

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I was also rather surprised to hear the reply of the Premier when he was questioned the other night by the Leader of the Country Party.

The Premier: Disappointed, I think.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No.

The Premier: Very disappointed.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I regarded it so seriously that I thought the Premier condoned the action of his Minister.

The Premier: Go ahead.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am going ahead. The Premier did not reprimand in any way his Minister for Justice who says he does not favour the upholding of the law. I think the Premier should immediately say to his Minister, "You have to give a better explanation than you have done, and you have to make some recommendation to me in regard to altering the law if you think it is not a fair law."

The Premier: The law is being observed.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: When I think of the financial position today, of the confusion that exists and of the contradictory statements of the Premier and Deputy Premier, I say we should not agree to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply as it stands, but should amend it.

Mr. Brady: Are you going to deal with the transport graft?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Before you tell me to sit down, Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment. That the following words be added to the Address-in-reply:—

"But this House regrets:

(a) That public statements made by certain of your Excellency's Ministers regarding the finances of the State have not since been corrected by them, and it is apparent that there is, at least, £1,403,000 more loan money to expend on works in progress and new works in the current financial year than such statements indicated, and

(b) That Your Excellency's Ministers apparently condone the attitude of your Minister for Justice towards the illegal game of 'two-up'."

Mr. SPEAKER: This is to be added to the motion?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.27 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 27th August, 1953.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Railways, (a) as to rail weights and standard gauge	317
(b) as to Tambellup-Ongerup line, freight and revenue	318
Claremont Mental Hospital, as to overcrowding and unhygienic conditions	318
Coconut, Papuan, as to condemnation of imports and payments of compensation	318
Horticulture, (a) as to backyard orchards, number and fees	318
(b) as to site for research station	318
Water supplies, as to reticulation of Malda Vale-Forrestfield area	319
Bulkhandling, as to storage facilities, Ongerup	319
Transport, (a) as to board personnel and term of office	319
(b) as to regulations made and tabled	319
Gaols, as to prisoners at Fremantle and crimes	319
Traffic, as to proposed sites for lights	320
Ex-servicemen's land settlement, as to valuations and complaints	320
Forests, as to complaints of withdrawal of tenders	320
Outports, as to recommendations of Royal Commission	321
North-West, as to income taxation exemption, delegation	321
Superphosphate, as to quantities transported	321
Address-in-reply, ninth day, amendment	321
Speaker on amendment—	
The Premier	321, 344
Speakers on amendment on amendment—	
Hon. A. F. Watts	330
Hon. A. V. R. Abbott	333
Mr. Hutchinson	334
Mr. Oldfield	337
Hon. L. Thorn	338
Mr. Perkins	340
Mr. Hearman	342
Hon. Sir Ross McLarty	348
Mr. Court	348

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAYS.

(a) As to Rail Weights and Standard Gauge.

Hon. C. F. J. NORTH asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Does he recall a speech made by him several years ago condemning the use of light rails on the W.A.G.R.?

(2) Does he favour 80lb. rails for all main lines?

(3) Even if, and when, the east-west line (Perth to Kalgoorlie section) is equipped with 80lb. rails, will the ruling grade still prevent a good running schedule?

(4) Has the alternative route proposed for a standard gauge line with suitable grades through Brookton and Armadale been abandoned, or postponed indefinitely?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes, on main lines where fast and heavy traffic warrants it.

(3) Owing to the heavy grades, fast timings are not possible on the section Midland Junction to Northam.

(4) Indefinitely postponed.

(b) *As to Tambellup-Ongerup Line, Freight and Revenue.*

Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) What was the total tonnage carried in each of the last five years to, and from, the various stations on the Tambellup-Ongerup railway?

(2) What was the total revenue in the same years, derived from the carriage of such tonnage?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) Information concerning tonnages and revenue on this section is not available in the form desired.

CLAREMONT MENTAL HOSPITAL.

As to Overcrowding and Unhygienic Conditions.

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Health:

The report of the Inspector General for Mental Hospitals for the year ended the 31st December, 1952 refers to the gross overcrowding and unhygienic conditions at Claremont, and to the grave danger of a breakdown in the admission of acute psychiatric cases at some time in the near future—

(1) Do the conditions still exist?

(2) Are steps being taken to correct them?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) Yes, but there has been slight alleviation by the transfer of some children to the Nathaniel Harper Homes.

Temporary relief will be provided when a new ward is opened in three weeks' time, followed by another ward early next year.

As mentioned in the report, new wards are being planned at other institutions which, when completed, will provide further relief.

COCONUT, PAPUAN.

As to Condemnation of Imports and Payment of Compensation.

Mr. MANNING asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is it his intention to have all stocks of Papuan coconut condemned irrespective of when the supplies were imported?

(2) Is it intended to confine the condemnation to a particular consignment?

(3) What is the Government's intention regarding compensation to storekeepers holding stocks of Papuan coconut?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) No.

(3) The legal position is being explored.

HORTICULTURE.

(a) *As to Backyard Orchards, Number and Fees.*

Mr. McCULLOCH asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What was the number of registered "backyard" orchards for the years ended the 30th June, 1952, and 1953?

(2) Is he aware that the Agricultural Department will accept a fee for one year only?

(3) If the answer to No. (2) is in the affirmative, will he give favourable consideration to voluntary registration payments for "backyard" orchards up to a period of three or five years?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 30th June, 1952—55,772; 30th June, 1953—59,431.

(2) Yes.

(3) The method of paying fees in advance was adopted in 1944 but was abandoned in 1949, as it entailed difficulties in accountancy and increased costs. Should this again be put into operation, the moneys received would need to be held in suspense and receipts sent out annually. Apart from this, the fees may be reviewed from time to time as costs of administration varies.

(b) *As to Site for Research Station.*

Mr. OWEN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has a site for a central horticultural research station been selected?

(2) Has approval been given for the establishment of such a station?

(3) If not, will he do everything possible to expedite this project?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Several sites have been investigated but none has yet been obtained.

(2) Yes, subject to the availability of funds.

(3) Yes.

WATER SUPPLIES.*As to Reticulation of Maida Vale-Forrestfield Area.*

Mr. OWEN asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Has the survey for water supply reticulation in the Maida Vale-Forrestfield area been finalised?

(2) If so, what is the estimated cost of the scheme?

(3) Has approval been given to carry out this work?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) £102,000.

(3) No.

BULKHANDLING.*As to Storage Facilities, Ongerup.*

Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Have arrangements been completed for the construction at Ongerup siding of additional bulkhead accommodation for the reception of grain in bulk?

(2) If so, will these arrangements ensure that the additional facilities will be ready for the forthcoming harvest?

(3) If any doubt exists with regard to their availability for the forthcoming harvest, will he take steps to hasten the completion of the matter?

(4) When the proposed bulkhead is completed, what will be the total grain bulk storage capacity at Ongerup?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The Railway Department has made a site available to Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. for a new bulkhead.

(2) The company advises that the answer is "yes."

(3) Answered by No. (2).

(4) The company advises that the answer is 265,000 bushels.

TRANSPORT.*(a) As to Board Personnel and Term of Office.*

Hon. V. DONEY asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) What are the names of present members of the Transport Board?

(2) What is the expiry date in respect of each such member?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Mr. W. H. Howard, Mr. G. Drake-Brockman, Mr. N. R. Walmsley.

(2) All appointments are for the three years ending 30th August, 1955.

(b) As to Regulations Made and Tabled.

Mr. PERKINS asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) What regulations have been made in the last six months relating to the State Transport Co-ordination Act?

(2) Under what section of the Act have they been made?

(3) In what "Government Gazette" do they appear?

(4) Have these regulations been tabled in Parliament?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No such regulations have been made during the last six months.

(2), (3) and (4) Answered by No. (1). The hon. member probably has in mind the publication of certain exemptions from licensing. Approval of such exemptions is given under Section 14A of the State Transport Co-ordination Act, which states—

14A. With the approval of the Minister, the Board may, by notice in the "Government Gazette", exempt any vehicle or class of vehicles from the licensing provisions of this Act, subject to such conditions as may be prescribed in such notice.

Exemptions were published under the provision of that section in the "Government Gazette" on the following dates:—

24th April, 1953.—(a) Transport of farm machinery for repairs. (b) Transport of firewood by farmers. (c) Transport between the metropolitan area and Kwinana.

12th June, 1953.—Transport by farmers in the Dale-Wandering area of all their own produce and requirements and from the metropolitan area.

31st July, 1953.—Exemption for farmers to transport barley or rye in their own vehicles (in addition to other commodities already stated in the Act) and the right to back-load an unlimited quantity of their own requirements where forward loading comprises two tons or more.

GAOLS.*As to Prisoners at Fremantle and Crimes.*

Hon. V. DONEY asked the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

(1) What is the total number of prisoners now held in the Fremantle Gaol?

(2) Will he submit a list of the crimes for which inmates are imprisoned, and the number of prisoners appropriate to each of such crimes?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING replied:

(1) 285.

(2) Murder	17
Manslaughter	2
Robbery with violence	3
Robbery in company	1
Assault occasioning bodily harm	2
Common assault	3
Incest	4
Unlawful carnal knowledge	4
Indecent dealing	14

Unlawful wounding	3
Wilful exposure	2
Rape	4
Gross indecency	5
Perjury	3
Bigamy	1
Arson	1
Breaking and entering	48
False pretences	15
Stealing and receiving	73
Forgery	1
Unlawfully on premises	1
Unlawful possession	2
Unlawful control of motor vehicle	14
Rogue and vagabond	4
Desert ship	4
Breach Natives Administration Act	13
Stowaway	1
Idle and Disorderly	25
Breach Maintenance Order	3
Drunk	12
Total	285

TRAFFIC.

As to Proposed Sites for Lights.

Hon. V. DONEY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

As to the proposed installation of street-crossing coloured lights—

(1) What were the proposed sites as at the 23rd February last, and what are they today?

(2) Has the number of proposed installations increased, and if so, to what extent?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied:

(1) The proposed sites at the 23rd February were at the intersections of William-st. with St. George's Terrace, Hay-st., Murray-st., and Wellington-st., and at the West Perth subway.

No alterations to these sites have been made.

(2) No.

EX-SERVICEMEN'S LAND SETTLEMENT.

As to Valuations and Complaints.

Mr. NALDER asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) How many land settlement farmers have received their final valuations?

(2) How many lodged complaints as to the final valuation?

(3) How many complaints have been dealt with by the Land Settlement Board?

(4) What was the difference in the total amount actually agreed to and the initial final valuation?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) One hundred and fifty-three.

(2) Seven.

(3) Four.

(4) £4,774.

FORESTS.

As to Complaints of Withdrawal of Tenders.

Mr. HEARMAN asked the Minister for Forests:

(1) On Tuesday, the 25th August, in answer to a question in connection with the withdrawal of tenders recently called for large areas of land, he replied that the tenders were withdrawn substantially because complaints were received about the conditions of tender and short time for consideration of areas by interested parties before closing date. Can he inform the House—

(a) Who lodged these complaints?

(b) What was the substance of these complaints with reference to the conditions of tender?

(2) As the reply to the question "Were these tenders called at the direction of or with the knowledge of the Minister" was "No," does this imply that the suggestion to call these tenders was never at any time discussed by him with any person?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) (a) State Saw Mills; Kauri Timber Coy.; Whittaker's Timber and Hardware Coy.; Antonovich.

(b) Time between the calling and closing of tenders was less than a fortnight, therefore the time for inspection of areas was too short. The customary notification to sawmillers by the department was not carried out. Logging operations were required to commence within one month from date of acceptance of tender. Stipulations regarding number of men to be employed—housing and other facilities to be available. Conditions that permits were to go to already-established mills and generally that conditions were drawn so that only certain sawmillers could conform with them.

(2) I am unable, clearly, to understand the meaning of the member's question because I have already indicated that tenders were called without my knowledge. I might explain, however, that I have discussed with the representative of a sawmilling concern my desire to ensure that, whilst the acute shortage of timber continued, no existing mill would be closed—I have spoken in similar strains on numerous occasions—but at no time did I discuss with anyone the calling of these tenders or the particular areas involved.

OUTPORTS.*As to Recommendations of Royal Commission.*

Mr. HILL asked the Minister for Transport:

Is it the intention of the Government to give serious consideration to the report of the Outports Royal Commission?

The MINISTER replied:

Yes.

NORTH-WEST.*As to Income Taxation Exemption, Delegation.*

Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Premier: Referring to his answer to No. (3) of my questions on Wednesday, the 26th August, concerning North-West taxation relief, in view of the fact that the delegation sent by the State Government in office in 1951 included representatives of all three parties in Parliament, does he consider it desirable, and is he willing, to arrange for a similar delegation to accompany the Minister for the North-West next month, and if so, on similar conditions as to travelling and expenses as in 1951?

The PREMIER replied:

To further their claims the Northern Rehabilitation Committee have requested the Government to make available the services of the Minister for the North-West (Mr. Strickland) to introduce the committee as a deputation to the Federal Parliamentary Labour Party's North Australian Development Committee at Canberra.

The only expenses the State will bear will be those of the Minister.

No useful purpose would be served by including all parties.

SUPERPHOSPHATE.*As to Quantities Transported.*

Mr. NALDER asked the Minister for Transport:

What were the quantities of superphosphate transported by the railways, road transport and farmers' transport for the years—

1950-51;
1951-52;
1952-53?

The MINISTER replied:

Rail deliveries were—		Tons.
1950-51	201,063
1951-52	201,997
1952-53	226,621

Road deliveries were—

1950-51	226,038
1951-52	220,828
1952-53	163,492

Of the quantities delivered by road, an accurate segregation of the portion carried in farmers' own vehicles is not practicable, but the following is estimated:—

	Tons.
1950-51	8,968
1951-52	22,576
1952-53	46,031

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.*Ninth Day—Amendment—Amendment on Amendment.*

Debate resumed from the previous day on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, to which Hon. Sir Ross McLarty (Murray) had moved an amendment to add the following words:—

But this House regrets—

- that public statements made by certain of Your Excellency's Ministers regarding the finances of the State have not since been corrected by them, and it is apparent that there is, at least, £1,403,000 more loan money to expend on works in progress and new works in the current financial year than such statements indicated; and
- that Your Excellency's Ministers apparently condone the attitude of your Minister for Justice towards the illegal game of "two-up."

Mr. SPEAKER: I might advise members that I have decided that the debate on this amendment will be portion of the Address-in-reply debate and that the time limit of one hour will apply to all speakers.

THE PREMIER (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam—on amendment) [2.33]: This is a very wishy-washy amendment. The first part of it asks the House to express regret that public statements made by certain Ministers of the Government have, in effect, been contradictory and therefore misleading. During the Address-in-reply debate, some members of this House exaggerated very greatly regarding my own knowledge of financial affairs. I think one of them even described me as an expert in that field. I lay no claim to such fame. In that regard I think I am very much like the Leader of the Opposition when he was Treasurer of the State. I would think that he brought to bear on the financial problems of the State a sturdy kind of commonsense supported by practical experience in certain fields over the years, and that is about all I can bring to bear on the problem myself.

Every Government employs experts in this field to deal with the more complicated aspects of public finance, and naturally almost every Treasurer depends very considerably upon those officers and experts for advice and guidance on those aspects. Therefore, I have obtained a report from the Treasury Department upon that part of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition which deals with financial matters. I propose to read it to the House in order that members may be able to decide this question, not so much upon what the Leader of the Opposition might allege or even on what I might of my own initiative say, but entirely upon the expert and politically unbiased views of the officers of the Treasury on the facts. The report reads—

Sir Ross McLarty has referred to inconsistency in statements relating to loan funds available for 1953-54.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: What is this? A minute from the Under Treasurer to the Premier?

The PREMIER: Yes. Continuing—

Although £20,750,000 is the total sum expected to be available, £3,750,000 has been specifically allotted for housing purposes under the Commonwealth-State housing agreement which leaves a balance of £17 million for the general works programme. This figure of £17 million has, therefore, been quoted in statements dealing with the loan works programme.

Of the £17 million, the State Electricity Commission is expected to raise £2 million, and loan repayments are estimated to provide £1 million. The balance of £14 million is the State's allocation of loan funds through the Loan Council.

In reply to an earlier question by Sir Ross as to the total loan funds allocated to Western Australia for the year 1953-54, the figure quoted was £17,750,000 which was quite correct, comprising £14 million for the general works programme and £3,750,000 for Commonwealth-State housing. The £2 million for the State Electricity Commission is not an allocation to the State, but is simply an improved borrowing programme, whilst loan repayments are the domestic concern of the State and form no part of the allocation to Western Australia through the Loan Council.

In dealing with the request made by Sir Ross for information in respect of commitments, it is pointed out that the figure of £11,344,000 referred to by Mr. Tonkin in his statement in "The West Australian" of the 25th May, 1953, was the amount given by departments in February, 1953, of the liability which would have to be met in 1953-54 in respect of contracts en-

tered into by the previous Government. This total commitment embraced the following amounts:—

	£
Railways	7,076,800
Tramways	10,000
State Electricity Commission	1,921,000
Public Works Department—Engineering	465,300
Public Works Department—Architectural	1,136,300
Metropolitan Water Supply	77,900
State Housing	346,500
Charcoal-iron industry	8,000
State hotels	2,400
State Shipping Service	300,000
Total	£11,344,000

In the statement appearing in "The West Australian" of the 25th May, 1953, reference was made by Mr. Tonkin to the works programme for 1953-54, other than Commonwealth-State Housing, being limited to £17 million. Of the £17 million, £11,344,000 was required to meet commitments and £2,894,500 was for works in the Kwinana area, which a little arithmetic will show, left a balance of only £2,761,500 for other works.

However, the statement referred to an allotment of £4,581,000 for other works, or £1,819,500 more than the balance of the £17 million remaining after providing for commitments and Kwinana.

This additional allotment of £1,819,500 was made possible, in the main, by arranging to pay off deferments in June, 1953, to the value of £1,403,000, and deferring payment to the Commonwealth of the £300,000 due in respect of the purchase of the "Kabbarli."

The relief obtained by meeting deferments to the value of £1,403,000 in June, 1953, was, therefore, taken into account in determining the allotment of £4,581,000 for other works, and Sir Ross's claim that there is at least £5,984,000 available is completely without substance.

The question might well be raised as to how we were able to make such a substantial cash payment in June, 1953, in reduction of deferred liability. This was made possible, in the main, through the substantial reduction in Government Stores holdings, which Sir Ross agrees was achieved by this Government during the five months to the 30th June, 1953. By reduction of stocks and using the moneys thus released to meet deferred payments,

this Government was able to save a considerable sum which would otherwise have been due in interest.

The reference by the Minister for Railways to £2½ millions of I.O.U.'s related to the deferment which was originally arranged in respect of railway contracts. As already explained, deliveries in respect of certain contracts were slowed down considerably, due to difficulties in maintaining production schedules, and accordingly the total deferment which would otherwise have been necessary was reduced to £1,134,000. This remaining deferment in respect of the railways was extinguished by cash payments in June, 1953, being part of the total payment made in that month of £1,403,000.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Do you intend to table that document?

The PREMIER: Certainly, and if the hon. member wishes, I shall have a copy run off for him.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: It was read so quickly that it was not easy to follow and understand.

The Minister for Railways: The hon. member will not like it when he does understand it.

The Minister for Native Welfare: It might be hard for him to follow it.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: You do intend to table it?

The PREMIER: Yes, I shall put it on the Table now. Dealing with the second portion of the amendment, this indicates an amazing piece of thinking on the part of the Leader of the Opposition or on the part of the person who inspired him to frame the paragraph.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You always have something like that at the back of your mind.

The PREMIER: The second portion of the amendment reads—

That Your Excellency's Ministers apparently condone—

Let members mark the word "apparently."

—condone the attitude of your Minister for Justice towards the illegal game of two-up.

The member for Stirling asked what I thought were some very pertinent questions regarding the attitude of the Minister for Justice to this matter. They were asked on the 18th August and the reply which I gave on behalf of the Government and which I considered fully met the situation, was as follows:—

In his replies, the Minister for Justice has generally discussed what he considers to be the merits of the game, and has expressed the view that the game at Kalgoorlie might have been allowed to continue as it had done for 50 years. The Minister's utterances

had no bearing on his intentions regarding his oath of office. He, as well as every other Minister, agrees that no instructions should be issued to the Police Department to allow any illegal practices to operate.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Then why did he say so in answer to my question? He implied that I had neglected my duty and was unsympathetic towards the Goldfields.

The PREMIER: I trust that the member for Mt. Lawley will control himself if only out of consideration for his blood pressure.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: It was not quite right, was it?

The PREMIER: It is quite clear that the attitude of every Minister to this question is at least as good as, if not better than, the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition to similar questions during the six years he was Premier of the State. The Leader of the Opposition had such a hopeless case that he put forward the preposterous suggestion that the Premier ought, publicly, I suppose, to have reprimanded the Minister for Justice. I should say that if ever a Premier had justification for publicly reprimanding some of his Ministers, it was the present Leader of the Opposition when he held office. At no time did I hear of his publicly reprimanding any of them, though I am sure his patience must have been sorely tried on many occasions.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: What about sticking to the particular charge I made?

The PREMIER: I am.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: No, you are getting away from it.

The PREMIER: The fact is that even if the occasion arose and the justification existed, no Premier, irrespective of the party he represented, would publicly reprimand the Minister. To suggest that such a thing would be done is too silly for words, and the Leader of the Opposition knows only too well that that is the position.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Have you done anything privately?

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition has now embarked upon a fishing expedition, and I may tell him that he is fishing in very barren waters. Obviously, the statements made by the Minister for Justice about the game of two-up were made from his long association with the Goldfields and because he felt that it was a game that had done no harm at all to the people who cared to indulge in it.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Do you share that view?

The PREMIER: The Minister was of the opinion that, as the game had been allowed to run on the Goldfields and in other places, including Mandurah, for 50 years, it might have been allowed to continue for another 50 years.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Has it been going on at Mandurah?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: What, two-up?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I did not know of it.

The PREMIER: The hon. member did not know that it had been going on at Mandurah!

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: For 50 years?

The PREMIER: It may be so; I would not know as to that, but during the six years from 1947 to 1953 when the hon. member was in office, 11 charges of playing two-up at Mandurah were heard in the Mandurah court.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: It seems that you have been keeping a very close eye on Mandurah.

The PREMIER: Yes, much closer than has the member for the district.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I admit that I have not been going around two-up rings.

The Minister for Transport: Have you been to the s.p. shops?

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: No.

The PREMIER: The point to be considered is the action of the Government and any action by a Minister in connection with the law. The police decided that the law against two-up must be enforced and it is being enforced. Surely no member can take reasonable exception to that! What does the Leader of the Opposition desire should be done in the matter?

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Do you agree with the Minister for Justice that, as a result of enforcing the law, a very great injustice has been done?

The PREMIER: No, I do not agree at all that a very great injustice has been done. At the same time, I do not have to agree with every view of every Minister, any more than has the Leader of the Opposition to agree with every view put forward by every member of his party on every question under the sun. Surely we are not going to become a gang of robots holding the same view on every question! If that occurred, we might as well close down Parliament.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Do not you think that the Minister's statement was a very important one?

The PREMIER: I do not think it was very important. I take the view that the Minister, as a resident of the Goldfields of 50 years' duration, was entitled, as a member for a Goldfields district, to express his opinion about the merits of the game and about something which was decided by a previous Government last year or the year before.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: The Minister said that a great injustice had been done by the previous Government's agreeing to the carrying out of the law.

The PREMIER: That is his opinion.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: What is yours?

The PREMIER: Mine is that anyone who indulges in an illegal game or practice should be prepared to take the consequences if the police land him and lay a charge against him.

The Minister for Justice: Why was not action taken against bookmakers on the racecourse?

The PREMIER: That is my view, and I think it is the logical and commonsense view.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: The Minister should have been logical, instead of criticising me. That is what I complain about.

The PREMIER: I am not prepared to accept the hon. member as an expert on the laws of logic.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: You are wrong, because he is pretty good!

The PREMIER: I have had too much experience of him in this House. This attempt to report the Ministers of the Government to His Excellency the Governor for having apparently condoned the attitude of the Minister for Justice towards the illegal game of two-up is too silly for words.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Who else do you report too?

The PREMIER: It is childish in the extreme that we should have a proposal of this kind brought along to be added to the Address-in-reply, which is to be presented to His Excellency thanking him for his action in opening the present session of Parliament.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I think you had better take a trip to Kalgoorlie and hear what is being said there.

The PREMIER: I am prepared to do so, but what is being said there would not affect my views.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: It might.

The PREMIER: No, it would not. I know my views on the subject. I have thought them out and I am not influenced and swayed by the views of people I hear in different places, if those views do not seem to me to be logical and well-founded, even though the Leader of the Opposition might be influenced by happenings of that description. Let us have a quick, broader look at this question of the enforcement of the law about which the Leader of the Opposition, and evidently the member for Mt. Lawley, the former Minister for Police, are so tremendously concerned.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: No. Interference with the Police Commissioner. That is my objection.

The PREMIER: We will have a look at the other angle of the question of the enforcement of the law against illegal practices. The Leader of the Opposition was Premier of the Government from 1947 to 1953, and the member for Mt. Lawley was Minister for Police for a good part of that time.

Recently, some questions were asked in the Legislative Council about starting-price betting in a number of localities in Western Australia, and the questions had relation to, I understand, the six-year period during which the present Leader of the Opposition was Premier and the member for Mt. Lawley was Minister for Police. The replies given to those questions as to the amount of money raised in fines in various localities where starting-price bookmakers were found guilty and punished show, for instance, that at Geraldton the sum was £2,630; at Midland Junction, £6,320; Fremantle, £6,640; Albany, £784; Mt. Barker to York, £762; Northam to Coolgardie, £190; Brunswick to Pinjarra, £66; Mullewa-Mingenew to Goomalling-Gingin, £82; Collie, nothing at all.

Mr. Yates: They are very law-abiding in Collie!

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You should have gone back a bit further than six years, you know.

The PREMIER: I would be prepared to go back 60 years.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You need not go back 60 years; only three or four more.

The PREMIER: I am raising this angle because the Leader of the Opposition comes forward with this amendment as one who is out to see that the law is enforced; one who is out to see that illegal practices are prevented.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Out to see that the Ministers do not ridicule the law and make a farce of it.

The PREMIER: Yet, during the six years he was in charge of the Government of this State, and therefore in charge of the police, he allowed this sort of thing to go on.

Mr. Hutchinson: That is not the point at all.

The PREMIER: If he is so tremendously concerned and anxious about enforcement of the law and the prevention of illegal practices, why did he not see that the law against starting-price betting was more evenly and strongly enforced throughout the State?

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Did not the same apply when you were in office previously?

The PREMIER: It may have done.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I never told the police not to do their duty.

The PREMIER: I am not suggesting that the Leader of the Opposition did so.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Neither did the former Minister for Police.

The PREMIER: I am not suggesting that.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: My instructions were that the law was to be enforced.

The PREMIER: What I am arguing is that the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mt. Lawley cannot consistently come into this House and put on a song and dance act about one illegal practice and remain absolutely free from criticism in regard to the attitude they took, when in office, about another illegal practice.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: They can say that they never told the police not to do their duty, or suggested that they should not do it.

The PREMIER: I say that the game of two-up would do far less damage in every shape and form in the community than would s.p. betting.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I doubt that.

The PREMIER: I would say it.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Some curious people frequent the Kalgoorlie two-up school—professional gamblers.

The PREMIER: Some curious people frequent Parliament, but that is no argument for closing down Parliament.

Hon. L. Thorn: We agree with you there.

The PREMIER: I say that if the Government of which the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mt. Lawley were members, was keen or anxious to do something about suppressing, or keeping suppressed, illegal practices which were doing great moral and other harm in the community, then it should not have been the game of two-up which was attacked or, if it was attacked, then s.p. betting and similar illegal practices should have been equally attacked.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You are accusing us of doing the very things you did yourself.

The PREMIER: I am afraid that the Leader of the Opposition is assuming a denseness which does not do him much credit.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I have heard you say that before.

The PREMIER: Is there anything in the Standing Orders to prevent its being said again?

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Nothing. But what I said is a fact.

The PREMIER: I am attacking the Leader of the Opposition—if attacking it can be called—on the basis that he comes forward with this amendment and puts on a great song and dance act about the game of two-up—

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Not so much about the game of two-up.

The PREMIER:—when, at the same time, the Leader of the Opposition, as Premier of the State for six years, did not do anything to see that the law against s.p. betting was evenly enforced through the State, or fully enforced.

Hon. L. Thorn: The same as you did during your previous term of office.

The PREMIER: I do not expect to penetrate the wisdom of the member for Toodyay.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: But what he says is true.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Premier please resume his seat. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition and other members who have been interjecting to allow the Premier to have as good a hearing as was given to the Leader of the Opposition when he was speaking.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I will try, Sir, not to add to the Premier's discomfiture.

The PREMIER: I have had some information obtained regarding the number of s.p. betting charges heard at Pinjarra during the last six years. The number was four.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Does the Premier say that I was responsible for that?

The PREMIER: No. I did not say that.

Hon. L. Thorn: What about Northam?

The PREMIER: I have not had the figures for Northam, but there is nothing to prevent the member for Toodyay from getting them. He might also obtain the figures for Toodyay.

Hon. L. Thorn: Toodyay is a law-abiding country town.

The PREMIER: I make no suggestion whatever that the Leader of the Opposition was responsible for that, but I point out that one who comes forward at this stage to try to report Ministers of this Government to His Excellency for apparently condoning something the Minister for Justice said in connection with the game of two-up, ought to have been much busier during his period of office in seeing that other illegal practices—and worse illegal practices—received more attention.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You are making very heavy weather of this.

The PREMIER: That may be so, but, judging by appearances, the Leader of the Opposition is not enjoying it much.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I am all right.

The PREMIER: So I have shown by a report from the Treasury Department that the portion of the amendment dealing with the financial angle has no foundation in fact, and that that portion was developed by the Leader of the Opposition

and others in company with him because they did not have all the information which they could easily have obtained.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I think you had better say something about the inconsistencies of the statements made by yourself and the Deputy Premier.

The Minister for Education: There is no inconsistency at all.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: They are full of inconsistencies.

The PREMIER: The second part of the amendment falls to the ground because, as I explained in my replies a few days ago to the questions of the member for Stirling, the attitude of the Government and the Minister for Justice in relation to the action taken by the police in connection with the game of two-up, is one that cannot be questioned. The time has arrived when we ought to dispose of the amendment, and I propose to move an amendment to it to achieve that objective. I move—

That the amendment be amended by deleting all words after the word "regrets" for the purpose of inserting in lieu thereof the words, "the action of the Leader of the Opposition and some of his Liberal Party followers in this House in supporting the Commonwealth Government's recent decision to make, by way of taxation reimbursement and supplementary grant, a total payment to Western Australia this year which, on the basis of equivalent money values, will be less than the total amount received last year, that decision having created serious financial problems in Western Australia in relation to many of the State's vital activities."

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: The electioneering drum in full swing; blatant electioneering of the worst kind.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition has changed his mood in the last two seconds. He is now tremendously discomfited and upset.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I told the people of Western Australia that you would be electioneering against the Commonwealth for the next 12 months, and this is a start.

The PREMIER: At the moment I am not concerned with the Commonwealth.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You are very concerned.

The PREMIER: This amendment relates directly and absolutely to the Leader of the Opposition and to some of his Liberal Party followers in this House; and it is what is now before the Chair.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You have got yourself into a mess and you want to blame someone.

The PREMIER: The amendment on the amendment is what I am going to deal with.

The Minister for Housing: The biter is bitten.

The PREMIER: One would never think the Leader of the Opposition had had a three months' holiday overseas just lately, judging by his present bad temper.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I am not bad tempered.

The PREMIER: There has been a lot of nonsense talked in the House by one or two Liberal Party members, and there have also been statements made in the Press from them with regard to the attitude I adopted at the recent Premiers' Conference at which the question of reimbursement of taxation and supplementary grant was discussed and decided. I therefore propose to quote a few extracts from the speech I made at the conference and I shall after having quoted them, place the document upon the table so that any member who cares to read the whole of what I said at the Premiers' Conference will be in a position to do so. I said—

Western Australia is faced with considerably increased expenditure from Consolidated Revenue for a number of reasons. . . . We all realise the desirability of reductions of taxation, but there is no net advantage to the taxpayer if the Commonwealth authority reduces taxation by, say, £50,000,000 and the States, by a variety of measures, have to increase taxes payable by the same set of taxpayers by the same amount.

Later I said—

We have a somewhat similar problem in our North-West. Every Commonwealth Minister who travels through that part of Western Australia sympathises greatly with the people who are battling there because of the enormous natural disabilities that they suffer and also because of the great production costs to which they are subjected. . . . The people in the North-West will not be helped if the Commonwealth reduces their tax burden by £500,000 or £1,000,000 and the Government of the State, as the result of receiving less money from the Commonwealth, is obliged to raise its charges on such persons by £500,000 or £1,000,000 a year. . . . We in Western Australia are dependent to a considerable degree not only upon the tax reimbursement scheme but also upon the decisions of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. Western Australia is more largely in the hands of the Commonwealth in respect of its budget than is any other State.

Further on I said—

If Western Australia received £10,900,000 under the formula and by way of supplementary grant this year, which is the same as last year's total, plus an amount of £6,000,000 from the Commonwealth Grants Commission,

we shall be faced with a deficit of well over £4,000,000. Therefore we consider that it is necessary for us to receive from the Commonwealth this year under the formula and by way of supplementary grant, a total amount of between £14,000,000 and £14,500,000. If the Commonwealth considers, in its wisdom, that it must make such reductions of taxation as would prevent the payment of that total, and that Western Australia should take action in its own sphere to increase railway freights by which means, of course, the State could obtain an additional £2,000,000, we should require from the Commonwealth under the formula and by supplementary grant a total of approximately £12,500,000.

We hope that we shall not be forced into the position of having to increase railway freights because that would have a tremendously bad effect upon primary production, goldmining and the policy of decentralisation which we are trying earnestly to carry out on a widespread scale.

Those are just a few extracts from the address I gave at the recent Premiers' Conference. Members can comb through it from beginning to end and they will find that the approach I made was a completely legitimate one; that it was based entirely on the needs of Western Australia and upon a realisation that we, in this State, would be compelled to place considerable additional burdens upon our people if the Commonwealth Government made decisions which were unfavourable to us in respect of this year's total amount by way of taxation reimbursement and supplementary grant.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: That would apply to the other States as well, would it not?

The PREMIER: Of course it would. Members can go right through that speech from the first word to the last and they will find no politics of any kind in it. It was an earnest, straightout, strong attempt by me, on behalf of the people of Western Australia, to get the utmost financial consideration possible from the Commonwealth. I should have thought that the approach I made at that conference on behalf of the people of this State would have been whole-heartedly supported by every person in Western Australia.

Yet we find that the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Nedlands and, I think, even the member for Greenough have tried to make it appear in the newspapers as though the approach I made to the Commonwealth at the conference was party political; as though it was inspired by an anxiety to discredit the Commonwealth Government. If they read carefully the speech I made at the conference they will find that there was one overwhelming desire and anxiety running through it, and that was to try to prevail upon the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, and

his Treasurer, Sir Arthur Fadden, to give Western Australia a reasonable deal this year.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: What do you say you have this year from income tax reimbursement?

The PREMIER: It is £9,600,000 and from the supplementary grant £1,697,000. Let me explain briefly to members how the Commonwealth treated Western Australia on this occasion. I hope members are big enough—I am sure most of them are—to realise that when the Commonwealth treated Western Australia in a miserable way, as happened at the recent conference, it did not do this Government, as a government, harm but did harm to the whole of the people of this State.

If, as a result of the attitude of the Commonwealth Government, we have to raise additional revenue to bring our accounts somewhere near to balancing, it is not individual Ministers of the Government who will have to make up the deficiency, but the whole of the people of the State, and that is exactly the situation which is developing as a result of the deliberate decision of the Commonwealth Government at the conference to treat us this year far less favourably than it did last year, the year before or the year before that.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: It treated you just as fairly as it did any other State.

The PREMIER: What has that to do with it?

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: It treated you as fairly as any other State.

The PREMIER: If the member for Mt. Lawley was as logical as he gave us to understand a few moments ago, he would use the word "unfairly" instead of "fairly." I will agree with him that, by and large, the Commonwealth treated this State equally as unfairly as it treated the other States. Do I understand that the member for Mt. Lawley agrees with that?

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Equally, but not unfairly.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: Tell us why.

The PREMIER: The member for Subiaco should know that the Prime Minister and his Treasurer do not take me into their confidence although I believe she enjoys their confidence, and so I suggest that she try to obtain the answer. I have my own views as to why they did what they did.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: The answer was to reduce taxation.

The PREMIER: I dealt with that in my speech, as the hon. member heard from the extracts that I quoted from it and she may substantiate that more fully if she troubles to read the whole of that speech. Let us examine what the Com-

monwealth Government has done to the State this year as compared with last year or the year before and it will then be as clear as can be that a pretty severe blow was delivered against this State and its people. It is a well-known fact—the Leader of the Opposition will agree wholeheartedly with this—that when a Government receives income at a certain volume it provides services to that limit. We know also that we are living in a period when costs are still rising, as evidence of which there was an increase of 5s. per week in the basic wage declared recently in our State Court.

Mr. Bovell: In your policy speech you said you were going to stop that.

The PREMIER: I said we would take steps to try to bring rising costs to an end and, if possible, reduce them.

Mr. Bovell: You implied that you would prevent the basic wage rising further.

The PREMIER: I said we would take steps to try to do that, and we have done so, but I think the member for Vasse has had sufficient experience of problems of this kind to know that one cannot put out, in a few minutes, a bushfire that someone else has allowed to rage for days or stop a flood, in a matter of minutes, that others have allowed to develop to tremendous proportions over a long period.

Mr. Bovell: You have had six months in which to do something about it.

The PREMIER: The hon. member was behind a Government that had six years in which to do something about it, and the net result of that was simply that things went from bad to worse.

Mr. Bovell: We did not make on the hustings the extravagant statements that you made.

The PREMIER: The hon. member should look at the policy speech delivered in 1947 by the present Leader of the Opposition and that delivered by the member for Stirling.

Mr. Bovell: I did listen to them.

The PREMIER: Listening to them and understanding them are two different things. In 1950-51 the total of income tax reimbursement grant and supplementary grant paid to Western Australia by the Commonwealth was £7,176,426.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: That is so.

The PREMIER: In the following year it was plussed up by £2,200,000 to £9,400,000 and that represented a percentage increase over the previous year of 30.98. That amount of £9,400,000 was plussed up in the following year by £1,500,000 to £10,854,544 which represented a percentage increase of 15.47. This year the amount we are to receive is only £442,456 above last year's, which represents a percentage increase of only 4.08 and from the increase this year of £442,456 the State will have to find, for

the enforcement of price-fixation, a total of from £62,000 to £70,000, which was found last year and in previous years by the Commonwealth. It is therefore obvious that Western Australia has been treated very badly this year by the Commonwealth and I say there is no justification for it.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I am afraid you did not adopt the right technique at the Premier's Conference. You have told the House of the large amounts that we got and of your failure to do likewise.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition is now quickly changing his ground. Those who heard him in this House yesterday, speaking on this issue, must have been appalled at the case he presented. It was the worst I have ever heard delivered in the Parliament by anybody.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Of course you would say that!

The PREMIER: I say it because the Leader of the Opposition did not know anything about what happened at the recent Premiers' Conference.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I was away, of course.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition now puts forward the very thin excuse that he did not know what he was talking about yesterday because he was away from Australia when the last Premiers' Conference was held.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I say you made a dreadful failure of your first visit to a Premiers' Conference.

The PREMIER: I accept that and say that the failure was equally noticeable in respect of the Leader of the Opposition's colleague in South Australia, the Liberal Party Premier, Mr. Playford.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: He is not making the fuss about it that you are.

The PREMIER: I will convey to Mr. Playford and the people of South Australia the fact that the Leader of the Opposition in this State says that I and the Premier of South Australia failed shockingly at the recent Premier's Conference.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: The Premier of South Australia is very unlike the Premier of Western Australia. The only resemblance is that they were both born in the same State.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition is getting bad tempered again.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: That will be the day.

The PREMIER: I am fast coming to the conclusion that the money which the State spent to give him this three-months holiday recently was completely wasted. I thought he would come back a jolly, happy, optimistic fellow, but here he is in a mood which might upset him at any tick of the clock.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I am not getting upset.

The PREMIER: In his speech yesterday, in dealing with this matter, the Leader of the Opposition was hopelessly at sea. I am sure that he did not prepare his own speech.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Wrong again.

The PREMIER: Then the Leader of the Opposition is more guilty than even I had imagined. He made a worse hash of it than I thought.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You have not prepared your speech. You read a statement prepared by the Under Treasurer.

The PREMIER: I was going to be generous enough to say that the hon. member had been misled, probably by the new hope of the Liberal Party in this House.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: Who is that?

The PREMIER: Evidently the Leader of the Opposition misled himself.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Who is the new hope of the Liberal Party?

The Minister for Native Welfare: The member for Maylands.

The PREMIER: There is one member sitting very close to the Leader of the Opposition who knows to whom I am referring when I speak of the "new hope."

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Are you trying to get rid of me?

The PREMIER: I should say that after the inner circle of the Liberal Party in this State finds out about the poor show the Leader of the Opposition put up in connection with this amendment, they may try to get rid of him and that the new hope will take his place.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You are not putting up a very good case.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition does not look a bit happy about it.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: The Premier ought to look at the discomfort of those on the front bench with him.

The Minister for Housing: We are feeling sorry for you.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition is like the man in the cemetery at night, whistling to keep up his courage.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: I have not seen the Premier get so irritated before. It is not often he gets this moody.

The PREMIER: The member for Mt. Lawley is always—

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Be careful!

The PREMIER: —an inspiration to me because every time he interjects he provides us with more grist for the mill.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: The Premier certainly wants some inspiration.

Hon. L. Thorn: What about getting on with the case instead of side-tracking the issue with funny stories?

The PREMIER: Here we have this veteran from Toodyay coming in with the most fundamental interjections and ideas imaginable. I would advise the Leader of the Opposition, when he speaks upon these matters in the House, to inform himself beforehand, especially concerning such vital questions as decisions made at Premiers' Conferences. As a matter of fact, during the speech of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday I tried on six occasions in the space of two minutes—

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Oh, dear.

The PREMIER: —to get him to answer questions about what happened at the recent Premiers' Conference. On each occasion the Leader of the Opposition wriggled away from the question and finally dodged it altogether. That was a complete confession on his part that he did not know what he was talking about.

Mr. McCulloch: That is nothing unusual.

The PREMIER: I will prove that I asked the Leader of the Opposition this question on six occasions; that might satisfy even the member for Mt. Lawley. My first interjection was, "What about dealing with this year?" At the time the Leader of the Opposition was dealing with what the Commonwealth gave us last year by way of income tax reimbursement—a supplementary grant—which was past history. A bit further on I said, "But what about this year?"

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Your year of failure.

The PREMIER: A little further on I asked the Leader of the Opposition to express an opinion about what actually happened—that was for this year. A little further on I said, "Why do not you answer the question?"

The Minister for Native Welfare: He could not.

The PREMIER: The subterfuge which the Leader of the Opposition had finally to adopt was, "I shall answer it; I shall have another opportunity at a later stage." I said, "When?", and the Leader of the Opposition said, "I shall then give the Premier much more information about the financial position." So it was obvious that the Leader of the Opposition did not have the information and had apparently not taken the trouble to obtain it, although it has been well publicised since he came back from his trip overseas.

Therefore, as the Leader of the Opposition supports the Commonwealth Government in making this drastic decision against the best interests of Western Australia I think, in all the circumstances, we ought to express our regret about his attitude, because it is one which is injurious to the best interests of Western Australia.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Political manoeuvring!

HON. A. F. WATTS (Stirling—on amendment on amendment) [3.26]: I must confess that, after a careful perusal of various Press statements and answers to questions in this House, I am opposed to the deletion of the words which the Premier seeks to strike out of the amendment. I would say, without fear of successful contradiction, that the statements made in the Press, particularly the one which is mentioned in the original amendment, were capable of little or no other construction than that which was placed upon them by the Leader of the Opposition, especially when taken in conjunction with answers to questions which have since been before the House.

Therefore, in my view, without any question, there is little, if any, justification for the deletion from the amendment of the words which the Premier now seeks to delete. Perhaps you, Sir, will allow me to quote from that Press statement to support my view that the matter which it is proposed to strike out should be retained, because that matter is based on a statement made by the Acting Premier and reiterated on at least two occasions in the statement that after £11,344,000 had been set aside for contractual commitments in Australia and overseas, there would be a sum of £4,581,000 available for works in progress and new works in this State. The hon. gentleman was reported in "The West Australian" and no effort has been made by him or any other Minister to correct that newspaper report. As three months have elapsed, it can be safely assumed that the report was as the Minister intended it should be. It says—

From the £17,000,000—

I would like to point out, with reference to the speech just made by the Premier, that I am not dealing with any sum other than the £17,000,000, so on that point we are in complete agreement. It says—

From the £17,000,000 Western Australia would have to meet Australian and overseas contractual commitments entered into, Mr. Tonkin said. These embrace the following:—

Then there is a long list ending up with the words "totalling £11,344,000" and about three inches further down the column there is—

There would be only £4,581,000 to finance State works in progress and new works in 1953-54.

And about two inches further down the column the following appears:—

Mr. Tonkin said that it appeared that the only course would be to allocate to the appropriate department other than for contractual commitments—

Bear those words in mind! "Other than for contractual commitments!"

—amounts on the basis of a total works programme of £4,581,000.

So there is no doubt whatever that the impression sought to be created by the Leader of the Opposition in asking for the words he moved to be inserted in the amendment got its foundation, without any question whatsoever, from that statement and therefore the statement is among the other things which do not justify the removal of the words which the Premier now seeks.

But perhaps I may go a little further and analyse a portion of that statement in the light of the questions since asked of the Treasurer—or Acting Treasurer I think it was on one occasion—since the House has been in session. On the 18th August, 1953, the Treasurer himself was asked by the member for Greenough—

Referring to a statement made by the Acting Premier and appearing in "The West Australian" newspaper on May 25 last, will he state how much of the £3,000,000 originally deferred in London was included in the £11,344,000 mentioned in such statements as required to meet Australian and overseas contractual commitments.

And the Treasurer answered that question with the figures, "£1,669,000." On the face of that, the £11,344,000, to which the Acting Premier referred as having to be made available during 1953-54, included £1,669,000 of the deferred payments.

Now, what happens to the deferred payments? Here we have to go to another question asked of the Treasurer by the member for Greenough when he inquired, a few days before he asked the question I have just read—

How much of last year's deferment was outstanding on the 30th June, 1953?

And the answer he got was, "£266,000." Therefore, if £1,669,000 of the £11,344,000 which the Acting Premier, in his statement of the 25th May claimed had to be paid this year, was actually paid as the answers by the Premier clearly disclose—with the exception of £266,000—during the year ended the 30th June last, then without any question whatsoever, there was £1,403,000 available, being the difference between those two figures. This sum ought to be available in addition to the amount of £4,581,000 which had been mentioned on two occasions in the statement, because of the commitments he had to meet were reduced by £1,699,000 less £266,000 still outstanding, he must have had £1,403,000 more to spend this year than he contended and, on those statements, there is no other answer to the question.

I am not suggesting that the Acting Premier, when he made the statement on the 25th May, did not think that that was

the position nor do the words which the Premier now seeks to strike out suggest that. They merely suggest that they ought to be corrected and that the House regrets that they have not been and it has taken something like 14 or 15 questions and this debate before we have even been able to get down to the fundamentals of the matter and see where we stand. So is it not justified that the words in this amendment, that the Premier seeks to strike out, should be retained in those circumstances?

In my opinion, there is no question whatever about it. The impression that was sought to be created—whether it was created in complete good faith or not,—and I am not sitting in judgment on that question; I do not know—was one suggesting that it was absolutely impossible for the Government to venture on to any programme of new works because of these overseas and contractual commitments—and those in Australia as well totalling £11,344,000 which had to be paid during this financial year. And, it was not £11,344,000 which had to be paid during this financial year, but that sum less £1,669,000 from which we would have to take into account the £266,000—a mere fraction that was outstanding on the 30th June.

So I must confess that I see ample justification for the very moderate amendment suggested by the Leader of the Opposition to the Address-in-reply which the Premier now seeks to decimate by striking out the greater part of it. As far as I am concerned, I must vote strongly against the further amendment moved by the Premier because I am not going to stand here and let go, without some complaint, a series of statements of which I have quoted only one or two—and I do not propose to quote the others because reference has been made to them already—and the ones I have quoted are the clearest of them all because these statements have come forward shortly after the general election and they have not only completely clouded the issue, but have mystified the public and misled them.

Until the questions by the member for Greenough were asked I had no means of knowing whether there was anything better than that stated in the Press by the hon. gentleman. So, whatever the facts—and I still confess that I am not too clear about them—the situation is that there was no £11,344,000 of contractual commitments out of this year. If it was not known on the 25th May, it was known on the 30th June, and there was the whole of July and the first week of August to correct it, but no attempt was made to correct it until questions were asked in the House, and those are the words that the Leader of the Opposition and I desire to have retained in his amendment.

I may say a word or two also about the proposed deletion of paragraph (b). I think that the Premier, in dealing with the proposed deletion of that paragraph having

reference to the Minister for Justice, has skimmed too lightly over the major problem. Had the Minister for Justice, for whom I have the highest regard, been speaking as the member for Eyre only, the remarks he made could have been subject to no other criticism than that we agreed or disagreed with them, but as the Premier himself has implied—though he did not actually say it—when a member of the Government speaks from the front Bench, he speaks, not for himself, but for the Government.

Good gracious me! That matter was taken up often enough by members now on the Government side when they were sitting on this side of the House whenever Ministers of the Government in which I took part were making observations that might or might not have been on behalf of the Government, but those Ministers were certainly tied down by the then Opposition, frequently, too, to the effect that they could not speak for themselves alone; they must, when speaking from the front Bench, be speaking on behalf of the Government. So, the Minister for Justice was speaking, not as the member for Eyre, but as Minister for Justice, and that is a situation which it appears is being lost sight of. I have before me an extract from the answers he gave when questioned by an hon. member. He said—

I do feel that it was a very great injustice that the previous Government should have acquiesced in preventing the playing of two-up on the Goldfields. The game is traditional and one of the fairest that could be played.

When the Minister was pressed with questions as to whether he held those views, and whether he did not think the law should be amended, he said—

There is no intention of that sort so far as I am concerned, but I feel that amenities that have been enjoyed on the Goldfields for the last 50 or 60 years should be permitted to continue.

The Minister for Justice: I did not say that it had to be allowed to continue.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: But, speaking as Minister for Justice, the hon. member should have said either that he would amend the law if he had an opportunity or do his best to have it amended or, alternatively, he should not have made the statement he did unless he could, by some peculiar method, succeed in speaking from the front Bench only as the member for Eyre which, I suggest, he could not do.

The Minister for Justice: I did not say that I would try to sway anyone.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: Consequently, I consider that the paragraph should not be deleted from the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. The words are demonstrative of the mild manner of the Leader of the Opposition himself.

The Premier: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. F. WATTS: They do not seem to criticise the Minister for Justice in the way they ought to do in the minds of people who might hold very strong views on the subject. The words are simply "that the House regrets that Your Excellency's Ministers apparently condone the attitude of your Minister for Justice towards the illegal game of two-up." Judging by the answers of the Premier, and if I understand the meaning of the word "condone" as given by Allandale's dictionary—to forgive, pardon or overlook—I consider that the word "condone" has been wisely used in this instance.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.3 p.m.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: I was saying that the word "condone" as I understood its meaning—and I called up the assistance of a dictionary for the purpose—meant to pardon, forgive or overlook. I suggest it is a very proper word to use in regard to this matter because certainly there were some utterances of the Minister for Justice to which I have made some short reference and to which I am sure the Acting Premier did not agree, because they were first made at a time when he was Acting Leader of the House. I am equally sure the Premier himself does not agree with them as coming from the front Bench of the Government, and made by a responsible Minister of the Crown in his position as such.

Without fear of successful contradiction I say that they have forgiven, overlooked or pardoned the statements which the Minister made. I think, therefore, as I have said, it is a very suitable word to leave in the amendment. It conveys, I consider, the exact shade of meaning which the Leader of the Opposition desired should be conveyed when he used it. It is, in my opinion, still a matter of regret that the Leader of the Government should have seen fit to pardon, forgive, or overlook, in the manner that he did, the statement made by his Minister. I think it is reasonable and proper that His Excellency the Governor should be advised that this is what the House thinks about it.

In conclusion, because I know that if I want to address myself to the words proposed to be inserted after these words are struck out I shall have to do so on a separate occasion, I would like to say that I have never heard the Premier present so weak a case as he did in making the remarks leading up to his suggestion that these words be struck out of the amendment. The hon. gentleman was obviously floundering at every turn, except when he was able to read a considered document prepared for him by officers of the Treasury.

In my opinion the document entirely missed the point inasmuch as I consider the officers had not studied the statements made by the Acting Premier on the 25th May, which statements are the basis for the amendment moved by the Leader of

the Opposition. If they had analysed those statements, they could have indicated to them nothing more than that the public had been misled, that members who read the statement had also been misled, and that there had been no attempt, which is plain in the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, despite the many weeks intervening, including the period since the 30th June, to correct the statements about which we now complain.

Therefore, so far as the Premier's observations are concerned, except for the report from the Treasury, which I believe has entirely missed the point of the amendment, the hon. gentleman was able to make no defence of his deputy's statement, and he did not make the least attempt to offer any, and in consequence there is every justification for leaving the words in both paragraphs (a) and (b) of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I therefore oppose the amendment on the amendment.

HON. A. V. R. ABBOTT (Mt. Lawley—on amendment on amendment) (4.8): I propose to deal with my objection to the striking out of the second portion of the amendment as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, because I consider there was some implication that I was not justified in adopting the attitude I did when the Commissioner of Police took action against the two-up school at Kalgoorlie.

The Minister for Native Welfare: You are in favour of paragraph (a) being struck out of the amendment, are you?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: No.

The Minister for Native Welfare: I thought you said you were in favour of striking out paragraph (b) but not paragraph (a).

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I am not in favour of either being struck out, but I propose to deal with the reference to paragraph (b) as I am more personally connected with it. I asked the Minister for Justice, after he had answered certain queries, a question without notice. I did this so that I could get quite clear his or the Government's attitude regarding my conduct. That was the reason why I asked it. I do not want to go into the merits of allowing two-up schools to continue or not, or whether we should introduce legislation to permit the game to take place. I asked the question only to clear up the point of view of the Government with regard to myself as an ex-Minister for Police, and so I asked the Minister for Justice—

Was he correctly reported in this morning's issue of "The West Australian" in the statement that it is a very great injustice that the previous Government acquiesced in stopping the two-up schools on the goldfields? Did he intend to imply that the then Minister for Police should have exercised pressure on the Commissioner

of Police to ensure that two-up schools at Kalgoorlie were permitted and thus allow a breach of the law.

His answer was—

I was correctly reported. I feel that as the game has been played since the inception of the Goldfields, it is really an amenity and I think the Minister at the time should have given consideration to this point.

The Minister for Justice: Consideration of what point.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: That which I have mentioned—did he imply that the then Minister for Police should have exercised pressure on the Commissioner of Police?

The Minister for Justice: I did not say that you should have.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Of course I did not have to, but I asked should I have exercised pressure either by suggestion or instruction, and instead of saying "No", which I believe is what the Minister should have said, he replied that I should have given consideration to the matter, and that must mean that I should have given consideration, and probably favourable consideration—to exercising pressure on the Commissioner of Police. Had the Premier taken the trouble to inquire into the Commissioner's reasons he might have learned a lot. He took the trouble to inquire into betting at Pinjarra but had he questioned the Commissioner on this aspect, he would have learned that the two-up school was being frequented by a number of men of ill-repute.

The Minister for Native Welfare: At Pinjarra?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: He would have found that the two-up school was being frequented by a number of men who made their living there, by gambling.

The Minister for Native Welfare: At Pinjarra?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I am talking about Kalgoorlie. He might also have learned that the Commissioner had received a number of complaints from womenfolk at Kalgoorlie and Boulder with regard to the two-up school and the fact that their husbands were spending their pay and wasting it there and that the households and children were going short.

The Minister for Justice: What rubbish! There is far more money wasted on s.p. betting than on two-up.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I challenge the Minister for Police to get the Commissioner's reasons and publish them in this House.

The Minister for Police: I am not buying into this argument!

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The Minister is well advised not to. I am referring to this because the Premier took the trouble to quote certain matters in this House

and make accusations against me. If the Minister for Justice had taken the trouble to ascertain the position, he would have discovered that the two-up school was being frequented by men of ill-repute—professional gamblers—and that the Commissioner of Police had received many complaints about it from housewives in Kalgoorlie and Boulder.

The Minister for Justice: That is the greatest lot of rubbish I have ever heard.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: In the circumstances, I do not think I would have been justified in expressing my own point of view in favour of the two-up school or in voicing any ministerial wish that no action should be taken.

The Minister for Justice: Do you condone betting at headquarters?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I do not condone betting anywhere. I made it clear in this House last night, and I do not think any Minister for Justice has enforced the law more severely than I did. I introduced into this House a Bill to amend the Licensing Act so that people on the Goldfields and elsewhere would not be breaking the law and in order to bring the illegal drinking into conformity with the law. When a law is so frequently being broken, it should be either enforced or amended; and the same applies to s.p. betting.

The Minister for Justice: Betting at headquarters should be stopped, if that is the case.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: All illegal betting, wherever it takes place, should be stopped.

The Minister for Justice: It is illegal to bet on the racecourse.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Yes, and it should be stopped. That is my own opinion and I made my position quite clear last night—that there should be a State-wide totalisator.

Mr. McCulloch: Last session you supported the legislation to impose a tax on illegal betting.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Yes, and a totalisator tax, and I gave my view that betting should all be done through totalisators. Some day the public may become sufficiently educated as to agree that gambling of that nature is not in their best interests, but we do many things that are not in the best interests of some of us.

The Minister for Justice: Lots of things we do are not legal.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I know there are numerous breaches of the law but I do not think they should be condoned. Every opportunity should be taken to ensure that the law has the respect of a large proportion of the community so that it will be observed and people will know where they stand. If I have mistaken

his answer, I would like the Minister to make it quite clear—I admit I asked the question without notice—that he did not mean that I should have suggested to the Commissioner of Police—or used influence on him—that he should allow the two-up school to continue in Kalgoorlie. I am not prepared to go into the merits of two-up or say whether I approve of the game.

Mr. Lawrence: Have you a guilty conscience?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I say that a Minister of the Crown has no right to suggest that a previous Minister should have taken action that I consider would have been improper.

MR. HUTCHINSON: (Cottesloe—on amendment on amendment) [4.20]: I do not desire to speak at any great length on the further amendment but I wish to add my small quota to the debate. Firstly I desire to state that I oppose the amendment on the amendment, moved by the Premier. I do so on several grounds, but I oppose it strongly because it carries with it the deletion of the great majority of words which were in the original amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lawrence: Should not they be deleted if they are wrong?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: The Premier commenced his speech by describing the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition as "wishy-washy." That descriptive term might well have applied to the Premier's speech thereafter, when he dealt with paragraphs (a) and (b) of the original amendment. It appeared to me that when the Premier flung his bomb-shell into the arena, he did it for a number of reasons; possibly some of them were genuine but one was an attempt to cloud the issue. I do not want to read too much into his intentions, but I think his further amendment was an attempt to gag members from speaking to the original motion.

The Premier: How could it do that?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: That has not proved to be the case.

The Premier: It could not possibly do it.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I think an open and full debate should ensue on the original amendment and I oppose the Premier's amendment to it because, on a question of finance, there are certain matters which should be ventilated as they have a direct bearing on the interests of the electors of every member in this House. Shortly after the present Government took office, there must have been some misconception with regard to moneys in hand—the sum of money really available for public works, construction of schools, bituminisation of playgrounds and so on.

The Minister for Education: And how much was there?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I will mention a figure or two later if the Minister will allow me to proceed.

The Minister for Education: I will be most interested.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: There was enough left for the Government to pay a considerable sum off the deferred debt. That was money that could have been left over to this financial year, but it was paid at the eleventh hour. There was approximately 1½ millions left that could have been used for the purposes I have mentioned.

The Minister for Education: Have you any idea how it was paid?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Yes. I do not pretend to be a financial wizard but I have some slight smattering of finance.

The Minister for Education: You say that it was paid. Where did the money come from?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: By the release of stores in hand—

The Minister for Education. No; it was not.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: —and the utilisation of that money, or some portions of it. Does the Minister deny that? It was about £900,000.

The Minister for Education: No; it was over £1,000,000.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: It was not far off £900,000, so despite the fact that I am not a financial wizard, at least I knew the figure, roughly, and I think it is rather paltry on the part of the Deputy Premier to endeavour to swing me out of my stride.

The Minister for Education: You do not know what you are talking about. That is the whole point.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: That is absolute and utter rubbish.

The Minister for Education: I will show you that you do not.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: This is particularly interesting to us, although it may not be to members on the other side.

Mr. O'Brien: Speak for yourself.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I am endeavouring to do so. This sum of money that was paid by the Government, but could have been deferred to the present financial year, could have been utilised for the construction—as I was about to say when I was rudely interrupted—of schools, hospitals and other public works projects.

The Minister for Education: Wrong again.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I am not wrong at all. It was money that could have been used.

The Minister for Education: If it could have been utilised, why did not your Government pay for the schools that it bought?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Our Government met each monthly account and carried on in a proper accounting fashion until the end of the financial year.

The Minister for Education: It did not.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: It did. The Minister must admit that.

The Minister for Education: You will find that that is not so.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: What I have said is perfectly true.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: The late Government met its commitments month by month as they became due.

The Minister for Education: No, it did not. It asked for them to be deferred.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will address the Chair and the Minister for Education will refrain from interrupting in this fashion.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I would like you, Sir, to ask the Deputy Premier to refrain from interrupting me.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: It is absolutely disorderly.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: So it seems that if this Government had had the perception to utilise these funds instead of deciding, at the eleventh hour, that it must get rid of the money somehow otherwise it would be lost because loan funds could not be carried over to the next financial year—probably the Treasury had something to do with it—a good deal more work could have been done. At present only £266,000 remains to be paid on these contractual commitments although they were in the vicinity of £3,000,000. There again I am open to some slight correction which the Deputy Premier might like to make.

The Minister for Education: You're telling me!

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Those figures were given by the Minister and quoted in "The West Australian."

The Minister for Education: I did not use figures in that way.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: They are figures given by the Minister and quoted in "The West Australian"—today's issue I think it is.

The Minister for Education: You get on with your story. I will tell you the position.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: The Minister cannot deny it because the figures are here.

The Minister for Education: You get on with your story. I will deal with that later.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: The Leader of the Country Party may have quoted some of these figures, but it says in "The West Australian"—

Of the £11,344,000 that Mr. Tonkin had claimed to be commitments on overseas contractual agreements payable out of loan funds available for 1952-53, £1,669,000 represented deferments from last year but of these deferments only £268,000 remained on June 1st.

That is what I said previously.

The Minister for Education: What is the date of that quotation?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Of the sum of money that could have been deferred to this financial year, only £286,000 remains out of the £3,000,000. A good deal of money paid last financial year could have been utilised—at least a quarter of a million or half a million—for essential public works. In addition, every deputation taken to Cabinet Ministers was put off with the story that no loan moneys were available. So we in this House, as individual members, have a right to protest very strongly because of that. I would like to mention briefly something that is connected with the second part of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, which concerns the attitude of the Minister for Justice towards the law of the land.

When dealing with this section of the amendment, the Premier did not skim lightly over the surface of it, as suggested by the Leader of the Country Party, but I consider his comments had hardly any bearing on the amendment. He endeavoured to show up the Opposition as a body of people who would do nothing in regard to two-up or s.p. betting during its term of office on the Government benches. That has nothing to do with the second part of the original amendment. On this matter, the Minister for Justice suggested that the police should not be allowed to intervene and uphold the law, and I do not think that can be denied.

The Minister for Justice: It can be denied. You are inferring that I had some sinister intent with regard to influencing Ministers.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I can quite understand the Minister's attitude in this respect, but I cannot understand his attitude in endeavouring to influence the police by making this statement.

The Minister for Justice: Did I do that?

Mr. Lawrence: Rubbish!

Mr. HUTCHINSON: It is not rubbish. His very words uttered in this Chamber are construed by the public as an indication to show up the police—

Mr. Lawrence: Construed by the hon. member! You have not the mind of the public. I would say that that is a misstatement of fact.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: The fact that the Minister for Justice should adopt such an attitude is as serious as anything can be, and all members of the Opposition seem to agree that the inference is that the law can be flouted. If Government members feel that two-up should be allowed to continue, they should endeavour to legalise it.

Mr. Heal: Is the hon. member's party against the playing of two-up?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: And they should be whole-hearted in that move. The attitude of the Minister for Police has been admirable in every respect, but I can hardly say the same of the Minister for Justice. He reiterated his belief that it was an injustice for the police to interfere.

The Minister for Justice: Of course, that is a definite lie.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: It is not a lie.

The Minister for Justice: It is a lie.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: The Minister has said it in this House.

The Minister for Justice: I have not.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: The Minister said it was a very great injustice for the police to stop the game of two-up on the Goldfields.

The Premier: That is not what the hon. member said a moment ago. The hon. member said it was an injustice on the part of the Minister to do so.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: How are the police going to endeavour to put into effect the law of the land if the Minister for Justice says such things?

The Premier: They are doing their job.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Yes, because of the firm attitude adopted by the Premier. I do not agree with others who say that the Premier has done nothing in the matter, and I repeat that the attitude of the Minister for Police has been admirable.

Mr. Lawrence: What has the hon. member's party done about s.p. betting?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I do not see that that has any bearing on the matter.

The Minister for Justice: It is political hypocrisy.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: It is not.

The Minister for Justice: Of course it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to stop these repeated interjections.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: At the conclusion of the Premier's answer to the question asked by the Leader of the Country Party, the Premier said, in effect, that the Minister for Justice, as well as every other Minister, agrees that no instructions should be issued to the Police Department to allow any illegal practice to operate. That certainly tells the Minister for Justice where he gets off in regard to this.

The Premier: Did not the Minister for Justice agree to the answer before it was given in the House?

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Of course he did.

The Minister for Justice: I have never disagreed with it.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Does the Minister want the police to interfere with the practices operating at Kalgoorlie?

The Minister for Justice: I want them to go out to headquarters and stop the betting that is going on out there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I again ask members to stop interjecting.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I would ask the Minister for Justice whether he desires the police to refrain from interfering—

The Minister for Native Welfare: Put your question on the notice paper!

Mr. HUTCHINSON:—with two-up in Kalgoorlie. According to the answers given in this House, not once, not twice, but three or four times, he most certainly does wish them to refrain from performing their duties in this matter, but his attitude has been modified to the extent that the Premier, and possibly other Ministers, have influenced him in this regard.

The Minister for Justice: They have not tried to use any influence.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: Well, I would say that their suggestion to him is that he should pull in his head.

The Minister for Justice: They have not suggested anything. This is political humbug!

Mr. HUTCHINSON: So I oppose the amendment on the amendment moved by the Premier on the grounds I have stated.

The Minister for Justice: I suggest we have a new Minister; the "Minister for Morals"!

MR. OLDFIELD (Maylands—on amendment on amendment) [4.38]: I do not want to deal with the section of the amendment referring to finance because I must confess that I am not well acquainted with that subject and, like the member for Guildford-Midland, I will leave that for the experts; but unfortunately I do not think we have any experts in the present Government.

Mr. May: How would the hon. member know?

Mr. OLDFIELD: In the Premier's reply to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, he kept referring to s.p. betting, but I do not know what that has to do with the question before the House. Paragraph (b) of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition reads as follows:—

That Your Excellency's Ministers apparently condone the attitude of your Minister for Justice towards the illegal game of "two-up."

There is no mention whatever of s.p. betting in that paragraph. We all agree that s.p. betting is illegal, and the Commis-

sioner of Police, the inspector of police in Kalgoorlie, or somebody, took such action as was required under the Act and suppressed the illegal game that was being carried on in Kalgoorlie—the illegal game of two-up. Mention has been made of the game in Mandurah that was being conducted during the term of the Leader of the Opposition as Premier. That goes to show that when members now on this side of the House formed the Government, the law was enforced. Two-up was being played at Mandurah, as has been stated, and the police took action at every opportunity to apprehend the offenders.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: But why Mandurah?

Mr. OLDFIELD: I understand that a two-up school was operating at Fremantle, but that it is no longer in existence because the police took action to stop it, just as they did at Kalgoorlie. If a game is illegal, its continuance should not be permitted. If Goldfields members consider there is nothing wrong in playing two-up, but that it is a fair game and should be permitted to be played, let them have the courage to introduce a Bill designed to legalise the game! Last evening when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, most of the Goldfields members indicated that they did favour the playing of the game at Kalgoorlie.

The Minister for Justice: It has been played for 60 years with no interruption.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Because an illegality has been permitted for a number of years, there is no reason why it should be allowed to continue. There are two courses open to members either to prevent any further flouting of the law or, if it is thought advisable to permit the game to be played, to introduce the necessary legislation to legalise it.

The point at issue is whether the Government intends to condone the playing of an illegal game, and I am wondering whether a member on the Government side intends during the present session to introduce a Bill to legalise the playing of the game. It has been said that two-up schools are not as harmful as is s.p. betting. All forms of betting are harmful to the workers because they lead to the losing of money that such men cannot afford. The member for South Fremantle told us that the worker could not afford to buy beer on Sunday.

Mr. Lawrence: That is a lie.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I ask for a withdrawal of that word, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will withdraw the word.

Mr. Lawrence: I withdraw, but that is not so.

Mr. OLDFIELD: During the debate on the Licensing Act Amendment Bill two years ago, the member for South Fremantle opposed the provision to permit

clubs to remain open for two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon on Sunday, and his ground was that workers coming into the town would spend their money and that, as a result of the expenditure on liquor on Sunday, wives and families would suffer. If all forms of gambling, whether legal or illegal, are harmful, an opportunity is afforded people to patronise them and lose their money—money they can ill afford to lose seeing that such loss must lower their standard of living.

The Minister for Justice: Are you in favour of horse racing?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister not to interject.

Mr. OLDFIELD: I am opposed to all forms of gambling that the law forbids. I am a law-abiding citizen and respect the law. I congratulate the Commissioner of Police on his action in taking steps to close the two-up school at Kalgoorlie. As the member for Mt. Lawley has said, it was a nest of people of ill-repute who fleeced the workers of Kalgoorlie of their hard-earned money. There were people of ill-repute, racecourse urgers and touts, living on the game without doing any work for a livelihood, their living having been provided by the men who worked underground and then lost their money at the week-end. Goldfields members are fully aware of what was going on. The workers were going to the two-up school and mixing with those people of ill-repute when they would have been better employed at home in their gardens or attending a place of worship.

I oppose the Premier's amendment on the amendment on the ground that the law prescribes that two-up is an illegal game of chance. There is no room for such a game in our community while that law remains on the statute book. If a Bill were introduced to legalise the game, I would not support it, but if Goldfields members desire that the game should be permitted and are not merely indulging in political humbug to please their electors, let them introduce a Bill with the object of legalising the game! I know the fate that would befall such a Bill in this Chamber. Five or six Goldfields members would support it, and I believe the remaining members would be honourable enough to appreciate their duty to the community and treat the Bill as it would deserve, that is, provided members on the Government side were permitted to vote on such a measure as conscience dictated. I support the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition.

HON. L. THORN (Toodyay—on amendment on amendment) [4.48]: I wish to express my approval of the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition because it was moved with a desire to bring the true position of the

finances of the State to the knowledge of the public and also to direct attention to the statements made by the Minister for Justice on the game of two-up. The Premier, I am sure, felt very uncomfortable this afternoon in opposing the amendment from this side of the House, and so he tried to divert attention by dealing with the treatment the State had received at the hands of the Commonwealth. I have no intention of touching on the subject of finance, but I propose to deal with the paragraph relating to the game of two-up. I say at the outset that this is a game of chance and that the law of the country is against the playing of any game of chance.

Mr. May: Did you not play it during the first world war?

Hon. L. THORN: At that time we were in another country and were not sure of the laws operating there, though I admit that I did witness one or two games. I agree with what has been said that two-up is not a desirable game.

Mr. Hutchinson: Will you ask the Minister for Justice to speak in reply?

Hon. L. THORN: In his own interests, he ought to reply. It is not a desirable game.

The Minister for Justice: I am not afraid of replying.

Mr. Oldfield: Will the Minister reply?

The Minister for Justice: If I so desire.

Hon. L. THORN: It is not a desirable game. And who suffers? Without a doubt, the mothers and families! With many of these men I know for a fact that gambling becomes a disease. It is the same with s.p. betting. It will often be found that the bulk of men's wages is spent in gambling and the wives and families suffer. I have heard Goldfields members and the Minister for Justice say that two-up is an amenity for the Goldfields. The way some people talk about the Goldfields one would think that the 'fields were out in the middle of the Sahara Desert and had no amenities at all!

Mr. Lawrence: How could they be out in the Sahara Desert? That is not in Australia.

Hon. L. THORN: I am only making a comparison.

Mr. Lawrence: A poor one.

Hon. L. THORN: That is the hon. member's opinion, and I do not think much of his opinion.

Mr. Lawrence: I do not think much of yours.

Hon. L. THORN: I have been to the Goldfields on more than one occasion, and I will say that Kalgoorlie and Boulder are two very fine towns, which enjoy most of the amenities of our city and have many more amenities than a lot of our country towns. I know that many people go to

live on the Goldfields for the sake of their health. To say that the Goldfields are hard done by, and that they require amenities such as gambling, is just eye-wash. To interfere with the activities of the Commissioner of Police in carrying out the laws of the land, and to indicate that the previous Minister for Police should have had some discussion with the Commissioner to prevent this great and fair game from being stopped on the Goldfields is just too bad, coming from a Minister of the Crown who has taken an oath to carry out the laws of this country.

The Minister for Housing: He has honoured that oath.

Hon. L. THORN: He has suggested that two-up should continue.

Mr. Lawrence: That is all right. He is not breaking his oath, because it has not continued.

Hon. L. THORN: It is unlawful.

Mr. Lawrence: It has not gone on. Be fair!

Hon. L. THORN: It is unlawful, but the Minister said it should continue.

The Minister for Justice: We do not blame you! We know it is all political humbug.

Hon. L. THORN: Humbug! That is very fine coming from the Minister! After all, I hope we are all here to uphold the laws of the country. It does not give me any pleasure to make an attack upon the Minister personally, but I know that if members opposite were sitting on this side of the House and we dared to make such a statement, the Minister would set out to tear us to ribbons.

The Minister for Justice: I would not.

Hon. L. THORN: Not in his personal capacity but as an ex-Minister of the Crown. The Minister would have to carry out his obligations the same as anyone else.

Mr. McCulloch: What amenities do they have on the Goldfields? Tell us some of them.

Hon. L. THORN: Yes, I will. There are the sporting bodies.

Mr. McCulloch: What sporting bodies?

Hon. L. THORN: Cricket, football, tennis and golf. Then there are hotels that provide refreshment, and picture shows.

The Minister for Justice: We have not got the Indian Ocean.

Hon. L. THORN: No, but Kalgoorlie has a jolly good swimming pool. I have been there night after night watching the young people enjoying their leisure hours in that pool.

The Minister for Justice: I have not seen them fishing or sailing on the swimming pool.

Hon. L. THORN: The talk about the Goldfields having no amenities is just bunkum. Kalgoorlie is a very fine inland town and is not without amenities.

Mr. Lawrence: Nobody suggested there were not amenities on the Goldfields but there are not as many as are to be found in the city areas.

Hon. L. THORN: There may not be, but there are amenities whereby the people can occupy their time in a useful and healthy manner. I am surprised to hear so much from the member for South Fremantle in this debate. I thought that if there was one member on that side who would uphold law and be against gambling it would be he. I was never more impressed with him than when he spoke last night on the liquor question.

Mr. Bovell: A very pious speech!

Hon. L. THORN: Yes, a good, healthy speech on the question.

Mr. Lawrence: Thank you!

Hon. L. THORN: I thought to myself, "Well, well. What a reformed man, since he has had the privilege of joining this august body in this Chamber!"

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member had better get back to the amendment.

Hon. L. THORN: I was just linking that up.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a pretty long link!

Hon. L. THORN: You will agree, Sir, that it is surprising to hear from the hon. member that he is in favour of two-up. I know that they had a school at the smelters at South Fremantle years ago, but when it became known to the police, they took action and enforced the law.

Mr. Lawrence: As a matter of fact, that is where I first met you.

Hon. L. THORN: I have moved about so much that I am not sure whether I met the hon. member there or in some other place. The remarks of the Minister for Justice surprised me and I was hoping that he would retract.

The Minister for Justice: Never shall I retract!

Hon. L. THORN: If the Minister is such a great believer in this illegal game, he should try to move his Government to introduce legislation to make it legal. If he holds that opinion, he should take some steps to bring the game within the law. I repeat what the member for Mt. Lawley has already stated, that the women of the Goldfields made representations to the Commissioner of Police on this matter.

The Minister for Justice: They have a divorce court down here, you know, and are using it.

Hon. L. THORN: The Minister does not believe in divorce, does he? We do not want that sort of thing to happen through an illegal game. We do not want to see happily married couples separated. The women of the Goldfields appealed to the Commissioner of Police. I think that every member of this House will agree that excessive gambling, both in the case of s.p. betting and that of two-up, or any excessive gambling, brings great unhappiness to homes.

The Minister for Justice: Why do you not mention the racecourse?

Hon. L. THORN: The racecourse is responsible for unhappiness. Do not make any mistake about that.

The Minister for Justice: Nothing has been done about it.

Hon. L. THORN: The Minister has an opportunity to do something. His party is in office and if it does not believe in the racecourse, now there is an opportunity to do something about it.

The Minister for Justice: You have never raised your voice against it before.

Hon. L. THORN: It is the Minister who is raising his voice now. All forms of gambling bring great unhappiness into homes, and the women of the Goldfields were fully justified in making representations to the Commissioner of Police. I congratulate him for standing up to his responsibilities and taking the action he did.

The Minister for Housing: That will make him happy, I bet!

Hon. L. THORN: I hope the amendment on the amendment will be defeated and that the amendment to the Address-in-reply will be agreed to.

MR. PERKINS (Roe—on amendment on amendment) [4.59]: I am one of those who think that the amendment would be better in the form presented by the Leader of the Opposition rather than if it were mutilated along the lines suggested by the Premier. At the moment he wants only to strike out certain words, but judging from what he had to say in speaking to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, one can easily imagine the further arguments he may try to adduce in support of other words he desires to insert in lieu of those he wants struck out.

This is a subject which has already been discussed in the House by a number of members, including myself. I think it is a convenient side-alley along which the Premier can divert members if they can be persuaded to go along it. Actually the Premier must take, fairly and squarely, the responsibility for the finances of the State as they are at present. I do not deny that he is entitled to blame the previous Government for any difficulties which

he thinks might be properly attributable to it, but so far he has not, in my opinion, made out a case to support the contention contained in his reply to the Leader of the Opposition.

We know perfectly well the overall set-up between the Commonwealth and the States. The system of uniform taxation has been in force since the war years when it was introduced to meet the great emergency which faced the whole of Australia, as well as the rest of the British Commonwealth, and while at present Western Australia seems to be gaining some advantage from uniform taxation, that does not alter the fact that the machinery is still in existence to meet the difficulties that might arise from the return of taxing rights to what are known as the non-claimant States.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will not proceed with that line of thought on the amendment. The amendment is to delete certain words and all the hon. member can do is to give reasons why they should or should not be deleted. He will have an opportunity later, on the motion for the insertion of certain words, to debate them.

MR. PERKINS: If these words are deleted, the amendment will not make sense unless some others are inserted, because the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply will then end with the word "regrets," and we would not want to send a motion in that form to His Excellency.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot anticipate what may be done.

MR. PERKINS: The Premier, in his speech, certainly foreshadowed what he intended to do, and I take it that members are entitled to criticise what has been said in the course of the debate, and that is what I am trying to do.

MR. SPEAKER: I will have to rule that the hon. member cannot pursue that course. He must deal with the amendment in the same way as the previous speakers have.

MR. PERKINS: If I am only to use the same words as have been used by previous speakers I will be contravening the Standing Order which deals with tedious repetition.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot help that.

MR. PERKINS: This particular question which the Leader of the Opposition has raised and which the Premier has replied to, deals with the overall financial position of the State. Its ramifications are very wide indeed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member please resume his seat? The amendment we are discussing deals with one particular factor concerning loan

money. I cannot allow the hon. member to pursue his present vein of thought. If he wishes to do so, he will have to disagree with my ruling.

Mr. PERKINS: I will deal with it along the line of loan funds.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I think the amendment deals not with loan funds so much as—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to disagree with my ruling?

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: No, but the question before the Chair does not refer to loan funds.

The Premier: We are not debating them.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the words proposed to be deleted, be deleted. The insertion of any other words has not yet been moved, so that the only course we can pursue is to give reasons why these words should or should not be deleted. The previous speakers have dealt with the motion on that basis, and I cannot allow other members to pursue any other line of thought.

Mr. PERKINS: The ruling which you, Sir, have given, and which I have to accept, does limit one's scope in dealing with the question, but in deference to you I shall try to deal with the matter along the line of loan funds, although it is very difficult in that the division between the use of loan funds and revenue is very artificial.

The Premier: There is nothing artificial about it. It is a very real division.

Mr. PERKINS: The difficulties which face a Government by reason of its revenue position do, in turn, affect its policy on the question of loan expenditure. It is useless for members of the Government to allege that the limitation of loan funds is not affecting the Administration, and the facilities which can be provided. I have heard the Deputy Premier say to members on this side of the House that it is utter nonsense to say that that is the position.

The Minister for Education: When did I say that?

Mr. PERKINS: The Deputy Premier said that to one member on this side who was referring to some educational facilities.

The Minister for Education: He was dealing with an entirely different matter from what you are.

Mr. PERKINS: It is not material.

The Minister for Education: It is very material. You are right off the beam.

Mr. PERKINS: I shall give a concrete instance that I know something about. There have been many deputations to the

Minister for Health asking for assistance in the provision of public health clinics. The Minister's reply to the deputations that I have been associated with has been that the Government will help, provided the finances available will permit it to do so. Up to the present time the Minister for Health has not given, to a number of the centres which desire to build these clinics, any definite indication of what money is available. He has told them that up to 60 per cent. is available. I understand that a couple of five-percenters—which significantly are represented by members sitting on the other side of the House—have been told that they are going to get 60 per cent.

The Minister for Justice: That is not true.

Mr. PERKINS: I am sorry if I have made a mistake. It is only hearsay. I hope the Minister will make the point clear. I take it that no one has been promised any funds up to date.

Mr. Bovell: Did not the member for Leederville make a statement about the 60 per cent.?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member please resume his seat? I cannot allow a general discussion on loan funds on this particular motion. There is a particular issue involved in the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. It refers to an incorrect public statement being made about a certain definite sum of loan money and those are the words that the Premier wants deleted, and so if members wish to give reasons why that should or should not be done, they must confine themselves to that amendment.

Mr. PERKINS: I will try to keep within those limits.

Mr. SPEAKER: As other speakers have done so, the hon. member should not have any difficulty.

Mr. PERKINS: I desire to discuss different things.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot do so on this motion.

Mr. PERKINS: I desire to do so and you, Sir, do not desire me to and so we disagree, but I bow to your ruling. Until the Government makes its position clear with regard to the amount of loan funds it has available, none of the bodies which approach it from time to time for assistance in carrying out certain works—I instanced infant health clinics in particular and would point out that there are a number of applications before the Government from bodies that have their portion of the money in hand and have contractors ready to proceed—will be able to do anything further, as the whole question hinges on the total of the loan funds that are available.

If there is more than £1,000,000 available to the Government, over and above the sum announced as the maximum, surely that will make a considerable difference to the likelihood of money being made available for the purposes I have mentioned, and that is why I am so interested in getting a definite statement from the Premier and Treasurer or from one of his Ministers as to the actual amount of loan funds available to this State. The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition sets out clearly from documentary evidence, what the position is. We, on this side of the House, are particularly interested in finding out why the Premier and Treasurer has some other ideas as to the amount of loan money at his disposal.

Unfortunately he does not seem to be prepared to face up to the question posed by the Leader of the Opposition and is attempting to side-track attention to some difficulties with the Commonwealth Government. Perhaps we can debate that matter on some other occasion and when we are dealing with the Estimates or another Supply Bill, I will be interested to pursue the line of argument which you, Sir, have prevented me from following on this occasion. The important thing is to discover just what loan money is available to the Government and if that can be done, the people we represent will know what requests can be put to the Government for the provision of facilities in various parts of the State, with some prospect of their being acceded to.

Having gained the knowledge I seek, members will then be able to criticise the Government on the floor of the House, but until we have that information, members must find difficulty in assessing what the Government can or cannot do in regard to the various vital developmental projects which each of us can list as being essential to his own electorate as well as to the overall progress of the State.

MR. HEARMAN (Blackwood — on amendment on amendment) [5.15]: I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that you have drawn attention to the fact that there has been considerable digression during this debate, and I believe it would facilitate the business of the House if members would stick to the subject matter before the Chair. I would draw your attention, Sir, to the fact that the Premier, in speaking to the amendment, made what was in fact an Address-in-reply speech. Certain diversities were introduced then which, to my mind, were completely irrelevant, and I am afraid the debate has degenerated to some extent on that account. However, it is well that the House should be brought back to the point at issue between the Opposition and the Government.

As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, a number of the Press statements which emanated from various Ministers shortly after

their attainment of office were of a distinctly propagandist nature. I must add that since the Premier's return from Great Britain the tone of the statements emanating from Ministers has been more factual and has contained less propaganda, although at one stage, during his absence, there was, I repeat, a considerable amount of propaganda injected into ministerial statements, including some on finance.

It seems to me that, as the result of questions by various members of the Opposition, the position, as outlined in some of those earlier Press statements, would appear to show a discrepancy, when compared with the answers given on the floor of this House recently and in more recent Press statements. The discrepancy is in the nature of £1,403,000. The point that interests me—I think the Minister for Works will appreciate this because I have recently introduced deputations to him and have been told that no decision could be made until the Government knew what money would be available—is just what money the Government will have to meet its commitments, and I would like to see the matter clarified as it is high time that that was done.

I have told some of my constituents that I cannot say what the Government will do as I believe its finance is restricted, but now it would appear, from the answers given to questions, that there is a discrepancy and the amendment with which we are dealing seeks to have the position made clear to the public. That is only right and reasonable because if more money is available than was indicated by previous statements, the public should be told of it. If, as the result of questions by members of the Opposition, a fictitious case has been presented, it is necessary that the public should be told of it. Confusion is simply worse confounded if the public do not know which side is telling the truth.

As I have said, there has been a considerable amount of propaganda injected into ministerial statements and propaganda statements have emanated from various State Premiers in connection with loan moneys. It seems regrettable that the matter of the allocation of loan moneys should have been brought down to the level of party politics. It seems obvious to me that that is what has happened, although I must say that some of the earlier statements which emanated from Ministers were quite clever propaganda, and I must congratulate them. I have a considerable admiration for the Premier's adroitness on the floor of the House, but on this occasion I think he has run below form. Striking out the words he has suggested and substituting others in their place, is purely propaganda, and I must object to the further amendment. The original amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition sought to inform the

public of the true situation, and the public are entitled to it. Surely there can be no quarrel with that suggestion.

The Premier: Do you not accept the statement I made on behalf of the officers of the Treasury?

Mr. HEARMAN: I am afraid it does not clear up the matter. I want to see it further clarified, and I see no reason why it should not be. What is the Premier's objection to allowing the original amendment to stand? I have often enjoyed the Premier's capacity for repartee across the Chamber, but this afternoon he seemed to be tricked by his own magic in his desire to demonstrate his repartee. His speech consisted largely of irrelevancies, and when one replies to such a speech it is difficult to deal with those irrelevancies in view of the Speaker's ruling. Some of these irrelevancies were the merits of two-up versus s.p. betting, whether s.p. betting should be allowed and so on. But that is not the point at issue at all.

S.p. betting was not mentioned in the amendment; it does not even mention the merits of the game of two-up. What the Opposition wishes to bring out—and I think you, Mr. Speaker, would agree with me—is the attitude of the Minister for Justice towards an infringement of the law. It is not a question of what infringement or what law; the fact is that the Minister for Justice has suggested—and I think the general public must obviously think that the Minister for Justice believes this—that if a certain law has been broken for a considerable number of years in any district regardless of what the law in the matter may be, the public should be allowed to continue to break it.

That is a serious matter. Imagine a Minister for Justice, of all Ministers, suggesting that because a law has been consistently broken for a long time, any Government or Commissioner of Police who endeavoured to enforce the law was doing wrong. I would say that any Government which prevented, or attempted to prevent, the Commissioner of Police from enforcing the law as it exists on the statute book, would be guilty of a very grave miscarriage of its responsibilities and oath of office. Perhaps the Minister for Justice was a little unfortunate in the way he expressed himself, but nevertheless he did use the words, and the impression has been gained—as can be seen by the number of cartoons in the newspapers—that the laws should be allowed to be broken in a certain direction in certain areas.

That seems completely inconsistent with the statement the Premier subsequently made in reply to a question asked by the member for Stirling. The Premier suggested that all Ministers would uphold the law, and he repeated the same thing this afternoon. I agree with the Premier, and even though we have a Minister for Justice who is so far unable to realise his responsi-

bilities as a Minister as to make statements of the nature he did, it is a good thing that we have a Premier who has been forthright in saying that the law will be upheld.

The Minister for Justice: That is an unfair statement.

Mr. HEARMAN: So long as it complies with the Minister's ruling, it must stand.

The Minister for Justice: It does not comply with my ruling.

Mr. HEARMAN: During the Premier's speech, I asked him if he intended to ensure that the Industrial Arbitration Act would be upheld, and I think, although there was something in the nature of a hubub at the time, the Premier said it would be.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: It wants altering.

Mr. HEARMAN: That is a classic example. The member for Fremantle has come in very nicely and said the law regarding the Industrial Arbitration Act should be altered.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: That will be known as "the McLarty Blot."

Mr. HEARMAN: There is no suggestion that the law should be altered in connection with the matter in which the Minister for Two-up—I suppose we might even call him that—was concerned. There is no suggestion that the law should be altered in connection with two-up to comply with the ideas of the Minister for Justice. That is a classic example of political inconsistency.

The Minister for Justice: Can you tell me of any action that has been taken on racecourses?

Mr. HEARMAN: I am not concerned with s.p. betting or betting on the racecourse; I am concerned with the question of upholding the law. If members believe that the law should be altered, and apparently a number of members on the other side believe that the Industrial Arbitration Act should be amended, I suggest that they can, with perfectly clear consciences, bring down an amendment. But if they believe that the gaming laws should be altered then, with equally clear consciences, they can bring in an amendment. However, the Minister for Justice cannot have it both ways. He cannot say it is right that the gaming laws should be broken but that it is wrong for any other law to be breached.

The Minister for Justice: Can you give me one instance of where I have broken the law?

Mr. HEARMAN: I am not concerned whether the Minister for Justice has broken the law or not. I think a man would be most unwise if he suggested that he had never broken the law.

The Minister for Justice: I merely asked for an instance.

Mr. HEARMAN: The Minister for Justice may be a paragon of virtue; I do not know.

The Minister for Justice: I am not; I have played two-up.

Mr. HEARMAN: That is beside the point. I think it has been a matter of policy throughout this debate, and the Premier started it by drawing many red herrings across the trail. He discussed the question of two-up playing at Mandurah. What has two-up playing at Mandurah, s.p. betting or betting on race-courses, or the discussion we had across the Chamber between the member for South Fremantle and the member for Toodyay, to do with the question of whether the Minister for Justice believes in upholding the law?

The Minister for Justice: I do.

Mr. HEARMAN: The Minister's public utterances on the floor of the Chamber do not seem to indicate that he would assist those whose duty it is to enforce the law.

The Minister for Justice: I believe in consistency.

Mr. HEARMAN: There is an obvious element of doubt in the public mind, and I have already referred to newspaper articles and cartoons on this subject. However, I think every member of this Chamber is aware of those newspaper articles and cartoons. It would seem to me that I am justified in saying that there is an element of doubt in the public mind as to where they stand on this question of infringement of the law and with respect to the attitude adopted by the Minister for Justice.

The Minister for Justice: Political propaganda!

Mr. HEARMAN: The amendment by the Leader of the Opposition seeks to clarify that position. I suggest that as it stands it will do far more good for the people of Western Australia and the upholding of the prestige of this Chamber and this Parliament than would the striking out of all the words in the amendment, as suggested by the Premier, for the insertion of what is obviously a party political amendment of the worst kind and which I suggest is degrading to the standing of this House. It is not even good propaganda because it is too obvious. The best propaganda is subtle propaganda.

The Minister for Native Welfare: That is what the hon. member is trying to indulge in—subtle propaganda.

Mr. HEARMAN: I am doing better than the Premier because his propaganda could not be termed subtle by any stretch of the imagination, and if the Minister is suggesting that I am more subtle than the Premier I thank him for the compliment. I suggest to the members of this House that they should uphold the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Amendment on amendment (to strike out words) put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	22
Noes	20

Majority for 2

Ayes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. McGuiloch
Mr. Graham	Mr. Norton
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Heal	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Styant
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lapham	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. North
Mr. Court	Mr. Orfield
Mr. Doney	Mr. Owen
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hill	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Yates
Mr. Manning	Mr. Bovell

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Moly	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Mann
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Cornell

Amendment on amendment thus passed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [5.36]: I now move—

That, in lieu of the words struck out, the following words be inserted:—

“the action of the Leader of the Opposition and some of his Liberal Party followers in this House in supporting the Commonwealth Government's recent decision to make, by way of taxation reimbursement and supplementary grant, a total payment to Western Australia this year which, on the basis of equivalent money values, will be less than the total amount received last year, that decision having created serious financial problems in Western Australia in relation to many of the State's vital activities.”

When speaking previously, I indicated the reasons for moving this amendment and quoted supporting figures. All I want to say at this stage is that the support of the Commonwealth Government's decision by the Leader of the Opposition and two or three other members of his party is a “lining up” by them against Western Australia.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the Premier to speak at length as his amendment has already been moved.

The PREMIER: I do not desire to speak on this at length, Mr. Speaker, and, in fact, I did not wish to speak at all. I do not intend to indulge in reiteration.

HON. SIR ROSS McLARTY (Murray—on amendment on amendment) [5.38]: I oppose this most extraordinary amendment.

The Minister for Housing: Why?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier is certainly making an attempt to draw a red herring across the trail.

The Minister for Housing: What the heck was yours?

[*The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.*]

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It is also extraordinary by virtue of the fact that it is an attack on another Government. I said previously, and I repeat, that this is nothing more than electioneering tactics. The Premier can laugh, but I knew—and I warned the people—that this would take place. From now until the Commonwealth elections, we shall hear repeated attacks of this nature, namely, the Premier telling the people that he is unable to fulfil the many promises that he has made because the Commonwealth Government will not give him the necessary money.

The Minister for Housing: Aided and abetted by the hon. member.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I would suggest that the Minister keep quiet. I will pay the Premier this tribute; I think he is able to do without the Minister's assistance at this stage. In fact, such assistance must be embarrassing to him.

The Minister for Housing: It is a pain in the neck to listen to you.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I refuse to be drawn aside by pains in the neck. Recently the Premier attended a Premiers' Conference and tonight he told us of his failure there. He told us the percentage increase that was obtained when I attended a Premiers' Conference and emphasised how little he had received both on a percentage basis and in the sum of money he had obtained.

The Premier: The Leader of the Opposition supported the Commonwealth's decision in the matter.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: When he went to the conference and a majority of the Premiers decided upon a certain sum, he knew perfectly well that the proposition put to the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer was not a practical one.

The Premier: Will the Leader of the Opposition agree—

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No, let me go on. He knew perfectly well that it was not a practical proposition for the Commonwealth. I emphasise the point that the hon. gentleman is receiving more money today by way of income tax reimbursement than I or any previous Government ever received. By his amendment, however, he tries to cover up the position by talking about equivalent money values. What has he received?

The Minister for Native Welfare: He told you.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It is well that the public should know the figures, which I have been reckoning up. Last year, when my Government was in office, we received £10,854,554. Under the formula, we were entitled to £8,744,329, so the additional assistance we got from the Commonwealth was £2,110,000.

The Premier: For which year?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The year 1952-53. Now let us consider this year, which is the one with which the Premier is concerned.

The Premier: The figure you have just given is not correct.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: These are the Premier's own figures, supplied by the Treasury.

The Premier: No, they are not. You have got them mixed up.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Nothing of the sort! In 1952-53 the income tax reimbursement amounted to £10,854,554.

The Premier: I mean the increase you mentioned.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I said that under the formula last year, we were entitled to receive £8,744,329. Therefore the additional assistance granted to us was £2,110,000 above the formula.

The Premier: For which year?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: For the year 1952-53.

The Premier: But for which other year?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Now I shall come to this year and deal with the Premier's position. He has told us that this year he will receive an additional £338,000, which means a total of £11,192,000 odd. Under the formula for 1953-54, he would have received £9,574,000. This means that he has got an extra £1,618,554 above the formula. Yet he complains about the so-called niggardly treatment of the Commonwealth. Let members and the people bear in mind that the Commonwealth today is facing tremendous responsibilities.

The Minister for Housing: And an election.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier knows that and hence his amendment.

Mr. May: The Commonwealth is collecting a lot of money, too.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, but are not the demands on the Commonwealth increasing at a tremendous rate? Even in tonight's paper, we find a heading, "Wave of Sympathy for Pensioners." I knew there would be a wave of sympathy for them; I understand that some provision is being made in the Budget to help pensioners to enjoy a better standard of

living, but it is going to cost some millions, and there are many other demands on the Commonwealth.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are so many conversations going on in the Chamber that I can scarcely hear what the Leader of the Opposition is saying.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The many other demands will mean that the Commonwealth Government will have to find millions more of money.

Mr. McCulloch: That is why they gave away the two million pounds to build up Korea.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier should indicate in which direction the Commonwealth, of which he complains so bitterly, should raise more money so that larger sums may be made available to the States.

The Premier: The Commonwealth had a revenue surplus last year of £100 million.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: And the Premier is aware that that is diminishing and is being spent at a fast rate. I can quite understand the Premier's position. When electioneering, he made lavish promises and he has to get money to fulfil them. It might be a popular move to go around the country blaming the Commonwealth Government and saying that this miserable and niggardly Commonwealth will not give the State money in order to enable him to carry out all the promises he made to the electors.

The Premier: Do you agree with the Commonwealth's decision?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I consider that the Commonwealth Government has treated the States generously, taking into consideration all the factors.

The Premier: This year?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, this year. Let me repeat that the Premier has received more money this year than any other Premier ever had, and he has forgotten to tell us something else. I could give him a reference to the report of the Grants Commission for 1952 and also to the special grants that have been made available to the States including Western Australia. When he goes out criticising the Commonwealth Government, particularly the present one, for its niggardly treatment of the State, as he described it, he should give the whole of the facts. Consider the Commonwealth expenditure generally.

During the time the present Federal Government has been in office—the one that the Premier is so anxious to get at—the expenditure on social services in the States has increased from £73,000,000 to £136,000,000 and expenses from £37,000,000 to £66,000,000. The Premier should certainly tell us something about that. The Deputy Premier referred to another matter, and I agree with him, namely, the

unsatisfactory setup as between the Commonwealth and the States. What happens under present conditions? The Commonwealth bears all the odium of imposing and collecting income taxation and the States spend it. Of course, the more irresponsible State Governments are, the greater are the demands that will be made upon the Commonwealth.

I have been to Premiers' Conferences, and I say that there has been some irresponsibility on the part of the States; and what is required today, apart from a convention to overhaul Commonwealth-State financial relations and Commonwealth-State overlapping generally—is that there should be on the part of the States and those who represent them, a more responsible attitude with regard to the demands made upon the Commonwealth.

The Premier: The hon. member's Government built up expenditure tremendously during its six years of office.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I know that we had increasing expenditure during the six years my Government was in power.

The Premier: My word!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: But I know this, too: When I attended the Premier's Conference, I did have a sense of responsibility and did not join the band-waggon when I thought excessive demands were being made upon the Commonwealth.

The Premier: There is no band-waggon.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I have here a rather interesting cutting from the "Daily News" of the 10th August, headed "Hawke Puts a Rail Poser to Menzies." I do not propose to quote the whole of the article; members can read it for themselves if they wish. It says, in part—

South Australian Premier Playford—the only Liberal Premier at the conference—made it clear he did not support the State's overall demand for £165,000,000 reimbursement. The other Premiers sat silent and expressionless—

The Premier: Drivel!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: There was the Premier amongst those others who were silent and expressionless!

The Premier: Absolute drivel!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No drivel about it! The other Premiers sat silent and expressionless.

The Premier: Just drivel!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The article says—

The other Premiers sat silent and expressionless as Mr. Playford said he thought the States should get only £17,000,000 more than last year—a total of £153,000,000.

Of course they sat silent and expressionless! They knew that demands were being made upon the Commonwealth that could not be carried out.

The Premier: Of course they could!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: When I was speaking last night, I told the House of some of the promises of the Premier as to what he would do—how he would not increase railway freights unless certain things were done first, things which would take a very considerable time under the best of circumstances to carry out; how he would not increase water rates unless a committee first investigated them; how he would bring water charges down in the country, or, to use his own words, more in conformity with rates charged in the metropolitan area; how he would give free school books; and all the rest of the things he was going to give. Of course he has a difficulty, a very real difficulty. He has to get money to do all that, and it is very convenient indeed for him to be able to say, "This Commonwealth Government will not give me the money," knowing full well—

The Minister for Lands: It is perfectly true.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: —the responsibilities the Commonwealth has. When the Premier attacks the Commonwealth, I hope he will tell people of the amount of money paid to us by way of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. Here a very interesting story can be told. I notice that in 1947-48 we received £2,977,000. Then in successive years we received £3,600,000, £5,618,000, £5,839,000 £5,000,088, and last year, over £8,000,000. All this came from a Government which the Premier now tries to make the people of this country believe is treating him unfairly and not giving him a reasonable go.

The Premier: How does the hon. member justify a drop in the rate of increase from 15.47 per cent. last year to 4.08 per cent. this year?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I justify it because of the financial position of the Commonwealth Government. The Premier can use this against me if he wishes: I assert that the extravagant demands of some of the States have been such that the Commonwealth has adopted the right attitude in saying that it will not provide all the money asked for.

Hon. A. F. Watts: It was that or, "take back your own income taxation."

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes.

The Minister for Native Welfare: You do not want it back, do you?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No, and I said so.

The Minister for Native Welfare: You did want it back a little while ago.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not want it unless I know what fields of taxation are available to us, and unless I can be certain that the Grants Commission will continue to function. I agree that there is necessity for a convention—an

urgent necessity—to consider the Commonwealth-State financial relations and overlapping as well.

The Premier: Does the Leader of the Opposition claim that the total amount that his Government received from the Commonwealth last year by way of income tax reimbursement and supplementary grants was fair and reasonable?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I would have liked more, but, taking all the facts into consideration, I think we are treated fairly generously by the Commonwealth. That is the answer the Premier wants.

The Premier: Yes, it is.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I would request the people to ask themselves this question. If the Premier and his colleagues are going to obtain from the Commonwealth the demands they make, by what means does the Premier propose the Commonwealth should obtain the additional taxation? There is no question that if the demands were acceded to, the people of this State, in conjunction with those of the whole Commonwealth, would have to bear very much more heavy taxes and charges.

The Premier: That is not so.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It is so.

The Premier: No, it is not.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Where does the hon. gentleman think he can get all this extra money from? If he wants to spend additional money from revenue, it must be provided from somewhere.

Mr. Bovell: Mr. Ward will print it.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: There is that danger. I am glad the hon. member mentioned that point. If the Premier's demands are met by some future Government, the printing-press will be used, and he will soon find himself in a very sorry plight indeed.

The Minister for Lands: Ha, ha!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am surprised that the Minister for Lands does not agree. I thought he had fairly sound views.

The Minister for Lands: I have been waiting for some from you, but cannot get them.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: This amendment is one that should never have been moved.

The Premier: It is like the previous one.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Apart from the party political aspect, and that is its chief objective—the Premier cannot deny that—

The Premier: I do!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am amazed at the Premier! Why, anybody can see through this.

The Premier: No, they cannot.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It is purely party political propaganda to slay the Commonwealth Government.

The Premier: No, it is putting the Leader of the Opposition on the spot for having sided with the Commonwealth against Western Australia.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am not siding against Western Australia.

The Premier: You are! My word, you are!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am not afraid to tell of what happened to Western Australia when we were in office, and our relations with the Commonwealth Government. It was the most progressive period, or one of the most progressive periods, in the history of this State. I am not likely, nor are any of my colleagues, to do anything wilfully to damage the prospects of Western Australia.

The Premier: That is what you are doing.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY. I am doing nothing of the sort.

The Minister for Lands: Turning Western Australia down—that is what you are doing.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We want to have a reasonable attitude between the State and the Commonwealth. I do not want to make political propaganda out of it when the Commonwealth says I cannot have something. I do not want to do that. We should deal with the Commonwealth on a businesslike basis and not indulge in this miserable political propaganda, when the Federal authorities cannot give something to us; and it is indulged in only because the Government is unable to carry out the many and lavish promises which it made. So I would even suggest that some of the moderate or right-wing members on the Government side should come over and vote with us when the amendment which the Premier has moved is put, because there is no doubt in my mind, or in that of any other member, that this is purely political propaganda aimed at the Commonwealth Government because of the realisation that there will be an election in 12 months' time. I strongly oppose the amendment and hope it will be defeated.

Mr. COURT: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

Mr. COURT (Nedlands—on amendment) [6.11]: I oppose the insertion of the proposed words. The Premier, in his previous speech, mentioned the Leader of the Opposition and me amongst others as having condoned the action of the Commonwealth Government, and spoke of his attitude towards Western Australia, in particular, in respect of its financial policy. I feel that in my previous utterance in the House I made an objective approach

to the overall problem of Commonwealth-State financial relationship without any particular reference to Western Australia. It was my desire to keep my remarks at that time on an objective and overall basis. I much regret that the Premier has seen fit to infer that some members on this side of the House are acting against the interests of Western Australia.

If he includes me, I take strong exception because I feel that at all times I personally have done my best, and I will continue to do so, in the interests of Western Australia. I suggest to the Premier that if he studies my previous remarks he will observe that I referred to the overall economic position of Australia and I said that we, in this State, must address ourselves to that particular problem and not take a purely parochial view of it, because we are closely associated with the overall economy of the Commonwealth. It cannot be denied that there is a clamour for tax reduction, and apart from this clamour, there is an economic necessity for it so as to give the industry and commerce of the country the necessary incentive to do better and better for the stability and prosperity of Australia.

Mr. Johnson: That is rot.

Mr. COURT: I invite the attention of the hon. member who made that comment to the fact that the members of the Commonwealth Opposition have been most outspoken in their demands for a reduction of the taxation burden, and I agree that those demands are warranted. It is time the taxation burden on the people of Australia was reduced.

Mr. Johnson: That is not what you said the first time.

Mr. COURT: So we have the proposition that there is only so much income that can be provided by the people of any nation—on this occasion it is Australia—and from that income only so much can be dispersed if the stability and solvency of the country is to be preserved. I do not suggest that in the original approach which the Premier made to the Commonwealth Government for assistance and allocation of funds he was anything but objective and well-balanced. I am pleased he has tabled the whole of his utterances as I shall certainly study them.

What I take exception to is the fact that subsequent to the Premiers' conferences there has been a lot of publicity and comment from many States—I am not singling out Western Australia in particular—in respect of the Commonwealth Government's attitude, and the use of extravagant language including such words as "miserable" and "niggardly" as well as others. I cannot see how the Commonwealth Government could grant to Western Australia, or to any other State, more money than it has without resorting to unorthodox and undesirable methods of finance.

The Minister for Housing: What about the Budget surplus? Could it not have made use of that?

[The Speaker Resumed the Chair.]

Mr. COURT: I repeat that, in my opinion, the Commonwealth Government could not make any more moneys available than it has if it wants to preserve the stability of the Australian economy. There is only so much money available, and I feel it has done the best it possibly can with it on the assumption, of course—we do not know what the Budget contains—that it will be making some reduction of taxation to give the necessary incentive. I feel that the Premier would do well to make a clear and concise statement on the financial situation that has arisen. I view the position as a very young member of this Parliament, and I have yet to be initiated fully into the methods of Government finance.

My approach at the present time, therefore, is virtually that of a member of the public, and I have to glean my information from the public statements that have been made. I strongly urge the Premier to make a statement to the public in the near future setting out clearly what loan funds have been made available so that the doubt in the minds of the people may be cleared up and the present uncertainty removed. If no such statement is made, it might well be assumed that the Government desires to use the problems of the present financial relationship between Commonwealth and States for some political purpose. My impression at the moment, gained largely from the public statements that have been made, is that there exists a shortage of funds and that the suggestion has been advanced in order to infer that there is a prospect of reduced employment.

The inference has been that the shortage will retard the development of Western Australia and it has been responsible for a feeling of uncertainty that is dangerous as far as the public are concerned because they look to the Government of the day for a clear-cut statement of its financial policy and problems. I cannot quarrel with the efforts of the Premier to gain more money for this State, as I am all for the rapid development of Western Australia, but the time must come when we, the people of this State, must ask, "Is this good for Australia?" That has been my approach to the problem. I have at no time meant to convey that I desire to do anything to injure Western Australia, and in defending the present financial policy of the Commonwealth, I say it is one that is in the best interests of Australia and that what is good for Australia as a whole must be good for Western Australia.

MR. HEARMAN (Blackwood—on amendment on amendment) [6.10]: I mentioned earlier that I did not think the Premier was doing his best this

evening. He entered into a discussion on the subject of logic with the member for Mt. Lawley, but I feel that the Premier's logic with regard to this question is a little faulty. We have had for some time the spectacle of the Acting Leader of the Federal Opposition, Mr. Calwell, clamouring loudly for a reduction of taxation and, on the other hand, the Labour State Premiers clamouring for a further hand-out from the Federal Government. The Commonwealth has already given the States all the loan funds and is financing its works from revenue, but the suggestion now is that the Commonwealth should give the States still more money. In other words, the States want some of the revenue also.

As I have said, Mr. Calwell suggests that taxation should be reduced and if that is done it is hard to see how Commonwealth hand-outs can be increased. I feel that the principle adopted in Russia, that one's opponents should be assassinated, has been adopted in the case of this amendment. Because we, on this side of the House, do not agree with the Premier, he seeks to imply that we are not good Western Australians. I have a greater respect for the sense of fair play and justice of the people of this State than to believe that propaganda of that nature will go down with them.

Amendment on amendment (to insert words) put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	22
Noes	19
Majority for			3

Ayes.

Mr. Andrew	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Brady	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Graham	Mr. Norton
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Heal	Mr. O'Brien
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Styants
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Lapham	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. Owen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hill	Mr. Yates
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Manning	

(Teller.)

Pair.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Moir	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Mann
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Cornell

Amendment on amendment thus passed.

Amendment, as amended, put and passed.

On motion by the Minister for Education, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.17 p.m.