

ing, it was all the more important that they should be in writing when made by a board.

Progress reported.

### ELECTION RETURN—EAST PROVINCE.

The PRESIDENT announced the return of the writ for the election of a member for East Province, showing that Mr. Warren Marwick had been duly elected.

Hon. Warren Marwick took the oath and subscribed the roll.

*House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Wednesday, 19th October, 1910.*

	PAGE
Questions: Marconi station, Fremantle ...	1032
Railway South side of Swan river ...	1032
Council Election, East Province ...	1032
Perth Tramway Company, street watering	1033
Abattoirs and Freezing works, site ...	1033
Land Transactions, Nugadong ...	1033
Land settlement, Mr. Veitch and the "Bradford Observer" ...	1033
Stock trains for Midland Junction sales ...	1034
Departmental draftsman and outside work ...	1034
Fremantle Prison, proposed inquiry ...	1034
Lands Department and charges of corruption	1034
Returns: Railways, chaff lost in transit ...	1035
Civil Servants' Land Settlement Scheme ...	1036
Public Works tenders and estimates ...	1037
Railway Telegraph and Telephone lines	1037
Fire Brigades Board contributions ...	1037
Papers: Barry v. the Government ...	1036
Land selection, Morawa ...	1037
Retirement of Mr. S. F. McCallum ...	1037
Land transactions, Dunkley case ...	1037
Want of Confidence in the Speaker ...	1037
Motions: Payment of Members, to increase	1038
Tuberculosis, proposed Conference ...	1056
Bills: Geraldton Municipal Gas Supply, 3a ...	1035
General Loan and Inscribed Stock, Message, 3a ...	1035
Tambellup-Ongerup Railway, 1a ...	1035
Tributers, Com. ...	1056

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

### QUESTION—MARCONI STATION, FREMANTLE.

Mr. GORDON (for Mr. Murphy) asked the Premier: 1, Has he any infor-

mation to give to the House as to when the Marconi station will be started at Fremantle? 2, Has a site been selected, and, if so, where?

The PREMIER replied: I have no definite information on the subject, but a site on the south side of Point Walter reserve was inspected by the Federal authorities during Admiral Henderson's visit, and a verbal intimation was given that the land would be made available for the purpose of a "Marconi" station if this site were chosen.

### QUESTION—RAILWAY SOUTH SIDE OF SWAN RIVER.

Mr. GORDON (for Mr. Murphy) asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Are there any reports in existence from the present Railway Commissioner as to the advisability or otherwise of the construction of a south side railway? 2, If so, does he intend to lay such reports upon the Table of the House? 3, If not, will he call for such a report to be made at as early a date as possible?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Not until fuller reports now being obtained are available. 3, The Government have called for further information, together with reports from the Commissioner of Railways and the Engineer-in-Chief. When these are available they will be laid upon the Table of the House if deemed advisable.

### QUESTION—COUNCIL ELECTION, EAST PROVINCE.

*Proposed amendment to Constitution*

Mr. BATH asked the Premier: 1, Will the Government take into consideration the advisability of refunding to Mr. Fitzgerald Frazer the amount of his deposit as a candidate for the East Province, his nomination having been refused as informal owing to the candidate being under the necessary age? 2, Will the Government provide in the Amending Constitution Bill for a provision making the minimum age for candidates for the Legislative Council the same as that for the Assembly?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Repayment of the deposit to Mr. Frazer was approved in Executive Council on the 6th instant. 2, It is not proposed to do so.

#### QUESTION — PERTH TRAMWAY CO., STREET WATERING.

Mr. SWAN (for Mr. Horan) asked the Minister for Works: Will he take such action with the Perth Tramway Company as will compel them adequately to water the streets in terms of their agreement.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: There is no power conferred upon me by the Perth Tramways Act to intervene in the matter.

#### QUESTION — ABATTOIRS AND FREEZING WORKS, SITE.

Mr. JACOBY asked the Minister for Agriculture: Has the site of the proposed abattoirs and freezing works at Fremantle yet been fixed. If so, where?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Yes. 2, At North Fremantle, adjacent to the river, on lots Nos. 29, 30, and 31, Reserve No. 11069.

Mr. JACOBY: In view of the probability of a railway line being built on the south side of the Swan river will this not lead him to reconsider the question of the site for the abattoirs?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No, for I do not think the building of such a line would interfere with the position of the works.

#### QUESTION—LAND TRANSACTIONS, NUGADONG.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Lands: 1, When was the area between the Nugadong agricultural area and the Murchison railway reserved from selection? 2, Why was it reserved? 3, Did a Geraldton deputation request the Minister to remove the reservation? 4, If so, on what date did the Minister receive the deputation? 5, What was the nature of the Minister's reply? 6, When did the Minister approve of the reservation of portion of this area being removed? 7, Did he inform the Geraldton deputation of this approval? 8, When was the removal actually effected? 9, Was the removal

gazetted or in any other way published? 10, If so, how and where? 11, How many public servants have secured land in this area? 12, Did Mr. Duncan Paterson apply for portion of this area? 13, On what date, and for what acreage? 14, How many other applications were lodged the same day for blocks adjoining that applied for by Mr. Paterson? 15, Were any of these applicants related to, or employed by, or connected with Mr. Paterson or his firm? 16, If so, how many? 17, Did the Minister advise Messrs. Veitch, Powell, and Clarke that this area was open for selection? 18, Does the Minister believe in survey before selection? 19, Did he practise it in this case? 20, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, 5th July, 1909. 2, Pending surveyor's inspection as to suitability of land for subdivision. 3, The deputation referred to requested that the land on the south side of the railway at Mullewa should be thrown open. 4, 25th February, 1910. 5, The land would not be thrown open until subdivided. 6, 3rd February, 1910. 7, No, it was not the land that the deputation had inquired for, but the Government land agent was advised in the usual way. 8, 23rd April, 1910. 9, Not gazetted, but the public plans were amended and the Government land agent advised. 10, Answered by 9. 11, Twelve. 12, Yes. 13, On September 8th, for 2,000 acres. 14, Eighteen. 15, All these applications were made by Mr. John on behalf of Mr. Paterson and others, but with the exception of the application by L. V. Paterson I am not aware of the relationship, personal or otherwise, of the applicants. 16, See reply to No. 15. 17, I believe they were shown a plan of the locality. 18, Yes. 19, No. 20, Because the surveyor advised that, with the exception of the portions that had already been subdivided, the land was not suitable.

#### QUESTION—LAND SETTLEMENT, MR. VEITCH AND THE "BRADFORD OBSERVER."

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Premier: 1, Did the Hon. the Premier receive a cable-

gram from the Agent General stating that Veitch and party had written to the *Bradford Observer*, charging the Land Board with prejudice and with favouring speculators? 2, Were the names of Veitch and party mentioned in such cablegram? 3, Is it too much to ask the Hon. the Premier to go to the same trouble to ascertain the true facts of the case as he suggested the leader of the Opposition should have done on another occasion? 4, In view of the denial given by Messrs. Veitch and party, is it the intention of the Hon. the Premier to apologise publicly to these gentlemen? 5, If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, 4, and 5, I immediately cabled to the Acting Agent General advising him of Messrs. Veitch and Powell's denial.

#### QUESTION—STOCK TRAINS FOR MIDLAND JUNCTION SALES.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Are the Railway Department running special stock trains from Midland Junction to North Fremantle on Wednesdays? 2, Is the stock on these trains carried at ordinary rates? 3, If so, will the Government grant the general producers similar privileges? 4, Have these trains proved profitable to the working railways? 5, Have the purchasers of stock at the Midland sales experienced any difficulty in securing stock trucks after the sales on Wednesday? 6, Is any preference shown to the requirements of North Fremantle for stock trucks?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes, occasionally when ordinary tabled trains are unable to land the stock in time for sale. 2, Yes. 3, Under similar circumstances arrangements are made to deliver stock at Midland Junction or other saleyards by specials. 4, As a whole, yes. 5, No. 6, No.

#### QUESTION — DEPARTMENTAL DRAFTSMEN AND OUTSIDE WORK.

Mr. PRICE asked the Premier: Has his attention been drawn to the fact that departmental draftsmen are competing

with outside citizens in the preparation of plans? If so, what action, if any, has he taken in the matter.

The PREMIER replied: 1 and 2, Yes. In June last the attention of the Government was called to the fact that a temporary draftsman had prepared plans for additions and improvements to a building. He subsequently pleaded ignorance of the public service regulations on the subject, and gave an assurance that so long as he was in the employment of the Government he would not undertake work for outside people.

#### QUESTION—FREMANTLE PRISON, PROPOSED INQUIRY.

Mr. SCADDAN (without notice) asked the Premier: Have the Government had appointed, or do they contemplate appointing, a committee of inquiry into the administration of the Fremantle prison, and if they have made such an appointment, who will constitute the committee.

The PREMIER replied: The Colonial Secretary has under consideration the appointment of such a committee, but I cannot give any details about that now. I will make inquiries and give the information to-morrow.

#### LANDS DEPARTMENT AND CHARGES OF CORRUPTION.

##### *A Royal Commission.*

Mr. SCADDAN (without notice) asked the Premier: Have the Government appointed a Royal Commission, as requested by the Minister for Lands, to inquire into the administration of the Lands Department? If so, what Judge or other person will constitute the Commission, and what will be the scope of that Commission?

The PREMIER replied: I have received the following letter from the Chief Justice, dated to-day:—

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that Mr. Justice McMillan has consented to act as Royal Commissioner to examine into and report upon the allegation made in the Legislative Assembly of corruption in the adminis-

tration of the Department of Lands and Surveys. His Honour has, however, accepted the Commission with great reluctance and only on the condition that the allegations into which he has to inquire are formulated in a definite manner, and that some person is appointed to conduct the proceedings before him and adduced all the evidence.

It will now be open to the hon. member for Albany (Mr. Price), or to any other hon. member, or to any other person, to formulate his charges, when the Commissioner will, immediately on receiving his appointment, inquire into them.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): May I make a statement. It may have the effect of saving the expenditure of a large sum of money if I say at once I do not think any member of this side of the House proposes to make any such charges as the Government desire them to do. They will not place themselves in the position of defendants. We want an inquiry by a judge or anyone else into the general administration of the Lands Department. Free scope should be given to an inquiry into all acts of administration. If that were done we would be prepared to give statements as to the charges that have been made, and others probably would also do so. If the Government imagine that members on this side of the House intend to make charges and act as defendants and prosecutors for the purpose of whitewashing the Minister, they are making a great mistake.

Mr. PRICE (Albany): I have been specially referred to, and I think I have every right to resent the attempt on the part of the Premier to make me the defendant or prosecutor in a case of this character. I made certain statements in this House, purposely and explicitly, and the particulars concerning the statements I have made I am quite prepared to hand over to any independent tribunal, but I resent the attempt to place me on trial for having attacked the Minister for Lands as to the manner in which he administers his department.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): I give notice that to-morrow I shall move—

*That the proposed Commission is unsatisfactory owing to the limitation of the inquiry as proposed by the Government.*

#### BILL — GERALDTON MUNICIPAL GAS SUPPLY.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

#### BILL—GENERAL LOAN AND INSCRIBED STOCK.

*Message.*

Message from the Governor received and read, recommending the Bill.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson): It was unfortunate that this Message had not been submitted at one of the earlier stages in the passage of the Bill. He had only discovered this morning that this had not been done. For his own part he had always made a practice of bringing these Messages down on the first readings, and he was sorry it had not been done on this occasion.

*Third Reading.*

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

#### BILL — TAMBELLUP-ONGERUP RAILWAY.

Introduced by the Minister for Works and read a first time.

#### RETURN—RAILWAYS, CHAFF LOST IN TRANSIT.

On motion by Mr. HEITMANN, ordered "That there be laid upon the Table of the House a return showing: 1. The number of claims received by the Railway Department for chaff lost in transit during the last two years on the Geraldton-Cue railway. 2. The names of claimants. 3. The amount of chaff picked up along the above-mentioned lines and sold by the department at Geraldton and Cue. 4. The names of the purchasers."

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have here the return made out, and I beg to lay it on the table.

wish. However, so far as the information could be secured, it would be given.

Question put and passed.

#### RETURN—CIVIL SERVANTS' LAND SETTLEMENT SCHEME.

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle) moved—

*That a return be placed on the Table of the House showing:—1, The names and positions of officers who applied for an area of land in connection with the civil service land settlement scheme. 2, The names of officers granted land in the settlement. 3, The names of officers who made application for land under the settlement scheme and such application not being granted, showing the reasons for such refusal.*

It had been reported that a rush of civil servants for the land under the civil service land settlement scheme had taken place owing to the dissatisfaction which existed at that time throughout the service. Since then the Public Service Commissioner had pointed out that only a small number had applied for the land, that in fact the applications were not equal to the number of blocks thrown open for settlement. On the other hand it had been stated that so many civil servants were anxious to get away from their employment in the service of the State and go on the land that the Government had found it impossible to spare them all. It was because of these conflicting statements he was moving for the return.

The PREMIER: Whilst not desiring to oppose the motion, he desired to point out the difficulties of obtaining exact information, such as was required by the terms of the motion. Public servants had made applications from various branches of the public departments, and many of these communications had been rather in the nature of inquiries than of definite applications. To secure definite information the whole of the branches and sub-branches would have to be approached. His desire was to point out that the return, when supplied, might not be as exact as the hon. member could

#### PAPERS—BARRY *versus* THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. BROWN (Perth) moved—

*That there be laid upon the table of the House all papers in connection with Barry v. the Government.*

He said: I am moving for these papers in order that the remarks of the puritanical member for Murchison may be refuted, and both sides of the question fairly placed before the public.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): I second that. I will be only too pleased to have those papers laid on the Table. It will be shown that they bear out exactly what I have said, namely that the administration of the Attorney General's department is no credit to that Minister. In connection with this, I may say that when we have an opinion given by the Attorney General's office declaring that a member would forfeit his seat if he accepted a position on the Central Board of Health—

The Attorney General: They have not said that.

Mr. HOLMAN: If not exactly that, still that was the purport of what they said. The Attorney General, we know, will deny having said what he really did say. If he is not satisfied, *Hansard* will have to be called upon to show that he did say it. A denial of that sort does not carry much weight. I hope it will be seen, when the papers are tabled, that a medical officer received a very high fee for examining and reporting on the case of Barry, and that when the case came into Court the Crown refused to call this medical officer as a witness, or to allow his report to be submitted in court. This shows that the Crown is not prepared to give justice to a poor man, which displays a very poor spirit in a department supposed to protect the interests of the poorest individual in the State. Yet that department has utilised its strength and money to secure a report from a medical officer, and subsequently has refused to

allow the report to go before the court. When the papers are tabled, I shall have a great deal more to say upon this case. Question put and passed.

#### RETURN—PUBLIC WORKS TENDERS AND ESTIMATES.

On motion by Mr. HEITMANN, ordered: "That there lie upon the Table of the House a return showing:—The amount of successful tender, also the amount of Public Works Department estimate, for the following public works:—1, The Nannanine to Meekatharra railway. 2, The Upper Chapman railway. 3, The Marble Bar railway. 4, The Dowerin to Merredin, 1st extension. 5, The Boyup to Kojonup railway. 6, The Busselton jetty. 7. The Midland Workshops extension, last contract.

#### RETURN — RAILWAYS, TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE LINES.

On motion by Mr. HEITMANN, ordered: "That there be laid upon the Table of the House a return showing: 1, The amount paid in salaries and wages to Electrical Engineer's Branch for maintenance of telegraph and telephone lines on Government railways for the year ending 30th June, 1910. 2, The amount received by the Railway Department from Commonwealth and other sources for upkeep of telegraph and telephone lines for the year ending 30th June, 1910."

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have the return here, and I beg to lay it on the Table.

#### WANT OF CONFIDENCE IN THE SPEAKER.

Notice of motion by Mr. HOLMAN, "That Mr. Speaker has not the confidence of the members of the House," read.

Mr. SPEAKER: With reference to this motion I will ask the Chairman of Committees to be good enough to take the Chair.

Mr. HOLMAN: I will not move the motion, Mr. Speaker.

#### PAPERS—LAND SELECTION, MORAWA.

Mr. JOHNSON (Guildford) moved—

*That all the papers relating to the applications lodged for Blocks 3879, 3935, and 3931, Morawa, together with evidence submitted by applicants to the land board and the board's decision be laid upon the Table of the House.*

Probably there would be no objection to the motion. He desired to see the papers with a view of determining whether there was any justification for the criticism levelled against the land board's decision in this matter.

Question passed.

#### PAPERS—RETIREMENT OF MR. S. F. MCCALLUM.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison) moved—

*That all papers in connection with Mr. S. F. McCallum, late of the Friendly Societies Department, be placed on the Table.*

He said: As Ministers had often stated they had no objection to placing papers on the Table and not knowing the full facts of the case involved, he would reserve any remarks until he had seen the files.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) seconded the motion. He had the same object in view as the hon. member in reserving his remarks.

Question passed.

#### PAPERS—LAND TRANSACTIONS, DUNKLEY CASE.

Mr. PRICE (Albany) moved—

*That all papers connected with the allocation of Block 208-(9) on the Stirling Estate to G. A. Dunkley be laid on the Table.*

He said: It was understood this motion was to be treated as a formal one in view of the fact that a number of other papers had been laid on the Table without any motion being moved for them.

Question passed.

# MOTION—PAYMENT OF MEMBERS, TO INCREASE.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara) moved—

*That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that members' salaries be increased from £200 to £300 per year, such increase to have effect as from the commencement of the present financial year.*

He said: I have no intention of dwelling at any length on this motion; it is a matter that has been discussed at considerable length inside and outside the House for the last four years. I am positive the duties of a member of Parliament deserve better recognition than they get at present. I have not been very ambitious in my motion, as I desire to put it gently, so to speak; I believe that at least £400 per annum is not more than is absolutely necessary and justified; but hon. members may not be used to such an amount of wealth all of a sudden; and if we could increase the salaries as from the beginning of the year to £300, then those of us who come back to the new Parliament will be more used to the wealth I have just spoken of.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson): I should like to make further inquiries into this matter before a motion of this description is absolutely adopted. More especially would I like to inquire further because the hon. member wants to make the motion retrospective. I certainly oppose a motion of this description, that the increase should date from the beginning of the present financial year. I have always opposed payment of members.

Mr. Brown: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I admit the principle, there is little argument against it, yet in practice I do not think it has panned out too well. Nevertheless, it has become an established practice almost throughout the British Empire that members of Parliament should receive payment for their services. Indeed, I see in the Press that even in the Old Country the matter has been mooted, and the chances are that in the near future steps will be taken in the British Houses of Parliament to pay their

members as is done throughout Australia. If we are to pay members, as we do in this Assembly and have done for many years past, I am not one to advocate a starvation wage. I believe in members being paid an adequate remuneration for their services. I say also that Ministers should be paid an adequate remuneration, I do not consider they get anything like a reward for the hard work they have to do and for the long hours they have to work, and also for the severe criticism they are subjected to from time to time by members of the Opposition. There is another aspect of this question I have been thinking about considerably for the last few months, that is, that the leader of the Opposition should receive some extra remuneration. It is an important post he fills. He has, during the session of Parliament at any rate, very long hours to work and very arduous labours to perform, inasmuch as he has to criticise nearly every measure that comes before the House, whereas we have a number of Ministers to make a study of these measures and we can distribute the work among many. Altogether I feel that if we are to take this step, first of all it should not be made retrospective.

Mr. Walker: Why not?

The PREMIER: I think at any rate, if any step is taken it should be for the next financial year, if not from the beginning of the new Parliament, in order that immediately afterwards we may appeal to the country to get the endorsement of the electors. I would prefer it to date from the beginning of the new Parliament.

Mr. George: Have a referendum on it?

The PREMIER: I do not believe in any referendum. Payment of members is part of an accepted policy. If the House passes the motion we go to the country with it, and it is sufficient for the electors to express an opinion on. To-day, however, I am not prepared to definitely commit myself. I have the matter under consideration, and I am prepared to consider it still further, but in the meantime I would rather the hon. member would not press his motion to a division, at any rate in its present terms.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): I think the matter has received ample consideration for many years. It is by no means a new question. It has been considered, I think, more than once by direct motions in this Chamber. In the other States, with the exception of Tasmania, the remuneration to members of Parliament is considerably higher than it is in this State, and I think there should be no hesitation or doubt about carrying the motion in its present form. We know the conditions of living are worse and higher in Western Australia than in any other part of Australia; and we know that with the exception of Queensland, the travelling conditions are worse than in any other State. If New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland find it necessary to pay their members an honorarium of £300 per year, I do not think there should be the slightest hesitation in carrying this motion and in bringing down a Bill to put the matter through and make it retrospective from the beginning of the present financial year. We have been promised in the past that certain concessions allowed in other States should be allowed here. In the matter of postages, telegrams and other expenses, members of Parliament are recouped in other States, but these expenses are not allowed here. In fact, a member of Parliament is worse off in Western Australia than in any other State. In the case of the member for Pilbara, when he visits his district each year it costs him at least £50 to do it, and then he does not cover all his district. It takes three or four weeks to travel through my electorate, and then I cannot visit all the centres, but it costs me between £40 and £50 to do it each year, not for any benefit to myself, but solely in the interests of the people. I maintain that no member should be put to that expense out of his own pocket. We have had promises made that this matter would be considered, and I sincerely trust that the motion will be carried and that the Premier will take the earliest opportunity of bringing down a measure to make the increased payment of members date from the commencement of the present financial year. I would rather the mover had inserted £400 instead of £300. I have always

found from my reading of Parliamentary history that the cleanest and best Parliaments were those that were best paid. Unfortunately we have had in the past—I do not say it has occurred in this State—examples where those who have been the strongest opponents to payment of members took every possible opportunity to pay themselves when they had the opportunity, and when that opportunity did not turn up itself took every possible opportunity of making the opportunity. I feel strongly on this question because I maintain no member should be called upon to devote his services to the State unless he receives an adequate return for them. I was pleased to hear the Premier say that, although in the past he was opposed to payment of members, he was prepared to accept the principle that is adopted throughout the whole of the British Empire, and that he also believed in paying a fair amount when the principle of payment was adopted. I fancy there are members on the Government side of the House just as anxious to receive increased remuneration as members of the Opposition; and as the matter has been discussed so often and has been before the country so often, I do not think there is any necessity to delay it further. We should carry this motion, and the Premier should bring down a Bill to give effect to it at the earliest possible date.

Mr. JACOBY (Swan): I think it has been admitted that the salary at present paid to members is not sufficient, provided a member is dependent entirely on his salary. If the principle has to be thoroughly recognised by the people of the State that members are to be paid for their services, I do not think there can be any answer but an affirmative one to the question as to giving an adequate remuneration; but the motion asks this Assembly to vote money into the pockets of its own members; and I think we must be fully aware that the action of the Federal Parliament in voting money into the pockets of its own members—

Mr. O'Loughlen: Was endorsed.

Mr. JACOBY: While condoned at the general election, still gave a shock to the people of Australia. We find that in every case where payment is given for ser-



vices, those who have to make the payment generally fix the amount, and it is right and proper that they should do so. In the circumstances, I think this matter should be remitted to the people to decide, and a referendum should be taken at the next general election asking the people if they are favourable to the amount being increased to £300 per year. I could myself feel that I was doing an improper thing if I voted for an increase of money to be paid to myself. If the case is a good one surely the people can be trusted to give the right answer.

Mr. Seaddan: You did not suggest a referendum as to whether you should accept the Speaker's salary.

Mr. JACOBY: The Speaker's salary is provided for by Statute.

Mr. Seaddan: So will this be.

Mr. JACOBY: I have no objection to the view taken by members that the salary should be increased. I believe that members conscientiously hold that view, and I cannot understand how members who are relying upon their Parliamentary salary can manage to live on it. My own position is that I feel if the salary is to be increased it should certainly be increased by the decision of the people and that should be ascertained by referendum. I propose to move an amendment—

*That in line 2 all the words after "desirable that" be struck out and the following be inserted:—"a referendum be taken at the next State general elections to ascertain whether the electors desire that the payment of members of the Legislative Assembly be increased to £300 per annum."*

Mr. WALKER (Kanowna): I believe that the electors sent us here trusting us to do what was right. They sent us here believing that we had sufficient courage to take the responsibility of our own actions. The amendment moved by the member for Swan is one that refers the matter to the future, and deals with another Parliament, in which some of us may not have the honour to sit. We are dealing with our services to the State and it has been admitted by the Premier and by the mover of the motion that we are not receiving adequate remuneration,

if remuneration it be considered, for our services. Then why have any hypocrisy about it. Why not say at once that we are doing work for which we are underpaid and sweated, and that we as custodians of the purse of the people, justly and with their wish, fully appreciating their sense of justice, undertake to pay a fair and reasonably low amount for the services of each member of the House.

Mr. George: We did not take a contract when we came in for £200 per annum.

Mr. WALKER: We took on the contract, we accepted the position as we found it, but I am speaking, as one of 22 at least on this side of the House, who undertook to raise the salaries of members of Parliament on the first opportunity that presented itself. There is not one of the 22 on this side of the House who did not pledge himself publicly to raise the pay of members of Parliament when the first chance offered itself. That was my case in the previous Parliament. There was never an election, never a meeting held, but that point was brought before the electors, and if the candidate for the time being happened to forget to mention it it was brought up by the electors themselves and they insisted upon it. Why? Because the electors did not desire men to be considered their servants at a sweating wage. What are the first principles of the Labour party? They are that a man shall receive the full payment that he is deserving of. That is to say that the position should be sufficient for him to live on respectably and to fulfil all duties in the course of that employment. The electors have sent us here for that purpose. The Premier has admitted that £200 is not sufficient. Then if he admits that why not pay more than £200 a year. He says, Oh no, he wants to be paid in the future. Why in the future if you are doing the work now? If we are deserving of it now it is an injustice to defer it. The member for Swan wants it to be still further deferred. He wants it to be deferred to another Parliament. That is to say that

we vote money for someone else who in the future shall perform the duties we are now performing. Honestly, does he not think he is deserving of £300 per annum as well as any member of the coming Parliament will be? Then why not have the courage to say so. If it is a fair amount there is no injustice in voting it. Are we to have better men in the next Parliament than we have in this when we are performing work for which £300 is admitted to be proper pay? Why have any false shame about it? Why not take what is justly due? There is only one argument against the position that I am maintaining, and that is that we are not entitled to it, that we are voting themselves some luxury, or some undue privilege, that we are taking some unwise advantage of the people. None of these notions is suggested. It is not for a moment argued that this is some gift to the necessary, and that we have the necessary already; it is not contended that this is a sort of superfluous; it is contended by everyone that it is essential, that it is only a fair payment to meet all expenses and the exigencies of Parliament and parliamentary life. If so, what is there that an elector in the country can cavil at or object to. There is only one species of opposition that has any show of straightforward honesty about it and that is that there should be no payment of members at all. I could understand that argument. There are those who believe that payment of members is in some way injurious and creates professional politicians. That argument is quite on a different footing from that which says that every member in this House is entitled to £300 per annum or more but he shall not have it, some other fellow afterwards shall have it. Bye and bye we will admit that our successors will be entitled to it. Why not have the manliness to say that it is fair and just and proper and a rightful pay and little enough at that? We are earning it and we will pay it ourselves. That is manliness and there is some courage in it, or at least there is some ordinary business acumen in it.

Mr. George: Why not £400?

Mr. WALKER: Yes, £400. A congress of workers from every part of this State which met at Bunbury in May last and which represented the bulk of the electors of the State directed their representatives to ask for £400 a year, and if the mover of the motion will pardon me saying so I am at a loss to understand his reasons for departing from that mandate from a congress that represented the bulk of the majority of the electors in this State, no later than last May. They were not members of Parliament, they were representatives of labour organisations in the State, and therefore £400 a year is to my mind what we should ask for at the present moment and ask for it ourselves, and get it as soon as we can. It is only false modesty to postpone the matter. Five years ago I was told to do my utmost and I promised to do so in order to raise the payment of members. As a matter of fact resolutions were suggested, but were pooh-poohed, and the matter was always put off, and it is proposed to put it off now. The Premier himself asks that it be put off for a few weeks so that he can consider it and the member for Swan wants to put it off for another Parliament, and he wants us to shirk our responsibility and to hand it over to the people. The people have voted upon it. Every member returned to this side of the House and some on the other side are pledged to it already. The people have voted upon it, and in the presence of their representatives they made a demand for an increase of members' salaries. Why shirk the matter further? The Premier says he wants time to consider it. I have the means of knowing that this has been under consideration by the previous Premier more than the length of the present session of Parliament, and I venture to think that the Premier is not ignorant of every phase of this question. He knows it from A to Z, from Alpha to Omega, and he has himself formed opinions which he this afternoon admits he has modified. He is willing to meet us half-way. There is some concession there and we are pleased to see such advancement, but we ask him

in deference to the wishes of the people to meet us all the way, and that is to consent to bring in a measure and not only to consent to bring it in but to bring it in for the present financial year. We have to be just to ourselves, as well as to our successors.

— to thine own self be true;  
And it must follow, as the night the day,  
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

I am not going to be false to myself. The hon. member smiles, but one greater than he said those words, and they are about as true as any gospel, absolutely true and sound. I despise that hypocrisy that pretends it does not want more but will snatch every time. I am suspicious of that pretended modesty that is the greatest form of egotism—ask the people to vote it next time, wishing to goodness that the motion will never be carried. There are those in the House, I have seen them: I happened to be in the same fight years ago in New South Wales. I was in that Parliament for years before they had payment of members, and I heard members there—the old conservatives who wanted to follow the House of Commons in having devoted service to the country without a fraction of reward, honorary service—I have heard them say they would give the salary to charities and not take the money, but there was not a member but who grabbed at the very first payment. I have seen these things before; I have known men to pose as disinterested, fighting for the high principles of honourable patriotic service to the country, and yet they admit that they will be only too glad if the justice of their own cases were recognised. There is no consistency in saying that £200 is too little and we will not have any more.

Mr. Jacoby: You have taken it yourselves.

Mr. WALKER: Taken what yourselves?

Mr. Jacoby: You propose to take it yourselves.

Mr. WALKER: I would vote it to myself every day of the week, and the moment you show me what I am voting for myself is unjust not earned, not rightfully bestowed, then I will refuse to take

it. I will certainly then set an example, perhaps to some others; but, whilst it is justice, there is no false pretence about me in pretending I do not want it when I know it is my due; I want no more than my due. Unless the argument can be advanced and proof adduced to show this is an unjust request, I am going to vote for the motion, and if it is a just request everyone who votes against it commits an injustice. It is unjust to vote against the giving of justice, and we have the right to justice as much as our successors. Why should we be deprived of that justice which is admittedly our due? I can see no valid argument, none whatever, in deferring this question any further: it has been considered again and again. Every member has made up his mind upon it, and is ready to vote on the subject. As to frightening this Chamber by allusions to the Federal House, if we were to take that as an omen, we ought to rush into voting for it and make the salary higher. Notwithstanding that vote and its retrospective character, everyone who voted for it was returned, and I believe those who voted against it—or some—were left out in the cold. If there is any argument at all in the illustration brought forward by the member for Swan, it is upon our side.

Mr. A. A. Wilson: The High Commissioner now in England voted for it.

Mr. WALKER: We are here to vote for what is rightly votable. This is one of the questions which has been before the country all along. The principle is admitted. We have payment of members to-day, but we have payment of members in such a character that I think it creates a public disrespect for the House. The artisan in the street receives a salary that is paid to a member of Parliament. Some men who can work in moleskins get more money than those who are in the service of the country, and naturally there will be some degree of contempt for a House that has not the pluck to say we are worth more than £3 16s. 7d. a week. Not worth more? We have not the pluck to say we are not worth more than that? What can the people think of us! Soulless people are we who will not have the pluck to say what we think. What right have we to represent a nation when we

dare not seek for justice for ourselves? Poor miserable creatures! We are satisfied with a crust when the country would offer a little bit of butter with it. It is our duty to do what the people have asked for years for us. Is it pay? No one present will say it is. Do we not feel the necessity of paying more? If we do, let us pay it. What objection is there in paying it to the present members? What objection can I have to the member for the Swan getting it? What objection can he have to my getting it if I deserve it?

Mr. Jacoby: The employers should have a say.

Mr. WALKER: The employers have sent you here. I know the electors of the Swan are above that mean wretchedness that would say "our representatives are not worth more than £200 a year"; they have said you are worth something because there was payment of members when you came in. If a member is worth something, he is worth more than a sweating wage. Look at it from another standpoint. No country was ever prosperous which did not pay its men well. Show me the country where wages are high, and I will show you a progressive country, a country which is going ahead. I care not whether the men receiving wages are carpenters at the bench, or ploughmen in the field: show me that they are getting a high wage, and I will show you a country that is making strides in advancement. Show me the country where the wages are low, and I will show you a degraded country; I will show you a country without hope, a dispirited country of men, wretched, contemptible. If there be any truth in the comparison I have made, it follows that we who are in the leading van, or should be in the leading van of national advancement, we should set the example: we should not try and pay the lowest of all possible wages, because if we pay the lowest possible of all wages will not the example be followed by every other employer of labour. What is the object of this House but to raise wages all over the country.

Mr. Brown: Then, why do you not strike?

Mr. WALKER: Strike at what? I would like to strike at him, metaphori-

cally—in a Pickwickian sense. The member is always trying to make himself appear eccentric, always aiming at a little public notice by doing something odd—a perfect mediocrity capped with oddity; therefore I pass him by for this argument. The inference is if we do not pay ourselves a fair rate of wage we are false. That is to say we are not sound in judgment, or content in advocating better wages for the workers outside. Our plea is that this side of the House always wishes to give good just wages, and we have no exception. We fight for the people to get good wages, and good conditions of living for them, and these are the very people who would turn round and say the same for us also. We need not go to the country to ask them if they are kind enough, or just enough, to give us a fair allowance. We trust them, we know they are; they would be more generous to us than we are asking, but with modesty the motion simply asks that we be paid £300 a year for the services which we render to the country.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray): In connection with this particular motion, I think my views have been described by the leading Perth newspaper as archaic. As far as the question is concerned, the country has endorsed the payment for a number of years, therefore it is not for me now to object, and I am not going to try and attach to myself that modesty which the member for Kanowna has so graphically and eloquently announced for himself, because I have always thought that if members of Parliament are sincere in what they say and believe—

Mr. Underwood: I am.

Mr. GEORGE: The hon. member cannot be otherwise; his modesty exudes—but I am speaking of myself from whom modesty does not exude. The hon. member for Kanowna said with great force that for his part he would be satisfied if the figure were made higher. As to referring the matter to the electors, I was not aware until the hon. member told me that the Opposition members put this question before their electors prior to being elected, therefore there is every justification for what they are now doing.

Mr. Walker: Many on the other side also.

Mr. GEORGE: I was saying I was not aware until the member for Kanowna told me that the Opposition members put this plainly before their electors before they were sent here. Therefore they are perfectly justified in attempting to raise their "screws." There may be members on this side who put the matter before their electors, and got the same answer, but, as far as I am concerned, the question was never mentioned. My views were well known to those who sent me here; but I want to put my views before the House, and I think it is right to do so. There is one thing in connection with this question that might well be taken into consideration, that is that members who come from a great distance and necessarily have to keep up separate homes, and have to put up with greater inconvenience than those who live in the town, should in all fairness be allowed more than members who have homes close to Parliament. It would be possible to fix up a scheme of that sort.

The Premier: Where would Mt. Lawley come in?

Mr. GEORGE: That would not come in, for it is near at hand, as is also Fremantle. The member for Sussex might, for instance, like more, if he had the chance, or the members for Nelson or Pilbara, or any of the representatives of out-of-the-way places.

Mr. Bolton: Or the member for Murray.

Mr. GEORGE: That district is not very far away and the hon. member need not worry about it. If the representative has a home in Perth he need not draw the allowance. Take my friend in the far corner, Mr. Underwood, who comes from the North, or Mr. Male; those gentlemen should have an extra allowance made to them.

Mr. Bolton: The latter never sees the North.

Mr. GEORGE: There should also be an allowance made for postages. It costs me on an average 10s. or 12s. every week for postages to my constituency, or to other constituencies who communicate with me. I am speaking now of political

letters which have to do with me as a member of Parliament and not in connection with my private avocation. That is the sum it costs me. I do not know how it is with other members, but if it were possible to make an arrangement for an allowance for postages it would be a fair thing to do. As to what is a fair remuneration for the services rendered, my modesty prevents me from saying what would be a fair remuneration for my services. I know what I value them at, but perhaps the country would not pay that. I would prefer to see the matter referred to the electors the next time the opportunity arises, as those electors who send many members to this House without hearing their views on this question should have a chance to signify their desires in this direction. That chance will arise at the next general election. In this case I would not like to fight for myself, but rather for posterity. As I have said, members who have to travel a long distance to their Parliamentary labours should receive a higher recompense than £200 a year.

Mr. Scaddan: Would you pay according to the time the member is away from his district?

Mr. GEORGE: There is another privilege that might be granted and that is that the railway passes of members should frank their wives over the railways. I would sooner see these matters attended to than have our screw raised.

Mr. FOULKES (Claremont): I remember that this subject was first brought forward about eight years ago, and then, if my memory serves me correctly, it was argued by many members who were in favour of payment of members that it would be impossible for all classes of the community to be truly represented in Parliament unless a sufficient amount was paid in defraying their expenses while attending Parliament. It was then decided that a salary of £200 a year was sufficient. Since then, however, it has been pointed out frequently by many members to their constituents that £200 is insufficient. That has been pointed out more particularly by Labour members. I have read speeches made by most of them in the various

electoral districts during the last few years and I know quite well that every Labour member has had the plank on his platform that there should be increased payment of members. So far as they are concerned there has been no beating about the bush and no ambiguity about the claim they make on the public purse. This question has to be regarded not only from the personal point of view, as regards the members themselves, but also from another aspect. There are many people who are considerably opposed to the payment of members. They argue that if a man is prepared to offer his services to the country his election should be regarded as an honour which of itself is sufficient remuneration. There was a class of members, more particularly Labour members, who openly advocated that members' salaries should be increased to such an amount as would not only compensate them but would also reward them for the services they rendered to the country. I take very strong exception, however, to one opinion, strongly held in Labour circles, which is that no Labour member should follow any other avocation than a political one. During the last year or two various Labour members have pursued their original callings, those which they carried on before being elected to Parliament.

Mr. George: More credit to them.

Mr. FOULKES: A great many of the public bodies, more particularly the labour unions, take the strongest exception to that procedure. I remember that eight or nine months ago the member for Guildford openly stated that he found his Parliamentary salary was not sufficient to reward him for the services he rendered in Parliament and that he found it necessary to pursue his calling. He therefore undertook certain contracts in the North-West. I think that was a very proper thing for him to do, but the strongest exception was taken to his conduct. That hon. member was quite justified, if he thought it necessary to earn his personal expenses and those of his family, in carrying on his trained avocation. Of course I realise the fact that £200 a year is not sufficient to pay the expenses

of a member or sufficient reward for a man who devotes his whole time to Parliament, but what I wish to call attention to is this: It is not necessary for a man, unless he is a Minister of the Crown, to devote the whole of his time to his Parliamentary duties.

Mr. Heitmann: He could do it with advantage to the State.

Mr. FOULKES: I am quite sure the State does not expect a man to devote the whole of his time to political duties. The State is right in taking up that aspect. It would be a great disadvantage to the State if members devoted all their time to their Parliamentary work, and thus became members of what might be termed the political profession. There are a great many people seriously alarmed at the idea of having the affairs of the country entirely carried on by a class of men who can only be described as professional politicians. If we get that class here I am sure it will be a distinct loss to the State.

Mr. Walker: A distinct gain.

Mr. FOULKES: No, a distinct loss, for I consider it is always a great advantage to Parliament that we should have men here who have experience of various trades, professions, and businesses. If Parliament were to consist of one class alone, men who thought of nothing else but politics, and never of the various trades and callings which perhaps many of them originally belonged to, it would be all the worse for Parliament and this State. If this system were to be adopted then it would mean that men would come here as professional politicians who had become divorced from their callings for many years. For that reason I consider it unnecessary, and indeed it would be almost indecent of us at this stage, to raise our own salaries. I sympathise with members—and they can take those sympathies for what they think they are worth—and realise that many must find it exceedingly difficult to pay their expenses on such a small salary as £200 a year.

Mr. Wilson: You are not going to help us much.

Mr. FOULKES: My advice to those members is that there is no reason why they should not carry on their callings. An amendment has been brought forward that the matter should be referred to a referendum of the people. It is unnecessary to take a referendum in regard to this question for we are to have a general election during the next twelve months, and it will be open to every candidate then to set forward his views on the question.

Mr. McDowall: We have done that.

Mr. FOULKES: Members of the Opposition have done it, but there are many on the Government side, and I speak for myself as one, who have never had the question put to them by their electors. I intend to vote against both the motion and the amendment.

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill): The House can best judge of the remarks of the member for Claremont by recalling the fact that when the hon. member is discussing a question of securing effective legal opinions he is always in favour of people going to a man who makes the law a profession and takes very good care to secure his fees. It shows the inconsistency of the hon. member in his remarks in regard to politicians. I have no intention of discussing the arguments adduced by hon. members in regard to this motion, except to say that so far as members on this side are concerned they have had an emphatic opinion expressed by their electors time after time. As for the attitude of members on that side of the House, it serves to illustrate the old adage that hope deferred makes the heart grow sick. As a matter of fact, in the previous Parliament the member for Guildford moved a motion affirming the desirability of increasing the salaries to £300 after the next general election. That motion was opposed by hon. members on the other side of the House, and when an amendment was moved by the hon. member for East Fremantle to the effect that a referendum should be taken, that amendment also was opposed by them. So, whichever way we turn, we are not permitted to get a definite opinion one way or the other. I have no objection to a referendum, but I do

object to its being used as a means of postponing the proposal session after session and Parliament after Parliament, merely for the sake of staving it further off. Again, in this Parliament the member for Perth moved for a referendum on the question of the abolition of payment of members; and we have had opposition from that side of the House to the proposal for a referendum. That being the case, and recognising that hon. members on this side of the House have had the verdict of the electors on the matter—I myself have had it, not only in the last but in previous elections—I say it is about time to cease fooling with the question and make up our minds definitely one way or another. Undoubtedly the remuneration is insufficient, and undoubtedly the great majority of the electors is in favour of an increase, not only to £300 but to an even higher amount. Members are expected to give their time to their Parliamentary business, and the mere fact that a member is elected often makes it impossible for him to carry on the vocation which he previously followed; so that argument is of no weight so far as this motion is concerned. I would like to see the motion include reference to the desirability of an increase to a larger amount than is here proposed for the leader of the Opposition. I was pleased to hear the remarks of the Premier in regard to this. Not only has the leader of the Opposition to deal with many matters which, on the Ministerial side, are divided amongst the Ministers, but he is also handicapped in that he cannot call upon the clerical assistance at the disposal of Ministers in dealing with these questions. I certainly think the duties and responsibilities of the leader of the Opposition should receive suitable recognition. It is constitutionally laid down that the Opposition occupies a definite place in the Constitutional machinery of those countries which have followed the traditions and example of the British Parliament, and the leader of the Opposition is essentially a part of the Constitutional machinery just as much as the Premier or any Minister of the Crown. I do not want to see the jovial countenance of the present Leader of the Opposition de-

pressed, his bulky frame reduced and his health sapped by his carrying out the duties of his office without being able to avail himself of that assistance which enables Ministers to carry out similar duties. I strongly support the resolution, and I would vote for the payment to date from the time the resolution is carried.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret): To remove any doubt that may exist in the minds of some hon. members on the other side I would like to point out that this question has been before the electors ever since I stood for their suffrages in 1901. Every time I have since stood, at nearly every meeting addressed, the question has been put to me as to whether I was in favour of an increase in members' salaries. I have always answered in the affirmative. I have addressed meetings on behalf of others who were fighting the same battles as myself in other electorates far removed from my own, and even there, when making observations in favour of the policy which I was advocating, I have been invariably asked by the electors whether I was in favour of an increase in members' salaries; and again I have always answered in the affirmative. In 1904 the electors of Western Australia returned to this Parliament 22 Labour members, of which I am prepared to say I believe every one was pledged to support increase of salary. And there were returned at that election many men who sat on the right of the Speaker—the Labour members sat on the left—and who were returned on the same lines. There were indeed, I am certain, some 30 or 35 members returned to the House in support of that principle. But, unfortunately, when it came up later the matter was not carried by the House. After the no-confidence motion in the James Government was carried, and the member for Subiaco, who was leader of the Labour party, became Premier of the State, as one of his Ministers I urged upon him the necessity of increasing the salaries of members and bringing down a Bill to the House with that object in view. In my opinion the electors regarded it as one of the most urgent questions put before them. We had a mandate from the people, indeed the

majority of the House had that mandate, and during the whole time I was in the Cabinet I tried to impress upon my chief the necessity of bringing down such a measure. The hon. member pointed out to me that the supposed surplus alleged to have been left by the James Government was not there, and declared his belief that the finances were not then in a position that would justify the bringing down of such a measure. The hon. member is in his seat to-night and if he thinks that what I say is not quite true he will correct me. We have had several elections since then and on every occasion, when advocating my own candidature or that of any of my colleagues, I have been asked the question whether I was in favour of an increase in members' salaries. I am in favour, and always have been, and I am confident the people of the State are in favour of it. Certainly a large majority is in favour of an increase, and I believe that if the people had the deciding of how much that increase should be it would be considerably higher than is indicated in the motion moved by the member for Pilbara. I venture to say that not only a majority of the people of the day but most of the members of the House have been returned pledged to an increase of salary.

Mr. George:—Free of income tax?

Mr. TAYLOR: The hon. member's commercial instincts are always on the surface. I am not supporting this motion with the object of escaping the income tax. I only wish I had to pay to the Treasury a large sum as income tax on the salary received from Parliament. I think Parliament should decide this point. There is no necessity for sending it to the people. The people have already decided, times out of number, that the remuneration received by members of Parliament is insufficient. Why, then, ask them by referendum whether they are in favour of it? I am surprised at the member for Murray. It has to be remembered that he has been absent from active politics for the last four or five years during which time he was too busily engaged with the operations of the railway system to read candidates' election speeches: but anybody who has taken an



active part in politics during the past 10 years must be convinced that a majority of the people is in favour of paying Parliamentary representatives a fair and adequate salary. I am surprised that the member for Pilbara has not moved more in accordance with the expressed wishes of representatives in congress at Bunbury, and made the amount higher. A discussion there took place among the representatives of the workers of Australia, industrial and political, and it was unanimously decided that the increase should be made at an early date, and should be £400 per annum.

Mr. Brown: Why did you not carry out the motion moved by Mr. Henshaw when your party was in power?

Mr. TAYLOR: I have already indicated that I urged my chief, the then Premier, that he should do so, and I have given the reasons that hon. member gave for not doing so.

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

Mr. TAYLOR: I am anxious that we should test the feeling of the House on the question. I am sure any further remarks that I may make will not influence those who hold views contrary to my own on this point.

Mr. BROWN (Perth): It is my intention not only to oppose the motion but also to oppose the amendment. It surprises me that gentlemen on the opposite side of the House have not formed a union and struck for increased wages. They were all competitors for the positions at £200 a year, and how many of them were getting more than £200 a year before they came here? The man who would give up a greater salary than £200 a year to come here to work for less is a great fool. I was rather surprised the Premier did not get up and say straight out he was absolutely against payment of members and really in favour of its abolition. I would have been much pleased had he done so. We have heard the Premier and his Ministry twitted for not bringing in increased payment some time ago, but in 1904-5 when the Labour Government were in power. Mr. Henshaw

moved that the salary should be raised from £200 to £300 a year. Did they take any notice of the resolution of the House which was carried by a majority of six? The member for Brown Hill was a member of that Ministry.

Mr. Scaddan: No, he was not.

Mr. BROWN: Well, we had the Hon. William Dartnell Johnson, the Hon. George Taylor, the Hon. William Charles Angwin, and also, last but not least, the Hon. John Barkell Holman. They were the Ministers at the time that resolution was carried by a majority of six, five years ago; and yet the Government of to-day are twitted for not introducing a Bill increasing the salaries from £200 to £300 a year. It was carried five years ago when the Labour party were in power.

Mr. Bolton: Who said it was carried?

Mr. BROWN: Here it is in *Hansard*, "Ayes 21, Noes 15."

Mr. Bolton: Who were the "Ayes"?

Mr. BROWN: They were—Mr. Angwin, Mr. Bath, Mr. Bolton, Mr. Diamond, Mr. Ellis, Mr. Hastie, Mr. Heitmann, Mr. Henshaw, Mr. Holman, Mr. Moran, Mr. Isdell, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Keyser, Mr. Moran, Mr. Needham, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Scaddan, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Troy, Mr. F. F. Wilson, and Mr. Gill.

Mr. Bath: The division was not on the motion: it was on an adjournment.

Mr. Collier: Withdraw!

Mr. BROWN: I withdraw. At any rate all those 21 members were in favour of payment of members; but the gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House came into the Assembly knowing full well the salary they were to get. We have heard through Western Australia, and in the majority of the Eastern States, the Federal Senators called absolute robbers for voting themselves an increase of salary without a mandate from the people. Members came to the House knowing full well the salary they were to get, and if several of them say they were getting more previously I say they are very foolish to throw up better jobs to sit as members of Parliament. I say also that if we abolish payment of members, those gentlemen opposite would still be here getting

paid, but members of the Liberal party would not be here, or else would have to pay themselves out of their own pockets.

Mr. Scaddan : They cannot all get on boards like you do. How much do you get from boards ?

Mr. BROWN : I got three guineas from the same board that the member for Murchison got two guineas from.

Mr. Holman : You said " two guineas " before.

Mr. BROWN : I got three guineas, and, according to the solicitor's bill of costs, the member for Murchison drew five guineas. Members complain of the paltry £200 a year, but I say it is at the rate of £400 a year, because we are here for six months of the year only, and members have the use of one of the best clubs in the city, they get free billiards, they have one of the best libraries in the city and the cheapest feeding they can get in Perth at the present time. Also they get payment at the rate of £400 a year. There is nothing to hinder members doing other work the same as members on the Government side of the House. The member for Cue is one of the shining lights of the Opposition ; he does not attempt—and I think his electors admire him for it—to give all his time to Parliament. He goes and works for his livelihood for six months of the year.

Mr. Heitmann : It is not for the love of it.

Mr. BROWN : Other members have the same opportunity. In the present state of the country when taxation is increasing everywhere, not only State but Federal, it is time rather for retrenchment than for increasing members' salaries. No one asked members to come here ; they were all applicants for the position.

Mr. Holman : What do you get out of the Fire Brigades' Board ?

Mr. BROWN : I get £50 a year, and I give two or three afternoons a week to the board.

Mr. Scaddan : Instead of giving it to the roads board of which you are secretary, and I have to pay taxes to keep you.

Mr. BROWN : I have never received any taxation from the hon. member. I am rather surprised to hear him make that admission, because a plank of the Labour party's platform is that no one should own an inch of land, and that it should all be leasehold land. I imagine this increase of salary is like the hypocrisy of the present Federal Minister for Defence who went before his electors and told them he was far better off at £3 a week than he was as Minister for Defence with a salary of £1,500.

Mr. O'Loghlen : He never said that.

Mr. BROWN : I say it is absolutely true. In a speech the Minister for Defence is reported as saying he was better off at £3 a week than as Minister getting £1,500. I hope the Premier will refuse to make this a party question, and have nothing to do with any increase. It is a scandalous thing, like the Federal case, that in the middle of the session members should have the impudence to get up and rob the State purse by increasing their salaries by £100 a year. Certainly I want the money as much as anybody, but it is absolutely scandalous to take it.

Mr. HARDWICK (East Perth) : I can hardly think the member for Perth is sincere in what he has said. I know of no Standing Order that tells him he must lift his salary every month. I take it it is not compulsory for him to do it. I wish to intimate to the House that I have an amendment to move which I think will meet with the favour of members. It is to make the motion read—

That in the opinion of the House it is desirable that members' salaries be increased.

I do not think it would be wise for us to adopt the motion in its present form. It is only fair in a matter of such importance as this that it should go to the electors for their endorsement or otherwise at the next general election. It is hardly the right thing to do at the present time considering we are not far from an election. I desire to intimate to the House that when the other amend-

ments are disposed of I will move in the direction I have indicated.

Amendment (Mr. Jacoby's) put and negatived.

Mr. HARDWICK moved as an amendment—

*That all the words after "desirable that" in line 2 be struck out and "the salaries of members of the Legislative Assembly should be increased," be inserted in lieu.*

Mr. JACOBY (Swan): I much regret that the amendment I proposed has been defeated, and it appears to me that even if we deferred bringing the matter in until after the next elections, it would be practically the same thing as members voting this money into their own pockets. It has been stated that because certain members have been elected to support this particular provision, that therefore there has been a mandate from the country in favour of the increase. Such is not the case; no election has turned upon this particular issue. One can only claim that the electors have spoken in a particular direction when there has been a certain issue before the country and the verdict of the people has been given. The question of the increase in salaries of members has not been before the electors. There have been personal opinions expressed by members in favour and against the proposal, but we must all be aware of the fact that these opinions, as far as this particular question is concerned did not affect the fate of any individual member at the elections. Although we have a precedent in favour of voting this money to ourselves, it is desirable that some other precedent should be introduced. The member for Kanowna made the Chamber ring with a declaration of his manliness in voting money to himself. I do not know whether that particular courage is of a very fine character.

Mr. Walker: It is better than your humbug now.

Mr. JACOBY: I look upon Parliament as the trustees of the national Treasury and under these circumstances I consider that to adopt the proposal would be improper. That is the view

I take of the position, though members may disagree with it.

Mr. Scaddan: It comes well from you.

Mr. JACOBY: Under these circumstances, being entrusted with the key of the national Treasury, we should not dip our hands in and take money for our own use. In all cases where a trust is reposed in trustees, the amount to be paid to those trustees is fixed by those giving the trust. The directors of a company have their fees fixed by the shareholders.

Mr. Walker: Who fixes the Ministers' salaries?

Mr. JACOBY: They are fixed by Statute.

Mr. Walker: We want to fix this by Statute.

Mr. JACOBY: The plea has been raised that there will be a new Parliament next year, but I submit that a large majority of present members will be in that new Parliament. Under these circumstances, I intend to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Scaddan: It will not apply to you.

Mr. JACOBY: The hon. member will understand that I shall be returned by my constituents and not by the will of the hon. member. I am responsible to them for any acts of mine or opinions that I may express. It is absurd talking about hon. members not being able to get back.

Mr. Johnson: You will have to scratch.

Mr. JACOBY: The hon. member scratched very hard to keep me out at the last elections.

Mr. Bolton: You will not get back this time.

Mr. JACOBY: It reminds me of a couple of boys quarrelling over marbles in the street to hear members talking like this. However, that does not concern me; what does concern me is the expression of opinion and I claim I have the right to express that opinion.

Mr. DRAPER (West Perth): This question puts in a clear way the simple issue, namely, whether it is desirable at the present time that the salaries of members of Parliament should be increased. The first thing that occurs to me is what is meant by the word "desirable." Is it desirable in the interests of the State

or is it desirable in the interests of individual members?

Opposition Members: Both.

Mr. DRAPER: Hon. members treat my remarks with some levity, but at the same time the observations I am making really go to the root of the whole matter, and looked at from the point of view as to whether it is desirable in the interests of all members, there can be no doubt that the motion would pass this House, probably unanimously. There is another point, and that is whether in the interests of the State it is desirable. What is the effect of it? We must admit that if a man is going to devote the whole of his time, year in and year out, to politics and do nothing else, it is obvious to everyone that £200 a year is a ridiculously small remuneration. But are you going to exclude from this House practically every man who has some other occupation which he cannot afford to throw up, and in which he has succeeded, and who therefore, has to some extent justified his position to stand as a candidate for election to this House? If we are going merely on the basis that we must receive a full remuneration for devoting the whole of our lives to politics and nothing else, then increase the amount by all means. It will mean, in effect, that you are going to shut out the men who have other occupations and who have proved their fitness to be members. That will be the logical result of this motion if it be carried. On these grounds I intend to vote against the motion.

Mr. OSBORN (Roebourne): I have heard it mentioned on several occasions that the electors have practically instructed their members to ask for this increase in salary, but so far as my memory takes me, and I have helped several people through their election campaign, I do not think I ever heard it made a platform speech. It may have been referred to in a casual way, or in the street, but I have not yet attended a meeting where the question has been directly asked, "Are you in favour of increasing your own salary?" For that reason I would not be justified in supporting this motion. I do

think members of this Chamber, or any other place, who undertake to do certain work at a certain fixed salary should be prepared to do that work for the remuneration during the time for which they have undertaken to do it. If members consider their salaries are too low they would be justified in attempting to increase them for those who are to follow, if hon. members were not desirous of continuing in the service. But to make the motion retrospective, to ask the House to pass a motion as in its previous form we could not do. The motion in its original form intimated to the Government that we should have our salaries increased as from the beginning of the present financial year. The original motion was of a retrospective character, but now the motion affirms that it is desirable that the salaries of members of the Legislative Assembly should be increased. When the motion was moved it was intended to direct the Government to increase the salaries from the beginning of the financial year, that was the object of the motion when moved.

Mr. Collier: Of course it was.

Mr. OSBORN: Members seem to be a little bit amused. They should be amused at the absurdity of the motion moved and the audacity to ask the Government to pay them the back time, practically, that they consider they should be remunerated for.

Mr. Bolton: How much value have they given?

Mr. OSBORN: I do not wish to express an opinion upon that. I do not think the country has improved much from the valuable services rendered since they have been here.

Mr. Collier: There may be a chance if you get out.

Mr. OSBORN: That is so. Hon. members are amused again at their own supposed wit. Although I admit that perhaps there would be a chance when I get out, but there would be a better chance if many of the members who are interjecting followed my footsteps, and got out and remained out; it would be better for the country. We must admit that some members are very clever indeed, doing a lot of work for the country.

Mr. Scaddan : That is true.

Mr. OSBORN : In their own estimation, but they must admit that their services are liable to be weighed in the balance and when weighed in the balance they may be found wanting. As a matter of fact this particular question, when the campaign in the constituency I represent was going on, was made a direct question, and I stated—

Mr. Collier : You said it was casually referred to in the street, just now.

Mr. OSBORN : Members opposite like to have a chat amongst themselves and have all the amusement on their side. I certainly shall express what I intend to in the face of the fact that members do not show much courtesy. When I was electioneering, the question was asked me direct, and I said I was not in favour of an increase of members' salaries, and certainly I am not going to vote for an increase, having stated that. When I entered the House I knew very little about who were receiving pay other than Ministers. As a matter of fact I thought members of committees were paid, and I also thought the leader of the Opposition received more than the ordinary salary.

Mr. Collier : There are lots of things you did not know.

Mr. OSBORN : And there are lots of things you will never know. When I understood that the leader of the Opposition carried out his duties for the same remuneration as other private members I did express the opinion that I considered that he should have remuneration that was in keeping with the duties he had to perform. I expressed that to more than one member, and I also expressed the same view on the Address-in-Reply. And I still say that I am prepared to vote to-night, or any other night, for a fair remuneration to the leader of the Opposition, no matter who he may be. I do think it is a fair and reasonable thing that the leader of the Opposition should receive sufficient remuneration to enable him to give those services to the State which he is supposed to give, and not be required by other avocations to supplement his salary to enable him to carry out his duties.

Mr. Scaddan : Move another amendment.

Mr. OSBORN : I would like to have seen the member who moved the amendment have included those words. The Premier having stated he believed the leader of the Opposition should have further remuneration, I am satisfied he will not forget that particular expression, and if anything is done at all the Premier will certainly remember the leader of the Opposition if he intends to remember any of the remarks in respect to this question to-night. I intend to support the amendment that has been moved.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	33
Noes	..	..	..	10
Majority for				23

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Bath	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Male
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Carson	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Walker
Mr. Heilmann	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Holman	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Layman
Mr. Johnson	(Teller).

#### NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Davies	Mr. Monger
Mr. Draper	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Osborn
Mr. George	(Teller).
Mr. Harper	

Amendment thus passed.

Question as amended agreed to.

### RETURN—FIRE BRIGADES BOARD, CONTRIBUTIONS.

Debate resumed from the 24th August, on motion of Mr. Plesse, "That there be prepared and laid upon the Table of the House a return showing—(a) the municipalities and district road boards

that have been scheduled as contributors under the District Fire Brigades Act, 1909, setting forth the amount of contribution assessed against each local authority for the present year; (b) the basis upon which such contribution has been arrived at."

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle) moved an amendment—

*That the following be added to stand as Subclause (c):—"The amount of annual expenditure for fire brigades by such municipalities and road boards for three years previously to the passing of the District Fire Brigades Act."*

He said: If the amendment is carried members will have an opportunity of seeing the amount of increased expenditure that has been brought about by the passing of the District Fire Brigades Act. I do not think any member ever thought that the municipalities and roads boards of the State would have to provide such a large amount for the upkeep of the brigades as is the case. Not only does this remark apply to municipalities and roads boards but also to the State, who have to find a considerable sum. So far as the district I represent is concerned I will give some instances showing the increased expenditure. The Melville roads board district previously to the passing of the Act contributed nothing towards the upkeep of the fire brigades. As a matter of fact, a fire brigade would be useless there for there are only about 93 buildings in the district, scattered over an area of about 12,000 acres. They have to contribute over £100 per annum.

Mr. Brown: Seven pounds per annum.

Mr. ANGWIN: I am only quoting what the members of the board have told me. They drew my attention to the amount they were required by the board to pay. The account was sent to them and I was given a copy of a letter which was sent to the Minister administering the Act pointing out how absurd this sum was. Perhaps the member for Perth, who is chairman of the board, as the nominee of the Government, knows that there has been a change since the information was given to me, but I have had no noti-

fication of anything of the sort. I am dealing with the charges levied by the board at the time the accounts were sent out. East Fremantle had a competent brigade and no complaints were ever rendered against the man in charge of that brigade. The previous cost was from £50 to £70 per annum, but now they are billed by the board for the sum of £157 per annum. The increase is very considerable. The same complaints apply to very many places in the State. It is only fair that members should have an opportunity of seeing what this increase amounts to, and I feel confident that, when the return is placed on the Table, members, and the Ministry, will consider the advisability of repealing the measure.

Mr. BROWN (Perth): I can only say this, that it is waste of time for the House to pass this motion, for they have no power to enforce it. What power have they to force municipalities to send in a return as to the amount they spend in the upkeep of the fire brigades.

Mr. Scaddan: The municipalities would be only too pleased to supply the information.

Mr. BROWN: Any how, we have no power to force them to do so. As to the charges made by the member for East Fremantle, I would like to say that he knows full well that the Bill was brought in late in the session and no opportunity was afforded for bringing forward much needed amendments. There were certain amendments suggested but no opportunity was provided for them to be dealt with. With regard to the statement as to the Melville roads board, under the "restricted areas" it was suggested by the board and approved by the Colonial Secretary that the contribution of that board should be only £7 per annum. The member for East Fremantle was referring to what he terms the protection afforded in East Fremantle, but I can say that they never had any protection there.

Mr. Angwin: They had all that was required.

Mr. BROWN: The board were appointed to carry out the Act, the provisions of which apply throughout

the whole of Western Australia. The fire insurance companies have three or four members on the board, and so have the municipalities, while the Government are only represented by two members. All those gentlemen are satisfied with the expenditure of money that is now being incurred. They know that before the Act came into force the State was not protected at all against fire.

Mr. Angwin: Insurance rates have gone up 1s. per annum since then.

Mr. BROWN: That is untrue, and no one knows it better than the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member says the member for East Fremantle said something which was untrue he must withdraw.

Mr. BROWN: The member for East Fremantle said that insurance rates had gone up 1s. per annum since the Act came into force. I said that was an untruth, but I will withdraw the remark. The hon. member knows full well that it has been publicly stated by one of the representatives of the insurance companies that the rates have not been increased one farthing since the advent of the District Fire Brigades Act.

Mr. Scaddan: They have.

Mr. Holman: Yes; by 50 per cent.

Mr. BROWN: The member for Murchison will contradict any thing and everyone, and his remarks should be treated with disdain. Mr. Murray, at the opening of the Fremantle station, said that not a single premium had been raised since the introduction of the measure. I am quite prepared to take the word of a gentleman managing such an insurance company as Mr. Murray's against that of the member for Murchison.

Mr. Scaddan: You are a fire insurance companies' representative.

Mr. BROWN: I have nothing to do with them. I wish I had. The member for East Fremantle forgets that under the present system East Fremantle has the protection of one of the most up-to-date brigades in Australasia. The board have only been in existence for seven or eight months, and it has taken the chief officer nearly all his time

visiting the country districts. Member of the board have also given a great deal of time for the same purpose. The board should be given a trial. Should a conflagration occur the hon. member would be one of the first to blame the board if they had not taken steps to make adequate provision for the saving, not only of property, but also of life, from fire. The board have only one object in view, and that is to get the best results from the expenditure of the money at their command. When the Bill was originally before the House certain amendments were proposed by me and, I think, by the member for Murchison, but the then Premier said he would accept no amendments, and the Bill had to go through as it was. The new board consequently had to take the Act as it stood. All the members of the board are imbued with the one idea of carrying out the purposes of the Act and giving Western Australia up-to-date appliances for the protection of property from fire.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson): I am ready to admit that the fire brigades board are doing excellent work, but on the other hand I am also ready to admit that they are spending a lot of money. I believe, however, that the expenditure is necessary, more especially at the inception of their term of office. They have a lot of expenditure that is not recurring, and when they get into full working order the annual expenditure will be considerably less than it has been during the present year. As to the request for information, I do not see that we can object to give all the information in our power to the House, nor can I see that any harm would result from publishing the expenditure of the roads boards and municipal councils for the maintenance and upkeep of the brigades during the past three years; that is, if we can get the information. If we can do so—and I think we can get it, although it might take some time—we shall be only too glad to provide it. Under the Parliamentary Privileges Act we have the power to call for information of this kind, and if it is refused we can report to the House, who can take what

action they like to obtain it. As to the information from the Fire Brigades Board, there is power under the Act to get certain returns and reports from them, which would give all the information necessary. It may involve considerable time, because we will have to communicate with every roads board and every municipality which has had a fire brigade of its own during the past three years, and ask to be supplied with the information.

Mr. Angwin: They can give it in a week.

The PREMIER: If they would. The hon. member knows probably that the municipal council with which he is connected would willingly give information, but—

Mr. Angwin: There is so much dissatisfaction throughout the State that they will all be willing to give it.

The PREMIER: However that may be I do not intend to oppose either the motion or the amendment. If it is carried we will do our best to get the information.

Mr. HOLMAN (Murchison): I desire to support the amendment moved by the member for East Fremantle. As for the remarks of the member for Perth in connection with the increase of fire insurance in Perth for the last twelve months, I am in a position to say that my rates have been increased by at least 33 per cent. while the risk is practically as it was twelve months ago. We have heard a great deal about the work of the Fire Brigades Board up to the present, but clearly it is too early to speak definitely on this point yet. For my part I have seen some appliances sent out to the brigades which are practically out of date, and almost useless. If this is to be taken as an example of the work of the board I am not impressed by it. In the first place the board made a great mistake when it endeavoured to levy on every municipality and road board irrespective of whether they had any brigade or not. I had thought of bringing the matter forward earlier, but I discovered that the intention was to prevent the board collecting these dues. One municipality levied upon for protection has no fire brigade

within 25 miles. Of what use is the fire brigade in Fremantle to property in East Fremantle, except in the event of a big fire embracing a large area? The present system is by no means satisfactory. I have ever been a strong advocate of the volunteer system. The present board is practically doing away with that system altogether. The cost of fire brigades in Western Australia to-day shows an increase of 200 per cent. and we are not getting anything like an adequate return for this increased expenditure. A promise was made that a direct representative would be nominated by the Government and placed on the board. That promise has not yet been carried out. Inexperienced men with no knowledge of brigade work are on the board, but there is no representative of the volunteer system. There will be no difficulty whatever in getting the returns from the fire brigades, because these returns are published every year. East Fremantle has been called upon to levy some £150 or £160 a year or an increase of 200 per cent., and every other brigade throughout the State has been increased, if not in the same ratio at least very near to it. The expenditure is out of all proportion to the benefit we are receiving, and it would have been far better had we retained the system previously in force in Perth. In South Australia, where they run the two systems under one board, the expenditure is 100 per cent. greater than in Victoria where the volunteer system is kept separate. The Cue fire brigade, with which I was associated from its very inception, has refused to come under this board.

Mr. Brown: They cannot resist.

Mr. HOLMAN: We were wise enough in the early days to see that the whole of the property belonged to the brigade. I am prepared to pit that brigade against the brigade in Perth, for the record of the Cue brigade is just as good as is that of the Metropolitan brigade, and there have been as good saves from fire in Cue as in any other part of Western Australia. It is my intention to go into the matter and see if we cannot get a better system than that inaugurated by the



board. For the last 15 or 16 years I have been a practical fireman, and I am satisfied that the expenditure at the present time is far in advance of the benefit we are deriving from it.

Amendment put and passed.

Question as amended, put and passed.

#### MOTION — TUBERCULOSIS, PROPOSED CONFERENCE.

Debate resumed from 24th August, upon the following motion of Mr. Heitmann:—"That in the opinion of this House the Government should communicate with the Federal Prime Minister requesting him to convene a conference of State medical officers for the purpose of devising systematic and uniform methods for combating tuberculosis."

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson): I do not propose to oppose the motion itself. I recognise that the question of tuberculosis is one of serious moment, not only for Western Australia but for the whole of the continent, and any conference of medical men which could devise systematic and uniform methods of combating the disease would be welcomed by all hon. members. But I take exception to the declaration in the motion that the Government should communicate with the Federal Prime Minister requesting him to convene a conference of State medical officers. The Federal Prime Minister, I submit, has no power to convene such a conference. It must be convened by a State Government. I intend to oppose the resolution as far as those words are concerned. If the hon. member will agree to strike them out with a view to inserting "various State Governments" I will be quite agreeable to the motion.

Mr. Heitmann: I am not particular how it is done, so long as the conference is convened. I am prepared to accept the proposal.

The PREMIER: Then I beg to move, as an amendment—

*That the words "Federal Prime Minister requesting him to convene" be struck out and "various State Governments with a view to arrange" inserted in lieu.*

Amendment passed.

Question as amended agreed to.

#### BILL—TRIBUTERS.

*In Committee.*

Resumed from 14th September, Mr. Taylor in the Chair, Mr. Walker in charge of the Bill.

Clause 5: Payment for special development work:

The CHAIRMAN: There was an amendment to this clause moved by the Minister for Mines—"That in line 3 after the word 'claim' the words 'other than such as the tributer has by the terms of the tribute expressly agreed to' be inserted."

Mr. HOLMAN opposed the amendment. Owing to the way in which the Mining Act was administered there were thousands of acres of auriferous land locked up under exemption, and a grave injustice would be done to a large number of men. He proposed to submit the following as an amendment to the clause:

Provided that in every instance where development work is done the lessee or owner of a claim shall pay the tributer a proportionate share of the cost of such development work. When tributes were sought the lessees asked the persons applying to do a great deal of dead work. At Wiluna there were leases that had been held for years without work being done on them, and, contrary to the warden's recommendation that these leases be forfeited, the Minister for Mines had given the leases back to the holders who were doing no work on them. These holders on some occasions had refused to allow tributes to be granted. To show a great deal of protection was necessary for tributers, one tributer had written to him claiming that the amendment which the member for Kanowna had accepted would nullify the whole of the Bill, and that all development work should be paid for, because in very few cases did the tributer receive benefit from it. This correspondent quoted two instances in which, before tributes were let, the holders of the lease de-

manded that certain specified sinking and driving should be carried out. The tributes were declined in the circumstances as there was no prospect of the tributers making any profit if the obligations put upon them by the leaseholders were carried out. If the amendment were carried, in every tribute things would be hard and fast and this would be by no means satisfactory.

The Minister for Mines : The conditions will be in the terms of the agreement.

Mr. HOLMAN : In the case mentioned by the writer of the letter, the conditions named by the leaseholder would have been put in an agreement. It was desired that if tributers did any development work for the benefit of the leaseholders the tributers should be paid for that work. There was the recent case on the Cumberland mine in the Norseman district where the tributers made a rich discovery.

The Minister for Mines : Did you not see that contradicted in yesterday's *West Australian* ?

Mr. HOLMAN : There must have been something in the case for the thing to get about.

The Minister for Mines : There was something in it.

Mr. HOLMAN : There were numerous cases where tributers made rich discoveries and were immediately turned out. The tributer was a very useful person to have in the community ; but if he was called upon to do development work, whether it was in the terms of the agreement or not, he should receive payment for any dead work done. The amendment by no means treated the tributer fairly. There was no reason why we should not provide that the leaseholder should be called upon to pay a share of the development work. The Minister said power would be given to the warden to extend the time of the tribute.

The Minister for Mines : That has nothing to do with the amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN : It suited leaseholders to let tributes in order that the labour covenants might be carried out, and in the circumstances the tributers should be given more protection. He (Mr.

Holman) would move later that no tribute should fulfil the labour conditions on any lease. If a person held a lease he should perform the labour conditions, and not get tributers to do it and then secure the benefit not only of the development work they did but also of any discovery they made without paying for it. The member for Kanowna had apparently accepted the amendment moved by the Minister under a misapprehension.

Mr. BATH : The Bill might as well be wiped off if the amendment were passed allowing the tributer to contract himself out of the provisions of the Bill. In all industrial legislation it was necessary to safeguard that those for whom the legislation was designed should not be permitted to contract themselves out of it. Furthermore the amendment would perpetrate two injustices. It would be a direct encouragement to leaseholders to evade their obligations, and it would enable them to filch something to which they were not entitled. It was astonishing under the circumstances the Minister should move such an amendment.

The Minister for Mines : Will you tell me the meaning of the clause without these words ?

Mr. BATH : Beside the Cumberland instance, there were the Chaffers, the Eclipse, and Bayley's Reward instances where leaseholders shepherded their leases, and where tributers stepped in and developed the properties and gave them a new lease of life, yet the leaseholders came in and robbed the tributers of the fruits of their labour.

The Minister for Mines : Even if that is the case what has it to do with the clause ?

Mr. BATH : The amendment would give legislative encouragement to that kind of thing. It was directly opposed to the development of the fields.

The MINISTER FOR MINES : Apparently the hon. member did not understand the clause or endeavoured to put a wrong meaning on the amendment. The clause said that every tribute must provide that all development work done at the express request or by

the express order of the lessee or holder of a claim should be paid for in cash at the current rate of wages. The member for Kanowna had not satisfactorily explained what was meant by the words "at the express request or by the express order of the lessee or holder." The amendment provided that if any new developmental work was ordered say by the inspector of mines, after a man had made his contract, then for that new work he should be paid at the current rate of wages. It was his (the Minister's) desire to go further now, and he had been given to understand when the measure was last debated that there would be an effort when dealing with the Bill to provide special facilities for those who took these tributes, to make it more comprehensive than it was. Members expected to see some special amendment with a view to protecting the tributer more than had been done in the mining regulations and more than was proposed in the Bill. If the member for Kanowna chose, he (the Minister), would agree to a conference with a view to preparing some legislation dealing with the tribute question fully. There were in existence some extensive regulations dealing with tributes generally and they contained a great number of provisions for the protection of the tributer, and he (the Minister), proposed to make further amendments, which would give the tributer still further protection. If a conference were agreed to an arrangement would probably be arrived at, either by an Act or an amendment to the regulations to give the tributers a greater degree of protection than they enjoyed at the present time. The only conclusion to be arrived at if the Bill was passed was that the regulations were not required.

Mr. Walker: A wrongful conclusion altogether.

Mr. SCADDAN: The avowed intention of the Minister was to assist the leaseholder to get out of what was considered his just deal in the way of paying his share of developmental work performed by the tributer. If the amendment was carried and the words suggested were inserted the effect would

be that all developmental work would have to be paid for by the tributer.

The Minister for Mines: Could we not make it clear what developmental work should be paid for?

Mr. SCADDAN: The Minister for Mines knew exactly what was going on. He had been in charge of the Mines Department for eight or nine years and why had he not done something? The Minister had never raised his little finger in the direction of assisting the tributers. A letter before him (Mr. Scaddan) referring to one of the leases held by a man named Yeo, showed that Yeo had compelled the tributer to deposit £8, and, although warned by the Warden, he continued to hold that money and when the Mines Department were asked to assist in obtaining a refund nothing was done. The Minister's object, apparently, was to protect such men as Yeo. Certainly the amendment was submitted for the purpose of defeating the object of the Bill. Would the Minister like to present a return to the House showing how many leases were being manned to-day by tributers on which the leaseholders did not spend one penny, excepting the money obtained by royalties? These were the people who got all the consideration from the Mines Department while the tributers got no consideration at all. The tributers were worth something to the industry and ought to be supported.

The Minister for Mines: I know that.

Mr. SCADDAN: Then it was a pity the Minister did not put some of his sympathy into practice. Some of the goldfields in Australia had been kept alive by tributers, and in Western Australia there were hundreds of shows which companies could not successfully work and which tributers had taken control of and leaseholders had not spent anything except the rent which was obtained in the way of royalties.

Mr. WALKER: The clause was clear enough as it stood, and if it was not clear enough to satisfy the Minister the amendment would be accepted if it did more; but it had been pointed out that it did no more. The sole object was to bring about what the clause expressed as it stood and no more. He (Mr.

Walker) was open to perceive that use might be made of the Minister's amendment. It was in itself a sort of suggestion to all those who entered into a contract to contract themselves out of the fair conditions of tributing. The object of the clause as it stood was to allow tribute contracts to be entered upon and pursued in the ordinary work of tributing. Then if any direction such as that suggested by the Minister, were deemed advisable, the expenses of that loss of time should not be borne by the tributer as was now too often the case, it should be paid for at the current rate of wages. If the Minister desired to benefit the tributers, he should withdraw the amendment because it was clearly open to the interpretation placed upon it by members on the Opposition side of the House.

Mr. BATH: Large areas of land were held unworked on a number of mining fields and there were those who perhaps from scarcity of employment were desirous of earning a living if they had access to these areas. There were many of them who were buoyed up with hope borne of previous experience that they could earn a living for themselves on these areas. If the mining covenants were enforced as he would like to see them enforced there would be no question of the tribute agreement in order to enable these people to go on a lease and develop it, but these people found the agreement shut against them. Necessity compelled them to accept the conditions enforced by the shepherding leaseholder, although these conditions were repugnant and detrimental to the men. These men took the tribute and through the impregnable position which the shepherd occupied he could say, "You must carry out certain development work, you must really develop my lease," and the tributers had to accept the terms or they could not get access at all. These men carried on the development work which the leaseholder should be doing, and even if they found something valuable and had time to get one crushing the leaseholder stepped in. The hon member who introduced the Bill sought to obviate that by saying that if the leaseholder opposed the

development work he should pay for it. If the clause was carried the tributer would have some return for his labour in developing the lease. But the Minister wished to encourage the shepherd by giving him a chance to impose conditions and force the tributer to contract himself out of the agreement, and to do the work without securing any payment for it. To that he (Mr. Bath) strongly objected in the interests of a body of men who had and were doing a great deal to develop the mining industry, and leases held by leaseholders who, if the Mining Act were enforced in a proper fashion, would be compelled to carry out the development.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Minister had made a threat that unless he got his way he was going to kill the Bill. If the Minister proposed to bury every man in the dead end he could get sufficient support from those members who were not in the House, but who would come in and vote when the division bell rang. He (Mr. Holman) had quoted an instance showing the danger of the amendment of the Minister, where, after a party of tributers had worked for 12 months and wished an extension, when they wanted to earn their tribute, the only conditions on which it would be let to them was that they had to sink 10ft. at a cost of £4 per foot, and drive 20 feet at £3 per foot. The owner wanted to take £100 from the tributers. If the clause was passed that work would be done at the express order of the owner of the claim, and he would have to pay for it; but the Minister desired to insert in the agreement certain conditions so that the leaseholder could escape. What we asked was that when the tributer was called on to do dead work the owner should pay his share of the expense. The desire was to protect the tributer and prevent him from being imposed upon. If the Mining Act was administered fairly and justly to the people of Western Australia the tributer would have an opportunity of benefiting himself and the country, but the only persons who got protection were the boddler and speculator, who got justice every time. The prospector,

who took up a lease, and was away for a few months earning money to develop his lease, this man was dropped upon by the Minister and his lease forfeited, while other leases were held by booblers for years without the conditions being fulfilled.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The object of a good many, he did not include the member for Kanowna, was to kill the tributer altogether, because he was not a useful man to the trade unionist. The tributer was not appreciated by a good many members who sat on the Opposition benches, but if we passed a clause that would altogether abolish tributing some members would suggest that it would be to the benefit of the mining industry. But to his (the Minister's) mind it would do a great deal of harm. The discussion which took place in Victoria some years ago on the tribute question showed how careful we had to be in the method of dealing with the two persons who desired to make a contract, the tributer and the lessee. The Bill introduced gave a certain amount of protection to the tributer, and the clause under discussion was inserted so that ordinary development work would not have to be paid for, but that any special work which the tributer did he should be able to demand payment for. Owing to the way the clause was drafted this object would not be attained. The amendment would make it more clear. There was not the slightest doubt we ought to find conditions which would be acceptable to the person who let the tribute and the person who accepted it, by inserting provisions that would give protection to the tributer, but the Bill would not do that. It would be well if several members interested in mining with the officers of the department consulted together and drafted a few clauses that would not destroy tributing but would assist the tributer. He (the Minister) would do his best to prevent the destruction of tributing. He was prepared to assist the member to frame a good Bill. Time after time the warden had refused to allow contracts to be registered, as they were

not fair. There was no protection to the tributer. He (the Minister) was prepared to agree to the postponement of the Bill to see if some amendments could not be framed for the protection of the tributer. If the terms of a tribute were that the tributer had to carry out a certain amount of development work, and he was unable to deal with the ore that he had taken out, he should be able to apply to the warden for an extension of time, and there should be power given to the warden to deal with such extensions of time. There was no provision in the Bill which would meet this. We should consider the question that where development work was insisted on, a certain proportion of the development work should be paid for by the lessee. We should be careful that we did not abolish tributing, and he (the Minister) would not do anything that would lessen it. Many of the mines had been kept going, and good finds had been opened up, by tributers. The tributers certainly needed looking after, for there had been numerous instances where tributes had not been registered and there had been no written agreement, with the result that, on making a discovery, the tributer had been ordered off the mine by the lessee. It would be well to postpone the consideration of the clause for the time being so that it might be made quite clear.

Mr. WALKER: The Minister talked about the Bill not being a perfect one and that much was needed in order to make it a full measure, but if there were any fault in that direction it was that of the Minister.

The Minister for Mines: The regulations are quite enough.

Mr. WALKER: Then why should the Minister oppose the clause?

The Minister for Mines: It is not clear. It is just about as clear as some of the clauses in the Workers' Compensation Bill.

Mr. WALKER: The Bill dealt with very simple matters. The additions provided by the Bill to the regulations were few but vital, and would be of great benefit to the tributers. There

was no reasonable excuse for delay and no necessity to postpone reforms that could be obtained now. The Minister threatened that unless the clause were postponed he would oppose the whole measure, have a party vote, and defeat the Bill. It made one feel inclined to let the Minister take the responsibility of defeating the measure. Were it not that delay would be caused he would be quite happy to agree to a conference.

Mr. Holman : He wants a select committee like the one appointed on the Workers' Compensation Bill.

Mr. WALKER : That was it ; delay was what was wanted. What assurance was there that if there were a postponement the measure would again be reached. If he received a definite assurance that within a fortnight the measure would be called on again he would be pleased to have a conference with the Minister in his office, and he would like to include in the conference one or two of the most experienced mining representatives on the Opposition side of the House.

Mr. SCADDAN : A great number of tributers on the fields had feared that if the member for Kanowna accepted the amendment of the Minister the Bill would be wrecked. It was well, therefore, that the member for Kanowna should have taken the stand he had now done. There had been trouble in connection with tributers in Bendigo some time ago, but the position there was very different from what it was in this State, for there the owners manned the leases with wages men and the tributers were allowed to work on other parts which were not being worked by the company. Here, however, the tributers were actually manning the mines. Let the Minister inspect some of the tribute agreements in his office and he would find that the owners of properties were doing nothing whatever on them but were leaving all the work to the tributers ; in fact, those owners were fattening upon the work of the tributers. Did the Minister intend to sacrifice the

general tributer for the sake of those men ?

Mr. TROY : The evils the Bill was meant to deal with were by no means new to the Minister ; it was very hard to understand his attitude. A select committee of this House inquired into the conditions of the tributers on the goldfields some time ago and much evidence was taken. It was shown that the tributers were in the habit of taking tributes from persons holding leases, and that although they did not earn the wages provided by the regulations, they were compelled to comply with the labour conditions ; thus leases were held by persons having no legal right to hold them. There were some notorious cases where tributers worked for months without receiving one penny, and all the time were holding the leases for the persons in whose name they were registered. Then there were cases of sub-letting.

The CHAIRMAN : The clause under discussion does not deal with the fulfilment of labour conditions.

Mr. TROY : The Minister's amendment gave the owner of a lease power to impose whatever condition he pleased. Surely that had to do with labour conditions. The Minister's insinuation that members opposite had no regard for tributers merely because they did not belong to the trades unions should be strongly resented. As a matter of fact, the great majority of the tributers did belong to the unions, but even if they did not, what justification had the Minister for making that utterance ? It was vindictive and small, and hardly worth consideration. It was to be hoped there would be no compromise in regard to the clause.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result.

Ayes	..	..	..	20
Noes	..	..	..	18
				—
Majority for	..	..	..	2

## AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Layman
Mr. Carson	Mr. Male
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Davies	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Draper	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Hardwick	(Teller).
Mr. Harper	

upon was that the amount of royalty in respect of any virgin ground should not exceed  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. If the proviso were passed it would follow that in the event of a tributer desiring to sink a shaft on the reef, or for the purpose of locating reef, one-half the cost would have to be borne by the leaseholder, even if the sinking of that shaft were of no value to him.

## NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bath	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Walker
Mr. Heltmann	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Holman	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hudson	(Teller).
Mr. Johnson	

Amendment thus passed.

Mr. HOLMAN moved a further amendment—

*That the following proviso be added :—“ Provided that in every instance where development work is done the leaseholder or owner of the claim shall pay the tributer a proportionate share, being at least one-half of the cost of any such development work.”*

If the owner desired any work done he certainly ought to pay one half of its cost. The proviso was intended to protect the tributer against unfair conditions being set down in the agreement. Unless the proviso were put in, the Bill was practically killed by the previous amendment.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory) : In the first place it would be necessary to define developmental work. In an amendment of this sort the meaning of such a term should be clearly understood. What would be the class of developmental work to be paid for under the proviso? In some cases where a reef underlay very flat, the lessee was allowed to take up a very large holding comprising several leases. But in such cases the department insisted that in respect to any leases on which the holder was not carrying out the labour covenants he would have to be prepared to let tributes; and a further condition insisted

Mr. HOLMAN : That was not so. All that was contemplated was that the leaseholder should pay one half the cost of any developmental work demanded by him of the tributer. For any developmental work that the tributer might do for himself the leaseholder or owner of the claim would not be called upon to pay anything. The only work towards the cost of which the leaseholder would be called upon to pay half would be that carried out by the tributer at the express desire of the leaseholder.

Mr. SCADDAN : It was not at all certain that the terms of the tribute were in the best interests of the tributer. For his part he thought that instead of having a fixed period the tributer ought to be granted a block. Then if he had any developmental work to do it would be a matter for his own consideration and he would have to pay for it himself. A few feet from an existing drive there might be payable ore, and the tributer might put in a crosscut. This would be development work, and development work that would be useful to him; but at the end of that work there might be only two months of the tribute to run, yet the whole of that development work, which would be useful also to the leaseholder, would not be paid for by the leaseholder. The amendment carried by the Minister was an instruction to the lessee to make provision in his tribute agreement for all development work in order to avoid any cost to himself. Now, the member for Murchison desired that at any rate the leaseholder should pay half of the cost of such work. The Minister might agree to that.

The MINISTER FOR MINES : One could not tell how far-reaching the amendment might be. There was no reason why a mine owner should not con-

tribute towards the cost of development work, which would be of future value to him, and an amendment that would carry out that object might be passed; but if it was provided that half the cost of all development work carried on by tributers, whether for the advantage of the tributers or not, should be paid for by the lessee, it was another matter. It might have an effect of preventing the letting of tributes. At any rate the matter would need further looking into.

Mr. WALKER: If further opportunity was given of considering the Bill progress might be reported.

The Minister for Mines: Opportunity will be given on the next private member's night.

Mr. WALKER moved—

*That progress be reported.*

The MINISTER FOR MINES: As it was not possible to guarantee that the Bill would be considered on the next private members' night, it would be better to agree to the amendment, and if further amendment were needed it could be done in the Legislative Council. He would not pledge himself to agree finally to the amendment until he understood its purport. It might be too far-reaching.

Motion (progress) withdrawn.

Mr. BATH: Even as amended by the Minister for Mines the clause provided for development work being paid for in some instances, but the amendment of the member for Murchison would deprive tributers of half that payment.

Mr. WALKER: As the clause stood now the current rate of wages was to be paid for development work done, but the hon. member's proposition only ensured half expenses, which might be less than the current rate of wages in some instances.

Mr. HOLMAN: The intention of the amendment was to cover all development work done at the express order of the leaseholder, or according to the terms of the agreement. The addition of the words "in accordance with the agreement" to the amendment should meet the difficulty raised by hon. members. He altered his amendment to read—

*That the following be added to the clause:—"Provided that in every in-*

*stance where development work is done in accordance with the agreement the leaseholder or owner of the claim shall pay the tributer a proportionate share, being at least one-half of the cost of any development work."*

Mr. HARPER: The clause was altogether unnecessary. Tributaries were only a matter of conditions. Each tribute differed from other tributaries. The clause defeated its object. It was only a matter for agreement for development to be done at the current rate of wages. It was not compulsory on the tributer to do the work. The leaseholder could not force him to do it if it was not provided for in the agreement. Tributaries desirous of doing work on their own account were at liberty to do it, and any zone they developed they were entitled to work. Tributaries were usually let for a term, or for a block of land; but whichever it was the tributer was entitled to what appeared in the contract between the parties.

Amendment, as altered, put and passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6—Term of tribute:

The MINISTER FOR MINES desired to move an amendment, the object of which was to reduce the term of six months to three months for the tribute, and to provide for a definite block of land. If the period were made three months many opportunities would be afforded for the taking up of tributes which would not exist if the longer period of six months were insisted upon. He moved an amendment—

*That in line 2 the word "six" be struck out, and "three" inserted in lieu.*

Mr. WALKER: The term of six months was quite short enough. One of the grievances now existing was that there was no security in the agreement, and that this could not be obtained unless a period of at least six months were granted. At present the tributer was used in too many instances by the lessee to fossick round until payable gold was discovered, and was then sent about his business.

Mr. SCADDAN: In Victoria the term fixed for the tribute was twelve months,



and it was surely not asking too much that it should be fixed at six months here. The trouble here was that in many cases the tributer had to do the opening up work, and would find at the end of three months that at least two months had been spent in finding payable country, and then just as he got on to work which would bring him some return the lessee would step in and determine the tribute, and so benefit from the work performed by the tributer. Six months was a short enough term. There should also be a specified block of country laid down so that the tributer would know exactly where he stood.

Mr. HARPER: It was ridiculous to fix any term for a tribute, as it was all a matter of circumstance and arrangement. All depended upon what work had to be done, and how much development there was in the ground taken over by the tributer. Personally he had had cases where tributers had thrown up their work within a week, while in other cases he had let tributes for one or two years. It would not be possible to frame an Act of Parliament to protect properly either the leaseholder or the tributer. Mention had been made of the tributers opening up country, but he had not known of a tribute let for virgin ground. Most of the tributes let were with regard to mines which had been worked, and the tributer usually came in for the cleaning up of the mine. A tributer could work a mine which had been nearly worked out better than a mining company could. It would be well for the tributer if all the clauses of the Bill were struck out.

Mr. COLLIER: Men often took up tributes knowing that at least three months would be spent doing dead work, but that after that time there would be some chance of a return being obtained. If the period were fixed at three months the tributer would get nothing. Six months was quite a short enough term. The result of the three month's agreement would be that as soon as the tributer got on to gold he would be turned off and the dead work he had done would go to benefit the lessee.

Mr. HOLMAN: Where tributers took over a mine that had not been worked for some time, it always meant at least a month's work to clean up. Therefore it was necessary that a term of longer than three months should be allowed, and six months was quite a short enough period. The member for Beverley had said that tributes were never granted over virgin ground, but he had known very many instances where tributers had gone on virgin ground. There were many leases in the State where the only work done had been that performed by tributers. The men should receive fair treatment, and in addition to a period of at least six months being fixed, there should be provision with regard to a definite block of land for the tributer.

Mr. HARPER: There would be no opposition to this period, or even to a period of 12 months. A hardship, however, would be imposed on the tributer if it were made six months.

Mr. Holman: At least six months.

Mr. HARPER: A tributer could break a tribute or leave it at any time.

Mr. Holman: It is only a one-sided contract at that rate.

Mr. HARPER: As far as he (Mr. Harper) was concerned the amendment could be carried. It was only a matter between the two parties making their own arrangements. Speaking personally, he had never had any difficulty with regard to the tributers he had employed: he had also been a tributer himself. There was no necessity for any of the clauses in the Bill in connection with tributes. It was difficult to make hard and fast rules. A tributer might make a good discovery, and if he had it for six months there would be no one to interfere with him, and if it did not suit him, at the end of six months he could fill that tribute up. All these things were matters of agreement, and laws could not be made to compel a tributer to stick to the work for a certain period.

Mr. SCADDAN: The hon. member showed that he knew nothing about the matter. It would be one-sided if we permitted a lessee to get three months' work out of the tributer, and then reap

the advantage afterwards. The case of the tributers on Chaffers after the mine had closed down might be instanced. They prospected that ground and they found something pretty good.

The MINISTER for Mines: Digging post holes.

Mr. SCADDAN: That did not matter. They found something good and the tributers got the advantage of it, and no one would blame them. It was not only provided in these agreements that it should be for a term of three months, at the end of which time they might cancel the agreement, but it was provided that they should not employ more than a certain number of men, so that if they struck anything good they could not put on a number of men in order to get it out in the three months. It should be the desire of the Committee to protect the tributer, and give him justice in an Act of Parliament, and not put him in the hands of the warden. No tribute should be allowed for a period of less than six months. If a man took a tribute and did any work and discovered anything he should have the opportunity of getting some return for the labour he put into it.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: There would be no objection to striking out the time limit altogether in connection with the clause.

Mr. Scaddan: Will you provide a minimum block of ground?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We could make an area if the hon. member desired that; at the same time it was necessary to be careful in drafting legislation to make provision in regard to the tributer employing a certain number of persons during the course of that tribute. So far as he could judge from the condition of mining in Western Australia it seemed it would be wise to make the time three months. On the other hand, he was prepared to strike it out altogether, and leave the clause reading something like the Victorian clause, namely, that it should be for a distinct block of ground, and make provision for the cancelling of the tribute if a sufficient number of men was not employed.

Mr. WALKER: While prepared to agree to the alternative of "not less than six months" or "a definite block of ground" he could not agree to lessening the time nor to eliminating it altogether.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not think it will matter much.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. WALKER moved a further amendment—

*That the following be added to the clause:— "An application may be made to the warden of the district for an extension of the time expressed in the tribute agreement and the warden shall have power to grant or refuse the application."*

Amendment passed.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Tributers deemed workers:

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It was difficult to follow some of these clauses, but he intended to propose an amendment which he thought would cover the whole ground. He had no objection to the principle contained in the clause. If progress were reported he could, on a future occasion, submit an amendment which he thought would adequately meet the case.

Mr. WALKER: If the Premier would agree to provide another opportunity for dealing with the Bill, he (Mr. Walker) would be quite prepared to now report progress.

The Premier: Yes I will do that.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 10-45 p.m.*