

of computing scales a fee of 5s. is proposed for verification. Previously the charge was 2s. 6d. Such scales are owned by small shopkeepers, and I hope that the rate previously decided upon will be retained. Certainly there is no justification for the doubling of the rate.

The Minister for Lands: We used to buy a weekly paper for 1d. in 1914, but we have to pay 3d. for it now.

The Premier: And advertising rates have gone up correspondingly.

Mr. SAMPSON: The "Western Weekly Times" in Cornwall could not be bought for a penny.

The Premier: But we used to get the "Farmer" for a penny.

Mr. SAMPSON: No. The rate for testing fixed measuring instruments is set down at £1, which seems to me a very high charge. Leather measuring machines are scheduled at the same rate.

The Premier: I would remind the hon. member that these are subject matters for Committee, and not for second reading.

Mr. SAMPSON: Very good, Sir. Since I am advised that a few minutes suffice for making a check, it appears to me that a charge of £1 is excessive. I hope members will give these matters attention in Committee, and reduce the charges to what is reasonable and proper in the circumstances.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 11.56 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Friday, 11th December, 1925.

	Page
Questions: Sessional arrangements	2625
Parliamentary Allowances Act Amendment Bill	2625
Standing Orders, Suspension	2626
Bills: Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act Amendment, Recom., Report 3s.	2628
Loan, £4,000,000, 2s.	2630
General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment, 2s., Com. 3s.	2630
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, Com. Report, 3s.	2635
Main Roads, Com.	2637
Parliamentary Allowances Act Amendment, 2s., Com. Report 3s., passed	2639
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, Recom., Report 3s.	2650
Motion: Police Force, Pension Allowance	2653

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

QUESTION—SITTINGS AFTER CHRISTMAS.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (without notice) asked the Chief Secretary: In view of the large number of Bills that have reached this House from the Legislative Assembly, and the prospect of further Bills being received from that House, will the Government make arrangements for Parliament to continue its sittings after Christmas so that due consideration may be given to the various measures brought forward?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: I intend to make a statement that will cover the question.

QUESTION — PARLIAMENTARY ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (without notice) asked the Chief Secretary: In the event of the Standing Orders being suspended to-day, does the Minister propose to finalise the Parliamentary Allowances Act Amendment Bill during to-day's sitting?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: I cannot bind myself in regard to any particular Bill. I will exercise my discretion. If the Bill is amended to any extent I will not attempt to put it through. It may require revision before being finally disposed of.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.*Close of Session.*

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [3.5]: I move—

That during the current month of December so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable Bills to be passed through all stages in one sitting, and messages from the Legislative Assembly to be dealt with forthwith on their receipt.

We are in the last days of the session. When I asked the House a short time ago to commence sitting at 3 p.m., I stated it was the desire of the Government to close the session on the 18th December. I consulted the Premier this morning, and he informed me that after next Tuesday's sitting there would be a practically clean Notice Paper in the Legislative Assembly. He had some anxiety, however, as to what progress we could make in this Chamber, and I was able to assure him that I had been approached last night by several members who offered to sit from 11 a.m. each day if necessary, to assist the Government in the despatch of business. I went into the matter further with the Premier, and I am now satisfied that we shall, without much difficulty, be able to close down early on Friday night.

Members: Hear, hear!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am sure it can be done with the co-operation of hon. members. When I was approached last night I pointed out the difficulties regarding my own position and referred to the disadvantage I would be placed at in my endeavour to get a grasp of the various Bills.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We will help you.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I received the assurance of those hon. members that they would overlook any shortcomings in that regard, and would extend every assistance to me. Thus I was able to approach the Premier with the assurance that there was every prospect of this Chamber being able to complete the business of the session by Friday night. I therefore propose to ask the House to meet at 11 a.m. each day next week, commencing on Wednesday. The suspension of the Standing Orders is necessary in order to facilitate the business.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [3.9]: I asked the Chief Secretary a question without notice, and if I had received a satisfactory reply, I would not offer any objection

to the suspension of the Standing Orders. No one knows better than the Leader of the House that throughout the session I have endeavoured to assist him in the conduct of the business of the House. Time after time, when the Minister sat down, I have spoken on the second reading without waiting for the adjournment of the debate. I have done everything possible to facilitate the business, and I want to make that point clear in order that the House may not misunderstand my action on this occasion. What I am concerned about is the passing of the Parliamentary Allowances Act Amendment Bill in the absence of a full House. I can take my beating with the next man, but I know what has happened. The Chief Secretary knows, too. He knows it was intended to deal with the Bill on Friday last. On Thursday night I went to the Chief Secretary and told him what had come under my notice. I informed him that I had arranged to be absent from town on Friday and that I did not think it was a fair thing, as I had sat in the House day after day, that the Bill should be dealt with during my absence. He said he would interview the Premier, and later on at 11 o'clock he rang me up at my house and told me he had seen Mr. Collier. He said that the Premier had told him that the attitude I took up was quite right. Prior to that the Minister said he acted under instructions from the Premier, but he had had no instructions up to that time. Mr. Drew informed me over the telephone that the Premier had said he would not ask him (Mr. Drew) to do anything in the way of pushing the Bill through in the way I feared might be done. I said that that was just what I would expect from a man like Mr. Collier. Everyone knows the respect and esteem in which I hold the Premier. In season and out of season, I have said that he is one of the statesmen of this country. I regret that at times he is compelled, because of the party machine, to do things that he would not otherwise attempt to do. The Chief Secretary intimated at the same time that the Premier did not think it was a fair thing that the Standing Orders should be suspended until the Parliamentary Allowances Act Amendment Bill had been passed. That was what the Premier of this State said, and that is what I say, too. When I came back to the House on Tuesday I was the first to speak on the

Bill in question. On Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday we had a majority in the House against the Bill. There were 16 against it and 13 for it.

Hon. J. Ewing: How do you know that?

Hon. E. H. Gray: Had you counted heads?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I know the promise that was given to the Premier. I much regret that it was given to him because if there is one man in this country that I do not want to see let down, it is the Premier. A motion was passed in the Assembly requesting him to introduce the Bill, and he had a promise from a member of this House—that is my information—that there was a majority to carry the Bill in the Council.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You have been dreaming.

Member: Is this in order?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am giving my reasons for opposing the suspension of the Standing Orders. I told the Chief Secretary that I did not want to see the Premier let down, and I suggested that he should withdraw the Bill. It is not my fault that I am fighting this matter now. Two members of the Country Party, Mr. Baxter and Mr. Willmott, are absent, and I know that the members of that party are pledged to oppose an increase of salaries by this means. I do not know whether Mr. Burvill is a member of the Country Party or not. He also is absent. All I ask is that the House shall go as far as the Minister likes with the Bill—he can pass the second reading if he likes—but he should give the absent members an opportunity to be present at the third reading stage in order that we may get what we want—an expression of opinion from the whole House. That is not an unreasonable request. If it were a request concerning the ordinary business of the country, it would be acceded to at once. If it is not acceded to because this matter concerns the interests of individual members, the public will be able to realise what is happening.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Will this do any good at the elections?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Does the hon. member who belongs to a democratic party believe in snap divisions?

Hon. E. H. Gray: No.

Hon. J. Ewing: There is nothing of that sort about this matter.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Of course not. There is no snap about it at all.

Hon. T. Moore: Look at the House!

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: And remember what it was like when the Racing Restriction Act Amendment Bill was before us.

Hon. E. H. Gray: This is a big House.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Let us remember the position of this Bill on the Notice Paper when the Racing Restriction Act Amendment Bill was dealt with. It would not have done to have dealt with the Bill on that day!

Hon. T. Moore: What difference is there?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There was a full House then.

Hon. T. Moore: Not full.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, a complete House.

Hon. T. Moore: How often do we get a full House?

Hon. H. Stewart: We have had better Houses during the last fortnight than ever before.

Hon. T. Moore: It is quite a good House to-day.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If members could attend here to the extent of a full House to decide the Racing Restriction Bill, it is not too much to give them opportunity to attend in full House to deal with the Parliamentary Allowances Bill.

Hon. J. R. Brown: You didn't worry about a full House yesterday, when those amendments to the Racing Restriction Bill were brought along.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Parliamentary Allowances Bill concerns members and individual taxpayers. If the Bill be put through all its stages this afternoon probably it will be assented to to-morrow, and from that time onwards the taxpayers will have to find an additional £16,000 per annum to satisfy members of Parliament. Surely every member should have an opportunity to vote on that question. If the Minister, when I asked him the question, had said he would leave the final stages until Tuesday next, I should have seen to it that those absent members were notified.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Are they not notified already?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Then the responsibility for their absence would be theirs, not ours. It is not an unreasonable request, and if the Chief Secretary will comply with it, I will offer no objection to the suspension of the Standing Orders. If not, I will vote against that proposal.

HON. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [3.17]: As a private member, I feel sorry that Mr. Holmes should have been impelled to make the remarks he has made. I have known the Chief Secretary for many years, and I could not believe that he would be a party to doing anything mean or contemptible in respect of the Parliamentary Allowances Bill, or any other Bill. Also I have known Mr. Collier for some time, and I endorse what Mr. Holmes has said, namely that he is not only perhaps the most able politician in the State, but also he is a man whose word is to be depended upon. I do not like the suggestion that we should not suspend the Standing Orders for fear the Chief Secretary might take some advantage of it. If Mr. Holmes desires to give two or three members who are absent—and I take it their absence is not unintentional—opportunity to vote on the third reading, I will support the Chief Secretary in going just as far as the third reading; for I am sure the Chief Secretary will give Mr. Holmes the opportunity he requires to notify the absent members, so that they may be reminded of their duties and be here to vote on the third reading. For those reasons, I must vote for the suspension of the Standing Orders and trust myself to the undoubted honesty and fairness of the Chief Secretary.

HON. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [3.20]: I will vote for the suspension of the Standing Orders because I have never yet been a party to taking the business out of the hands of the Leader of the House. I very much regret the innuendoes and gossip introduced into the debate this afternoon. If hon. members choose to stay away from an important division, the responsibility is theirs. Every hon. member has the option of voting for a motion, of opposing it, or of abstaining from voting. If members choose to abstain from voting, theirs is the responsibility. The Parliamentary Allowances Bill has been on the Notice Paper for a considerable time, and every member must be aware that on any day it might come up for a vote. Consequently, it is the duty of members to be present if they wish to record their votes.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [3.21]: I cannot give any assurance at all as to what may occur in the course of an hour or a couple of hours. Mr. Holmes has no reason what-

ever to complain. I intended to go through with the second reading of the Parliamentary Allowances Bill last Friday, but I was approached by Mr. Holmes, who, telling me he had arranged to go into the country, asked me to see to it that the second reading should not be put through until Tuesday. Solely at his request, I undertook to secure the adjournment of the debate till Tuesday. That was done. Mr. Holmes had full opportunity to express his views on the measure. Since then it has been on the Notice Paper and it is not my fault that it is to be brought on to-day. I put it on the Notice Paper in the ordinary course of routine. I gave notice yesterday of my intention to move the suspension of the Standing Orders, and I think I have justified my action to-day. It seems to me we have a very good attendance of members in the House.

Question put and passed.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

Resumed from the previous day. Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

New clause:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move—

That the following new clause be added to stand as Clause 2:—‘Notwithstanding the provisions contained in Section 93 of ‘The Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act, 1909,’ the rates prescribed by Section 94 of the Act shall be levied uniformly within the boundaries of the area constituted by Section 6 of the said Act.

I do not propose to add anything to what I have already said. The Minister promised that he would consider the proposed new clause.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I got into touch with the department about this, and here is the department's statement—

Section 93 of Act provides for separate rates for each district, and the districts as defined by Section 6 of the Act are Perth, Fremantle, Claremont and Guildford. At one time separate rates were levied in each of these districts because they were separate supplies, but as the supplies became merged into each other it became necessary to review the districts as provided for under Section 7 of the Act, and some years ago the original districts were abolished, and the metropolitan area is now divided into the metropolitan water and sewerage district,

Armadale water district, and five stormwater districts. Last Monday the Minister, when opening the hills scheme, outlined the position in regard to centralised control, and indicated that everybody would agree that it would have been absolutely uneconomical to allow four separate supplies to exist. The position is now that uniform rates are levied for the whole metropolitan area, subject to the power to levy rates given under Sections 90, 91, and 92 of the Act. It is not likely that a differential rate will be applied to any portion of the metropolitan area, as once a distinction was made the Government would be inundated with requests from other localities for similar treatment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: According to the department's reply, it is unlikely that any differential rating will be imposed. That being so, is there any reason why we should not provide that there shall be uniform rating? As the law stands, the door is open to allow of one or two districts getting all the hills water, yet having no increased rates, in consequence of which there will be further increases in other districts. Apparently the department has no objection to uniform rating, but we do not know what political influences may operate hereafter to set up differential rates. If we agree that the rates should be uniform, it is only right that we should say so in the Bill.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I represent a number of people who may be affected by the amendment, to which I have the greatest objection. People who are being supplied from Mundaring will not get water from the new scheme, and I cannot understand why they should be brought under the rating for the new scheme. The cost of the new scheme should be charged to the people who will benefit from it. No doubt a fair proportion of the cost will later on be charged to the general community. I have never been able to understand why the people of Perth should have set their faces against obtaining supplies from Mundaring. If the people who use Mundaring water can get it at a cheaper rate, they are entitled to it.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Do you say that the people of Perth have set their faces against obtaining supplies from Mundaring?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It seems to me they have.

Hon. J. Nicholson: They are prepared to take it from wherever they can get it.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: And they should pay for the water they receive. They should not seek to impose the new charges upon

communities who get their water from Mundaring.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Mr. Hamersley is evidently under a misapprehension. A pipe, which is part of the Perth scheme, runs from Mundaring to the Mt. Hawthorn reservoir and it is tapped by the people of the Guildford district. Those people are taking all Mundaring water. If they did not take that water, it would come to Perth. Surely such people must be regarded as being within the metropolitan area. They are getting the best of the water and yet, because Perth is taking some and wants more, it is contended that the people of Guildford should not contribute to the cost.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I object to the new clause. The Act gives discretionary power to the Minister, and Mr. Lovekin has not shown any cause whatever for his amendment, except to offer the vague statement that perhaps some political influence might be brought to bear to sway the Minister's decision.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: He has good ground for making that statement.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Reasons other than political might guide the Minister. There might be certain portions of the district that have no water supply at all, and it would be manifestly unfair to rate them.

Hon. J. Nicholson: They would not be rated unless they were within a certain number of yards of the main.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Before giving my decision on the point, I should like to look up precedents and ascertain what influenced Parliament to give the Minister this discretionary power. Of course Mr. Lovekin can decide these matters offhand. He is one of the gentlemen who might very well have commanded the armies in France or the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. A. Lovekin: It does not matter; it is only Dr. Saw.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Mr. Lovekin is fitted to express an opinion on any subject whatever without any premeditation or forethought. It comes to him intuitively. I am not one of that kind. As the present Act gives the Minister discretionary power, I see no reason why it should be taken from him.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The reason I moved the new clause was because of a statement made in another place by the Hon. W. D.

Johnson that the district in question should be taken out of the rating area. I think it a fair thing that all should be in the one area.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: According to Mr. Hamersley, anyone served by the Mundaring pipe should not be charged the extra rating. On that line of argument I ought to oppose the new clause, because my Murray-street premises are supplied from that pipe. No doubt many other people are getting Mundaring water, but we could not discriminate between people living west of Bayswater and east of it, because all of them are in the metropolitan area. The department should be able to impose a uniform rate so that the burden will bear evenly and lightly upon the whole of the community. I support the new clause.

New clause put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	6
Noes	14

Majority against .. 8

AYES.

Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. E. H. Gray
	(Teller.)

New clause thus negatived.

Bill again reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—LOAN, £4,000,000.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [3.45] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is required to provide an additional authority for the Government to borrow money for expenditure on the works and services detailed in the schedule, totalling £4,000,000, including

the cost of raising. The Loan Bill is an authority to borrow money on specific lines, the appropriation being provided in the Loan Estimates. On the 30th June the balance unraised was £4,929,019. Against this, £2,000,000 was included in the overseas loan raised by the Commonwealth for the States in July last. There was recently raised in London £2,000,000 (5 per cent. at £98). We were just ready to go on the market when the embargo was placed on foreign borrowing. When the embargo was lifted some weeks later the terms were not as good as they had been previously. The raising of this loan reduces the authority to £1,000,000, which is being reserved to cover special loans from the Commonwealth on account of migration under the agreement with the Imperial Government, and exhausts the loan authority. Hence the necessity for the Bill. To cover the expenditure provided in the Loan Estimates, and for the period intervening before a further authority can be secured from Parliament, the provision for £4,000,000 is necessary. No loans were raised in London last year. The proceeds of the overseas loan of £2,000,000, also portion of the recent issue of £2,000,000, were used to pay off the London bank overdraft. The overdraft on the 30th June was £2,340,000; the overseas loan proceeds amounted to £1,935,000, and the debit balance was £405,000, to be met from the recent £2,000,000 loan, excluding the redemption of £500,000. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. H. Stewart, debate adjourned.

BILL—GENERAL LOAN AND INSCRIBED STOCK ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [3.47] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is required to authorise the rate of interest for inscribed stock and debentures issued under the General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act, being fixed at a maximum of 5½ per cent. The rate of interest under the principal Act is 4 per cent., but this was increased in 1915 to 5 per cent. and in 1918 to 6½ per cent., but for 12 months only. In the

subsequent year the rate was reduced to 6 per cent., and in each successive year the same rate was authorised. The authority of last session expires at the end of this month, and in the absence of any further authority the rate would revert to $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., that is so far as inscribed stock and debentures issued under the General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act are concerned, and to which the Bill applies. Treasury bills can be issued at 6 per cent., also inscribed stock and debentures under the Treasury Bonds Deficiency Acts at the same rate. Treasury bills could be issued for the whole balance of loans unraised. Under the Bill the rate is $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and the annual restriction, which is not considered necessary, has been deleted.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: There is no restriction as to the tenure of this borrowing now?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No. Loans are being raised in London for Australia at 5 per cent., but usually at a discount. Our last loan was raised at £98. The additional half per cent. is provided to cover contingencies, but more especially for Australian money which is not obtainable for less than $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., this being the rate for the Commonwealth conversion loan. So far as the local market is concerned, there is no probability of money being obtained in the near future at a lesser rate than that provided. Clause 3 refers to the sinking fund, and authorises payment of contributions, in the case of loans raised by the Commonwealth for the State, from the date of issue in lieu of after the expiration of four years as provided under the principal Act. Under the principal Act the sinking fund commences four years after the date of the loan, but in connection with borrowing in Australia the sinking fund commences straight away. The clause also provides for such sinking fund to be subject to the National Debt Sinking Fund Act. The reason for the departure from the usual practice in regard to the State's sinking fund is that when loans are raised by the Commonwealth for the State the sinking fund commences from the date of the issue of the loan, instead of after the usual four year period; and the contributions are paid to the Commonwealth for investment and control by the National Debt Sinking Fund Trustees, this being a condition under which the loans are issued.

This will for the present apply to a loan of £1,231,320 issued in Australia in October 1924, and £1,500,000 in New York, and £500,000 in London in July last. I think the necessity for the Bill will be apparent to members. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [3.53]: This is a somewhat important Bill, as to a certain extent it fixes the price at which money can be borrowed by the Government of this State. It does not altogether fix the price, inasmuch as it really fixes the rate of interest, or rather says that the rate of interest shall not exceed $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It is quite true, as the Chief Secretary says, that there does not seem at present any probability of money being obtained at a lower price than that in the near future. All the same, I think that in previous Bills of this kind there was a limitation as to their duration. There was a period fixed as to the time during which they operated. I would suggest that in Committee the same course be followed with reference to this Bill as was followed in the case of previous Bills. It seems to me, furthermore, that there ought to be some limitation in the Bill as to the maximum price that has to be paid for our loans. This would have some effect in causing care and moderation to be exercised as to the price that we have to pay for our loans. I would suggest that in Committee some member might take that aspect of the question into consideration, and, at any rate, limit the duration of the Bill for a definite period, as has been done in the case of similar Bills that have been brought before Parliament for many years past.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 10:

Hon. J. EWING: I presume the usual practice with regard to sinking fund in respect of loans raised from the Old Country is still being preserved.

The Chief Secretary: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

New clause:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Under the General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act passed in 1924 a section was embodied stating that the Act should continue in force until the 31st day of December, 1925, but no longer. This Bill is really an enlargement or continuance of the Act of 1910.

Hon. H. Stewart: As amended in 1922.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes. I move—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 4:—"This Act shall continue in force until the 31st day of December, 1926, and no longer."

The insertion of the new clause will mean that the Government must bring down another continuance Bill before the close of next session.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is no justification for the new clause. There was justification for such a provision in 1913, when the Government were granted a maximum of $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In the original Act the maximum was fixed at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. permanently. When the war occurred and the value of money fluctuated so that it was impossible to secure funds except upon payment of such rates as $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., there was necessity for amending the original Act, and this House thought it wise to limit the discretion of the Government. Is there any likelihood of our being able to obtain money at considerably less than $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.? What is the object of insisting that the measure shall be brought up every session?

Hon. H. STEWART: Mr. Nicholson is complicating the position by placing his new clause at the end of the Bill, because there it will apply to the sinking fund provision as well, whereas he merely wishes to limit the operation of the maximum rate of interest. The new clause had better be inserted as a paragraph to follow paragraph (a) of Clause 2. Only yesterday I read in the newspapers that the Premier had said the Government were being offered considerable sums of money at 5 per cent. It is a good thing that measures of this kind should come up for consideration periodically, if only for the sake of the educative influence on members.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Mr. Stewart's suggestion is wise, and it can be adopted by a different means from that which he

has indicated. I ask leave to amend my amendment by inserting at the beginning the words—

The provisions of Section 2 of.

Leave given, the words inserted.

Hon. J. EWING: During the war it was found necessary to carry on certain public works, and in view of the difficulty of securing money the rate of interest was raised to as much as $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Under those conditions it was reasonable to say to the Government, "You shall not carry on extensive public works when you have to pay such a high rate of interest." Therefore a provision of the kind now suggested by Mr. Nicholson was introduced. However, the rate of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. provided by this Bill is not abnormal. If the Government can get money for less, they will do so. The new clause might embarrass the Government.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The new clause is a wise safeguard. If at any time the Government find it absolutely necessary to pay a higher rate than the maximum here provided, they will come to Parliament for the necessary authority. We have to remember that the country is borrowing not trifling amounts but huge sums.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Why not give the Government a free hand when they come down with a Bill to lower the rate of interest? I am informed that it is impossible to borrow money in Australia at less than $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The market might improve.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The Government, having the right to borrow at 6 per cent., have recently been borrowing at a cost of £5 4s. 9d. Therefore Mr. Collier has not exercised his discretion to pay 6 per cent. This shows that the Premier is acting wisely. If he is given authority to borrow at $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and finds himself able to borrow at 5 he will certainly do so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Premier was offered money in Australia at a rate slightly higher than that at which he can borrow in London, and he refused the Australian offer.

New clause put and negatived.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and passed.

MOTION—POLICE FORCE, PENSION ALLOWANCE.

Debate resumed from the 4th December on the motion by Hon. J. Duffell—

That in the opinion of this House it will be conducive to the best interests of the State if provision be made for the payment of reasonable pension allowances to members of the police force who may be injured, wounded, or maimed in the execution of their duty and for adequate allowances to their dependants in the case of death.

HON. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban—in reply) [4.13]: I feel that some apology is due to the House for adding to the remarks I made on this motion some time ago. I realise that members have been exercising their minds considerably on the important measures which, as usual, have reached the Council at the end of the session. I do, however, claim consideration for a brief period in view of the vital importance of the subject to one of the most material factors in the administration of this community. When moving the motion I stated, initially, that my remarks would be based upon reports I had read in the Press, reports appearing as the result, chiefly, of that exciting period which culminated on the Fremantle wharf at the beginning of last month. I now refer to that aspect because the Chief Secretary, in opening his speech, said he wondered upon what I had based my motion. I repeat that my information at the time in question was based upon the Press reports. Since then, however, there has been placed at my disposal information of far greater importance, information which makes evident a still greater necessity for a police pension scheme than that which I had in mind when moving my motion. It appears that the pension scheme is not a new idea, but one which has exercised the minds of all members of the police force for a considerable period. I find in looking through "The Police News," which is the official organ of the Western Australian Police Association, that at the end of 1924 the Government had this matter brought under their notice. The issue of "The Police News" dated 22nd June last contains the following paragraph:—

Some 18 months ago the Government, after promising to prepare a draft pension scheme (prepared by a committee appointed by the association, to Parliament without any alteration whatever), at the eleventh hour of the closing of the session, returned the draft with various

amendments, and so mutilated as to be almost unrecognisable by the framers of the scheme, for the approval of the association. The executive, however, were pledged to submit any alteration in the scheme to the members for their approval or otherwise, and as it was impossible to communicate with individuals in the time—the prerogative of Parliament was merely a question of days—the question of pensions had to be left for a more convenient season. Since that time the executive have had the matter under consideration, and in August last the Hon. the Minister for Police stated that in the following month a concrete proposal would be submitted to the association for consideration.

From that it will be gathered that the Government have reasons, not yet apparent, for delaying their pensions scheme. A special meeting of the Police Association was called for the purpose of giving the pensions scheme further consideration, and on the 12th June the following resolution was carried:—

That this branch of the association ask the Minister to fulfil his promise to the executive, that a concrete proposal for a pensions scheme for the police would be submitted in September last, and as the question is a burning one, and the cause of a lot of discontent, the Minister be requested to expedite his proposals.

A number of letters appeared in the paper dealing with the question, including those that passed between the department, the Government and the association. A meeting of the executive of the association was held on the 2nd June, at which the following decision was arrived at:—

As a reply from the Minister for Police regarding the pensions scheme had not been received, the secretary was instructed to again bring the matter before the Minister, requesting that the proposed scheme mentioned in August last be submitted in time to allow of the proposals being discussed at the forthcoming conference.

There are several other references to the pensions scheme, and in the issue of "The Police News" of the 20th November last there appears a leading article setting out the incidents that happened on the Fremantle wharf, and commenting on the dangers to which the police were exposed. It points out that on that occasion the police were assisted by the presence of 31 probationers, who are not entitled to any benefits from the Police Benefit Fund that exists to-day. Hon. members should bear that in mind. In the course of his remarks the Minister said that if Parliament were to endorse my scheme, it would not meet with the approval of the Police Association, who

did not ask for an allowance for constables who were injured. I do not know that my motion contains any scheme whatever. It merely represents a request from this Chamber that the Government should give consideration to the question of providing a scheme for pension allowances to the police. In those circumstances I think it will be necessary for me to prove to hon. members how anxious the police are that a pensions scheme shall be established as early as possible. They are influenced to a great extent by the fact that in four States out of the six in the Commonwealth, police pension schemes are in force. Something like £40,000 has been accumulated in the Police Benefit Fund in Western Australia. It was first established as far back as 1866 and has been built up as the result of the police contributing 3 per cent. of their earnings towards the fund, the Government subsidising it on a pound for pound basis. The police were willing to place the amount of £40,000 at the disposal of the Government for the purpose of working up a nucleus for the pensions scheme. Bearing in mind the fact that probationers do not benefit from the scheme, it would be as well to show to what extent the members of the police force benefit themselves. I will compare the position here with those obtaining in the other States where police benefit schemes are in operation. The Leader of the House said that the pay roll of the police force had been increased recently by £25,000. That is quite correct, but we must bear in mind the rates of pay here compared with those obtaining in the other States. A constable in Western Australia receives 13s. 6d. per day, with a lodging allowance of 1s. 8d. per day for a single man and 2s. 6d. a day for a married man. In South Australia a constable receives 14s. a day with a lodging allowance of 1s. 6d. a day for single men and 2s. a day for married men. In New South Wales the daily pay amounts to 15s. 6d. and the lodging allowances to 1s. 6d. a day for single men and 2s. 6d. a day for married men. In Tasmania the constables are paid 11s. 6d. a day with a lodging allowance of 2s., which applies to single men and married men alike. In Queensland the police receive 16s. 4d. a day, with a lodging allowance of 2s. all round, and that rate of pay includes an allowance for the 44-hour week. In Victoria the daily pay amounts to 12s. 7d. and the lodging allow-

ance to 2s. a day for married and single men alike. It has been stated that the members of the police force receive good pay. While I am prepared to admit that, I did not know until recently that they had to work seven days a week. They work 104 hours per fortnight.

The Chief Secretary: Yes, and they are paid for it.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: What about that 44-hour Bill?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: It seems to me that this is another matter that will have to receive consideration when that Bill is again before us. When this fact is borne in mind, it will be seen that the rates of pay are not out of the way by any means. A contribution of 3 per cent. to the benefit fund means that a policeman receiving 13s. 6d. a day has to contribute 12s. 4d. per month to the fund. There are four States in the Commonwealth where pension funds are in force. In New South Wales the Government contributed £116,300 for the year 1923-24. The amount contributed by the members of the police force there was £54,524, which was deducted from their pay, and £29,774 being 3 per cent. of pension, fines, and so on. In other words, a percentage deduction amounting to 4 per cent. was made from their pay. As regards the benefits to be derived from the scheme there, a policeman benefitting would draw one-fortieth of his salary for each year of service, but not exceeding three-fourths of the salary from which 3 per cent. was deducted. It may be added that the Government contributions in New South Wales vary from year to year. In Victoria the Government contributed £50,000 towards the pensions scheme in 1923-24, and the police force contributed £1,841 from the 1st January, 1924, to the 30th June, of the same year. I quote that as an illustration to show what the police there contribute in proportion to their pay, which is based upon 2½ per cent. of the amount they received. In South Australia the Government contribute £7,500 and the members of the force £4,953. The percentage of deductions from members of the force varies from £8 to £10 on a sliding scale, and the benefits they receive are £130 per annum. The Government subsidy is not less than £8, nor more than £15 per annum per member. In Queensland in 1923 the Government contributed £44,150, while members of the force contributed £14,930. The percentage of deductions from

members were two per cent. prior to August, 1889, four per cent. between that date and 1891 and five per cent. after 1891. The benefits received are £115 after 15 years service and £5 per annum for each subsequent year, with a maximum of two-thirds of salary on retirement. The contributions are based on actual requirements. In this State we are very much in arrears in our duty to the police force. I am sorry that time for the consideration of the motion is so limited, but I feel sure members will give it favourable attention and ask the Government to get the scheme in hand straight away. Regulation 6 of the regulations controlling the Police Benefit Fund reads as follows:—

Any member of the force who entered the service prior to the 14th December, 1917, and who may have served therein for 12 consecutive years or over, shall be permitted to claim his discharge therefrom and a gratuity of one month's pay for each year of service.

Regulation 7 reads as follows:—

Any member of the force who entered the service on or after 14th day of December, 1917, and who may have served therein for 12 consecutive years or over shall be permitted to claim his discharge therefrom and a gratuity on the following basis:—

Then follows a sliding scale showing that for over 12 years' service and under 15 years he gets two weeks' salary for each year of service; for over 15 years and under 20 years he gets 2 2/3rds weeks' salary for each year of service; for over 20 years and under 25 years he gets three weeks' salary for each year of service, and for over 25 years he gets four weeks' salary for each year of service. Regulation 9 reads as follows:—

Any member of the force compelled to leave the service from injuries received or ill-health contracted in the execution of his duty may claim a gratuity not exceeding one year's pay in addition to any further claim he may have under these regulations.

It is further provided that a probationer is not entitled to receive any gratuity if injured or killed in the discharge of his duties. I ask members to bear that in mind while I tell them that during the raids on the Fremantle wharves all the probationers, to the number of 31, were called out for duty on the wharf. How necessary then is it that a pension fund should be provided for the police! In Western Australia, more than in any other State of the Commonwealth, should justice be done to members of the force. We have only to think of the far North-West and the conditions prevailing there. How often do we

see in the Press of policemen being hurriedly sent out in search of civilians who have missed the track and are in danger of perishing. Up there the police have to cover long lonely stretches under the most trying conditions and taking great risks, notwithstanding which no pension provision is made for them. Only the other day we saw in the Press that a policeman, when bringing in six native prisoners, was attacked by those men and it was only as the result of taking extreme measures that he escaped with his life. The duty of a policeman is continuous. In no other branch of the public service are men liable to be called upon at any time of the day or night to perform their duties. Also, the policeman has to undergo very special training. He is required to have a fair knowledge of first-aid. He has to submit to physical training and training in self defence. When he is out on night duty, especially in times of industrial trouble, his lot is one of the hardest imaginable and he never knows when he may stop a missile or a bullet that will put an end to his career. However, it is not for the policeman himself that I am asking consideration, but for his wife and dependants. A special commission of inquiry held on the 9th April last submitted the following recommendation:—

The question of the Police Benefit Fund is an urgent matter, and is bound up with the question of a pension scheme for the force. We understand it has been the subject of representations to the Government by the association, and we strongly recommend that it receive early consideration.

Now I think I have proved from the documents before me that it is necessary we should ask the Government to give earnest consideration to this question.

Question put and passed.

On motion by Hon. J. Duffell, ordered: "That the foregoing motion be transmitted by message to the Assembly and its concurrence desired therein."

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from 4th November. Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; Hon. H. J. Yelland in charge of the Bill

Clause 2—Power temporarily to close roads not in use (partly considered):

The CHAIRMAN: When last the clause was under consideration the Chief Secretary moved the following amendment:—

That after "council," in line four of Sub-clause (1), the following be inserted:—"Of the municipality by an Order in Council published in the 'Gazette.'"

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I have no objection to the amendment, but I have an amendment to move that will alter the whole complexion of the Bill. It is that the operation of the Bill be confined to the municipality of York. Therefore, I think there is scarcely any necessity for other amendments, except one that I have to move to Subclause 4.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: As the hon. member intends to limit the operation of the measure to the municipality of York, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I move an amendment—

That after "vested in," in line three of Subclause (4), the words "or acquired by" be inserted.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: What is the reason for the insertion of those words? So far as we have gone, the Bill proposes to give general power to all municipalities to lease streets.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I intend to move an amendment limiting this provision to York.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The limitation has not yet been inserted. The addition of the words "acquired by" would mean giving municipalities power to purchase.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: When such land has been handed over temporarily to a municipal council, they will have the power to deal with it as if it were vested in or acquired by the council, though the street would still be a street and the land adjoining would still be vested in the registered owners.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I would object to the clause if it had general application. I understand there is some particular reason for it in this instance, but it would have been better if the proposal had taken the form of a road closure Bill. This seems to be a roundabout way to accomplish what is desired.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I move an amendment—

That after "council," in line three of Sub-clause (4), the words "during the period of closure" be inserted.

This will restrict to the specified period for which a road is closed the council's power to deal with any one of the closed roads

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I move an amendment—

That the following be inserted to stand as Subclause (5):—"This section shall have effect only within the boundaries of the municipality of York."

Regarding Mr. Nicholson's comment, I referred the question to the Solicitor General and it is at his suggestion that I am moving to restrict the operation of the measure to the municipality of York. It was because of the requirements of York that the Bill was introduced.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This is a Bill to amend the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906, and I question whether the amendment is in order, because it will confine the measure to one municipality, whereas the title purports to cover all municipalities.

The CHAIRMAN: If the amendment be carried, it will be necessary to alter the title by adding to it such words as "so far as it relates to the municipality of York"

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I quite understand that that is necessary.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: My point is that the amendment is foreign to the title. The Committee cannot pass the amendment unless the title be altered. We are asked to pass the amendment, however, and it will not be in accordance with the title.

The CHAIRMAN: It is quite competent under our standing orders to amend the title of a Bill if an amendment has been inserted that is not quite in accordance with the title. The title of the Bill, "to amend the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906," is very wide. I suggest that the better course would be to submit the amendment in the form of a new clause.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I agree that that would be better. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment temporarily.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to

New clause:

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I move—

That a new clause be inserted to stand as Clause 3, as follows:—"This Act shall have effect only within the boundaries of the municipality of York."

New clause put and passed.

Title:

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I move—

That the Title be amended by the addition of the following words:—"So far as relates to the municipality of York."

Amendment put and passed.

Title, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—MAIN ROADS.

In Committee.

Resumed from 9th December; Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 28—Main Roads Trust Account:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in new paragraph (c), the last line, the word "main" be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move a further amendment—

That in Subclause (e), after the word "Act," the following be inserted:—"Provided that so far as any moneys so appropriated are raised under a Loan Act, the Main Roads Trust Account shall be charged with one-half of the amount of the annual interest and sinking fund contribution payable in respect of such moneys."

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

Clause 29—Appropriation of Main Roads Trust Account:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in proviso (i), after the word "any," in line four, there be inserted "main road or developmental road," and after "not," in line five, there be inserted "deemed to be."

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. H. STEWART: Before the select committee sat a proviso appeared on the Notice Paper, the object of which was to safeguard the position with regard to developmental roads constructed out of Federal grant, and dealing with such outdistricts as the North and the East. I suggest that owing to the many alterations that have been made to the Bill, this proviso has been in-

advertently omitted from the Notice Paper, and should be inserted in the clause.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have that amendment here. I understand that the Bill was in order with the amendment which is on the Notice Paper. If the additional amendment is necessary, I will move it. I move an amendment—

That in the first proviso, after the word "use," there be inserted "in the prescribed area."

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move a further amendment—

That the following proviso be added to the clause:—"Provided also that notwithstanding that moneys received from the Government of the Commonwealth under the Main Roads Development Act, 1923, are paid to the credit of the main roads trust account, such moneys may be applied to the construction and maintenance of any roads in the State which are deemed to be main roads for the purposes of that Act."

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

Postponed Clause 1—agreed to.

Postponed Clause 10—Amendment of Section 47, tenure of office:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (1), line four, the words "in Council" be struck out.

That amendment should be consequential throughout the Bill.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (2), after the word "shall," in line four, there be inserted "in respect of his service on or under the board be deemed to serve in an established capacity in the permanent civil service of the Government so as to preserve any pension rights that may be accruing to him, and with reference to any question as to continuity of service, and."

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Will this amendment compel the board to pay pensions to officers of the Public Service whom they may take over?

The Chief Secretary: No. It will compel the Government.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If a public servant puts in 25 years with the Government and then puts in 10 years with the board, will he be entitled to a pension on the basis of 35 years' service?

The Chief Secretary: His continuity of service would be preserved.

Hon. H. STEWART: The recommendation of the special committee was that all the words after "shall" in the amendment inserted on the recommendation of the select committee should be struck out. A limitation was proposed as follows:—"So as to preserve any pension rights that may be accruing to him and in reference to any question as to continuity of service." The Solicitor General, who has been most careful in drafting this, says that without the limitation the board would still be in no way responsible for pension rights, and that if an officer left the service of the board he would have no claim on the board but would have simply the right, as having been a member of the Public Service, to claim continuity of service and pension rights if he went back to the Public Service. The Government, after calling applications, might desire to put some permanent members of the Public Service on the board or in high positions under the board. If such men are to be called upon to sacrifice their pension rights or their continuity of service in the event of anything unusual happening, it is considered unlikely that any increased emolument which might be offered would induce officers of long service to apply for positions on or under the board.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Is the amendment in place in this Bill? The provision seems to me one which should rightly be inserted in the Public Service Act.

Hon. H. STEWART: The Solicitor General contends that if the limitation is not introduced, the clause simply conserves those particular privileges with regard to being a permanent civil servant of the State, and that if the clause as proposed two or three days ago were carried without the addition suggested by the select committee, members of the Civil Service joining the board would no longer be under the Public Service Act. I want those opinions of the Solicitor General to be on record.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I have in mind the position that may arise in the event of other persons being employed by the board and those persons endeavouring, as has been done before, to come under the operations of the Public Service Act.

Hon. H. STEWART: This is simply a provision recommended by the Government

so that any officer in the Public Service shall not be debarred from applying for the position. As the Bill stands, no one would apply for one of the posts.

Amendment put and passed.

New clause further amended by striking out "office" in line 5 and inserting "service"; and by inserting "shall" after "board" in line 7.

New clauses:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the following new clause to stand as Clause 10 be inserted:—"Each member of the board shall receive such salary or fee as may be fixed by the Governor."

New clause put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the following new clause be added, to stand as Clause 23:—"(1.) If after a developmental road is handed over to any local authority, such local authority fails to maintain to the satisfaction of the board a developmental road, the board shall by notice in writing direct the local authority to carry out, within a period to be named in the notice, such works of maintenance as are specified. If the local authority fails to comply with an such direction, the board may carry out such works. Any expenses so incurred by the board shall be repaid by the local authority to the board, and if not repaid within three months after demand by the board, shall be deemed debt due and payable to His Majesty, and a remedies therefor may be enforced in the name of His Majesty against the local authority and the revenues thereof. (2.) All moneys repaid by, or recovered from a local authority under this section, shall be placed to the credit of the main roads trust account. (3.) Where, in the opinion of the board, two or more districts derive benefit from any such development road, the board shall determine the proportion which the local authority of each district shall contribute to such expenditure; and the provisions of Section 31 of this Act relating to the apportionment of the amount expended on permanent works and maintenance shall mutatis mutandis, apply, subject to such modifications thereof as may be prescribed to a just and apply those provisions to this section."

New clause put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the following new clause be added, to stand as Clause 30:—"Authority for expenditure by local authorities: 30. It shall be lawful for any local authority to expend out of its ordinary revenue, or money borrowed for the purpose under its borrowing powers, such sums as the local authority may, in its discretion, think fit—(a) in payment to the board of contribution to the cost of the construction of any main road, or developmental road; (b) in payment of the expense incurred by the

local authority in the construction, maintenance, or repair of any main road or developmental road undertaken by the local authority, so far as any such road is within the district of the local authority.

Hon. H. STEWART: This matter cropped up after the select committee's work had been concluded and members will be interested to know why it is being incorporated in the Bill. Where money is to be spent out of Federal and State funds on the construction of a main or developmental road running through the territory of some local authority, the local authority, if it does not agree with the width it is intended to construct, may say "As you intend to build that road to a width of 20ft., we will pay the extra cost involved if you will build it to the full width of 66ft." or any other width that the local authority may desire. The clause simply authorises the local authority to voluntarily contribute towards the construction of a road to a width to suit local conditions.

New clause put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in the new clause headed "apportionment of the amount expended on permanent work and maintenance," strike out from paragraph (1) the words "and the cost of maintenance of main developmental roads."

Hon. H. STEWART: I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the manner in which the secretarial duties of the select committee were carried out. The work was of an extremely complicated nature and on behalf of the members of the select committee I wish to pay a tribute to the unstinted personal application to the work of the committee and the ability displayed by the secretary, Mr. E. A. Brown, the Clerk Assistant of the House. This officer devoted a considerable amount of time to assisting the committee in the drafting of amendments and in many other ways, and did all this in addition to his other duties.

Amendment put and passed.

On motions by Chief Secretary, the following amendments were agreed to:—

Subclause (5): Delete the word "six," and insert the words "six and a-half" in lieu thereof.

Insert at the end of Subclause (5) a paragraph, as follows:—"The amount of contribution from a local authority in respect of maintenance shall be a debt due from such

local authority to the board, recoverable in any court of competent jurisdiction."

Title: Delete the words "to further amend the Traffic Act of 1919; to provide for the licensing of dealers in petrol."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the Chairman do now report the Bill to the House.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation of the work carried out by the select committee. I have not offered my congratulations to the members of that committee previously. They put in good work and exhausted every avenue from which they could procure useful information. In my view the result of their work is that we have an excellent Bill.

Members: Hear, hear!

Question put and passed; Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—PARLIAMENTARY ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 8th December.

HON. H. J. YELLAND (East) [5.50]: I do not intend to cast a silent vote and therefore ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments. I notice that the title of the Bill refers to the remuneration received by members as a "Parliamentary allowance." I believe that when the payment of members was first instituted it was referred to as an allowance, and if our remuneration is regarded as an allowance then I consider £400 is quite sufficient. If, however, it is regarded in the light of a salary, then I am satisfied that a member cannot carry out his duties, live in a fair amount of comfort, meet all his obligations, and do all that is required of him even on £600 a year. If the Bill is a salaries Bill, £600 is quite insufficient; if it is a Bill to provide us with allowances, £400 is quite adequate. I have always looked upon our remuneration as an allowance, and when I was asked on the hustings if I would vote in favour of increasing the Parliamentary allowance, I stated definitely that I was not in favour of it. I intend to adhere to that promise and shall vote against the Bill on this occasion. When payment of members was instituted years ago it was for the purpose of assisting those who represented one section of the com-

munity and could not attend to their Parliamentary duties from patriotic motives alone, but required financial assistance to help them to carry on. A small amount of £200 a year was granted as an allowance. It was the sole channel from which those members received any payment for their work and it was, in fact, looked upon as a salary. The great objection that I have to that practice is that it makes for the presence of the professional politician. I believe that when we enter a Chamber such as this or the Legislative Assembly, members of Parliament are there not so much for what they can get out of their positions as members of Parliament, but are there to work for the good of the country. We must make some sacrifices, both of time and energy. We are supposed to give of our best for the advancement of the country and I feel that we should not look upon our remuneration as salary, but as an allowance for out-of-pocket expenses. There are those who are not in receipt of an income apart from the allowance, and it is suggested that if they are not paid a reasonable remuneration, one section of the community will not be represented in this House. I appreciate that the argument is sound, and that those members are entitled to receive an adequate return for the sacrifices they make. But, as Mr. Holmes pointed out, each one of those members fought to get here. They used every endeavour to be returned at the top of the poll.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is the good Australian spirit.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: The fact remains that those members have been prepared to fight their election battles and spend money on them in order that they might be returned to Parliament on the rate of remuneration then fixed. I do not think we are justified in altering the allowance until we have had an opportunity, as Mr. Holmes suggested, of consulting the electors. The allowance should not be raised until after the next general election. If that were done, then those who were returned would know that they were to take their seats at the higher rate. Although the present allowance is £400, I would like to ask how many members who have come here and have left their outside positions in order to become professional legislators, if we may refer to them as such, have not improved their positions, both financially and socially.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Socially!

Hon. J. H. YELLAND: Yes. Members have gone so far as to pay £25 down and run the risk of losing it. I do not think the allowance should be increased without some reference being made to the electors and securing their sanction in one way or another. At any rate that is how I view this question. I know perfectly well there are legitimate arguments to be put forward in favour of the increase. If I felt inclined to vote for the Bill, one reason that could be advanced in favour of it is that the Government have greatly increased expenditure. Although we are already heavily taxed and the finances have not improved to the extent we would have liked to see, the Government have increased the expenditure by granting £60,000 to the railway employees.

Hon. J. Nicholson: And increased the metropolitan water supply and sewerage rates.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: But that applies only to expenditure in connection with work now under construction. In addition to the expenditure of £60,000 for railway employees, the Government now suggest that all the departmental employees shall enjoy a 44-hour week. That represents another expenditure. In fact, salaries have been raised almost without the asking. And the conditions have been improved. If we were justified in undertaking those increases, we should be equally justified in increasing our own allowances. But who is to pay for all these increases? The taxpayers will have to foot the bill. Now, at the request of a number of Fremantle people it has been decided to spend a tremendous lot of money on racing at the port, thus increasing expenditure to no effect whatever. The community will receive no benefit at all from that enterprise. If the people of Fremantle are prepared to throw away hundreds of thousands of pounds on that scheme, they can scarcely object to an increased annual amount of £16,000 for members of Parliament. So there are two sides to the question, and sometimes I feel I would be quite justified in supporting the proposed increased allowance. However, that is all it is, an allowance for out-of-pocket expenses, and consequently one would not be justified in increasing it. I am satisfied that if the amount is to be increased the method of doing it adopted by the Government is the only feasible one. It is virtually impossible to take a referendum on such a question. Also it is absurd to

suggest that the question should be made an issue at a general election; for it would at once be made the principal issue, and all the really greater issues would be obscured although, perhaps, representing millions of pounds as against the £16,000 represented in this proposal. Parliament must take the responsibility for its actions. Certainly I am prepared to take the responsibility for my action in voting against the Bill. I have promised to do so, feeling that I am already receiving as an allowance for out-of-pocket expenses all that I am entitled to. It has been suggested that there should be an increase in the number of portfolios, it being urged that the work of Ministers is much greater than it used to be. I think we should be quite justified in spending another £2,000 or £3,000 on additional portfolios. I would support such a proposal, but I cannot support the Bill before us.

HON. H. STEWART (South-East) [6.5]: When, in 1919, a similar proposal came before the House I opposed it for several reasons. Being then new to Parliamentary life I was very much incensed at the tactics adopted. The party with which I am associated have a foolish plank in their platform providing that there shall be no increase in the Parliamentary allowance except as the result of a referendum of the people.

HON. A. J. H. SAW: A dog-in-the-manger attitude. They cannot get it for themselves, and so they do not want anybody else to have it.

HON. H. STEWART: I do not see that the interjection is in any way justified. I have said I think it is a foolish plank in the platform of the Primary Producers' Association. It is not only foolish, but impracticable. It is one of those silly things that creep in and, apparently, people are too lackadaisical to get removed. After the Bill of 1919 was disposed of I wrote to the council of the Primary Producers' Association and advised them to have that plank discussed with a view to its removal. I suggested in lieu of it that the proper way in which to bring about an increase in the Parliamentary allowance was that a motion affirming it should be passed by Parliament, but that the increase should not take effect until after the next general election. Every member here, when last he faced the electors, did so without expectation of any increase during the term he was to serve. In 1919 one of the arguments for the increase was

that there had been a substantial increase in the cost of living. The increase in the Parliamentary allowance brought about by the Bill of 1919 was 33⅓ per cent. Now, when we have had no appreciable increase in the cost of living, the proposal is that members should increase their allowance by 50 per cent. This action, if taken by members, will not improve the prestige of Parliament. In the commercial world it would be stigmatised as an act of commercial immorality. Mr. Holmes has characterised it as job control. I can scarcely go as far as that, but I do say, as I said in the 1919 debate on a similar measure, that it constitutes direct action. I said the same in 1919, and I added that probably it would cause trouble. My prediction was vindicated by the strike of public servants that followed shortly afterwards. A feature that struck me in 1919 was that the Bill did not in either Chamber receive the support of an absolute majority. However, the Bill before us has been carried by such a majority in the Assembly. A few days ago the "West Australian" published an article in which Mr. Archibald Sanderson reviewed the position to the disadvantage of Parliamentarians. That gentleman's attitude towards the Bill of 1919 was a curious one. He was then a member of this House and he inveighed against the unseen lobbying over the Bill. He declared that it was being rushed through in a shameless way.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE: Yet he voted for it!

HON. H. STEWART: Yes, and that is why he voted for it. It is very interesting to watch the course of a Bill to increase the allowance of members. When it comes before the Legislature it is allowed to overshadow in importance everything else. Undoubtedly the Bill of 1919 was rushed through. In another place a resolution affirming the increase was passed, whereupon the "West Australian," always an ardent supporter of the Mitchell Government, declared that the Government had no alternative to bringing in a Bill for the increase, since they had received a constitutional instruction by a resolution of the Assembly. In both Houses many resolutions are passed, only to be ignored by the Government of the day.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

HON. H. STEWART: I was contrasting the position to-day with that of 1919 when a

similar measure was before us. Mr. Sander-son, one of the members at that time, stated that he would vote for the Bill in the hope that it would rouse people to a sense of the unseemliness of what had taken place. On that occasion there was a good deal of canvassing amongst members, and the leading daily newspapers endeavoured to excuse the Premier's action by stating that he had a constitutional instruction to introduce the Bill. The measure passed another place quickly and without a division. One reason why I felt incensed regarding the previous increase no longer holds good. This Bill has been brought forward in a reasonable and seemly manner. Had the public so desired, they have had plenty of opportunity to express an opinion on it through the Press. Except that the "West Australian" has deprecated members voting themselves an increase during the currency of the term for which they were elected, there has been no public protest. As members, by their actions, have indicated that they consider this measure an important one, I hope they will make a point of being in the Chamber when the vote is taken, regardless of whether they vote for or against the measure. I can appreciate the action of any member in expressing an honest opinion for or against, but if members, without adequate cause, do not record their votes, it will be deplorable. Last evening when Mr. Baxter was moving the second reading of the Dried Fruits Bill, I was called to the telephone to speak to his son. Word was received from the farm at Meckering, where Mr. Baxter's eldest son was in charge, saying that the young man was ill, and I was asked to convey the message to Mr. Baxter and tell him he was wanted at Meckering immediately. Seeing that I received the message, it is only fair that members should know the reason for his absence in the event of his not returning in time to record his vote.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: My point was that he should be given an opportunity to record his vote.

Hon. H. STEWART: Quite so. This measure has been on the notice paper for a fairly long time, and as the attendances at the House have been full, an earlier opportunity should have been taken to deal with it. I would sooner it had been taken to a division earlier, so that I would not have been so tied to the House in order to record my vote. It has been asked how members could place their views on this question before their constituents. It never occurred to me that such

a Bill would come before us for consideration during my present term of service. I was returned in May of last year. Originally, I was elected in 1918 and within 18 months of my taking my seat, the measure for an increase came before us. With other members, I voted against the Bill, and endeavoured to amend it so that the increase would not take effect until the succeeding Parliament. During my last election campaign I informed my constituents that I had adhered to the principles of the Country Party and voted against the Bill, but I also told them that I did not like this being a plank of the Country Party platform, because I considered it the height of absurdity to refer such a question to the people. As I believe it will be possible to get the platform as regards this question altered, I think members would be justified in carrying the Bill, so long as it did not take effect until after the next general election. If that is done, any exception that might be taken to the measure would be obviated, and it could not be considered that interested parties had, by direct action, voted themselves increased emoluments on the spur of the moment. I shall oppose the second reading. It is not a matter of whether the increase is warranted by the amount of work that members do. During my first year in Parliament I found one could put in a lot of brain work quite as trying and intensive as is required of a man in any other walk of life, professional or commercial. There is no limit to the amount of work a member can do and he cannot be too highly paid for it. Whether members give service on that basis, each one can answer to his own conscience. If the emoluments were higher even than are proposed, they would not be adequate for the services of some esteemed members of this House. One of the disappointments of political life is the amount of work required of a member to fit himself for his legislative duties, and the relatively small results that he is able to achieve for all the expenditure of brain and effort.

HON. E. ROSE (South-West) [7.40]: I shall not cast a silent vote on this Bill. Every member who so far has spoken agrees that the allowance of £400 a year is insufficient. I concur in that opinion. A member now has double or treble the work that was required of him six years ago. Country members have to spend six months of the year in Perth to attend the sittings of

the House and a considerable portion of the rest of their time is occupied in travelling through the country. Quite a number of members cannot afford to undertake the travelling they should do. I have asked several members to visit the South-West to see at first hand what is being done, in order that they might be able to deal more intelligently with legislation affecting that part of the State, but the reply has been, "It costs too much; I cannot afford it." Every member should devote part of his time to travelling through the State in order to gain first hand knowledge of its requirements. I have travelled through the greater part of Western Australia and I know what such travelling entails. Mr. Holmes mentioned the names of members who voted against the Bill in 1919, my own name amongst the number. He went on to say—

In 1922 I stood on the platform in my native town and said, "I do not want to get mixed up in this election, because I belong to a non-party House. I do not want to take sides because, whoever you send to Parliament, I shall have to work with him. I deem it my duty to tell you I have known the candidate for many years, and I have never known him to do anything dishonest. He has stood up for right in season and out of season." When the fate of this Bill has been decided, I hope to be able to speak of him in a similar strain.

As to how I shall cast my vote, my conscience is perfectly clear, and after the vote is taken, I hope Mr. Holmes will still retain of me the good opinion he had before. I have always endeavoured to carry out whatever business I undertook in a straightforward way, and so long as a member of this House acts according to his conscience, no one should accuse him of being dishonest. Some members suggest referring the proposal to a referendum of the electors. On no other occasion when an increase has been proposed has the question been referred to the country.

Hon. H. Stewart: It has been stated that it should be referred to the country.

Hon. E. ROSE: Members have been likened to directors of a company. There is no comparison between the two. The directors of a company have meetings half-yearly or yearly to which any important matter may be referred. The Bill means the expenditure of another £16,000 a year, but I think we should be justified in voting for it to-night. Members who say they wish to refer the matter to the country are conscientiously voicing that view. Mr. Holmes

said if the Bill were withdrawn, and he were returned next May and it was again brought before the House, he would vote in favour of it. That is only six months hence. If 10 members on being returned to Parliament could carry a Bill like this, they would be justified in voting as their conscience dictated to-night. I intend to support the Bill, and trust it will be carried.

HON. W. T. GLASHEEN (South-East) [7.45]: I shall oppose the Bill, not because I believe that an increase in the Parliamentary allowance is not justified, but because I disbelieve in the method by which it is proposed to bring about this increase. I was rather puzzled by Mr. Yelland's speech this afternoon. He led off by saying that, calculated on the basis of a salary, the present allowance of £400 a year was quite insufficient. Later on he said that any man who entered Parliament at £400 a year very much improved his financial position. It appeared to me that Mr. Yelland said one thing at one moment, and something directly opposite the next moment. He also said that when a man entered Parliament he very much improved his social position. If we take the views expressed by the man in the street, we are led to believe that instead of a man improving his social position by entering Parliament he becomes completely ostracised as soon as he does so. Soon after I was elected I was travelling in the train. The carriage was full of commercial travellers, who were discussing Parliament and politicians. They unanimously agreed that Parliamentarians should be placed in the same category as bugs and other vermin.

Hon. H. Stewart: Were they short of room on the train?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: They did not know there was a new-born politician amongst them. I am pleased to be assured by Mr. Yelland that it is quite all right socially to enter Parliament. I read the remarks made by Mr. Stubbs in the Legislative Assembly. He pointed out that a very great curse had fallen upon every member of Parliament who had dared to vote against an increase in the allowance.

Hon. H. Stewart: That is not so in this Chamber.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I do not know whether Mr. Stubbs was serious. He is reported to have said, or wished to convey

the impression, that if a man was not outed for voting against an increase in the salary, some calamity would befall him, such as being run over by a train or being gored by a bull. The other night Mr. Holmes said something diametrically opposite to that. He stated that if members of this Chamber voted for the increase, something dreadful would happen to them. He pointed out what had happened when the increase in salary was voted for on a previous occasion and added that out of 14 members, only six had remained and that eight had been politically annihilated because they had voted for the increase. According to Mr. Stubbs we shall be annihilated if we do not vote for the increase, and according to Mr. Holmes we shall be annihilated if we do.

Hon. H. Stewart: Each member was making a remark applying to his own particular Chamber.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Possibly. Mr. Holmes also said that every man who entered Parliament knew he would get £400 a year, and that, if he were not satisfied, he should not have applied for the job. I agree to some extent with Mr. Holmes, but would like to add that every member of Parliament did not know when he stood for the position how many obligations would fall upon him when he got here.

Hon. J. Ewing: You have found that out.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Yes. I had no conception of the number of trotting clubs, race clubs, bazaars, agricultural shows and all the other social events there were, for as soon as I was elected each and all notified me that I had been appointed patron of the organisation or society, which was only another way of saying that they desired me to send them a guinea. That is one of the things we find out after we enter Parliament. Mr. Holmes also said that if a member was not satisfied with £400 a year he could get out. He also said that if such a member did get out, there would be perhaps a dozen applicants for his position.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I said there would be three.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: If such a member did get out because he thought £400 a year was insufficient, and if the remuneration were cut down to 25s. a week, possibly there would be many more than three applicants for the job. When one of these candidates entered Parliament, it would not be a question of what they re-

ceived in the way of salary, but it would be a question as to how they behaved when they got here. I am afraid we should get into Parliament the type of man described by Mr. Stephenson, when he was speaking about the Racing Restriction Act Amendment Bill, as tick-tackers, tale-tellers, esplanade orators and so forth.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Do not put them in.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: With such men in Parliament it would be possible to buy their votes for a pot of beer. That would happen if the remuneration were brought down to that level. It has been said there was a time when there was more dignity attached to Parliament, and that this was when men entered Parliament without receiving any salary.

Hon. H. Stewart: And passed faulty Acts which have had to be amended since.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: There never was a time when men entered Parliament for nothing. If they did not receive a salary they entered Parliament in order to defend certain privileges, and out of defending them they received more than any salary they could have been given. The present allowance of £400 a year is insufficient. I think the man who labours with the pick and shovel, all things considered, is getting more than a member of Parliament to-day. If it is desired that men should enter Parliament, and use their brains, if they have any, we should apply the old adage, "Jack is worthy of his hire." I am sorry to have to vote against the Bill for the reason I have stated. We are told that the only way to bring about an increase is by means of this Bill. I understand that in one of the other States the question was referred to a Supreme Court judge. If that is so, I fail to see why the same method should not be applied here for the same purpose.

HON. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [7.55]: During the session many Bills have been introduced. The point has been emphasised both here and in another place that the most important measure of the session was the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill, and that this had at heart the welfare of some 35,000 unionists, and that it would make for industrial peace. The Chief Secretary, in moving the second reading of that Bill, emphasised this, and urged

members to give careful consideration to the measure with the object of bringing about industrial peace. Now we have before us the Parliamentary Allowances Bill. It would seem that at one time there are too few members present to deal with it, and at other times too many. I wonder whether the right atmosphere has been created to-night so that it might be passed. We have suspended the Standing Orders, which will permit of the Bill being passed through its remaining stages to-night. I do not consider the present remuneration given to members is adequate for those who do their work thoroughly. Much has been said concerning members increasing their own salary. Reference has been made to a contract that was entered into, or a bargain that was made with the electors. Every candidate makes some sort of bargain. Everyone knows, when he nominates, what his salary is to be. From time to time the onus of altering the allowances has devolved upon the Parliament of the day. I subscribe to the idea that the properly constituted authority to do this is Parliament. Members themselves should decide, if they do not consider the remuneration is adequate, to increase it. It will be said by some that they are increasing their own salaries. I think they would be very wise if, when increasing the salary, they did not apply it to this Parliament. This would mean that the Bill would be passed, and that the subsequent Parliament would get the benefit. When the candidates were elected, they would be able to receive the increased remuneration. Mr. Holmes referred to 10 members who were going up for re-election next May. He suggested that the 10 would make a test for the 30 who constitute the House. I shall be facing the electors shortly, and they will have every opportunity of passing judgment on my vote. According to Mr. Holmes, the next Council election will decide the issue for those members of the Council who will be here for another two years and another four years before approaching the electors again. If it were decided that the members of the next Parliament should collect any increase that might be granted, it would be more in keeping with fitness than would be the passing of a Bill under which the members carrying it would immediately collect. A suggestion has been made that a referendum might be taken on this question. That suggestion I consider foolish. If we pass the Bill, let us make it applicable to

the next Parliament, and then we shall have done our duty by the electors. In 1907, when the Labour Party were in Opposition, they were not keen on doing what is being done on this occasion. Members of the present Ministry and prominent members of the party suggested that there should be a referendum, and were fairly unanimous in urging that the increase from £200 to £300, if it were granted, should not apply to the then existing Parliament, but to the next Parliament. Evidently they have altered their views in that respect. Nevertheless I submit that this was a wise precaution that was suggested in the years gone by. Another suggestion is that we are putting our hands into the till and assuming job control. My conception of job control is that authority is taken from the people who should be vested with it and delegated to others. As a Legislature we are vested with power, and are merely exercising the privileges conferred upon Parliament by its very Constitution in dealing with such a Bill as this. If we were endeavouring to establish job control, it would be easy for Parliament to provide that legislating is an industry, and that members should come within the scope of the Arbitration Court. Then the Arbitration Court would decide our rates of pay. But if we could be registered as an industrial organisation, it would be possible for us to exercise job control by closing our books and deciding who should become members of the organisation. Thus we could defy the whole of the electors. In those circumstances we would be here for all time, because we could close our books and declare black everybody of whom we did not approve. Then we could go to the Arbitration Court and say, "We want you to fix our remuneration." We would be the deciding factor in that matter, and thus would be exercising job control as it is exercised in other parts of the State and in other walks of life. Perhaps the Labour Government will give serious consideration to my suggestion, so that they may entrench themselves on the Treasury bench and remain there for life. However, I make an earnest appeal to the Leader of the House to stand to his guns in regard to the Arbitration Bill. I share the opinion which has been expressed here and elsewhere, that that is the most important Bill of the session. Yet we find it pushed aside in order that this Parliamentary Allowances Act Amendment Bill may take precedence.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: But there will be a state of industrial unrest until this question is settled.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: This measure should be held in abeyance until the Arbitration Bill has been disposed of finally. Many amendments of much importance have been tabled, and the measure is of sufficient moment to warrant the Labour Government who introduced it, as they said, for the benefit of the industrial workers, in standing to it. It is said that the measure may be cast aside, that it is unacceptable, that it may be used for propaganda at the next election. The very men who have introduced the Arbitration Bill are prepared to say that it does not matter whether that Bill is enacted or not, so long as Parliamentary salaries are put up. I ask the Leader of the House to consider seriously whether the present Bill should not be held over and an opportunity given us to dispose of the Arbitration measure finally before the Parliamentary Allowances Act Amendment Bill is carried.

HON. H. SEDDON (South-East) [8.10]: I do not wish to cast a silent vote on this measure. I am going to support the Bill, because I regard it as in the interests of better politics and the betterment of Parliament. The propriety of members of Parliament raising their own salaries has been questioned. This Bill is a money Bill, and should therefore be handled by us as we have handled many money Bills. The other place deals with funds amounting to eight and a-half million pounds annually, and members of that other place are regarded by the electors as competent to deal with such sums. Then those members should also be competent to deal with the question of their own remuneration. I agree that the present remuneration is not sufficient for a member of Parliament. We should change the title of the Bill and call it plainly a "Parliamentary Salaries Bill." The members who are objecting to this Bill have had Bills before them dealing with much larger sums involving heavy obligations on the people and which they were far more justified in opposing. We are responsible men and recognise the responsibility of our positions. I support the second reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [8.12]: Whatever may be the fate of this measure, it is gratifying to know that the large majority of

members who have spoken against the Bill have not expressed themselves as opposed to it because they regard the present allowance as adequate. Indeed, they have endorsed my contention as to the inadequacy of the payment; but they are disinclined to make the increase before the electors are consulted. The Legislative Council of 1900, of which I was a member, and which by resolution carried without a division was responsible for the early introduction of payment of members, does not appear to have been troubled with any such scruples. When subsequently the Bill was placed before them to carry out their wishes, the opposition to it was based on two grounds. Firstly, members of the Council were to be paid only £100 a year, whereas members of the Assembly were to receive £200. Some members of the Council strongly objected to this as unconstitutional, and one member spoke of it as "an insidious blow at the power and influence of this Chamber." The Assembly gave way on that point. Secondly, there was objection to the proposal to make the measure retrospective. A number of members offered opposition to that phase, and the Council decided to remove the retrospective clause. However, that amendment was not accepted by the Legislative Assembly, and on the Bill being sent back to the Council the amendment was not insisted upon. The Bill, with the clause for retrospective payment, was passed by a majority of 17 to 4. The present Bill makes no provision for retrospective payment, but the old Legislative Council of 1900 eventually passed a Bill with a provision for retrospective payment by a majority of 17 against 4.

Hon. T. Moore: There were statesmen in those days all right!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Such a course was objectionable to many members of the Council, but rather than see the Bill defeated they yielded to the Assembly. The majority of the members of the Council of that day were extreme Conservatives. There was not a solitary Labour representative among them, for the simple reason that the Labour Party as a political party was not then in existence here. I was a member of the Chamber at that time, but I was not a man of means. In those days, however, the Legislative Council used to adjourn for two or three weeks at a time repeatedly during the session, and we rarely had more than 20 Bills to deal with throughout the session.

Consequently I was able to come down from Geraldton and attend the sittings of the Council at not very much expense and at the same time do some business that was beneficial to me from a professional standpoint. The members of the then Council, although they were extreme Conservatives, recognised that there were other men in the Assembly who were not in a position to face the financial obligations imposed upon them by membership of that Chamber. They knew that they were not men, as it has been phrased by Mr. Kitson, richly endowed with this world's goods. Accordingly the Legislative Councillors of that day faced the responsibility of passing the measure for payment of members as it had been passed by the lower House. I do not remember any protest, either at the time or afterwards, as a result of their agreeing to the retrospective payment. On the other hand, I know that the Council went up high in the estimation of every democrat in Western Australia for the liberal measure of political reform it had sanctioned. In consequence of that great reform, due primarily to the Legislative Council, every party in the State can now be represented in the Parliament of the country. I cannot understand members who, while admitting the increase is justified, consider it prudent to postpone payment until after the general election. One could appreciate such an attitude if it were practicable, or desirable, to make it an issue at the general election. In the first place, as I stated when introducing the Bill, it would be impossible to get an expression of opinion on the question at a general election. I would like to emphasise the fact that when the general election comes round, the old-time issues will prevail. A Labour Government will have been in power for three years and all their sins of omission and commission, real and imaginary, will be laid bare to the public gaze by the parties opposed to them. Their mistakes will be exaggerated, their shortcomings magnified, and the electors will be told that the Labour Government are not fit to continue to run the country. The electors will be warned that danger lurks under the Labour platform. On the other hand, the Labour Party will strive to prove that the Government have discharged their responsibilities faithfully and efficiently, and have left the State more prosperous than they found it. The beneficial effects of the Labour policy

will be stressed to no end. These are the issues that will be raised at the general election. Unless, of course, the Nationalist Party and the Labour Party both go to pieces in the meantime, such an irrelevant question as Parliamentary allowances cannot even creep into the programme, because the leaders of both parties with large followings are committed to this measure. All the parties are committed to it except one that has made provision on its platform that this question should go before the electors per medium of a referendum, to which every member of the House, outside that particular party, is strongly opposed. It would not be desirable to make it an issue at the general election. There would be any number of candidates for Parliamentary honours who, as Mr. Lovekin indicated, would be prepared to come forward and offer to do the work at the old wage. Possibly there would be some without any visible means of support, quite ready to take on the job for nothing, just as an enterprising couple approached me many years ago and asked me to use my influence to secure for them the management of a State hotel. It was a short time after there had been some strong criticism in Parliament in regard to the high salary paid to one of the managers. The applicants for the position agreed that the salary was too high, and they offered to do the work for nothing, except keep, provided they got a three-years' engagement.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Where was this?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I cannot mention names. The members of the Federal Parliament receive £1,000 a year and I do not think their labours are more strenuous than are ours. Except in regard to the Post Office and Pensions Department, they deal mostly with matters that concern the Commonwealth as a whole rather than the individual, whereas our responsibilities cover everything that directly and intimately affects our different constituencies. The increasing of the salaries of Federal members from £600 to £1,000 a year was adversely commented upon in the Press at the time and, although I was in my district during the succeeding general election, I did not hear even one candidate for re-election asked to give an explanation. The issue was decided on the usual Labour and anti-Labour basis, and I do not believe that any of those members who voted themselves an increase lost

a single vote for so doing. The electors, after giving the matter thought, recognised that the increase could not have been brought about by any other means. Apparently none of them was prepared to contend that the amount was unwarranted. In our case it is stated by one of our most respected members that, although he cannot support the Bill, he is prepared to take the platform and say that the increase is justified. Two other members argue that they entered into a contract to discharge the duties on the basis of £400 and that they would be guilty of a violation of contract if they supported the Bill. If that principle were generally accepted, payment of members would have to be made an issue at the next three biennial Council elections before it would be proper to assent to any increase in the emoluments of members of the legislature. In other words, the Assembly would have to wait until after 1930 before the Council could even consider the question. And, extending over the three biennial elections, we would have the question of increased Parliamentary allowances pushed into the forefront and made to supersede the score of other issues that engage the minds of electors during the progress of a political campaign. I made reference to the old Legislative Council. I am always curious to delve into old historical literature and, in connection with this question, I refreshed my memory regarding what occurred in the old Legislative Council of 1900. One member told us that those who support the proposed increase in Parliamentary allowances on this occasion will be guilty of improper conduct. That was the effect of what he said. Were the members of the old Legislative Council who were first responsible for the introduction of payment of members, and who unanimously passed the second reading of the Bill that initiated the principle in this State, guilty of improper conduct? Were those same members guilty of improper conduct who finally passed the retrospective clauses of the Bill by a majority of over four to one? The late Mr. George Randell and the late Sir Winthrop Hackett—then plain Mr. Hackett—could scarcely be accused of conduct politically immoral or unconstitutional. I would like hon. members to listen to what those gentlemen had to say when the Bill was before the Legislative Council. When the Bill had come back from the Legislative Assembly, after the Lower Chamber had refused to agree

to the deletion of the retrospective clauses, Mr. Randell said—

He had been listening to hon. members, but he thought the arguments used with reference to the retrospective character of the clause were overstrained. The same state of circumstances would arise on the meeting of the new Parliament to a very large extent, if not entirely, so far as this Council was concerned, as existed at the present moment. The Council would consist of the same members as at present, and if the question had then to be dealt with, the members would still be voting in just the same way, for the legislation would be retrospective. Supposing the Bill were now thrown out, it would not be reintroduced in the first week Parliament met next session, and though the length of time would not be so great, the principle would be just the same. The legislation would, as he had said, be retrospective, because most likely it would be arranged that the honorarium should take effect from the first of July, and Parliament might not meet before that date, or, perhaps, till August, as was the case this year, but he did not think that was likely. The argument had been overstrained.

There is no indication of improper conduct suggested by Mr. Randell, regarding the attitude of other hon. members, although Mr. Randell was first opposed to that provision. He continued—

..... It was true there would be a general election for the Lower House, but members would have to come back and vote themselves, as it was very baldly stated, an honorarium. There seemed to be very good reasons given why members who had been serving the country for years—for the last four years many of them—should have some reward for their labour. It was admitted by all that the amount of the honorarium did not represent the labour which members of either House of the Legislature were giving to the business of the country.

Now let members hear what the late Sir Winthrop Hackett, who was practically the founder of the "West Australian" newspaper, had to say. These were his words—

Taking into consideration that after all this matter concerned another place more than us, that the Assembly were the custodians and the guardians of the public purse, and that grants of money came in the first instance from the Assembly, since the Council had given the other House an opportunity of reconsidering this matter, and retracing their steps in regard to the retrospective payments, he (Mr. Hackett) would not press his opinion; he would vote for the motion.

There were other members, too, who expressed themselves in a similar strain, and who were men of high standing in the community, men who were in no need of remuneration for their Parliamentary labours. I have quoted the late Mr. Randell and the

late Sir Winthrop Hackett, as they were known personally to many of the present members, as legislators and citizens of the soundest judgment and of unimpeachable integrity. I submit that the proper course for members to take, if they think the increase can be justified, is to support the Bill and shoulder the responsibility. As I said in my second reading speech, there are members of this House in such affluent circumstances that they do not need the increase. I am sure they would be quite prepared to give their services to the State without remuneration. The same could be said of 90 per cent. of the Legislative Council of 1900. The fact, however, did not weigh with them when they adopted payment of members with retrospective effect. Their concern was for those not so happily circumstanced from a financial point of view. Owing to the number of men of wealth in this Chamber it is in a strong position—as was this House 25 years ago—to endorse the action of the Assembly without leaving itself open to any possible charge of being actuated by selfish motives in coming to such a determination. Mr. Harris referred to the Arbitration Bill. I hope that measure will come on for consideration this evening and be finalised so that it may be sent back to the Assembly for consideration there on Tuesday. I know Mr. Harris will co-operate with me in that regard and that no obstacle will be placed in the way of submitting that important piece of legislation to the other branch of the Legislature.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Could we not finalise that before we dispose of this?

Question put, and a division taken, with the following result:—

Ayes	12
Noes	10
			—
Majority for	2
			—

AYES.	
Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Harris	(Teller.)
Hon. J. W. Hickey	

NOES.	
Hon. W. T. Glasbehn	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	(Teller.)
Hon. G. W. Miles	

PAIR.

AYS.	NO.
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. A. Lovekin

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3:

Hon. H. STEWART: I move an amendment—

That in line two, “commencement of this Act” be struck out.

If that be agreed to, I will move to insert, in lieu of the words struck out, the words “day after the next general election of members of the Assembly.” My object is simply to put the proposed increase on a basis that will maintain the prestige of Parliament. It will establish a better precedent than that obtaining at present.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: This is a very important amendment. I am opposed to it. The proposal might very well have emanated from the Assembly, but it is not right that the Council should put such a condition into the Bill, for it does not vitally affect the members of the Council. It will merely mean that the increase in the remuneration of those of us who do not go up for re-election next May will be delayed. But as it affects the other House, it will be a self-denying ordinance. Under it members of the Assembly will be expected to offer up their political selves as sacrificial lambs. I do not recommend that attitude, and I cannot support the amendment.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The object of the amendment is that the proposed increase should be deferred until such time as the electors can express an opinion upon it. I happen to be one of those who have to go up for re-election next May. I am prepared to go to my constituents and state what I have done and what I am prepared to do, namely, not to increase the allowance until such time as the finances of the State are appreciably improved. By deferring the increase until the next general election for the Assembly, we shall be giving the electors of this House an opportunity to express an opinion on it at the May election. Also, if

the Bill does not come into operation until after the next general election for the Assembly, if Council members who have supported the Bill are returned in May next it will indicate a ratification by the electors, not only of the Council but also of the Assembly. That is how I view the matter. I will support the amendment.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I will support the amendment because it will serve to remove any stigma that might be cast upon Parliament. I cannot agree with Dr. Saw that the amendment will put up another place for execution. If there is to be any trouble at all we have to remember that the Bill emanated from another place, and at a time when another place did not give much consideration to what might happen to members of this Chamber in consequence. The 10 members of the Council who have to go before the electors in May next will be called upon to give an account of their stewardship long before Assembly members are asked to make explanation. It may be that, as a result of the May election, this Bill will be repealed and, in consequence, the Treasury will not be called upon to pay out anything additional. The Committee would be wise to accept the amendment.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I support the amendment. Unfortunately I shall not be in a position to record my vote because I have undertaken to pair with Mr. Dodd. This money should not be taken from the Treasury until the electors have had some voice on the question directly or indirectly. The passing of this measure will put some members in a very awkward position. The cost of living is increasing by leaps and bounds, and here is another incentive for it to advance. We cannot justly refuse to increase the wages of the masses if we take 50 per cent. increase for ourselves.

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

Ayes	9
Noes	12
				—
Majority against	..			3
				—

AYES.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. J. R. Brown
Hon. W. H. Kitson	(Teller.)
Hon. T. Moore	

PAIR.

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. J. E. Dodd

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [8.51]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [8.52]: Will the Chief Secretary defer the moving of the third reading till the next sitting of the House?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I see no reason for deferring it. The Bill has been before this Chamber for a week and contains only two clauses involving a simple principle.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

Resumed from the previous day. Hon. J. W. Kirwan in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 47 of the reprinted Bill and Clause 57 of the original Bill. Mr. Lovekin had moved to strike out all the words after "Part V., Basic Wage," with a view to inserting the following:—

100. (1.) Before the fourteenth day of June in every year the Court, of its own motion, shall determine and declare—

- a basic wage to be paid to male and female workers;
- wherever or whenever necessary, differential basic rates to be paid in special or defined areas of the State.

(2.) The expression "basic wage" means a sum sufficient to enable the average worker to whom it applies to live in reasonable comfort, having regard to any domestic obligation to which such average worker would be ordinarily subject.

(3.) By leave of the Court any party concerned may be represented at and take part in any inquiry which may be held by the Court when determining the basic wage. The Court may allow such reasonable costs to the parties as it may deem to be sufficient and such shall be payable from moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purposes of this Act.

(4.) The determination of the Court shall be presented to the Minister, who shall cause it to be published forthwith in the *Gazette*.

(5.) The basic wage so declared shall operate and have effect from the first day of July thence next ensuing and shall remain in force until the thirtieth day of June in the year following.

(6.) After the declaration of the basic wage as aforesaid, no award or industrial agreement shall be made which prescribes a lesser wage in money or money's worth than the basic wage, except in the case of junior, infirm or aged workers, or apprentices.

Existing awards and agreements.

101. Awards and industrial agreements made before the commencement of this Part of the Act may be varied by the Court on the application of either party so far as the same may be inconsistent with the basic wage as determined under this Part of the Act. If no application be made such awards and industrial agreements shall continue in force until the expiration of their currency.

New awards and agreements.

102. Awards and industrial agreements made after the commencement of this Part of the Act shall prescribe and distinguish separately—

- (a) the basic wage;
- (b) any other wages or allowances, and/or additional remuneration in respect to skill or employment in offensive, unhealthy, injurious, or dangerous occupations, trades, or vocations.
- (c) any deductions in respect to junior, infirm or aged workers or apprentices, or for benefits received in the course of the employment.

Automatic increases or decreases.

103. Subject to section one hundred and one the basic wage prescribed in every award and industrial agreement shall, from time to time, automatically become increased or decreased so that it conforms to and is parity with the basic wage as last determined by the Court: Provided that in the case of junior, infirm, or aged workers or apprentices, in respect to whom a lower basic wage may have been prescribed, such increase or decrease shall be *pro rata* to such lower rate of wage.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I promised Mr. Stewart to see Mr. Keenan, K.C., about two points, but unfortunately I have been unable to get a reply. The point he raised regarding the proposed new section 103 is met by the proposed new section 102. To accept sub-

section 2 of the proposed new section 100, reading, "In declaring such basic wage the court shall not take into consideration any deductions from such wages for allowances," would be disastrous. Possibly members do not appreciate the effect of Mr. Keenan's opinion. After the passing of this measure we shall enter upon a new era. Every award and agreement must then contain the basic wage—the lowest living wage. Under this provision there can be no deduction from the basic wage for allowances or anything superimposed upon the basic wage. Suppose the rural workers had a union, and a man was at present receiving £3 a week, the employer providing him with a house, milk, butter and eggs which are now regarded as allowances to the worker.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That is frequently done.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes. Under the new order of things the award or agreement would have to contain the basic wage. If this were fixed at £4 per week, and subsection 2 of the proposed new section 100 were retained, the worker on such a farm would receive £4 for the basic wage, plus the allowances in the shape of house, milk, butter, eggs, etc., because the court could not take those allowances into consideration.

Hon. H. Stewart: The employee would not necessarily get them. It would depend upon the arrangement between the employer and the man.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: As the provision stands, employees would naturally resent being deprived of any such privileges and there would be trouble. They would get the basic wage in cash and these allowances on top of the basic wage. On the other hand, a man working on the road would have no farmer to find a house, eggs, butter and milk for him. He would receive only the basic wage, as has been pointed out by Mr. Keenan. The same might apply to clubs where the basic wage is stipulated to be, say, £4 and the employees get board and lodging as allowances. The employees would object to having any of their allowances or privileges taken away, and would get those on top of the basic wage. I do not think anybody intends that. What is intended is that the basic wage shall be a living wage, out of which the employee has to pay for all the cost of his living. That is possible under the clause which I am submitting, and that clause meets the point raised by Mr. Stewart. If the basic

wage were £4, then on a farm it would still be £4, but payable partly in money and partly in money's worth. The same thing would apply with regard to club employees. There is also the case of railway employees who are supplied with uniforms.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Who would decide the value of the board, for instance?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Arbitration Court when making an award, or it would be decided when an agreement was being made. The original clause, however, would cause a great deal of difficulty, as pointed out by Mr. Keenan.

Hon. H. STEWART: I cannot accept Mr. Lovekin's amendment, which in my opinion is not sufficiently definite. The hon. member has proved himself a word-spinner. His word-spinning has repeatedly given rise to difficulty here. One occasion was in connection with the Parliamentary Allowances Bill of 1919. Some statements made by Sir Edward Wittenoom gave rise to criticism by Mr. Lovekin in 1920, but the hon. member was unable to secure any support. Another occasion was in connection with the two Grain Elevator Bills of 1920, both of which measures were lost practically without an opportunity for discussion. In "Hansard" for 1921, on page 2,311, Mr. Colebatch, speaking on the Grain Bill, is reported as saying—

The proceedings in regard to this Bill will be a lesson to me to be slow about entering into any agreement as to following a certain course of action. On Thursday I read a letter from the company as to the action I was going to take. That undertaking had its basis on a letter I received from Mr. Lovekin, which stated that the company would be satisfied with the deletion of all the clauses of the Bill, except Clause 19. That letter was drawn up by Mr. Lovekin. It was presented to the directors of the company, and they fell in with it, and advised me accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member to give merely the purport.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I insist, Mr. Chairman, that you allow the hon. member to read the whole of that now. This is most unfair. It has nothing to do with the Bill. I must have an opportunity of replying to this, and I suggest that the hon. member should not stop there, but should read the whole of it, and get to the end and see where it will lead to.

Hon. H. STEWART: In order to do that I shall have to read pages upon pages of "Hansard."

The CHAIRMAN: I was about to suggest to the hon. member that he need not go into the details. I understand the drift of his argument.

Hon. H. STEWART: I am merely giving specific instances as to why I am unable to follow Mr. Lovekin regarding his amendment. In 1924 the hon. member—

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask the hon. member to give just the purport.

Hon. H. STEWART: In 1924 Mr. Lovekin laid on the Table of the House an opinion by Sir Howard D'Egville as to the rights of the Legislative Council in regard to money Bills.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask what the purpose of this is?

Hon. H. STEWART: To show why I cannot support the hon. member in his phraseology, nor as regards the amendment he has put up. The Committee is being asked to accept another set of amendments because they are simpler. I am giving reasons why I cannot follow that series of amendments. In each of the cases I have quoted, misunderstanding arose; and I doubt if the misunderstandings have been settled yet. According to the "Hansard" of 1924, page 826, Dr. Saw. joined issue with Mr. Lovekin regarding certain words that were supposed to be an epitome of the opinion of Sir Howard D'Egville. Dr. Saw interpreted the opinion of Sir Howard D'Egville, and said he had submitted the opinion and interpretation to three eminent lawyers in Perth, who had assured him that his interpretation was perfectly correct and that the Bill in question was perfectly in order, according to Sir Howard D'Egville's opinion. I do not think that any member of the House would gather these important conclusions from Mr. Lovekin's epitome of Sir Howard D'Egville's opinion. Mr. Lovekin's epitome was not accepted by Dr. Saw and three eminent lawyers.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Will you tell me why you cannot read this clause?

Hon. H. STEWART: There is another instance, being the case of an insurance manager concerned with industrial insurance canvassers. Since the debate on that subject has been published, I have been sought out by an insurance manager who was not present at the conference held here. He came here subsequently with the same table that I submitted to the House, except that the former contained the names. The insurance

manager told me that Mr. Lovekin and some other members saw that table, and that Mr. Lovekin asked for a copy of it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I stated that here.

Hon. H. STEWART: The manager said he would be only too pleased to furnish a copy, but that the table gave the men's names and incomes, and that he did not think it would be fair to give that information in detail. He said that but for that he would have given it to Mr. Lovekin. The hon. member suggested that numbers should be substituted for the names. The manager went back to his office and before the House met, he despatched by special messenger a copy of the document, containing numbers instead of names, to Mr. Holmes and Mr. Lovekin. They were the only two to whom copies were despatched.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I got mine the next day, as I told you.

Hon. H. STEWART: When the matter was referred to in the House, Mr. Lovekin interjected that others seemed to have a copy but he had not one at all. If the hon. member had not received his, then it was because he had not attended to his mail, or for some such reason. Mr. Holmes received his.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member is wandering too far from the scope of the discussion.

Hon. H. STEWART: I am instancing this as an example to show that there has been some misunderstanding, and it is because of these things, I am not prepared to give my support to the series of amendments upon which the legal opinion has been tendered.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am sorry that Mr. Stewart has decided to vote against the clause, not on its merits, but has preferred to launch out and make a personal attack upon me. It has been a studied attack because he brought a number of volumes of "Hansard" with him in order to support that attack. I do not mind being attacked, but I do not think any member should produce volumes of "Hansard" with which to attack another member without giving him some notice, thereby enabling him to look up the references for himself to ascertain if the views of the attacking member are correct. My memory, however, is good enough to enable me to deal with the matters that have been referred to. Mr. Stewart has accused me of all sorts of things, even of lying to this House.

Hon. H. Stewart: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That is what Mr. Stewart's statement amounted to. He said that the manager had sent two copies of the wages sheet relating to industrial insurance agents to the House, one for Mr. Holmes and one for me. When I spoke I said I was surprised that other members apparently had the particulars, but that I had not received them. That was the truth.

Hon. H. Stewart: You were misleading the House.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I was not misleading the House.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I know you had not got a copy at that time.

Hon. H. Stewart: And I say a copy had been sent.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That does not say that I had received it, or that I had made a misstatement to the House. The fact is that I had not got it; I received it next day. It is wrong for an hon. member to make an attack on me in these circumstances, and say that the amendment should be voted against because of something that happened in this Chamber in 1919. I must have something to say about that, and I hope you, Mr. Chairman, will allow me to refer to the incidents that Mr. Stewart spoke about. If I do not do so, hon. members will remain under a false impression. The first reference Mr. Stewart made was to a matter that concerned the President and myself. I am sorry that the incident has been revived; I am forced to defend myself. The President made a charge against me after I had left the House and said that I had divulged to a newspaper information that I had heard in the corridor. I repudiated the charge, but as the session had ended I could not take any action to bring the matter before the House. I looked up the Standing Orders and found that I could bring it up when the House met again, that being the earliest opportunity I would have of doing so. I followed that course and moved a motion. Mr. Colebatch was then Leader of the House and he came to me and said, "It is not seemly for two members of the Chamber to have this personal feud. Let it drop." I was in the position then that if I forced my motion, the then President, Mr. Kingsmill, would have had to repudiate the Standing Orders or call upon Sir Edward Wittenoom, who was then a private member, to withdraw his statement. Mr. Colebatch had seen the President, and he told me that he had

arranged with Sir Edward that if I withdrew my motion and repeated that I had not divulged the information to the newspaper, Sir Edward would get up and express regret, and that would end the matter. I did so, in accordance with Mr. Colebatch's representations, and I suppose that is on record in "Hansard" too. I rose in my place in the House and said that I had not been guilty of a breach of confidence in divulging anything to the newspaper as to what had taken place. I then sat down—but Sir Edward did not rise. After the business had been concluded Mr. Colebatch spoke to me and I drew his attention to the position in which I had been placed. Mr. Colebatch did not know what had happened, but at any rate, that ended it. Mr. Stewart did not continue his extracts from "Hansard" to tell hon. members about that point. Then he referred to the two Grain Elevator Bills. I believe that the action I, in conjunction with other members, took on that occasion saved the farmers many thousands of pounds. That fact is demonstrated by what happened in New South Wales and also by Mr. MacCallum Smith, who came to me subsequently and told me he was glad we had set aside the Bills because the work could be carried out now for half as much as it would have cost at that time. I do not like having to say these things, but I am forced to do so by the stab in the back from Mr. Stewart.

Hon. H. Stewart: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: His remarks have nothing to do with the Bill. Mr. Stewart has taken up a lot of time this afternoon, and instead of studying the Bill, he has wasted his time by looking through "Hansard" and then quoting portions of it to the Committee. The Minister who was in charge of the Bill realised the position.

Hon. H. Stewart: What about Mr. Colebatch?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I will deal with that incident too. The late Mr. Basil Murray came to see me at my house regarding the Grain Elevator Bill then before us and wanted to know what the objections to it were. I told him, and at his request I wrote out what was required. I handed the written document to Mr. Murray and he took it away and had it signed. Mr. Colebatch came to this Chamber, not with the original—fortunately the original had come back to me from Mr. Basil Murray, and I can

produce it to-day—but with a copy from which a very important omission had been made. Mr. Colebatch read the document and I challenged it. Mr. Colebatch stuck to it and I said I could produce the original next day. Why did not Mr. Stewart refer to the "Hansard" report on that point?

Hon. H. Stewart: You know that the crux of the question was the schedule in the Bill.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not know anything of the sort.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask Mr. Stewart to allow the hon. member to proceed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Mr. Stewart attacked me in respect of the letter.

Hon. H. Stewart: That was the outcome of the trouble.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Hon. members who were here at the time know that Mr. Colebatch read the letter, an important portion of which had been omitted. I drew attention straight away to the omission and Mr. Colebatch said that it was a copy that had been handed to him. I told him that it was an incorrect copy and after I had produced the original Mr. Colebatch apologised to me. Why did not Mr. Stewart tell the whole story? If he desires to attack me why did he not read the rest of the extracts from "Hansard"? The next point he raised related to the legal opinion from Sir Howard D'Egville, which I laid on the Table of the House. It is true that I spoke on that matter. Hon. members will see, if they peruse the "Hansard" report, that before I could explain it I was stopped by the President. I was not allowed to proceed with it. Dr. Saw attacked me for misrepresenting the position. I intended to reply to Dr. Saw at the start of the following session, which would have been my first opportunity. When I had an opportunity to refer to it, I pointed out the position to Dr. Saw. I said, "Does the hon. member think that I was so insane as to get up here and make a statement as to the contents of a document which did not bear out what I said and then be fool enough to put it on the Table, as well as to furnish members with printed copies of the document?" I suggested to Dr. Saw that if I had done any such thing he should get another medical man and together they should certify that I was a fit subject for an institution and not for this House. Are these miserable attacks that

have nothing whatever to do with the Bill, to be made upon a member for motives of pure spite?

Hon. J. Nicholson: I do not see that they have anything to do with the Bill.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I was going to say more, but perhaps I can leave it at that.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It is not worth while.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: It is wrong for such attacks to be launched upon a member in this Chamber without any notice whatever. I regard Mr. Stewart's attack as a wicked one. If I had not happened to remember the circumstances, I do not know what hon. members would have thought. Are the reasons that Mr. Stewart advanced such as should influence members in voting against the amendment? Do they furnish ground for his inability to understand it? Perhaps I should not be surprised that such is the state of Mr. Stewart's mind that he could spend the whole afternoon in turning over the leaves of "Hansard" instead of studying the Bill. I am not surprised at the result. I am sorry that I have had to go into these matters, but hon. members will acquit me of any responsibility for the position.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Members will regret having had to listen to what has taken place. I give expression to the view of the majority of the members of this House when I say that they agree that the reasons advanced by Mr. Stewart for not agreeing to the amendment suggested by Mr. Lovekin have, to use an old phrase, "nothing to do with the case." Those reasons are so far wide of the position that I was astounded at Mr. Stewart attacking Mr. Lovekin in the way he did. I am sorry he did so. Every member appreciates Mr. Lovekin's earnestness in his work. When any member seeks faithfully to discharge his duties, the least that other members can do is to show their appreciation of his zeal, and not destroy the work he is engaged upon. The whole question is one of choice between two draft clauses, one presented by the Chief Secretary and the other by Mr. Lovekin. I have no hesitation in saying that the simpler of the two clauses is that submitted by Mr. Lovekin. I will support it. I appreciate the good work put into the Bill by the Chief Secretary and Mr. Holmes, and the assistance they have obtained from Mr. Jackson and the Solicitor General. But it

is undoubted that Mr. Lovekin's clause is the simpler of the two, and the more clearly expresses our intentions.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I intend to vote for Mr. Lovekin's clause. As one who made some remarks in reference to the interpretation of Sir Howard D'Egville's opinion laid on the Table by Mr. Lovekin, may I be permitted to say a few words. It is quite true that Mr. Lovekin, when laying the paper on the Table indicated that Sir Howard D'Egville's opinion coincided with the view of certain members of the House who had contended that the Bill was not in order. I was not present when Mr. Lovekin made that statement, but I have read it in "Hansard." Months afterwards, when addressing the House I went into the matter, and perhaps dealt somewhat hardly with Mr. Lovekin. However, I have since come to realise that mistakes can be honestly made. For instance, only the other evening, when I was quoting from an industrial agreement issued by the A.M.P., I read out certain words. Mr. Lovekin denied that those words were in his copy of the agreement. The explanation proved simple. I had quoted from the end of a paragraph, whereas Mr. Lovekin, on looking up the paragraph, read only its opening lines, and so did not see at the end the words I had quoted. There was an instance of a perfectly innocent misrepresentation. I am sorry that this extraneous matter should have been introduced to-night.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Subclause (6) would cause no end of complications: "Which prescribes a lesser wage in money or money's worth." What does "money's worth" mean?

Hon. J. Nicholson: Uniforms, or things of that sort.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: How is one to arrive at the value of uniforms and things of that sort? It will cause no end of complications. It is necessary that when determining the basic wage the court shall not take into consideration any deduction from such wage for uniforms or things of that sort. The court cannot take into consideration the thousand things that different employers might do. For instance, the Railway Department might supply its employees with uniforms, while one farmer might supply his employees with eggs, as against another farmer who supplies his employees with butter. That is a question to

be considered only when the parties come before the court. It cannot be taken into account in determining the basic wage, which has to apply all round.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: "Money or money's worth" are words suggested by Mr. Keenan.

Hon. T. MOORE: I take the Chief Secretary's line of reasoning. There is a difference between the basic wage and the wage fixed by the court for a given industry. It is when a body of workers come before the court for an award that the court will consider what those workers are to get, including uniforms, or eggs, or other commodities. Mr. Lovekin's idea apparently is that Subclause (6) shall take the place of Subsection (3) of Section 100.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am afraid the Chief Secretary has not grasped the point. In the new order of things every man must get the basic wage, which is the lowest living wage.

Hon. T. Moore: Whether he be living in or living out?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes, he must get the basic wage. If the basic wage is £4 per week, he might get £3 in cash and £1 in kind for board and lodging, but he must get the basic wage wherever he is. On top of that he will get certain allowances. He may be a railway man who receives an allowance for uniform or a travelling concession for his wife and family. All those things would be fixed on top of the basic wage either by the agreement or the award. It is necessary that it should be in that form. There is a provision that the basic wage may increase or decrease according to the annual declaration of the court, but it is only the basic wage portion that is to be affected by the increase or decrease. The other allowances will not be affected by the rise or fall of the basic wage. If the basic wage is £4 and a man has 10s. worth of allowances, those things will be set out in the award or the agreement.

Hon. E. H. Gray: And that will reduce his wage to £3 10s.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No, he will get the £4 plus the 10s. First the basic wage and then any additional wages or allowances must be set out.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If the basic wage increased by 5s., he would get £4 5s., plus the 10s.?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes, and if it went down 5s., he would get £3 15s. plus the 10s.

A rural worker may receive board and lodging or have a house to live in. The first thing the union would do would be to make industrial agreements, and the agreements would have to vary because the accommodation and food and allowances supplied on some farms will be better than those supplied on others. Every worker, however, will start off with a certain value for his basic wage. One farmer might provide a nice house and plenty of butter and eggs, and the employer and employee would either come to an agreement as to what it was worth, or the court would award it. The man would receive so much cash for the basic wage and so much for the allowances. Another man probably would have to pay all in cash. It would be monstrously unfair if any other basis were adopted, because we would have one man employed on a farm getting the basic wage and the allowances, while another man employed on the road received the basic wage without any allowances. The farmer of, course, might take away the allowances, in which case there would be trouble. The employee is not bound to accept the allowances; he may have cash if he wants it. There would be this anomaly: that the man on the road with no farmer to board him or supply him with butter and eggs would get the basic wage and no more, whereas the man on the farm would get the value of the basic wage plus the allowances from the farmer. That would not be fair. The clause drafted by Mr. Keenan would place the two men on the same basis, though probably the worker on the farm would be better off in that his house rent might be less than the man on the road would have to pay. Members apparently cannot get out of their heads the existing state of affairs and realise that a new order of things will be instituted. We cannot do better than provide that every man shall receive at least a living wage to start with. That is what the clause provides. Mr. Keenan says it is set out clearly in my amendment and I think the Chairman or Dr. Saw would say it is set out more clearly in my amendment than in the Bill. The only thing left out of my amendment is the provision that the court shall take into consideration any reduction from such wages for allowances, which provision is incomprehensible when an attempt is made to apply it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I pose as a peacemaker. We have arrived at a stage when no principle is involved as to the adoption of

the basic wage. The only question that could be introduced is that of including the five-roomed house. Two members have endeavoured, both jointly and independently, to draft new provisions dealing with the basic wage. All that concerns us is the phraseology and whether the essentials agreed upon have been adequately expressed. Now it is becoming a personal question.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There is nothing personal in it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If I were asked to decide on the personal aspect, I would be neutral; if I were asked to say which was the more concise of the two clauses, I would favour Mr. Lovekin's. Difficulty arises, however, because Mr. Lovekin's clause is not acceptable to the Minister, though if it were put to the vote, I think the Committee would accept it. If the Committee agreed to the clause and the Minister would not, we would be no further ahead. I suggest that the Minister should agree to report progress and that he with Mr. Lovekin and Mr. Holmes should endeavour to find a way out of the difficulty.

Hon. J. Nicholson: They have tried.

Hon. T. Moore: This is the third night we have discussed it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Let them try again.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Let each member vote for the clause he prefers.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Yes, and get rid of it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is the position I wish to avoid. The Minister will not agree to Mr. Lovekin's amendment.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Anyhow, let us settle it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Then we shall be no further forward.

Hon. T. Moore: Another place has yet to consider it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, but surely members here can agree upon a mere matter of drafting in which no principle is involved.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Will the Minister tell us the meaning of the provision that the court shall take into consideration any deduction from such wages for allowances? I am the more anxious to know since hearing the remarks of Mr. Moore. The court has to declare a basic wage once a year and that should stand by itself.

Hon. J. R. Brown: It will be an index figure.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I see no reference to an index figure. If the basic wage is to be based on Knibbs's index figures, or some

other method. I cannot see why any reference should be made to allowances.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The court will have to decide the lowest wage to be paid to an unskilled man. It will hear evidence as to what constitutes a fair wage.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Then why refer to allowances?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It will not be the function of the court to take allowances into account in arriving at the basic wage. A farmer employing a man might be providing him with milk and eggs free. After the declaration of the basic wage, the farmer would be within his rights in saying, "A basic wage has been declared and new conditions are coming into operation. Hitherto I have been supplying you with milk and eggs free. In future you will have to pay for them."

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is exactly the position.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Then why refer to allowances?

Hon. G. W. Miles: Would not board and lodging be taken into consideration?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The employer might charge for board and lodging, say 25s. a week. On that, employer and employee must come to an agreement.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The employer would not be entitled to deduct the value of it from the man's wages.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Then the farmer would have to trust the employee to pay him. If an employer had to pay £4 a week as the basic wage, he might ask 10s. a week for house rent. These matters must be arranged between the employer and the employee. The allowance for uniforms for railway men, however, might be fixed by the court, and other similar allowances for large bodies of men might also be submitted to the court.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Minister is quite right. The employee would have to pay, say, 10s. a week for the house. When the farmer came to pay him at the end of the week he would pay him £3 10s. in cash and say, "The house represents 10s. a week; that makes up your full basic wage." It is also set out here that these things must be stated. There must be no doubt about the man getting the basic wage in full, either in cash or in kind. But the words "no deductions for allowances" cannot be interpreted.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am not satisfied with the Chief Secretary's remarks. They do not get us anywhere. The court is to fix the basic wage. It does not matter whether some sections of employees get railway passes, or suits of clothing, or anything else. Those things do not come into the picture. I do not yet understand why the words in question should be inserted, and I am not yet satisfied as to what they would mean in the clause.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: A basic wage, I understand, is a living wage for a man, irrespective of any perquisites he gets. Whatever he gets over and above the basic wage is his own look-out. The House is disturbed over a controversy between Mr. Lovekin and Mr. Holmes.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There has been no controversy.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: When Mr. Holmes came back here armed with his reports, Mr. Lovekin went away and got Mr. Keenan's opinion. Now, two lawyers will never agree. They have to disagree in order to get a case. We have been fighting night after night over such a disagreement. In this instance I am prepared to support Mr. Holmes. We are wasting time and sitting late over a difference of opinion which is simply a lot of rot. Once the basic wage is fixed by the court, if a man gets a house in addition, or milk in addition, that is the man's good luck. This controversy between Mr. Holmes and Mr. Lovekin should cease, and we should get on with the Bill.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I move—

That the Committee do now divide.

Motion put and passed.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	10
				—
Majority for	1
				—

AYES.

Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Nicholson	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)
Hon. J. W. Hickey	

Amendment thus passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 49—Apprentices in building trades:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The next amendment I have on the Notice Paper is an entirely new part. The principal Act is divided into parts, and there is a part preceding this one headed "Government Workers." The proposed new part deals solely with apprentices. It begins with proposed Section 115a. If it becomes incorporated with the principal Act, proposed Section 115a will be placed between Sections 115 and 116, and thus the context of Section 116 will be taken away by the interposition of these proposed new sections. No principle is involved, but the carrying of my amendment will make the separate part dealing with apprentices quite clear, and avoid taking away Section 115 from Section 116 in the principal Act. I move an amendment—

That in lines one and two the words "section is inserted in the principal Act, as follows" be struck out, and "new part is added to the principal Act to stand as V.a, as follows:—103a" be inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 50—Apprenticeship generally:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The intrusion of a comma after "board" in the second line confuses the meaning of Subsection (4) of the proposed section. I suggest that the words "or by the apprenticeship board in the case of apprentices in the building trade" should appear in the Act in parentheses.

The CHAIRMAN: I agree with the hon. member, and will note that point.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 51—Registration of agreements of apprenticeship:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That before "service," in line one, the words "subject to Section 103a, Subsection (3)" be inserted.

This refers to the probationary period that has to be taken into account and the inclusion of the amendment will make it clear.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That proposed Subsection (9) be struck out.

This is already provided for.

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

Clause 52—Regulations as to apprenticeship:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The clause provides that the court, with the approval of the Governor, may make regulations for the purposes set out. Subsection 2 of Section 4 of the principal Act contains provision for the court dealing with some of these things as industrial matters. This point should be referred to the Minister in order to ascertain whether he wishes the regulations to be subject to the approval of the Governor, or whether the court is to retain that power. I will move to add a proviso, and if the Minister so desires he can strike it out later on. I move an amendment—

That the following proviso to Subclause (1) be added:—"Provided that this section shall not operate in limitation of the powers of the court in respect to industrial matters."

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move an amendment—

That in line three of Subclause (2), after "apprentices," the words "employed in the building trade" be inserted.

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

New clause:

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I move—

That the following be inserted, to stand as Clause 49:—

49. Section one hundred and ten of the principal Act is repealed, and a section is inserted in place thereof, as follows:—

Penalty for contempt.

110. (1.) Any person who—

- (a) in writing, by speech, or otherwise insults any member of the court or of a board, or any commissioner or member of a committee, or the clerk of the court, or a witness, whether in court or in the precincts of the court, or elsewhere; or
- (b) wilfully interrupts the proceedings before the court; or
- (c) without good cause refuses to give evidence; or

(d) is guilty in any manner of wilful contempt of the court, shall be guilty of an offence against this Act. Penalty: £100.

(2.) It shall be lawful for any officer of the court, or any member of the police force, to remove any person offending against this section from the precincts of the court to be detained in custody until the rising of the court: Provided that a person so offending shall be liable to the penalty for his offence whether so dealt with or not.

(3.) The court shall have the same power as the Supreme Court to punish for contempt, and nothing in this section shall be deemed to derogate from such power.

We have materially extended the court by the creation of a number of boards. In future members of industrial organisations may need protection to just as great an extent as the members of the court, so I have consulted the Solicitor General and had the proposed new clause framed.

Hon. T. MOORE: Subclause 2 of the proposed new clause gives extraordinary power to a policeman. Is a policeman to be the sole judge of an offence?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That is an extract from the parent Act. It has stood there for 13 years, and I thought it wise to copy it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think there is to be found in any portion of the British Dominions legislation on similar lines to this. Of course, if the court is attacked by written language, the offence is serious; but, under the clause, if any person in a speech delivered, say, on the Esplanade, insults any member of the court, he is to be fined £100. Is the Committee seriously asked to pass legislation of this kind? Again, the court is to have the same power as the Supreme Court to punish for contempt. Suppose a man in drink wanders into the court with a pipe in his mouth. That would be contempt, and he would be liable to a fine of £100.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But that is the maximum.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Ample provision is already made in the existing Act to deal with such offences. It has been in existence for 13 years, yet it has never been called into demand. Insulting speeches may be delivered on the Esplanade by irresponsible persons; but are we to put the whole punitive machinery of the court into action because of that? The penalties in the original Act are mild in comparison with those proposed by Mr. Harris. Under the pro-

posed new clause all offences of contempt, great or small, real or imaginary, are to be punished by a fine of £100.

Hon. T. Moore: Have there ever been any offences?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There has never been a prosecution.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Quite a number of boards have been provided for and there is no protection for them. Is it intended that a board shall be able to fine anyone for interrupting the proceedings, or would the court alone have that power?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Nearly everything stipulated in the new clause is in the parent Act or in the Federal Act. The words "writing or speech," to which the Minister objects, appear in the Federal Act. Provision is made to cover all the men who will be representing the various organisations coming within the scope of the measure. From experience I am satisfied they will need protection as great as if not more than the court itself.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Does the Federal Act contain the words "or of a board or any commissioner or member of a committee"?

Hon. E. H. Harris: No.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: A difficulty might arise there.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	8
Noes	6

Majority for .. 2

AYES.

Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. J. Nicholson

Hon. G. Potter
Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. W. H. Kitson

Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. R. Brown
(Teller.)

New clause thus passed.

Bill again reported with further amendments and the report adopted.

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.47 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 15th December, 1925.

	PAGE
Questions: Railways authorised	2660
Deportation by State Government	2660
Members of Parliament and State Officers	2661
Motions: Close of Session, Standing Orders suspension and sitting hours	2661
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Departments, Select Committee's Report	2667
Bills: Main Roads, Recom.	2661
Eight Hours, 2A. defeated	2662
Miner's Phthisis Act Amendment, 1A.	2662
Fire Brigades Act Amendment, 1A.	2662
Road Districts Act Amendment, 2A., defeated	2662
Loan, £4,000,000, 2A., etc.	2667
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	2692
British Imperial Oil Coy., Ltd. (Private) 2A., etc.	2692
Workers' Homes Act Amendment, 2A., etc.	2692
Taxation (Motor Spirit Vendors) 2A.	2695
Resolution: State Forests, Revocation	2696

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

QUESTION—RAILWAYS AUTHORISED.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What is the total length of all railways authorised by Parliament? 2, What is the estimated cost of their construction? 3, Is there any order of priority in regard to their construction?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, The total length of all railways authorised but not yet commenced, including the Pemberton extension, which was commenced and stopped, is 176½ miles. 2, £916,200, including rails and fastenings and water supplies. 3, No.

QUESTION—DEPORTATION BY STATE GOVERNMENT.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Have the Collier Labour Government deported any person or persons from Western Australia? 2, If so, what were the full names and nationality of such persons, on what date and by what method were they deported, and to what destination? 3, What was the constitution of the tribunal, if any, that recommended deportation? 4, What expense was involved in the case of each deportee?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Not compulsorily. In a number of cases, where the interests of the State so required,