered to the extent of 10 per cent. The Government pay about £200 a year to an officer whose duty it is to see that these children are vaccinated, but we find that only about eight per cent. or nine per cent. of them are vaccinated. Now I contend that it is the duty of the Government to sack that officer, or to see that he does his work. It is a ridiculous proposal to pay a man and allow him to carry on his affairs like that: and it is equally ridiculous for a member to come

before the House with a Bill to retain that officer, when it is proved by results that the officer is not worth a penny of the salary.

Mr. Angwin: The officer could not look after the whole State.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: At any rate he could look after Fremantle. There were more than 616 children born down there. I intend to vote against the Bill; but if the second reading be carried, in Committee I shall endeavour to strike out a considerable portion of the Bill.

Mr. Bolton: Yes; anything to kill it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I do not propose to do anything to kill the measure; but I do say that if we are going to have no penalties let us have no trouble whatever. I contend that if it is not necessary to have a child vaccinated it is not necessary to send a man to a magistrate to get a certificate; and I intend to move an amendment in Committee which will meet the objection of the hon. member for North Fremantle; that is, that the provisions shall simply be enforced in the case of an epidemic, and that we shall do away with the compulsory clause, or with the penalty for non-vaccination. If we obtain that we shall obtain as much as we possibly can. The member for North Fremantle said that we had heard arguments from both sides. Perhaps we have; I will not say anything about that; but there is one thing I want to say in regard to the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition. Those remarks to me were very cheerful, particularly when he was talking about those landlords. I am sorry I cannot altogether agree with the hon. member, because I would like to. It may be true that we would not require vaccination if we had cleanliness; but the fact is we have not cleanliness and we have to deal with things as they are. I would like to have a go at those landlords with an axe; but that is not legal; therefore seeing that we cannot get at the landlords we perhaps had better retain vaccination until we get more reason from the electors. If the second reading be carried I intend to move the amendments I have foreshadowed.

Mr. WALKER (Kanowna): I am not quite sure that I do not go a long way with the last speaker. I think if we believe a thing is an evil we should destroy it and not maintain it in any form. Undoubtedly we are in the position that we are expected to protect the public from contagion, or from any other insidious danger that might be communicated from one person to another. If it be necessary to protect our people by the introduction of the virus to prevent small-pox, by all means does it not become our duty to insist upon a law, which is protecting the people, being carried out; but the question for us to consider is: does vaccination prevent or mitigate small-pox? If we are positively convinced—I do not mean to say that if we are of opinion; but if we are absolutely sure, then we must insist on the law we have on the statute-book being complied with; but on the other hand, if we believe vaccination to be as great an evil as small-pox, then it is our duty to remove compulsory vaccination as a law from our statute-book; and I should go that distance. Unfortunately we cannot go that distance tonight because a Bill of that character is not before us. We are now asked to allow those who believe that vaccination is an undoubted danger to escape from being forced to submit to that danger. We have been told by the member for Claremont (Mr. Foulkes) that this is a question for medical men to deal with. The member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor) said the same. We were told that we were all laymen in the Chamber, and therefore it was a matter we should not pronounce an opinion on, but I submit that if we are laymen we have access to the opinions of medical men, I say it with all due respect, quite equal in capacity to give judgment as Dr. Hicks, a former member of the Chamber. And I propose to trouble the House with reading only a few brief extracts from those who are capable of speaking on the subject. Mr. Walter R. Hadwen, M.D., L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., L.S.A., gold medallist in medicine and surgery, says—

“As a medical man I assert that vaccination is an insult to common

sense, that it is superstitious in its origin, that it is unsatisfactory in theory and practice, and useless and dangerous in character. And furthermore, if you are going to commit such a very serious operation as this, namely, to take this filthy virus and inoculate it into the human being, then you must be prepared to give a guarantee that it will effect that which you profess it will effect, and that it will produce no injurious results. I defy any medical man in the United Kingdom to give a guarantee to that effect; and if no guarantee can be given, the Legislature has no right to enforce it.”

Mr. Collier: There are dozens of such opinions.

Mr. WALKER: There are. I want to read one or two only to show that it is not merely a layman's opinion, but that the highest authority can be cited against vaccination. Alfred Russell Wallace, a name honoured throughout the British Empire, a man not only eminent but pre-eminent in science, an author whose works are quoted by scientists of the highest standing, says—

“It cannot be proved that it ever saved a single life, but is probably the cause of greater mortality than small-pox itself.”

Now put that against the opinion of the member for Mt. Margaret. Nobody can gainsay the authority of Alfred Russell Wallace; but if I may depart from medical men and just cite one or two—say a couple—of those who stand high in public estimation for their common sense, for their keen judgment, and their high attainments, at least in general knowledge, let me take the late John Bright, M.P., a household name, a name that will ever be respected wherever the English language is spoken. John Bright says—

“I have always felt that the law which inflicts penalty after penalty on the parent who is unwilling to have his child vaccinated is monstrous and ought to be repealed.”

Now is there one member who will claim to stand above John Bright? And yet that is his opinion, that the law is monstrous and ought to be repealed. Then

take Sir Thomas Chambers, in the House of Commons debate on vaccination. He says, "You cannot show that vaccination ever saved a single life." When I am confronted with authorities like these I cannot help but feel that they are important to me as a guidance. Let us take another medical authority. Dr. Stramm, medical staff officer in the Prussian army, said—

"I myself have been vaccinated and twice successfully re-vaccinated and yet . . . I have been attacked with small-pox in the most violent confluent form."

This man is an eminent army doctor, and he gives the strongest possible testimony against vaccination.

The Minister for Mines: Do they not insist in Germany upon men in the army being vaccinated every two years?

Mr. WALKER: Because once superstition existed, is that an argument why one should never eradicate it? The Minister is a man of a considerable amount of reading, and has he not in the history of medical science, or the history of the development of civilisation, read of the old faith cures, the visits of the pilgrims of faith? Does he not know how century after century people believed in the efficacy of the bone of a dead martyr to cure all sorts of diseases? There are superstitions in every avenue of life; in every profession one finds these old fictions that come down from the old unholy past. It is the most difficult thing in the world to get rid of what has been taught us from our childhood upwards. We are told of Dr. Johnson himself, whose intellect was of the very highest type, a teacher of mankind from his day to the present, that he could not walk along a pathway where there were posts but he must touch every one he passed, and if he passed one without touching it, and discovered his error, he would walk back and touch it. There is no safeguard against superstition, and the hugest one that ever afflicted medical science is this of vaccination.

Mr. Male: Why have Japan adopted it?

Mr. WALKER: Japan is a baby in medical science, sitting at the feet of the Western world, and the Western world is not particular what kind of pills she mixes up for her new patient to take. When we consider the strength and the respectability of the agitation which has been going on for years in England, which has brought to its side the ablest and foremost thinkers, the most accomplished scientists, the most learned men in medical knowledge; when we consider the brave way in which the law which compels a parent to submit his child to the lance, impregnated with poison, has been resisted, surely we in this Chamber must hesitate before we pin our adherence to the old faith of Dr. Jenner. Medical science is still, I venture to think, only at the threshold of genuine knowledge. It is only since the days of Pasteur reform that we have gained knowledge of that medical science which departs altogether from the old fixed notions, and which is opening up all those possibilities that the discoveries in bacteriology have disclosed. It is recent, it is new, there has been a complete revolution in this science, just as great, in fact, as there has been in electricity or organic chemistry. Shall we go back to Jenner for our dogmas in medical science and stick to them? Yet this is what we are asked to do, to stick to that old science that has been completely revolutionised. Of course, those of the old school, the doctors of the old school, stick to it, but the new school, as I have shown, and could show by a thousand names, are constantly departing from it. The vaccine virus is a poison, and any one has the right to object to transplant such a mischievous poison compulsorily into the life of a child. It is not a layman who says that, but it is a doctor of eminent standing. "Nothing is clearer to anyone who will open his eyes than that what is now called vaccination has no effect in lessening small-pox, and has frequent and terrible effect in doing mischief." That is the opinion of Professor F. W. Newman. He is not a layman, but a man qualified to speak. I could cite names for an hour. There are parents in this State who

firmly believe that they run a risk, the possibilities of which they cannot foresee, in submitting their children to vaccination. I know families who have discovered it, have seen the ill effects of vaccination in their own children. There are those who, placing their faith in the law, have submitted their first child to vaccination. That child has grown up with consumption, or with some other disease, sometimes with foul diseases, too foul to be mentioned in a polite assembly, and the child has grown up with its sisters and brothers—those sisters and brothers in perfect health, robust and strong and healthy-minded—a dwarf, carrying disease along with it through every stage of its growth, and one goes to these parents and says, “submit every child you have to vaccination,” and this after the experience they have had of one child, and the evil effects which have resulted to it and would last its life through. The child can never escape from the disease vaccination has given, although it may escape from smallpox. There are those who have been sent to our asylums, and the cause can be traced back to some disease that has grown from the period of vaccination, and extended until it reached the brain and disorganised the tissues, and madness has resulted, and one asks the parents of that child to place implicit faith and blind confidence in the doctrine of vaccination. It is no matter for jest, for the health of the future depends upon this question. Where can one find generally a better class of children than we have in these Australian States and yet there is no part of the world where compulsory vaccination is administered where it is more laxly administered. It is laxly administered here, and we escape from the law when we can, for we love it not. Out of the 7,000 children born in one year only 600 were forced to be vaccinated. Is it not a farce that such a state of affairs should exist? Some say that we should force our single vaccination officer to compel the vaccination of every child in the State. The Government themselves admit that it is a farce to have

one officer for all the people of Western Australia. The officer must pop in first thing in the morning at Broome and after that drop in at Day Dawn swoop down on Kalgoorlie, then turr into Coolgardie, and finally end at North Fremantle. Surely as it is such a farce, let us admit it and put an end to this state of affairs. We object to being compelled to submit children to what may be a horrible death. Under the proposed Bill a person shall not be penalised for trying to protect his child from harm. I know mothers and fathers who would risk gaol again and again rather than submit their children to the danger and the ill effects of vaccination, which they have seen or experienced. Why should the law step in and force them to this martyrdom? Are we civilised? We cannot prove that vaccination suits us, we cannot prove that it prevents disease, nay, the whole theory of prevention is now given up even by the advocates of vaccination. Vaccination does not even mitigate the disease, and yet we sensible people with medical testimony of this kind before us, say we will put mothers and fathers in prison if they do not submit their innocent babes to inoculation by poison. It seems to me we are back in the old superstitious times, when people had to smelt bones and dirt in order to be cured of their diseases. We are in a superstitious age still, we are not using reason or even commonsense but are submitting blindly to a faith which has been again and again exploded. It is for us, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, to protect the future. This fell disease when it comes, whatever predisposing cause there may be, does not always come from dirt, for kings and queens have perished from it. We only need to remember the case of Louis XV. and our own Queen Anne. The disease touches the cleanest palace as well as the dirty cottage. What we do need is to study the laws of health which govern ourselves, and the laws of cleanliness which takes away the miasma and the filth of the atmosphere. We need care in that direction, and if we attempt to get that we shall have a

healthy population. There was not only smallpox in the olden days but many other diseases, such as the black death, plague, and, in fact, thousands of other epidemics that periodically swept over the pathways of commerce in days gone by. Medical science and progress and, above all, sanitary improvements, have mitigated the ferocity of these pests, and there is no fear of the ravages of this disease of smallpox as there was in days gone by. Whatever there may be in this respect, one thing is certain, that we are in duty bound in the face of testimony I have cited to-night, and could cite still further, if necessary, to give liberty to the conscience of parents and to give them immunity from persecution and imprisonment and fine if they refuse to risk the diseases that come from vaccination. I am pleased that the Bill is here. It is a step in the right direction, but it does not go as far as I would like. It goes far enough, however, to enable us to express an opinion to-night, and I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): I would like to say that personally I am in favour of the Bill. I think we should have some method by which parents who do not believe in vaccination should not be compelled to comply with the compulsory clauses of the parent Act. However, the question is one that needs a lot of consideration, more especially in regard to legislation of this description, and the possibility at any time of an epidemic occurring by which we might require to take stringent and drastic action. I would ask hon. members not to be led away by the admirable discourse we have just listened to, and believe that the medical men who have recommended vaccination have been induced to do so through medical superstition. The hon. member may be able to point out some half a dozen or a dozen medical men who do not believe in vaccination, but it is possible, on the other hand, to point to a far greater number of medical men high up in the medical world who have pronounced their faith in the

virtues of vaccination. More than that, although it is not possible to prove how many persons' lives have been saved by vaccination, statistics have shown that where there has been an epidemic of smallpox, those who have been previously vaccinated have been less liable to get the malady than those who were not vaccinated. The hon. member also drew a picture of the danger of a child having vaccine introduced into the system, but at the present day, with the methods adopted of using pure lymph, there is not that grave danger which existed many years ago.

Mr. Bolton: Have you read the report of the Royal Commission of the House of Commons?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, I have not. I do not want the Bill to go to the Committee stage to-night. I am quite prepared to vote for the second reading, and I want the member for North Fremantle to understand that I am going to vote with him, but I would like to get some medical opinions on the matter before we reach the Committee stage. I appeal to the hon. member to agree to the second reading to-night, and to the postponement of the Committee stage, so that we may have a short time in which to consult the medical faculty.

Mr. BOLTON (in reply): I am willing that the Committee stage should not be taken to-night, but not for the purpose of enabling the hon. Minister to consult the medical authorities.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Mr. HUDSON (Dundas) in moving the second reading said: I am pleased to have the opportunity so early this session of introducing a Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill. My desire in the Bill is to bring our legislation in this direction as much up-to-date as possible. I do not propose to deal at any length with the various amendments that are contained in the Bill before the Chamber, be-

cause the Bill itself was before the House during the whole of last session, and every member had the opportunity of digesting its contents and considering the propositions as they relate to the original measure, and I have no doubt that hon. members are as fully acquainted with the provisions as I am myself. However, I think there is necessity for the introduction of some such measure as this, because I believe that instead of being in the van of legislation of this description, we are hopelessly in the rear. The law of England at the present time is far more liberal than that which obtains in Western Australia, and I will point out during the course of my remarks that the amendments proposed obtain in England to-day, and have obtained there since 1906. I do not propose to make any further general observations, but to deal with the amendments as they appear in the Bill. The first two amendments are with relation to definitions. One is as to "injury" and the other as to the definition of "worker." The alteration with regard to the definition of "injury" is one of considerable importance, because it introduces specifically, the definition, or the inclusion of a disease, as being in the nature of an injury: that is to say, a disease contracted during the course of a worker's employment. This portion of the measure will come up for consideration in the latter part of the Bill, but the most important perhaps of all is the definition of "worker." Under our present Act compensation payable to workers is confined to those who are expressly mentioned in the Act itself. In this definition compensation is made payable to all employees except those who are expressly excluded. The difference is perhaps not at first fully realised, but I want to make it clear that it is the intention of this definition of a worker to make the provisions of this measure extend to all classes of employment, and that where the relationship of master and servant exist, that provision should be made for the payment of compensation to a person who is injured or disabled whether from accident or disease in the course of employment, or in the event of death, that the dependants of that person should be

provided for. This definition is taken almost word for word from the English Act, and the observations made in the House of Commons when that Bill was introduced there induced me to believe that it was satisfactory not only to the employer but to the employee, and, although it was suggested at the time that there might be a difficulty with regard to insurance, a difficulty in making not only for an increase in cost, but in ascertaining what really was the responsibility of the employer, and I think, from the reports I have read, that the experience gained in England in the working of their Act of 1906, justifies us, at any rate, in adopting their definition of a worker and extending the provisions of the Act as it is proposed to be done in this particular Bill. Bearing in mind the extent of the measure, I would like it to be understood that it is confined, at any rate, to cases where there is a contract of service or apprenticeship with an employer whether by way of manual labour, clerical work, or otherwise, so that the measure is confined to that extent that there must be a relationship between master and servant. As I suggested I propose to run through the Bill and the various amendments. Some of them are of minor importance and may not seem to fit in well with the arguments on the larger question, but as I have made the suggestion, I propose to follow it. The next alteration of consequence is also taken from the more liberal measure which obtains in England to-day, and that is the striking out of the clause relating to compensation, and inserting a new clause, the effect being that it would mean an alteration in this direction. At the present time no compensation is payable to a worker when the accident arises from the wilful misconduct of that employee in the course of his employment; that is to say, that a defence may be raised and may be proved by the employer that the accident or death of the worker was the result of his own serious and wilful misconduct, when no compensation is payable. The very use of the words "serious and wilful" misconduct has led to a great deal of irritation between the workers and their employers; it has led to a great deal of litigation

between them as to what was and what was not serious and wilful misconduct, and also to a great deal of hardship and practically to the abolition of the principles of the measure by the withholding from the widows and orphans of a deceased worker that compensation to which they would have been otherwise entitled. I only propose to go so far with this Bill as it has been taken in England, and not to trespass beyond that stage. The alteration to be made on the passing of this measure will be that there will still be the defence open to the employer that he is not liable to pay compensation if the worker has been guilty of serious and wilful misconduct, but that that defence will not be allowed to be raised in the event of death, or the serious permanent disablement of the worker. As I have shown, without giving instances, there is so much irritation and litigation in regard to the clause as it stands in our own Act that I think this will commend itself to the House. Because it could not, I think, be seriously urged that any man could be wilfully guilty of serious misconduct which would lead to his own death, or to his serious and permanent disablement.

The Attorney General: Does not that occur in mines occasionally, where miners smoke, and cause an explosion?

Mr. Heitmann: They are working under responsible officers.

Mr. HUDSON: There are the underground managers and the foremen and the bosses to see that this does not occur. Certainly sometimes instances of that class have occurred, but it is rarely that accidents have been caused by serious and wilful misconduct; and I do not know any cases where smoking has caused such dire results.

The Attorney General: I am referring to coal miners.

Mr. Bath: They are searched, and their pipes are taken away from them.

Mr. HUDSON: For my part, I am referring more particularly to gold mines. Of the next two alterations, the first is only technical, but the second relates to the question of costs in actions brought for the recovery of damages under the Employers' Liability Act, or at common

law. At present, in cases of accident, it is open to injured persons, or their dependants, to bring a case at common law where negligence will have to be proved; or under the Employers' Liability Act where, again, negligence has to be proved under slightly different conditions. And it is provided in our Act that if a worker be unsuccessful in his action in these regards he may still be entitled to compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act. But under our present Act, the Judge at a trial must and shall order that the costs occasioned by the other claims, in which the worker has been unsuccessful, should be deducted. Now the actions are all tried together, and Judges have from time to time expressed a wish on their own account that they should have a discretionary power and be able to say that the worker should not be responsible for such costs, or he should only, in certain instances, be responsible for a portion of them. The effect of the amendment as it appears in the Bill would give the Judge discretion instead of saying that he shall deduct all the costs previously incurred. The words are, "and may deduct therefrom," that is to say, the Court in its judgment could say what part of the costs should be paid by a worker under the proposed Act. Now I have mentioned the question of diseases, and it is proposed in this Bill to extend the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act to cases where the worker becomes disabled from a disease which he contracts in the course of his employment. These provisions also are taken from the English Act, and the principle is in application in other parts of the world. I do not propose to make any lengthy observations as to the danger or extent of these diseases, nor is it my intention to prove cases where disease occurs amongst the workers. But I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the provision here relates particularly to mining. The description of disease given in the schedule relates exclusively to mining. The terms have been obtained by me from Dr. Cleland lately a Government officer in the State. He gave me considerable assistance in

finding out what the diseases are to which the miners are subject ; and I believe I shall have the assistance of some hon. members in describing the diseases to which miners are liable, and the existence of these diseases among the community generally. There are safeguards in these clauses which operate against malingering, but I think these may be better dealt with in Committee than in a general speech on the second reading of the Bill. In the second last clause of the Bill there are several amendments made to what is described as the schedule in the original measure. The first is in regard to the time from which compensation is to date. Under our present law, there is no compensation payable to a worker for his injuries during the first 14 days after the accident, or after the damages have been incurred. In England that period was reduced to one week ; and in the course of argument there no logical reason could be suggested why there should be any limit at all. Because if the principle of the measure be good, then it ought to apply from the very time at which the accident occurs. That is to say, from the time when the worker was first unable to provide for himself and his family, when he was unable to earn any reward. And even under the Bill, he would only receive half-rate of wages, and that would be little enough. Under our present Act the 14 days' stipulation works considerable hardship, and the difference in cost to the employer in the matter of insurance would be very slight. It is proposed, therefore, to strike out the 14 days provision, and the result will be that the payment will date from the date of the accident. With regard to the weekly earnings, considerable difficulty has arisen in the determination of what, in applying the Act, are the weekly earnings of the worker. During last session we passed a short measure which extended the provisions of the Act to lumpers and workers in a similar capacity. There seems to me to be no reason why the same principle should not extend to all classes, inasmuch as very great hardship has occurred in this connection, and a great deal of expense and litigation has been involved. I might point out this

as an example : a man who is earning, say, £3 a week, might leave one employer, be out of work for a week, and go to work for another employer on the following Monday morning. He only works a couple of hours when he meets with an accident. Under these circumstances, he has only earned 3s. or 4s., and the result is, that according to the Act he is only entitled to compensation at the rate of 2s. or 3s. per week. That was held to be the case with regard to lumpers and other employees. We have remedied this, as far as lumpers are concerned, and I think we might well remedy it in regard to all. There is another clause which has been inserted for the purpose of removing an anomaly existing at present, and which I think ought to commend itself, not only to the worker but to the employer also. I refer to the case of a person who has been partially incapacitated by injury and who, thinking he is well again, attempts to resume work, but soon finds that he cannot do it. In some cases that has been taken as an indication that he is no longer entitled to compensation, because he has implied by his own act that he is in a fit state to go to work. It may be that he feels well enough to go to work, but that when he takes on his task he finds that after all he is not equal to it. It is provided here that when such a man attempts to work and finds he cannot work, he should not be deprived of his compensation.

The Premier : How long a period would you give him after the time that he considers he is fit ?

Mr. HUDSON : He should not be deprived, at any rate, of the continuance of his compensation pay. He should be entitled to be paid for the time he is incapacitated from work. It is a matter for medical examination ; it is a matter of proof entirely.

Mr. Draper : Section 5 of the old Act contradicts your schedule. : : :

Mr. HUDSON : Oh, no. : : :

Mr. Draper : You do not propose to amend Section 5 ?

Mr. HUDSON : Yes. I have struck it out altogether. I have dealt with it in that way. At any rate, the only other point in the Bill with which I wish to deal

now is in regard to the payment of a lump sum as compensation. In the schedule of the present Act the employer has the privilege of applying to the Court to have a lump sum fixed which he may pay into Court, or to the injured person, and so relieve himself of further responsibility. Under the clause I have inserted in the Bill, the same opportunity will be given to the employee after a certain period, of making a similar application to the Court to have a lump sum fixed which may be paid to him. There are some cases where there is serious permanent injury and where the man may have a family, where the half-wage would be of little service, whereas if the man were in a position to have a lump sum paid to him as compensation he might apply it to purchasing a small business, or to entering some walk of life by which he would earn a little better income than he would otherwise receive, and which would be permanent for him, and not ending at the fixed period on the expiration of the £300. There are many cases within my knowledge where men have been injured, particularly in mines, where operations have been necessary. In one case a man was getting only 30s. a week, just barely enough to keep him, so that he had nothing with which to pay the doctor; but if he had been under this provision he might have applied to the Court and got a lump sum fixed which would have been paid to him, and which he might have used perhaps to place himself in the position of being able to get a livelihood. I commend the provisions of this Bill to the House, and trust that the Government will give every opportunity for the full consideration of these proposals, and that the Bill will be passed through the House during the present session. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Attorney General, debate adjourned.

BILL—LICENSED SURVEYORS.

IN COMMITTEE.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2, 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Constitution of board :

Mr. BATH: The board was to be re-constituted and would consist of the Surveyor General and five other members. Would the Premier give the constitution of the board, and say whether it was intended to make any change in the near future?

The PREMIER: The board would be on the same lines as that which existed. The Surveyor General, by virtue of his position, was an ex officio member. Mr. Brockman, the Chief Inspecting Surveyor, and Mr. Hardy, a surveyor in private practice, were also members of the board. Off-hand he could not mention the others, but they were all surveyors with the exception of the Government Astronomer, who was also a member of the board.

Mr. BATH: There was necessity for a change in this method of constituting boards similar to this, where members of the profession were appointed as boards to determine whether candidates should be admitted to professions: because in doing so we were providing too favourable an opportunity for members of these boards to exercise a restrictive influence in the interests of those already engaged in their professions, and would probably give them the opportunity for imposing difficulties in the way of deserving candidates seeking admittance to the professions. In other directions the constitution of such authorities acted in a restrictive way, making the professions close professions. He had no practical suggestion to offer, but some other means should be adopted in this regard. Certainly the measure proposed that one certificate would cover work in the Lands Department, the transfer of land, and in the Mines Department. The Kalgoolie School of Mines acted as an examining authority; and in the absence of a university which might give diplomas, that institution could be well entrusted with the task of examining candidates and issuing certificates of competency, which would be better than having a board constituted of those already members of the profession, who were likely to look with jealous eyes on applicants seeking admission to the profession.

The PREMIER : The suggestion would only apply so far as the elementary subjects were concerned. The papers were set by the board, and there was the same examination throughout the various States. In addition to the necessary educational test, it was essential for candidates to have at least two years' practical experience in the field, so that while the Kalgoorlie School of Mines might be of value in enabling students to acquire an elementary knowledge of surveying, until the student had an opportunity of serving with a practical surveyor the educational part of his training could only be looked upon as elementary. It was usual with the Surveyors' Board, as with the Barristers' Board, and the Medical Board, to appoint members of the profession ; and when all was said and done, the board was simply an examining body to control examinations. It was provided in the suggested regulations covering examinations that any candidate securing 60 per cent. of the maximum marks should be entitled to be registered as a surveyor ; and that registration carried the title to practice under the Lands Act, the Transfer of Lands Act, and the Mining Act so far as surface surveys were concerned. In each other State the board was appointed the same way, except that in Queensland the chartered institute of surveyors nominated two members to the board. He had intended to include a similar provision in this Bill ; but as there was no institute in existence in the State, the clause he thought could very well stand as drafted, and in the event of an institute being established, a slight amendment might be made in the direction of adopting the Queensland system.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Secretary and other officers :

Mr. O'LOGHLEN : What fees would be paid to the board ?

The PREMIER : The total expenditure would be £50, including the salary to the secretary, Mr. Morris. The fee paid to members of the board was nominal, he thought not more than three guineas or four guineas a year.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Existing licensed surveyors may apply to be registered :

Mr. BATH : If the clause passed as printed, hardship would probably be inflicted. A surveyor might be in any part of the State, might be in Kimberley, or near the South Australian border, or might be pursuing his profession in one of the other States ; but if he did not apply within seven months from next January to be registered, under this measure he would be deprived of his license and prevented from following his profession. The Premier should look into this matter, and perhaps suggest some slight amendment which would be less drastic.

The PREMIER : The objection at present was that there were many names on the register of surveyors of men who were not in the State now, and there was no proof that they were even living in Australia, or that they were not dead. Possibly the period mentioned was rather short, and he would be prepared to accept an amendment to increase the time. It was certainly necessary that the registrar should be satisfied that those on the register as licensed surveyors were in Australia. The idea of the board was that by insisting on registration, and by making the necessary proviso that the notice be sent to the last known place of abode, no hardship would be incurred.

Mr. Walker : The measure is a new one, so the period might well be made 12 months.

The PREMIER : The suggestion met with his approval, and he was quite willing to make the period 12 months.

Mr. BATH : It would be better to provide that if instances arose where surveyors did not receive notice and were thus unable to apply in the necessary time, the board should be authorised to consider their case, so that they would not be deprived of registration. It was unnecessary for the Premier to draft the resolution now, but the question could be talked over, the old members of the board could be consulted, and later on the Bill might be recommitted and the amendment inserted.

The PREMIER: An amendment which would probably meet the wishes of members was that the period should be made 12 months, and that persons who could show due cause why they had been unable to comply with the notice should be entitled to be registered. Such an amendment could be drafted later on.

Clause passed.

Clauses 16 and 17—agreed to.

Clause 18—Plan and field notes to be approved by Surveyor General:

The PREMIER moved an amendment—
That in line 4 the words "to receive" be struck out.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 19—Surveyors to correct errors at their own expense:

The PREMIER moved an amendment—

That in line 8, of Subclause 2, the word "three" be struck out and "two" inserted in lieu.

The object of the subclause was to provide that surveyors should be compelled to correct errors at their own expense, provided the request was made within three years from the date of the lodgment of the plan. It was thought, however, that the period of three years was too great, so it was proposed to reduce the term to two years. It might happen that if the longer period were adopted it would cost a surveyor as much to make the corrections as the fee he received originally for making the plan.

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

Clause 20—Surveyor not to be interested:

Mr. ANGWIN: The clause made it unlawful for a licensed surveyor, either directly or indirectly, to acquire any interest in any land open for selection, if he had been or was concerned in the survey thereof. There had been cases in the past where surveyors, by making known to their friends the quality of the land that would be available at an early date, had made it almost impossible for other people to get a chance of acquiring the good lands, the friends of

the surveyor having been able to put in applications ahead of the general public. It had been said that some surveyors had made a practice of charging a percentage for giving such information. The public should be protected in a matter of that kind. A man had asked him a few days ago whether it was right that he should pay a commission to a certain surveyor for information as to land, and the informant stated that this had been done by someone else in the district.

The PREMIER: Was he a contract surveyor or a salaried officer?

Mr. ANGWIN: Apparently it was a contract surveyor. But whether it was a contract surveyor or a salaried officer it did not much matter. Some of these men had made a permanent addition to their income by giving special information to favoured persons as to certain blocks of land. The PREMIER should look into the matter with the view of stopping that sort of thing in the future.

The PREMIER: It was rather hard to deal with a question like that unless specific instances were enumerated. The clause was inserted to make a greater safeguard than existed previously. As a rule we were to be congratulated that so far as surveyors were concerned, there had never been instances, to his knowledge, of men having taken advantage of the knowledge they had gained as to the quality of the land, etcetera.

Mr. Angwin: I know of cases myself.

The PREMIER: It would be very difficult if a surveyor was asked by a man to put him on to good land in a certain district and he were not able to do so. It would be unwise to bar a surveyor from giving information of that kind. There were certain instances where people were sent to contract surveyors for this information. They camped with the surveyor, used his horses, and had the services probably of one of his men, and surely, in a case of that sort, it would not be fair that the surveyor should be put to the expense without being recuperated for it.

Mr. Angwin: What about the man waiting for that land to be thrown open?

The PREMIER : It was hard to follow the hon. member. So far as notifications of land being thrown open were concerned they were advertised in the *Government Gazette* a certain time before the land was thrown open for selection, so that everyone had an opportunity to apply. If more than one application were received for one block they were dealt with by the Simultaneous Applications Board. If the member could bring under his notice any instance where a surveyor had received fees for giving information which he should have reserved exclusively for the Department, the case would be thoroughly looked into.

Mr. UNDERWOOD : It certainly would be difficult to prevent surveyors from giving information, and it was doubtful whether it would be a wise course to stop them. All information with regard to State lands should be disseminated as freely as possible. The final two lines of the clause should be deleted. They set out that a surveyor could not become interested in the land unless he obtained the permission of the Governor to do so. The proviso with regard to permission should be deleted from the clause. In other Acts he had frequently objected to a similar proviso, and had said that too much power was given to the Ministers. It would be sufficient if the first portion of the clause were adopted.

The Premier : Then you would never allow a surveyor to acquire land.

Mr. UNDERWOOD : The surveyor would be able to take up land which had been surveyed by other men. The clause provided that the surveyor should not take up land he had surveyed himself, and the final words were "unless before acquiring such interest he obtains the permission of the Governor to do so." These concluding words might be taken out of the clause.

The PREMIER : In the hon. member's own district there was only one licensed surveyor north of Roebourne, Mr. Riches, who was the present Warden. If the hon. member's suggestion were adopted it would mean, so far as that officer was personally concerned, he would never be able to survey a pastoral lease or

take an interest in any land whatever, because of the fact that he was the only licensed surveyor in that district.

Mr. WALKER : For his own part he could not see the justice of the clause. Our land laws prevented the holding of land over a certain area in extent, and a surveyor was entitled to become a settler just as much as any other man in the country.

Mr. Angwin : They might dummy.

Mr. WALKER : The clause as it stood would prevent dummyming. From the sample of surveyors we had in the country, commencing from Sir John Forrest and going on to the present Premier, one could not but say that they were desirable citizens, and they should not be prevented from taking up land if they wanted to become settlers. Like everyone else they could only get a certain area from the Crown, and supposing they got that from their own survey, they could not get more. We were endeavouring to settle people on the land, so why should not a surveyor have as much chance as anyone else of taking up an area? There were regulations in existence preventing railway men from going on the land, and in his opinion that was unjust. A man because he was a civil servant was none the less a citizen. It would be an imputation against the honesty of surveyors to have a clause like the one under discussion in an Act of Parliament. It was a supposition that we could not trust a surveyor to go out without fear that he was going to rob the country. There were no glaring instances at any rate of any surveyor having abused the power or confidence placed in him. As far as he was concerned he approved of surveyors, if they did get hold of a good tract of country, letting the fact be known either to their friends or anyone, so that the country might be settled. If we were going to prevent a surveyor from speaking, why not prevent a neighbour or the man nearest the spot from speaking about the land also? We should give to all equal privileges and equal rights.

Mr. UNDERWOOD : As far as he could read the clause it would apply,

almost exclusively. to land which had been surveyed before selection. It said that a surveyor could not have an interest in any land which he had surveyed. That would not prevent Mr. Riches, for instance, taking up land which he had not surveyed. Pastoral country was only surveyed after it had been applied for, and sometimes a long time afterwards. If the clause meant anything it meant that a surveyor could not take up land on the survey of which he had been employed, and if a block of land was surveyed before selection he could not acquire an interest in it. The clause, therefore was worth retaining because a surveyor would undoubtedly have the opportunity which would be superior to that of anyone else in the State of selecting a block of land in a particular area. In surveying it he could survey a block just to suit himself. Surveyors, he admitted were a worthy body of men who were entitled to every privilege of citizenship.

Clause passed.

Clauses 21, 22, 23—agreed to.

Clause 24—Board may sue and be sued :

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It was his desire to get a little more information about this clause and the following clause. His desire was to know, if a surveyor who considered that he had been harshly treated by the board by having his name erased from the register, proceeded to litigation to recover his rights, what position would the board be in with regard to funds? Where were the funds to come from? He had listened to the remarks of the Minister when introducing the measure, but it had not been made clear what funds were likely to be possessed by the board and where they were to come from.

The PREMIER: The board would not have any funds. The fees for registration would be paid into the Consolidated Revenue, and in the event of an action the Government would consider whether they would be justified in asking the assistance of the Crown Law Authorities to defend or prosecute as the case might be.

Clause passed.

Clauses 25 to 30—agreed to.

First Schedule:—

The PREMIER moved an amendment that in the third column, after "17," the words, "and in Section 166 the words 'and the survey shall be performed in all other respects as therein directed, and the map shall be declared to be accurate by a statutory declaration, in the form of Schedule 27 of this Act, of a licensed surveyor.' be inserted.

Schedule 27."

The amendment would provide for the declaration the Leader of the Opposition referred to the other night.

Amendment passed: the schedule as amended agreed to.

Second and third Schedules—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 9th September, 1909.

	PAGE
Papers presented	252
Questions: Furniture for Government Institutions	252
Abattoirs at Kalgoorlie	252
State Batteries, Erection	252
Miners' Phthisis at Day Dawn	252
Goat Straying Nuisance	252
Companies Act Administration	252
Mining Development, Expenditure	252
Return: Machinery Permits	253
Bills: Mines Regulation Act Amendment, 1R.	253
Mining Development Act Amendment, 1R.	253
Licensed Surveyors, Recommittal	253
Sea Carriage of Goods, Com.	253
Abattoirs, 2R.	255
Opium Smoking Prohibition, 2R.	260
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage, 2R.	262
Vaccination Act Amendment, Com.	268
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, 2R., Com.	268
Redemption of Annuities, 2R.	268
Public Education Endowment, 2R.	269
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, Com.	270
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 2R.	275
postponed	275
Motion: Immigration system, to inquire	275

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