

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 20th December, 1911.

	PAGE
Papers presented	1337
Questions: Municipal Subsidy, proposed deputa-	
tion, City Council's payment	1337
Police Benefit Fund	1337
Fishery Inspector Appointment	1338
Land Settlement, Advertisement	1338
Railway Extension to Cowcowing	1334
Railway Appointments	1338
Railway Excursion Fares	1339
Return: Esperance Townsite	1339
Bills: Murrumbidgee Branch Railway, 2s.	1339
Veterinary, Com.	1339
Police Benefit Fund, 2s., Com., 3s.	1341
Parliamentary Allowances Act Amendment,	
2s. Com.	1343
Health Act Amendment, Council's amend-	
ments	1358
Licensing Act Amendment, Council's amend-	
ments	1359
Early Closing Act Amendment, Council's	
amendments	1359
Loan Estimates Introduction	1360

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Works: 1, Report of the Public Works Department; 2, Special By-laws relating to the system of valuation of the Mount Magnet, North Coolgardie, and Greenbushes Roads Boards.

By the Premier: 1, Report of the Fremantle Harbour Trust; 2, Return in connection with the West Australian Cricket Association (ordered on motion by Mr. Lander); 3, Return showing the amounts paid on revenue and loan accounts and the number of persons participating in salaries and wages in October, 1911 (ordered on motion by Mr. S. Stubbs); 4, Annual Report of the High School; Annual Report of the Board of Management of Perth Public Hospital; 5, Papers re appointment of Assistant Fishery Inspector at Mandurah (asked for by Mr. George).

By the Minister for Railways: Return showing the amount of cast steel and cast iron imported for the Government Railways (ordered on motion by Mr. Swan).

By the Honorary Minister: Annual report of the Commissioner of Police.

QUESTIONS (2)—MUNICIPAL SUBSIDY.

Proposed Deputation.

Mr. ALLEN (without notice) asked the Premier: 1, Whether he is prepared to receive a deputation from the Perth City Council with reference to the Government subsidy. 2, If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: 1. No. 2, Because it is unnecessary.

Perth City Council's Payment.

Mr. ALLEN asked the Premier: What amount of money do the Government intend to pay the Perth City Council by way of Government subsidy for the current year?

The PREMIER replied: It is proposed to increase the scale from 5s. to 7s. 6d. in the £ with a minimum of £75 and a maximum of £3,000, so that Perth will receive £3,000.

QUESTION — POLICE BENEFIT FUND.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN asked the Premier: 1, What is the number of members of the Police Force still serving (including commissioned and non-commissioned officers and constables) who have drawn their gratuity under the Police Benefit Fund? 2, The names of all such members? 3, Amount paid to each? 4, Does he intend to have the annual balance sheet printed and published in the *Police Gazette* for the information and guidance of the contributors?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Twelve. 2 and 3, Superintendent W. C. Lawrence, £428 1s. 1d.; Chief Inspector R. Connell, £446 2s. 1d.; Inspector E. O. Drewry, £90 5s. 7d.; Inspector T. C. Holmes, £368 11s. 6d.; Inspector J. McKenna, £388 1s. 1d.; Inspector M. Brophy, £378 11s. 3d.; Inspector W. C. Sellenger, £502 1s. 8d.; Sub-Inspector C. Woods, £609 14s.; Sub-Inspector W. Lappin, £536 15s. 8d.; Sub-Inspector J. Duncan, £366 15s. 10d.; Sub-Inspector F. G. J. Mitchell, £429 4s. 4d.; Detective J. Croyle, £24 6s. 8d. 4, The balance-sheet of the Fund is always

published in the annual report of the Commissioner of Police. The question of publishing it also in the *Police Gazette* will have consideration.

QUESTION—FISHERY INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT.

Mr. MOORE (for Mr. George) asked the Premier: If he will lay the Papers on the Table of the House relating to the appointment, in 1909, of W. Hollingworth as Assistant Fishery Inspector at Mandurah?

The PREMIER replied: I have the papers here.

QUESTION—LAND SETTLEMENT, ADVERTISEMENT.

Mr. MOORE (for Mr. George) asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Having in view the statements of the Government with regard to land settlement, does the Minister consider the advertisement appearing on page 455 of the *Fruit World of Australasia* gives a correct and reliable epitome of the present land policy of this State? 2, Is the statement correct that there are in the South-West division of Western Australia 38,000,000 acres available for wheat and sheep, 7,000,000 acres suitable for fruit and sheep, 6,700,000 acres suitable for dairy produce and potatoes, and 5,000,000 acres suitable for stock? 3, Is the statement correct that 2,000 acres may be held by one person, whose wife or husband may select an additional 1,000 acres, on 20 years' terms, half-yearly payments, and for the first three years no more than 6d. per acre is charged? 4, If so, has the non-alienation policy been revised? 5, If not, will he take the necessary steps to prevent any misunderstanding on the part of would-be settlers who desire to obtain freeholds under the allurements of the picturesque advertisement referred to?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes, approximately. 3, Yes. 4, The non-alienation policy has not yet been adopted in regard to rural lands. 5, Yes, due notice will be given of any

amending legislation which is to be introduced in accordance with the policy of the Government.

QUESTION—RAILWAY EXTENSION TO COWCOWING.

Mr. LEFROY (for Mr. A. N. Piesse) asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that the *Selectors' Guide*, page 15, 1909 issue, published by the Moore Government, contains the following:—"The Northam-Goomalling railway line has been opened up as far as Dowerin, and it is now proposed to extend the line to Cowcowing"? 2, That on this definite assurance and also information given on departmental plans many settlers have taken up land, and made their homes on this area? 3, That a number have areas under cultivation, and are over 20 miles from any existing railway? 4, Does the present Government intend to carry out the promise given, and assist these settlers by introducing at an early date a Bill for the construction of a railway into this area?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, No; the majority of the holdings were taken up prior to the publication of the 1909 *Selectors' Guide*. 3, Yes. 4, The present Government have previously announced that it is their intention to provide railway facilities for the settlers in this district. The early introduction of a Bill to Parliament would not in any way expedite the work.

QUESTION—RAILWAY APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. LEWIS asked the Minister for Railways: 1, How many engineering assistants have recently been brought from the British Isles under agreement to the Existing Lines Branch of the Railway Department? 2, What period have they been engaged for? 3, What pay are they to receive for the first, second, and third year? 4, Were their fares, also fares for their families, paid by the Department? 5, Were applications called for these positions by advertisement in this State or Commonwealth? If not, why not? 6,

Do these imported engineers possess such extra ability and experience to justify paying them higher salaries than officers of years' standing in the department, and trained to local conditions? 7, If during the next two years no increments are granted to engineer assistants, will the imported men be receiving more salary than those mentioned in the classification of the 16th September, 1911? If so, will the Minister provide for such a contingency? 8, Have any officers whose services were dispensed with during retrenchment since applied for similar positions in the department? If so, what rate of pay was offered? 9, Will the Minister see that justice is done to engineers of years standing in the service, by seeing that they are not paid less than men brought out under agreement or otherwise?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Seven. 2, Three years. 3, £270, £285, £300. 4, Yes. 5, Yes, in this State. 6, In some cases, yes, and in some cases, no. 7, Yes, but each case will be treated on its merits. 8, One application was received, but the applicant was not considered qualified, and he was offered another position which he did not accept. 9, No case of injustice will knowingly be permitted.

QUESTION — RAILWAY EXCURSION FARES.

Mr. ALLEN (for Mr. Harper) asked the Minister for Railways: In view of the reduction in excursion fares from Perth and the Goldfields to Albany, will the Minister make equal proportionate concession to residents between Perth and Albany?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied:—It is not intended to make further concession.

BILL—MARRINUP BRANCH RAILWAY.

Introduced by the Minister for Railways, and read a first time.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. P. Collier) in moving the second reading said: This short branch line,

some five miles in length, has already been constructed to connect up the Government saw mill at Dwellingup. As honourable members are aware a new mill is in course of erection there and will be working early in the new year. It is to this that the line has been constructed. It was approved by the late Government and will be open for traffic in the early part of January, but before it is possible to open the line it will be necessary to put this Bill through in order to legalise the construction. The measure is a purely formal one. It is necessary, however, in order to work the railway which will connect up with the saw mill. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

RETURN—ESPERANCE TOWN-SITE.

On motion by Mr. GREEN ordered: That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing:—1, The number of town and suburban lots disposed of in the townsite of Esperance to date; 2, the total receipts from such sales.

BILL—VETERINARY.

In Committee.

Mr. McDowall in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clause 21.—Qualification of Practitioners:

The CHAIRMAN: Progress had been reported on Clause 21, to which the following amendment had been moved by the Minister for Lands:—"Strike out Subclauses 2 and 3 and substitute the following in lieu thereof:—"Provided that until the first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and twelve, the Board may register any person who has been continuously practising as a veterinary surgeon in Western Australia for seven years on his passing the prescribed examination in diseases of the horse and other domesticated animals, in lieu of

his holding a diploma. 2, Save as in this section provided, no person shall be registered as a veterinary surgeon under this Act."

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It had since been found necessary to alter the amendment. He would ask leave to withdraw it.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved—

That in Sub-clause 1 the following be added to paragraph (c) "or has passed a prescribed examination to the satisfaction of the board."

As would be seen from the Notice Paper there was a number of amendments proposed to be made to the clause. When the clause had been amended as proposed there would be two classes of practitioners. Those who submitted themselves to examination would be provided with a certificate of competency, while those who relied on the fact that they had been in practice in the State for a certain term before the Bill became law would merely secure a certificate of practice. By that distinction we would be able to ensure the qualifications certified to by the State. The one class would have certificates of competency, while the other would have certificates of practice. That was the substance of the proposed amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL: The Minister was to be congratulated on the clause, and also upon the amendment. It was a better arrangement than that in the English Act, and would adequately meet the case.

Mr. LANDER: The Minister was to be congratulated as having acted in accordance with his promise to bring in a reasonable amendment. The amendment would effectually serve to block the quack. Considering the time it took a man to qualify himself to become a veterinary surgeon the House should protect him as well as the public.

Mr. THOMAS: The Minister ought to be thanked for the concession made to meet the wishes of the members of the House; the amendment would turn out very well; but whilst congratulating the Minister, one could not congratulate the member for East Perth, who made a fad

of the subject and wanted to inflict every possible punishment on persons who did not come up to his view of what was right. Many estimable citizens would benefit by the clause, and it was not just for the member for East Perth to continually throw jibes at them and refer to them as quacks, or use such-like epithets. While admiring the honourable member's enthusiasm one could not admire his discretion. The honourable member should exercise a little more consideration.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved a further amendment—

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

The term of five years would be a reasonable provision.

Amendment passed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved a further amendment—

That after "entered," in line 1 of Subclause 3, the words "as a veterinary practitioner" be inserted.

While a person was registered as a veterinary practitioner, still for the general purposes of the Act his designation was not equal to that of a veterinary surgeon.

Mr. THOMAS: Can he recover fees for attendance?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Undoubtedly. Giving him the certificate admitted him to practice, and thus we must give him all legal redress given to others.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause as amended, put and passed.

(Mr. Holman took the Chair.)

Clause 22—Certificate of registration:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The printer had inadvertently omitted this clause in reprinting the Bill with the Council's amendments. Instead of reinstating it he proposed to amend it, and for that purpose would move a new clause at the end of the Bill.

Clause formally negatived.

Clauses 23 and 24—agreed to.

Clause 25—Penalty for practising when not registered:

Mr. MALE moved an amendment—

That after "castration," in line 2 of the proviso at the end of Subclause 2, the word "speying" be inserted.

This was to remedy an oversight on the part of the other House.

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

Clauses 26 to 29—agreed to.

New clause—Certificate of registration:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved, That the following be added to stand as Clause 22:—

1, Every registered veterinary surgeon shall, on payment of a fee of one shilling, be entitled to obtain from the registrar a certificate stating that he is so registered, and setting out the qualifications by virtue of which he is registered. 2, In case of a certificate issued to a person qualified as provided in Subsection one of Section twenty-one, the certificate shall be called a certificate of competency, and shall state that such person is registered as a competent veterinary surgeon. 3, A certificate issued to a veterinary practitioner shall be called a certificate of practice, and shall state that it is issued to the practitioner without any proof of competency having being furnished by him. 4, Every such certificate shall be prima facie evidence of the matters therein stated.

Mr. THOMAS: The only objection was to the registration fee being fixed at 1s. As the Government would be put to some considerable expense in connection with this Bill, they should ask a reasonable fee for registration. The fee should be three guineas or five guineas, the usual fee in these professions.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: This charge of 1s. was merely for the certificate. The question of fees was to be fixed by regulation as provided in Clause 14.

Mr. Thomas: A fee of 1s. would not pay for the cost of printing the certificates.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was hardly necessary to ask for a greater sum. There was no desire to make a profit out

of the right to practise as a veterinary surgeon.

Mr. LANDER: It was a direct insult to describe as unqualified a veterinary surgeon who not only held a diploma as a veterinary surgeon but also as a qualified chemist. It was a mean contemptible thing for the member for Bunbury to do.

Mr. Thomas: The honourable member is accusing me of contemptible conduct.

The CHAIRMAN: If so, it is out of order.

Mr. LANDER: It was contemptible for a so-called professional man to brand as unqualified another who obtained a diploma by passing an examination at the Royal College. When an hon. member under cover of the House tried to do a professional man an injury—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not impute motives.

Mr. LANDER: At any rate it was his wish that the amount should not be increased, the amount of 1s. was enough. It was the chemists who had been running the quacks in different parts of the country.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—POLICE BENEFIT FUND.

Second Reading.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) in moving the second reading said: This is a small measure, and one which I think I can recommend to hon. members with very few words. To-day under the Police Benefit Fund those persons who are appointed to administer that fund can only pay from it to widows and orphans who are entitled to receive a benefit. It has been found by the ex-Colonial Secretary, Mr. Connolly, that injustices were done in some cases, because payments from the fund were restricted to widows and orphans. A short time prior to leaving office a constable who had been in the service for 12 years, and who was the sole support of his widowed mother, unfortunately died, and

the mother who was living in poor circumstances applied for a gratuity which she thought she would be entitled to receive from this fund. The board was not in a position to grant anything, and the then Colonial Secretary did everything in his power to relieve the distressed circumstances of the parent, but he had no authority to pay her claim out of the fund. He then caused to be drafted this measure, having in view the circumstances of that case and the hardship which had been imposed, not only in that instance, but in others. The object of the Bill is to provide for the payment out of the fund to the next of kin, and these words have been added. There is a possibility by the inclusion of these words that someone who is not really entitled to receive any benefit might obtain it, but the regulations provide that benefits from this fund may be granted at the discretion of the Board. Members can rest assured that no danger will arise, so far as the fund is concerned, by the insertion of these words. If the next of kin is a distant relative, who really had no claim on the deceased person, then the Board will use their discretion and refuse to hand over any amount which might have been due to the officer if he had not died.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Could you not put in the word "dependent"?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This was thought to be the best method of getting over the difficulty, seeing that the board have the power to exercise discretion in the payment of moneys. Mr. Connolly saw the necessity for drafting this measure and Mr. Drew, the present Colonial Secretary, endorsed it, and submitted it to the Legislative Council. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. MITCHELL (Northam): I have no objection to the Bill, and I was pleased to hear the Minister say that the former Colonial Secretary was responsible for the drafting of it. With regard to the case the Minister has referred to, if it is still under consideration I hope he will see that justice is done.

Mr. LANDER (East Perth): It gives me great pleasure to support the Bill. I think I know the case to which the Honorary Minister referred. It was a very sad case. The officer had done extensive service in the North-West, and he was coming down on a health trip when death overtook him at Carnarvon. His widowed mother was in the old country, and under the existing regulations it was not possible for her to obtain relief from the Police Benefit Fund. I would like to see the measure made retrospective, so that something might be done for her.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair; Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Amendment of 30 Victoria No. 10:

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Was it understood that the Bill was not to be made retrospective? It was very little use talking about the injustices of the past unless something was done. He knew of a couple of cases where great injustice had been done, on account of, in one case, the individual being a single man who was supporting his widowed mother, and it was impossible for her to obtain relief. This officer had been paying into the fund for twelve or thirteen years, and an attempt was made to get something for the dependent of this officer, but without avail.

The Minister for Mines: There are quite a number of them.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: It was surprising that this Bill was not introduced years ago if that was the case. He would suggest that the Minister should add after "next of kin" the word "dependents." The difficulty in which the Minister found himself was that if the word "dependents" were put in, the Bill would have to go back to another place, and possibly in the last hours of the session would be lost. If, however, the Minister was further amending the law at any future time he should remember that often the next-of-kin might not be depend-

ent on the person who had died, so that the person most in need of the allocation from this fund might not receive any of it at all. The best thing that the Committee could do was to pass the Bill, and ask the Minister to take an early opportunity of amending it in the direction indicated. He regretted that the Bill had not been made retrospective, and if that could not be done some consideration should be given, even by way of a lump sum, to those who had suffered injustice owing to the limitations of the present legislation.

Mr. S. STUBBS: Was it not possible that justice could be done to those persons who had suffered through this measure not having been passed into law before?

The Premier: They have already got a little justice by the kicking out of the people who wronged them in the past.

Mr. S. STUBBS: Anything which the Minister could do in the direction of giving relief to those unfortunate persons dependent on this fund should be done. It would be only justice to give consideration to the claims of those whose cases could not be met under the existing ordinance, and if the Minister gave a lump sum it would be approved by every member of the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR: It was almost impossible to make the Bill retrospective, and then say that justice should be done. The ordinance under which the fund was operated had been in existence 30 or 40 years, and there had been a number of hardships. If it were necessary to go back to rectify some of the injustices of the past, the Minister would be confronted with a difficulty as to how far back he should go. The Board could take into consideration those cases, and perhaps make some recommendation to the Minister as to how the difficulty could be got over. If the Minister brought down a lump sum to assist those people who had lost their bread-winners, through the death of contributors to the fund for a number of years, it would be readily agreed to. As had been pointed out by the member for Forrest, the next-of-kin

might not be the party most in need of the money.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It would be left to the discretion of the board.

Mr. TAYLOR: Retrospective legislation was bad in principle. This amendment had perhaps been made more urgent only within the last few months, and there might not have been as great hardships in earlier years as had occurred lately. The wishes of members might be met by an investigation on the part of the board, and amends might be made by bringing down an item in the Estimates next year.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There had been dissatisfaction in regard to the administration of this fund, and the Minister in charge of the department had already promised an alteration in the composition of the board. The policemen contributed about half the money they received annually towards the upkeep of this fund, but they had no representation on the board. When the constables obtained proper representation on the board, that body would go into the question of revising the ordinance now in force, and it might be necessary to make an amendment next session. The fund now consisted of about £15,000, and last year deductions were made from the pay of the police to the extent of £2,097. As they contributed so largely they should have a greater say than at present in regard to the administration of the fund. In view of the intention to give them representation on the board, members could rest assured that it would be administered more justly than in the past.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—PARLIAMENTARY ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Resumed from the 14th December.

Order of the Day for resumption of debate on the second reading read.

Question put and passed.
Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of No. 33 of 1911:

Mr. UNDERWOOD moved an amendment—

That paragraphs (b) and (c) be struck out.

The object was to leave the salaries of the President of the Legislative Council, and the Speaker of the Assembly, and the Chairmen of both Houses, as they stood at present. It was not necessary to make a long statement on the question, members had made up their minds, and he thought the majority of members recognised that the officers were not overpaid.

Mr. MITCHELL: While Ministers had a perfect right to ask that their own salaries be reduced; having had a mandate from the country we should not quarrel with them, especially as they had pointed out that the country objected to the increase in Ministerial salaries.

The Minister for Lands: We did not say the country objected; we said they had never countenanced it. That applied to the whole of the salaries.

Mr. MITCHELL: It was the same thing. He might have felt compelled to vote against the Bill but for the manner it had been introduced, and the public led to believe that we had done something that was not quite honest, and that the late Government brought down a Bill by a process of trickery and increased their own salaries by £300.

The Premier: We will make it retrospective from the 1st January if you like.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Do as you like, we do not mind.

Mr. MITCHELL: We should carry the Bill because Ministers in three years time, when they went to the country, would tell the people that they endeavoured to reduce their own salaries, but members of the House would not

allow them. We had no right to touch the salaries of the Speaker and the Chairmen of Committees; the country never objected to the increase in the salary of any of these officials, but he thought the country would object if these salaries were reduced now. He was not going to vote for what would be practically a vote of censure on these officers, who did their work well.

Mr. BOLTON: Most of the remarks of the member for Northam hinged around the question that the country had refused to endorse the action of the late Government. He had a recollection, when the Wilson Government proposed to reduce the salaries by £200—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must deal with paragraphs (b) and (c).

Mr. BOLTON: There was only one clause in the Bill, and an amendment had been moved to delete paragraphs (b) and (c). At the time the Wilson Government proposed to reduce their own salaries by £200—

Mr. Frank Wilson: They never did; that is a misstatement.

Mr. BOLTON: At that time the Wilson Government did not propose to interfere with the salaries of the Chairman of Committees and the Speaker; they only wanted to reduce their own salaries.

Mr. MITCHELL: The Wilson Government never proposed to reduce their salaries at all. He was not a Minister at the time when Sir Newton Moore mentioned the matter of a reduction of salaries. He (Mr. Mitchell) was not getting any salary at all, but he told Sir Newton Moore before he (Mr. Mitchell) joined the Cabinet as an Honorary Minister that he would not vote for the reduction. A thousand pounds was altogether too little for a Minister.

The Premier: The reduction was mentioned in the policy speech.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee was the amendment to strike out paragraphs (b) and (c).

The PREMIER: The Government were not prepared to accept the amendment. The object of introducing the Bill was because the people during the general elections, at various divers times at pub-

lic meetings expressed an opinion against other members' salaries being increased. We had an opportunity during the election of telling the people what we thought. The increases in this clause were on parallel lines with the increases to Ministers. There was not the slightest difference, and there never was a demand for an increase of salaries except to members from £200 upwards. He was not prepared to ask his colleagues to sit under a reduction of their salaries to £1,000 while the President of the Legislative Council received £700 for three months work in the other Chamber. If the amendment were carried he would accept it as an intimation that the Committee did not desire the passage of the Bill at all.

Mr. GEORGE: If the Premier did not carry the Bill it would be a stain on his career. There was a difference between the salaries of the ordinary member of Parliament and those who occupied positions of responsibility, as Ministers did. It would not be unreasonable to raise Ministers' salaries to £1,100, as members salaries were increased by £100. He would be prepared to support any amendment to that effect. He was opposed to the addition of £300 a year to Ministers salaries, but he would support £100 a year, and he thought £100 added to the salaries of the President, the Speaker and the Chairmen of Committees was not too much.

Mr. Gill: The country could not afford to pay £1,500 a year to the Premier.

Mr. GEORGE: The country would not go bankrupt even if it paid the Premier £2,000 a year; £1,300 a year was not a very large salary for the Premier, but £1,500 was more than we could pay in Western Australia. It was a question of what the office was worth. He trusted the two paragraphs would be struck out. The officers earned their money, therefore the country should pay them.

Mr. THOMAS: While disagreeing with the other portions of the Bill he was entirely in accord with the proposed amendment. The Ministry should have the right to provide what was desirable

for themselves, but he thought it was unwise to interfere with the payments of the Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, and other officers who were benefitting under the Act of 1911. One had only to remain in the Chamber on the previous night to realise how arduous were the duties which sometimes devolved upon the officials of the House. Then again, the Speaker had a dignified position to uphold, and his present salary was probably the lowest paid to a Speaker in an Australian Parliament. It was to be hoped the amendment would be carried.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It was a pity that in playing to the gallery in connection with the salary business the Premier was about to perpetrate an injustice on the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees. No matter what the Premier might say in regard to Ministerial salaries, presumably he did not wish the House to believe for one moment that he (the Premier) had been misled in regard to the salaries of the Speaker and the President, and the respective Chairmen of Committees. We had had the astonishing statement made by the Premier that no mandate had been received from the people in regard to these officials. Did we require such a mandate? Were we to go to the country to ask what should be paid to responsible officers? If there was a mandate at all in respect to the salaries of either members or officers it had been merely a mandate from the Labour caucus which sat at Bunbury and which had resolved that the members' salaries should be £400 per annum.

Mr. Bolton: Will you support that?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: No. How inconsistent was it of hon. members to say they were entitled to £400, while, on the other hand, they were prepared at the bidding of the Premier to consider the reduction of the salary of the Chairman of Committees to £400 also. The Premier was merely playing to the gallery in this matter and trying to hoodwink the people. There was no justification whatever for the Premier's attempted interference with the salary of the Speaker and Chairman of Committees.

The Premier: You used for electioneering purposes the cry of reduction of salaries.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Never had he done anything of the sort.

The Premier: Then your leader did.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It had never been any part of his (Mr. Wilson's) administrative policy, and even had it been it would not make the Premier right in the action he proposed towards the Speaker and Chairman of Committees.

Mr. LANDER: The amendment was deserving of support; we would not be justified in reducing these salaries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: A gentleman who had shown his fitness to be entrusted with the office of Speaker was certainly worth £700 a year. Even if it could be contended that this sum was too much for the President of the Legislative Council and ought to be reduced, it would be unfair to reduce the salary of the Speaker in order to keep the two in line. If the officers of the Legislative Council were being paid too much the proper way of righting the anomaly was to bring in an amendment of the Constitution to provide for differentiation of salaries as between the two Houses. Members should not compare the positions of officers of the House with other positions, but should estimate the value of the offices. The position of Speaker was worth £700 a year.

Mr. DOOLEY: In most cases one could compare the value of an office with other offices, but it was not possible to do that in regard to the Speaker or the Chairman. The amounts they were now getting were little enough, so he would support the amendment, and, if the amendment were passed, he would support a further amendment to strike out the whole clause. Ministers were foolish in seeking to reduce their salaries when there was no demand for it. It was only when one came into close contact with Ministers that one recognised the work they had to perform.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: There was no comparison between the duties of the Speaker and Chairman and those of Ministers. The question of increasing

Ministers' salaries was made a burning question by the late member for Kalgoolie, Mr. Keenan.

Mr. George: And your party handed on the fiery cross.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: One or two might have done so, but he had never mentioned the subject right through his campaign. At the same time he would vote for the Bill as it stood, and oppose the amendment. The present Speaker, and the present Chairman of Committees, before they were elected, knew it was intended to reduce their salaries, so voting for a reduction would not be in the nature of a vote of censure upon them. There was no suggestion of raising the salaries of officials of the House up to the time the Bill was brought before the House.

Mr. GEORGE: The Speaker's duties did not solely consist of occupying the Chair. The Speaker was chief officer in charge of the business of the House of Parliament during the recess, and did a great amount of work. The present Speaker would probably do so unless he held to the scarcely veiled threat of treating the amendment as a vote of want of confidence in himself.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: When the question of raising the salaries of ordinary members was considered, officers of the House were not taken into consideration. It was entirely a question of an increase to individual members, and therefore the question of Ministers' and officials' salaries stood on the same plane.

Mr. TURVEY: The Minister was wrong. The country in a very decided manner said it was opposed to increasing Ministerial salaries, but during the campaign there was no reference to the increase of the salaries of the Speaker or Chairman of Committees. In view of his own utterances during the campaign and his own opinions, it was his duty to support the amendment, and at the same time to support the reduction of Ministerial salaries.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The second reading was put during his absence from the Chamber or he would have called for a division. Now, in order to be consistent, he would support the amendment in the

hope that it would lead to the defeat of the measure. The question of the salaries to be paid to the Speaker and the Chairman was a matter solely for the decision of members of the Chamber who were in the best position to judge. The Government had made a mistake, and he would do his best to defeat the measure to condone that mistake. We had no right to put ourselves on a lower level than any other Parliament of Australia.

Mr. TAYLOR: So strongly was this matter spoken of during the campaign by the party to which he belonged, and by the official organs of the Labour movement—

Mr. George: The *Vanguard*.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Do you feel bound by the *Sunday Times*?

Mr. George: No.

Mr. TAYLOR: The member for Forest should not compare the *Sunday Times* as an official organ with the *Worker*, the official organ of the Labour movement.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Is it a party bar-racker.

Mr. TAYLOR: That might be so. The hon. member would not deny that the other paper was the official organ of the Labour movement and it condemned the action of the last Parliament. The *Vanguard* which was brought into existence at a time when it was needed, was even stronger and more decisive in its condemnation. He had yet to see in any section of the Press where one Labour man contesting the elections had said that he was in favour of what his colleagues had called a steal. There was no condemnation of those who called it a steal and for that reason he was prepared to support the measure, but he was sorry that the Premier had brought it down to interfere with the salaries of the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees. Those two officers were not overpaid. The increase of salaries to the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees was not before the people. Hon. members knew well that as a party, members had some say in the policy which was put forward, but they had little or no say with reference

to the platform; that was decided by a higher authority in the Labour movement, Congress. Had this matter been brought before Congress, Congress would have agreed that the Speaker and Chairman of Committees were not overpaid. It was his duty to support the measure as it was, except for the amendment that he desired to move. If this measure had not been brought down by the present Government they would have been held up as accessories after the fact, as well as before; therefore the Government had no other course to adopt as honourable and straightforward men.

Mr. Heitmann: You were the most disappointed man in this country when we got a majority.

Mr. TAYLOR: The hon. member may have been disappointed himself. That, however, had nothing to do with the matter under discussion. The interjection was one which emanated from a mind which had something else behind it than the Bill or the issue under discussion, and he was committed to accept the position as it was in the Bill at present.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: The House decided by a large majority last session that there should be an addition to the salaries of the officials, and it appeared to him that the House having so decided, it was strange now without any special reason being given, that there should be a desire to amend the Bill in the direction of making reductions so far as those particular salaries were concerned. The public would be prepared to leave the matter to the House to decide. The people as a whole were not thoroughly seized with the work of the officials of the House, nor even that of the Ministers or again even that of the members. In a general way the public knew what had to be done, but they did not concern themselves any further. It required special qualifications to fulfil the positions in question and those qualifications had to be paid for. The Speaker in the old country received a very high salary, and, upon relinquishing his position, was given a pension for two lives and a seat in the House of Lords. We could not make the Speaker

of our Parliament a viscount, the democratic tendencies of the country did not desire that, but still, even in this State we desired that the position of Speaker should be one of high dignity and should be adequately paid. We also recognised this fact that the position required special qualifications. The Speaker was the first commoner in the land and whoever he might be, his remuneration should be adequate for the services rendered. He was not thinking of the individual for one moment, he was considering only the office, and for that reason it was his intention to support the amendment because the Government of the day had made an error of judgment in desiring to bring about a change. The country was progressing, and as the country progressed that high and important office should be more fully recognised.

Mr. DWYER: In the Governor's Speech there had appeared a distinct announcement that certain Parliamentary and Ministerial salaries would be reduced, and in speaking on the Address-in-Reply he had not mentioned any opposition to such reduction. Other members who spoke on the Address-in-Reply had also omitted to express opposition to the Bill, and their silence was tantamount to acquiescence. If members had intended to resist the reduction they would have made some reference to it on that occasion. In taking exception to it now, when they had buried themselves in deep and profound silence in regard to it on the Address-in-Reply, they were guilty of inconsistency. The work of the Speaker, and Chairman of Committees should be contrasted with the work of Ministers of the Crown, and if the salaries of Ministers were to be reduced all the Committee could do was to also reduce the salaries of those high officers. He would oppose the amendment.

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

Ayes	28
Noes	14
				—
Majority for	14
				—

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Monger
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Mullan y
Mr. Broun	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Dooley	Mr. O'Loghien
Mr. Foley	Mr. A. E. Piesse
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. George	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Harper	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Lander	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Male
Mr. McDowall	(Teller).
Mr. Mitchell	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Moore
Mr. Bath	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Collier	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Walker
Mr. Green	Mr. Heltmann
Mr. Johnson	(Teller).
Mr. Johnston	

Amendment thus passed.

The PREMIER: If members were of opinion that the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees in the Assembly, and the President and the Chairman of Committees in the Legislative Council were entitled to retain the increased salary they received during last session, he was prepared to say that Ministers of the Crown were fully worth the salaries they were receiving at the present time. He took the public responsibility of saying that. As head of the Government he believed that when they introduced this Bill they did so in compliance with the wishes of members on the Government side, and it was not fair to Ministers or to the public that they should be misunderstood. The amendment to the Bill having been carried, he was not prepared to ask his Ministers to sit in their offices day after day, and often night after night all the year round, and suffer a reduction of salary at the hands of the House, when the Government thought that in bringing forward a Bill for the reduction of Ministers' salaries they were doing what the House desired; he therefore asked the Committee to vote against the clause altogether. As head of the Government he was in duty bound to state the position as it appealed to him in connection with this matter.

Mr. CARPENTER: The attitude which the Premier had adopted was not surprising. It was regrettable that the Premier had been forced by the Committee to take up that position. But seeing that the Committee had decided to amend the clause, and to exempt from its operation some of those who were more entitled to be affected by it than Ministers were, there was only one stand to be taken, and that was to support the attitude adopted by the Premier. Although he would have been glad to see the Bill carried, and would have given the Government credit for having brought it in, he realised that Ministers were now taking the only consistent stand, and he would support them.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The statement made by the Premier must cause profound surprise. The leader of the Government had argued that if the Speaker and President, and the Chairmen of Committees were worth the salary Parliament had said last session they should receive, the Ministers were also worthy of the salaries passed on that occasion. He had never heard such an argument by a responsible Minister of the Crown.

The Premier: We would not expect you to, sitting over there.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: One could expect nothing but foolishness from the Premier.

The Premier: Anyone but a fool might.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Premier's own followers had defended him in this action, and he could not ask them to vote against the Bill, nor could they vote against it, without stultifying themselves.

Mr. Swan: I will be stultified for one, for I will vote with the Premier.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Then the hon. member would stultify himself.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Will I be stultified?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Yes. Hon. members were not manly enough to stand by—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order in accusing hon. members of not being manly enough to stand by anything. The hon. member must withdraw the words.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: He would withdraw the remark. This was the most peculiar position any Government could be placed in. The Premier on introducing the measure, in terms of indignation and reproach had accused him (Mr. Frank Wilson) and his late colleagues of having passed the Parliamentary Allowances Act surreptitiously through Parliament, and with having done something which they ought not to have done in order to raise their own salaries.

The Attorney General: True.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Attorney General says that was true.

The Attorney General: Yes.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It was absolutely untrue.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw the word "untrue."

Mr. FRANK WILSON: I withdraw the word untrue. Will the Attorney General withdraw the word "true"?

The Attorney General: No.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Here we had this peculiar position. We had Ministers parading their virtue, their righteousness, and saying they were beguiled or misled into passing the Bill last session. He (Mr. Wilson) had already convicted the hon. gentlemen out of their own mouths from *Hansard*. He had proved what they stated was incorrect. Did they think the country would believe that Parliament would pass a measure without knowing what it contained? He had previously said that he had stated what we were going to put into the Bill, so that members of the House and the leader of the Opposition knew what it would contain. How many of our measures were advertised beforehand as to the details they were to contain. But this measure was fully advertised in the debate that took place in October, and it was not until the following January or February that the Bill was brought down after the private conversation with the present Premier, telling him exactly what it was intended to do.

The Premier: And which he denied.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: One did not care. The conversation was held, and was it reasonable to believe that he would

tell the Premier one portion of the Bill and not the whole of it?

Mr. Dwyer: Of course it was.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Premier had not denied that he (Mr. Wilson) told him that the Chairmen and the Speaker and President were to have increases.

The Premier: Then I deny it now.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Perhaps the Premier would deny that we had a conversation at all.

The Premier: I had one conversation with the hon. member, but I had several with the Minister for Lands.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Had we any conversation about this measure at all?

The Premier: Yes.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Did he tell the Premier what the Bill was to contain?

The Premier: Yes.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: What did he (Mr. Wilson) tell the Premier?

The Premier: That the leader of the Opposition was to receive £500 a year, and that members were to receive £300 and—

Mr. FRANK WILSON: And—

The Premier: Nothing else.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Premier had said that he (Mr. Wilson) agreed to consult him, and that he was consulted and was told what it was intended to put into the measure; was that true?

The Premier: Not all.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Was it reasonable to suppose that he would tell the hon. member two clauses of the Bill, and not the others?

The Premier: Of course it is reasonable.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: It was an insult to insinuate such a thing. It was a disgraceful thing to say in this Chamber that he would mislead the Premier in this respect when within 48 hours he was to bring down the Bill, and explain in detail everything that he intended to do—that he proposed to increase members' salaries to £300 a year, that the leader of the Opposition was to receive £500, and the Chairmen of Committees £500, and the President and the Speaker each to receive £700. He explained that *in*

extenso. The Premier did not get up then and say that he (Mr. Wilson) had misled him in the conversation. Would it not have been the first thing for the Premier to do, to get up and say, "You never told me you were going to increase the Ministerial salaries, and those of the Chairmen and the President and Speaker. Why did you not tell me that when I had the conversation with you"? But the Premier never said a word, and not a single member in the House mentioned the circumstances in the whole debate, in the second reading speeches, in the Committee stage, when every clause was read out by the Chairman and passed; then the third reading. And again in another place the Bill was explained by the Colonial Secretary what it was intended to do, that Ministers would receive £300 as members of Parliament in addition to their Ministerial salaries. There was not a word of comment in another place, and not a word in this Chamber. He was asking members to judge whether he was right or wrong in that statement, and whether the Premier was not inaccurate, or that his memory was at fault when charging him (Mr. Wilson) with not having disclosed the full details of the Bill. If we had a conversation, and we had, was it reasonable to suppose that he would tell the Premier one half of the measure. It was unreasonable to suppose that he would come into the Chamber and tell members something different from what he told the Premier in the conversation. When he (Mr. Wilson) explained the whole Bill the Premier did not get up and say, "You misled me."

The Premier: Where did we have the conversation?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: In the corridor. It was unmanly, it was not right, and he thought the Premier ought to withdraw from the position at once. He was treating him (Mr. Wilson) unfairly, and the Premier certainly treated him grossly unfairly inasmuch as he allowed it to go forth in the recent campaign that he (Mr. Wilson) had acted unfairly in the matter. The member for Kalgoorlie, if he remembered aright, said he was given to understand by some circu-

lar issued by the Labour party, that they had been misled as to these salaries.

Mr. Green: I said the Labour Press.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: And he believed all through the campaign that the charge made in the Labour Press was correct, and he used it in his campaign, and many other members did so, and one did not blame them. Was that fair fighting; was it hitting above or below the belt? He did not care how he might have been defeated, but he protested that his political opponents allowed this scurrilous charge to go throughout the country, influencing the people in their attitude against the Ministry. Because members would not have used the charge unless they had believed it. Then the Premier comes here and says he did not know this, that, and the other thing.

Mr. Green: Do you always fight straightforwardly yourself?

Mr. FRANK WILSON: Every time. He had always fought in a straightforward manner.

Mr. Thomas: You protest too much.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: And the hon. member would protest. It was the most disgraceful thing—this attitude taken up in Parliament—in my whole career for 15 years. The Premier said that he would ask members to strike out the whole Bill. If the Premier thought the Bill would not be passed he should withdraw it, and say, "I have made a wrong charge, I am sorry, I apologise to the leader of the Opposition." That was the manly thing to do.

The Premier: I will give you a written apology.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: The Premier's verbal apology would be accepted so that we could get it into *Hansard*. Let the Premier say, "I have done an injustice. I have done his party an injury, and I now withdraw the measure and let the matter rest."

Mr. MUNSIE: One could not allow the discussion to close without expressing his opinion and the attitude he intended to take. While voting for the amendment to strike out paragraphs (b) and (c) he did so because he had a perfect right to use his judgment as to what he thought

the positions were worth. On three different occasions during the last election he was asked the question that if returned what would he do. Would he see that the Ministerial salaries were again brought back to what they were prior to the increase. He was surprised to hear members say that during the elections nothing was ever said on this question. It was discussed during the election, and he never heard the question contradicted, and the labour papers used it for all it was worth. He was pledged to a reduction and was going to keep the pledge.

Mr. THOMAS: When the previous clause was under discussion he had taken what might seem to be by some individuals an inconsistent attitude. When speaking on the Address-in-reply he had complimented the Ministry on the action they had taken in introducing the Bill to reduce Ministerial salaries. He was not approving of the action because they were not worthy the increased salaries, but he objected to the manner in which the increase had been taken by the previous Administration, and he admired the self-denial of present Ministers by refusing to be benefited by the increase of salary. On the Address-in-reply, when he was supporting the Ministers in the attitude they had taken up in reducing their own salaries, he did not think he pledged himself to reduce the salaries of the President, the Speaker, and the Chairmen of Committees. Moreover he was questioned, in the campaign, whether he was in favour of Ministers introducing a Bill to do away with the extra £300 a year which previous Ministers had secured, in what, he thought, were wrong circumstances. The action of the Government in introducing the Bill was a very honourable one, and one for which they deserved every possible credit. All had voted, no doubt, according to their consciences, and he had tried to do what was right. Several members had twitted him on his attitude as being inconsistent, and he made this explanation because he did not desire to be thought inconsistent. If there was any responsibility for the action of the Government he desired to take his part of it. We had now reached a pecu-

liar situation in respect to which the Premier had made a definite announcement, in consequence of which his (Mr. Thomas') loyalty to the party demanded that he should join with the leader and dutifully render his vote. The salary grab indulged in by the previous Administration was nothing whatever to their credit. There might be some blame attachable to those then in Opposition, but in this respect there was a considerable amount of extenuation, especially in view of their determination to undo this session what had been done last.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was his desire to make his position clear. He considered that the provisions in regard to the salary of Ministers and of officers should stand together, and he did not intend to depart from his own stand because hon. members had taken up a stand they were not justified in taking up.

Mr. GEORGE: The member for Bunbury found himself in rather a difficult position, but with his usual self-confidence he hoped to wriggle out of it. The Premier had no right whatever to put his party into the position in which they found themselves this evening. The Premier had brought in a measure to deal with certain Parliamentary allowances, and because he was refused a portion of the cake he had told the House and the country that he was going to practically throw the thing into the waste paper basket.

The Premier: No.

Mr. GEORGE: The Premier had practically told the House and his followers that it was a question of personal loyalty to the Ministry and his party, and that unless they voted as he wanted them to do he would throw the whole thing into the waste paper basket.

The Premier: You are making me say something I did not say.

Mr. GEORGE: If the party sitting behind Ministers were absolutely free, why had we had the speech from the member for Bunbury? At the recent election many hon. members opposite had made capital out of what they termed "the salaries grab," although they had since had occasion to modify their views.

Mr. Green: I still think it was a grab.

Mr. GEORGE: Possibly it might be regarded as a grab. He himself had told the late Ministers that had he known they were raising their salaries he would have opposed it.

The Premier: Is it likely that the then Premier would have given me inside information which he did not give to you, one of his supporters?

Mr. GEORGE: Had the late Premier desired to mislead the House would he have used the unmistakable language which had since been quoted from *Hansard*? The attitude of the present Premier in declaring that he would have the whole Bill or none of it served to throw a doubt on his sincerity in having brought down the Bill. The Attorney General had dramatically laid down to the House the axiom "To thine own self be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order in endeavouring to imitate another hon. member's voice.

Mr. GEORGE: Nothing was further from his intention than to imitate the Attorney General in any way whatever. The Premier was endeavouring to recede from his attitude on the Bill. The vote of the Committee was no personal reflection on the Premier. It simply showed that his party, and other members of the House not belonging to his party, did not entirely agree with him in some of the things brought forward. But instead of taking it as a reasonable man and saying that, seeing he could not get the whole of his cake, he would take the part he honestly believed should be in the Bill, we had all these orations from the hon. gentleman, showing he was really glad in his inner heart to get rid of the Bill. The Premier should face the situation. If he started at the first fence how was he to get over the water jumps later on? If members gave their vote on the amendment according to their consciences and sense of right they could not now stultify themselves because the Premier wagged the stick. They had either voted dishonestly to their principles last time—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in reflecting on any decision of Parliament.

Mr. GEORGE: Then the gentlemen who voted last time were mistaken in their views, and now found that their views could be taken in another way, so they were to be absolutely inconsistent because the Premier wagged the stick. There was no half way about the matter. Either the Premier was right or was wrong. If the Premier was sincere in stating that the last Parliament were immoral in their action—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot reflect on any Parliament.

The Premier: I never used any such reflection.

Mr. GEORGE: If the Premier was sincere in bringing forward the Bill he could not in common honesty try to induce his followers to throw it out. The Premier must take his gruel. In justice to the opinions they expressed and in justice to the constituents members unwittingly deluded—

Mr. Munsie: It is questionable whether we did.

Mr. GEORGE: The Premier must take his gruel, and could not honestly, or decently, or consistently, endeavour now to throw the Bill into the waste paper basket.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: Although the leader of the Opposition was well able to look after himself, it was unfair to the hon. member that it should have gone out to the country that the Parliamentary Allowances Bill was a Ministerial grab. The gentleman who was leader of the Opposition in the last Parliament should not have allowed it to go to the country that the Bill was a scramble for a further increase in salary. As far as one could learn and read in the debates of last session, the leader of the Opposition at that time, and every member of Parliament, should have been fully aware of what the terms of the measure were. The then Premier had stated distinctly that it was the intention of the Government to look after Ministers. The present Premier now claimed he knew nothing about it, but everyone would agree that when he

was leader of the Opposition last session he should have known it, and must now admit it.

The Premier: That was after the Bill was in front of members. The difference now was that the member for Sussex said he (the Premier) knew it before the Bill was introduced.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: One could not say what took place in the lobbies, but, judging from the records, the leader of the Opposition took absolutely no exception to the Bill when it was pointed out it contained a provision for an increase to Ministerial salaries. During the turmoil's of a general election candidates might allow themselves to be carried away a little by making use of expressions for which they might be sorry afterwards, but certainly when the Bill was before the House the then leader of the Opposition took no exception to it, and it was not fair to the then leader of the Government to say that it was a Ministerial scramble, as the present Premier claimed was said in the country.

Mr. Mitchell: The Premier said it himself.

The Premier: Where?

Mr. Mitchell: Everywhere.

The Premier: No.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: One trusted the Premier would not make use of such words. The Bill of last session contained a distinctly fair proposition. It was a fair thing that Ministers' salaries should be raised, and it should have been done years ago. When payment of members was introduced in 1900 there was no provision for increasing the salaries of Ministers, but it was unfair to Ministers that their salaries should not have been increased, or that they should not have been allowed to draw their salaries as members as well as Ministers; because Ministers were paid for two things, as members and as Ministers. The duties of a Minister as a member for a constituency were quite apart from his duties as a Minister of the Crown. While a Minister of the Crown he still had all his duties as a member of the constituency to carry out. It was perfectly logical that Ministers should be allowed to retain their salaries as

members of Parliament on taking office as Ministers of the Crown. The amount of £1,300 a year was not excessive for an hon. member to draw as a Minister of the Crown in conjunction with his position as a member of Parliament. The duties of a Minister were very onerous if the Minister carried them out conscientiously and in the interests of the State. He was politically opposed to the party in power, but that was no reason why he should consider that the duties of those in power were less responsible than those of the party to which he was allied might be were they in the same position. The Government had got into a jumble over this matter and for some reason this had been called a "grab." He did not like to use the word, but it had gone out to the country that that was so, and Ministers seemed to want to justify the statement by reducing their salaries. He would be sorry to use such expressions with regard to the party at present in power, and he hoped he would never be led away to use them towards the Government of the day. The people of the country fully recognised the duties a Minister of the Crown had to perform, his great responsibilities, and the amount of work he had to do, and the people were prepared to allow that these increases of salary were not unworthy of Parliament, but that Parliament was perfectly justified in adopting them. He could not understand after what had taken place last session why the Government had brought forward this measure.

Mr. ALLEN: On a previous occasion when the matter was before the House he took the opportunity of rising to express his pleasure at hearing the late Premier give a full and ample refutation of the charge that he had been a party to using his position for the purpose of increasing the salaries of not only himself but his co-Ministers. The impression was at that time abroad that that had been the case. When the Premier was introducing the Bill now before the House an interjection was made referring to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition when that gentleman was submitting the Parliamentary Allowances Bill to the House, but the then leader of the Opposition made no refer-

ence to it. The present leader of the Opposition had just cause for being indignant, feeling that he had not been justly treated by having such an insinuation thrown at him. It would be a dignified position for the Premier to adopt if he were to admit that he was not in the Chamber at the time and therefore could not have known about what had been read from *Hansard*, and that the leader of the Opposition had proved conclusively that he had made clear the fact that it was intended to increase Ministerial salaries.

The Premier: The point of difference is that the leader of the Opposition asserts that he told me these provisions were in the Bill.

Mr. ALLEN: The Premier had admitted that he was not in the Chamber at the time when the measure was submitted for the second reading. There had been a good deal said about the question, and it was a serious matter for the leader of the Opposition to be accused in the manner that had been done, and that gentleman had good grounds for resenting the insinuations which had been made. It seemed to him that during last Parliament too much time was spent by members outside the House, and that they did not pay enough attention to their work.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): There was never a better record of attendance than last session.

Mr. ALLEN: What he meant was that members did not spend sufficient time inside the walls of the Chamber. There was good reason for the leader of the Opposition taking the strongest exception to the manner in which he had been criticised and he (Mr. Allen) was pleased to have heard that hon. member's refutation to the insinuations which had been made. The public would be satisfied to know that the then Premier was not rightly accused and that he was perfectly justified in refuting the charges which had been levelled against him.

Mr. MITCHELL: There was no one more inconsistent than the Premier and his followers; they voted for the increases and now we found them asking the House to reduce salaries. They were not sincere, however, in asking for these

reductions and in addition to that they ought to admit their inconsistency. The members on the Government side were allowed to use this question at the general elections, and there was ample proof that they allowed their party to believe that they had been deceived into voting for these increases. His opponent at Northam made the fullest possible use of this and called the action a "salary grab." The Premier right throughout his actions had made it amply evident that he did not want to have the salaries reduced. He was obliged by the Premier's attitude to vote with him. In any case he would hesitate to vote against him, because by doing so he would give the Premier an opportunity of using this very same question at the next general election. The Premier would then have the opportunity of saying that he had submitted the Bill to the House and had desired to reduce Ministerial salaries, but the House had refused him permission to do so. It would be wise for the Premier to report progress and withdraw the measure. That hon. gentleman had behaved very unfairly towards the late Government. It had been shown by his own followers that he had told the country, and allowed them to tell the country, that there had been a Ministerial grab, and thousands of votes had been gained by the Labour party by reason of the denunciation of the late Ministers on account of the increase of their salaries. The measure itself was confirmation of that statement. Members of the Government voted for the increase of salaries, and now without any adequate reason they were asking for the salaries to be reduced. Ministers did not want the Bill to pass. This was simply an attempt to throw dust in the eyes of the people. They had made accusations against the late Ministers during the elections, and they had brought the Bill before the House in order to justify themselves with the country; they expected the country to accept the Bill as a confirmation of the statement that they had been deceived when the Act was put through the last Parliament. The discussion of this measure could have no other effect than to convince the

country that the present leader of the Opposition had made it perfectly clear to the last Parliament that Ministers' salaries were being increased, and to convince the country also that the Ministers of to-day were not sincere in introducing this Bill. He was sorry to have to vote with the Premier, because he believed that Ministers were not more than adequately paid. The Premier had stated that he had been to the country and that the country had determined that the late Government were not justified in increasing their salaries. As the present Government were returned with such a large majority members should be willing to believe that the country had expressed an opinion against the payment of £1,300 to Ministers.

Mr. GREEN: When speaking on the second reading he had supported the measure, and he was going to vote in favour of it now. During his election campaign he had been frequently asked questions about the increase of salaries, and he had described the increase as a Ministerial grab. He had been led to believe that that was so from reports in the Press, and he had believed that the late Government had been guilty of a scurvy trick. He now admitted that he had been deceived, inasmuch as he had been led to believe that the members then in Opposition were not aware that the Ministerial salaries were to be increased. At the same time he believed that the whole conduct of the then Government, even after that explanation had been given, could not be entirely white-washed of all blame, because they had proposed to reduce their salaries to £800, and instead of that had increased them to £1,300.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Even that would not justify the charges made against us of deceiving.

Mr. GREEN: On that point he admitted honestly and squarely to the leader of the Opposition he had been deceived. Nevertheless he considered that the rise in Ministerial salaries had been extremely blameworthy, for there did not seem to be the slightest doubt that

the present Government, when in Opposition, had voted in favour of the increased Ministerial allowances, because the sword of Damocles had been held over their heads, and they knew that if they did not vote for the larger Ministerial salaries they would have no chance of getting a living wage for themselves. He did not think £300 a year was sufficient for a member of Parliament, or £1,000 a year for a Minister. But to justify his attitude on the platform he would vote for the Bill. The rank and file of the Labour party on the goldfields were against the retention of the present Ministerial salaries; at the same time, the Labour Congress, he knew, was in favour of £400 a year being paid to private members, but as the congress did not know the work Ministers had to do and had not realised why they should get more than £1,000 a year, he considered the time was not opportune for the Ministerial increase to be retained.

Mr. HEITMANN: Good old opportune.

Mr. GREEN: There was nothing opportune about his attitude; this was the policy.

Mr. DWYER: During the election campaign in the Perth electorate not the least objection had been taken to the increase of private members' salaries, but in regard to the raising of Ministerial salaries a different attitude had been adopted. Since coming to the House and reading the reports in *Hansard* he did not think that the present leader of the Opposition—

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. DWYER: The old Act dealing with payment of members was very clear, a measure which no one could misconstrue. In the amending Act introduced last session the alteration was made in such an insidious way as to almost deceive anyone except the author of the statute and the draftsman. The increase in Ministerial salaries was brought about by omitting all reference to the section of the Act. One would have thought that Ministers would be paid under the new Act as they were under the old Act. As to whether the leader of the Opposition, then Premier, took the House into his

confidence, that was, as far as he (Mr. Dwyer) was concerned, beside the question. Whoever the late Premier did take or did not take into his confidence, he did not take the country into his confidence. Very few people knew that Ministers had been granted an increase until it was discovered before the general election.

Mr. MONGER: Every member of Parliament knew it.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: There was a leading article in the *West Australian* against it.

Mr. DWYER: Notwithstanding the member's reference to the leading article in the *West Australian* against it, there were members who were then sitting in Opposition who did not know it.

Mr. MONGER: Has one member denied it?

Mr. DWYER: They had, and whatever their knowledge was, the people in general did not know what was being done.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The late member for Kalgoorlie denied it.

Mr. FRANK WILSON: He was away from the State at the time.

Mr. DWYER: Objection must be taken to a measure of importance being passed without the public being fully aware of what was being done. We had been treated this afternoon to a very peculiar exhibition of tactics by the leader of the Opposition. He had endeavoured to retain the salaries apportioned in the 1911 Act for the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees of this House and the President and the Chairman of Committees of the Legislative Council, but at the same time he had expressed his intention of voting in favour of the reduction of Ministerial salaries. How could the leader of the Opposition reconcile these inconsistencies. He (Mr. Dwyer) had come into the House this afternoon prepared to vote for the Bill as it stood, that was for the reduction of Ministerial salaries and those of the Parliamentary officials, and the fact of the member adopting the tactics such as had been mentioned so inconsistent with any conceivable position of political straightforwardness, was sufficient to serve as a guide for him

to vote for the retention of the Ministerial salaries, and he intended to do that and take the full responsibility. To pay the officials £700 and £500 respectively and then reduce Ministerial salaries to £1,000 each, was tantamount to fixing the ratio as to the work to be performed, and it was not proportionate to the work performed by the parties concerned. Ministers had to work early and late, in the House and out of it, in session and out of session, and he did not think anybody at any time objected to Ministers being paid £1,300, but what they did object to was the insidious, deceitful, and disgraceful manner in which the increase was brought about. In view of the fact that the Committee had deliberately apportioned the salary to the officials at £700 and £500 respectively there was no other course open in justice and fair play but to record his vote to retain the Ministerial salaries at the larger amount. Their work justified it. The Premier had stated that it would be almost belittling responsible Ministers of the Crown if they were to have their salaries reduced and at the same time other salaries being increased. He intended to support the request of the Premier.

Mr. TAYLOR: While being in favour of the measure and knowing its full purport, the position had been somewhat changed by a portion of the measure being deleted. That portion in the opinion of the Premier was just as vital as the portion now under discussion. The Premier had pointed out that in view of the attitude of the Committee this afternoon he would ask members to vote against the Clause.

Mr. Frank Wilson: What would be left of the Bill?

Mr. TAYLOR: The Title would be left, and if the Committee would give him support when his amendment came forward there would be something in the Bill left. Paragraph (a.) of Clause 2 was the bone of contention in it, was the whole trouble that had cropped up during the election campaign. The two paragraphs which had been removed from the Bill were not discussed during the last election, but the paragraph under discussion was the

objectionable portion of the measure, and the Bill was brought in to rectify what was thought to be wrong. He was supporting the Premier in the position taken up of asking members to support him in voting against the subclause and he was prepared to do it. In view of the speeches made in this and another Chamber it was idle for the member for Perth to say that some hon. members had not known what they were doing in dealing with last year's Bill. It might be that the then leader of the Opposition had not known what was in the Bill until the second reading stage was reached, but from that stage onward every hon. member should have been cognisant of the purpose of the Bill. It was his intention to support the Premier should it come to a vote.

Mr. PRICE: After the exhibition we had had of the independence of members sitting behind the Government it was to be hoped that we would not again hear the accusation that Ministerial supporters had to vote as they were instructed.

Mr. Frank Wilson: Why, you are coming to heel now.

Mr. PRICE: This from the hon. member who last session, in respect to the Redistribution of Seats Bill, had called his dogs around him and instructed them to bark as he barked. He (Mr. Price) approached this question with a mind free and unbiassed by any previous expression of opinion, because he had not in any way bound himself upon it during the recent election campaign. The statement made by the member for Perth that hon. members had neglected their duty, and that it was notorious that they were not in the Chamber when the original Bill was being discussed, could only be attributed to that hon. member's ignorance of the actual facts. If the hon. member could show in *Hansard* any evidence that members of the then Opposition were not in the Chamber when the Bill was being discussed, he (Mr. Price) would be prepared to apologise to the hon. member. As a matter of fact, members of the then Opposition had been paying more attention to their business than was comfortable for the then Government. To-night

we had been placed in a peculiar position because a member supporting the Government had moved an amendment in which the leader of the Opposition had been quick to see an opportunity of embarrassing the Government by taking out of their hands the question of deciding what should be paid to officials in this and in another Chamber. Now the leader of the Opposition had gone a step further, and we found him endeavouring not only to use certain members sitting behind the Government to assist him in deciding the salaries to be paid to officials of the House but attempting also to decide what salaries should be paid to Ministers. It did credit to the strategy of the leader of the Opposition, for if that hon. member succeeded in his object he would be able to say that he had decided the salaries to be paid to Ministers and to the officials of the Chamber. He (Mr. Price) intended to vote against the Bill, though not for the sole reason that the Premier had announced that in view of what had happened he (the Premier) intended to vote against the Bill. It was to be regretted that the Premier had not reported progress and withdrawn the Bill. As for the original Bill, it would be better if hon. members were to acknowledge that they were in the Chamber at the passing of the Bill and knew all about its significance. For his own part, he had never attempted to cast odium on the late Government for their action in bringing down that Bill. He regretted that the present Ministers had brought down a Bill for the reduction of their own salaries.

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

Ayes	..	18
Noes	..	23

Majority against .. 5

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Mullan y
Mr. Bath	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Broun	Mr. Nanson
Mr. George	Mr. A. E. Plesse
Mr. Green	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Harper	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Male	Mr. Moore
Mr. Mitchell	(Teller).
Mr. Monger	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Bolton	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Collier	Mr. Price
Mr. Dooley	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Swan
Mr. Foley	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Gill	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Heilmann
Mr. Lander	(Teller).

Clause thus negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 2:—Paragraph (a.) of Section three of the principal Act is hereby amended by the omission of the word "three" and the insertion of "two" in lieu thereof.

The object of the amendment had already been indicated. It was the only means by which he could reach that object. As a private member could not move to increase expenditure he was forced, in order to bring about an increased salary for members, to suggest a reduction in the salary, in order that when the three hundred pounds was struck out, the Government could bring down a Message from the Governor and insert £400 in lieu of the £200 suggested in the amendment. Congress at Bunbury had decided that salaries should be £400 per annum, and this was the first opportunity there was of giving effect to the will of Congress and of carrying out the wishes of the people the Government party represented.

The PREMIER: The Government did not intend to proceed further with the Bill. He moved—

That progress be reported.

Motion passed; progress reported.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with two amendments which were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair, Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

No. 1—Clause 6, Strike out:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Council were afraid that the clause as amended by the Assembly would have the tendency of reducing the qualifications necessary for general nurses, and they desired the question to be left over until next year when a general nursing Bill would be brought down. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed, the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2—Clause 7, Strike out paragraph (b):

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The paragraph the Council desired to strike out referred particularly to certificates issued in other parts of the British dominions. It was the desire of the Council to omit the power given to the registration board to register any person coming with diplomas issued in any part of the British Dominions, because there might be a possibility that the board would accept certificates obtained in an institution which might be described as not qualified. For that reason he moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR: Some members tried very hard to get something of a similar nature done in the Legislative Assembly. It was rarely that he supported anything that came from the Legislative Council but he did so on that occasion.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

for the word "twenty-four" in paragraph (a):

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The object of the amendment was to reduce the quantity of wine, the produce of fruit of his own growing, which a person might sell within the State without a license. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2—Section 65 of the principal Act is amended by inserting the following proviso:—"Provided that nothing in this section shall prevent the Licensing Court from granting or transferring a license to a married woman living apart from her husband by reason of his being an invalid suffering from an illness or disease which precludes him from living on the licensed premises":

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The amendment dealt with the license which might be held by a woman under the circumstances disclosed. He understood that there was a specific case in the district of Katanning to which it would apply; indeed there might be other cases as well in which it would be only right that the wife should carry on the business. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with two amendments which were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair, the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

No. 1—New Clause, Subsection 1, of Section 44 of the principal Act is hereby amended by substituting the word "two"

BILL—EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with six amendments which were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair, Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

No. 1—Clause 3, After the words "*Government Gazette* and" insert the words "notwithstanding anything in Section 4":

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Section 4 referred to chemists and druggists and by inserting the amendment it would provide in effect that on a vote being recorded in the affirmative, chemists would close on Saturday instead of Wednesday afternoon. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2—Clause 3, Strike out "Electors entitled to vote on a poll" and insert in lieu "duly registered electors who would be entitled to vote at an election of a member of the Legislative Assembly":

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The object of the amendment was solely to make the position clearer. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3—Clause 4, Add new paragraph to stand as paragraph 4 as follows: "A public or private dispensary shall be deemed to be a chemist's shop within the meaning of this Act":

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The object of the amendment was that these dispensaries should be brought into line with those of chemists and druggists. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 4—New clause, Insert new clause to stand as Clause 5, as follows: "Section 9 of the principal Act is hereby amended by the insertion of the words 'nine or' immediately after the word 'one or'":

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This dealt with the employment of assistants in shops after closing hours. The Act originally provided that assistants could not be employed on certain days after one o'clock and ten o'clock respectively. Nine o'clock had already been substituted for ten o'clock as the hour of closing when shops remained open late, and if the Council's amendment were agreed to assistants could not be em-

ployed after nine o'clock on Fridays if the Saturday half-holiday were adopted. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 5—New Clause, Insert new clause to stand as Clause 6, as follows:—"Section 5 of the Early Closing Amendment Act, 1904, is hereby amended by the insertion at the beginning of Subsection 2 of the words 'subject to the effect of any resolution carried at a poll of electors'":

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This amendment was to compel small shops to close at one o'clock on Saturdays if the referendum was in favour of early closing on Saturdays. At the present time the small shops closed at one o'clock on Wednesdays; this amendment proposed to make them subject to the poll of the electors. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 6—Clause 3, Strike out the words "during the whole day" and insert in lieu thereof, "after the general time of closing of shops."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Bill provided that if any exempted shop sold or offered for sale during any part of the day any article which was not appropriate to that description of shop, such shop should "during the whole of the day" be deemed not to be an exempted shop. The amendment proposed to make the clause clearer by providing that such a shop should not be deemed an exempted shop "after the general time of closing of shops." In other words, if an exempted shop traded in goods which were not exempt, it could trade up to the general time of closing of shops, and then it must close. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted; and a message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

LOAN ESTIMATES INTRODUCTION.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Seaddan) : I should like to announce before the House adjourns that I will introduce to-morrow the Loan Estimates for the year ending 30th June next, and a Bill for loan authorisation.

House adjourned at 8.40 p.m.

BILL—EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Message from the Legislative Assembly received and read notifying that the amendments made by the Legislative Council had been agreed to.

BILL—LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Message from the Legislative Assembly received and read notifying that the amendments made by the Legislative Council had been agreed to.

BILL—VETERINARY.

Returned from the Legislative Assembly with amendments.

BILL—MARRINUP BRANCH RAILWAY.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 21st December, 1911.

	PAGE
Papers presented	1361
Question : Betting in streets	1361
Motion : Electoral Rolls, Legislative Council	1361
Bills : Health Act Amendment, Message	1361
Early Closing Act Amendment, Message	1361
Licensing Act Amendment, Message	1361
Veterinary, Returned	1361
Marrinup Branch Railway, In.	1361
Divorce Amendment, postponed, 3a.	1361, 1381
Workers' Homes, Com., Recon.	1364
Transcontinental Railway, 2a., Com., 3a.	1369
Early Closing Act Amendment, Printer's error	1372
Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment, Com.	1372
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, Com.	1381
Adjournment, Sitting Hour	1388

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3 p.m.. and read prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary : 1, Report by Dr. Moloney on leprosy among aborigines in the North-West. 2, Report of the Chief Inspector of Fisheries for 1910.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

Message from the Legislative Assembly received and read notifying that the amendments made by the Legislative Council had been agreed to.

QUESTION—BETTING IN STREETS.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER asked the Colonial Secretary : 1, Whether, in the opinion of the Government, the present provisions of the law dealing with the suppression of street betting are effective ? 2, If not, whether the Government will amend the law so as to make it effective for that purpose ?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied : 1, No. 2, The advisability of introducing legislation on the lines of the Victorian Act on betting will receive consideration.

BILL—DIVORCE AMENDMENT.

Postponement.

Order of the Day for the third reading read.

Hon. M. L. MOSS : As the printer had not completed the necessary printing, he moved :—

"That the Order of the Day be postponed."

Motion passed ; the Order of the Day postponed.