

buildings on the land. He moved an amendment—

That Subclause (3) be struck out.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 10—agreed to.

First schedule—agreed to.

Second schedule:

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: There would be certain consequential amendments in this schedule, viz., the striking out of "occupier" in several places.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: As the Committee had already decided that the poll should be taken under the Municipalities Act, the schedule could be struck out altogether. He moved an amendment—

That the Second Schedule be struck out.

Amendment passed.

Third Schedule (consequential) negatived.

Bill reported with amendments and returned to the Legislative Assembly with a request that the amendments suggested by the Committee be made; leave being given to sit again on receipt of a Message in reply from the Assembly.

House adjourned at 9.22 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 4th November, 1913.

	PAGE
Papers presented	2246
Papers: Thompson's dairy	2246
Questions: Government Tramways, sale of tickets	2246
North-West mail	2247
Employment Brokers, Inspections	2247
Electoral: Cue seat	2247
Bills: Interpretation Act Amendment, 1A.	2247
Declarations and Attestations, returned	2247
Land Valuation, 3A.	2247
Annual Estimates, Procedure, Votes and Items discussed	2247

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Return of prosecutions in the metropolitan area—(a) for the sale of light-weight bread, (b) for the sale of impure and adulterated milk, (c) for the sale of impure and adulterated liquors (ordered on motion by Mr. Lander).

By the Minister for Lands: File dealing with the registration of transfers of conditional purchase lands (ordered on motion by Hon. J. Mitchell).

PAPERS—THOMSON'S DAIRY.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have to present the reports of Government officers on Thomson's dairy (ordered on motion by Mr. Lander). The report mentioned in the latter part of the motion, that by Messrs. Lovekin, Battye, and Lander, was not a report to the Government or any State department, but to the board of the Children's Hospital, and one of those gentlemen, when approached for the report, and acting in behalf of one of the other signatories, stated that before he could make it available he would require an indemnity from the Government, which at the time I was not prepared to give; hence these papers do not comply with the latter part of the motion.

QUESTION—GOVERNMENT TRAMWAYS, SALE OF TICKETS.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS asked the Minister for Railways: 1, The total value of the 2s. 6d. per dozen tickets taken on the trams during the week prior to the alteration in the system of selling the tickets? 2, The total value of the same tickets taken during last week? 3, Is he aware that conductors are often short of workmen's tickets thereby depriving many workmen of their return concession?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, £548 9s. 7d. 2, £368 16s. 4d. 3, There may have been one or two isolated cases of conductors being short of workmen's tickets. In such cases, however, the conductors buy from other conductors, and so no workmen have been

deprived of the concession. Steps have been taken to guard against short supplies of such tickets to conductors.

QUESTION—NORTH-WEST MAIL.

Mr. MALE asked the Premier: 1, Will he ascertain if it is a fact that the "Western Australia" arrived in Roebuck Bay from Port Hedland on Wednesday morning, October 15, but did not land her mails till nearly midnight, with the consequence that the public did not get their letters until 10.30 the following day? 2, Will he ascertain why the mails were not landed by the ship's crew on the day of her arrival at Broome, so that the public might have received their letters the same day?

The PREMIER replied: 1 and 2, Owing to unavoidable circumstances, the vessel missed the tide at Broome, and for some hours the wind and tide were too strong to permit of the mails being landed by boat.

QUESTION—EMPLOYMENT BROKERS, INSPECTIONS.

Mr. GREEN asked the Honorary Minister: 1, How many inspections have been made during the current year of the books required to be kept under the Acts at the several employment brokers' places of business by the Inspector of Factories, or by any other person authorised to inspect same under Section 22 of the principal Act and Section 8 of the amending Act, and the results of such inspections or inspection? 2, On what dates were the inspections made? 3, If the inspections disclosed what fees have been paid by the employees, also what fees have been disclosed as having been paid by the employers? 4, If the inspections disclosed whether Section 15 of the principal Act amended by Section 6 of the amending Act, relating to posting of scale, have been complied with? 5, If no inspections have been made, why not?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) replied: 1, Forty-nine inspections were made by inspectors of fac-

tories. No breaches of the Act warranting further action were disclosed by the inspections. 2, Inspections were made on the following dates:—March 20th and 27th; April 29th and 30th; May 20th and 21st; July 14th, 15th, 21st and 28th; August 23rd and 30th; September 29th; October 15th, 23rd, and 24th. 3, Inspections disclosed fees paid by employees. No fees paid by the employers. 4, Yes. 5, Answered by No. 1.

EJECTORAL—CUE SEAT.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received the resignation of Mr. Heitmann as member for Cue.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) moved—

That the seat be declared vacant.

Question passed.

BILL—INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

BILL—DECLARATIONS AND ATTESTATIONS.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BILL—LAND VALUATION.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1913-14.

Future procedure.

Order of the Day for the resumption of the discussion in Committee of Supply read.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker): Prior to going into Committee, I think we ought to come to some definite understanding as to the procedure in future when debate takes place on departmental Estimates. The other night a ruling was made, or at all events

the impression was left, that whenever the Estimates are being debated in Committee of the whole House, whatever the question stated from the Chair, every hon. member is privileged to speak as often as he may choose. The Standing Order was cited in support of that. I want it to be clearly understood that there is a distinction between a general discussion relating to the whole of the Estimates and a discussion of the particular items that comprise the whole of the Estimates of a department. In discussing the Estimates it is true that we should never reach finality until every item has been threshed out and the whole Committee is in possession of every one of the facts. For that purpose there may be the privilege and the right of speaking more than once, but the object of the general discussion is an innovation on the provisions made by the Standing Orders for the discussion of the Estimates in detail. That innovation is a modern custom, I believe, the one that is adopted—I may say I know of no instance to the contrary—in every British Parliament. A discussion where the Minister in charge of the department or, in the first instance, the Treasurer, who speaks for all the departments, may cover everything connected even remotely with the subject of the finances, and in that discussion every analogy exists between that and the discussion on the second reading of a Bill or the discussion on a motion. The mover has full latitude to cover all the ground and each member of the House has the right to criticise in debate the points submitted, and when the first speaker rises to reply it is understood that that closes the discussion, which is really a sort of preparation for the discussion in Committee of the whole House, and in the case of the finances a discussion by the Committee of the whole House on the Estimates in detail. I think the ruling given the other night, and the ruling from the Chair a few nights previously, was confined too closely to the Standing Order view of the question. It ignored altogether the custom that has grown up and has become now part of the law of the Parliament, the discussion on the preliminary introductory debate. That de-

bate is not at all touched by our Standing Order, and I want to have the matter thoroughly debated. Without argument at any great length I desire, Mr. Speaker, with your permission and the permission of the House to move—

With reference to the ruling of the Chairman of Committees and of Mr. Speaker as to the rights of members in speaking in Committee of the whole House on the general debate introducing the Estimates or Departmental Estimates, as this ruling concerns the privileges of members, that the rulings in question be referred to the Standing Orders Committee for consideration, recommendation, and report.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath): In seconding the motion I may state that when Chairman of Committees in 1904 I gave a good deal of attention to this among other matters, and I found so far as our own Standing Orders are concerned that they are absolutely silent, both as to the general discussion on the Budget and also as to any general discussion on the individual departments, and of course failing specific reference on the part of our own Standing Orders, other than the particular Standing Order which refers to the practice and procedure of the Imperial House of Commons, we have to refer to that practice and the authenticated records of their procedure. Under the House of Commons procedure, if it were followed, it means that all the procedure which takes place in this House in Committee is entirely out of order because the general discussion is not on the first item, "His Excellency the Governor," as we have it in the Budget discussion, but is on the motion "That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the purpose of going into Committee," and that general discussion, too, can only take place when first going into Committee on the Estimates, the general Estimates for the year, and no such general discussion as we have on the Budget is permitted in the case of the supplementary Estimates, and after that general discussion is completed the only discussion that can take place is on the items, if we were to adopt that

procedure, and that is really the legal procedure we ought to adopt if we adhere specifically to our Standing Orders. This means that discussion would be considerably curtailed, and in this House a custom has grown up, both to have the general discussion on the first item, "His Excellency the Governor," and also to have a general discussion on each of the department's estimates, and that seems to me to be a fairly reasonable way out of the difficulty, so long as it is acquiesced in. It would I think be acquiesced in so far as reasonable rules are provided for discussion, that is, that members should speak once and after the Minister replies that closes the discussion and the debate should proceed on the items. Alternatively to that we have only to refer to the rules and practice of the House of Commons, which would materially restrict debate on the Estimates in this House. In the circumstances I think it is preferable for us to continue as we have done in the past with a reasonable understanding on both sides of the House that the general discussion should take place as if it were the second reading debate on a Bill, and the rule that a member can speak more than once in Committee should apply only to the discussion of the particular items.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): I do not know what the object of the motion is, whether it is that the Attorney General wishes a direction to the Standing Orders Committee or an intimation that that committee should draft some rule for this House which would close the debate upon the Treasurer replying in connection with the introduction of the Estimates. Is that the idea?

The Attorney General: Yes, or make such other recommendations as the committee see fit.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: A motion of this sort ought not to be discussed without due notice being given. Some hon. members are absent and perhaps do not know we are discussing this motion this afternoon.

The Premier: It will not prevent discussion on the point when recommenda-

tions come forward from the Standing Orders Committee.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That is true, but there might be objection even to submitting the point to the Standing Orders Committee. Hon. members might say they are perfectly satisfied at present.

The Attorney General: May I be permitted to explain my reasons?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Certainly.

The Attorney General: The object was, of course, in view of the fact that on the very last discussion of the Estimates Mr. Speaker's ruling was given to the House. It is only fair to Mr. Speaker that we should at the first opportunity, not exactly challenge his ruling, but refer it, as he particularly expressed a wish for directions in the course of giving his decision on that matter, as speedily as possible for the consideration of the Standing Orders Committee that they may make such recommendation or report as they may deem best after having given the matter consideration and after reference to precedents, etcetera.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I agree with the Attorney General. Personally I am in favour of having something definite placed on our Standing Orders, but I say at once that hon. members ought to know that a motion of this sort is being tabled so that if they desire to voice their opinions they may be here. To spring a motion upon the House without notice is always objectionable. I am with the Attorney General to some extent, but I want other members to have an opportunity to express their views if they desire to do so. As I said the other evening the general debate on the Estimates when the Treasurer introduces them to this Chamber has as a matter of custom been restricted to one speech from each individual member who wishes to speak, and the debate has always been closed by the Colonial Treasurer replying. That is a custom which has grown up for many years, and I think it ought to be adhered to. Coming to the introduction of the different departments, so far as I am concerned, I would much prefer to have the general debate cover the whole lot,

and think we ought to follow the British House of Commons.

The Minister for Lands: That is the Commonwealth practice, too.

The Premier: I do not see how you could do that and then deal with each item.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We could discuss each item and if necessary move to reduce each item in every department. But I think the general discussion should take place after the Treasurer submits his Estimates and any hon. member who has special knowledge of a particular department may fix his attention and his remarks on that department. I think many valuable hours of this House in the past have been wasted by reiterating discussions on each department which certainly ought to have been closed with the general discussion.

The Premier: We allow a general discussion on each sub-department as well.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes, I think it is objectionable. If the present Government had not a reasonable Opposition in the House they would know what a difficulty it was. I remember on many occasions sitting through the weary hours of the night listening to a general discussion on departments and sub-departments from the beginning of the Estimates to the end, and general discussions as often on different items. While I do not desire at all personally to restrict debate in this Chamber, and will never be a party to that, I think we ought to keep our debates within reasonable bounds, and, at present occupying a position on the Opposition benches, perhaps I ought to demand the utmost freedom and openness to repeat my arguments on every department and every item if necessary; but I realise that it will be only a few short months before I am on the Treasury benches once more, and then would wish to be treated reasonably.

The Premier: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Exactly. The hon. member forgets, he wants to do unto others not as he would have done unto himself but what he wishes at the moment to do. But I think the Standing Order ought to be amended. If we adhere

to the Standing Order the Treasurer could not introduce his Budget in Committee. There could be no discussion on the item of His Excellency the Governor. There would be no power to cover the whole of the Estimates and review the position of the State as has been customary to do. Whilst I say that we ought to have a motion of that sort on the Notice Paper, so as to allow hon. members, if they desire to be present, to come and discuss it, still I raise no objection because I am in accord with the motion and I hope the Standing Orders Committee will draft some rules for our guidance in the future, so that we shall not have this repetition.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam): The confusion arose the other night because the Premier said there was no one in charge of the Estimate, Joint Houses of Parliament. Of course he was wrong. The Premier brought the Estimates down and he was in charge. If the Attorney General's motion is carried, and I hope it will be, still it will be of no avail in regard to these Estimates; would it not be well for members to be content to speak once on each department. Members can agree to do that amongst themselves, not to speak more than once on each department, and in the meantime the Standing Orders Committee can make the Standing Orders clear on the point. It would be ridiculous to have the discussion as members desired in connection with each department. We can allow the Standing Orders Committee to do their work in the meantime and proceed with the Estimates, without availing ourselves of the privilege, which we have under the Standing Orders, of a discussion in Committee on each department. I think members will agree to that course. I know the leader of the Opposition has a great opportunity; he could continue the discussion and prevent the Premier bringing down his Redistribution of Seats Bill. He could stay on the Estimates until Christmas and worry the Premier if he liked. But he does not wish to do that, nor does any member on this side. We cannot get a decision from the Standing Orders Committee at present but we can

agree to allow the custom that has obtained in the past, to permit each member to speak once on each department, to continue during the discussion on these Estimates. The custom which has obtained in the past has been for the Minister to introduce the Estimates of his department, members speak and the Minister then replies, and that ends the discussion.

The Minister for Lands: That is reasonable.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I hope that will be done and I hope members will agree to follow that course.

Mr. McDOWALL (Coolgardie): I desire to support the motion because I think it is necessary. With reference to the misunderstanding the other evening, I want to refer members back to the famous decision of 1909, I want to make this as clear as I possibly can. On that occasion the Hon. Frank Wilson, now leader of the Opposition, was then Minister for Works. He introduced his Estimates, or at least he gave the opening address on the Works Department on the 17th November, 1909, and he started in this way; it is on page 1513 of *Hansard*—

In view of the Chairman of Committee's ruling when the Estimates were previously under discussion I will endeavour to keep my remarks quite within the point, so far as possible, of the figures contained in these Estimates.

Mr. Bath: You have plenty of latitude.

The Minister for Works: Unfortunately there is not too much latitude, because it is difficult to deal with these figures without reference to past expenditure. That, I understood the other evening from the Chairman of Committees, was out of order.

Mr. Bath: No fear.

I am not going to weary the House with the whole of the discussion but we come along to where the Minister for Works was alluding to some matter and he passed these remarks—

Last year our estimated total revenue was £3,370,000 and we received £3,267,000, or we had an over-estimate of £123,000, equal to £3 12s. 10d. per cent.

This is where the point comes in—

The Chairman: The Minister is proceeding outside the Works Estimate now.

The Minister for Works: I just wanted to show that the charge of extravagance made by the hon. member cannot be substantiated.

The Chairman: The Minister can discuss the division and that only.

The Minister for Works: Keep within the division?

This is where the leader of the Opposition was taken off on that particular point. Mr. Bath objected, Mr. George spoke on the matter, and the Chairman gave this ruling—

I can only rule that the question under consideration by the Committee is, "Works and Buildings, £129,428." The only question that can be discussed is either that division or a part of that division. Discussion can be allowed only on that division, and nothing outside that can be discussed. In giving this ruling I may say that I have been very careful in looking up the procedure of the House of Commons and the procedure of other Parliaments, and while I am anxious to give the Committee the fullest latitude I can find nothing that gives me the right to allow members to go outside what I have stated, or to talk irrelevantly on a particular question.

Various members then spoke to the question, objecting to this ruling; then Mr. Bath submitted a motion of dissent. That motion of dissent reads—

I dissent from the Chairman's ruling on the ground that if members are not permitted to discuss the administrative work of the Minister for Works and his officers on the general discussion of the Works Estimates, no other opportunity will be afforded to hon. members.

The Speaker resumed the Chair and upheld Mr. Daglish's decision, according, &c

he said, to the authorities quoted from *May*, and eventually the motion of dissent was put and passed, consequently we dissented from the Speaker's ruling in 1909, and that meant that the custom of the general discussion on each division or Minister's department of the Estimates was to stand. That was the custom laid down according to the dissent of this House, not the Speaker's ruling. The custom is to allow the Minister for Works, or any Minister, to give an opening account of matters in connection with his department. That I believe has been followed and the other evening the Premier raised the question that he had replied to the general Estimates, and, having replied to them, no other member could speak to them generally. Mr. Male ruled that members could speak to them generally; that is in opposition to the ruling laid down in 1909. Then we come along further and we pass on to the 17th December, 1909. The Minister for Works replied to his department and after having done so on page 2388 of *Hansard* it says—

Mr. Heitmann rose to speak.

The Chairman: What item?

Mr. Heitmann: I wish to speak generally.

The Chairman: The Minister has replied; and the hon. member cannot pursue a general discussion.

There was the allowance to speak generally on that question when the Minister had replied, and then the Chairman of Committees declined to allow a general discussion. Then Mr. Heitmann again, "We are in Committee." This is the point raised now and this is the point that renders it absolutely necessary and essential to have this Order altered, because, as has been pointed out, so far as I can see in the House of Commons the general discussion takes place when the Speaker is in the Chair on the motion that "we go into Committee of Supply," so that there can be no dispute whatever as to only one speech being allowed in the discussion. Our rule has been to take the discussion in Committee and reading our Standing Order 118 it says a member can speak more than once in Committee.

and Standing Order 372 says the same, but the practice of the House has been to treat the general discussion on each Ministerial department as a second reading speech and to only allow one speech. One is inconsistent with the other. And while this goes on the Chairman cannot give an intelligible ruling on this question. The Chairman stated then, and I believe this is the practice that has been pursued—

The practice of having a general discussion is only following the practice that has grown up for some years, and which the House decided recently should be followed, and that practice has been the same as that prevailing when the House is not in Committee, namely, that any member has the right to speak before the Minister replies on the general discussion, but only once.

Mr. Heitmann: It was not my intention to wait until the Minister had spoken before I spoke. I will speak on Item No. 1.

The Chairman: The general discussion takes place on the first item. The hon. member can now only speak on the item so far as it relates to the officer and his salary. The hon. member cannot speak on the general question.

Point of Order.

Mr. Taylor: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I draw your attention to Standing Order 207, which reads as follows:—

No member shall make any motion, initiating a subject for discussion, but in pursuance of notice openly given at a previous sitting of the House, and duly entered on the Notice Paper. It shall, however, be in order at any time to move, without previous notice, that any resolution of the House, be communicated by message to the Legislative Council.

I think that Standing Order puts the whole of this discussion out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member take that point of order?

Mr. Taylor: Yes, I do.

Mr. Speaker: I have already borne the matter in mind. Any hon. member will be permitted to move a motion in

the House with the unanimous agreement of members of the House and at the conclusion of this discussion, which I have permitted, I had intended to ask the House whether they agreed to the motion, and if there was any voice protesting, the motion would stand aside and notice would have to be given.

Mr. McDowall: I presume, Mr. Speaker, I may go on. The ruling goes on to state—

And that practice has been the same as that prevailing when the House is not in Committee, namely, that any member—

Mr. Taylor: Before disposing of my point of order, am I to understand that you are allowing the House to decide the question in the face of that Standing Order? I protest against this proceeding.

The Attorney General: This is in the nature of privilege. It affects the privilege of every member of the House; it is not a motion for general discussion but it is a matter that affects the privilege of every member, and an opportunity has been taken on the first available occasion to bring it forward. A motion of privilege can be brought forward at any time.

Mr. Taylor: That is the reason it should have been on notice.

Mr. Speaker: The question was raised because of a discussion which took place the other evening and which tended to cause some confusion on the debate on the Estimates. The Attorney General intimated that he intended to raise the question in order that the House might express an opinion, but the Attorney General did not intimate that he intended to submit a motion. I had already taken the precaution to make some notes to suggest to the House how the matter could be attended to almost immediately. The Attorney General, as I say, did not express his intention of moving a motion, but he has moved a motion, and bearing in mind the occurrence as it is, I have not ruled it out of discussion. But I will not put the motion unless the House agrees that the motion shall be put. On a question of this character, if the House agrees that the motion shall be put, the motion

ought to be put for the convenience of hon. members. If there be any objecting voice whatever, the motion cannot be put. But I understand that the agreement was to have this matter, which has already been the subject of much comment, dealt with immediately in order that the House should know just under what rules the Estimates are to be further discussed. If the hon. member does desire that the motion shall not be put he can make his objection when I ask the House whether or not the motion shall be put.

The Attorney General: I take it, and have understood from the commencement, that this is a matter of privilege, and all privilege matters must conclude with a motion.

Mr. Speaker: But the hon. member did not state that.

The Attorney General: Surely it goes without saying. One of the dearest privileges of every House of Parliament is its right of speech. You cannot attack the dearest principle of an institution of this kind more thoroughly than by attacking the right of its members to speak. This is time-honoured in the British Parliament, and therefore when it affects our privilege to speak once or twice, as the case may be, it is attacking the very foundation of Parliamentary practice.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member take it as affecting privilege?

The Attorney General: Yes, all our privileges, yours as well as ours.

Mr. Taylor: I desire your ruling as to whether an hon. member can make anything he likes a matter of privilege. This is far from privilege. I hold that it has nothing to do with privilege at all.

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand that the hon. member takes exception to my ruling that I have considered this is a matter of privilege?

Mr. Taylor: I only desire to ask whether you are going to accept the motion as a matter of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I am of opinion that the question now under discussion is a matter which can be discussed under a question of privilege. As the Attorney General properly states, it concerns the privilege of this House.

Debate resumed.

Mr. McDOWALL: I am sorry that the member for Mount Margaret has been so punctilious—it is a new role for him—especially as I only desire to say a few more words in connection with the matter. I am afraid my reading of Mr. Daglish's ruling is becoming obscure in consequence of the frequent interruptions. However, I shall not go back, but will read on as follows:—

Any member has the right to speak before the Minister replies on the general discussion, but only once.

I want you to note the words "only once"; that is the question that caused the trouble the other evening. Members wanted to speak twice. I ruled that they could not do so on that occasion, but unfortunately I was wrong as to who was in charge of the Estimates of the Joint Houses of Parliament. It is a remarkable thing that this division of the Estimates was as a wail, actually like an infant on the doorstep. It was disowned by everyone. The Premier would have nothing to do with it, and Mr. Speaker, although he defended the vote, disowned it absolutely. Consequently my ruling, of course, fell to the ground. Now, on that occasion in 1909, to which I refer, Mr. Heitmann continued—

It was not my intention to wait until the Minister had spoken before I spoke. I will speak on item No. 1.

The Chairman: The general discussion takes place on the first item. The hon. member can now only speak on the item so far as it relates to the officer and his salary. The hon. member cannot speak on the general question. Now, this rule distinctly and emphatically lays down what was considered the correct procedure in 1909. The first part of it was laid down by the House itself by dissent from the ruling of Mr. Speaker and of the Chairman that a Minister's department could not be generally discussed. The second part is laid down by the ruling given here by the Chairman, which followed the procedure of previous years and which was not objected to then. These two principles have been laid down, and I was trying to follow them the other evening. I have told

you where I got off the track. The member for Kimberley (Mr. Male) gave a ruling diametrically opposed to these principles. We did not test it at the time because the objection to the ruling was withdrawn by the Premier, and therefore, we got no further forward in connection with that. Surely then it is right and proper that we should endeavour to get Standing Orders which will lift us out of this quandary. It seems to me that it is only a reasonable and proper thing to do, and I do not think it necessary to discuss it at any great length. I only desired to bring forward what had taken place in 1909 and to defend myself so far as my actions of the other evening were concerned. I trust the motion will be carried.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the motion is put I would like to make a few remarks in respect to the matter now under discussion. I find that there has been a divergence from ruling in that custom has been adopted in discussion of the Estimates for some years past. The custom is that the Treasurer introduces the Financial Statement and submits the vote "His Excellency the Governor," and moves the first item. If the rule had been followed the discussion would be entirely confined to the vote "His Excellency the Governor"; but the rule has been departed from and the custom grown up of discussing the whole of the financial proposals of the Government and the Budget generally on the one vote "His Excellency the Governor." This custom, I may say, is the custom in other Australian Parliaments. On subsequent votes the discussion is confined to the vote before the Committee, and the members may speak as often as they like. The discussion becomes a Committee discussion. By custom, when a Minister has introduced his Estimates, discussion was allowed generally on the administration of his department, and second reading rules obtained here also. When the Minister replied, just as when the Treasurer replied to the general discussion, it closed the debate on his department, and then the items or sub-departments came in for discussion. This was the custom for some years, but it was ruled out of order by the then Chairman, Mr. Daglish,

in 1909, and by the then Speaker, who supported the Chairman. But the House dissented from the ruling of both the Chairman and the Speaker, and the custom of discussing the Estimates generally as introduced by a Minister was resorted to. There are two instances, therefore, of the custom diverging from the rule. One is in the consideration of the Estimates in general, and the other the introduction and discussion of groups of votes controlled by Ministers. In my opinion the advantage of the first part of the rule is unmistakable. I consider it a distinct advantage to have a general discussion on the Vote "His Excellency the Governor," even though the general discussion is contrary to the rules of the House. In the second part, where a general discussion has been allowed on a ministerial department, the advantages are doubtful. In the case of the Mines Department where the votes are kindred and closely allied, the custom is suitable, but in the case of trading departments, where the votes are distinct and not kindred and allied, then I think the custom of allowing general debate on the vote would not be suitable. If therefore the House agrees with the custom, I would suggest, indeed I did suggest the moving of a resolution to take the form of a sessional order. My suggestion is that in consideration of the Estimates in Committee of Supply, discussion of matters beyond the question actually before the Committee shall be allowed in certain cases, and in these cases the general rules of debate in Committee shall be deemed to have been suspended and those of debate in the House on the second reading of Bills shall prevail, namely, (1) On the introduction of the Estimates when the question before the Committee is that the vote "His Excellency the Governor" be agreed to, the discussion may include all matters connected with the financial proposals of the Government as shown in the Estimates. (2) On the introduction of any group of kindred votes controlled by one Minister, when the question before the Committee is that the first vote of the group be agreed to, the discussion may include all matters under the administration of the said Minister.

When the Minister has concluded his speech in reply the discussion on the general question shall be at an end and the ordinary rules of the Committee shall obtain. Having gone into the matter, I intended to make that suggestion, but in view of the fact that the Attorney General has moved a motion that the matter be referred to the Standing Orders Committee, and in view of the remarks of members who have spoken and who desire that it shall be referred to the Standing Orders Committee, I will allow my suggestion to stand aside for the time being.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret): If I heard you correctly, you said that if any protest was made you would not put the motion. I had no objection to the motion being put to the House. My objection was to any Minister or any member springing a motion of this character on the House. That is the reason why I drew your attention to Standing Order 207. I think that when a motion affects every member of the House as much as does this motion, it is highly necessary that it should be placed on the Notice Paper, so that hon. members may realise the business before the House. This motion was sprung on the House under the guise of privilege. I am not going to oppose it being put.

Mr. SPEAKER: A motion has been moved by the Attorney General on a question of privilege with reference to a ruling of the Chair when in committee that in Committee of the whole House, a member may speak more than once on the general debate introducing the Estimates, or departmental Estimates, and as this ruling concerns the privileges of hon. members, the Attorney General moves that the ruling in question be referred to the Standing Orders Committee for consideration, recommendation, and report. The remarks I am going to make now are not for the purpose of influencing hon. members one way or the other in respect to this ruling, but in order to expedite the business of this House. I certainly am of opinion that a recommendation is necessary, or that a resolution of this House is necessary in order to define the rule of debate in connection with the

Estimates; but I only want to say that if this proposal is submitted to the Standing Orders Committee some little time must elapse before the Standing Orders Committee report, and further time must elapse before the report is taken into consideration, and that in the meantime the debate must be allowed to go on in accordance with the Standing Orders. If my proposal meets with the approval of hon. members, I would say that as this is a matter of privilege a sessional order—

The Premier: Could not the matter be brought up when the committee have reported, and pending the report could not we proceed as in the past?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan): On a matter of privilege, and in order to adjust the matter, I suggest that in the consideration of the balance of the Estimates the procedure as practised in previous Parliaments be adopted pending the report of the Standing Orders Committee.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Which Parliament?

The PREMIER: This Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: The recommendations I outlined were in that direction. One was that on the introduction of the Estimates when the question was before the Committee, that vote No. 1 "His Excellency the Governor" be agreed to, the discussion may include all matters connected with the financial proposals of the Government, as shown in the Estimates, and the Premier replying to the discussion will close the debate on that item. No. 2 recommendation is that on the introduction of any group of kindred votes controlled by one Minister, when the question before the Committee is that the first vote of the group be agreed to, the discussion may include all matters under the administration of the said Minister, and when the Minister has concluded his speech in reply, the discussion on the general administration of that department shall be concluded. The debate after that shall be discussion in Committee on the items. That is the suggestion I make.

Mr. Underwood interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: In reply to the hon. member's interjection, I want to say that nothing can prevent a debate on the sub-departments, because it is purely Committee debate.

The PREMIER: The only point I desire to make is that, as the matter has been submitted to the Standing Orders Committee for recommendation, pending the receipt of their recommendation, we had better carry on under the same procedure as previously, and not make any alteration, and then we can leave ourselves open to make any alteration. I think that would suit hon. members much better.

Mr. Taylor: Hear, hear!

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): That appears to me to be your suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is so.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: And it is just what we have all supported. The general debate on the Estimates is closed. When we come to the several departments there will be a general debate on them if hon. members wish it, and the general debate will be closed by the Minister replying.

The Premier: That is it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am quite in accord with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is entirely my suggestion.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan): I move—

That pending the report from the Standing Orders Committee on the points submitted to them, the usual custom of this House as to general discussion and debate on the Estimates be continued.

Question put and passed.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the 30th October, Mr. McDowall in the Chair.

Vote—*Joint Houses of Parliament, £10,603:*

Item, Reporters, 1 (chief) at £500; 5 at £350: £2,250—[An amendment had been moved to reduce the item by £50]:

Mr. GEORGE: Before the item was discussed, it was his desire to mention the fact—but he did not attribute the blame to the reporters—that the printing of the reports was very defective. In fact, the *Hansard* volumes contained the worst read reports he had ever come across, and any one with any knowledge at all of printing would know that it was the fault not of the reporters but of the printing establishment. The spelling as it appeared in the printed reports was very bad. He had frequently pointed out this matter to the Chief Reporter, and it was difficult to take up any of the weekly volumes without finding numerous errors.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It was his desire to support the amendment to reduce the item.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who is going to lose the £50?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The officer who was to get the increase if the Estimates were passed. Although the items were numbered 12 to 17, the idea was that item 12, Chief *Hansard* Reporter, was to get this increase. The object of the amendment was not to reduce anyone's salary but to prevent an increase being granted. It was his opinion that the first increase in salaries in Parliament, if any were to be given, was due to members themselves, and until we could afford to raise those salaries we should not increase those of anyone else in the House.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Anyone can be a member of Parliament, but it is not everyone who can be a Chief *Hansard* Reporter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The Treasurer had found it necessary to issue a notification that he did not intend to pay any increments to civil servants who were in receipt of over £204 per annum, and if that was so it was not a right proposal to give the Chief *Hansard* Reporter this increase from £500 to £550. The office was fairly well paid at present.

Mr. George: There is no item £550.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There was an honorarium in another portion of the Estimates for reporting Royal Commissions, and there the sum was £250, which he

understood was divided between five reporters.

Mr. George: That is a bonus, that is not an increase in salary.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is for special work.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: In his opinion the salaries generally paid in the Parliaments throughout Australia were most extravagant. It would be pointed out no doubt that the salaries of the *Hansard* reporters in this State were not as high as those paid to similar officers in other Parliaments. In some Parliaments they paid £1,000 a year to their clerks, but in his opinion that was an extravagant salary for the work which had to be accomplished. When we came to consider that we had under-secretaries in this State getting £600 and £650, and we had such men as assistant under secretaries like those in the Lands Department, who were getting less, and they were officers who had a power of work to do, and whose work required not only mechanical ability but brains, he thought members would agree that the Chief *Hansard* Reporter was not nearly so well entitled to an increase as a great many other officers in the service. For instance, there was the manager of the Savings Bank, who was paid £500 a year, and members of the public generally would not agree that a man who could write shorthand was more important than a man who could manage a Savings Bank.

Mr. George: Have you ever done the work; do you know anything about it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: What he knew was that there were thousands of people who could do it and there were, he supposed, hundreds in the civil service who could go into the reporters' box and report equally as well as the *Hansard* reporters we had, and who would do the work at a considerably lower figure than that paid to those who were there now.

Mr. George: Oh dear no; don't you believe it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: What he further wished to do was to enter a strong protest against the practice which was growing up of making the positions on *Hansard* cosy little corners for the friends

of those already on that staff. He objected strongly to anyone going from this State to South Australia or to any other State to engage a reporter. There were men in this State who were capable of filling the *Hansard* positions, and men who could fill them equally as well as any who had ever occupied them. Hitherto we had been able to get our reporters from the Press of Western Australia, and he was confident that the Press was not yet worked out. In regard to the question of what he knew about the matter, what he desired to say was that he had been reported by pressmen at public meetings, not where they had to do five minutes on and fifteen minutes off, but where they had to sit for two hours or two hours and a half, and the reports had been equally as good and better, in fact, than those of the *Hansard* reporters. There was at least one civil servant who had reported his speeches, and on a particular occasion he had read the proof of one of those reports, and in that proof not a single word required to be altered, whereas those members in the House who did read the proofs of their speeches found it almost invariably necessary to alter words. That went to prove that the reporting by some of the outsiders was better than that which members got here, and the officer to whom he had referred was not in receipt of anything near £400 per annum. In the first place, in the state of the finances, and in view of the fact that it had been decided not to pay increments to public servants, it was not advisable to increase the salary of the Chief *Hansard* Reporter. Then he protested against the spending of a considerable sum of money by sending an officer from this State to South Australia to engage a man, and to show the fallacy of the little corner that had been built up, we found this State going to South Australia for a man, while the Federal Government came to this State when they wanted a reporter.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Why should they not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If the Federal Parliament could come here for a man we could also get one here. He hoped

the increase would not be given, and that local men would be afforded an opportunity of applying for *Hansard* positions as they became vacant, as he was absolutely assured, notwithstanding the great knowledge of shorthand possessed by the member for Murray-Wellington, that the services of good men could be got here. He hoped the increase would not be given, and that in future residents of the State would be afforded the opportunity of filling these positions as they became vacant.

Mr. GEORGE: The hon. member who had just resumed his seat had told the Committee a great many things, but all were disconnected. So far as giving a fair show to anyone in Western Australia was concerned, there was not a single member in the House who would not say that charity began at home, and if we had people in the State who could do the work they should have it.

Mr. Foley: That is not charity.

Mr. GEORGE: What he was doing was merely to quote an old proverb and trying to bring it down to the understanding of the member for Pilbara. Hon. members must know that unless one used a thick wedge and a pretty strong hammer it was difficult to make the hon. member see anything. It was admitted that those in our own State should have first show, but so far as finding men who could be trusted to go into the box and take the speeches of hon. members, it was a very difficult job to get them. The ordinary newspaper reporter that the hon. member spoke about was given the opportunity of condensing the reports of speeches according to the space a newspaper could give him. In the House, however, the gentlemen who occupied the box had as far as possible to give verbatim reports of hon. members' speeches, or else there was a growl.

Mr. O'Loughlen: When were you a schoolmaster?

Mr. GEORGE: While he was never a schoolmaster he would tell the hon. member that he got a certificate for shorthand writing from Sir Isaac Pitman 40 years ago, and if the hon. member wished to

see it he could do so. There was no one in the House who was prepared to say a word against the gentlemen who occupied the reporters' box. The member for Pilbara had a set upon those gentlemen, as he had upon all whose education had been a little higher than his own, and because the hon. member had not the education and skill of others, he thought he was competent to judge and to throw mud at those who were not able to defend themselves. If the hon. member felt honestly about the matter, why did he himself not move to reduce the item, and even by more than £50. Instead of that he rose in his place and threw mud around, and with absolutely no knowledge of the subject, he stated that he could go out into the street and bring in anyone who could do this work. When he (Mr. George) joined the railway service a few years ago he had the greatest difficulty to get a shorthand writer who could take a letter in decent style. There were hundreds of men who could write 130 and 140 words a minute, but taking letters from dictation was a very different thing from taking notes of a speech made by a politician. Not only did the reporter require ability in the mere mechanical recording of symbols representing the words uttered, but his memory had to be trained to know the subject with which the speaker was dealing, and he had to absolutely put himself in the position of the speaker and try to give him better brains than God Almighty had given him. Yet the hon. member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood), who owed more to the kindly generosity of the newspaper Press and *Hansard* than any other member, rose to make out that the labourer was not worthy of his hire. The hon. member said he could go into the Works Department and find men who could do the work better than the *Hansard* reporters. The Chief of the *Hansard* staff had had great difficulty in finding men he could trust in *Hansard* work, and had given trial after trial before he got even the staff he had at present.

The Premier: You are the only man who is complaining.

Mr. GEORGE: There was no complaint on his part. The readers he referred to were in the Printing Office and not in the office of the Chief *Hansard* Reporter. If the member for Pilbara was in earnest, let him move to reduce the vote by £150 and see if the Committee would carry it.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Will you support it?

Mr. GEORGE: No, because he knew what the job was worth.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: There was no necessity to answer the verbosity of the member for Murray-Wellington. So far as his view of *Hansard* was concerned, he was one of the very few members in the Chamber who never read duplicates of their speeches. Any speech made by him went forth to the country just as *Hansard* turned it out and without any sub-editing on his part.

Mr. George: Then they are very generous.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Their generosity could be admitted, but all the same there were just as good reporters in the country as those on *Hansard*, and shorthand was something that was not impossible for any man or woman with ordinary intelligence to learn. A man required more ability and better physique to be a success as a mechanical engineer than as a shorthand reporter.

Mr. George: I do not agree with you.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member's concurrence was not desired. He did not consider that he owed *Hansard* anything. The reporters did their work reasonably well and they were reasonably well paid, and he saw no reason for increasing their salaries.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was difficult to understand that because there was a number of people outside a certain position, who would fill the position as well as the men who occupied it, that man should receive no preferment. The attack was apparently against the proposed increase in the salary of the Chief *Hansard* Reporter. Was the position worth £500 a year, and did the occupant of the position carry out his duties to the satisfaction of the House? Was his ability such as to warrant the payment of

a salary of £500 per annum? Apparently some hon. members were not satisfied with the reports of their speeches in *Hansard*.

Mr. Munsie: The member who complained was one of your own colleagues.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It did not matter who he was. The *Hansard* staff in this State would compare with any *Hansard* staff in the Commonwealth, and the reports would compare for accuracy with the reports in any other parliament.

Mr. George: I have not disputed that. I say that the reading in the printing office is bad.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The reports of the speeches of other members did not concern him, but when he was speaking on an important subject such as the Treasurer's financial statement, he did take the trouble to go through the *Hansard* duplicates to see that accuracy had been attained in reporting, and seldom or ever had he to make an alteration in his speech. Whether that was due to the generosity of the reporters or not, he did not know, but he maintained that this Parliament had a good staff, their work was well done, and anything in reason which the State could afford to pay by way of remuneration for their work was deserved and ought to be voted by the Committee. The member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) had argued that the state of the finances would not permit of this increase of £50 being given. The state of the finances was not going to be affected very much by giving the Chief *Hansard* Reporter an extra £50. If the hon. member's colleague, the Premier, had considered the state of the finances when on the hustings two years ago he had promised to shove up the wages of Government employees by 1s. per day, it might have made some difference, but now that the Government had raised everybody's wages 1s. per day, the Committee were coolly asked to refuse an increase of £50 to a man who deserved it. He was not going to be a party to any such action. He wanted to see every man get a fair reward for his services. He did not want the Premier to get sympathy from his numerous supporters by giving

them a bribe of 1s. per day increase all round. He did not want to see the Premier buying votes.

Mr. Munsie: It would be wrong to give the low-paid man an extra shilling per day?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It would be wrong to give men an extra 1s. per day in order to get their votes at election time.

Mr. Munsie: You infer that the Premier did that?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It had been done undoubtedly, and the result was that to-day the railways were not paying, and men who were not entitled to an advance got it on that occasion simply for political reasons.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: What reason actuated you in giving an increase to the higher paid officers?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Had the hon. member asked what reason had actuated Ministers in keeping their salaries up after they had promised to reduce them? He did not know, but he thought it was simply because they were so fond of the golden sovereigns that they did not like to let them go. He agreed with the member for Pilbara in regard to the desirableness of filling vacancies from applicants within the State. He did not believe in going even to South Australia to fill a responsible position provided they could obtain locally the man they wanted. Every time he would give preference to the local man; not in any spirit of hostility to the sister States, because all the States were one Commonwealth, and every citizen in these States should have the chance of getting a position. We ought to help men in any part of the Commonwealth to better themselves, and he welcomed the fact that the Commonwealth Government had taken some of the best men from the Western Australian public service, because every time those men had bettered their positions. Whenever he had had the opportunity he had always assisted men to ascend the ladder of life and improve their positions. At the same time, we ought to give our own people the first chance, and if a reporter could have been obtained in the

State to fill the vacancy—he thought there should have been a chance of getting a man in Western Australia—the position should have been filled in this State. His knowledge of some of the leading reporters on the newspapers in Western Australia led him to the conclusion that there were many who could well fill a *Hansard* position.

Hon. J. Mitchell: And some in the public service, too.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That was admitted, but it might be that those men did not want the position.

Mr. O'Loughlen: There would have been hundreds of applicants.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If that was so, those men should have had the first opportunity. Doubtless a member of the Printing Committee would be able to explain why the Chief *Hansard* Reporter had been dispatched to South Australia to obtain a man. However, that did not affect his view of the proposed increase for the Chief *Hansard* Reporter. If that officer was not worth £500 for the work which Parliament put on him, they had better shift that gentleman and get a better man; because he did not think that £500 per annum was too much for the position.

The PREMIER: It was not his intention to express any opinion on the question as to whether the Chief *Hansard* Reporter was worth £500 or not; it was for the Printing Committee to decide what remuneration was to be paid to their officers, and, therefore, he had submitted to Parliament the Estimates as they had been sent to him by the various Parliamentary committees. He would not have spoken at all on this question had it not been for the remarks of the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member had made some reference to the action of the present Administration in increasing the wages of the men employed in the Railway Department to 9s. per day. He could not see that that increase had any bearing on the matter under discussion, but what he took exception to was the statement that the increase had been given to the railway men for the purpose of securing their votes.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Undoubtedly.

The PREMIER: It was remarkable that the hon. member should make that assertion, when at the time the general election took place the present Ministerial party were sitting in Opposition.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You promised it then.

The PREMIER: The hon. member was quite wrong. The leader of the Opposition could not find any utterance of his where he had promised to increase the wages of the railway men to 9s. per day.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It was promised all through the campaign by your satellites.

The PREMIER: The hon. member was again quite wrong. At no stage of the campaign had he asserted that he would increase the wages of the railway men to 9s. per day. The hon. member, as head of the then Government, however, had on every possible occasion gone to the extent of increasing wages or salaries or making retrospective increases for the one purpose of securing votes.

Mr. George: Can you prove it?

The PREMIER: Certainly. The leader of the Opposition knew very well that the public servants were pushing him very hard at the general elections.

Mr. George: Not as hard as they will push you at the next election.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition when at Donnybrook on the eve of the general election had wired to the Public Service Commissioner asking him whether the increases that had been granted to the permanent service to take effect from July 1st, when the reclassification was finally published, could also take effect from the same date for temporary clerks, and to show that the hon. member had an ulterior motive he had asked the Public Service Commissioner to wire him if he agreed to that course. The Public Service Commissioner had replied that he had no objection if the Premier so instructed him. Then on the platform at Donnybrook the hon. member had announced that temporary clerks would receive their increase as from the 1st July. In spite of that incident the hon. member

had the audacity to accuse the present Government of having increased the wages of railway men to 9s. a day in order to get their votes.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

[*Mr. Holman took the Chair.*]

Mr. TAYLOR: It was his intention to oppose the amendment for the reduction of this item by £50, the arguments which had so far been advanced in favour of the reduction not having convinced him of the necessity for it. If we took the *Hansard* staff of the Commonwealth Parliament and those of all the States of the Commonwealth we found that our *Hansard* staff was not paid as well as they were paid elsewhere and especially the Chief *Hansard* Reporter. The Commonwealth Parliament had 11 reporters and the amount paid to the Chief *Hansard* Reporter was £750 per annum, deputy chief £625, lowest paid reporter £500; New South Wales, 11 reporters, Chief *Hansard* Reporter £800 per annum, deputy chief £600, lowest paid reporter £330; Victoria, six reporters, Chief *Hansard* Reporter £600 per annum, lowest paid reporter £370; Queensland, 13 reporters, Chief *Hansard* Reporter £600, deputy chief £410, lowest paid reporter £310. Taking the cost of printing, the South Australian *Hansard* was done by the Press which was indeed a more costly method than our *Hansard*. The reports by the Press of the South Australian proceedings of Parliament were more costly than the *Hansard* reports of our proceedings in this State and less satisfactory, he was informed by the hon. member for Fremantle (Mr. Carpenter), who had had the honour and pleasure of being a member of the South Australian Assembly, and therefore spoke with some authority. The cost of printing *Hansard* in the various States was:—New South Wales, 16s. 10d. a page; Victoria, 10s. 4d.; Queensland, 19s.; South Australia, 28s. 0½d. (done by the Press), Western Australia, 8s. Was there any room for economy in this direction or any room for complaint when we took the standard

of *Hansard* as produced by the reporters of our staff? He did not think there could be any reason to reduce the item or any complaint against the Chief *Hansard* Reporter or against any member of the staff. When the Imperial Trade Commission visited Western Australia, their last place of call in the Commonwealth, they had our *Hansard* staff to report their proceedings here. He had been told, and had no reason to doubt, that they had the best staffs of reporters available in the Eastern States of the Commonwealth, but the chairman said when reports were handed to him here that it was the most expeditious work done during their visit, not only including the Commonwealth, but wherever they had been up to that time. The reports of a day's proceedings had been handed to him on the following morning and in some instances the same afternoon. That spoke volumes for the *Hansard* staff of Western Australia and at the same time reflected great credit indeed on the Chief *Hansard* Reporter. It was to be hoped members would not support the proposed reduction. Something had been said the other night about greasing the fat pig, but in his opinion it was not a matter of greasing the fat pig, but of paying for merit and paying for services that were worthy of being paid for. The debate hinged around the Chief *Hansard* Reporter as being the one who was to receive this increase, but it was deserved. He (Mr. Taylor) was only sorry to think that when the Commonwealth Parliament desired a reporter at £500 per annum one of our reporters was selected to fill that position in open competition throughout the Commonwealth of Australia, not only among men on other *Hansard* staffs but on the Press of Australia.

Mr. Underwood: There was no open competition for the vacancy here.

Mr. TAYLOR: There was open competition in the case he had mentioned, and the fact that one of our men had been selected proved the competency of the staff here. When a man had gone away from here to receive £500 a year, and it was said that the Chief *Hansard* Reporter, who had to bear the whole of

the responsibility was not worthy of this increase, then surely it was about time we should try and arrange some means of convincing this House that where merit existed it should be recognised.

Mr. FOLEY: The leader of the Opposition in his criticism had touched on many questions and had drawn a comparison between the increase in connection with this item and the 1s. a day extra which railway men had received throughout the State. The hon. member had said distinctly that it was his opinion that the latter was a bad action on the part of the Government, which meant that he was against that increase. The hon. member had said it was used for political purposes and that it had been promised. We should not, however, compare that increase in any way with the one before the Committee. We should say that, for services rendered, no matter in what branch of industry, a man should receive fair consideration, and if there was any branch overworked in the public service no amount of extra money paid to the individuals would compensate them for what was being taken out of their lives through overwork. When he (Mr. Foley) was elected to this Chamber there were not so many *Hansard* reporters as at present and these gentlemen had considered they were overworked. Members of this Chamber who had had ample opportunity of gauging the merit of that statement, decided in their wisdom that if the staff was overworked, rather than give the members extra money, they would distribute the work up among more men, which was done by the appointment of an extra reporter. That was an argument which could be used against those who were not in favour of this amendment. It had been said that last session was very heavy upon the *Hansard* staff. If so they had a man extra. However, that was irrelevant to the amendment. The member for Murray-Wellington had declared that the member for Pilbara knew nothing about the subject.

Mr. George: Well, does he?

Mr. FOLEY: The member for Pilbara had admitted that he did not know much.

The member for Murray-Wellington had declared that the member for Pilbara knew nothing about the work, adding that he (Mr. George) had taken his degree 40 years ago, and knew that brains were required. How much shorthand work had the member for Murray-Wellington done to qualify him as a better authority on the subject than any other member of the House? The hon. member was the only one who had ever criticised the production of *Hansard* at all, the only one to say that it was badly spelt and contained clerical and typographical errors. If there were errors in the spelling then the chief of the staff, whom the member for Mount Margaret had said made such a good job of that work, did not make a good job of it.

Mr. George: He is not responsible.

Mr. FOLEY: But as chief he ought to be responsible.

Mr. George: But he is not.

Mr. Underwood: He should correct it.

Mr. FOLEY: The chief of the staff went through the proofs, and if there were any mistakes in spelling it was his duty to see that they were rectified. Then when the proof came from the printers, the chief of staff had to go through the matter just as a reader in the Printing Office, and in that capacity he should see that there were no errors in the proof.

Mr. George: The reading should be done in the Printing Office.

Mr. FOLEY: No, it should be done in the *Hansard* office, as was done.

Mr. George: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. FOLEY: The hon. member might be an authority on shorthand, as he was on many other things, but he (Mr. Foley) had had a bigger experience of what constituted the requirements of a reader in a printing office than had the hon. member. All the speakers had missed the point. It was desired that a fair rate of wages should be paid for services rendered. At the same time, it was contended that an extra £50 to the Chief *Hansard* Reporter was more than a fair thing. When we took into consideration the management of the *Hansard* staff, it was found that the staff was not being managed to the benefit of those who com-

prised it, or to the benefit of the State. All the reporters and pressmen and others in the State knew that pressmen were graded as first-class, second-class, and third-class reporters. He would like to know whether, whenever the Chief *Hansard* Reporter went outside the State to get a reporter, he had always got a first-class pressman. If that gentleman wished to see *Hansard* managed properly he should remember that men who had been on the local newspapers for many years, who knew the requirements of the State, who had a grasp of the subjects which members spoke upon, and who knew the State from A to Z, could report an hon. member more clearly than could a new-comer. If members wished to give an equitable return for services rendered, then rather than grant the increase they would see the *Hansard* staff graded and insist that reporters who gave the greatest services to the State should have a larger return than any man who had just come into the State. In respect to going outside the State for *Hansard* men he had voiced his opinion months ago. Hon. members had lauded to the skies the fact that the Commonwealth *Hansard* had come to Western Australia for a man. He had known of one man then in the State, attached to no newspaper staff, who was willing to submit to any examination as an applicant for the local vacancy. He knew of men on newspapers here who should be competent, and who, he believed, were competent for the work. If the Chief *Hansard* Reporter had issued the ultimatum ascribed to him, that a West Australian man was not to be chosen for the vacancy on the West Australian *Hansard*, then that officer had gone beyond his position. If we could get men in Western Australia for vacancies on *Hansard* we should get them. The member for Murray-Wellington had stated that it was all very well for a newspaper reporter to sit in the gallery and report, for he could condense. But the fact that those gentleman condensed their reports or wrote them in a certain fashion was no indication of their ability. There was not a newspaper in the State which did not dictate to its reporters how

far and in what terms they should write on every member in the Chamber, and so long as that obtained those gentleman in the Press gallery had not a fair chance. Taking everything into consideration, and having regard to item 19 on page 41 of the Estimates, which specifically stated that another £250 was paid to *Hansard*, and remembering that when the chief of *Hansard* went outside the State to get a reporter, it all cost money, which should be debited against *Hansard*, he thought the amendment should be carried. Not that he wished to reduce the salary of any man, but because at the present time the finances would not stand too many salary increases. There were many other channels in which increases should be given if they were to be given.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The increase to which exception was taken had been granted because of application made to the Printing Committee. The matter had been fully discussed by the Printing Committee, and after several adjournments the committee had decided to recommend to the Treasurer the advisability of granting the increase shown on the Estimates. If at any time he had entertained doubts as to the advisability of giving the increase those doubts were not as to whether the services of the officer were worth the increase, but had been whether it was wise at the present stage to make any such increase, in view of the finances. This officer had done good and loyal service for many years and no exception had ever been taken to his work, no complaint ever uttered against that work. Since that officer had always given the greatest satisfaction and there being a possibility of his being lost to the State by going elsewhere when he had the opportunity, the Printing Committee, taking all these facts into consideration, had decided that it was advisable to provide the increase shown on the Estimates. A comparison showing the salaries paid to *Hansard* reporters had already been made, by which it was shown that salaries paid in Western Australia were the lowest paid to any *Hansard* reporters or chief of staff in the Commonwealth. Of course,

South Australia was excepted, for the *Hansard* work of that State was done by the Press on contract terms, and under conditions which, according to the figures, were not nearly so satisfactory to the State as where the work was done by the parliamentary staff.

Mr. Foley: By day labour too.

Hon. M. F. TROY: This was by day labour also, although the actual reporting was by night labour. The *Hansard* reporters of Western Australia had the very same class of work to do as was done by the *Hansard* staffs in other States. The best proof was the evidence of the work done, and comparing the work done in this Parliament during this session with the work done by the Federal *Hansard* staff, consisting of eleven reporters, it was found that the six reporters in Western Australia had done just as much work as had the eleven in the Federal Parliament. The comparison was perfectly fair, because both Parliaments had met at the same time, and both had adjourned for a month. A comparison of salaries should be made. The West Australian *Hansard* reporter, as had already been stated, did just as much work, if not more, than was done in the Eastern States. For instance, in Victoria, and he believed in New South Wales also, the *Hansard* reporters did not report select committees. Last year in this State five select committees had been appointed by another place.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Are the *Hansard* reporters not paid for that specially?

Hon. M. F. TROY: No, it was included in their salary.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Surely they are paid specially.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Under an agreement which had been entered into some years ago between the Treasurer of the State and the *Hansard* staff, it was agreed that £250 a year should be paid to the staff to report Royal Commissions, but all other work of the Parliament was included in the salary. The *Hansard* staff claimed that when Royal Commissions from outside the State come to Western Australia

they were entitled to be paid for the work. In Victoria the reporters received a higher salary than is paid here, and had special remuneration for any select committee or Royal Commission work. A statement had been made, and such statements were often made—he supposed he himself had made them—without much consideration and with less justice, that the *Hansard* reporter's work did not require much ability or any brains, that the *Hansard* reporter was merely a machine, that any ability required was merely of a mechanical order. That assertion could easily be made by those who knew nothing of the character of the work. It had been emphatically stated that no matter how valuable the work performed by the individual pressman or how difficult that work, no ordinary pressman could take up *Hansard* work. On that point he would offer no dogmatic opinion, but would leave it to members of the Printing Committee. The member for Albany (Mr. Price) and the Colonial Secretary (Hon. J. M. Drew) were both representatives of the Press holding seats on the Printing Committee, and both those members, having had a long experience of *Hansard*, were satisfied that no ordinary pressman could do the necessary work. There was required in a *Hansard* reporter a very accurate knowledge of shorthand work, in addition to which he must possess high literary and educational attainments. As a result, when the committee were selecting a man they selected one holding these qualifications. He was satisfied that the critics who said this work called for no brains would not be able to do the work themselves. A complaint had been made that a *Hansard* reporter had been introduced from the Eastern States, and quite a number had voiced this as a real grievance. Personally, he did not favour the introduction of reporters from the Eastern States, and when the last arrangement was made by which a reporter was introduced from the Eastern States he was not a party to that action, but the gentleman who was responsible acted in very good faith, and it was possible that had he (Mr. Troy) been in the same position he

might have acted similarly. He was away at the time, and when it was known that Mr. Weatherston, one of the members of the staff, would resign, the President was approached as a member of the Printing Committee.

Mr. Foley: How long before that gentleman resigned?

Hon. M. F. TROY: Exactly how long he could not say.

Mr. Foley: A lot hinges on that.

Hon. M. F. TROY: It was not altogether a question of how long before Mr. Weatherston resigned, as how long the officer could be appointed before the House met and his services were required. As soon as it was known that Mr. Weatherston would leave, although he had not resigned, the Chief *Hansard* Reporter had to set about to find a suitable officer to take his place.

Mr. Foley: Was not there sufficient time to have done that in Western Australia at less expense?

Hon. M. F. TROY: There was not sufficient time, and when the President was approached the President had no doubt but that the best thing to do was to seek for an officer at once, and if one could not be obtained here the Chief *Hansard* Reporter was to go to the Eastern States.

Mr. Foley: It took some time to go to South Australia.

Hon. M. F. TROY: A statement was made that a suitable officer could have been secured in this State.

Mr. Foley: They were never given a chance; it was not advertised.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Only 12 months previously applications were called here for a *Hansard* reporter before Mr. Bridgman was appointed, and the applications then put in were deemed unsuitable. The committee had to go elsewhere, and from what we could judge there would have been no more applicants on this occasion than there were 12 months ago.

Mr. Foley: How do you know?

Hon. M. F. TROY: We judged by the material offering in this State. The hon. member did not know.

Mr. Foley: Yes. I do.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Printing Committee acted in good faith. He was

not one who desired to go to the Eastern States for a reporter, and although a good deal had been made of the fact that the Commonwealth came to Western Australia for a *Hansard* reporter it must be borne in mind that a reporter was not taken from the newspaper staffs for the Commonwealth *Hansard*, but from the Western Australian *Hansard* staff. That showed that the Commonwealth had very little choice to secure a man except from the Western Australian *Hansard* staff.

Mr. Foley: Most of our men have worked on the papers in this State.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Personally, he was not in a position to say whether a man was competent or not; neither was any other member of the House unless he was a journalist. He was not in a position to say whether there was any man on the Press in Western Australia competent to be a member of the *Hansard* staff. Those who knew said there was not.

Mr. Underwood: Wigg says so.

Mr. Foley: How long ago, 12 months?

Hon. M. F. TROY: On the Printing Committee there were two journalists, the Hon. the Colonial Secretary and the member for Albany.

Mr. Underwood: Does the member for Albany say there is not a reporter in this country worthy to be a member of the *Hansard* staff?

Hon. M. F. TROY: No, he did not think the hon. member for Albany was so dogmatic. The only persons who were dogmatic were those who said there were millions of competent men available.

Mr. Foley: No one here said there were millions.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Chief *Hansard* Reporter was responsible for the department he administered, and he had to administer it satisfactorily to Parliament. If he was to be responsible for that work he should have some choice in the selection of his instruments to do the work. He (Mr. Troy) had no knowledge of what constituted a good *Hansard* reporter, and would not force a man on the Chief *Hansard* Reporter. Because of his lack of experience, was his word to be taken in preference to the word of those who knew? He had always held this

opinion, that the Chief *Hansard* Reporter must do the work satisfactorily to him as the Chairman of the Printing Committee. That work was done satisfactorily, but in so far as the choice of the instruments was concerned then he would not interfere because he did not think it his duty to force on the Chief *Hansard* Reporter someone who might not be able to do the work. Provided the Chief *Hansard* Reporter did his work to his (Mr. Troy's) satisfaction and to the satisfaction of the House particularly he was content, and the Chief *Hansard* Reporter should be allowed some discretion in the choice of his reporters. He did not know that there were soft billets being made for persons oversea. Neither of the persons appointed had been friends of the Chief *Hansard* Reporter. They had been strangers and had not been appointed until the recommendations had been before the Printing Committee. These gentlemen had come from overseas to Western Australia and had been appointed by the Printing Committee after having produced the very best credentials from literary men which it would be possible to secure, and on these credentials they were appointed on the recommendation of the Chief *Hansard* Reporter, but only by the wish of the Printing Committee. When it was said that we went overseas and did not recognise merit in our own country, he asked the hon. members who used that argument to suggest those whom they considered should occupy these positions.

Mr. Foley: I told them about one man.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Let the hon. member mention his name, and he would be given a trial at the first opportunity. He (Mr. Troy) would give hundreds of names if he had had no responsibility, but when he had the responsibility of seeing that the work must be done, he wanted something else besides suggestions; he wanted evidence of merit and ability to do the work. Although he was not responsible for the latest officer being brought over from South Australia, he justified the action taken by the President in another place. The President had acted in perfect good faith,

and had he been in the same position he might have acted in the same way because he wanted to see the very best choice made in the selection of men for the *Hansard* staff, and he wanted to see that the Chief *Hansard* Reporter had an opportunity of giving satisfaction to hon. members by exercising some discretion in connection with these appointments as had been the case during the years in which he had been Chief *Hansard* Reporter. Some hon. members said that these officers were too highly paid, and the statement was made that they should not receive an increase because other people in the State did not.

Mr. Foley: There are other people more deserving.

Hon. M. F. TROY: But were they? Every man thought himself the most deserving. If we made a distinction between those who were most deserving, we would have to make a distinction in respect to their qualifications and the work they were called upon to perform. It had to be remembered that the salaries paid to the reporters on the Western Australian newspapers had gone up considerably. A reporter received a considerably higher salary to-day than a few years ago.

Member: They needed it, too.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes, and there was no reason to refuse it to them because somebody else had not got an increase. While hon. members made an assertion that any man could do *Hansard* work, and that it required no ability except mechanical ability there were men on this staff to-day who had occupied important positions on the newspapers of this State and who could command a good salary. The positions which they occupied on the newspapers of Western Australia were better paid positions to-day than those they occupied in this House. It might be asked why they did not go back.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Did you say that the salary paid for the position of a reporter is better than for a *Hansard* reporter?

Hon. M. F. TROY: There were two *Hansard* reporters who were heads of staffs on the newspapers.

Mr. O'Loghlen: And receiving higher wages?

Hon. M. F. TROY: Because salaries had gone up they to-day would be receiving higher salaries than they received as *Hansard* reporters, but they had burned their boats, so to speak, by leaving the newspapers for their own good, and could not expect to go back and occupy the higher positions. The chief reporters on the Press in Western Australia received from £8 to £9 per week and in Melbourne from £10 to £14 a week. These rates were new, of course. They had gone up since the reporters had had the good sense to form a union. They had gone up all over Australia and the gentlemen now on the *Hansard* staff of Western Australia, if in their old positions, would have been in receipt of a higher salary than they were getting to-day. If hon. members complained of these gentlemen receiving too high a salary they had to consider the possibility of them resigning and going to other spheres, and then it might be doubted whether those persons who were considered capable and had not been successful in the past were suitable to become members of our *Hansard* staff. Regarding the statement that the Chief *Hansard* Reporter did not keep down the costs in respect to the work done, so far as his department was concerned—

Mr. Foley: Who made that complaint?

Hon. M. F. TROY: Amongst many the hon. member did.

Mr. Foley: I made no such complaint.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Then he would accept the hon. member's denial and withdraw his statement if he had misrepresented him, but he had understood that the hon. member had done so. The cost of the West Australian *Hansard* was considerably less than that of any other State in Australia. Our work was as great but the cost of producing *Hansard* was only 8s. per page here as compared with 16s. 10d. in New South Wales, 10s. 4d. in Victoria, 19s. in Queensland, and 28s. 0½d. in South Australia. If the Chief *Hansard* Reporter were to send along the copy to the Government Printer in a slovenly manner the Government

Printer would not make corrections but would send the proof back, and if the chief had to make the amendments to the proofs on account of work having been done slovenly in the first instance, the cost would be greater.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Some of our speeches are pretty bad.

Hon. M. F. TROY: It had to be remembered that the saving was due to the fact that the Chief *Hansard* Reporter arranged his work so well with the result that the cost of printing per page was as low as he had stated. The Government Printer simply printed what was sent down, and if the copy was not properly prepared the extra charge for rectifying mistakes later on would be charged to the vote of *Hansard*. As a matter of fact a great deal depended on the Chief *Hansard* Reporter. He must be a man of undoubted ability and must be careful in the preparation of the work he submitted to the Printing Office. Because he (Mr. Troy) had found from experience that the Chief *Hansard* Reporter was careful and did his work accurately, when the matter of the increase was submitted to him he was favourably disposed to it. Personally he wanted to say in conclusion that the *Hansard* work was done well. There had not been any complaints in the House, and not only was the work done well, but the best discipline was exercised throughout the department and the work was done promptly and to the satisfaction of the Printing Committee and of all concerned. Before members thought of striking out this vote they should give the matter very careful attention, and they should not make statements unless backed up by knowledge received through coming into close contact with the particular department. The members of the *Hansard* staff did make an application for an increase in salary, but it could not be granted and the Committee had to turn it down. But it was not turned down because it was thought the reporters were not worth it, but because it could not be justified under existing conditions. The application of the Chief *Hansard* Re-

porter, however, was considered from the point of view of his long services to the State and the quality of the work which he had performed, and it was considered that it would be in the interests of the House to grant the application.

Mr. PRICE: That there was no person in Western Australia competent to perform *Hansard* duties he would be sorry to imagine. He was of opinion there was. Neither did he subscribe to the dictum that no ordinary pressman could do the work. A man certainly needed special qualifications, and personally he had always regretted the fact that recent appointments had been made from outside the State. But he would ask hon. members, who like himself believed that we should endeavour to secure the services of those already in the State to fill these positions, to realise that these men were called upon to work under the Chief *Hansard* Reporter, and if he was of the opinion that they were not competent or for any other reason were not desirable, it was only reasonable to bow to his desire in the matter and allow him to select whoever he considered he could best work with, and whoever might carry out the work with satisfaction to himself and to the House. It was because of the views which the Chief *Hansard* Reporter held that appointments had been made from outside. In his (Mr. Price's) opinion there were many men in the State who were competent to fill positions on the *Hansard* staff, at the same time the real trouble was struck earlier in the evening by one hon. member who spoke of the fact that in some Parliaments the *Hansard* staff was graded and he certainly thought that should be done in connection with our *Hansard*. It was ridiculous to bring here an absolute stranger from another part of Australia, put him into the box to report speeches of hon. members, and pay him exactly the same salary as that received by the other men who had been in the State for many years, and who had had many years' *Hansard* experience. The work of such a new reporter required a great deal more supervision than that of the others; that was inevitable, until he be-

came accustomed to the conditions in connection with reporting in the State. The member for Murray-Wellington spoke of errors appearing in the volumes of *Hansard* but it was unfair to attribute those to the *Hansard* staff. The reason for those errors was a simple one. Only one proof was sent along by the Government Printer, and he had been told, and he believed it to be correct, that the Government Printer refused to supply a second proof or what was known as a revise, after the first proof had been sent along. The literals were corrected in the first proof and it was the duty of the compositors in the Government Printing Office to make those corrections, and often some of them remained uncorrected. In connection with the increases which it was proposed to give to the Chief *Hansard* Reporter, he personally regretted that similar increases could not be given to the whole of the staff, who undoubtedly were worthy of them, and he was quite convinced that, at all events the older members of the staff, if they resigned to again enter the newspaper world, would receive higher salaries than they were getting on the *Hansard* staff to-day. It might be asked why they give up their positions on newspapers to join *Hansard*. But it should not be forgotten that when the older members of the staff resigned from the local press to join *Hansard* the salaries paid by the newspaper proprietors were far below the rates which those proprietors were compelled to pay to-day.

Mr. Foley: And that would still have been the case if they had not formed a union.

Mr. PRICE: If the hon. member's interjection was worth anything it proved that by the retirement of the present members of the *Hansard* staff from the press, the formation of a union became possible, and increases in salary followed. If the argument were followed out then the members of the *Hansard* staff should form a union and the result would be instead of the *Hansard* reporters receiving £350 which they were getting to-day—

Mr. Underwood: Four hundred pounds.

Mr. PRICE: Three hundred and fifty pounds; he knew nothing at the present juncture of any £400.

Mr. Underwood: But I do.

Mr. PRICE: At the present moment we were dealing with the items, one Chief Reporter £500 and five reporters £350.

Mr. Foley: Read page 41 of the Estimates, item 19.

Mr. PRICE: The salaries paid to the *Hansard* reporters in this State were £350, plus £50 to each of five reporters which was paid for special work.

The Premier: No. If they did not do that work they would be paid just the same.

Mr. PRICE: It might be pointed out that if in the course of the year the *Hansard* staff had to do £1,000 worth of work they would still only receive £250. This arrangement was entered into a few years ago between the then Colonial Treasurer (Hon. Frank Wilson) and the members of the *Hansard* staff, and they took as a basis in arriving at that sum of £250 the amount which had been paid by the Government for reporting Royal Commissions.

Mr. Foley: They were all very fond of Royal Commissions.

Mr. PRICE: That might have been the case but it was pleasing to know that the present Government and their immediate predecessors were not so fond of Royal Commissions. A number of years, six or seven, were taken as a basis, and it was found that the payments made for Royal Commissions worked out at just £400 per annum. The then Colonial Treasurer considered, and he (Mr. Price) also considered, that a good stroke of business was being done when the arrangement was entered into with the staff to report all Royal Commissions for £250. That agreement which was entered into then held good to-day. Then, if we compared the salaries of the staff in this State with that extra £50 included with the salaries paid in other parts of Australia it would still be found

that the reporters in this State were the lowest paid in Australia.

The Premier: What about outside work?

Mr. PRICE: If the Premier were conversant with newspaper work he would know that there were very few openings for *Hansard* reporters to secure work in that direction.

The Premier: What about other Royal Commissions?

Mr. PRICE: That, he contended, had absolutely no more to do with the amendment before the Committee than a discussion on the private income of the Premier, or a discussion on what salary he should receive as Premier of the State.

The Premier: If we pay them a salary they are State servants and they come under the same category as other State servants.

Mr. PRICE: There was no objection to the Premier laying it down as a rule that they should not have permission to do this work.

The Premier: But they do it in the time for which they are paid by us.

Mr. PRICE: The Premier was paid so much as Premier to give his time to the affairs of the State.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): And he does nothing else.

Mr. PRICE: It would be hard to imagine that even the Premier would suggest that money received for doing what was strictly private work should be taken into consideration in connection with this matter. If a Commission was appointed by the Commonwealth Government, a Commission over which this State or Parliament had no control, surely the Premier would not seriously suggest that the *Hansard* reporters should be compelled to do work for another Government and that the proceeds of that work should go to the State Government.

The Premier: There are hundreds of public servants doing it every day.

Mr. George: Is it a condition of employment?

Mr. PRICE: That was so where the conditions of employment obtained, but in this case an agreement had been made between the House through His Honour

the Speaker and the members of the *Hansard* staff, giving them the right to do this work, and to receive payment for it, and if it was the desire of the Chamber that that state of affairs should be altered the alteration should be made in a proper manner by the cancelling of the whole of the agreement. It would be manifestly unfair, however, to bring that forward as an argument why the staff should not be fairly and adequately remunerated in connection with their ordinary employment. The only increase provided was £50 for the Chief *Hansard* Reporter, making the salary £500, which was paid to-day to the ordinary reporter in the Commonwealth Parliament and which was received by the ordinary *Hansard* Reporters in at least three other Parliaments of Australia. He regretted to say that the ordinary reporters in this Parliament were receiving what was, after all, only the minimum rate paid by any other Parliament in Australia. They were receiving really £100 less than they should receive if their salaries were only brought up to anything like those paid in the other States. In regard to the work which the staff performed, he found that in the session of 1912 the New South Wales *Hansard* staff had cost the State £7,813, whilst the staff in Western Australia had cost £2,791. Members might say, "Look at the difference in the two States, and in the work"—

Mr. Dwyer: And in the speakers.

Mr. PRICE: That should be, if anything, an argument in favour of increasing the salaries because of the extra work the staff had to perform. In New South Wales *Hansard* for 1912 ran to 4,402 pages, whilst the Western Australian *Hansard* reached 4,723 pages. In the one case it had cost £7,813 to produce 4,402 pages, whilst in Western Australia it had cost £2,700 to produce 4,723 pages; therefore, this Parliament had no cause whatever for complaint. He sincerely hoped the Committee would not agree to the amendment, but that in the near future the finances of the State would be in such a position as to warrant on the next Estimates an increase for the whole of the *Hansard* staff commensurate with the

payments received for similar work in other parts of Australia.

The PREMIER: The *Hansard* staff were engaged for the purpose of reporting Parliament and were paid on a yearly basis. When Parliament was not sitting the staff did any work required of them by calling at the office from day to day, and they were permitted to have yearly holidays, which, considering the long hours they worked during the session, were quite essential. He contended that if they were engaged during the State's time in doing work for the Commonwealth Government, their earnings, like those of other public servants, should be paid into the coffers of the State. There were hundreds of men in the public service who were performing duties for the Commonwealth authorities every day, and the Government had declined to allow them to receive payment from the Commonwealth unless the work they did occupied them after ordinary office hours. Then there was in the public service an essential rule that if a man was being paid a proper salary he should give the best of his services to the State. He could not be permitted to take employment outside the service. The Government had had difficulty in preventing public servants from working on the totalisator on race days, and from playing at picture shows at nights. Those men came to their office at nine o'clock in the morning and left at five o'clock, and they cared nothing about what happened during the day. He contended that the State paid its servants a salary in order to get the best out of them, just the same as any private employer, and seeing that the Government had introduced that principle in the public service, it became very difficult to adhere to it when Parliament was the first to break away from the rule and permit outside work to be done by its own servants. He held that the *Hansard* staff were being paid a reasonable salary, taken in conjunction with the fact that if they reported commissions for the State during recess they received a special honorarium, which might or might not be necessary. The reason for the honorarium was that there had been a good deal of criticism of the action of past Governments when

appointing Royal Commissions in permitting the reporting to be done sometimes by the *Hansard* staff and sometimes by private reporters.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What about members of Parliament?

The PREMIER: The hon. member was talking an absurdity if he contended that members of Parliament and the *Hansard* staff were on the same basis. *Hansard* staff were paid a yearly salary in order that they should give their services to the State, and they could not leave their offices for one day without leave. The difficulty was that there were a number of servants who came under the Public Service Act and some who did not. Some were controlled by individual Ministers and others by Parliament, each authority had a different idea, and as soon as any difficulty arose, it was pointed out that under some some Minister or under Parliament, certain conditions were applying and those servants not enjoying them asked that those conditions should apply to them. The Government were trying to set up a definite principle that they should pay a man a salary sufficient for him to give to the State the best services he could render, and so that he could apply himself to the work of the State. Yet Parliament, which should uphold the rule, was the first to depart from the principle and allow its own servants to work for the Commonwealth Government and receive extra payment. The hon. member for Albany had said that the Government had no control over the *Hansard* staff. That was so, but neither had they any control over the services of the Solicitor General and the Under Treasurer. Both those officers were charged with certain responsibilities to the Commonwealth and they did not tolerate any interference by the Government in regard to their Commonwealth duties, but the State did not permit them to accept payment for those services.

Mr. Nanson: What about university professors?

The PREMIER: They were not Government employees.

Mr. Nanson: They are paid from Government funds.

The PREMIER: No. A special Act of Parliament provided that a certain amount should be paid to the Senate, but the Senate spent that amount without any interference from the Government. He was pointing out that the various controlling bodies had different methods of dealing with their servants and the Government were continually having it pointed out that the system of allowing outside work to be done by State officers was in operation in some other department. Because it did not involve a large amount in a particular instance it was not considered as it would be if it covered the whole of the Government employees. For example, it would be nothing for the University to provide long service leave for its small staff, but if long service leave were to be given to the wages staff in the Railway Department, the cost in the first year would be about £165,000; that was where the trouble arose. There was a *Hansard* staff in Parliament only of six members, it was true, but there were 5,000 other persons in the Public Service asking that the conditions applying to the *Hansard* staff should apply to them. The one principle should be adhered to all round, and if the *Hansard* staff performed services for any other Government in the time for which the State was paying them an annual salary, the State, and not the individual should be recouped.

Mr. George: Would you farm them out to the Commonwealth?

The PREMIER: The hon. member could call it farming out if he liked. Servants of the Commonwealth rendered services to the State Government, but that was not considered farming out. When the hon. member was Commissioner of Railways, he farmed out his employees to other departments. It was really not a matter of farming out at all, but rather of service rendered in State time and the State being paid for those services. Suppose the bulk of the *Hansard* staff's time was taken up in doing work for the Commonwealth, would hon. members still be content that the staff should be paid an annual salary?

Mr. George: Certainly not.

The PREMIER: Well, the same principle was at stake. If Parliament was paying a proper salary to the staff (and he contended the salary was sufficient), Parliament should get the best services that those men could render, and the man who did not apply himself wholly to his Government work but did outside work, could not do justice to his position. Already this system was causing discontent, and it was unfair to the Government and to Parliament itself. When that condition of affairs obtained, the State absolutely lost control of its servants. Parliament was at present paying the *Hansard* staff a yearly salary, and in addition to that £250 for reporting royal commissions, but he contended if the Commonwealth wanted a commission reported, so long as it was done in the State's time, the Commonwealth should pay the general taxpayer and not the individual reporter.

Mr. PRICE: It was rather suggestive that the Premier should be the only Minister present this evening to support the amendment.

The Premier: I have not expressed any opinion on the amendment.

Mr. PRICE: The Premier had stated that he considered the *Hansard* staff was being well paid. On the 15th November, 1906, the then leader of the Labour party (Mr. Bath) made a very strong appeal to the House in behalf of *Hansard* and pointed out that the staff were overworked and underpaid.

The Premier: There has been an improvement since 1906.

Mr. PRICE: There had been no increase to the ordinary members of the staff since 1906.

The Premier: There has been an increase of at least £50 per annum.

Mr. PRICE: Not to the ordinary members.

The Premier: Yes. at least £50 per annum.

Mr. PRICE: Then again, the present Minister for Works, speaking only on the 12th January, 1911, had said—

We had to remember that these officers were following a profession which was more exhausting than any other which

could be followed. Everyone must know that breaking stones was quite desirable work compared with taking shorthand notes.

And the hon. member had gone on to ask whether Parliament had not power to see that fair consideration was extended to the *Hansard* staff.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Was he not referring to long hours?

Mr. PRICE: And to payment. The position was that two members of the present Ministry, a short time ago, were pleading in behalf of *Hansard*—the Minister for Lands and the Attorney General—and hon. members could imagine with what fervour the appeal had been made by the Attorney General in behalf of the overworked and underpaid *Hansard* staff. It was decidedly unfair for the Premier to place the members of the *Hansard* staff in the same category as the ordinary civil servants employed under the Public Service Act.

The Premier: There is no difference.

Mr. PRICE: The Premier, within the last fortnight had written letters to the Printing Committee to the effect that the *Hansard* staff did not come under the Public Service Act.

The Premier: Of course they do not.

Mr. PRICE: Furthermore that they were not civil servants within the meaning of the Act. Why did the Premier endeavour to lead members to believe that the *Hansard* staff came under the Public Service Act? They did not in any way. They were under a special agreement entered into between the Speaker on behalf of this House and themselves.

The Premier: That does not alter the fact that they are public servants.

Mr. PRICE: But they had special conditions of employment and the agreement referred to gave them the right to receive payment for Royal Commissions other than State. Therefore, it was manifestly unfair of the Premier to continually allege that they were in the same position as the ordinary civil servant, who was under entirely different conditions of employment. There were special terms in regard to their employment, exactly as there were in regard to the employment

of university professors, for instance. What he (Mr. Price) wanted to do was to give them a fair rate of pay and to continue the agreement at present existing. They were not ordinary civil servants as they could not claim any retiring allowance, and although some of them had joined long enough ago to bring them within the provisions of the Superannuation Act they were debarred from it.

The Premier: Who said so?

Mr. PRICE: The Premier's own letter said that.

The Premier: I never gave any decision on that.

Mr. PRICE: That was certainly the inference to be drawn from the correspondence. The whole point was that the *Hansard* staff had special conditions of employment. They had a special agreement and if the Premier or any other member of this Chamber desired that that agreement should be varied there was a way for it to be done. It should certainly not be broken at the dictation of the Premier or any other Minister who considered these conditions were not fair. If it was contended that they should not receive that £250 for reporting Royal Commissions then notice should be given to the Chief *Hansard* reporter, and through him to the staff, that it was the intention of the Speaker on behalf of Parliament to terminate the agreement and enter into a new one. But to-day members of the *Hansard* had every right to receive that money as it was a condition of their employment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): In regard to that special Royal Commission agreement he was quite in accord with the action of the Premier. There was no doubt to his mind that when we paid £250 a year for commission work, whether there were commissions or not, when a commission came from the Federal Parliament it was the duty of the *Hansard* staff to report it and the payment should go to recoup the State for the expense it was put to under this heading, as the same people paid taxes to the Federal Parliament as paid to the State Parliament, and therefore ought

not to pay twice for this work to be done. The hon. member for Albany said there was an agreement. He (Mr. Angwin) had not seen the agreement, but he believed it was the intention at the time that *Hansard* should report all Royal Commissions that required to be reported.

Mr. George: Federal or State?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Any Royal Commissions that required to be reported. If that was not part of their work there were plenty of reporters outside who would be only too pleased to have the opportunity of earning that extra money. A large majority of members of this House would immediately express their indignation if members of the public service were allowed during the time for which they were paid by the State to give their time to some other service and be paid additional for it. The hon. member for Murray-Wellington would object to it in a private capacity, and therefore he should object to it in his public capacity.

Mr. George: Not if I made an agreement.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Parliament had voted £250 for reporting Royal Commissions. That amount was paid whether there were any Royal Commissions or not, and there had been very few during the last few years.

Mr. George: Then that shows bad management.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Take the case of the principal medical officer of the Health Department. Parliament voted for him a certain salary and the Commonwealth subsidised a certain amount for him to act as the principal quarantine officer in this State. Would it be right for us to give him that additional money, because he had to carry out these duties in State time, if it was a portion of his duties prior to the Commonwealth being established? While that subsidy was paid it went into the Treasury and the only amount the medical officer received was the sum voted by Parliament. The same should apply to the *Hansard* staff.

Mr. George: It is a question of an agreement.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): No doubt like every one else the members of the *Hansard* staff wanted to get all they could, and that was only human nature. In reply to the hon. member for Albany he wished to say he (Mr. Angwin) was quite in accord with the Premier that the £250 paid for reporting Royal Commissions should cover both State and Federal, and any amount received from the Commonwealth should go to recoup the State.

Mr. GEORGE: Debate on this item had gone far beyond the question that had been raised by the hon. member for Leonora, namely, that the amount should be reduced by £50. The Premier's speech contained a considerable amount of information but kept the Committee absolutely in the dark as regarded that £50 per annum. The Premier said these were his Estimates, and therefore we had a right to assume that he endorsed the figures in his Estimates. Consequently, if that were so, so far as this amendment was concerned, the Premier must vote against it. It had been a very sore question in this State for many years as to whether those receiving a salary from the State should engage in other duties. Ten or 12 years ago when Commissioner for Railways he remembered there was a great controversy which was carried to this extent, that clerks and other employees of the Railway Department who were members of musical societies and bands were complained of very strongly because in their own time they went and earned some extra remuneration. He had a great amount of sympathy with the argument that a man getting a reasonable salary should not interfere with others.

Mr. Foley: You farmed out the services of station-masters to do postal work.

Mr. GEORGE: His department had been called upon by the State Government to do postal work and in classifying the various stations took into consideration the amount of

work that had to be done, but the money received from the Federal Government was collected and paid to the Commissioner for Railways for the reason that he would not permit that there should be two masters over one man.

Mr. Foley: The men doing the work did not get anything.

Mr. GEORGE: They got their stations classified at a higher rate. The classification of the stations where postal work was done was higher than where it was not done. The point raised in this instance was not so much this £50 a year, but whether the gentlemen of the *Hansard* staff should do nothing during the recess or should get employment if they could do so, and if they did get it the Premier said that the money should go to the State. If the Premier said that, there was a proper course to take in connection with the matter. If there were conditions of employment existing and the Premier did not agree with them, his course was clear. That was to insist that a termination of the present agreement should take place, and he could then make what terms he liked. If there was an agreement, however, it should be carried out. Whoever made that agreement let us keep it.

The Premier: You are talking as if the agreement has been broken.

Mr. GEORGE: The Premier admitted that there was an agreement, but wanted to break it, and was seeking by this impromptu debate to introduce a principle which he would not bring in by direct motion. If the Premier had the courage of his convictions let him say that the agreement should be terminated.

The Premier: It has no more to do with me than with you.

Mr. GEORGE: Then why was the Premier breaking the agreement?

The Premier: Excuse me.

Mr. GEORGE: The Premier had given a speech for half an hour on the question, and now said he did not want to break the agreement.

The Premier: You were talking about education just now; you are educating me to a bear garden.

Mr. GEORGE: Anyhow, there was an agreement with *Hansard*. If the Premier and his Ministers did not agree with that agreement there was a proper course to take, namely, to call upon the persons responsible for that agreement and have it terminated.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Has not the Speaker already said that every member has power over the Estimates?

The Premier: It is nothing to do with us.

Mr. GEORGE: If every member had the same power, the Premier had at least more opportunity. Let the Premier say to the House by direct motion that the agreement should be terminated. Then we would have something definite to go upon.

Mr. ALLEN: A great deal of extraneous matter had been introduced into the debate. As a member of the Printing Committee he could say the Committee had given considerable time and attention to a request from the Chief *Hansard* Reporter for an increase in salary. Circumstances had come to the knowledge of the Printing Committee which were duly considered, and as a result of careful and deliberate consideration the committee had made to the House the recommendation that this increase should be granted. Every member who had spoken admitted the undoubted ability of the present leader of the *Hansard* staff and of every member of the staff. In that he agreed. If hon. members were going to be niggardly in salaries paid to *Hansard* reporters the time was not far distant when we would lose them. The members of the Printing Committee had the assurance of the Chief *Hansard* Reporter that professional reporters of this class were not so plentiful as members might imagine. It was rather a difficult matter to fill a position on *Hansard* by the class of man required for the work. A great many figures had been given to-night in regard to the cost of *Hansard* work in other States. He desired to emphasise the low cost of turning out *Hansard* in Western Australia. The

figures supplied to him proved conclusively that the cost of *Hansard* was, in Western Australia 8s. per page; in New South Wales, 16s. 10d.; in Victoria, 10s. 4d.; in Queensland, 19s., while in South Australia the reports were done by the Press. In Western Australia the cost was only 8s. per page, which was very much cheaper than the cost in any of the other States. When we realised that the standard of work was equal to or, as some said, better than that of any other *Hansard* work in the Commonwealth, it would be seen that we were taking up a great deal too much time with the motion.

Mr. Thomas: What about the matter in *Hansard*?

Mr. ALLEN: If the speeches were reported as delivered some members would blush for shame. Unfortunately *Hansard* reporters revised the speeches. A lot of extraneous matter had been introduced into the debate and we had discussed the *Hansard* staff and the reporting of Royal Commissions. He did not wish to refer to that more than to say that if the members of the *Hansard* staff were not specially paid for that work they would expect it to be added to their salaries and the members of the Printing Committee would be prepared to give it to them. In Mr. Wigg we had an excellent officer, and he hoped we were going to retain him and not niggardly refuse to give him this increase. We had already talked enough, in fact the debate had cost double the amount of the increase.

Mr. Lewis: Then why transgress?

Mr. ALLEN: There was scarcely any transgression whilst he was keeping to the item. The Printing Committee had been appointed by the House. It had done its best and after due consideration had made a recommendation to the House. In the circumstances the House might give some consideration to that recommendation. It had not been done in a hurry; many sittings had been held, and after full consideration and in the best interests of Parliament the committee had recommended the increase.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): A lot of officers want increases.

Mr. ALLEN: And when the time came he would be found supporting those increases also.

Mr. FOLEY: When a member moved the reduction of an item such as this, while his position would be understood by other hon. members, yet it went out to the country that he must be in favour of a sweating wage. One of the members of the Printing Committee had expressed a fear that if these increases were not granted the gentleman holding the position might leave the *Hansard* staff and go over to the Press. Although *Hansard* reporters did good work—and that was acknowledged by hon. members—the country ought not to be allowed to think that hon. members were doing something which was not right and equitable in respect to a question of wages. It should be known that one member of the *Hansard* staff during one recess was out of the State for four months.

Mr. Allen: His colleagues did his work while he was away.

Mr. FOLEY: That was admitted, and he was very glad that the reporter in question was in a position to make the trip; but when it was used as an argument that if the increase were not given these reporters would go back to the papers on which they had worked before, he felt that if they went back to the newspapers, even if the money they would there receive under present conditions was a little higher, they would not get the five months' holiday nor the conditions which they had on *Hansard*. He was afraid that they had very little idea of leaving the positions they had. However, he was glad to think that one member of the Printing Committee had been sufficiently plain spoken to say that a request had been made by the Chief *Hansard* Reporter for a £50 increase. That hon. member had said that certain arguments were used as to why the increase of £50 should be given. These arguments had not been given to the Chamber. If the member for West Perth (Mr. Allen) had arguments put before him by the Chief *Hansard* Reporter and if those arguments

had weight with the member for West Perth it was the duty of that hon. member to put those weighty arguments before the Committee and close the discussion. Until he did that and those arguments were found to be sufficiently weighty he (Mr. Foley) would still ask the Committee to carry the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS: It was not desired to give a silent vote on this matter. At the same time he was in a somewhat peculiar position. He felt perfectly satisfied that if the country were in a flourishing condition and we had money to burn, there were few officers in the State more deserving of an increase in pay than the officer under discussion. However, he must cast a vote in favour of the amendment, although he would do so with extreme regret.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Why must you?

Mr. THOMAS: On principle. He had not a single complaint to bring against the officer in question, but honestly believed that officer had done his work as well as any other officer in similar circumstances in Australia. He had personally received from that officer unflinching courtesy at all times, and every possible consideration, but the position was that we were face to face year after year with a deficit. The Government were blamed by the Opposition for not doing the best with the finances, and abused for not going in for proper administration. With the deficit continually and perennially facing us, we were not justified in giving these increases. Under the circumstances he would regretfully vote for the amendment. He would like to see the increase given, just as he would like to get about another £200 a year himself. It was a source of considerable annoyance to him that the country could not afford it, and it was a fault he found with the Treasurer that that hon. gentleman had not introduced it. If a Bill were introduced to give immediate effect to an increase of £200 a year to members of Parliament, he would with great reluctance have to vote against it, because, much as members needed it and still more as they deserved it, the country could not

afford it. There were thousands of men in the country doing hard toil and many of them receiving no more than 8s. a day. In the Railway Department when a certain number of workers were raised to a minimum of 9s. a day, an outcry was made that it would bring about a deficit, that it was unnecessarily raising wages. If it was unnecessary to pay 9s. a day to a man doing his best for eight hours on end, then he was reluctantly forced to the conviction that it was not fair that this officer, receiving £500 a year, should be increased by another £50.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: We are not doing that.

Mr. THOMAS: It would amount to that with the additional charges introduced later on in the Estimates. He was perfectly satisfied that if every man had what was due to him the officer in question should have his £50; but there were thousands of others who could not get nearly what was due to them and they were in a worse condition than the officer in question. Therefore until the time came when we could do justice to everybody and to those more in need he would vote to reduce the amount.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The logic of the hon. member was difficult to understand. The House controlled this particular vote. It was not for the Ministry to say whether we should give increases or not. It was for the House to see that these officers were well paid. The Premier raised the cry of want of funds, and regretted that he could not through want of funds raise the salaries of other civil servants.

The Premier: I have not given utterance to anything on this point.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier went further and said he did not propose retrenchment.

The Premier: What has that to do with this?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Everything. We were entitled to look at the expenditure and see what was available to the Crown and what was spent, and to see that our officers were reasonably paid. Not a member had spoken but had said that this officer was worth the money, that

the position was worth the money, and that he ought to have it. The argument was that hon. members were paid only £300 and that someone else got less.

The Premier: Why did not you provide the increase?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Because they did not have the revenue which the Premier had. The Premier proposed to spend £5,528,000 this year as against £3,734,000 in 1910-11. That was an increase of nearly 50 per cent. in expenditure since the present Ministers had occupied the Treasury benches, and now they said they must practise economy and could not pay their officers well. There was a deficit, not because of the salaries paid to officers or of unnecessary expenditure under this vote; it was due to extravagance in a hundred directions, extravagance that ought to be rectified, and which if rectified would enable the Premier to carry out his boasted desire to pay the civil service better than they were being paid. The House was responsible for these officers and it was for the House to protect them and see that it was not bluffed by Ministers. If hon. members turned up the details of revenue they would see that there ought to be enough money for everyone and to spare. He hoped members would realise that they could not increase any single vote on the Estimates.

The Premier: You would like to.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: But members could protect an item on the Estimates which had the concurrence of the Printing Committee. Hon. members should stand by their officers and not take the slightest head of the Premier's plea that the increase ought not to be given because of the state of the finances. The Premier had said that these officers were paid £250 to report Royal Commissions. That was a perfectly reasonable and right thing. The *Hansard* staff were worked night and day during the session. The Premier knew that. All hours of the night and early morning they were in their places working. They needed special skill, special training and special aptitude to do the work. We expected it of them and we got it from them.

When we appointed a Royal Commission hon. member not only received their £300 salary, but a fee day by day and travelling expenses. Surely if we were entitled to take a fee when sitting on these Royal Commissions, these officers who did the reporting were also entitled to be paid for their work. When hon. members were called upon to do special work they were paid for it, and why should not the same apply to these officers? In regard to the Federal Fruit Commission and the Dominions Commission this work was paid for, not by the State Government or Parliament, but one by the Federal authorities and the other by the Imperial authorities.

The Premier: Where do the Federal authorities get their money from?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: These Commissions were reported and the Premier collected and bagged the fees that ought to have been paid to the reporters.

The Premier: I did.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier stuck to them for the Treasury.

The Premier: I did.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Presumably the Premier had since paid the money out. The *Hansard* reporters had a perfect right to be paid for that special work.

The Minister for Works: Why?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Hon. members who sat on a Federal Commission and drew £600 a year were paid extra for their services.

The Minister for Works: What has that to do with it?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If members of Parliament made one law for themselves and one for those who served in another capacity it was time the people knew of it. It was time they knew that in the opinion of some hon. members Federal members should receive a salary of £600 and extra fees for sitting on Royal Commissions and that *Hansard* reporters who got £350 were not entitled to receive more for reporting those commissions.

The Minister for Works: Because Sir John Forrest gets a pension of £500 it does not follow that we should give you 20s.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Treasury benches were never occupied by such short-sighted inexperienced men. Sir John Forrest did not draw his pension at the moment.

The Premier: Because he cannot; he would if he could.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: And Sir John Forrest had earned it.

The Premier: He never refused to draw it when he could.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The item under discussion is Item 12.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier's expenditure was 50 per cent. more than it was two years ago, and was sufficient to cover every increment which should be given to the civil service, including this increase to the Chief *Hansard* Reporter. Every hon. member who had spoken had admitted the worth of the work, and the responsibility of dealing with the vote rested on hon. members. Why should we be bluffed by the Ministers? The *Hansard* staff were our officers, and we must stand by them and see that they were paid a fair thing.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The statement made by the member for West Perth in regard to the cost of turning out *Hansard* was entirely incorrect. He stated that it was done in this State for 8s. a page. On the Estimates the cost was £5,130, and last year the *Hansard* contained something like 4,000 pages, which showed that the *Hansard* cost something over £1 a page, instead of 8s. as stated by the member for West Perth.

Mr. ALLEN: The hon. member for Leonora challenged him to give the reason why the Printing Committee had recommended this increase of £50. There was no secret about it. The Chief *Hansard* Reporter was about to leave the service of this Parliament. He had received overtures for another position, and he approached certain members of the Printing Committee, and was practically given to understand that something would be done to give him an increase if he did not leave. The Printing Committee felt that he was an officer who was giving Parliament good service; his ability was undoubted, and it would be a disadvantage

to Parliament if we lost his services. In view of that, the Printing Committee had made this recommendation. In regard to the cost of *Hansard* he had quoted the cost per page for printing *Hansard*. He was quite prepared to stand by the figures, especially in contrast to the lighting calculation made by the hon. member for Pilbara.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The statement made by the member for Pilbara was incorrect. The hon. member had merely combined all the totals including the cost of reporters, typists, typists occasionally employed, sessional messenger, printing and distribution of *Hansard*, and stationery, postages and typewriters, and had taken that as the cost of printing *Hansard*. That was not fair.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Are these items included in the Eastern States?

Hon. M. F. TROY: Certainly not. The statement made by the hon. member for West Perth referred only to printing, and not to binding or posting. He protested against such unfair tactics on the part of the hon. member for Pilbara.

Amendment put and negatived.

Vote (as previously reduced to £10,403) put and passed.

Vote—*Premier's Office*, £1,192—agreed to.

Treasury Department (Hon. J. Scaddan, Treasurer).

Vote—*Treasury*, £11,335:

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Would the Premier explain what arrangement had been made with the Under Treasurer. Was it his intention to leave or retire, and when?

The PREMIER: In the Treasury there had been one head in the person of Mr. Eliot. That gentleman had reached the retiring age, and had asked on several occasions to be retired, but it being impossible to get a satisfactory basis for his retirement the matter had been held up. A position had arisen which was not in the best interests of the State in that there was no person ready to take up the control of the Treasury if Mr. Eliot suddenly retired. After careful consideration he had decided that, subject to being

able to arrange a basis on which that officer would retire, he would secure somebody as an understudy for a period to pick up the various points. The operations of the Treasury were different from those of any other department, and no matter how well a person might be trained he would be absolutely lost when put into the Treasury. Applications were called for the position of Assistant Under Treasurer on the distinct understanding that if the service proved satisfactory after 12 months, Mr. Eliot should retire and the chosen applicant would become Under Treasurer in charge of the department. In the meantime Mr. Eliot had agreed to give his successor all possible information, and his services had been retained for the twelve months instead of retiring him. Provision had been made for twelve months' salary in lieu of leave. He was sure that the leader of the Opposition would at once admit that Mr. Eliot had rendered magnificent service to this State, and that, as Under Treasurer, he had been somewhat underpaid. Mr. Black was making progress, and at the end of the term no doubt he would be able to take up the position of Under Treasurer and everything would work on smooth lines, as should be the case in such a department as the Treasury.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was his wish to express appreciation of the services which had been rendered by the Under Treasurer during the better portion of his lifetime. For fifty years Mr. Eliot had been in the service of the State, and having risen from a junior position in the service to the highest he could reach, we must recognise the splendid service he had rendered, and he (Mr. Wilson) did not take exception to the generous treatment meted out to him. From the Premier's explanation, one presumed he was to retire next July.

The Premier: Perhaps earlier if he desires; it is definitely decided that he shall retire on the 30th June next, or earlier.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Would he be paid a bonus as well as his pension at the same time?

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That was not in accordance with the ordinary custom, but an exception might be made in the case of Mr. Eliot, after his long service.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Audit, £9,523:*

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There was an estimated increase of £1,079 in the Audit expenditure. One naturally looked for the cause of this increased expenditure, and recognising the position of the finances at the present time, it seemed that we ought to endeavour to keep down our expenditure as much as possible. He admitted that in the Audit Department there must be a considerable increase in the work, owing to the Government's State enterprises, and those enterprises had been promised by the Premier on many occasions to do so much for the State, but had failed up to the present to meet his expectations. We had been asking for balance sheets in connection with these enterprises, more especially with regard to the State steamers, one of the most disastrous in view of the expenditure—

The PREMIER: On a point of order, he wished to inquire whether this discussion could be permitted. The hon. member had introduced the question of expending money on the State Steamship Service, and hon. members would want to reply. The hon. member should confine his remarks to the Audit Department, or we would never get through this discussion.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: His intention was to lead up to the balance sheets which had been promised by the Premier from time to time, but which had not been received from the Audit Department. He claimed, notwithstanding the Premier's interference, that he was leading up to the point he was now making, that was that we could not get these balance sheets, more especially those of the State Steamship Service, which was such a bright example of our State enterprises at the present moment.

The Premier: Get work.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier was not at a football match now.

The Premier: I am not at the Shamrock Hotel, either.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier must not bluff him if he wanted to get his business through. The Premier had said we could not get these balance sheets because the Audit Department had not done their work. If the Audit Department had not done their work, what was the reason for it? Hon. members were entitled to some explanation, and ought to know why they were asked to vote an increase of over £1,000 in this Department. He (Mr. Wilson) very much doubted whether these balance sheets were in the hands of the Auditor General at the present time, and if they were not the Committee was entitled to know why they were not in his hands, and why those in the department were not busy doing the work for which they were paid. If the department could not cope with the work let us make other arrangements. It was time the Premier gave some explanation as to how this work stood.

The PREMIER: It was not his intention to follow the hon. member in discussing the question of the State Steamship Service, as it had nothing to do with expenditure under the Audit Department. The duty certainly devolved upon the Audit Department of auditing public accounts. It had to audit the accounts of Parliament House, but we were not at this stage going to enter upon a discussion concerning expenditure at Parliament House. If the hon. member was within his rights in discussing the State Steamship Service, we could have a discussion upon all the other State enterprises.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The Chairman will call me to order if I am out of order. What about the work of the department?

The PREMIER: It was not his intention to deal with the question of the State Steamship Service at this stage. The hon. member would soon develop a tattooed steamer on his forehead. It was quite a nightmare to the hon. member.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Yes, it is.

The PREMIER: The hon. member should shake himself out of his sleep.

The increased expenditure in the Audit Department was due to the increased work that had to be performed, and due also to increased salaries provided in the Audit Department under the reclassification for positions that had been filled which were not filled last year. He would read each item to account for the increase. A minute by the Auditor General stated—

The following particulars show how the net increase of £1,079 0s. 2d. is made up—Officers on leave on half pay and without pay for portion of 1912-13 now provided for at full rates, £115 13s. 9d.; provision for five officers for full year, portions only of last year being paid for, £111 8s. 1d.; positions provided for in reclassification scheme not filled last year, £534; automatic increases provided for in Public Service regulations to other than Class G officers, £99 19s. 7d.; regulation increases to Class G officers, including juniors now on temporary staff who will be permanently appointed if they pass Class G examination, £151 17s. 1d.; regulation increase to messenger, £3 5s. 10d.; new item, clerk on trial, £10; increases to three inspectors provided for in reclassification scheme, £93; estimated increased expenditure in district allowances and extra remuneration items, £11 10s.; estimated increase in incidental item due principally to overtime to pull up arrears of work caused by positions not being filled, £171 7s. 8d.; new item, workers' compensation, £6. Total, £1,308 2s., less decreases, £229 1s. 10d. Net increase £1,079 0s. 2d. That was a complete explanation of the reason for the increase.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That was not an explanation why we could not get the work carried out. Why was the Premier not supervising the work of this department, and seeing it was done? The Premier had distinctly stated in this House on more than one occasion that we could not get these accounts because the Audit office had not yet audited them. When were they to be audited? Were they in hand, and when might we hope to get them?

The PREMIER: The work was being performed by the Audit Department. It was in hand and when completed it would be submitted to Parliament.

Hon. Frank Wilson: How long?

The PREMIER: It was not possible for him to say how long.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Compassionate Allowances, et cetera*, £1,281—agreed to.

Vote—*Government Motor Cars*, £3,193

Hon. FRANK WILSON: An explanation might be given in regard to this item. The Committee were asked to vote £3,193 for this year's expenditure, and the amount, which was very large, did not even include a sum for the purchase of a new car. Last year we spent about £4,000, but in that there was a sum of £1,600 for a new car. In several departments provision had been made on the Estimates for new motor cars, and in addition, we had this large expenditure. It was rather alarming to notice the rate at which the amount was increasing.

The PREMIER: Last year the sum of £3,982 was expended, and out of that two new cars were paid for. It had been the intention originally to purchase only one, but at that time there was no idea of disposing of one of the cars in the garage to another department. When the transfer was made it was expected that the money would be set off against the vote, but it was discovered afterwards that this could not be done. The money which was earned by Government motor cars went into revenue. The amount provided for this year covered the whole expenditure in connection with the cars. The new car which was purchased in England last year was the cheapest which had been obtained, not because of any particular ingenuity on his own part, but because of the fact that it was brought out to the State by a shipping company with which the Government did a good deal of business, free of charge. It cost the Government £700, whereas if it had been purchased in the State in the ordinary way, the price would have been £900. Then another car had to be secured to replace the one which had been dis-

posed of to the Water Supply Department, and that cost £800. There was a great demand from the departments for the use of these cars. Only this week, Mr. Paterson, the Managing Trustee of the Agricultural Bank, and Mr. Sutton, the Commissioner for the Wheat Belt, were using the cars in the country.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Have they not their own?

The PREMIER: No. These officers often used the cars for eight or ten days.

Hon. Frank Wilson: There are items for new cars under other departments.

The PREMIER: Only the Mines and Inspection of Machinery Departments. Other highly paid officials occasionally made use of the Government cars for the purpose of delivering lectures at places which they could not reach by train, and when it was desired to return to office next day. The departments paid for the use of these cars, but the amounts received were not set off against the vote.

Hon. Frank Wilson: There is a footnote which states that the estimated revenue is about £900.

The PREMIER: Yes, but that was not a set off against the vote. These cars were not, as some people thought, merely for Ministerial purposes.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I hope you do not send the new car out on departmental work.

The PREMIER: The department endeavoured to keep the old Talbot for country work as much as possible. The use of the cars made it possible for Ministers and departmental officers to keep many engagements and carry them out without loss of time. The Minister for Works went to the Lake Grace district the other day, a trip that would have taken two or three weeks to accomplish in the ordinary way, but he carried it out in five days. In the North-West an inspection was made which but for the use of the car could never have been carried out. The net cost was small, but the results were of great value. An item which hon. members would notice, was fitting machinery in the garage. There had been difficulty in connection with the repairs and now that there were a number of

cars it was essential that they should be kept in good repair, and that the repairs should be done in the garage. The services of a first-class mechanic had been obtained and the necessary machinery had been installed. Although the vote looked large, it was one which was of considerable benefit, and all the departments had admitted that to be the case.

Mr. ALLEN: The sum of £60 per week for motor cars seemed to be excessive. No doubt the cars were useful, but in the state of the finances something should have been done to cut down the vote. Instead of keeping a number of cars, as we were doing at present, some hiring might be done and probably a good deal would thus be saved.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Savings Bank*, £22,335:

The PREMIER: The attention of hon. members might be drawn to the increase in this vote, £3,364. Hon. members would appreciate that this was a demand which was made upon him and which he could not resist. At present the Savings Bank had opposition from another quarter, and it had been necessary to make provision for branches. The Government had to provide new agencies in lieu of the post offices, and it would be necessary to increase the facilities in some centres for the purpose of keeping the business in the hands of the State.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Do you not think the manager should have made a better selection of agents?

The PREMIER: It was easy enough to ask a question like that but it was doubtful whether it would have been possible.

Mr. Lewis: The rate of commission is very low.

The PREMIER: It was not proposed to make it any higher.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The manager has appointed the accountants of big employers.

The PREMIER: It had been found necessary to do that on several occasions, because the question which often arose was whom were we going to get to do this work. It would be admitted that post offices were the preferable place, but the State had been turned out of the post

offices. The Manager of the Savings Bank had been given practically a free hand in this matter.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Quite right too.

The PREMIER: And he was told to deal with the matter from the point of view that there was no thought of entering into an agreement with the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What are the prospects of settlement now?

The PREMIER: Sir John Forrest was to move and the Government were waiting for him to do so. He merely desired to point out that the increased expenditure was due to the fact that we had to make special provision for our Savings Bank business.

Item, Commission payable to agents, etcetera, for services rendered at agencies, £5,000:

Mr. FOLEY: In many instances the Premier had made excellent arrangements for carrying out the work of the Savings Bank; but if the Commissioner of Railways could be counted as an agent that gentleman, or his department, was being paid for services rendered by officers of the department without any recognition whatever.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): When they are doing that they are doing nothing else.

Mr. FOLEY: Still, it had been stated that these station-masters who had post office work to carry out had been reclassified on a higher scale. At one station the turnover of the Savings Bank business was £4,000 per month. The officer in that instance was practically on his own, and although his railway work did not take up the whole of the time, yet he had to see a train out early in the morning and attend to railway work again at other periods of the day. The Savings Bank work claimed a great deal of his time, because he had to attend to the office at all hours.

The Premier: He has definite hours.

Mr. FOLEY: The men who were on night-shift could not deposit their money before eight o'clock in the morning.

Hon. Frank Wilson: But the same situation obtains in the post office.

Mr. FOLEY: No, in the post office they worked shifts.

The Premier: You know they have their definite hours, the same as in the railway offices.

Mr. FOLEY: At all events, it was a hardship to place on the station-masters in remote districts. The men who did the work should receive special remuneration. If it was reasonable to do this in one branch of the Public Service it was reasonable here also.

The PREMIER: Not all station-masters or officers in charge were called upon to perform this work. It was only in places where the Commissioner of Railways was satisfied that the officer had plenty of time. In every case it could be proved that, if it were not for this work, the officer might as well close his doors and go away. It mattered nothing at all what the turnover might be. In most of our goldfields towns more customers would be found at the post office than at the railway station; yet the postmaster had to do the Commonwealth Savings Bank business just as, in the old days, the same officer had had to attend to the business of the State Savings Bank. No outcry had been made against that system, but immediately we attempted to work railway officers the hon. member demanded, not that they should be relieved of the work, but that they should have extra pay. In any case a fairer way of bringing forward a complaint of that kind would have been to go to the department and not come to the House and make a public complaint. This was the first he (the Premier) had heard of it. Why had not the member come to him as Minister controlling the department? So long as we were not unduly pressing upon a man's time, and were paying him a decent salary, it was not much to ask him to take a few shillings on behalf of the Savings Bank.

Mr. Foley: Do you think it is right to go to the Minister with every petty trouble that comes along, instead of running to the Commissioner of Railways?

The PREMIER: It did not affect the Commissioner of Railways; it was a matter for the Savings Bank. The hon.

member should have come to him and complained, when he (the Premier) would have found out from the manager of the bank how much was in the statement. He would tell the hon. member plainly that when a man was employed by the State he should give his best services to the State and not think that because he had worked half an hour he could then sit down for the rest of the day.

Item, Incidental, including postage and stationery, etcetera, £4,000:

Hon. FRANK WILSON: This item showed a decrease of £1,244. What was the reason for the decrease, seeing that the business of the bank was increasing every year and likely to go on increasing?

The PREMIER: The reason was that last year the item had been swollen by expenditure connected with the transfer of agencies from the post office, by the purchase of safes intended for the new agencies, and by extra advertising involved in the transfer.

Vote put and passed.

Votes—*Government Stores, £14,654; Indenting Office, £4,912; Literary and Scientific Grants, £13,400; Lithographic, £6,461; London Agency, £4,912*—agreed to.

Vote—*Printing, £40,299*:

Hon. FRANK WILSON: This vote went on increasing year by year. A very large increase had occurred during the last two years. Would the Premier tell the Committee if there had been more outside work than was done previously to account for it?

The PREMIER: The increase was not due to any increase of outside work, but to a increase of work for Government departments and largely of work done for Parliament. Last year was a record in so far as *Hansard* and the *Government Gazette* were concerned. Naturally the printing of both these concerns was increased. This work was performed largely for other departments, and also for the Commonwealth, and the expenditure was recouped. The only increase of any extent represented automatic increases under the Public Service Act and in connection with reclassification. Up to a cer-

tain point increases in the Public Service were beyond his control. The late Premier had approved of a reclassification and promised that it would be retrospective to a certain date, and the present Government had had to comply with that promise. The increase here provided was for automatic increases up to £204. It was due largely to the fact that work had increased. The Commonwealth work had increased tremendously in view of the elections. There had been very little outside work; only that which could not be done by the printers in town. It was only when approached that the department did any outside work.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Public Service Commissioner, £2,371*:

The PREMIER: A promise had been made that when dealing with the Estimates generally further information would be given in connection with the public service. Hon. members would appreciate the fact that during recent months, as well as in previous months, there had been numerous complaints through the public Press, and particularly in the *Civil Service Journal*, about the treatment meted out to the public service, and certain accusations had been made from time to time, which, he contended, were not warranted, in view of the treatment extended to the service by the present Government. He was not going into the pros and cons of all those matters, except to tell hon. members that in his opinion the public servants in this State were well treated. The public servants were working under an Act of Parliament, and regulations made thereunder, and outside of the Act there was no mandate from Parliament as to what treatment should be meted out to the service. If their privileges and conditions were confined to those laid down in the Act itself, their position would be comparable, he admitted, with the conditions of persons in private employment of a similar nature. But there were regulations, and he had no hesitation in saying that not to his knowledge were there any employees in the State doing similar work

whose conditions would compare with the conditions of those in the Government service. He would quote to the Committee some of the privileges enjoyed by the public servants, and not enjoyed by employees of private firms. For instance, the office hours on Saturday were from nine o'clock till noon. It was true that the banks closed at twelve o'clock on Saturdays, but only to the public and not so far as the officers within were concerned. Public servants received tea money and overtime, public holidays in excess of those enjoyed by employees of any outside institution, and sick leave on the most liberal scale, and he could give instances showing how the expenditure was administered and would challenge any outside institution to show similar treatment to any of its officers. In addition to long service leave on full pay, there was the privilege of Regulation 78, which allowed a most liberal payment to an officer performing the duties of his superior for a longer term than three months. Ladies leaving the service for marriage were paid an equivalent allowance to the proportion of long service leave for which they were qualified. There was special annual or biennial recreation leave to recompense for Saturdays and Sundays where duty entailed attendance on those days; special concessions to officers in remote districts of once in every two years obtaining a free pass to the coast for themselves, wives and families, and they received full pay whilst on their holiday; additional time for leave taken in travelling from an officer's domicile to the metropolitan area, and special allowance to officers who had to maintain two homes. He wanted to tell the Committee also what the present Administration had done for the betterment of the service.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You had better tell the public servants; they want to know.

The PREMIER: The public servants knew, but he was going to tell them again through Parliament. The present Government had provided retrospective increases to the value of £13,000.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who granted them?

The PREMIER: The hon. member had promised that the retrospective increases would be provided, but he was not in office to provide the money. It was easy enough on the eve of an election to make promises, but it was a different matter to keep faith with the promises. The Government had provided automatic increases to officers up to £204 per annum, and £5,000 had been paid last year on that account. Payment of salaries to juniors on the age basis in lieu of the previous basis, had been introduced. The bar to clerical officers being unable to be paid over £450 per annum had been removed, and an independent board of appeal on the value of their offices had been given to the service. An Act of Parliament had been passed to remove all age restrictions and enable the Commissioners to recommend the appointment of temporary hands free from those restrictions. Where those men had been previously temporarily employed, they were now made permanent officers. The Government had liberalised the payment for overtime, and had re-enacted Regulation 141, by which an officer should not be subject to reduction owing to reclassification. They had re-affirmed the promise of the previous Government to grant pensions to officers who established their claims for such under the Superannuation Act, and had provided a tribunal for the purpose of deciding each application, so that every application would be dealt with on exactly the same basis. That tribunal comprised the Under Secretary for Law, the Public Service Commissioner, and the Solicitor General, and the decisions of that body were never seen by Ministers until they were presented to Cabinet. The Government had granted additional political rights to civil servants, which their predecessors had refused. They had abolished the liability of officers to pay their own fidelity guarantee premiums. They had granted free passes to the coast to officers on the goldfields and their wives and families once in every two years. They had given recognition to the principle of payment of at least the minimum salary of any position to any officer appointed thereto.

They had increased the allowance paid to lighthouse keepers in distant places, and had given recognition to the Civil Service Association as the medium of communication between the service and the Government. Those privileges were sufficient to show that the service had not been neglected, whilst the Government were paying attention to other people in the State. It was not generally appreciated what the granting of those privileges meant to the country.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What are you paying your temporary officers?

The PREMIER: The rate awarded by the Arbitration Court. The hon. member and other Ministers of the late Government had filled their departments with temporary officers, and had thought that they were doing a great stroke for election purposes by paying those men 11s. a day.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You reduced them to 10s. per day.

The PREMIER: The present Government had not done anything of the sort. The member for Northam had filled his department with temporary officers, and had refused to allow those officers to go to the Arbitration Court to have their working conditions fixed. The present Government had told them to go to the court, and although the award was not binding on the Government in any way, they had kept faith with the award.

Hon. J. Mitchell: No, you sacked them.

The PREMIER: The Government had sacked a few men whom the hon. member had employed for writing him up in the Press, and they could well afford to get rid of those persons. Other temporary men had been placed on the permanent staff, and were to-day getting all the privileges of the permanent officers. The hon. member, if he had his way, would set aside the Public Service Act altogether, and have complete Ministerial control and introduce on the permanent staff, as he had done on the temporary staff, all his favourites.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. Munsie: You ought to be ashamed of yourself for doing it.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Spoils to the victor is the Premier's policy.

The PREMIER: The hon. member had employed a man in his department to do nothing but write him up in the Press.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is an absolute lie.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must withdraw that remark.

Hon. J. Mitchell: I withdraw.

The PREMIER: The mere reading of the privileges enjoyed by the public service did not give a clear impression of what they meant to the State. The Government had granted those privileges because they considered that the public servants were entitled to them. He was not complaining of the concessions, but the general taxpayer was not aware of what the concessions were costing him, and yet he was asked to give to the public servants further consideration which they were not entitled to. Long service leave in 1912-13 had cost the State under the Public Service Act alone £14,471, sick leave, £4,445, annual leave, £14,774, public holidays, £14,063, additional remuneration to acting officers and to temporary assistance employed, £4,053, making a total under the Public Service Act alone of £51,776. For those exempt from the Public Service Act it had cost the taxpayer for long service leave £8,961, sick leave £7,057, annual leave £42,848, public holidays £9,256, additional remuneration to acting officers and temporary assistance employed, £2,045, or a total cost of £70,867 for the privileges enjoyed by those exempt from the Public Service Act. The cost of the wages staff who did not come under the Public Service Act, had been, annual leave £38,169, public holidays, £4,452, sick leave, £90, total £42,711, or a grand total for the public service for the privileges mentioned of £165,354. Those figures were interesting to the general taxpayer, as showing what those privileges were costing the State, and they were privileges which not one per cent. of the persons employed by private firms had conceded to them. And yet the salaries

paid to those in the public service compared well with those paid by outside firms.

Mr. Allen: Are you in favour of abolishing those privileges?

The PREMIER: No. But there was a strong objection to increasing the privileges at the present stage. He had not gone into many questions upon which he might have touched, but he wanted members and the general public to know what it meant to grant these concessions. Many people imagined that to give a man long service leave cost nothing. In some cases it was necessary to provide temporary assistance, and in other cases additional remuneration had to be paid to other officers to perform the work, which was really in the nature of a bonus for valuable services rendered over an extended period, and one could not complain from that point of view. He was not complaining. The same applied with regard to sick leave. One man had been employed for eighteen months and for fourteen months he was on sick leave. He would like to know what private employer would keep a man that long. There was practically no difficulty for public servants to get leave for all and sundry purposes, and have their places kept for them. He knew from applications continually being made for positions in the public service that those outside were anxious to get into the service. Under existing conditions the public servant had a better assurance of continuity of employment than any other person. Persons outside the service, even managers of mines, had not continuity of employment. It was impossible to get rid of an employee unless a definite charge was laid against him and proved. If he was retired, it was necessary to pay retiring allowance, and if one holding an established position reached a certain age a pension had to be paid. This did not apply outside the service, and we had a right to claim the best possible service that could be rendered. Civil servants should apply themselves not merely from the point of view of better-

ing their own positions, but of rendering better service to the State.

Mr. Allen: Do you claim credit for all those concessions?

The PREMIER: Credit was claimed by him for those concessions.

Mr. Allen: They were in existence before you came into office.

The PREMIER: In his remarks he had indicated that the Government had not neglected their duty to the public servants, but had treated them well. They might have something to complain of with regard to superannuation, but that was out of the control of the Government. There was an Act of Parliament and the Government could not act illegally. The Government were making inquiries with a view to putting the superannuation law on a definite basis, which would be understood by every public servant.

Hon. J. Mitchell: It will be the only thing you have put on a proper basis.

The PREMIER: The hon. member naturally would think so. He was put on a proper basis in 1911, and was nearly squeezed out by a few votes, but the hon. member could not appreciate anything of value.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier inspired him with admiration. He had treated the civil servants so well, and there had never been such a Premier. They ought to be thankful for all the good things which he had provided for them. They should just imagine the advantages conceded worth £165,000. They would no doubt take £9,000 and feel well compensated for all the good that the Premier had done. The Premier had been two years on the Treasury benches two years of disaster to the State, and he wanted to tell members that he granted long service leave. The Premier had said he would stand by the Arbitration Court award. The court awarded 12s. 6d. a day for temporary employees who were getting 11s.

The Premier: That was twice as much as you paid.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: And the Premier sacked dozens, and perhaps hundreds, of them.

Mr. Munsie: There is room for a few more to go yet.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The hon. member entirely approved of the trickery of the Government. The employees went to the court, the court which the Attorney General said was the best possible in the world, and when they got an award they went back to their offices feeling satisfied that they would get an honest deal. Instead of that they got the sack. Some were put on permanently at very much less than the court award, and some were reduced to 10s.

The Premier: They were not.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: In the Attorney General's Department, he believed a man was reduced to below 10s.

Mr. Foley: Why do you not bring it up?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier could find it out. The award of the court was not respected.

The Premier: It was; they are getting it to-day.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier dismissed them or re-appointed them to the permanent staff at a lower wage.

The Premier: You are absolutely incorrect.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Then on the following day he would ask the Premier a question in this regard. The award was not respected.

The Premier: How many more times will you parrot that out?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier had taken half an hour to stone-wall his own Estimates, and had attacked the previous Administration. Was there a single thing he had mentioned which had not been done before his Government took office? The Premier said that he (Mr. Mitchell) employed men to write him up in the Press. The Premier knew that was inaccurate. When the present Government took office the Premier set to work to ascertain the friends of the previous Administration. The Commissioner for Tropical Agriculture was pensioned off; the Commissioner of Police had to go, at a pension of £500 a year—a man who was perfectly able to perform his duties; in fact, there was no man more capable

and there was no man more capable than the Commissioner for Tropical Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member could not discuss that under these items.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Commissioner for Tropical Agriculture came under the Public Service Act, and so did the Commissioner of Police. The Premier had accused him of having re-appointed men for doing something which benefited him. In his desire to rid the service of men who were politically opposed to him, the Premier had got rid of a great many servants and had appointed many men who were partisans. The Premier had no right to claim for himself the credit for all that had been done for the civil service, although one realised that the Premier had agreed to deliver certain goods and had made certain promises which had never been fulfilled. The Premier, however, came down here and in order to cover himself, said he had given certain conditions, but he was not right to give certain things if the men were not entitled to them. Certain considerations the men were entitled to, because they had earned them.

The Premier: Then why did you not give it to them?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: We were giving them more than they were getting now. The Premier wished to bluff the public that he had safeguarded the public interests as well as those of the civil servants, but neither the public nor the civil service were so easily gulled.

Mr. Munsie: The public service have long since realised that your party was no good to them, anyhow.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: They had realised how they stood with the present Government and the supporters of the present Government.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In listening to the Premier's list of benefits conferred on the civil service, he (Mr. Wilson) wondered where the taxpayer came in. These benefits, the Premier had stated, represented £169,000.

Mr. Munsie: He did not say anything of the kind.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Then it was £165,000. The Premier gave a total of £165,000 and said, "We conferred all these benefits on the civil service."

The PREMIER: On a point of order, what he had done was to read out privileges which were being enjoyed by the civil servants and he had read certain privileges which had been conceded by the present Administration, and he had said those privileges which they had previously enjoyed and those which the present Government had conceded had cost a certain amount of money.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You stated you conferred them all.

The PREMIER: He had been saying that he wanted the taxpayer to understand what these privileges cost.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier had certainly impressed him with the idea that he (the Premier) claimed to have conferred upon the civil servants privileges and advantages which amounted to £165,000.

Mr. Munsie: He did not say it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We should know then what the Premier had given the civil servants. If these privileges, amounting to £165,000 had been granted, for which the State was not receiving any return whatever, according to the Premier, it was about time the matter was looked into to see whether they were entitled to have the privileges. It was a nice thing for the Premier to get up and claim he had given a large sum of the taxpayers' money away for which they got no return, but it was idle for the Premier to say he had no complaint against the civil service. The Premier had complained often.

The PREMIER: Against their non-recognition of the privileges conceded.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Hon. members had a recollection of the Premier taking the civil servants on the roll of Perth to task because they or some of them had not voted for Mr. McCallum during the last Federal campaign.

The PREMIER: That is absolutely incorrect. I have already denied that here, and you ought to accept the denial.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier was always denying; he denied practically everything that was reported of him. He (Mr. Wilson) had never heard so many denials in his existence. The Premier when he opened his mouth talked very fast and then denied what he had said. The Premier had a grievance against civil servants a few months ago because they did not support his candidature, and said that they should remember the privileges which had been granted to them.

The PREMIER: That is absolutely incorrect.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: To use the Premier's own words, he said they could get leave of absence for all and sundry purposes. If that was so, there was maladministration. The public ought to ask the Premier to account for his administration and warn him off the grass if he was not doing his duty. What motive was actuating the Premier now, but to curry favour with the civil servants, to try and appease their appetite for more, and to try to get their political support for next year, which support he knew was falling away from him.

Mr. Munsie: It is not going over to your party anyway; long hours and less pay.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The leader of the Opposition is addressing the Chair at present.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier was not content with rolling out this long rigmarole for the purpose, one could only imagine, of creating a favourable impression with the civil servants, but asked where did we find the private employer who gave his employees sick leave and paid their salaries, and gave them annual leave and at the same time paid their salaries. He (Mr. Wilson) did not know any private employers who deducted an employee's salary when he was on annual leave or was sick.

The PREMIER: Do you not? I have hundreds in my electorate.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In every good firm they got annual leave. The Premier could not claim credit for having done something which, according to his

own statement, required inquiring into. But he must attack private individuals and say by inference that we were doing much better than the private employers and that the employees were rushing to the State for billets. If that was so the Premier was not doing his duty to the State. He had to remember that he was handling State funds and that he should not throw away £165,000 for privileges which he implied were not earned by State employees. The Premier should be warned that he was over-doing it and the people would begin to inquire why all this expenditure should take place. The poor settler wanted to know why he had to contribute to this lavish expenditure. What was going to be the end of it all? Were we going on paying for something which perhaps was not justly earned by those who were employees of the State? If that was the right view of the case one could only conclude that the Premier was taking this action in order to get political support. He was preparing for the inevitable disaster which was coming to his party next year on account of the maladministration of the finances, and to-night he had given proof positive of his incapacity to handle the finances of the State.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The complaint of the Premier was that the public servants failed to realise the advantage they had over private employees. When it was known that £165,000 per annum was paid for special privileges over and above what outside employees got, it was necessary that the public service should be aware how much better off they were than other members of the community. He (Mr. Angwin) agreed with the leader of the Opposition that those privileges could only go to a certain extent.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Moderation in all things.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): And while we had the public service, as it was to-day, clamouring for additional privileges, it was time that the public outside took a hand in the question, and it was time they realised that when Acts of Parliament bound men to

positions, it was necessary that some move should be made to relieve the general public of an incubus that might some day become a big burden. So far as the elections were concerned, the leader of the Opposition was entirely wrong. It was our duty to look after the interests of the State and not votes.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are not doing it this way; you are giving them everything they are asking for. Why, the Minister for Works at the sanatorium the other day gave the men everything they wanted.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): It had been pointed out distinctly that the clamouring on the part of the public servants was uncalled for and unjust, and it had also been pointed out what the service had in the way of privileges, and with which they ought to be satisfied. The *Civil Service Journal* carried no weight. The views expressed in that paper were only the views of one man, a former public servant. That journal was not worthy of being quoted so far as the service was concerned. It was the duty of the Government to see that State interests were protected and that unjust claims were not made.

The PREMIER: Most of the statements made by the leader of the Opposition were absolutely inaccurate and they were made with a knowledge of their inaccuracy. The hon. member knew that the statement he had made about civil servants and Mr. McCallum had already been dealt with and yet he repeated that he (the Premier) had protested at a certain social that Mr. McCallum's defeat was caused by the civil servants not voting for him. That statement had already been denied in the Chamber and yet the leader of the Opposition repeated it, knowing that what he was saying was absolutely incorrect, or that he was not accepting the denial which had been given. What he had said was that the civil servants openly canvassed against Mr. McCallum on the ground that the present State Government had made promises at the elections of 1911 and had not kept them. That statement was quite incorrect and he had since challenged the service to

bring forward any proof that he had made promises which had not been kept to the letter. But the service crawled out, just as the hon. member for Northam crawled out when he was challenged. It was unfair for public servants to do that. They had also wrongly used other information which had been distributed in the departments in connection with the preparation of the Estimates, deliberately placing a wrong construction upon it. Some of these Liberals in the service and out if it were absolutely unscrupulous.

Mr. Allen: That is a nice reflection.

The PREMIER: The hon. member could put any interpretation he liked upon it.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Then you cannot blame them for thinking you unscrupulous if you say a thing like that.

The PREMIER: The difference was that he challenged them to bring the proof. The hon. member brought up statements but he never came forward with proof.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I have proved it over and over again.

The PREMIER: The hon. member had never been able to prove any of these accusations which he hurled across the Chamber.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What about your statement in regard to Mr. Turvey's retiring allowance?

The PREMIER: On the occasion referred to he had gone on to explain the additional privileges conceded by the present Administration, and on concluding his statement he had read out the cost of certain privileges enjoyed by the public servants. The hon. member could twist that just as he liked. His object was not for the purpose of carrying favour with the public servants, for he expected he would get a column or two in the next issue of the *Civil Service Journal*. His desire had been to warn the public servants that all that was possible under the circumstances had been conceded. Personally he was not concerned in the slightest. He had no fear of making known his opinion on this or any other question. He desired the Public Service to clearly understand that so far as this Adminis-

tration was concerned they were prepared to deal fairly as between the Public Service and the taxpayer. He considered that public servants were well treated, and could not fairly claim any additional privileges except the adjustment of the superannuation question, and the fixing of a basis for the pensions. Oather than that he was not prepared to concede any further privileges than were enjoyed by the service.

Item, Assistant Public Service Commissioner (twelve months at £52 per month), £624:

Mr. LEWIS: Was this officer to be continued permanently? It had been stated last year that the officer was continued merely to relieve the Public Service Commissioner while on leave, and to carry out certain duties. Would the Premier tell the Committee whether this officer was to be permanently employed, or for how long he was to be continued?

The PREMIER: It was not proposed to permanently employ the gentleman occupying the position, although such a course might be decided upon ultimately. It was not the present intention to do so. The question of whether this gentleman should receive the appointment of Public Service Inspector would be a matter for consideration when applications for that position were received. But it was not intended to permanently employ an assistant public service commissioner. On the appointment of the present occupant of the office certain matters had arisen requiring attention, and that gentleman was asked to carry on while Mr. Jull took his long service leave. Then the appeals had come forward, and it was felt that as a member of the reclassification board there was no better person than Mr. Alcock to attend to the matter, and so his services had been retained. Mr. Alcock had been specially adapted to attend to this and several other matters calling for attention, and when these matters were all disposed of the question of the appointment of inspector would be taken into consideration.

Mr. PRICE: Was it the intention of the Government to call for applications for the position of inspector in the usual

way, instead of appointing a man in the way the present Assistant Public Service Commissioner had been appointed? Personally he thought such a position should be open to any officer qualified to occupy it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): It might be better to get a man from outside.

Mr. PRICE: That might be so, but he believed the highest positions should be open to men in the service, should be goals which officers of the service should strive to attain. He had yet to learn that we had not in the service officers of proved competency to occupy positions of this character. There might be men just as good outside, but if they were only just as good the man inside should get the preference.

The Premier: He does.

Mr. PRICE: Unfortunately in this case the man inside had not got the position.

The Premier: No appointment was made.

Mr. PRICE: The appointment had been made and had now been held by Mr. Alcock for nearly three years.

Hon. Frank Wilson: He has taken root.

Mr. PRICE: Mr. Alcock had been connected with the Government—he was surprised that there should be any quibble on the matter—for over two years in a position for which applications should have been called, and which officers in the various departments should have been given an opportunity of applying for if they so desired. Was it the intention of the Government to throw the position of inspector open to applicants from within the service?

The PREMIER: As he had previously said, there was no intention to permanently employ Mr. Alcock as Assistant Public Service Commissioner, nor was there any intention to create such a position as a permanency. It was proposed to eventually appoint a public service inspector. Mr. Alcock had been engaged by the late Administration to act upon the reclassification board.

Hon. Frank Wilson: But not as Assistant Public Service Commissioner.

The PREMIER: It was merely a matter of title. The officer in question had not completed his duties as a member of the reclassification board until the end of the financial year 1912, or even later. Prior to that Mr. Jull had taken his long service leave, and it was thought desirable that Mr. Alcock, who had been working in the Public Service Commissioner's office, should act as Public Service Commissioner, instead of displacing some officer in another department. Then, as the appeals would take place in accordance with an Act of Parliament before the reclassification board completed its work, it was felt that there was no person with the same knowledge as Mr. Alcock possessed as to the reasons why the reclassification board had arrived at their decisions. Therefore it had been decided to retain Mr. Alcock's services for dealing with appeals and the question of temporary employment in the public service which at that time was becoming a scandal. The permanent men were working side by side with the temporary men and the latter were getting from 1s. to 2s. 6d. per day more. That condition of affairs the Government considered should not continue, and Mr. Alcock had been specially told off to deal with that work, and also the appeals, and as soon as the appeals were disposed of the question of filling the position of inspector would be dealt with. It would be advertised in accordance with the Public Service Act, and other things being equal the man in the service would get the preference. It was remarkable that whilst the service claimed that the temporary men should have the first opportunity of getting permanent positions, and whilst the Government declined to make a rule that the temporary officers should get the appointments because it would block the promotion of men already in the service, the public servants were not willing to allow Mr. Alcock to be considered as a temporary employee, and to be appointed inspector when the position was permanently filled. He again assured the Committee that when the position of inspector

was finally filled, applications would be called for and dealt with in the manner laid down in the Public Service Act.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Government should get the best man they could for the position, and they ought not to be too thin-skinned about confining themselves to men within the service. Mr. Alcock was a very capable man. He had been appointed by the late Government in a temporary capacity, and he had shown a considerable amount of ability. Therefore, if Mr. Alcock was the right man, why should the Government not stick to him? They ought not to undermine a man who had served successfully a couple of years in a very peculiar position.

Mr. Lewis: What about the man who has 20 years record in the service?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The man who had been in a position for two years had gained some experience, and if he had been able to fill that position without undue friction it showed he had some ability, and the State should not lightly cast aside a man who had gained that experience at the State's expense. He agreed that these positions should be thrown open to everybody inside and outside the service, because the State wanted the best brains it could get.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Refunds, £1,063*—agreed to.

Vote—*State Hotels and Inspection of Liquors, £38,231*:

Item, Tourist Bureau, £10,000:

Mr. PRICE: It seemed remarkable that this vote was confined solely to two sections of the State, Rottneest, which was entirely a Government tourist resort, and the South-West. On going into the Tourist Department one found literature dealing with the tourist resorts throughout New South Wales and New Zealand, and at Colombo, while only two sections of this State were mentioned in the literature there. The Government of New South Wales dealt with the whole of that State. Every time the Estimates came on he had protested against this preferential treatment of different sections of the State.

Mr. Green: Dog's head rock is mentioned.

Mr. PRICE: Would the hon. member go out and have a little dog's head stout? He protested against public money being spent in the interests of one small section of the State. One hon. member, in referring to the Albany season, stated that the railways gave certain concessions. As a matter of fact the railways gave nothing. The whole of the placards in connection with the Albany season were paid for by the citizens of Albany. The only concession they received from the railway was a large—

The Premier: What about the fares?

Mr. PRICE: They were nothing for the people of Albany. He presumed the Government got a return from them.

The Premier: We are carrying people down at a loss.

Mr. PRICE: Then the Government ought not to do so.

The Premier: We do not propose to do so.

Mr. PRICE: It was just as well to know that the Premier intended so far as he could to prevent the people from going to that health resort.

The Premier: You are getting as bad as the Opposition.

Mr. Harper: As good, you mean.

Mr. PRICE: Although so much had been done by the people privately, and although the Government absolutely refused to assist in any way to advertise that end of the State, yet in connection with tourist development there was an estimated loss of £2,000.

Mr. Underwood: The hon. member is sufficient advertisement for that part of the State.

Mr. PRICE: It was only fair that when people were doing so much for themselves, they should receive a little consideration from the Government. It might be urged that they had ceased from advertising in the journals in which they previously advertised. That was not exactly correct because only recently sums of money were paid for advertisements at a time when the representative of the Government, the manager of the Tourist Department, was writing to

Albany asking the people to supply free to the Government their publication containing several pages of matter in connection with the Lands and other departments. Yet, although these were supplied and over a thousand copies of the publication were handed to the department, they refused to assist in any way in the publication of it.

The Premier: What benefit will we derive from it?

Mr. PRICE: The State must derive benefit from it. The greater the number of people who went there, the greater must be the benefit to the State.

The Premier: Local residents principally obtain the benefit. At Rottneest the place is owned by the Government.

Mr. PRICE: Attention was being directed by him to the advertising of the South-West which was continually going on.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): The caves are the only place worth going to.

Mr. PRICE: There were huge placards and publications, and every effort was made to induce the public to go there.

The Premier: The public alone benefit; it is a State institution.

Mr. PRICE: The hostel at Yallingup was the only place, but the public benefited in many cases more so than the Government.

The Premier: No; we have our own motor cars.

Mr. PRICE: Some consideration should be shown to those sections of the State which assisted themselves. The Government should not, as they had done in the past, take everything and give nothing.

Item, State hotels, £25,300:

Hon. FRANK WILSON: What struck one about the Estimates was that the Government were not getting a proper return from the hotels. It was rather difficult for hon. members to understand the true position. The Treasury figures were published, but certain other offices were included, and the actual operations of the hotels were not disclosed. For the four months to the 31st October the revenue

had been £7,477, and the expenditure £7,166, leaving a profit of approximately £300. The expenditure on the inspection of liquors was included, which would tend to show the hotels in a worse aspect than they really were, but even making allowance for that expenditure the position did not seem to be satisfactory.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): The tourist bureau is included also.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The whole of the tourist expenditure could hardly be under that heading, because the estimate for the tourist bureau was £10,000. It looked as though the hotels were not being carefully administered, and the revenue one ought to expect was not being derived from them. On the Estimates there was provided an expenditure of £25,300, and the revenue was estimated at £32,900, showing a profit of between £6,000 and £7,000. That did not seem to be an exorbitant profit for three State hotels. If he remembered correctly, the State hotel at Gwalia had returned a profit of £7,000 in one year. The estimated profit this year did not cover rent, incoming, interest or depreciation on the property. There was something wrong, and members wanted to know what was happening. If one hotel earned £6,000, and the price of liquor had not been reduced there should be more profit from three hotels.

The PREMIER: The hon. member would appreciate the fact that the Government were making provision for the maintenance during portion of the year of three new hotels which were being erected.

Mr. Allen: Where?

The PREMIER: One at Wongan Hills, one at Bruce Rock, and the other at Kwollyin.

Mr. Allen: Are they going to be submitted to a local option poll?

The PREMIER: No, certainly not. We had licenses for them except in the case of Wongan Hills. A license had been obtained at Wongan Hills, but he had not been prepared to go on with the expenditure entailed for the likely turnover, and after numerous requests from the progress association new plans had been sub-

mitted, and it depended on whether the licensing bench was prepared to grant a license for the new plans as to whether the work was proceeded with. There would be a certain amount of initial expenditure to provide out of revenue for the opening up of the hotels and at the same time practically no revenue would be received. But so far as the hotels were concerned, not including Yallingup, which was now a State hotel, Gwalia and Dwellingup were paying handsomely.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What about the balance sheets on them?

The PREMIER: There were one or two matters that had to be fixed up. Provision had to be made for the keeping of books under the Trading Concerns Act, which were not previously required. The capital value of these places had to be fixed, also the depreciation, and it required a lot of thinking out, but once a basis had been fixed upon there would be no difficulty in coming years. The hon. member knew that the Trading Concerns Act had not been put into operation until the close of the last financial year. Dwellingup was really the only new hotel, and already it had paid in profits the whole of the capital expenditure entailed in its purchase. He could give the hon. member any items, takings from the State hotels generally, inspection of liquors, and tourist bureau. They were kept separate, but he did not think it was desirable at this stage to give them in detail for each hotel; they were doing as well as they ever did.

Mr. MONGER: A couple of months ago there was an advertisement in the Press calling for applications for the position of manager of the State hotel at Rottnest; would the Premier say what had been done in connection with these applications?

The Premier: We have not got the hotel yet.

Mr. MONGER: Why had the applicants not been notified accordingly? For some time after the applications had been sent in those who had applied naturally thought they had some fair and reasonable prospect of obtaining the position. Since then there had been no advertise-

ment in the paper, but it was certainly the duty of the Government to give some notification that the applications would be held over until a certain event took place.

The Premier: What we have advertised for was manager of the State hotel at Rottnest, but it was not certain whether a license would be obtained.

Mr. Allen: Of course, you will not get a license.

The PREMIER: The hon. member probably knew the feelings of his friends in another place, as they decided these matters in caucus. He was not prepared to make the appointment of a hotel manager until he knew whether there was going to be an hotel. No appointment had been made and therefore no appointment could be announced.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.37 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 5th November, 1913.

	PAOB
Companies Act Amendment Bill Select Committee, Report presented	2296
Questions: Royal Prerogative of Mercy	2297
Gold Discovery at Duketon	2297
Paper presented	2297
Bills: Mines Regulation, 2A.	2297
Traffic, Com.	2317

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

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL SELECT COMMITTEE.

Report presented.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) brought up the report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the Companies Act Amendment Bill.