

and two boards to grant certificates of service, and would compel men to have engine-drivers' certificates before taking charge of an oil engine, gas engine, or anything of that sort where there was no danger to the life of men working.

THE MINISTER was willing to have progress reported. This Bill was arranged to deal with those engaged on machinery driven by steam.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Deputy Governor received and read, assenting to Supply Bill (No. 2), also Day Dawn Rates Validation Bill.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at six minutes to 11 o'clock, until the next afternoon.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 5th October, 1904.

	PAGE
Petitions presented	597
Private Bills: Kalgoorlie Tramways Racecourse Extension, report of select committee	597
Kalgoorlie and Boulder Racing Clubs, first reading, select committee	597
Question: Railway Construction, Magnet to Lawlers	597
Returns and Papers ordered (formal)	597
Collic-Cardiff Townsite (remarks)	598
Motions: State Governor, Chief Justice to perform duties	598
Hospital Nurses and Probationers	610
Empress of Coolgardie G.M. Lease, inquiry ordered	623
Payment of Members, to increase	623
Bill: Inspection of Machinery, in Committee resumed, progress	623

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 3.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PETITIONS PRESENTED (2).

By MR. J. M. HOPKINS, to introduce the Kalgoorlie and Boulder Racing Clubs Bill; leave given.

By MR. T. H. BATH, from residents of the Eastern and North-East Goldfields, praying that the present practice of the Arbitration Court, to sit in the nearest place to where a dispute has arisen, be continued in future. Petition read.

PRIVATE BILL REPORT, KALGOORLIE TRAMWAYS RACECOURSE EXTENSION.

MR. W. NELSON brought up the report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the Kalgoorlie Tramways Racecourse Extension Bill.

Report received, read, and ordered to be printed with evidence.

QUESTION—RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, MAGNET TO LAWLERS.

MR. RASON, for Mr. Carson, asked the Premier: 1, Is the Government making inquiries as to the necessity and justification for the construction of a railway from Magnet to Lawlers? 2, Should such investigation justify the construction of the railway, will the Government place this work in the forefront of their public works policy?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, The attention of the Government has been drawn to this matter by the representatives of the electoral districts concerned. 2, The project will be dealt with on its merits.

PRIVATE BILL—FIRST READING.

Kalgoorlie and Boulder Racing Clubs Bill, introduced by Mr. J. M. HOPKINS.

Read a first time, and referred to a select committee comprising Mr. Bath, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Nanson, Mr. Nelson, also Mr. Hopkins as mover; to report this day week.

RETURNS AND PAPERS ORDERED.

CONTINGENT ACCOUNTS, SOUTH AFRICA.

On motion by MR. THOMAS, ordered: That all papers in connection with the claim from the War Office in reference to the South African Contingent accounts be laid on the table.

CATTLE IMPORTED, DUTY.

On motion by MR. HENSHAW, ordered: That there be laid on the table all papers in connection with the non-payment of duty on importations of cattle across the

Northern boundary from South Australia by Messrs. Forrest, Emanuel, & Co., concerning which matter a select committee of this House reported on the 6th September, 1902.

TIMBER LEASES RESUMED.

On motion by Mr. F. F. WILSON, ordered: That there be laid on the table a return showing:—1, Total area held under timber lease on 1st January, 1904. 2, Amount of such land resumed by the Government during the following half-year. 3, Lessees, if any, affected, and the acreage of each resumption. 4, Number, acreage, and position of the areas, if any, reserved from sale after resumption. 5, Total acreage under timber lease on 30th June, 1904.

PAPERS—COLLIE-CARDIFF TOWNSITE.

MR. HENSHAW (Collie) moved: That all papers in connection with the proposed townsite at Collie-Cardiff be laid on the table of the House.

MR. BOLTON seconded the motion.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. R. Hastie): Though not opposing the motion, he desired to take the opportunity of pointing out to members desiring the production of papers, especially those not familiar with departmental matters, that it would be well, as far as possible, to first see the Minister who had the papers required under his charge. If members did so, in almost every case the Minister would be glad to show them the papers, which would prevent a large number of papers from being absent from departments and from lying on the table of the House for months, very often at great inconvenience to the business of the departments.

MR. A. E. THOMAS (Dundas): Most members giving notice of motion that papers should lie on the table of the House did so because they desired later on to take some action in regard to the matters concerned. The objection raised by the Minister had been raised previously, but he (Mr. Thomas) did not wish to go to the Minister's office and peruse the papers quietly. If he thought there was anything in the papers of public interest they should be laid on the table, so that the public, whose property they really were, could peruse them. In the future he intended, in any matter of

public interest, to adopt the course moving that the papers be laid on the table so that the public could see through them. He objected to going to the Minister's office and perusing papers secretly. He preferred to peruse them publicly.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—STATE GOVERNOR, CHIEF JUSTICE TO PERFORM DUTIES.

MR. W. NELSON (Hannans): I move that the Governor be permitted to amend a motion on the Notice Paper standing in my name by substituting the following words after "opinion":—

That at the termination of His Excellency the Governor's term of office, the Colonial Office should be petitioned to reconsider the appointments of State Governors, with a view to permitting the duties of the office to be performed by the Chief Justice of the State.

MR. RASON: This is not the motion appearing on the Notice Paper. The hon. member must give notice of the motion.

THE SPEAKER: The question is whether leave be given to the hon. member to amend his motion.

MR. RASON: May I ask what motion it is before the House that is sought to be amended?

MR. NELSON: The motion before the House which I desire to amend is—

That in consequence of the need of adjusting the legislative machinery of the State in harmony with the new conditions introduced by the establishment of the Commonwealth, and in order to effect necessary economies, this House is of opinion that the office of State Governor should be abolished and its duties performed by the Chief Justice of the State.

MR. RASON: Is this the motion you are moving?

MR. NELSON: I desire to move the motion with the amendment I have suggested.

THE SPEAKER: If there is any objection on the part of the House to allowing this motion to be amended, the proper course for the hon. member will be to allow his motion to lapse, and give notice again. Failing that, his motion can be amended during the debate.

MR. NELSON: Very well. I shall move the motion as it stands on the Notice Paper, and I shall accept any amendment that may be subsequently

submitted to the House. I need not say that I do not move the motion which has just been read, with a view to casting, directly or indirectly, any reflection on the most estimable English gentleman who, at the present moment, represents the Monarch in this State. On the contrary, I desire to pay my tribute of respect to His Excellency, and to express the opinion that he performs his duties, such as they are, with an ability, dignity, and sometimes I suspect with a certain sense of humour, that do him infinite honour. It may be quite true, as some people allege, that his Excellency does not really do anything; but to that it may be replied that he does it most excellently, most gracefully, and well. In fact, I venture to say that many members of this House would earn the gratitude of the State if they would confine themselves to duties of a similar nature. By doing nothing, and above all by saying nothing, they would render the land of their birth or their adoption the greatest service they are capable of rendering. Before proceeding to deal with the subject in a general way, I should like members to bear in mind during the course of the debate three very elementary facts. First, that originally the sole power of and responsibility for governing each British colony rested on the shoulders of the Governor; and second, that in proportion as self-government in those colonies has been developed and completed, in like proportion has the power of the Governor been diminished, until it is almost entirely of an ornamental character. And finally I should like members to bear in mind that the Governor represents the Crown nominally only; because he is practically the appointee of the Colonial Office, and holds his appointment just as any other person holds an appointment of that nature. I intend, for the sake of clearness of presentment, to divide my speech into two parts. Firstly, I shall try to reply to some of the arguments continually advanced in favour of the present method of appointing a Governor; and secondly, I shall try to advance some arguments in favour of the change of method which I have indicated in my motion. First of all, we are constantly told that the fact of the Governor's being appointed by the Colonial Office, and the fact of his selec-

tion from a certain class living in England, remove him from the political partisanship which would be likely to characterise any local appointment to the post. In reply to that, I say that if it were a good argument against the local appointment of Governors, it would be equally good against the local appointment of, say, our Judges. I venture to say that our Judges must be as free from all political bias as our Governors; and so far as I am aware, the Judges have never in that respect been impeached by anyone.

MR. MORAN: Governors have political duties, and Judges have not.

MR. NELSON: In the true sense of the word, the Governor has no political duties. He is not permitted to have even political opinions; and when occasionally he is sufficiently indiscreet to reveal the awful fact that he has political convictions, he generally gets into trouble. As a man, the Governor may have political convictions; but as a Governor he has no right to political convictions at all, and is for the time being but the symbol of the Crown in this State.

MR. MORAN: In changes of Government, he must exercise his discretion in the choice of his Ministers.

MR. NELSON: He may indeed exercise his discretion in regard to the many matters brought before him; but he exercises that discretion not as a politician but as an executive officer representing the Crown. And I am amazed to find that the hon. member, who knows so many things, is so deplorably ignorant of this interesting subject. It is most remarkable in connection with our Judges, that whenever a man is elevated to that high position, he seems almost instinctively to abandon entirely his former political fervour. For example, since our ex-Prime Minister, Sir Edmund Barton, was elevated to the bench of the High Court, it is really marvellous to note to what an enormous extent he seems to have sunk out of political life in the Commonwealth, and to have become entirely Judge. The same may be said of Sir Samuel Griffith. And if we have men who can be taken, as it were, red-hot out of the political arena and placed on the bench, and if they, recognising the grave responsibilities of

their higher position, entirely dis sever themselves from political connections and perform their functions in a manner which places them practically beyond impeachment, then I say that the same will hold good of locally-appointed Governors; and therefore that argument sometimes advanced in defence of the imported article falls completely to the ground.

MEMBER: You are not a freetrader in that respect.

MR. NELSON: I do not know that I am a freetrader in any respect. My friend should not make rash assumptions. Another contention is that the Governor who is imported, if I may use the word, is generally the possessor of a private fortune, and can entertain on a lavish scale. I was sorry to find, on reading up *Hansard* for the last few years, that one member of this House even went so far as to suggest that this was a very good reason for importing Governors. It is a reason which should not commend itself to an Australian with any true sense of patriotism. I am of opinion that if a lavish expenditure is necessary in connection with the office of Governor, then we should pay the money out of our own pockets, and should not be mean enough to get somebody else to do what we are too niggardly to do ourselves. In other words, a lavish expenditure in connection with Government House is either necessary or unnecessary. If it is necessary, we should defray it ourselves; and if unnecessary, then there is no reason why an imported Governor should be thrust on this State. Again, it is contended that the Governor represents the Crown, and ought therefore to be appointed by the Imperial Government. I wish to say again that I do not think the mere fact that the Governor represents the Crown is any reason why he should be appointed by the Imperial Parliament. I submit that the loyalty of a State Parliament is as far beyond reproach as is the loyalty of the Imperial Parliament itself. To cite our Judges once more, we must remember that they are appointed to represent the Crown. They have to administer the King's laws. And I hold that if we are good enough to appoint Judges to administer the King's laws, we are good enough to appoint Governors to represent the King's

person. In other words, I think the contention that the Imperial Government rather than the State Government should appoint the Governor will not bear examination.

MR. MORAN: Has it ever been held by any authority that the Imperial Government does appoint the Governor?

MR. NELSON: He is appointed by the Colonial Office.

MR. MORAN: He is appointed by the King and by nobody else.

MR. NELSON: Let me again correct the hon. member. The Governor is no more appointed by the King than a Judge is appointed by the King. In one sense it is quite true that the King does everything. They are the King's laws that we pass in this House. All the statutes are the King's statutes. The King, in short, does everything. Every appointment made by the Government is really made in the name of the King. But wise men know that this is only a manner of speech; that the powers we attribute to the King are the powers we ourselves exercise; and that all the dignity and all the power which he possesses would be nothing but for the great Empire which stands behind him, and imparts to him that power and that dignity. Accordingly, my friend's observations are, I think, slightly mistaken. Before I was interrupted I was trying to urge that we are just as capable of appointing a Governor as the Imperial Parliament. I was about to point out an analogous case in the United States of America, where a State Governor represents the Federal Government, just as the Governor of a Commonwealth State like this represents the Imperial Government. And if it is quite consistent with the loyalty of one of the United States of America to the central authority that such State should elect its own Governor, then I hold that there is no violation of loyalty, that there need be no inconsistency to the principle of loyalty even to the Empire itself, if we exercise the right of saying who, in our own particular constitution, shall for the time being represent the King or the Crown.

MR. MORAN: The Governor is the King's deputy. Why not elect the King if you can elect his deputy?

MR. NELSON: If my friend were as well versed as he ought to be in con-

stitutionalism, he would know that we elect even the King himself. He would know that the royal line which gives His Majesty a title to occupy the throne was created and confirmed by Parliament. Nay, not only so; but my friend is actually guilty of high treason, because if he reads carefully the Act of Parliament formulating the succession, he will find that not only has Parliament the right to define the royal line, but that any person disputing that right is guilty of high treason. I am sorry indeed to find that a friend whom I have learnt to esteem should be guilty of that enormity. We come to another reason. We are told that the Imperial Government should make the appointment because they have been in the habit of selecting men of certain titular distinctions to send to this State, and that we would only elect a plain Mr. John Smith or some one of that kind, while they send us titular dignitaries. I want to reply to that argument by saying that a reason of that kind is an insult to human intelligence. I believe with Robert Burns, the only real nobility is the nobility created by the Creator of the Universe himself. I believe Burns once said of one great nobleman whom he admired, "This man has a patent of nobility direct from Almighty God."

MR. MORAN : Who was Burns ?

MR. NELSON : I am sorry to find that my friend's knowledge of literature seems to be on a par with his knowledge of law. I come to another reason. It is sometimes said that the Governor, were he appointed by the State, would be a mere creature of the State. The idea is that he would lose dignity, and not have the power, at any rate not have the symbols of power which the appointed Governor possesses at the present time. I have already intimated in what I said in reply to the member for West Perth just now, and I should just like to say again that the King himself, according to the constitution, is just as much created by the Empire over which he presides as the Governor we might appoint would be created by the people of this State. The power exercised by the King, as I have already said, is a power which is conferred upon him by the people over whom he rules. We practically say to the King, "Your will shall be law," but we take all

sorts of good care that his will shall be our will as expressed in an Act of Parliament; therefore there will be absolutely nothing disloyal, and there is no suggestion of disloyalty, were the House to carry the motion standing in my name. Again, we are sometimes told that the abolition of the Governor would lower the status of the State. I should like to say, much as I am in favour of a better appointment, if I thought there would be any tendency in the direction of lowering the importance of the State with which I am connected, I would personally refrain from moving the motion. I am of opinion that we cannot overestimate the importance of the States on the Australian continent. I am of opinion that there has been of late a very great tendency, particularly during the great federal wave, to overestimate the power of the Federal Parliament, and to underestimate the power and dignity of such a State as we are now living in. I think it was Jefferson who once described the Federal Parliament of the United States of America as "our department for foreign affairs." He referred, of course, to the fact that in the United States of America the Federal Government is almost exclusively concerned with matters of external and defence character, whereas all the legislation which intimately affects the material and even the moral well-being of the people is carried on by the State Legislatures. We cannot very well say that our Federal Parliament is our department for foreign affairs, for the very simple reason that we have no foreign affairs. Our Federal Parliament, unfortunately, at the present time is wasting an enormous amount of energy on matters that really do not rise to the level of a Federal Parliament; and I want to say here that I am strongly of opinion that we cannot overestimate the importance of our State Parliaments and Legislatures; and any attempt I may make of reforming the State Legislature, or in the direction of reforming the method of appointing the Governor, is not meant with the idea that the dignity of the State shall be diminished, but is meant with the idea that the efficiency of the State Legislature shall be greater and its importance increased. I need not point out that in addition to other powers, had we the

power of appointing our own Governor, it would not diminish our influence and dignity, but tend to increase them. The chief reason I have for moving the motion that stands in my name is that the constitutional reason for the existence of a Governor since the inauguration of the Commonwealth has really fallen to the ground. In order that this may be clearly understood I will quote here from *Parliamentary Government in the Colonies*, by Mr. Todd, who as members know is a recognised authority. He quotes from Mr. Herman Merivale, who was one of the greatest under-secretaries England ever had, a man of undoubted capacity and a man who for a very long time was in the Colonial Office. Mr. Merivale very clearly sets forth the chief functions of a colonial governor, and it must be borne in mind that he was writing long prior to the federation of these States, but he tried to show the specific functions that a Governor is called upon to perform.

MR. MORAN: What is the date?

MR. NELSON: The date of the opinion I am quoting of Mr. Merivale's is 1861, and it strengthens my case to cite an opinion of this kind long prior to federation.

MR. RASON: And in regard to a Crown colony.

MR. NELSON: Not in regard to a Crown colony. I will quote the words and members will understand. He says:

He constitutes the only political link connecting the colony with the mother country.

MR. MORAN: He does not agree that a Governor is not a politician.

MR. NELSON: I said he had no party power. There is a difference between party politics and politics. We talk of political economy, but to be a political economist is not to be a politician. The quotation goes on to say:

So far as regards the internal administration of his government, he is merely a constitutional sovereign acting through his advisers; interfering with their policy or their patronage, if at all, only as a friend and impartial councillor. But whenever any question is agitated touching the interests of the mother country—such, for instance, as the imposition of customs duties, or the public defence—his functions as an independent officer are called at once into play. He must see that the mother country receives no detriment.

Here we have three important functions attributed to the Governor; firstly that he is the only connecting link between the State and the mother country; secondly that he is a representative of the mother country in the matter of customs, taking care that nothing is done detrimental to her interests; and thirdly that he is a representative of the mother country in the matter of defence. I say that since the inauguration of federation these functions can no longer be performed by a State Governor. He has no longer any connecting link because the Governor General is the connecting link; he can no longer interfere with the matter of customs because the question of customs has been reserved entirely for the Commonwealth Government; he cannot interfere with defence because defence in this country is now a federal matter; therefore we find all the reasons that were given for justifying the existence of a Governor can no longer be given, because these functions, formerly performed by him, are performed by the Governor General.

MR. MORAN: Why have a Governor at all?

MR. NELSON: Exactly. It undoubtedly proves, if carried to its logical conclusion, that there should be no Governor at all.

MEMBER: Why not move to that effect then?

MR. NELSON: I do not move to that effect because, having a little amount of wisdom, I make my efforts in the direction of the possible and not the impossible. I have to remember too that there are members in this House who do not agree with me in that regard, that there are men in this House who would not go the whole length.

MR. MORAN: Could we do without a Governor?

MR. NELSON: I think we could. I may tell members that in the history of England for a short period—it was an exceedingly brief period, I admit—during that brief period in the history of England that country did without a House of Lords, and got along without a King and even without a President.

MEMBER: A Protector.

MR. NELSON: Not even a Protector. The protectorate only took place after the downfall of the Commonwealth.

For some period in England, for about two years, there was only a single Chamber, and that Parliament elected an Executive Council, and that Executive Council did not have a permanent chairman, for a temporary chairman was elected, and he was responsible to the Executive Council and the Executive Council was responsible to Parliament, and Parliament was responsible to the people. Although that Commonwealth existed for only a brief period, still it existed at a period when England, as it were, made her greatest mark in the history of the world ; and it goes to prove that a Governor or even a Monarch is not an absolute necessity in a country, provided there is intelligence enough and ability enough amongst the great bulk of the population to support and abide by it.

MR. MORAN : There must be an executive head.

MR. NELSON : I admit there must be an executive head : no one with any sense will dispute that, but he need not be a Governor. Supposing we had no Governor here at all, the executive head might be the Prime Minister. There is no reason why he should not be.

MR. MORAN : He would always pick himself as Premier.

MR. NELSON : To all intents and purposes the Prime Minister is the executive head. He represents the Cabinet, the Cabinet represents Parliament so long as it retains the confidence of Parliament, Parliament represents the people, and so long as Parliament represents the people and has the people behind it Parliament can introduce measures which will receive support and become law.

MR. CONNOR : Where does "caucus" come in ?

MR. NELSON : If my friend reflects a little, he will find that both in its origin and present nature the Cabinet is only a more dignified kind of caucus. All I am sorry for is that at the present time I am only a member of the undignified cabinet. (General laughter.) There is another reason why I am in favour of the abolition of the Governor ; because I believe it is part of the necessary readjustments which ought to take place, and which were promised during the period we were advocating, on the public platforms and in the public Press, the federa-

tion of these colonies. I need not remind members that wherever we went federation was advocated, and I suppose the majority of us, even here, were in favour of it ; and it was everywhere understood that just in proportion as we delegated to the Federal Parliament certain governmental functions we would diminish the legislative and administrative machinery of the States, and also diminish the cost. That was clearly understood, and I believe that if men had gone on the public platforms and declared that they wanted extra governmental agencies, extra governmental expenditure, without any corresponding reduction in the States, that what they wanted was simply more government, not a readjustment of the governmental machinery, but more government, more legislators, and more expenditure in connection with legislation, then probably much as the federal spirit was in the hearts and minds of men at the time, the majority of people in the continent would have rejected federation. It was, I say, clearly understood that the cost of legislation and administration in the States would be diminished just in proportion as the expenditure and the functions carried on by the central Parliament increased. I may point out that poor Australia has really an enormous and fearful burden on her back in the matter of legislators and legislative machinery. (Laughter.) At any rate I am not a very heavy burden ; I take it that Australia could manage to bear me without feeling any difference. I find that at the present time we have no less than 14 legislative chambers in this continent, and that we have no less than seven governors, receiving in the aggregate upwards of £100,000 per annum. In fact, in proportion to population vice-royalty costs the people of Australia more than royalty costs the people of England. Then again, including the Federal Parliament, we have no less than 800 legislators. I have just been making a calculation, and I find that if England in proportion to her population had the same number of legislators as Australia possesses, the British Parliament would contain no less than 8,000 members. I also find on calculation that if Russia should adopt representative government and go in for legislators on the same scale

as Australia the Russian Parliament would contain no less than 25,000 legislators.

MR. A. J. WILSON: What has that to do with the Governor?

MR. NELSON: I do not know how many Governors there would be on the same scale. I had to stop the calculations somewhere, for the results were too fearful. These facts go to show very clearly, I think, that there ought to be some readjustment, and my own opinion is that readjustment should take two forms. First of all we should abolish the use of the Second Chamber, and secondly we should abolish at any rate the post of State Governor, and get the functions performed by the Chief Justice for the time being. I find I shall be able to command the support of a considerable number of members of this House. I find that the member for Greenough (Mr. J. L. Nanson) moved a motion on a somewhat similar topic, and in the course of that motion he expressed himself as follows:—

Looking at our Governors as they are chosen at present, they are chosen from a very limited class. They are chosen from a class which in the conventional English phrase is known as the "upper ten thousand." We have three or four men in the State admirably fitted to fill the position.

I am glad to find I will be able, I hope when the division takes place, to count on the vote of that hon. member. I would like to say that the Colonial Secretary (Hon. G. Taylor) also made a very admirable speech on that occasion. I will read it:—

I second the motion.

I think that was one of the most effective speeches the hon. member ever made. I find also that the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) made a speech in the course of which he said:—

We could promote our Chief Justice to hold the office of Administrator at a salary of £2,000 a year. We should save £5,000 a year on the transaction.

This justifies me in expecting his sympathy, his support, and his vote. It appears that the hon. member is a statesman and also an auctioneer, and that he could not deal with vice-royalty without insinuating that he would deal with it much in the same manner as he would deal with a corner allotment. (General

laughter.) We have other members who also supported the motion. The member for West Perth (Mr. C. J. Moran) made an exceedingly brief and pertinent contribution to the discussion. Referring to the member for Boulder he said:—

The hon. member for Boulder has struck the nail on the head. It is too costly a luxury, or a necessity if you like, at the present time.

So in spite of the natural tendencies of the member for West Perth in the direction of upholding the dignity of the position of Governor, still on grounds of economy, if on no other grounds, I can expect to get his support and his vote. Now I find that the member for Beverley (Mr. C. Harper) also made an exceedingly interesting contribution to the discussion. He said:—

I am not going to support either the proposal or the amendment.

That hon. member has on more than one occasion taken a similar attitude. I remember that once he declared he would knock one Government out, and immediately upon its going out also apply the same drastic measures to the one that came in. It reminded me of that somewhat remarkable lover of liberty who refrained from entering into holy orders in order that he might be free to enter into holy matrimony, and refrained from entering into holy matrimony in order that he might be free to enter into holy orders. His love of freedom was so great that he was neither, in order that he might have the freedom to be both. (General laughter.) The ex-member for Cue (Mr. F. Illingworth) also made a speech upon the subject, and I think he was almost the one person who defended the Governor. He said:—

In later years, Governors have been appointed from the titled class as a compliment to the colonies.

I may say that according to *Hansard* those words were received with laughter. I do not think it would be fair on my part to weary the House longer on this subject. I should just like to say, in conclusion, that I believe sooner or later this question will have to be grappled with in this House. My main contention, rather my main justification, for introducing this measure is that it is part and parcel of the compact under which we entered federation. I believe there will be absolutely no danger should

this motion be passed of our interfering in the slightest degree with the British Constitution; that marvellous system which, although it has many imperfections, still seems to contain within itself the power of remedying those imperfections; the marvellous system which for centuries has proved itself susceptible to infinite modifications in accordance with the ever-increasing demands and needs of civilisation. I do not believe that the abolition of the Governorship would affect in the slightest degree the loyalty of the people in this State to the great motherland from which we have sprung. That loyalty rests on foundations too massive and too deep to be affected by so insignificant a change. It rests on our common race, our common language, and our common literature.

MR. MORAN: America has the same.

MR. NELSON: It rests on our common literature, and above all I think on our common possession, after centuries of struggle, of a common liberty. I am of opinion that the nobler parts of the great British Constitution must endure. Barbaric survivals may be eliminated, but the nobler elements will still abide. We may in time cast aside the elements inconsistent with our civilisation. For example, the distinctions of rank, of wealth, and of birth may ultimately be swept aside. The lords, with all their privileges, may ultimately be destroyed, and even the monarchy itself may in the course of evolution pass away; but I believe that our heritage of a well-ordered liberty will abide for ever, the most precious possession of our race, and a beacon-light and an inspiration to all the nations of the earth.

MR. E. P. HENSHAW: I second the motion.

MR. E. NEEDHAM (Fremantle): I do not intend to unnecessarily prolong any discussion that may arise on this motion, but simply desire to move an amendment which I think will be acceptable to the member for Hannans. I entirely agree with the principles the hon. member has enunciated. I do believe that the time has arrived when we should abolish the office of State Governor; but I do not want it to be thought that on this occasion we are in any sense personal. The member for Hannans, with his usual impetuosity and impulsiveness, perhaps

did not give that consideration to the wording of the motion to which it was entitled; and although we ourselves have no intention of making the question a personal one, it might get abroad in other places that such was our intention. The amendment I move is that all the words after "opinion" in line 3 be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—

That at the termination of his Excellency the Governor's term of office, the Colonial Office should be petitioned to reconsider the appointment of State Governors with a view to permitting the duties of the office to be performed by the Chief Justice of the State.

While I have every respect, and I think that respect is endorsed by the members of the House, for the gentleman at present occupying the position of State Governor, I agree with the member for Hannans that we ought to immediately take steps to abolish the office. The question was discussed during last Parliament, and after the elaborate address just delivered I do not intend to occupy any more time except to formally move the amendment I have read.

MR. E. E. HEITMANN: I second the amendment.

MR. C. H. RASON (Guildford): I believe the member for Hannans accepts the amendment. I wish to say but very few words. I submit that if the procedure adopted in regard to this motion is to be continued, we shall develop into something very much the nature of a farce. The motion moved in such eloquent terms by the member for Hannans has been on the Notice Paper for some months past, yet the hon. member came down to the House to-day with a very different motion, which is really an abstract motion, and wished to move it in place of the one appearing on the Notice Paper for so long. He wished to do so to carry out the views of the Government. It is a mere farce that someone else should move this amendment to-day, an amendment that is accepted by the member for Hannans. Had no progress been made at the commencement of the day's proceedings, instead of having this motion which has appeared on the Notice Paper for so long and which members may or may not have come prepared to debate, we would have found substituted for it a mere milk-and-water proposition to which

no one can take any exception, which means nothing and can convey nothing. It is not worth debating, and I for one am not going to waste the time of the House on the subject.

MR. C. J. MORAN (West Perth) : Really the alteration to this amendment does reduce it somewhat to the level of a debating-society discussion. It asks that the Home Office shall be petitioned at the end of the present Governor's period of office. There is a more effective way of giving expression to the wish of the House without violating in any way or discussing the prerogative of His Majesty in this State. We know it is the fundamental basis of the Constitution that the King holds certain powers and delegates them to others, and that the King alone can delegate these powers. The procedure usually followed, if it is desired to carry out a system of economy, is to save some money; but this motion has not the slightest reference to saving any money. The true reason for the motion is that amongst other wild and woolly promises made to the people of this State when we federated with the other States we were promised a reduction in the cost of government. That is one of the blessings we were promised. I suppose we may have a chance of getting it, for it is the only shred of a promise left among those federal promises. All other promises have been dissipated into thin air, nothing remaining of them but the written word of people who did not know what they were promising at the time. If we desire to economise in the matter of the State Governor we can do so by reducing the salary of the Governor to £1,000 a year; and those eminently wealthy and distinguished English gentlemen may perhaps find it well to stay at home instead of coming to Australia for £1,000 a year. It would be an effective way of dealing with the question without interfering with the prerogative of the King. The question of elective Governors, as the member for Hannans will recognise, is not known in the British Constitution or in any branch of it; so I would appeal to the hon. member at the present time not to push his motion. I thank the hon. member heartily for his speech; and I am sure the House listened with a great deal of interest, as I did, to his general dis-

quisition on the constitutional aspect of governorships. The hon. member is one of the well-informed members of the House, and is always well worth listening to. Any interjections I may have made were fruitful. One knows that interjections can do no harm to such an honourable member, and are only likely to make the flint sparkle. My sympathies are for economising in the matter of the State Governorship. I always think it is a great loss and a great pity that we cannot have that magnificent pile of buildings (Government House) used for public purposes; and it is a great pity we cannot have the magnificent ball-room used as a public reading room or a university or college, now that federation is an accomplished fact. Without in any way sacrificing the dignity or prestige of this Western State, we could economise in that way and put that ball-room to some public purpose. This is a view I have always taken in connection with State governorships. I take the same view with regard to the proceedings at Government House which are hallowed by other proceedings of days gone by: I consider there is no such necessity for them in Western Australia as there might have been in days gone by. We could, if necessary, substitute for these proceedings public favours distributed amongst the people. We ought, however, to make up our minds as to what we are prepared to give the executive officer who must necessarily represent His Majesty in Western Australia. I pointed out to the hon. member introducing this motion that it might be well to allow the Home Office, that is the King advised by the Imperial Parliament—and the hon. member must not forget that we are creatures of the Imperial Parliament still, and that the Federal Act is an Imperial creation passed by the Imperial Parliament, and that we are still, though we may not admit it, under the supervision of the Imperial Parliament—to make the appointment, while we might reduce the salary of the State Governor as has been done in other States, or we might go to work on the Canadian system and ask the Federal Parliament to consider the advisability of appointing Lieutenant Governors from among the distinguished public men who may have served the country. That may

be wise or not; but certainly, though we are anxious to conserve the dignity of Western Australia as a sovereign State, in some particulars we would not be decreasing its dignity by asking the Federal Government to appoint lieutenant Governors. I do not think it has been seriously considered in Western Australia whether to appoint the Chief Justice as our Governor would be wise. There could be no objection if a distinguished man from the old country, or a man of wealth, chose to come to Western Australia for £1,000 a year. It is, after all, the link between us and the Sovereign; but I agree we could get loyal British subjects in Western Australia capable of filling with dignity and importance the highest trusts imposed on the position of Governor. No doubt in Australia we can find men equally as loyal to the throne and person of His Majesty as in the old country; but this amendment before us amounts to nothing. It simply means to petition the Home Government to consider the advisability of asking the Chief Justice of the State to take over the governorship. I am not prepared to admit it is the wisest thing to do. If we do reduce the status of the Governor in a pecuniary way, I am not prepared to admit that it would be wise to mix up the judicial functions of the State with the governmental functions. That is a question which ought to be argued at greater length, whether it might not be wiser to have the Governor an altogether separate person from the Chief Justice. There are points on which the Chief Justice as Governor might possibly have dual functions to perform, might act as Chief Justice one day and as Governor next day. He might have to adjudicate differently on the same case, and to look at it from different points of view. I have not gone into the matter; but I am sure, if it ever comes to that, greater constitutional authorities than any we have here will guide us safely. Another thing. This motion is somewhat premature. The term of office of the present Governor has yet a long time to run. It is premature for us to come to a decision in the first session of this Parliament. I grant it is not too soon to open the discussion; but I do not think the House ought to commit

itself to this motion in its present form. Better allow the discussion to drop after having heard the hon. member; because we may not be the Parliament representing the people when the time comes, three years hence, for the present Governor to leave for the old country.

MR. NELSON: We are only expressing our own opinions.

MR. MORAN: Exactly; and I do not altogether agree with those opinions. As I say, I am not opposed to the principle of saving some expense in connection with the Governor. I think that magnificent pile of buildings, Government House, might be better used. I do not think the buildings are needed for their present purpose. On the other hand, I do not think that the machinery by which the mover proposes to attain his object will commend itself to a body of practical men. My idea is that we ought to make up our minds first as to how much we shall pay for a Governor, and secondly as to whether we are prepared to house Governors in so sumptuous a manner, comparatively for Australia, as we have housed them in the past.

MR. NELSON: You want to starve them out.

MR. MORAN: I do not know. I should not mind starving on a thousand a year, and I am sure the hon. member would not. And if we had him starving on a thousand a year as Governor of this State, that position would lose nothing in ability and eloquence, not forgetting that little vein of wit with which he credits the present occupant of the office. At present I am opposed to committing myself to a general motion of this character, which really means nothing in the end, and leaves the problem to be dealt with in a proper statesmanlike manner afterwards. I hope the hon. member will not press the motion to a division, because I suppose everyone in this House is in favour of doing something in connection with the matter. We all agree with the hon. member that it is ripe for discussion; but to decide in the words of the motion would I think only prevent the subject from being more fully discussed and a wiser decision come to perhaps next session or the session after, when the time comes to take effective action; because none of us desires to take any action which would in any way

reflect on or curtail the privileges of the present holder of the office of Governor.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES AND JUSTICE (Hon. R. Hastie) : I expected a long discussion on this motion. I thought that after the mover sat down members would have vied with one another for the honour of following him. Therefore I was surprised when the member for Guildford (Mr. Rason), instead of encouraging discussion, seemed at once to step in and throw a wet blanket on the whole proposition.

MR. RASON : I knew it was a farce. It was not a motion at all.

THE MINISTER : The hon. member mentioned that this motion has been amended ; and I agree with him that in its present state it is one of those motions to which few of us would seriously object. But the hon. member was kind enough to point out that something in the shape of the present motion is the only proposition we can possibly be asked to accept.

MR. RASON : Why not bring it forward in a straightforward way ?

THE MINISTER : I do not know what the hon. member considers a straightforward way. Perhaps he will make a suggestion. The hon. member seems to be much disappointed that he had not an opportunity of criticising the motion in the exact words which appear in the newspapers.

MR. MORAN : On the contrary, he had full opportunity if he wanted it.

THE MINISTER : He had not.

MR. MORAN : He had the opportunity.

THE MINISTER : But he must have disappointed most members by declining to take the opportunity ; and that is why I find fault with him. It has been pointed out by the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) that the better way of attaining the object of the member for Hannans would be for the House to reduce the Governor's salary. I do not think that would be the best way to proceed.

MR. MORAN : Provided the mover seeks for economy, which is the whole ground of his motion.

THE MINISTER : I quite understand the position which the member for West Perth takes up ; but it seems to me that the present Governor was sent out under certain conditions to this State. Those conditions will not continue for a great

length of time ; and that being so, it would look very shabby if during that Governor's term of office we passed a resolution to the effect that in our opinion we were paying far too much for that gentleman's presence. In any case, we should break faith with the Imperial Government if we took that course.

MR. MORAN : Who advocated that ?

THE MINISTER : The hon. member said that such a course would be better.

MR. MORAN (in explanation) : I said no such thing. I am sure the Minister does not wish to misrepresent me. I say this motion is for that reason premature. We all agree that the existing contract deliberately entered into should be honourably observed ; but when the time comes, one means of economising would be to state publicly and let it go forth to the world that we have decided to pay our Governor, say, £2,500 less.

THE MINISTER : The intention of the mover, I take it, is to convey to the Imperial authorities the fact that we think some other arrangement should be made as to Governors ; and until we do that, the Colonial Office cannot be expected to make any alteration. This seems to me a very straightforward way of accomplishing our object. I am not in accord with every word of this motion, but the principle which the hon. member has followed seems to me very good. Members must have noticed in the newspapers that this is not the only State which has reconsidered the position of its Governor. A motion was recently passed in the Victorian Parliament.

MR. MORAN : Some of the other States have reduced the salaries.

THE MINISTER : In the case of South Australia, a somewhat similar motion was passed ; but I am not able to say exactly what it was. Tasmania, on the other hand, has taken the course indicated by the member for West Perth, and has reduced the salary, which reduction has been followed by the immediate resignation of the present Governor, who takes a very fair view of the case. He says :— "The Tasmanian Parliament have declared that the office of Governor is worth only so much a year. There is no proposition to reduce my salary ; but they think that is all that should be paid ; therefore it is my duty to at once retire, and allow a Governor to be appointed

under those special conditions." That is the present position in Tasmania. I wish I were able to acquaint the House with what has been done elsewhere, so that we might take some action similar to that of other States. I think the words of the motion passed by the Victorian Parliament are—

That an humble petition be presented to His Majesty the King, praying that on the completion of the present State Governor's term of office the appointment of future State Governors be taken into consideration.

The members for Guildford and West Perth declare that the motion of the member for Hannans means nothing. In my opinion it means a great deal. It will be an indication to the Colonial Office that it is the opinion of the members of this Legislative Assembly; and this surely is all we can do in the matter, to indicate to the Imperial authorities what we think should be done in appointing State Governors. Some members have a notion that the appointment of State Governors is considered by the Colonial Office a most important matter. Is that so? I very much doubt it. I know that many of the leading statesmen in Great Britain have publicly, in their writings, declared over and over again that Australians could have Governors of their own if they wished them, and have again and again repudiated the idea that a Governor appointed by the Imperial authorities was a necessary link in the chain.

MR. MORAN: Governorship, and not the personality of the Governor, is the link.

THE MINISTER: The Governor is appointed by the Colonial Office at home.

MR. MORAN: That is only a detail.

THE MINISTER: That is not a necessary link. I do not think there are many serious-minded people who believe that the appointment of a local Governor would make much difference to the loyalty of the people of Australia. It might make a difference to the loyalty of a certain percentage; but I think that in such a question, that percentage is a negligible quantity. I wish members would take an opportunity of expressing clearly their opinions on this matter. It is surely necessary that this should be done now, and not at a time when the office of Governor is vacant; because

Parliament may not then be sitting. A member says we may be discussing the Jandakot Railway. The Jandakot Railway may be built by that time, or we may be so interested in the matter of the Jandakot and the Collie-Narrogin railways that we shall have no time to trouble with such an abstract subject as this. Now is the time for members to express their opinions on this matter; not necessarily to-day, but after an adjournment of the debate. I consider it highly advisable that members should give some indication of their opinions as to the appointment of Governors, and I feel fairly sure, from the expressions I have heard to-night and on previous occasions, that we shall find very little difference of opinion on the subject.

MR. C. C. KEYSER (Albany): I think an occasion of this nature demands that every man shall give his opinion; and for that reason I give mine. First, I think that Australia can produce men willing and competent to perform the work pertaining to this office. Secondly, I advocate a change on financial grounds. Those are my reasons for supporting the motion.

Question (that the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the question) put, and negatived formally.

THE SPEAKER: The question is that the words proposed to be inserted be inserted.

MR. MORAN: We have carried the question against striking out certain words.

[Explanations made as to procedure.]

THE SPEAKER: I put the question that the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the question, which was decided in the negative—that the words shall not stand part of the question. That is the first stage towards carrying the amendment. The question now is, That the words proposed to be inserted be inserted.

Question passed.

THE SPEAKER: The question is that the motion as amended be adopted.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Taylor): I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion negatived.

Question as amended put and passed.

MOTION—HOSPITAL NURSES AND PROBATIONERS.

DR. ELLIS (Coolgardie) moved :

That, in the opinion of this House, nurses and probationers employed in the Hospitals controlled by Government should not, except in case of emergency, be expected to be on duty more than eight hours a day.

I have little to say on the subject, because to my mind the motion is such self-evident justice that there will be little difficulty in getting the House to accept it.

MR. DIAMOND: Do you mean for six days or seven days?

DR. ELLIS: Every person who knows anything about nursing must admit that nurses are a very hard-worked section of the community. They are very hard-worked, and in this country they are scandalously underpaid. I do not suppose there is any section of the community that is underpaid to the same extent that the nurses of the State are.

MEMBER: What is the average pay?

DR. ELLIS: I will come to that. The first thing I wish to call attention to is the hours. The average hours worked by nurses is 12, at the present time. That is, the nurses of the State work for 12 hours a day.

MR. DIAMOND: How many days?

DR. ELLIS: Every day; for seven days a week and for 12 hours a day; that is the average. They get off for a certain time in the year and at certain times for food, when other nurses have to take on their duties. There are only two shifts in nursing. It appears to be very wrong indeed that in a State where eight hours a day is a recognised part of the conditions, nurses should be the one section of the community who are exempt, and should have to work such long hours. I can tell members, from my personal knowledge as well as from the knowledge of many other medical men, that nurses suffer seriously in health from long hours. I say that, knowing the full responsibility of the statement. It must be understood that when nurses are constantly in contact with disease, more or less infectious, they are more liable to take that disease if tired; there is less resistance against disease when one is overworked and overstrained. As a class, nurses suffer from very different health. I have had many nurses as patients suffering from over-work, and

these nurses have been employed by the Government; they have been overworked by the Government. It only requires a certain amount of reorganisation to put the whole matter on a proper basis. If nurses belonged to a strong union, such as the railway union, which several members of the House belong to, there would have been no question of getting eight hours a day long ago. I should be strongly in favour of nurses having a union. [MEMBER: What sort?] There are two kinds of unions open to them, but for the purposes of nursing only one is advisable. Nevertheless, the long hours are a very grave source of injustice, and I look on the nursing administration of the State as a gross injustice from beginning to end. The whole organisation of nursing is so awful that one can hardly call it organisation at all. To give an idea of the extraordinary condition of the salaries in this State, I will point out that under the Estimates passed in this House nurses are paid £12 per year, £18 per year, £20 per year, £25, £30, £36, £40, £50, £52, £60, £65, £70, £75, £80, and £90 per year. Can anyone suggest any reasonable plan of going through salaries so divergent? Can anyone suggest justice in going through 12 hours a day and earning £12 a year, especially in a State with such great wealth? Take the old countries: nurses get twice the salaries of domestic servants, while here they get half the remuneration that domestic servants get. There is hardly a cook in the employment of the hospitals who receives less than £100 a year, whilst the highest salary a nurse receives in this State is £90 a year, and only one gets that amount. On the ordinary basis of payment, a cook is better paid than a nurse.

MR. GREGORY: I thought the Colonial Secretary would look after them.

DR. ELLIS: What, after the cook? I think the other side would look after the cooks, they are most used to cooking—I do not say what. There is only one nurse employed at £90 a year, one at £80, and another at £75. The first big number is at £70 a year. I ask members, do they consider £70 per year proper payment to women who spend years in the service, and who are worked 12 hours a day, in season and out of season?

Nurses have most laborious work. Any one acquainted with sickness must know the constant attention that is necessary, always having to come up smiling and ready when a fractious patient is irritable. Can anyone consider £70 per year a proper and respectable salary to give. That is the highest salary on a large scale.

MR. DIAMOND: Do they get board and lodging?

DR. ELLIS: Yes. Take the average, it works out for the State at £40 a year, and housemaids get £50 a year.

MR. DIAMOND: And board and lodging?

DR. ELLIS: Housemaids get £50 a year and £52 a year, whilst the average payment for nurses is £40 a year. A wardman gets £90 to £100 a year, although he has not anything like such arduous or difficult work to perform as nurses have.

MR. RASON: That average includes probationers?

DR. ELLIS: Undoubtedly.

MR. RASON: I thought you said "nurses."

DR. ELLIS: Can the hon. member tell me where the line is drawn? There are a number of names on the Estimates. There are nurses, nurses in charge, night nurses, probationers, and two or three other names, I believe, in the Blue Book. Where a nurse begins and ends I cannot tell. What is a probationer? I do not know. [MR. DIAMOND: An apprentice.] Sometimes it is found that a nurse receives a salary less than that of a probationer, and both of them receive salaries below that of housemaids whom they are supposed to direct, so that the position seems to be absolutely anomalous. Putting aside the question of salaries, let us come to the question of the hours worked. I take it that the leader of the Opposition meant to convey that probationers were getting education, and they were receiving this education as part of their salary.

MR. RASON: I made no suggestion of the kind.

DR. ELLIS: Then the hon. member gives no reason for paying nurses such a small salary as £12 a year. There is an argument used against paying probationers such small salaries, that they get an education; but what opportunity has a probationer for education and for ac-

quiring knowledge? She is too tired and done-up at the end of her day's work to receive education. It seems to me there is nothing in the world to be said against the motion. Take the hospital at Coolgardie. Out of £1,400 a year paid by that institution, nurses only get about £224; that is, the other officials connected with the hospital absorb the rest—the wardsmen, the yardsmen, the cooks, and everyone else.

MR. KEYSER: How many nurses are there at Coolgardie?

DR. ELLIS: There are four nurses. There is a matron as well, but she does not do any nursing. I see by the Blue Book that there are five nurses, three charge nurses, one staff nurse, and one probationer. The names are mixed up so much that one is mislead. I hope that when the Public Service Bill comes into force, nurses will be put under it and properly classified. That does not do away with the great scandal of employing nurses for 12 hours a day. There is no excuse or reason for it in public institutions, although there may be in private institutions. There may be a necessity to increase a staff, especially in out-back places. I have known hospitals where one nurse has practically been left in charge night and day, and it is not an uncommon thing for two nurses to be left in charge night and day. But in many places one nurse is left in charge, and there is not a habitation anywhere near. I contend that where we call upon people for such very heavy work and they have such great responsibility, the least we can do is to limit the number of hours and give nurses a proper remuneration for their work. It is no use to say the State cannot afford it, because surely the State can afford to pay a fair amount for looking after its sick poor. If it cannot, it would be well to do away with some of these luxuries and pay properly. But I see no reason why, because the demand for nurses is great, they should be sweated as at present. What would be thought if a man worked twelve hours a day and was then paid only £12, £14, or £18 a year as remuneration? As far as I can see the whole question of nursing in this State wants ample reorganisation. It wants to be brought to some system. Of course I am presupposing that we would not harass the

Minister in charge of the department; but what I want now is to have a motion passed unanimously that in the opinion of this House he shall, as soon as he can conveniently do so, make arrangements that the nurses shall be worked only eight hours a day. I cannot for the life of me see why the time should be more. I can say, and say seriously, that nurses are being injured; their health is being injured; they are being overworked, and the whole State suffers as a result. The supply of nurses is plentiful. I am given to understand that the list is filled for probationers for two years ahead. There seems no reason why the State should not pay for that form of education, which must be of very great advantage right through the State, and teach the people through the State elementary nursing what to do in certain conditions of sickness, especially in out-back places. Those who attend on sickness know what a great advantage it is to have a nurse in an out-back district who has been trained, however poorly; and considering what we are doing in regard to technical education, it would be eminently to the advantage of the State that we should do a little more in teaching everybody, or a large section of the community, how to look after those who are sick. By that we should be doing a good work. I have nothing more to say on the matter, because it is right and just that this motion should be passed, and I feel that hardly any member would dare to think happily of a bed of sickness if he opposed this motion.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND: Do you mean 60 hours a week or 48 hours?

DR. ELLIS: I refer to twelve hours a day.

MR. DIAMOND: What number of hours do you propose they should have?

DR. ELLIS: I am quite willing to give eight hours a day for seven days.

MR. DIAMOND: That is not the eight-hours system. The eight-hours system is 48 hours a week.

DR. ELLIS: I know, but I am quite content, and I know the nurses would accept with gratitude a reduction of their hours to something reasonable, to give them a chance of reading and enjoying other opportunities. But even that is not the full eight-hours system. Still,

the advantage would be so great and the effect so good to the State that I feel sure no member of this House will seriously oppose it. I have much pleasure in moving the motion.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Taylor): I have no desire to oppose the motion, but I would like to point out to the House that if it is carried and put into practical operation straight away it will mean a very increased cost.

DR. ELLIS: £1,400 a year.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member has stated about £1,400 a year. I have the figures from the Principal Medical Officer, and he tells me that we have now 54 nurses employed in the Medical Department carrying this motion and putting it into practical operation would mean an additional 38 nurses, and the salaries alone would mean £1,950 per annum, basing the figures upon the salaries paid at present.

MR. CONNOR: Is that seven days or six days?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I presume that in dealing with a question of this description we are taking 365 days a year, because nursing is one of those callings in which one has to work all days whilst working, and it is in consideration of that continuous labour—

MR. RASON: It would be hard to work a day when one was not working.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I refer to working without a break, and in consideration of that continuous occupation nurses are allowed certain holidays, which I do not think is the practice with other classes of labour that have been compared with nursing by the members for Coolgardie.

DR. ELLIS: The railway employees get holidays.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not know that there are any nurses on the railway. I would also like to point out to my friend that though I have for many years been an advocate of the eight-hours system, and have helped in a large measure in many places to establish that system—for where the work is labourious one cannot follow it and do justice to himself and his employer if he is compelled to work longer than eight hours—I realise that there are lighter occupations to which the eight-hours system

perhaps could not be applied with the same degree of success. While I would like to see the hours for nurses limited to eight a day, and to an even shorter period if necessary, I wish to point out that notwithstanding the statistics produced by my friend the member for Coolgardie, we have, according to the Principal Medical Officer, 54 nurses now employed, and we should have to increase that number by 38; we should also have to increase the expenditure by £1,950 in wages and salaries alone. When we add to that the cost of uniform, washing, transport, and leave of absence, we get a farther expenditure of £3,040, making a total of £4,990.

MR. SCADDAN: What is the present cost?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have not the present cost, but the increase will be as 38 is to 54. We now employ 54 nurses, and we would have to increase that number by 38. I do not know what the actual cost is. I dare say the department does.

DR. ELLIS: The department does not know.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It will be recognised that there would be an increase of practically £5,000 per annum on the nurses alone. [MEMBER: Their efficiency would be increased.] I conclude my friend was dealing with the nurses in the State as a whole. Is that so?

DR. ELLIS: Yes.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The figures prepared by the department and laid on the table yesterday or the day before, in compliance with a resolution moved by the member for Fremantle (Mr. E. Needham), regarding the nursing staff at Fremantle, show that the average hours a day worked by nurses at the Fremantle Hospital are nine and a half. If that be so, some of the other hospitals must work very long hours to bring the average for the State up to twelve. I am not prepared to say whether the figures by the member for Coolgardie are absolutely correct or not. I hope they are not correct. With reference to the Coolgardie and Fremantle hospitals—

DR. ELLIS: That is not a Government hospital.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Fremantle hospital is a Government hos-

pital. I think the hospital at Coolgardie is a subsidised Government hospital.

DR. ELLIS: No. The Coolgardie hospital is governed by the department, and the Fremantle hospital is governed by a board. Fremantle is not a Government hospital in its ruling.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Government have to supply the funds.

DR. ELLIS: That is another matter.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The same thing applies to the Coolgardie hospital. With reference to the number of nurses in Coolgardie, the department says there are six. The total number of patients treated in the Coolgardie hospital for the year ending 30th June last was 351, and the average weekly number 27.31. There was an average daily number of 21 patients with a staff of six nurses. I have no desire to see the nurses worked any harder than others.

DR. HICKS: They are not hard-worked.

MR. HEITMANN: In many places they are.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the member for Roebourne, who is also a medical man, had heard the member for Coolgardie's statement this evening, it would, I am sure, have been a revelation to him. The member for Coolgardie pointed out that these nurses are not worked but simply harassed. They are worked until they are physically unfit to resist certain diseases which they are known to be suffering from—[DR. ELLIS: Quite true]—consumption and other diseases of that description, to resist which requires more physical strength than is left through hard work. [DR. ELLIS: Hear, hear.] I am sorry if that statement is true. I find another medical gentleman who says it is not true.

DR. ELLIS: He is talking of Fremantle.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If it were a medical proposition I might readily and quickly decide whose authority I would accept. But I believe the member for Coolgardie has somewhat based his statement to-day on the conditions prevailing at the Coolgardie hospital.

DR. ELLIS: Kalgoorlie is the worst.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie. If this statement is correct, showing that the nurses at Fremantle are only worked 9½ hours a

day on the average, and I know myself from personal knowledge that in other districts where smaller hospitals are controlled the hours are not so long as pointed out by the member for Coolgardie, those two hospitals, Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie, must work their nurses very long indeed to bring the average up to twelve hours, which my friend the member for Coolgardie says is the average for the whole of the nurses in Western Australia.

MR. GREGORY: Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie are controlled by the Government.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Most decidedly, they are Government hospitals. I am not disputing that. I am only pointing out that those are hospitals which the Government control, and that we have from the Fremantle hospital the return to which I have referred. I could have had a return showing the number of hours worked by the Perth hospital nurses. This return regarding the Fremantle hospital was moved for by the member for Fremantle, and it just struck me to take it from the table of the House and look at it. If we had a return showing the number of hours worked by the Perth hospital nurses, and also a return showing the number of hours worked by those in the smaller hospitals in the back country which are controlled by the Government, we could find out perhaps the hours the nurses work in Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie.

DR. ELLIS: Why do you want 38 extra nurses if they work only 9½ hours?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Perhaps this report may be based upon six days a week instead of seven days. I do not know whether it is, but since I have had the honour of acting as Colonial Secretary applications for leave to nurses and probationers have been made, and I have signed a very large number of leaves of absence for periods of from a fortnight up to three months. These nurses cannot be so badly off or so harshly treated as my friend tries to lead the House to suppose; because I am told by the Principal Medical Officer that any nurse becoming sick is, by the regulations, entitled to be treated free in the hospital and to remain on full pay for a period not exceeding three months. When the hon. member compares this

treatment with the treatment of domestic servants, will he find it the recognised custom that employers of domestic servants will pay the hospital fees of their servants who fall ill?

DR. ELLIS: The employer does not pay the fees, but he sends them to the hospital.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: To be treated at the expense of the State. Do employers send their servants to the hospitals and pay their expenses, and do they allow them three months' leave of absence on full pay? I say, no; and that being so, it is unfair for my friend to compare nurses with domestic servants, whose conditions are not the same.

DR. HICKS: Nurses would not thank the hon. member.

DR. ELLIS: Nurses get less pay.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think that the nurses on the goldfields receive higher salaries than those on the coast, as is the case in other occupations; and I find that at Fremantle the salaries are—charge nurses, £1 3s. 1d. a week and everything found; staff nurses, 18s. 5½d. per week and everything found; probationary nurses from 15s. 4½d. down to 11s. 6½d. and to 7s. 8d. a week and everything found. I should like to know how many domestic servants receive twice as much as the nurses. The member for Coolgardie has pointed out that nurses do not receive half the salaries of domestic servants. Do domestic servants receive 36s. or 37s. a week and everything found, and, if they fall ill, do they have free treatment in the hospitals and three months' leave on full pay? I want the hon. member to be fair. It is only right when an hon. member is making out a case that he should be fair in his comparisons. I do not for a moment wish the House to think that I desire nurses to work longer than eight hours. I believe my friend who moved this motion has not got the same record that I have for standing up for a reduced number of hours of labour, for I have ever been in the forefront in fighting for that in my humble way; but I want to point out the difficulty of applying the eight-hours system to nurses. The difficulty is greater when we come to consider the small hospitals that are scattered in the small mining camps of this State, where there are only one or two

nurses, or perhaps three, and where perhaps there may be very little to do at one period of the year and a great deal to do at another period of the year. I have already pointed out that these extra hours the nurses work are made up by leave of absence, and that when on leave of absence the nurses get full pay. I think the motion should be carried, because there is no desire on my part, or I think on the part of the House, to oppose it; but I want to be candid. I do not want the member for Coolgardie to think that, because this motion is carried, we can put it into operation to-morrow. Considerable reorganisation will be entailed before it can be carried out, and I am prepared to undertake that reorganisation; but the House should know what the extra cost is to be. I have already pointed out that by carrying this motion and putting it into practice, according to the Principal Medical Officer, it will mean that the nurses in the hospitals, apart from any other employees, will necessitate an additional expenditure by the State of something like £5,000 or, to be particular, £4,900.

DR. ELLIS : For how many nurses?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : For 38 nurses. To carry out the eight-hours principle in the hospitals, basing calculations upon the salaries received and the hours worked, we must increase our staff by 38, and the extra cost for food, uniforms, washing, transport, and accommodation will entail an expenditure of practically £5,000. The House should realise this before carrying the motion. It will take time to carry out the motion. If the management of the hospitals in Western Australia is in such a deplorable condition as the member for Coolgardie desires to convey to the Chamber; the Minister would require greater assistance and a very close and searching investigation to be made into the hospital system before he could reorganise the hospitals satisfactorily. If the condition of the hospitals is as bad as the member for Coolgardie suggests, some form of investigation should take place, and very urgently too. I hope, when I go into the matter with the head of the department, that I shall not find the hospitals in the deplorable condition which my friend conveys. I feel sure that those who preceded me in

the office of Colonial Secretary would not like to know that the hospital system is so bad as it is made out to be. I hope it will not be found to be so. I have no desire to oppose the motion; but all I desire to do is to place the facts before the Chamber. I can promise members that, so far as the Government are concerned, they have no desire that nurses or any of those employed by the State should work any longer hours than employees employed by other people.

DR. ELLIS : What is the average salary nurses get? I make it out at £48 a year.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : I have not the figures. It is not a matter one can go into straight away, this matter of reorganisation; but should the motion be carried, as I am sure it will be, I do not want the member for Coolgardie or the House to think that I have not kept my word. All I want is an opportunity to reorganise the department and to try to meet the wish conveyed in this motion.

MR. H. GREGORY (Menzies) : I hardly know what action we should take in regard to the matter. If there is one thing that I object to, it is the passing of motions by this House which are not to be given effect to. The Colonial Secretary states that, if the motion is agreed to and carried out by him, it will mean an extra expenditure of £5,000, and that he does not think the state of things is really so bad as is represented by the member for Coolgardie. Yet I presume the Colonial Secretary, according to his statement, has had information from his department. He, therefore, should be in a position to tell us exactly how things are upon the goldfields so far as nurses are concerned; but the hon. gentleman states he will agree to the passage of the motion, although he cannot see his way clear to carry it out. I object to this. We have no right to pass motions to which we do not intend to give effect. I hope this motion will not be passed. I think we can do better by amending it. I intend to move an amendment that all the words after "House" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu :—

That the Government should make inquiry into the hours of employment, general salaries, annual leave, and general treatment of nurses employed in the hospitals upon the goldfields.

We know that the present Government will do all they possibly can to give fair hours of labour to the nurses on the fields; but we also know that in outside districts there are many small hospitals where possibly only two nurses may be employed, and where it may be necessary for the girls to work twelve hours a day each. This is a matter of administration. In hospitals where long hours are necessary the department can make them up by giving longer leave.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is right.

MR. GREGORY: I do not think in the hospitals of this State we could enforce the principle of eight hours a day. It would be a very good thing if we could; but I feel perfectly satisfied it would be an impossibility. It would be much wiser for us to express the opinion that we consider nurses should be treated just as favourably as any other section of the community, and to ask the department to look into this branch of the service and see that nurses are well treated. Many times my attention has been drawn to the question of nurses' holidays. Girls living 400 or 500 miles back are compelled to pay their own train fares, and with the small salaries they receive holidays are useless to them. Such questions as this should be looked into by the Minister controlling the department, and when framing his Estimates he can give greater consideration to the nurses than has been given before. At the same time I think it would be wrong for us to pass this motion if we feel satisfied it would not be carried out.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is almost impossible for a Minister to go into the matter while the House is sitting.

MR. GREGORY: I do not think so. I think a good deal can be done. I always had a good deal to do when Parliament was sitting. This is a matter which is generally looked into by the department. The Minister asks for reports, and he can then see whether the nurses are properly treated or not.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have got reports, but they do not tally with the statements of the member for Coolgardie.

MR. GREGORY: I think the Minister only has a report dealing with the Fremantle hospital.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Also the Coolgardie hospital.

MR. GREGORY: The Coolgardie hospital comes within the cognisance of the department, and we should take the Minister's statement instead of that of the member for Coolgardie. But I wish to point out more particularly that we cannot have the eight-hours system in all our hospitals, because so many small hospitals have only two nurses. I hope the amendment will be passed; for I am quite prepared to trust the Minister to secure the welfare of those girls. I should like to see them well treated; but I object to passing motions unless we intend to give them full effect. Government members may rest assured that the nurses will get every consideration from the present Ministry. I move as an amendment:—

That all the words after "House" be struck out, and that "the Government should make inquiry into the hours of employment, annual leave, salaries, and general treatment of nurses employed in hospitals upon the gold-fields," be inserted in lieu.

MR. C. H. RASON (Guildford): I second the amendment.

MR. T. H. BATH (Brown Hill): In addressing myself to this question, I sympathise with the mover in his desire that the nurses of the various State hospitals should receive fair treatment and fair remuneration for their labour. But a divergence of opinion exists as to whether the conditions which the hon. member mentions as existing really exist. The hon. member is not the first knight who has set out on a chivalrous mission to remedy the grievances of the nurses in our hospitals. Before entering Parliament I was secretary of a trades and labour institution which was interesting itself in the question of the hours worked by nurses and the salaries they received. The question was brought before us by one of the delegates, who said it had come to his knowledge that the nurses in the hospital were being grievously sweated, that they were worked very long hours, and that the rates of pay were miserably small and inadequate. Without attempting to ascertain the truth of that assertion by eliciting information, we made representations to the Minister who controlled the State hospitals, pointed out that this state of things

existed, and requested that a remedy should be applied. The Minister made inquiries; the matter was ventilated in the newspapers; and we were met by a rebuff from the very people we desired to benefit. The nurses asked that we should not do anything farther in the matter, because they had not initiated any movement for an alteration in their condition, and were perfectly satisfied. The delegate who introduced the matter himself requested its withdrawal because of the nurses' statements, made through the medium of the local newspaper. Since I entered Parliament the matter was ventilated by a letter written to a newspaper by a man outside the department, stating that the nurses in the Kalgoorlie hospital were being sweated. The matter was brought before the Minister by me as one of the members for the district, and I believe by the member for Kalgoorlie; and an inquiry was again instituted into the allegation of sweating; and I believe that if the Colonial Secretary will look up the records of the department, he will find that the nurses themselves did not substantiate the allegations in the letter to the newspaper. I hold that not only nurses but all other State employees should receive fair treatment; that we should not sweat them or cause them to work long hours or to work for low wages, or for wages which do not represent a fair remuneration for their labour. But before we carry any motion distinctly laying down a line of conduct, we should first have an extensive inquiry to find out whether the allegations are really true; and therefore I approve of the amendment of the member for Menzies, or rather I believe that the question should, if necessary, be investigated by a select committee. I believe that extensive inquiry is needed, and that it can be well undertaken by a select committee of this House. Then we shall have the fullest information, not only as to the Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie hospitals, but as to every hospital in the State—those of Perth and Fremantle, and of the smaller hospitals out back. [MEMBER: Take asylums as well.] I think it better to confine the question to hospitals, in order not to make the inquiry unduly long. I believe there is plenty of room for inquiry, and that the question should be settled once and for all whether there is

sweating carried on in our hospitals. If there is sweating, the matter should be dealt with in some such way as is proposed in the motion. But before committing the House to the motion we should have some extensive inquiry into the conduct of the hospitals, so as to know exactly what are the conditions obtaining, and how to apply a remedy.

MR. C. C. KEYSER (Albany): If, as the member for Coolgardie states, the nurses are working 12 hours a day for seven days a week, and receiving an average of only £48 a year, it is necessary that some inquiry be made and made immediately; but on the other hand we find that the Colonial Secretary, speaking on behalf of the Principal Medical Officer, disagrees with those figures, disagrees with the statement as to hours worked and annual payments received. It seems there is a divergence of opinion, and I am therefore inclined to support the amendment. I think that would meet the case; and moreover, so far as I know, there has been no demand whatever from the nurses for shorter hours of labour, or for more pay. And surely, being the persons interested, if they thought that they were being imposed upon, that they were not receiving a fair wage, or were being worked too hard, they would have complained. If I were a nurse, and were being worked too long or were receiving a very small wage, I should be the first person to complain; and I think that if the member for Coolgardie had been honest in this motion of his, it would have been an easy matter for him to get a petition from the nurses in the various hospitals.

DR. ELLIS: They dare not sign it. I would not ask them.

MR. KEYSER: I venture to state that if they have a grievance, that is the position they ought to take up to ventilate their grievance; and in view of the Colonial Secretary's remarks, we ought to follow the procedure that the member for Menzies suggests. For those reasons I shall support the amendment.

MR. A. J. WILSON (Forrest): I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. E. E. HEITMANN (Cue): While I believe in the necessity for some inquiry, I am not prepared to go so far as the mover; but with all due respect to the

Colonial Secretary, I say that nurses are sweated. I have had experience in the hospitals of this State, and I say that women are worked until they have not the spirit to ask for better conditions. I was in the Geraldton hospital some two years ago. The night nurse there came on at 7 o'clock and worked till 8 o'clock the next morning, seven days a week, and was on this night work for as many as 10 weeks at a stretch. In the hospital at that time were 15 fever patients; and in addition, the nurse had on another floor of the hospital some 8 or 10 other patients. I consider that this is not fair treatment; and I am at one again with the member for Menzies, and believe it is absolutely necessary that there should be some inquiry.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES AND JUSTICE (Hon. R. Hastie): Before the debate closes I should like to say a word or two. This seems to be a very small question, concerning very few of the hospitals in the country. The motion mentions only the hospitals controlled by the Government; and I can think of only five or six of these, and probably there are not a dozen. Most of the hospitals in this country are controlled by the people who live in the districts, and are subsidised by the Government. I did not have the pleasure of listening to the mover's opening speech; but I am informed that he did not deal with any hospitals save those controlled by the Government and paid for entirely by the Government. For instance, the motion, if passed, will apply to the nurses in the Perth hospital, but not to those in the Fremantle hospital; it will apply to the nurses of the Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, and Menzies hospitals, where the people absolutely refuse to pay a single shilling for hospital purposes, while it will not apply to the vast majority of gold-fields hospitals, which are kept up, or mainly kept up, by the people. I do not know whether the mover thought of that phase of the subject. I would suggest that if anything is to be done in the direction the hon. member indicates, or, what I think better still, in the direction indicated by the amendment, we should inquire as to all hospitals subsidised by the Government and not merely as to Government hospitals. I am unable to say whether we

should now make a hard-and-fast rule of the eight-hours system in every public or semi-public hospital in the country. In many hospitals we have only one or two nurses, who are not occupied a tenth part of their time. The member for Coolgardie will probably agree that it would be unwise to apply the eight-hours system in every case to those hospitals; for this would involve an extra tax on the community, and the cost to the Government would be so great that we should not then be justified in giving so much hospital accommodation throughout the State as we give now. All those considerations will, I am sure, convince the hon. member that we cannot now agree to his motion; and I strongly advise members to support the amendment. If it is passed, inquiry will be made not only as to hospitals controlled by the Government, but as to all hospitals subsidised by the Government. The report should propose some fair basis; it should deal with all the difficulties I have mentioned and other difficulties bearing on the subject. I hope the suggestion made by the member for Albany (Mr. Keyser) will not be carried out, and that nurses from all over the country will not be encouraged to send in petitions. If an inquiry is to be made, they will not be troubled in that direction, but all will be asked, at representative places at any rate, how the position stands at present, and for suggestions as to what should be done in the future. If we decide the question to-night, I hope the amendment will be carried.

MR. M. F. TROY (Mount Magnet): I intend to support the amendment, because I think after all this amendment is the only possible one that can commend itself to the House. No doubt in some parts of the State at various times nurses may be over-worked, but I do not think that always obtains. I feel sure it does not; moreover I feel that the statements made by the member for Coolgardie (Dr. Ellis)—made with the best intentions—have been considerably exaggerated. I do not think that such a state of affairs exists in the hospitals, because I have not heard of such a disastrous state of affairs until I came into this Chamber. Members know something about the conduct of hospitals, but they have not heard of these dreadful things. I would like to

see the eight-hours principle introduced into hospitals, but with the Minister for Mines I think it is utterly impossible, especially in the back-blocks of the State where the Government give medical assistance. If the motion moved by the member for Coolgardie were carried, instead of it doing good to the people it would be doing them an injury. I agree that an inquiry should be instituted. We have heard from time to time that grievances do exist, although no statements have been made by persons who feel themselves aggrieved. Still it is the duty of Parliament to help these people if they require assistance. At the same time I think Parliament would be doing an injury to the nurses and the people of the State if the motion of the member for Coolgardie were passed. The only thing the House should do is to support the amendment moved by the member for Menzies.

MR. J. P. McLARTY (Murray): If it can be shown that nurses are suffering an injustice, then the House will, collectively and individually, try to rectify it. I was amused to hear the remarks of the member for Coolgardie, because I am acquainted with a number of hospital nurses and have relatives in the profession, and they are anything but physical wrecks. They get a number of holidays, and when there are vacancies for nurses at a hospital there are scores, I may say hundreds, of applications for the positions. I will not say anything as to the indirect chance of a nurse being able to marry a rich patient. I have pleasure in supporting the amendment.

MR. F. GILL (Balkatta): I am pleased that the member for Coolgardie has brought this matter forward, but I do not wish to mislead him in making that statement, for I intend to support the amendment, as I think the amendment would have a better effect. The eight-hours principle is one that most members on this side at any rate strongly advocate, and if there is anything in the statements of the member for Coolgardie, it is time that something was done. I believe that the amendment of the member for Menzies will have the effect of getting difficulties remedied. In connection with the eight-hours principle there is one thing that always strikes me as peculiar and it has occurred here to-night. When

the eight-hours question is discussed I have always noticed the heads of departments, or the persons in charge of departments, generally make out a very serious state of affairs in connection with the extra expense that would be incurred by the adoption of that principle. I do not know why it is so, but I noticed that the Colonial Secretary came here to-night with a statement from the Principal Medical Officer that the adoption of the eight-hours system amongst the nurses would mean the expenditure of an extra £5,000 annually. That seems an extraordinarily large amount to carry out the principle of eight hours, seeing how few persons there are to whom the principle will apply. I believe the number at present is 54.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: They get a month's holiday annually, and their places have to be taken by persons who get double pay.

MR. GILL: I assumed when the Colonial Secretary said it would require 38 extra nurses, they were to take the places of those who were having holidays. The proposal is to decrease the work of the nurses by one-third; and as the total number of nurses employed is 54, I fail to see how it will require 38 nurses to do one-third of the duties of 54.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Perhaps the hon. member would feel disposed to do away with all holidays.

MR. GILL: I thought the idea was that the 38 extra nurses were to do the work when the other nurses were on holidays. I say that the extra amount which it is said the adoption of this principle will cost is very large, but I do not dispute it. When I was on the railways in South Australia a similar thing occurred. The Railway Commissioner was asked to adopt the eight-hours principle, and he said it would cost an enormous amount to initiate the system; but when the system was in practice it was shown that the amount had been over-estimated by 100 per cent. The same thing applied to the Western Australian railways, and I think the same thing will apply to the hospital business. I am pleased that this matter has been brought forward, but I think the amendment will better carry out the object. We have heard of no very serious complaints; at any rate, I have not. The member for Cool-

gardie made very serious complaints to-day, and put a serious complexion before the House; and if the case is as stated there will be good grounds, after due inquiries have been made, for remedying the state of affairs. There is nothing to prevent the House from taking action provided the complaints are founded on fact. I believe the amendment will have a far better effect than the motion and will remedy the state of affairs. The House will not hesitate to apply the remedy if it is needed. For these reasons I shall support the amendment.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Taylor): In reply to the remark of the member for Balkatta (Mr. Gill) that he was unable to follow the increased expenditure which would be caused by the adoption of the eight-hours system, I may point out that on the goldfields and in the tropics nurses are allowed one month's leave of absence on full pay annually. The places of these nurses are filled temporarily, and in some cases the temporary occupants have to be paid double wages. Beyond doubt if the eight-hours system is instituted the nurses will only be allowed the same privileges that other people who are working under the eight-hours system enjoy; that will be the ordinary holidays. Leave of absence from duties for a month will have to be stopped. The same principles that govern the eight-hours system in every other walk of life will have to be adopted in regard to nurses. Nurses in the back country who like leave of absence for a month every year to come to the coast for recreation and pleasure to improve their health will be deprived of it.

DR. ELLIS: What about the railways?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not discussing the railways, and it is unfair for a member who is an advocate for the eight-hours principle to compare those following the occupation of nurses with those following an occupation where physical labour and energy and exertion are required. We know full well that nurses in hospitals are on duty for long hours, but they are not working all the time. In some instances, as was pointed out by the Minister for Mines, these nurses only work one or two hours during the time they are on shift, if I

may call it a shift. The eight-hours principle was first initiated in regard to occupations which were very laborious, and where it was found that men could not keep up their strength for the long hours they were required to work. It has been proved by science that eight hours are sufficiently long to follow laborious toil.

DR. ELLIS: In any occupation.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: But where persons are only called on to work for a few minutes at a time they can follow up that work for a lengthy period. I can speak with authority on that matter, for since I have been a Minister of the Crown I have been giving 14 or 16 hours every day, Sundays included, to get through my work. When I was following laborious work such as mining and shearing, and other similar work, I could not have stood the strain; but although I find it is a great strain when one has to be kept to his post for a long time day after day, still one cannot follow heavy laborious work for long hours. I do not think we can possibly put the eight-hours principle into force amongst the nurses. They are not called upon to work for the whole eight hours, as members having a knowledge of the conditions that exist in hospitals know full well. Nurses are simply on duty, but they are not working the whole time. Sometimes the nurses have to work hard when the patients are very bad, but at other times they are simply on duty and are not called upon to work all the time. I hope the amendment will be carried, so that it will give me, as Colonial Secretary having control of the hospitals, an opportunity of going into the matter. I will have the closest investigations made, and I hope to be able, by the investigations, to disprove many of the allegations made by the member for Coolgardie in the interests of those who controlled the hospitals before I became a Minister of the Crown.

At 6.30, the **SPEAKER** left the Chair.

At 7.30, Chair resumed.

DR. ELLIS (in reply): I wish to say a few words on the amendment, and I must state that it has a considerable amount of sympathy from my point of view. I have no desire to rush the House into any resolution carrying such

important results, but I should like to mention one or two points to show the necessity for inquiry. The Colonial Secretary has said the amount of money that would be required for the nurses to have the eight hours system is £5,000, and the number of additional nurses necessary would be 38. On those terms it would mean that each nurse would cost £3 per week. As the average payment is only £48, it would leave £2 a week for her living, which shows to me that the figures brought up by the Colonial Secretary do not bear the interpretation proposed to be put upon them, because it is an absurdity to suppose that the nurses cost, for uniform and food, so large a sum as £2 a week.

MR. GREGORY: The average for the nurses last year was £55.

DR. ELLIS: I worked it out at £48.

MR. GREGORY: I have the official figures.

DR. ELLIS: I have the official blue-book for this year, not last year. If the average is £48, or even if it is £52, it does not make any difference; the cost cannot be £5,000. At the outside it cannot be more than £4,000; and if the statement be correct that the nurses are not worked 12 hours a day, then the number of extra nurses required could not possibly be 38. I do not see how, even if it were 12 hours a day, the number of extra nurses required could be possibly more than 27. It is quite correct that in many cases the number of hours is not 12 a day. I am looking at the average case. In many places there is not work for that number to do; but what I want to get at is the principle. It would probably be found that the increased number of nurses required would not be more than 20, in which case the increased cost would certainly not be more than £3,000 a year. I think personally the inquiry will have to go carefully into the question of the average health and the average death rate of the nurses. That is my impression gained from experience in the matter. I have been a hospital doctor in one way and another for over 20 years, numbering among my patients many people who have been nurses and many who have been nurses under the Government, and I say the general impression I have got from them is to the effect that they are over-

worked, certainly in many of the gold-fields hospitals. I do not wish the House to hold the view apparently taken by many members, that I was painting a very lurid picture of the condition of the nurses. I do not mean for one instant to say that the picture is lurid, but I do say that nurses are worked many hours, and that their health is suffering. That is a clear statement, and the condition of things should be remedied. I make that assertion and am prepared to stand by it. I am quite sure that if one took a small hospital, he could find that the nurses were under-worked. I believe that in Coolgardie at the present moment the nurses are under-worked; there being a falling off in the hospital, they have gradually diminished the number of beds, and until recently they have had the same staff running; so one can easily see under these conditions the nurses would be under-worked; whereas in the Kalgoorlie hospital, which is a rising hospital and always has a sufficiency of accommodation, there is a tendency to over-work the nurses. One cannot make any statement which is true of every hospital in the State, but I have made inquiry into the matter, and am sure that the Colonial Secretary, with his well-known sympathy for the eight-hours system, will make inquiry and see if the same rights and concessions cannot be given to women as to men. The mental strain in nursing is as keen as that of any form of physical employment, and the patient suffers as well as the nurse, because one loses the delicacy of touch and the freedom to get up to the patient the instant the patient wants anything. It appears to me an inquiry will have a tendency to rectify that; that the nurses will be properly graded, the number of probationers will probably be materially increased, and the general salaries will be worked up on a fair and equitable basis. As far as I can see, the amendment by the member for Menzies (Mr. Gregory) is just as good for my purpose as the original motion, and it is quite on the cards that when the matter comes up for final settlement, the amendment will be accepted.

HON. W. C. ANGWIN (Minister): It was not my intention to speak on this question, but there is one matter which I hope the member for Menzies will include in his amendment—inquiry regarding the

warders in connection with our lunatic asylums. I believe there is a certain amount of dissatisfaction as far as they are concerned, and in my opinion we could almost classify persons holding these positions as nurses for the insane. As to the complaints by the member for Coolgardie (Dr. Ellis), no doubt the view laid before the public regarding the length of hours of nurses and others in hospitals is based principally on the hours they are supposed to be at their work during the day; but no consideration is taken at all for the half-days they are allowed off during the week. In Fremantle great complaint has been made in regard to the hours worked by those employed by the hospital committee. It has been found that a statement which has appeared in the Press repeatedly as to the actual hours worked in that hospital—

MR. GREGORY: Why do you not bring that matter before your colleague?

HON. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member says I should bring this matter before my colleague. I had an opportunity of doing so to-day, and I hope it will have some effect. The complaint made in regard to long hours at the Fremantle hospital has not been made during the last two or three months. It was made previously. No alteration has been made in the hours of labour with the exception of putting on one man as a relieving officer, and that would not affect the hours actually worked by the nurses employed at the hospital. I only hope that the inquiry will prove that the number of hours worked in the Fremantle hospital is the same as the number of hours worked in other hospitals, when taking into consideration the leave given during the week. It must also be borne in mind that some of the out-lying hospitals such as the member for Menzies refers to only have about one or two nurses. It will be necessary, if we adopt the eight-hours principle, to increase the number of nurses employed. Of course there would be three where there are two at present. Then it would be also necessary to increase the relieving staff; so I think the estimate by the Colonial Secretary will be nearly reached when the extra nurses and staff are employed to carry out the work under the eight-hours principle. Personally I should like to see

the eight-hours system adopted, if possible, but I think it would not only be detrimental to the hospitals in the back country, but at the same time would increase the expense greatly in hospitals in the coastal districts. I hope the member for Menzies will add the words "warders of the lunatic asylum" to the amendment he has moved.

MR. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): It is refreshing to me to find such a pronounced supporter of the Labour platform as the Colonial Secretary undoubtedly is admitting that in some employments it is even unnecessary to have an eight-hours day. The hon. gentleman, I believe, is a staunch supporter of the Labour platform; and I think in that platform one of the prominent planks is that we should have a universal eight-hours day.

MR. A. J. WILSON: Start here, please.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The Colonial Secretary admitted that he himself was to some extent a blackleg, which is, I believe, a term used in labour circles, since he works from 14 to 16 hours a day.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Do not put on too much. I said "12 or 14."

MR. FRANK WILSON: Well, 12 or 14. I must be pardoned for expressing my intense surprise that the hon. gentleman should so far fall away from grace as to object on the score of expense to extending the eight-hours system to nurses.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (in explanation): I did not object to the eight-hours system being applied to nurses. I only pointed out to the House, before passing the motion, what the expense would be. I have in no way opposed the eight-hours principle, and I have no desire to allow the hon. gentleman to lead the House to believe that I did.

MR. FRANK WILSON: I understood the Minister to say that an eight-hours day was essential to manual employment, but that when it came to the employment of women in hospitals it was not necessary, for nurses did not work continuously. I have a vivid recollection of discussions in the Assembly of this State when it was argued that if a man was on the premises for eight hours he had been there long enough, and ought not to be

kept there longer even though he did no work. A station master on a small station was the instance given. I think the South-Western Railway was mentioned in those days, where only two trains passed each day. It was pointed out that a man employed on a station on that line had a lot of leisure, and was not constantly employed; but the reply was "Never mind; eight hours on the station make an eight-hours day, and the man ought not to be employed any longer." I think if the hon. member who has introduced this motion is true in what he states, and if the hon. member believes that his statement is correct, and that he has just cause for making it in this House, that these nurses are working 12 hours a day, it ought not to be the case, and we certainly ought not to burk the question on the score of expense. The Government ought to set an example to private employers of labour in this State in this respect. [THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: So they do.] We find in every case that if the private employer argued that he must, of necessity, object to a reduction of hours on the score of expense, he would be howled down by the Minister and those who support his platform.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Most decidedly. He does not give holidays.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The question of expense does not come in. The cry is that if an industry cannot support an eight-hours day it must close down.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Is this an industry?

MR. FRANK WILSON: Certainly, it is. Will the hon. member say the same thing—that because the Government cannot stand the extra expense we must close the hospitals down?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not arguing that way.

MR. FRANK WILSON: If it is going to cost the Government £5,000 per annum to give the nurses an ordinary day's work, I take it the same reply is applicable as is given in the case of an ordinary industry—the reply of "Close it down." I am opposed to the suggestion altogether. I am opposed to the Minister working 14 or 16 hours a day. I think he is taking away another man's job, and if it be necessary, we ought to appoint another Minister to assist him.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Why do you not keep those deputations away?

MR. FRANK WILSON: I am also strongly opposed to the principle enunciated that eight hours a day should be for men workers only. I do not see why, in all earnestness, women should be expected to work longer than men. If it is good for a man, it is good for a female to have short hours of labour; and I, for one, hope that this House will so express its opinion that the amendment will be carried; and I hope that the Government, when they go into this inquiry, will go into it fully and thoroughly. If they find that the charge brought forward by the member for Coolgardie is substantiated in fact, I hope they will cause some alteration to be made forthwith, so that nurses who are carrying on an arduous and honourable work in the interests of those who are sick and ill, will have their hours of work reduced to the ordinary hours recognised to be a fair day's work, that is eight hours a day.

MR. H. BROWN (Perth): The member for Menzies should agree to omit from the amendment the words "upon the goldfields."

MR. GREGORY: We might first allow the words in the original motion to be struck out. If there is any intention to alter the amendment, an amendment on the amendment may be brought forward.

THE SPEAKER: A farther amendment may be submitted, should the words be struck out of the motion and the words proposed by the member for Menzies be inserted in lieu.

Amendment (Mr. Gregory's) put and passed.

MR. H. BROWN moved a farther amendment:

That the words "upon the goldfields" be struck out, and the words "throughout the State" inserted in lieu.

MR. THOMAS: I second the amendment.

Farther amendment passed, and the motion as amended agreed to.

MOTION—EMPRESS OF COOLGARDIE
G.M. LEASE, INQUIRY.

MR. A. A. HORAN (Yilgarn) moved:

That a select committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the application for forfeiture and subsequent reinstatement

of the *Empress of Coolgardie Gold Mining Lease*, with power to call for persons and papers; to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, and submit report on the 20th October.

The object of the suggested select committee was to inquire into the transactions that had become somewhat historic in connection with the *Empress of Coolgardie G.M. Lease*, at Coolgardie. They reflected upon the administration of the late Minister for Mines (Mr. Gregory), and some very strong things had been said about the matter on the goldfields, while the goldfields newspapers had also commented on the matter.

MR. HOPKINS: Did the hon. member say "reflected upon the Minister"?

MR. HORAN: No; the statements in the newspapers reflected on the administration of the late Minister for Mines; and in view of that fact the House would be justified in appointing a select committee to go through the voluminous papers on the table in connection with the matter and to report for the information of the House. It was only fair, in order that suspicion did not fall unjustly on any person, that all information should be given. As many witnesses would be needed who lived in Coolgardie, it would be well for the committee to take evidence in that place.

THE SPEAKER: Better keep to our usual practice, instead of giving instructions to the committee before appointment. When the committee were appointed, the hon. member could move that they have power to call for persons and papers, to sit when the House stood adjourned, and to adjourn from place to place; and if that motion were carried, the committee could, if necessary, take evidence at Coolgardie.

MR. J. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe) seconded the motion.

MR. H. GREGORY (Menzies): This motion had his entire concurrence. He hoped the committee would be appointed, and that it would exhaustively inquire into all matters connected with the case. The facts were that application was made for the forfeiture of a lease; and he, being then Minister for Mines, forfeited that lease. Subsequently the forfeiture was annulled and the original holder reinstated. He (Mr. Gregory) believed there had been some comments

in what was known as the "gutter press" of the State; but there were no comments in any newspaper of which he could reasonably take notice, and in which he could make an explanation for its benefit, and to the Press generally; and it was not till quite recently that he heard there was a real belief that something was wrong in connection with the matter. He asked as a favour that the select committee be composed entirely of members from the Government side of the House. His position was so clear that he would rely completely on a committee so selected. He had no fear whatever as to the result; as it could be shown conclusively both to hon. members and to the public that in every instance he and his department had acted properly. Recently he called for the papers to be placed on the table, so that members, and the Press if it thought fit, might see exactly what were the merits of the case; but with the exception of a few members none took any apparent interest in the papers. The committee should have every possible power, and should not only compel the people whose names appeared in the papers laid on the table to give evidence, but should examine those who contributed certain articles to a section of the Press, and should find out if possible the reason for the malicious libels. He and officers of the department would be pleased to give evidence, and to assist the committee in determining the merits of the case. He hoped no objection would be raised to the appointment of the committee.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES AND JUSTICE (Hon. R. Hastie): In the circumstances, he had no objection to the committee; but he trusted the precedent would not be followed whenever there was a misunderstanding about a decision given by a Minister. In his experience, the ex-Minister for Mines (Mr. Gregory) had always afforded any inquiring member full opportunity for perusing the papers in any matter; and if new members of the House were not conversant with this case, that was only because they had not inquired about it. In the great majority of the newspapers, he (Hon. R. Hastie) had never seen one word about the *Empress of Coolgardie*, but only in a section of the Press which apparently had a large quantity of important informa-

tion, or information which seemed important to it, which caused it week after week to publish about the member for Menzies the most disparaging statements which had ever been made by any newspaper within the State. The committee should thoroughly investigate the matter, and should if possible get legal assistance. A lawyer was needed in an advisory capacity; because a perusal of the papers would show that the legal aspect of the question was the most important determining factor. After perusing the papers, the committee could determine whether they should sit at Coolgardie. It was hardly wise to instruct the committee to adjourn from place to place, unless at the request of the committee.

MR. F. CONNOR (Kimberley): To appointing the committee he did not object; but what would happen if the committee reported that the people now in possession of the lease were unjustly in possession? Was not this rather a case for the Supreme Court than for Parliament?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: No.

MR. GREGORY: Only one person was ever in possession of the lease.

MR. CONNOR: Did no one else do any work on it?

MR. GREGORY: No one who had any right to be there. Certain persons made application for a lease; but that was never approved of.

MR. CONNOR: They had possession.

MR. GREGORY: Not legal possession.

MR. CONNOR: They had possession.

MR. GREGORY: No. The fact of their going on the ground did not give them possession.

MR. CONNOR: This was a deadlock. Why the need for inquiry?

MR. GREGORY: The hon. member opposite (Mr. Scaddan) seemed to think an inquiry necessary. He (Mr. Gregory) wished the truth brought out.

MR. CONNOR: The matter ought to be settled in the Supreme Court. No doubt the ex-Minister for Mines was quite free from blame, and he was not speaking against that gentleman; but this was a dispute as to who should own a claim, and should be left to the court to settle.

MR. GREGORY: It was not such a dispute.

MR. CONNOR: If the committee were to go to Coolgardie to hear the case, who would bear the expense?

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member could discuss that when a motion was made that the committee have such power.

MR. CONNOR: Too much time had been wasted on motions of this sort, and too much expense incurred. There was not much necessity for the motion.

MR. A. E. THOMAS (Dundas) supported the motion. A section of the Press had attacked an ex-Minister of the Crown in respect of his judicial capacity as head of the Mines Department. Whether the charges were true or false was of great concern to the House; and the hon. member affected had an undoubted right, had he so desired, to bring the matter before the House as a question of privilege. In discussing this motion, however, we need not consider whether the attacks had any justification, though personally he considered there was not an atom of truth in the allegations. But whether or not they had any foundation, when the honour of a member of the House who had held such an important position was impugned, it was our duty to take immediate steps to prove his innocence or his guilt. The committee should have power to go to Coolgardie, so that the inquiry might be as complete as possible.

DR. ELLIS (Coolgardie): It was incumbent on him to support the appointment of the committee, as the lease was almost within the boundaries of his electorate, and he had heard statements concerning it, in season and out of season, for the last nine months. The case was somewhat complicated; there were many legal and other difficulties, and the fullest inquiry was rightly demanded; for if it were not full, people in the habit of making false aspersions would have some ground to go on. He (Dr. Ellis) did not believe there was a word of truth in the damaging statements he had heard; but it was right for the honour of the House that those statements should be investigated as completely as possible. The whole business was unsatisfactory; but he believed the cause for dissatisfaction was not in departmental administration, but in the condition of the law which governed that administra-

tion; and that when the House heard the report of the select committee, members would know, as they knew now, that many statements made concerning various parties to the transaction were absolutely false. It was advisable that the select committee, if appointed, should take evidence at Coolgardie. Knowing some of the people engaged in the transaction would not stick lightly at small statements, every opportunity should be given of proving the statements to be false.

Question put and passed.

Ballot taken, and a committee appointed comprising Dr. Ellis, Mr. W. Nelson, Mr. Scaddan, Mr. Thomas, with Mr. Horan as mover.

MR. HORAN farther moved:

That the committee have power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, and to adjourn from place to place; to report on the 27th October.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: There was a danger in deciding that the committee should adjourn from place to place, before having looked into the papers. The committee could meet tomorrow and go into the matter, and if necessary members would agree to the committee's proceeding to Coolgardie to take evidence. If the motion were carried, it would create a precedent which other committees would desire to follow in the future.

MR. HORAN assured the Minister that it would be necessary to go to Coolgardie at once.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The members of the select committee had had no opportunity of seeing the papers.

MR. RASON: No bad precedent would be created by following the course suggested. The whole matter would be dealt with on its merits, and the mover of the motion had assured members that it was necessary to go to Coolgardie. The sole object of the committee in proceeding to Coolgardie would be to save expense, to take evidence at Coolgardie rather than bring the witnesses to Perth.

MR. THOMAS: If the select committee were only to meet in Perth, undoubtedly a number of witnesses would have to attend from Coolgardie, and the travelling expenses of those witnesses would have to be paid.

MR. GREGORY: And the members elected on the committee all lived on the Eastern Goldfields.

MR. THOMAS: Two of the members resided in Coolgardie, and in regard to the others there would be no travelling expenses. It would be infinitely cheaper for the committee to meet at Coolgardie than sit in Perth. He would like to know if the committee would be able to have the advice of a solicitor from the Crown Law Department to guide them in the questions to be put to witnesses.

THE SPEAKER: The committee would have power to call for persons.

MR. THOMAS: If the committee required the services of a solicitor from the Crown Law Department, could such officer be in attendance to give advice? He intended to sift the matter to the bottom; otherwise he would not agree to serve on the committee.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—PAYMENT OF MEMBERS, INCREASE.

MR. E. P. HENSHAW (Collie) moved:—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that payment to members should be increased to at least £300 per annum.

He said: This is a very important question as affecting members, and as a matter affecting the country it is of small importance. For years past I have been advocating payment of members, on the ground that it would introduce a wider choice of representatives. We have seen in the past where there has been an absence of payment that the choice of the people has been limited to a very great extent. We have seen a position where only wealthy people could be returned, and the attitude of those people has been towards the conservation of wealth. They have been there in the interests of the wealthy classes, and up to the present time we have had class legislation of a very extreme order.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in referring in that way to the legislation of Parliament. He must not reflect on Parliament.

MR. HENSHAW: Then I will withdraw that. We have not had the representation that the people would have desired in the past; but this has been dispelled somewhat by the affirmation of

the principle by this State. Within the last two or three years there has been a small amount passed as payment to members, which has widened the choice somewhat; but I contend that if the amount were increased to £300 per annum we would have a still wider range of choice than now. The present amount is insufficient to maintain what I would call respectability. We are called upon to spend a good deal of that allowance in the form of postages and in wires. Most of us have to keep two homes, one in the country and one in the town; and this absorbs the major portion of the small remuneration we are at present receiving. If this allowance is taken on an amount per day it turns out that we receive 11s. 1½d. per day.

MR. GORDON: Good value too, I reckon.

MR. HOPKINS: How many days a week?

MR. HENSHAW: I am referring to seven days a week.

MR. GORDON: Working on Sundays?

MR. HENSHAW: I know I am called upon to do a good deal of Sunday-work in connection with the position I occupy, and I believe many other members are the same. I have seen members of this House at home on Sunday besieged from eight o'clock in the morning till eight o'clock at night. Unless the amount is increased, we have two alternatives; one is to go back to the old order of things and limit the choice, and the other is that members will be compelled to devote a considerable portion of their time towards augmenting their salaries. This is not desirable. I believe we should give the whole of our time to our duties. There is plenty to occupy us, and if this increase is made we shall be able to give that attention to our duties which they deserve. I have pointed out briefly that it affects country members to a greater extent than it does those who are representing constituencies near Perth. We have to spend a considerable amount in travelling backwards and forwards, which absorbs to a great extent the amount we receive. This question was threshed out pretty fully during the recent election, and most of the members in this Chamber pledged themselves to an increase. I know that in my own instance I referred to this very clearly on the platform,

and it met with the approbation of the electors in my constituency. I may say farther that when they were selecting a candidate in the Collie constituency the branch of the party with which I have the honour to be associated stipulated that the increased payment should form one of the planks in our platform. In most of the other States, in fact I believe in all the other States, and in New Zealand, they pay their representatives the same as I am asking shall be paid to members of this Chamber, £300 a year. [Interjection.] Except South Australia. The total amount of the increase is a small sum, a matter of £5,000, and in the other States where they pay this sum of £300 the members are not subjected to the great amount of travelling which we do in this State. I do not intend to take up the time of the House on this question, because I believe almost every member in the Chamber recognises the justice embodied in this motion; therefore I will commend the motion to members, and hope they will pass it.

MR. RASON: When do you wish it to come into force?

MR. HENSHAW: I wish it to take effect from the 28th June last.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND (South Fremantle): I second the motion.

[A pause ensued.]

MR. MORAN: Why discuss it? It is so obvious.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. R. Hastie): I take it that to a large extent this is a Treasury matter; and in the absence of the Treasurer I propose the adjournment of the debate.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: No.

Motion (adjournment) put and negatived.

MR. C. H. RASON (Guildford): Surely upon a question of this kind we are entitled to hear the views of the Government.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: If the House will not wait for the Treasurer, they cannot hear the views of the Government.

MR. RASON: In the first place I wish to protest against the manner in which this motion is being received and treated by the members of the Government. If the Treasurer is absent, surely a Minister of the Crown could have given to the House some idea of the way in which the

responsible Ministry would treat the question; whether they would approve of it, whether they were prepared to endorse this motion, or whether they viewed it with disfavour. Although the Treasurer is absent, he only left Perth this morning. He surely would not be so neglectful of his duties as not to give to his colleagues some idea of the attitude they were to take up with regard to this question.

MR. SCADDAN: How long has it been on the Notice Paper?

MR. RASON: Members opposite know well enough—if they do not I know well enough—that this matter has been discussed amongst members opposite for weeks past. They have held several meetings on the question. Every member there knew exactly when this question was going to be brought up. [MEMBER: No.] They had a very good idea when the motion was going to be introduced.

MR. MORAN: They wanted to give you a chance.

MR. RASON: That is quite right; but I am not taking that chance. Not only was that the case, but I know this, and indeed it is no secret, for we saw it in the papers, that they had the audacity to decide they would not move in this respect, but that it would be far preferable to get a member from this (Opposition) side of the House to propose the motion, and for them to give to it their unanimous support.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Did you put that in the Press?

MR. RASON: Unfortunately I was not present at the caucus meeting. I did not give the information to the Press. Am I correct in making the assumption that this motion has the unanimous support of the Ministry? If it has not—I think I may take it for granted that it has—

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Why?

MR. RASON: Do you contradict? The hon. member interjects "why?" I give him an answer, Mr. Speaker, through you, in the shape of another question.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Oh!

MR. RASON: It is a familiar and common way of answering questions. I make this assertion, and if it is not true I am sure the hon. member will deny it. I assert that this motion has the unanimous support of the Government of this country.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: I never heard it before.

MR. RASON: That statement remains uncontradicted.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: I never heard it before.

MR. RASON: I repeat, that statement remains uncontradicted. It has not been contradicted, and may I be allowed to say the members of the Government are afraid to contradict it.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Oh!

MR. RASON: They know very well it is absolutely true that they dare not contradict it. The opportunity for contradiction has been given, and has not been availed of. That being so, I am justified in assuming this motion has the unanimous support of the members of the Government. I am surprised that this should be so, when we have a Government that has told us it is absolutely necessary to mark time, that funds are so bad that works must be stopped in several directions, that it is absolutely necessary to economise in every direction; and yet almost one of the first motions introduced into this House is to increase the payment of members' salaries. It is not correct to say it would only mean an extra expense of some £5,000. It would mean an extra expense of some £7,000. The hon. member's motion says "members of Parliament." It therefore includes members of the Legislative Council.

MR. MORAN: It really does.

LABOUR MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. HOPKINS: They must have abolished the Upper House already.

MR. RASON: If members of the Legislative Council are not members of Parliament, Labour members have already achieved that which they desire to achieve later on. The motion reads "members of Parliament." It undoubtedly includes, as it stands, members of the Legislative Council.

LABOUR MEMBER: No; it does not.

MR. RASON: I can only deal with the motion before me, which distinctly says "payment to members of Parliament."

LABOUR MEMBER: "Payment to members."

MR. RASON: What does "members" mean but "members of Parliament"?

MR. HENSHAW: The intention was to make it apply to members of this House.

MR. RASON: I accept the statement that it was intended only to apply to members of this House; but no one would have gathered it but for the explanation now made. As the motion stands, it means members of Parliament. I gather it is intended to only apply to members of this House. That is a statement I will deal with a little later on, but it does not make the motion any more commendable to myself. Even though it would only involve an expenditure of £5,000 per annum, are we justified in going to that expense in the avowed state of the finances, and when we are told by the Government that it is necessary to stop work and economise in every direction, which means, if it means anything, that men will be thrown out of employment? I hope not, though in fact they are already. I hope that many men will not be deprived of their occupations. We have men starving, or very nearly starving; and it is far better to my mind that fifty members of Parliament should starve rather than that 5,000 people should go wanting. This extra £100 a year which we are asked to give to ourselves, amounting to £5,000, would keep a great many people from starving, and would keep hunger and want from the doors of a great number of people. We already have £200 a year. If it does nothing more, it at least keeps hunger and want from our doors. Yet, not satisfied in securing our positions, so far as we are concerned, against absolute need, we must, if you please, vote the people's money to give ourselves another £100 a year. No one can say that I am so rich that I can afford to do without this extra £100. I probably want it as badly as any member of the House.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: You need not take it.

MR. RASON: I am not going to take it. While the finances of this State are in the condition they are, or we are told they are—[DR. ELLIS: Do you admit they are bad?—I should not be justified, speaking for myself, in accepting extra payment.

DR. ELLIS: Nothing for work done?

MR. RASON: If a man were paid according to the value of his work,

the member for Coolgardie would get absolutely nothing. We are told by the member who introduced this motion that one of his objects was that there should be a wider choice given to the electors. It was an argument that appealed to me when I first saw the motion, and I shall use it against the hon. member. Will the hon. member tell me that if payment for members had been £300 instead of £200 at the time of the last general election, there would have been a wider choice? Then some members sitting here, able to vote another £100 to themselves, would not have been here at all. [DR. ELLIS: Quite right.] If I represent my constituents, as I hope I do, I like to be able to say that I represent them in spite of any man that could have come forward. I do not wish it to be said of me: "If payment had been £300 instead of £200, So-and-so might have come forward; and if he had, he would have beaten you." We know this applies especially to what are known as the working classes. We know that a man in constant employment, a man with a wife and family, has to think and does think very seriously before he throws up his employment to enter parliamentary life. If he be a married man with a family he has to consider not his own personal desire and not the wishes of those who are urging him to go into Parliament, but he has to consider for the sake of his wife and family whether he can afford to do so. The difference between £200 and £300 a year might, and would in a majority of cases, make all the difference. Many a man who could not and would not throw up his position for £200, would feel justified in doing it for £300 a year. Now if this motion was to affect the Parliament to follow us I should have no serious objection to it; but I asked the mover of this motion when he wished it to apply and when it was to come into force if carried, and, if you please, he says: "Date it back to the day of the last general election."

LABOUR MEMBER: That was done last time.

MR. RASON: Nothing of the sort. It was, so to speak, to date back to the very moment the hon. member was in Parliament. I am surprised that such a

proposition should come forward from Labour members themselves.

MR. SCADDAN: We agree to the same principle in Arbitration Court matters.

MR. RASON: What was done when payment of members was introduced in this House? Payment of members was urged in this House by the member for Menzies (Mr. Gregory), and it was carried in this House; but it was not to apply to the members of the Parliament then sitting; it was to apply to the next Parliament. That is how affairs were conducted before the advent of so many Labour members in this House; and I regret very much indeed that the advent of more Labour members should be signalised by conduct such as this. It seems to me that, in spite of their boasted affection for their fellow working men, they give very little proof of it. It seems to me that, on this motion alone, it is clear that others may be thrown out of work and may look in vain for their daily bread, but we care not so long as we ourselves can have an extra £100 a year.

THE SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member is in order in imputing that motive to the member who moved the motion.

MR. RASON: If I am out of order, I withdraw the remark. I make no charge against any individual. I am speaking of a Labour party which boasts of looking after its fellowmen; and I submit that this is very small proof of its sincerity. We are told that at the present time the choice of members has been so limited that the class of legislation which has passed through this Assembly has been very one-sided. Stronger words were used; but since you, sir, ruled them out of order, I do not intend to refer to them. However, that was the effect, that legislation was one-sided, that it has not been liberal. I feel bound, for the sake of members who sat in the Parliament of Western Australia for so long, to repudiate that statement altogether.

THE SPEAKER: The statement was withdrawn.

MR. RASON: The actual words were withdrawn because they were out of order; but, with all respect, the fact still remains, and the statement was repeated in words which put the hon. member in

order. Certainly, the impression which the hon. member wished to convey was conveyed, and remained in the minds of members of this House. It is that impression which I wish to say is a false impression, because members of Parliament of Western Australia in days gone by introduced and succeeded in carrying liberal and progressive measures, some of the most liberal and progressive on the statute-books of Australasia; and it is a very poor return for members who worked years in and years out without any payment at all that they should be told that, because payment now is only £200 a year, it altogether limits the choice of electors and renders it impossible for those people who ought to come into this House, and who would give us better legislation, to be elected. The attitude I shall myself take upon this question is I think clear. It must be clear to every member of this House. If the increased payment was to apply to the next Parliament and not to this, I should have nothing to say. If circumstances were different, perhaps, I should not have so much to say about it; but I do protest against this Parliament doing anything to increase the payment to itself for its own members while we are told, and we know, that there are scores and hundreds of people out of work.

MR. WALLACE NELSON (Hannans): I have listened with a considerable degree of pain to the speech which was just now delivered, believing as I do that it appears to lack that sincerity which generally characterises the utterances of the hon. member. There is nothing one admires more in this world than virtue, and nothing that one despises more than an assumption of superior virtue where there is no reason to believe it exists. I would remind the member for Guildford that the party who at the present time are demanding for the members of this House a rise in their salary—

MR. HOPKINS: Oh, it is a party question!

MR. NELSON: I am willing to admit that at any rate a large proportion of the members of this House, though we are not all at one, believe that a rise in salary is justified; and I am persuaded and have no hesitation in saying that the people who are outside, those poor

miserable workers to whom the heart of the member for Guildford goes out, those poor miserable wretches who will be ground to the very dust if that £5,000 should be spent in adequately remunerating members of this House, poor though those people may be, humble though their homes may be, on the verge of starvation even though they may be, I believe that those people are generous enough, fair enough, and loyal enough to the traditions of this House and of this State, to say that the representatives of the people should be adequately and fairly paid. It is unjust to the men who have advocated this increase of salary to insinuate that they lack sympathy for the workers. I say that there are men here who fought for the workers when it was dangerous to fight for them; who championed their rights when men of the type of the member for Guildford were silent; and I believe that when his speech goes forth to-morrow, the people will know that his pharisaism, if I may be permitted to use the word, and the insinuations he has made against members on the Government side of the House, are unworthy of his character and of the high position he holds in this Assembly. I wish to point out that the member for Guildford appears to be as inaccurate in his statements as he is ungenerous in his general attitude towards the Labour party. He deliberately informs the House that when the member for Menzies (Mr. Gregory) introduced a motion for the payment of members, the Bill was not made retrospective; that it applied purely to subsequent Parliaments; and he even went so far as to compare the marvellous virtues of the House of that day with the degenerate condition of the present House. That there may be no misunderstanding, I will quote the words of the Act: "This Act may be cited as the Payment of Members Act."

MR. GREGORY: Will you not quote the motion affirming the principle?

MR. NELSON: I am quoting the Act. I beg the member for Guildford to correct his knowledge of the subject by paying careful attention to the following words:—

As from the first day of the present session of Parliament every person while a member of the Legislative Council, except as provided by

Section 4, shall be entitled to receive from the Colonial Treasurer out of the consolidated revenue payment at the rate of £200 per annum; and every person while a member of the Legislative Assembly, except as aforesaid, shall be entitled to receive in like manner payment at the rate of £200 per annum.

That is to say, from the first day of the session of Parliament in which the Act was passed. So that the member for Guildford, as I have already hinted, is as inaccurate in his statements as he is ungenerous in the imputation of unworthy motives. Another consideration. Members on this side of the House are in honour bound, in point of honesty and fidelity to their pledges, to support this motion. I would remind members that in the last session of Parliament the Labour members supported the increase of salaries. On that occasion we were told that it would be all right in the next Parliament, though it was all wrong in that one. Now we are told it will be all right in the next Parliament; and if we wait till the next Parliament, I suppose it will be the Parliament after that, and so on for ever and ever.

MR. RASON (in explanation): I find that I made a mistake when I said that the Act applied to the new Parliament. The actual position was that a motion was introduced in the last session of a Parliament which was then four years old. The member introducing the motion did not seek to make it retrospective at all. Members of future Parliaments were to be paid. But when the Bill was introduced it was made retrospective to the extent of that session—the last session of that Parliament. That position is, however, very different from the present.

MR. NELSON: There is no fundamental difference; and although I accept the statement of the hon. member, and believe that he spoke in perfect sincerity, I still submit that originally he inaccurately described the real state of affairs. But I desire to point out that the Labour members supported the increase in members' salaries. They did so openly and avowedly. They made no mistake about it. They spoke in its support and recorded their votes in favour of the motion. And when subsequently they went to the country, wherever the question came up, they openly declared that the salary was inadequate; and I say

that when we bear these facts in mind, when we bear in mind firstly that the Labour members of this House advocated the increase, that subsequently they voted for the increase, that they went to their constituents who with these facts staring them in the face returned them in relatively overwhelming numbers to this House, these facts prove conclusively that the great body of the people, unlike the member for Guildford, are in favour of adequately remunerating the men who do the work in this Chamber. I do not wish to labour the question. I say that I could quite understand a member holding that payment of members is wrong in principle. But so long as it is a principle, so long as it is accepted as reasonable that the members of this House should be paid for their services to the country, then I think it the duty of the country to adequately remunerate those services. If payment of members is wrong, let us abolish it; but if it is a just principle, let us apply that principle in a manner worthy of the great country to which we belong.

MR. E. NEEDHAM (Fremantle) : I regret exceedingly that on this occasion I shall have to support some of the remarks of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rason). While I agree with some of his remarks, I shall certainly not allow to pass unchallenged the imputations he has cast on the Labour party as supporters of this motion. I dare say almost every member recognises the necessity for the proposed increase. I recognise it; but I do not feel justified in voting to myself on this occasion an increase of salary without consulting my electors. The member for Hannans (Mr. Nelson) has stated that members on the Government side of the House are all pledged to the principle. [SEVERAL MEMBERS: No.] He said that members on this side of the House advocated on the hustings the increase in the payment of members. Anyhow, I was not tied on the question in any way. I can assure the House that during the time I was on the hustings the question was not mentioned. It was understood that if I were elected I should receive a salary of £200 a year. If I were working for a private employer, and had engaged to start with him at 8s. or 9s. per day, if I found I were worth more I should at least ask

him for an increase. I should not have the privilege or the opportunity of voting that money to myself. That being so, I do not feel inclined to support this motion now. Members may say, what would you do if something else transpired on which you had no opportunity of consulting your constituents? I should do just what I am doing to-night, act according to my own discretion; take the best possible stand I could so far as my scruples would allow me; and then give an account of my stewardship afterwards. I regard the present remuneration of members as inadequate; but I deny the right of members to vote themselves increases of salary without giving the electors a chance to say through the ballot-box whether members deserve the increase or whether it shall be paid them. I grant the supporters of this motion that if our salaries were increased we should have better facilities for travelling round the State than we at present enjoy. We wish to keep in touch with every part of the State, for our doing so has an educative effect. And as most members on the Government side are devoting all their time to their parliamentary duties, I consider that the proposed increase is justified. But I wish the mandate to come from the people, and not from members of this Chamber. I will vote against the motion, and will give an account of my stewardship to those who sent me here.

MR. HOPKINS : Minister!

MR. C. C. KEYSER (Albany) : I object to Ministers being called on. In my opinion, private members of Parliament should speak for themselves. I am much in favour of the increase of payment, and am justified, inasmuch as my constituency has the same feeling. When I was contesting my election, the question was asked whether, if returned, I should be in favour of the increase; and I said I should undoubtedly favour it, explaining that I considered it the duty of a member of Parliament to make himself acquainted not only with every part of his own district, but with every constituency throughout the State. I venture to say that a man like myself, who is totally dependent on his salary as a member, must find it utterly impossible to travel throughout the State. And so, in order that I may be able to travel more and that I may be

fairly remunerated for my service—as I do not think I am now, although other members may have a different opinion—I am in favour of this increase. The ex-Premier (Mr. Walter James), in speaking of this principle, said he was in favour of it because non-payment of members nowadays was almost as much out of date as would be an inquest to ascertain whether a person was affected with a devil or with witchcraft.

MR. RASON: That was prior to payment of members.

MR. KEYSER: No. I am quoting from *Hansard* a speech of 1903. Mr. James said we were committed to payment of members, and wisely committed. This is an aspect we must consider. If payment of members had not been in vogue, we should not have had 22 Labour members returned at the last election. That is a farther point, that almost half the members of the House are here simply and solely because of the principle of payment of members. That being the case, we have ample justification in asking for an increase in the payment to members. I regret the language used by the member for Guildford: he was most dramatic in his attitude, and his remarks in imputing motives to this side of the House were unworthy. I have not the slightest hesitation in telling members that I believe in payment of members, and I believe that £200 a year is not sufficient. The member for Guildford said it was something to be ashamed of. In my opinion it is nothing to be ashamed of. I have been returned to represent my constituents, and I am going to represent them as far as my ability allows, I am going to do what I can consistent with honesty of purpose. I am determined, as far as I am able, to be their representative who will receive the credit of this House, so that when I go back to my constituents I shall be returned and they will be able to say, "He did his duty and he did it well." On the other hand I want my constituents to remember that I have served them faithfully and have done my duty, and want to be paid for it. I venture to say the country should pay a member of Parliament and pay him well. I am not going to the hustings to agitate for eight hours a day and fair wages for men, and come into the House and work long hours of

labour to receive a salary which is not sufficient to keep me.

MR. FRANK WILSON: Three days a week.

MR. KEYSER: Yes, three days a week. What does it mean at the present time?

MR. NANSON: What were you getting before you came here?

MR. KEYSER: That is a very pertinent question, but it may be consistent with the hon. member's general character. This is the point I want to come to, that when I put up for election this question was asked, "If returned, will you live in your constituency?" I am pledged to live in the Albany district. That means that when the sittings of the House are over, I must go to Albany and live there; and I say at the present time it is most difficult for me to keep within the bounds of £200 a year, with the utmost economy. It is just as much as I can do to live on £200 a year, having to live at Albany and come to Perth to attend to my parliamentary duties. Without going farther into personal matters, I want to impress every member that on this question I am honestly in favour of the motion, because I believe members who are giving up positions to serve the country ought to be paid well, at all events sufficient to keep them out of debt.

MR. J. M. HOPKINS (Boulder): I do not hesitate to write down the actions of the Ministry to-night as the most scandalous that I have ever witnessed since I have been a member of the House. I repeat that statement: the actions of the Ministry in regard to this question I deem to be the most scandalous of anything I have witnessed as a member of the House. I say that emphatically and after mature consideration, and I mean it. To-morrow morning the Press of the State are amply justified in writing down the members of the Assembly as a crowd of canting hypocrites. I have heard speeches like that by the member for Hannans to-night in the Sydney Domain and on the Melbourne wharves before to-day.

MEMBER: What were you doing there?

MR. HOPKINS: A member interjects. I was there listening to the kind of thing we frequently hear from the member for Coolgardie. Referring to the Notice Paper which has been occupy-

ing the attention of Parliament to-night, we find that the member for Hannans moved:—

That in consequence of the need of readjusting the legislative machinery of the State in harmony with the new conditions introduced by the establishment of the Commonwealth, and in order to effect needful economies, this House is of opinion that the office of State Governor should be abolished and its duties performed by the Chief Justice of the State.

MR. NELSON: So do you.

MR. HOPKINS: I do hold with it, and I moved for it at a period in the Parliament when the question was not as popular as it appears to-day, with the blind following sitting on the other side of the House. There is another notice on the paper at the present time, moved by the member for Coolgardie.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in referring to these other motions.

MR. HOPKINS: In view of the hon. member for Hannans having tabled two motions, the one bearing upon the face of it an accusation against the other of mendacity, surely the question of expenditure —

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in using that term.

MR. HOPKINS: What, mendacity?

THE SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. HOPKINS: Then I withdraw the term, and say the member for Hannans, in keeping with his little way, has moved a motion in the affirmative, and immediately has moved another in the negative.

MR. W. NELSON: I rise to a point of order. I moved one motion and no other, and I ask if the member for Boulder is correct in declaring that I moved two motions when I only moved one?

MR. HOPKINS: The hon. member moved one motion —

MR. MORAN: He moved one and pushed the other.

MR. HOPKINS: Yes; to use the interjection of the member for West Perth, the hon. member gave the other motion a friendly help. I do not think it is possible to deal with the question without introducing its financial aspect. Before I conclude I am going to move an amendment:—

That in view of the House having this day affirmed the necessity to effect needful

economies, the question of an increase of payment to members should be deferred for the present session.

I shall await with interest the vote that will be taken on this amendment. The member who represents Collie has moved "That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that payment to members should be increased to at least £300 per annum." I assume that the party has thrown this out as a feeler to see if it is possible to get £500 per annum. How else could we interpret the wording of that motion? The member for Hannans stated that it was the desire of the party to do certain things, and they wish to increase their salaries.

MR. KEYSER: Did he not qualify the remark?

MR. HOPKINS: After an interjection made from the Opposition side, the hon. member found he had given away one of the caucus secrets, and in consequence he tried to rectify the statement so injudiciously made. That the choice would be considerably widened no person will deny, and if the salary of a member of Parliament was increased to £1,000 a year we might see exemplified the cartoon which appeared in the *Western Mail* recently, where the returning officer exclaims, "There is no one to vote: they are all candidates." That is the object and the only position that can come from it. If members of Parliament were paid £1,000 a year there would not be the same scramble for office.

MR. MORAN: Pay Ministers £800 a year and members £1,000.

MR. HOPKINS: We have a Government in power at the present time whose advent heralded the policy of "mark time," whose financial policy is that we should mark time, that there must be a decrease in expenditure, that this country cannot afford a public works policy. These are the statements which have fallen from the Colonial Treasurer, the present Prime Minister of the State. We have had a Bill lately introduced to establish a Public Service Commissioner, which will mean the creation practically of a new department. I do not suppose, when it is all said and done, that the expenses will be under £3,000 to £5,000 a year for that item alone.

MEMBER: You wanted to appoint an additional Judge.

MR. HOPKINS: The Government wished to appoint a Commissioner of the Supreme Court, who would be paid, I suppose, the same salary as a Judge. That would mean another appointment made by the party who stand for economy. I do not suppose the Government would appoint a Commissioner for the fun of removing him. The idea is that there is work for him to do. It cannot be anticipated that even the Labour party would appoint a Commissioner without making provision for his salary. We have had a large increase in expenditure recently, more particularly during the last three years, since federation was established, all the new expenditure as to the establishment of federation; and what economies which most of us anticipated would be possible have so far been effected? It was said there was a possibility of a High Commissioner being appointed, which would have obviated the necessity of keeping so many Agents General in London. That is the first mine that has been exploded. Then the Government were going to effect economy by giving the Agent General £1,000 a year, but they reconsidered the question and gave him £1,500. We have a Federal High Court and all the increased expenditure in connection with the establishment of the Commonwealth. For my part, I strongly advocated in the House economies following on the advent of federation. The obligation is cast on the State Parliament, as far as practicable, to bring about a reduction in the annual expenditure. I can cite many instances of civil servants in the employ of the country working just as hard and just as long, and indeed longer than the member for Albany or the member for Hannans; men who have got wives and families to support, and who are doing it, probably on £130 or £140 per annum. They have no free passes to travel on the railways. I can cite the case of the head of a family in the civil service of the country drawing under £100 a year; yet we have members here drawing £200 a year, and at this period in the Parliament a proposal comes down to increase the salary by fifty per cent.

MR. BOLTON: Does it cost a member nothing for donations?

MR. HOPKINS: I suppose there is an end to the folly of most men, and if it pleases the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Bolton) to contribute largely to all the sports and kindred associations throughout the State, I do not think it is fair for him to turn round and try and impose the penalty of his misdeeds upon the people of this country. Many civil servants in this State have wives and families to maintain on a remuneration closely approximating to £100, £130, £150, £180, or £200 a year; these men are denied the privilege of earning a shilling outside. That is a privilege which is not denied the members of this House. [MEMBER: It should be.] We know perfectly well many members of Parliament are able to earn in addition more than they receive from the coffers of the State. On the other hand, under the Civil Service Bill civil servants are all required to take out a life insurance policy, which will mature I suppose at sixty years of age, or at the time of their demise. I believe members of this House are all qualified for old age pensions, and in order to make assurance doubly sure the party on the Government side have made old age pensions the first plank in their platform to receive attention. I believe that to make assurance still more sure the Minister for Works (Hon. W. D. Johnson) and the Colonial Secretary (Hon. G. Taylor) made it their business to look at the site of the Old Men's Depôt. I would not be sure whether it was the Old Men's Depôt or the Lunatic Asylum. I should say they are both most appropriate. I do not want to take up the time of the House. I can perfectly understand that a gentleman like the member who represents Albany (Mr. C. C. Keyser), who has known a position of great affluence in his early period, now finding himself an under-paid servant of the Crown drawing a salary about 35 to 50 or 100 per cent. more than he ever drew before, is badly hurt. However, I want to take the opportunity, for my own part, of saying that whilst we have nurses in the hospitals of this country working, as we know they are, 12 hours a day for a miserable salary of from £50 to £75 a year, and whilst we have civil servants maintaining wives and families on a salary of £100 or £150—

MR. SCADDAN: You should have said that before when the matter was discussed.

MR. HOPKINS: And whilst we have a Government that calls for economy, I maintain that the present period, in face of the resolution moved by the member for Hannans (Mr. W. Nelson) and carried by the House this evening, is not an appropriate time for the concession sought by the member for Collie (Mr. Henshaw). I desire to move an amendment:—

That all the words after "that" be struck out, with a view of inserting the following: "In view of the House having this day affirmed the necessity to effect needful economies, the question of an increase of payment to members should be deferred for the present session."

MR. M. F. TROY (Mount Magnet): I was somewhat surprised at hearing the remarks to-night from the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rason), and also the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins). I was naturally surprised, because from extracts quoted by the member for Hannans those members have not always been consistent. I look upon it also as rather somewhat approaching hypocrisy.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order.

MR. TROY: I was not in the Chamber at the time, but I believe the mover said that if adequate remuneration were given for members' services, a better class of legislator would result. I do not altogether hold with that; but the leader of the Opposition seems to hold with it or something to that effect. He will no doubt remember that he at one time represented the constituency which I now have the honour to represent. There was no payment of members existing at that time. I cannot say whether that constituency was as well represented then as it was later on, but some people say it was not. Possibly that was because the remuneration was not adequate. That may have had a great deal to do with it. I will support the motion as moved by the member for Collie, because throughout a great part of the State everyone returned as a member of this Assembly had a mandate to secure adequate remuneration in connection with his services in this House. I think it was generally recognised that the remuneration was inadequate, and that those mem-

bers representing portions of the State removed from the metropolis had to incur greater expense; expense which the member for Guildford (Mr. C. H. Rason) has not to undergo, and which other members can ill afford. In connection with such members I think it only fair that some increased remuneration should be given, and in my opinion the time is now opportune. If the finances of the State are not in a position to bear this extra remuneration, we may assume that the Opposition are responsible for that state of affairs. Members now on the Opposition side filled the Treasury benches quite recently, and if the present Government have found the finances in a very bad condition, that, in my opinion, must reflect discredit on the previous occupants of the Treasury benches. The member for Boulder spoke with a great deal of feeling about scrambling for office by the present occupants of the Treasury benches; but I think he must admit that never was there a more undignified state of things presented to this House than the reluctance with which the men who occupied the Treasury benches left them.

MR. C. H. RASON: I must at once ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark. It is a reflection upon the leader of the Opposition. He says that with the greatest reluctance the party I belong to left the Treasury benches. On the contrary; but for the opportunity we gave, we should probably not have left those benches at all.

MR. TROY: If I am out of order, I shall withdraw.

THE SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member was out of order.

MR. TROY: Certainly it appeared to me as a new member that they did leave the Treasury benches with considerable reluctance, and I believe they left them for the country's good. Although members on the Opposition side who spoke against this motion referred feelingly to the wants of the people of this State, we never heard of anything they had done for the people; we never heard of their having championed the cause of the people. Now, of course, they can show that virtue which did not exist some time ago. They appeal to the Press to cry down this (Labour) party throughout the State because of its having proposed this

motion. That is nothing new to this party. This party has ever been misrepresented, and misrepresented to no purpose. No party has been more misrepresented; and if in this instance it is also done, then I can hardly think it will do the party much harm. We have at the present time a portion of the Press here always harassing the Government on every possible opportunity. Still the Government exists.

MR. W. B. GORDON: "Exists," exactly.

MR. TROY: Of course, we recognise that if we were not on these benches, those now on the Opposition benches would soon get votes in favour of this motion. I think you are —

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

MR. TROY: I think the game of ins-and-outs would be played. When there is an opportunity for members to hear something important we can always confidently expect the member for Boulder will give that opportunity to the Press. The member for Boulder naturally believes that the country has such confidence in him that it will believe everything he says in this Chamber.

MR. HOPKINS: It is jolly good, is it not?

MR. TROY: There is no necessity for my saying much more on this question, because I intend to vote for the motion, and I feel sure also that members on the Opposition benches are perfectly satisfied the motion will be carried. There are many on the Opposition side of the House who have a mandate from their constituents to have an increased remuneration in connection with their parliamentary duties.

MR. GREGORY: What are the Government going to do?

MR. TROY: We look towards the members of the Opposition, because we know at the present time they are more deeply concerned than are the Government. The Government have their salaries as Ministers of the Crown.

MR. GORDON: Is it not divided?

MR. TROY: The Opposition unfortunately have not that particular sum at the present time.

MR. MORAN: They are very generous—they do not want it; but your leaders will not look after you.

MR. TROY: I say emphatically that this is not a party question.

MR. MORAN: It looks very like it.

MR. TROY: When the member for West Perth went before his constituents, he advocated that members' salaries should be increased to £400.

MR. SCADDAN: And promised to move it at the first opportunity.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: And the people returned him on it.

MR. MORAN: Are you sure it was £400? Was it not £500?

MR. TROY: Four hundred pounds will meet my argument.

MR. MORAN: I think it was £300, was it not?

MR. TROY: If this was discussed, as we are told by the member for Guildford, in caucus, I heard nothing of it—I say emphatically I heard nothing of it. If the matter was discussed in caucus, I must confess I did not hear any remarks about it.

MR. MORAN: None so deaf as those who will not hear.

MR. TROY: The first intimation I had that the matter was discussed in caucus was when I returned from the Murchison. I then saw it in the *West Australian*, or perhaps in the *Herald*.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: That would be more accurate.

MR. TROY: As the hon. member says, any information derived from the *Herald* would be more authentic.

MR. NANSON: It was in "Labour Notes," I think.

MR. TROY: Of course the "Labour Notes" are written by the member for Greenough. I want an increased remuneration, and I have no hesitation in saying that I would go back to my constituents and tell them what I have done in this matter, just as on every possible occasion I have done my best to see that the poor starving workers mentioned by the member for Guildford have received every support that I could give them in getting fair remuneration for their work.

MR. MORAN: Why don't you cite a case for the Arbitration Court?

MR. TROY: I intend to support the motion.

MR. C. J. MORAN (West Perth): I have always held, during my number of years in public life, that it was incumbent upon the people to treat with respect and

look up to their leaders who represented them in Parliament. I hold that view still. It is not good for the country that members of Parliament should not have sufficient to move about as becomes the position of those who legislate for the State. I believe in increased payment to members; but I must express astonishment at the lame and halting way in which the Government have approached the matter at the present time. That is where I find fault, and the blame is magnified all the greater when the Government are simply the executive wing of a caucus which is the majority on this side of the House. It is part of the pledged platform of the party to which every member of the Ministry in this House belongs.

LABOUR MEMBER: What is that?

MR. MORAN: Increased payment to members.

LABOUR MEMBER: It is not in the platform.

MR. MORAN: I know it is. I have never come across a Labour man, in or out of Parliament, who does not believe in adequate remuneration for members of Parliament; and £200 is not adequate. I believe I advocated before the electors of West Perth that £300 was a fair remuneration for members of this House. I think £200 is an unfair remuneration for members of another place; but that is another matter. I very much regret the loss of the traditions of responsible government, and the loss of the traditions of what a Government should be in leading the people's House on such a question as this. To think that we to-night might commit the country on a question of this kind while the Ministry remain silent, either not having made up their minds or, in the absence of the gentleman who leads them, afraid to make up their minds, is altogether against the best traditions of Parliament. It would be more becoming on the part of the Government had they come down with a policy recommending an increased payment of members to £300 a year. That would have been a manly way of carrying out the matter. The Government should take the responsibility upon their own shoulders. They have the opportunity, having a following that other Governments have not had in Western Australia, a pledged party of 22 votes,

and being kept in power by the votes of some other members willing to give them fair play and willing to support them in a measure of this kind because they believe in it. But they do not believe in arrogating to themselves the functions of the Ministry, or in putting into a corner any Ministry, though such Ministry are preferring to sit calmly by like ducks in a thunderstorm while the rain sweeps over them, taking no responsibility. In the circumstances I demand from the Ministry of the day an expression of opinion on this matter.

MR. BOLTON: There will be an expression before the question is put.

MR. MORAN: In order that this information may be given, and given deliberately, I will not be one to corner the Ministry in any way. I do not think it will hurt to leave the question over for a day or two. The leader of the House may not have known that this motion was coming on to-day, as many important motions were before it on the Notice Paper, and one would not have imagined that such an important motion as this would have come on to-day. I had it on my mind that the important question of the State Governor would have lasted for hours, as it was entitled to do had it not been amended in the way it was. I therefore ask that the usual practice shall be followed in this matter, and that we shall adjourn the debate so that the Premier, who is doing his duty at Northam to-day and who might be surprised, may have an opportunity of putting up a Minister to speak on the matter. I ask for this, since I see that the members of the Ministry are not going to speak.

MR. RASON: They are entitled to it.

MR. MORAN: They are not entitled to it while there is a responsible Minister in the House. He should have been armed with an expression of opinion from his leader on the matter. Since we see that the Government have not considered the question, I crave for them an opportunity of giving an expression of opinion on the subject. We can then see whether the Premier will act in keeping with his expressed policy, or that, notwithstanding, he considers the matter of £5,000 is not of such importance as to prevent his agreeing to members of Parliament having decent salaries. If

the Government introduce a measure to pay members £300 a year I shall support it. It is my opinion that the affairs of this country are not in so sorry or sad a state that the payment of that amount is to have such a significant effect on the finances. In a country with a revenue of three and a-half millions, and luxuriating in a prosperity unknown in the world to-day, I do not think that a matter of £5,000 should stand in the way of a great principle of this kind; but I demand responsible government, and I wish to see the Ministry I support responsive to their duty. So I suggest that the debate be adjourned in order that we may get an expression of opinion on this matter from the Premier.

MR. GREGORY: Do not let us adjourn. One of the Ministers may speak.

MR. T. H. BATH: I move the adjournment of the debate.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	15

Majority for ... 6

AYES.

Mr. Angwin
Mr. Bath
Mr. Bolton
Mr. Diamond
Mr. Ellis
Mr. Hastie
Mr. Heilmann
Mr. Henshaw
Mr. Holman
Mr. Horna
Mr. Isdell
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Keyser
Mr. Moran
Mr. Needham
Mr. Nelson
Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Troy
Mr. F. F. Wilson
Mr. Gill (Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Brown
Mr. Connor
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hayward
Mr. Hicks
Mr. Hopkins
Mr. McLarty
Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Nanson
Mr. Rason
Mr. Thomas
Mr. A. J. Wilson
Mr. Frank Wilson
Mr. Gordon (Teller).

Motion thus passed, and the debate adjourned.

MOTION—ADJOURNMENT.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (at 10 o'clock) was understood to move "That the House do now adjourn."

Question put and negatived.

INSPECTION OF MACHINERY BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the previous sitting; MR. BATH in the Chair, the MINISTER

FOR MINES (Hon. R. Hastie) in charge of the Bill.

New Clause—Winding engine-drivers to be examined by medical practitioner:

DR. ELLIS moved that the following be inserted as Clause 67:—

(1.) Any person in charge of a winding engine used for raising or lowering men or materials on any mine shall be examined once at least in every 18 months by a duly qualified medical practitioner, who shall furnish a certificate stating that such person is not subject to deafness, defective vision, epilepsy, or other physical infirmity which would render him unfit for his duties; which certificate shall be delivered to such person and produced by him for inspection by the Inspector of Machinery for the district, or other authorised person, when required.

(2.) Any engine-driver who, in the opinion of a duly qualified medical practitioner, is not in a fit state to take charge of a winding engine shall forthwith desist from working the same, but may take charge of any other stationary engine which in the opinion of the inspector he may safely do.

(3.) Any engine-driver who does not comply with the provisions of this section shall be liable to a fine not exceeding fifty pounds, in addition to the cancellation of his certificate by the Board of Examiners appointed under Section 56.

This would protect miners from an evident danger. If a winding engine-driver suffered from a permanent or a temporary complaint, there should be a method of removing him from his charge. Recently a man afflicted with a tumor on the brain had charge of a winding engine, and continued in charge, though his medical attendant informed him of the danger. That man could not be punished, and the doctor could not betray a confidence by giving the information to others. The responsibility must therefore be placed on the engine-driver. A mail steamer was recently lost at the entrance to Hobson's Bay because the pilot was suffering from Bright's disease; and a similarly diseased engine-driver might wreck a cage and cause considerable loss of life. It was no hardship that drivers should undergo a medical examination every 18 months, to ensure that they were not suffering from any cardinal complaint. The remaining subclauses sought to prevent a man from wilfully taking charge of machinery when he had no right to do so. The moral effect of the clause would be considerable, and would avert disaster which was otherwise sure to happen.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES supported the clause generally, though the words "mines or" should be inserted before "machinery," in line 6 of Sub-clause 1. The Inspector of Mines ought to have this power of inspection; for it was intended that the Inspector of Machinery should travel through the country, the goldfields especially, about once a year, whereas the visits of the Inspector of Mines should be frequent, and it would be more convenient that he should see that the men had the certificates. In the past no one was granted a first-class certificate authorising him to drive an engine unless his sight and general health were good. The present rule was practically to the effect of the new clause. Apparently members acquainted with the engine-drivers' point of view did not anticipate any difficulty. It was of great importance that the drivers of such machinery, on whom so much depended, should be competent; and the clause would ensure a medical examination every 18 months, to ascertain whether they still retained the competency which they had when first certificated.

DR. ELLIS accepted the amendment suggested.

MR. SCADDAN: While drivers of winding engines should be periodically examined, the new clause would prove rather harsh to engine-drivers, especially those in outlying districts. The Government hospital doctors should examine the drivers free of charge. That a driver should every 18 months pay an examination fee, which was sometimes heavy, would be unjust. Moreover, there was no provision that the driver should pass a medical examination before receiving his certificate as driver.

THE MINISTER: That was the existing rule.

MR. SCADDAN: No. The board which gave him his certificate did not ask for proof of his physical fitness. True, the board might have demanded proof of this, though none but a doctor could determine such a question; and even if a mate of the engine-driver were aware that the driver was unfit to be in charge, it was not to be expected that the mate would give information. The clause should apply in none but populous centres; for drivers should not have to travel many miles every 18 months to

get medical certificates. Every three years would be often enough; and if the certificate left the health of the applicant in doubt, the board should have power to call on him to appear again in six months. There were only one or two cases of accidents caused by the illness of engine-drivers.

MR. A. E. THOMAS: Clause 57 stated that all applications for examination should be forwarded to the Chief Inspector of Machinery at Perth, accompanied by a certificate of a medical practitioner that the applicant was not subject to any physical infirmity which would render him unfit for his duties. The new clause provided only that the driver should continue physically fit, or might in default be removed. The amendment was necessary; but perhaps the words "or materials" could be left out. There would be no danger whatever to the men in the shaft where materials only were raised. In cases where small hoists for material were used the engine-driver need not have a first-class certificate.

THE MINISTER: No person should be allowed to work in a shaft or at the bottom of a shaft unless the man in charge of the engine had a first-class certificate. If men were working in a shaft where materials were being brought to the surface and something went wrong, the engine would have to stand still. It would be difficult to leave out the words "or materials." There were many shafts where men usually travelled by ladder, but often men were working at the bottom of the shaft and in the shaft itself. He could not see a way to meet the objection. As to the remarks of the member for Ivanhoe, if it were necessary to examine engine-drivers at Kalgoorlie and large centres, then engine-drivers employed out back should also be examined. It was thought in the first instance that engine-drivers should be medically examined every 12 months, but after discussing the question the period was extended to 18 months. It was thought that in that time engine-drivers would be near a doctor, so that they could be examined within the 18 months. The member for Ivanhoe also suggested that an arrangement might be made by the department with the officers in public hospitals so that engine-drivers could

obtain certificates free of charge. Engine-drivers were able to pay a small fee of, say, 5s. If the amendment were passed he would see the matter was looked into and that arrangements were made to meet the case.

MR. GREGORY: Perhaps it would be well to report progress at this stage. There was a phase of the question which had not been raised by the member for Dundas which was well worthy of consideration. A man might be driving a winding engine which was only raising water, in which case a first-class certificate should not be needed by the engine-driver. The proposal might be altered to read "any person being the holder of a first-class certificate," and then some words could be inserted so that an engine-driver while following his occupation every 18 months should pass an examination. If a man went away from his work as engine-driver for two or three years he should be compelled to have a certificate on returning to such work. There was no element of danger where an engine was used for raising materials, so then the necessity for examining the engine-driver did not exist.

THE MINISTER: There was no water shaft where water was hauled by bucket or by cage in which men had not to travel at least once a week in the shaft, because something was sure to go wrong in the shaft.

MR. GREGORY: There were supposed to be ladder ways.

THE MINISTER: But it would be impossible to reach the obstruction from the ladder ways.

MR. THOMAS: Where an engine was employed to carry material to an inclined stack or to a battery, it would not be necessary to employ a certificated engine-driver. It would be a distinct hardship to say that the man who was driving such an engine should obtain a certificate, because no danger existed.

THE MINISTER: This provision had been the law of the State for years.

MR. THOMAS: But it had never been in force.

THE MINISTER: The regulations about winding engines had.

MR. THOMAS: It would be a hardship which should not be inflicted on any man, to take away the means of livelihood and force him to remain out of work

for a considerable time when the labour market was congested. The Minister might bring in an amendment to meet such cases.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES, in moving that the House do now adjourn, reminded members that it was intended the House should adjourn next day at half-past eight. Members of the Assembly and the other place would then attend a "smoke social" to Mr. Walter James, within the precincts of the House.

Question passed.

The House adjourned at 10:31 o'clock, until the next afternoon.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 6th October, 1904.

	PAGE
Questions: Press Representatives, use of Parliamentary conveniences	641
Electoral Rolls, discrepancies	642
Notice of Questions insufficient remarks	642
West Perth School, overcrowding	643
Return ordered: Imports, Rebates and Commission	643
Bills: Inspection of Machinery, in Committee resumed, reported	643
Mines Regulation Act Amendment, in Committee resumed, reported	650
Municipal Institutions Act Amendment, in Committee resumed, Clauses 7 to 12, progress	651
Address-in-Reply, Presentation	654
Adjournment (complimentary function to new Agent General)	654

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 3:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—PRESS REPRESENTATIVES, USE OF PARLIAMENTARY CONVENIENCES.

MR. RASON, for Mr. Hopkins, asked the Premier: 1, In the management and control of Press galleries in the Federal and State Parliaments of Eastern Aus-