

The Premier: I am satisfied I will not even get down to my estimate.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	16

Majority for ... 4

AYES.

Mr. Angwin
Mr. Cherrson
Mr. Clydesdale
Mr. Collier
Mr. Corboy
Mr. Coverley
Mr. Heron
Mr. Holman
Mr. Kennedy
Mr. Lamond

Mr. Marshall
Mr. McCallum
Mr. Millington
Mr. Munie
Mr. Pantou
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Troy
Mr. A. Wan-brough
Mr. Willcock
Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Barnard
Mr. Brown
Mr. Davy
Mr. Denton
Mr. Griffiths
Mr. E. B. Johnston
Mr. Mann
Sir James Mitchell

Mr. North
Mr. Sampson
Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Thomson
Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Richardson

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.

Mr. Lambert
Mr. W. D. Johnson

NOES.

Mr. Angelo
Mr. Latham

Clause thus passed.

Clause 7—Section 56 of 1907, No. 15 not to apply:

Mr. DAVY: This is the clause that from year to year has been suspending the right of a taxpayer to pay his income tax assessment in two instalments. It seems to me a paltry expedient for keeping up the revenue. I hope the Treasurer will disregard that departmental expedient and let this clause go. There is no regularity in one's liability to pay income tax. One never knows when his assessment will arrive. I once had three within two years. Sometimes this imposes hardship on private persons. The right to pay in two moieties was but a small concession. Still it has been taken away from us, despite the fact that Parliament originally conceded it.

Mr. SAMPSON: Even the municipal councils give this concession. If in a small matter like municipal ratings the principle is acknowledged, it certainly ought to be acknowledged in respect of the payment of income tax. It is provided for in the original Act, but taxpayers are deprived of it by this provision in the annual Bill. Many taxpayers find great difficulty in meeting their income tax obligations and frequently an overdraft is necessary. I repeat that the House recognised such a provision was necessary and wisdom prompted its inclusion in the Act.

The Premier: It cannot be done.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 8—Deductions:

Mr. THOMSON: This clause provides for a deduction of £10 for each child under the age of 16.

The Premier: That is in addition to the £40 set out in the assessment Bill.

Clause put and passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 12.54 a.m., (Wednesday).

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 17th December, 1924.

	Page
Illness of President	2398
Question: Denmark district publican's House	2399
Motion: Standing Orders Suspension	2399
Personal explanation: Recording of pairs	2404
Bills: Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, report, 3s.	2404
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, Recomm., further recomm.	2404
Land Tax and Income Tax, received	2417
Appropriation, 2s.	2417
Loan, £8,645,000, 2s., Com., etc.	2420

ILLNESS OF PRESIDENT.

The Clerk announced that the President would be absent from the sitting of the Council owing to indisposition, and that it would therefore be necessary for members to appoint one of their number to take the place of the President during his absence.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) [3.1]: I move—

That the Chairman of Committees (Hon. J. W. Kirwan) be appointed to take the President's Chair.

Question put and passed.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN accordingly took the Chair at 3.2 p.m.

QUESTION—DENMARK DISTRICT, PUBLICAN'S LICENSE.

Hon. J. A. GREIG asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What is the present position regarding the proposed license for an hotel at Denmark? 2, Has any tender been accepted; if so, from whom? 3, What will be the next procedure? 4, Where will the Licensing Court sit to hear the application? 5, When, approximately, will the application come before the Court?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Tenders have been called for and one received which is not considered satisfactory, and fresh tenders will be called for. 2, No tender has yet been accepted. 3, On fresh tenders being received a date will be fixed to hear application for a provisional certificate and decide which, if any, tender will be accepted. 4, Albany. 5, First Monday in March, subject to alteration.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [3.4]: I move—

That during the current month of December so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable Bills to be passed through all stages in one sitting, and Messages from the Legislative Assembly to be dealt with forthwith on their receipt, and that Standing Order No. 62 be suspended during the same period.

We are in the last days of the session. I notice on reference to "Hansard" for last year that Mr. Ewing secured the suspension of the Standing Orders on the 28th November, and the House rose on the 13th December. It by no means follows that if the House passes this motion I will make use of it on every occasion. In every respect I will consult the wishes of hon. members.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [3.6]: We all desire to help the Leader of the House. We must not forget that we have been sitting here an extra day per week for some time, and going on until half past ten at night. We have had before us a good many Bills of more or less first-class importance, such as the Arbitration Act Amendment Bill and the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill. We shall presently have submitted to us the financial Bills, such as the Land and Income Tax Assessment Bill, the Land Tax and Income Tax Bill, and others. Whilst we desire to help the Minister I do not think we should suspend the Standing Orders so as to give him unlimited license to carry on the business of the House to all hours. We might

fairly compromise with him in this matter. I move an amendment—

*That the following words be added:—
"Provided that such suspension shall apply only to the Appropriation Bill, the Loan Bill, the Land Tax and Income Tax Bill, and to Messages passing between the two Houses."*

If we fall in with the wishes of the Minister to this extent we shall be doing all we ought to be asked to do in the circumstances. We must have full time in which to consider these important measures. I have been going from 5 a.m. and 6 a.m. for the last month, and have not stopped until half-past ten at night, or later. I feel I could not continue that strain, especially if it were added to, as must be the case under this motion. If we allow the Government to get through their financial Bills with the utmost expedition, we can leave it to them to say what they wish to do with the other measures. If they desire to go on with them we shall want time in which to deal with them. Many members are prepared to meet after Christmas and continue for months in order that we may do a measure of justice to the people of the State. I propose to leave the matter, as we ought, entirely in the hands of the Government. We shall deal with the greatest expedition with the financial proposals of the Government, such as the Bills to which I have referred, but we must have reasonable time in which to consider the Assessment Bill, which will be of a more or less highly controversial nature, the Traffic Bill, the Main Roads Bill, which may or may not be gone on with, the Liquor Bill, and the Fair Rents Bill. I will be no party to rushing legislation through. My suggestion is a reasonable compromise, and I hope the Minister will accept it.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [3.10]: I second the amendment. In order to assist the Leader of the House to get through the business on the Notice Paper, we have for some considerable time past been meeting at 3 o'clock in the afternoon and sitting on until late at night. When the Leader of the House asked leave to sit at 3 o'clock I stated I was quite ready and willing to share in the responsibility and assist him in getting through the business, provided that no new business was initiated in this Chamber after that date. This afternoon the Minister has given notice that to-morrow he will ask for leave to introduce a Bill which ought to have been introduced in the Legislative Assembly weeks ago. The other House, however, has been taking a holiday, whilst this Chamber has been doing the work. We have heard it said that the Government do not permit of any opposition there, and will not allow the

Opposition to dot their i's or cross their t's. That House prefers to take holidays and leave this Chamber to do a little more of what might be considered to be the duty of that House, as it is the popular Chamber, through the particular franchise it enjoys. If any alteration has to be made to the Bill mentioned by the Leader of the House this afternoon, it is in the other House that it should have originated. If the Colonial Secretary receives permission to deal with the Bills mentioned in the amendment, there is still not the slightest chance of our finishing the session before Christmas. It is my determination to give the fullest consideration to the measures before us, notwithstanding the lateness of the session. The Leader of the House ought to know, from his long experience and association with this Chamber, that members here will not be a party to rushing through legislation at the last minute and passing it in a slipshod manner. The amendment is a reasonable one. In the past we have always been ready and willing to assist the Leader of the House in a matter of this kind.

The Colonial Secretary: The permission I seek has never yet been refused.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Perhaps the Minister was not in the Chamber when Mr. Colbatch, as Leader of the House, moved a similar motion, and afterwards introduced a Bill that was not then on the Notice Paper, and permission to deal with it was refused. If I am any judge, members will refuse to pass the motion as it stands on the Notice Paper, if it is used for the initiation of new legislation at this stage of the session.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—on amendment) [3.16]: Mr. Duffell has referred to my long experience in this House. During the whole of that long experience I was never met with such opposition as has been offered this afternoon to my attempt to obtain a complete suspension of the Standing Orders.

Hon. J. CORNELL: In my recollection, we never had such a welter of Bills before.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The usual practice is to have a suspension of the Standing Orders a fortnight before the session is expected to close. Previously, I have been assisted in every way to complete the business of Parliament. Reference has been made to the Bill to amend licensing legislation. I distinctly stated yesterday that it was proposed to introduce such a Bill. I also mentioned the measure a fortnight ago. I was not then in a position to say whether the Bill would be initiated here or in the Legislative Assembly. However, a decision was subsequently arrived at that the Bill should be introduced here.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Try it on the dog!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have no more wish than any member to sit here after 10 o'clock at night. I am not an iron man.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: You have the sympathy of every member.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I shall not put anything in the way of hon. members giving full consideration to measures, but I want to know exactly where I stand. If there is a desire that the session should close before Christmas, the Standing Orders must be suspended.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: That means sitting here till two or three in the morning.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If it is not desired to close down before Christmas, there is no necessity whatever to suspend the Standing Orders; the work can be done after the New Year. I desire a clear expression of the views of the House on this matter.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [3.18]: I am indeed surprised at Mr. Lovekin's moving the amendment. The Colonial Secretary has my sympathy in this matter, and he has also my complete confidence. Last session, a fortnight before this date, the House was good enough to grant me a full suspension of the Standing Orders, and also to allow business to be taken after 10 p.m.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: You had not these measures.

Hon. J. EWING: There was then a great deal of work to be done, including the finance Bills. At any rate, I have every confidence in the Minister's promise not in any way to take advantage of the suspension.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: They were footling little, petty Bills you had.

Hon. J. EWING: Thank you very much. Doubtless the present Leader is not dealing with footling Bills. However, two of the most important Bills have been practically dealt with by the House, the Arbitration Act Amendment Bill and the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill. The Bill to amend the Licensing Act is not likely to take much time here. The Appropriation and Loan Bills are both down for second reading to-day. I have not considered either of them, but I am prepared to assist the Minister by speaking on them this afternoon. Hon. members know exactly what their views are on the various questions concerning the State and the Government.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Acting without sufficient consideration is the trouble.

Hon. J. EWING: We cannot alter the Appropriation Bill materially without refusing Supply to the Government. I am not in favour of that. Personally, I am quite prepared to come here after Christmas; that will mean no great sacrifice to me. We know, however, it is the desire of the Government that the Premier should go to England at an early date. I do not wish to do

anything that will prevent his going, if I can possibly help it. I understand the Premier desires to leave in the middle of next month. There are very important Bills on the Notice Paper, but if the Government choose to take the responsibility of curtailing discussion on those measures by suspending the Standing Orders, and thus running the risk of getting the measures defeated here, that responsibility will rest entirely on them, and not in any degree on members of this Chamber.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Are we to put the Bills through when we are not fit to deal with them?

Hon. J. EWING: The Leader of the House has said quite distinctly that he will not take up such an attitude. He is prepared to come back next year to discuss any Bills on which further discussion may be necessary. But let us give him the chance he desires of getting through this week. I have every confidence in the Minister's word. It rests with the sense of the House to decide whether the business of Parliament shall be finished before Christmas.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Are you prepared to sit until 4 o'clock in the morning?

Hon. J. EWING: I am prepared to go on at any time, and am prepared to say without any preparation what I have to say. After members have heard the Minister on any Bill, they will know what they want to say. Perhaps they may not, in such circumstances, speak at such length as they would after preparation. I will not be a party to preventing the Minister from doing what he can during the remainder of the week. If he pushes business in such a way as does not meet with the approval of the House, he will not be able to get his Bills through; and he knows that.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [3.22]: I understand the Minister wishes an expression of opinion from members in order that he may know where he stands. Therefore, I shall state my attitude. I have never been a party to taking the management of business out of the Leader's hands, and I will not be a party to it today. On the other hand, I am not going to be a party either to allowing Bills to go through without proper consideration and discussion. I will certainly oppose anything in the nature of rushing Bills through without their full purport and intent being understood and voted upon by members. With reference to sitting late, as hon. members probably know, during the last week or two my health has not been very good. I am perfectly sure that I shall not be able to stand the strain of sitting here until the early hours of the morning. I am, however, perfectly willing to come back in January and sit as long as is necessary in order to deal with the business before the House. In spite of what has been said, I can see no reason why we should not come back in

January. I am sure no member of this Chamber wants to interfere with the Premier's wish to go to England during the early part of the next year. We all desire that he should go there. But I can see no reason why he should not go to England while Parliament continues to sit. He has able lieutenants, and there is no doubt whatever that they will be able to carry on the business of the Government. If it should be necessary, the Leader of the Opposition in another place would doubtless give a pledge to the Premier that there would be no attempt to interfere with the course of government during the Premier's absence. However, I am perfectly sure that such a pledge is unnecessary, because, according to my observation, the Opposition in another place could not turn out a mouse, much less the Government. I do hope this Chamber will agree to the suspension of the Standing Orders and be content with the desire which we know our Leader has to carry on the business fairly and without unduly pressing the patience or taxing the strength of members.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [3.26]: I have never voted against granting the Leader of this House a suspension of the Standing Orders. In my recollection it has been done every session, but I know of no session in which so much controversial legislation has been on the stocks and held back so long.

The Colonial Secretary: The important Bills have been here for two months.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The trouble is not what is here, but what is coming. What is here has had fairly lengthy consideration. On this occasion there is an additional reason for the suspension of the Standing Orders, namely, that if Parliament does not prorogue on the very eve of the Christmas holidays, it will be necessary to reassemble after the New Year, and the Premier will be prevented from going Home as he desires. I am prepared to agree to suspend the Standing Orders, but not to pass legislation of such a highly controversial nature as the traffic, main roads, fair rents, and licensing Bills, to oblige any Government. I do not know what will be in the Licensing Bill. My advice to the House is to grant the Minister's present request, and let him use his own discretion as to the Bills he wishes to go on with. The other legislation can be given the shrift it deserves. If the Government are not prepared to sit after Christmas to give that legislation the necessary consideration, the fault will not lie with this House. There is a request from the Government to this House to close down before Christmas, and that can be done only by one means, namely, to give full consideration to the measures mentioned in Mr. Lovekin's amendment and dismiss from consideration, until next session, the Bills we are asked to pass as a sort of conven-

ience. I for one will not be a party to passing some of the measures that are about to come here from another place. However, I cannot refuse to give the Minister the suspension of the Standing Orders.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [3.29]: I am at a loss to understand the position. We are asked to suspend the Standing Orders so that the business of Parliament may be finished before Christmas. But we know that another place has been waiting for weeks for this House to complete the Bills we have. We are now informed that there is a highly controversial measure, a Bill to amend the Licensing Act, to be introduced here, discussed here first, and then sent on to another place. If a measure of that nature, to take a vote of the adult population, is introduced at all, it should be introduced in another place. Further, without having seen the Bill, I would ask how that Bill can be introduced here? Undoubtedly expense must be incurred in connection with the taking of a referendum, and I do not think this House can initiate a measure of that description. Thus on one hand we are asked to facilitate legislation here, and on the other hand we are asked to deal with legislation that should be introduced in the Assembly. I have no desire to inconvenience the Minister. He has my fullest sympathy. I congratulate him on the work he has been able to accomplish so far. It is too much for any one man to undertake to deal with all the legislation that comes before us. It is too much for any one individual to carry on the duties of leadership in this Chamber under normal conditions, but at the present time we have measures before us that will affect the welfare of the community for good or ill such as we have never had in any one Parliament before. Dealing with the Workers' Compensation Bill the Minister in introducing the measure said—

My desire in introducing this Bill is to avoid creating the impression that we are revolutionising workers' compensation in this State.

The Minister does not deny that he is doing it. Anyone who looks through the Bill will see that that is actually what is happening. As to the visit of the Premier to London, he should go. It is absolutely necessary that he should go to London, and the sooner the better, in order that he may get into touch with those at the seat of the Empire whose assistance we require. With the majority behind him in the Assembly, the Premier can go whether Parliament be sitting or not. I do not mind sitting on into January, but I am afraid that if we do that it will mean that we shall drift on to March, because while there is plenty of time to do the work, there will be plenty of time to drift along. With proper application we can easily clear

up the business of the session this side of Christmas, but that all depends upon how the Assembly deals with the Bills we send to them. While I have protested in season and out of season against sitting any later than 10 o'clock at night, I shall be prepared for the next three or four sittings to sit much later than that hour and also to sit earlier in the day if necessary. I do not wish it to be thought that the House will take up an attitude other than fair. On one occasion we took up the attitude that we would not pass the Appropriation Bill until the Government declared how they proposed to adjust the finances. The House divided on the question and the voting was 12 for and 13 against. The Government got their Appropriation Bill through on the casting vote of the Chairman. That was a drastic course to pursue. I do not think the suggestion to give the Minister the limited power indicated by Mr. Lovekin in his amendment is anything like so severe as the attempt made on that occasion to hold up the Appropriation Bill until the middle of February. We do not want to take the business out of the Minister's hands, and if he attempted to take advantage of the position we could easily put the check on him. I do not think the Minister would attempt to rush anything through without justification.

Hon. J. A. GREIG (South-East) [3.35]: I am prepared to agree to the suspension of the Standing Orders and to assist the Minister to deal with the business on the Notice Paper and with any business that comes to us from the Assembly. I am not prepared to agree to give him the right to introduce new legislation in this Chamber. I am opposed to that being done for various reasons. It is not a fair thing to introduce such a Bill as that indicated when we have so much to do already. We can get through the important part of the business of the session before Christmas and I for one do not wish to come back in the new year.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [3.36]: I support the motion. If it is found that the business on the Notice Paper cannot be completed before Christmas, I shall be willing to sit again early next year. As to business being rushed through, I agree with Dr. Saw that every facility must be given for discussion. I cannot recall any session when important legislation has been before the Chamber and when the Standing Orders have not been suspended. I cannot, however, remember any session when in these circumstances, some parts of those important Bills were not rushed through and not given the consideration their importance entitled them to.

Hon. J. Cornell: A lot have been rushed out, too.

Hon. H. STEWART: I remember one Bill that was before the House two or

three sessions ago. Several clauses were dealt with and attempts were made to amend them in Committee. At that time the House was practically empty.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It was about 3 o'clock in the morning.

Hon. H. STEWART: The fact remains that members would not listen to the amendments, but next session when the Government brought in a similar Bill they agreed to those amendments although they would not listen to them before. There is no excuse whatever for the Government seeking to introduce the Licensing Act Amendment Bill in this House. If the Government wish to put themselves right with the people to whom they gave the promise to introduce legislation, they cannot justify their action in delaying the introduction of the measure to the present time. In such circumstances they must know the risk they are running with the Bill and the public will be quite justified in questioning the bona fides of the Government when they made that promise. When they seek to bring in such a Bill here, they know that there is a majority against the main principle embodied in that measure.

Hon. A. BURVILL: They do not want it passed.

Hon. H. STEWART: The Bill should be introduced in the Assembly. The Government should even now introduce it there if they have any intention of honouring the promise they are said to have given.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [3.40]: It is usual to support the Leader of the House when he moves a motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders at this stage of the session. I would be sorry indeed to think that the Leader of the House was not to be accorded the same privilege as had been extended to previous Leaders of this House. In view of the importance of legislation now before us, and also of its controversial description, the amendment moved by Mr. Lovekin is amply justified, and those who support him are perfectly justified in having the position clearly placed before them. Very little further justification would entitle members to support the amendment. Knowing the Leader of the House as we do, it would be fair on certain understandings being arrived at, to grant to him the privilege he seeks. I will not be a party, however, to rushing legislation through. I have always opposed that course because I think legislation should receive mature consideration. I do not approve of the proposal to introduce a Bill to amend the Licensing Act here. If any such amendment is to be proposed, let the Bill emanate from the Assembly and not be initiated here. I will oppose the introduction of such legislation here and I hope the Leader of the House will convey to his

colleagues the feelings of members in this House, particularly with regard to that measure. There are many important Bills before us for consideration now. I do not know how it is possible to do this, if we are to give those Bills mature consideration and finish the work of the session this week or in the beginning of next week. The only way we can clear the Notice Paper is for some of the Bills to be carried over to next session.

The Colonial Secretary: Some of the Bills will be carried over, and that is why they have been sent here. The Main Roads Bill will be taken up again next session.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The Fair Rents Bill is another important measure. It is absolutely impossible for us to deal with that Bill this session. If we have an assurance from the Leader of the House that no attempt will be made to introduce such legislation as I have suggested, it may overcome the difficulty.

The Colonial Secretary: I can only succeed with the will of the House.

Hon. H. STEWART: If some of these more important Bills are to be held over till next session, I will give the Leader of the House every help to complete the work of the session as far as it is possible to do so.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN (Metropolitan) [3.45]: After the expressions of opinion we have heard, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. G. W. MILES (North) [3.46]: Each year since I have been in the House we have protested against the volume of business that is sent down at the tail-end of the session. It is the fault of the Council in having allowed successive leaders of the House in years gone by to suspend the Standing Orders and so put upon us a rush of business in the closing hours of the session. It is no argument to say that we have done it in the past. Each succeeding year members declare that they are opposed to the business being rushed through, notwithstanding which it happens every year.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It has become a habit.

Hon. G. W. MILES: That is so, and it is the fault of members themselves. I will oppose the motion.

Hon. H. SEDDON (North-East) [3.47]: I support the last speaker. It is the duty of the House to fully and thoroughly consider every piece of legislation. There is no reason why we should not come back after Christmas to finish up our work. We certainly ought to give full consideration to the business on the Notice Paper, and I am quite prepared to come back and give all the time that is necessary.

Question put and passed.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Recording of Pairs.

Hon. H. STEWART: Recently the practice has grown up of recording some pairs in "Hansard." It has never previously been the custom to do so. This departure may be of significance. During the elections in May last the Albany "Advertiser" made false and libellous statements about me, statements that have only recently been retracted. The paper contended that I had been absent from the House and had not arranged pairs. After the election I communicated with the Honorary Minister and Mr. Macfarlane, and they agreed that I had arranged pairs with them. The Albany newspaper had declared that if I had arranged pairs they would have been recorded in "Hansard."

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: No official cognisance of pairs is taken, and the recording of pairs in "Hansard" is simply a personal matter between members and the "Hansard" staff.

Hon. H. STEWART: I want to know what the procedure is. I have been seven years in the House and, prior to the last few weeks, there has been in all that time only one occasion on which a pair was recorded in "Hansard." However, during the last few weeks it has become the practice to record some pairs, while leaving others unrecorded. It is an entirely new practice.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. H. STEWART: I repeat that until quite recently only one pair has been recorded in "Hansard" during a period of seven years. Owing to the erroneous, damaging and libellous statements made by the Albany "Advertiser" I issued a writ against that paper, and after paying all my expenses, the respondents compromised the matter. In No. 19 of "Hansard" several pairs were recorded, but although I had arranged a pair, that pair was not recorded.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: If the hon. member considers that official notice should be taken of pairs, it is for him to endeavour to have an amendment made of the Standing Orders. At present no official notice is taken of pairs, and their recording in "Hansard" is for members to arrange.

Hon. H. STEWART: Is there anything in the Standing Orders providing for the recording of pairs?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: No, it is purely for private arrangement.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Recommittal.

Resumed from the previous day.

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

Clause 7—Notification of Disease:

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on this clause.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: At the last sitting we struck out Clause 6, the object being to eliminate occupational diseases altogether. I should like your ruling, Sir, as to whether Clause 7 should not be struck out as being consequential on Clause 6.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to hear the Colonial Secretary's view.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I certainly regard Clause 7 as being consequential on Clause 6, which has been struck out. But it is my intention, on recommittal, to move that Clause 6 be reinstated.

The CHAIRMAN: In that case we shall regard Clause 7 as consequential.

Clause 14—Amendment of Section 1 of First Schedule:

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Bill as originally received sought to amend paragraph (a) of sub-paragraph (1) of Section 1 of the First Schedule, dealing with "dependants" by omitting the word "any" and inserting "a widow or a child or children under the age of 16 years (whether dependent upon the earnings of the worker at the time of his death, or not so dependent), or leaves any other" dependants. That reference in Clause 14 was struck out, and the definition of "dependants" in Clause 3 was amended to provide for the widow and the children under the age of 16 years of a worker and such other members of the worker's family as were wholly or in part dependent upon the earnings of the worker at the time of his death. When Clause 14 was under consideration similar words were deleted somewhat hurriedly, and I think an anomaly has crept in. Has the Minister made a comparison of the provisions to ensure that there is no anomaly?

The Colonial Secretary: I have made no comparison.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If it was necessary to state the words in Clause 3, it seems equally necessary to have them stated in the schedule. We should either restore the words in the principal Act or perpetuate the amendment made to the original Act. I move an amendment—

That after "paragraph (a) in line 1 of Subclause 1 the following be inserted:— "The word 'any' in the fifth line is omitted and the following words are inserted in lieu thereof:—'A widow or a child or children under the age of 16 years or leaves any other: and.'"

That will then square with what we have done.

Hon. J. EWING: The definition of "dependants" has been altered, and the reference to "dependants" has been deleted from Clause 14. The schedule in the Act deals with a worker leaving any dependants, who would be the widow and children under 16 in accordance with the definition upon which we have agreed. Therefore Mr. Cornell's amendment is unnecessary.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I still think my amendment is necessary to preserve uniformity.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: We retained "dependants" in the First Schedule, and that definition includes the widow and children under 16 in addition to other people.

Hon. J. E. DODD: The schedule is at variance with the first part of the Bill, for the definition of "dependant" has been restored practically to what it was in the parent Act. I was opposed to the principle embodied in the Bill because there are many widows who are not dependant on their deceased husbands, but under the schedule they will be regarded as dependent. Mr. Cornell's amendment is, therefore, necessary.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: "Dependant," as altered, means a widow, or a child or children under the age of 16 years, etc., either wholly or in part dependent. In the schedule it has reference to the meaning given in the interpretation clause. If we retain the clause as it is, it will cover all dependants, including a child or children under 16 years. The Minister might draw the attention of the Crown law authorities to the point raised by Mr. Cornell.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I will not press the point. If the words are found to be necessary they can be inserted in the other House.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: We have made provision for funeral expenses, artificial limbs, etc. I moved an amendment at the beginning of proposed sub-section 6 to protect the institutions to which payment was due by the worker for services rendered. The amendment was passed, but at the time there was considerable discussion as to whether or not it would achieve the object I had in view. I think it expresses the intention of the Legislature, and that payment would be made to the institutions concerned, but it would perhaps be better slightly to alter the wording of the amendment. I therefore move—

That the words "to those persons to whom such payment is due" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:— "to those persons or institutions by whom the services hereinafter mentioned were rendered."

Hon. J. Ewing: Is it possible to stop money in this way in order to pay for these medical services?

The Colonial Secretary: This can be done by statute.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I move an amendment—

That in proposed Subsection 6, line 4, the words "one hundred" be struck out and "fifty" be inserted in lieu.

It is proposed that the maximum amount to be paid in this case shall not exceed £100, and that the funeral expenses shall not exceed £20. Queensland does not provide anything for the doctor, but does provide £50 for burial expenses. In my view, if £100 is provided for hospital and medical expenses, someone other than the worker will get the money.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is more than is given in other places.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This amounts to a preferential claim for one section of the community. I wish to do all I can for the worker.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You do not study the North-West workers much.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The worker does not get this money.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In many cases £50 would doubtless suffice to cover the medical expenses; but an accident might occur far out in the bush, and the doctor would have to travel a long distance. In such cases his fees, together with hospital expenses and so forth, would certainly exceed £100. In the cities nothing like £100 would be needed; probably not £50. But the £100 should be retained in order that the medical expenses may be covered in such an instance as I have indicated. It is not to be assumed that because the Bill fixes a maximum of £100, that amount would be unnecessarily spent.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This is an extra £100 to be covered by insurance, and the industry would have to pay the premium. With reference to the argument as to long distances, I have not yet heard of a case where a doctor has neglected an injured worker. The question is whether the industry can stand all this expense.

Hon. J. E. DODD: So many anomalies are being created that I hardly know where we are. On the goldfields and in the timber districts all the men pay their own hospital and medical expenses by means of a weekly contribution. Are such workers to get this £100, or are they to lose it because they bear the expense themselves? The latter position would be utterly anomalous. The foreign workers at Kurrawang had no such arrangement, and they came into the public hospital in numbers. Although many of them had banking accounts, rarely could any payment be obtained from them.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I disclaim any intention of obtaining preferential treatment for medical men or hospitals. The Bill, however, set out to provide that an injured man should have a sum set aside for medical and surgical attendance, ambulance, first aid, hospital treatment, artificial limbs, and funeral expenses. My amendment is designed to ensure that the institutions shall obtain what they are entitled to receive. As regards Mr. Dodd's argument, if the worker does not incur any liability for medical or surgical treatment or hospital accommodation, he will not get anything on that account. If the worker pays a weekly sum for medical and hospital treatment, he would be entitled to get the money. On the other hand, if he did not pay such a contribution, he would not be entitled to this £100, because he would not have incurred any liability for medical or surgical treatment or hospital accommodation. The sum set aside, £100, does seem an extravagant amount. I was surprised to hear Mr. Holmes dispute that in Queensland £50 is set aside for the same purpose, and in Victoria £75. As to the maximum of £100, we cannot legislate for the exception, such as a man injured at a great distance from a doctor and a hospital. In such cases the necessary funds are frequently subscribed by the man's friends; sometimes the doctor is not paid. Once a man gets to a public hospital, his medical and surgical expenses are very small indeed, as he is merely charged an amount to cover the cost of his maintenance. Where the allowance will come in is when the man is discharged from the hospital. Then he is often in a very difficult position. When a man is able to get about on crutches, and space is required in the hospital, out he goes. That is where the trouble begins. What the man then needs is massage and electrical treatment, in order that the efficient use of the limb may be restored as quickly as the fracture will admit of. Frequently a man in that condition drifts about for months, getting no massage, dragging the leg, not getting confidence in the limb and not getting the activity of the muscles restored. The medical profession would get very little of the money, because the man would only incur fees for medical supervision. The insurance companies recognise the necessity for further attention; and as under the law they are able to advance money for the purpose of massage and medical treatment, some of them do it. I do not want injured men to be induced to go into private hospitals and incur a lot of perfectly unnecessary expense when they can probably be treated more efficiently in a public institution. Therefore I support Mr. Holmes's amendment.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: During the last 12 months I have had two experiences, bring-

ing home to me the necessity for doing everything possible for injured workers in the country. A young lad had his hand badly smashed, and by the time his travelling and doctor's expenses were met he had no compensation left to draw upon. I am surprised at Mr. Holmes overlooking the man in the North-West. When I was at Carnarvon in February last a young lad was kicked on the head by a horse. The doctor said that to save the lad's life it would be necessary to send him to Perth for a special operation. The boy was brought down by aeroplane and successfully operated upon. Doubtless the expenses in that case were far in excess of £50. I hope the amount of £100 will be allowed to stand.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am not here to consider the North Province alone; I am aiming at bringing our legislation into line with that elsewhere. The greater the impost on our industries, the greater the disadvantage under which those industries will be suffering. In Victoria, for medical and burial expenses the amount provided is £75; in New South Wales it is £20, and in Queensland, for burial alone, it is £50. Under the Bill it is to be £100 in Western Australia, plus £20 for burial, or £120 as against Queensland's £50. As for the point raised by Dr. Saw, it shows where the £100 will drift to. The hospital authorities will get the major portion of it, and so a man will have no money left for special attendance such as massage after he leaves the hospital. If we fix the amount at £50 we shall compare favourably with the provision made in the other States.

Hon. J. EWING: If a man has to procure an artificial limb he will not have much left out of £100. But whatever amount we provide, it is not to say that it will all be used. Of course in many cases of serious injury the victims will require more than £100. It might well be left to those responsible to see that a man does not incur undue expense.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Mr. Ewing is overlooking the position in the other States. The question is, not what it is going to cost to do this or that, but how great an imposition our industries stand, as compared with those in the Eastern States? I have no objection to giving generous compensation, provided our industries can bear it. The whole question is what compensation can our industries stand? We are not justified in providing greater compensation than is afforded in the Eastern States.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: What about Victoria?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Victoria provides £75. Under the amendment we shall be providing £50 and £20, or £70 in all.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Of course in many cases £100 will not cover the expenses. What we have to do is to try to strike the happy medium. The cost will all come back on the industry. In Queensland, where only

£50 is provided for burial, and nothing for medical expenses—

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: You are not quite right in putting it like that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: In Queensland insurance is costing 8s. 11d. per head of the population as against 3s. 9d. in Victoria. If we are to raise our insurance as proposed, and cap it with another £100, one can imagine what premiums will be demanded. In New South Wales, for medical attention and burial expenses £20 is provided, whereas here it is proposed that we provide £100.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The Queensland Act provides that where a worker leaves no dependants the reasonable expenses of a medical attendant and burial, not exceeding £50, are to be paid. The total amount is £50, but it is not all for burial expenses. In some parts of Western Australia where there are hospital facilities at hand, the expense will not be so great as it would be if the accident occurred in more remote parts. Still, practically all victims will have to come to the metropolitan area if they require up-to-date attention and apparatus. I hope the amount will be allowed to remain.

Hon. T. MOORE: Mr. Holmes has raised the point that insurance will cost a lot more. But only in a few instances will the full amount be claimed. On the average the amount required will be very small, perhaps less than £10.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: At present they pay nothing.

Hon. T. MOORE: It is not always the desire of victims that they should rush to Perth. But in only two or three places is an X-ray plant, entering so largely into the treatment of accidents, available. Because of that, there have been brought down here many people who, apart from the necessities of the case, had no desire to come.

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

Ayes	9
Noes	9
A tie				0

AYES.

Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. G. W. Miles	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. Ewing	(Teller.)

PAIR.

Hon. H. J. Yelland

NONE.

Hon. E. H. Gray

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the Standing Orders, the question passes in the negative.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause 17—Amendment of Section 16 of First Schedule:

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I intend to vote against this clause for the reason that it is not understandable, and if it were understandable, it would not be necessary. It deals with weekly payments and investments to be made. If compensation is to be paid it should be optional with the person receiving compensation to do as he likes with the money he receives.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: This clause slipped through without our noticing it. I understood the clause was not going to be pressed. It gives power to buy an annuity, and as I have already pointed out as the result of inquiries made from one of the leading life assurance offices, a man would need to be 77 before he could get the smallest annuity, and 84 before he could get the largest. It is obvious that the clause is of no value, because you cannot buy an annuity for £750. It is only holding out false hopes.

Clause put and negatived.

Second Schedule:

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I move an amendment—

That in the line "total and incurable paralysis of limbs or mental powers £750," the figure be reduced to £500.

In the case of divers, it is known that when they remain at a great depth below water for an unusually long time, they are liable to be stricken by incurable paralysis of the limbs, and under the schedule they would be compensated to the extent of £750. The owner of the boat has no control over these divers. They are in deep water and he is not with them to see that they do not remain below for a period that might be regarded as dangerous.

The Honorary Minister: But the owner's are on the lugger.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Divers are permitted to remain below until they signal that they want to come up. It is entirely their own responsibility.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Do you know of any case where they have had £750 for total and incurable paralysis?

The Honorary Minister: No.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The old Act provides for £500.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I desire to see the amount reduced to £500.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment. Divers' paralysis does not come under the category of total and incurable paralysis, because it is not total. If it does, all 1

can say is that the divers have been covered since 1912 up to a limit of 100 per cent. of £500, the maximum allowed. I do not know of any case where the amount was claimed, but divers do not come under this category. Assuming they were entitled to £750, is it any reason that because an unfortunate Asiatic incurs this dread total and incurable paralysis to both limbs as the result of his going into deep water for pearls we should deprive of compensation the other 99 per cent. of people who meet with accidents and become totally and incurably paralysed in the two limbs? As we have agreed to the inclusion of the maximum for total incapacity, surely this particular provision should be allowed to remain.

Hon. J. E. DODD: The second schedule in the Act contains the heading "Nature of injury," not "Occupational disease." Divers' troubles are the result of occupational diseases, not accidents, and that is the reason why nothing has been heard of cases brought under the Act.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: It all comes back to a question of the amount of compensation. I have not challenged the higher amounts for we could not possibly fully compensate in those instances. The minimum rate of compensation for death in the Queensland Act is £300, and the maximum £600, so that the schedule in our Bill provides an advance of 25 per cent. My object in drawing attention to these matters is to show how we are penalising industry in Western Australia.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The schedule provides £600 as the amount payable as compensation for the loss of a leg. The present Act provides for the payment of £350. In this instance the schedule provides for an increase of nearly 100 per cent. I move an amendment—

That the amount of "£600" for the loss of a leg be struck out with a view to inserting "£350."

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: For the loss of sight of one eye compensation amounting to £375 is provided. I shall move to make the amount £300.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Why haggle about a few pounds?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Very well, we will allow that amount to stand! The next item to which I wish to draw attention is that relating to complete deafness of one ear, for which compensation is provided to the extent of £300. The compensation provided for complete deafness in one ear under the Queensland legislation is £75.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The schedule in our Act provides £50 as compensation.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That the amount of "£300" for complete deafness in one ear be struck out, with a view to inserting "£75."

Hon. J. E. DODD: Surely the reference to the amount in the Queensland Act is not correct. This is a question of which I know something. I never could understand why a distinction should be made between partial deafness and partial loss of sight. I have been partially deaf for many years, and I say emphatically that the man who is partially deaf has a greater handicap in life than the man who is partially blind. There is no comparison between the man who is totally blind and the man who is totally deaf. The former is one of the most unfortunate of God's living creatures. The man who is partially deaf, however, is in a far worse position to earn his living and carry out the obligations of life than the man who is partially blind. If we asked Mr. W. M. Hughes his opinion regarding his partial deafness—

Hon. G. W. Miles: You would probably find that it is a good asset for Mr. Hughes. He can hear only what he wants to!

Hon. J. E. DODD: I wish I could. I hope hon. members will not make any distinction between the man who is deaf in one ear and the man who has lost the sight of one eye.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I cannot agree with Mr. Dodd. I am one of the unfortunate people who are deaf in one ear. In my opinion £300 is too much compensation to pay to a person who is totally deaf in one ear. My experience is that I cannot locate sounds readily, but that is not a very vital loss. I would rather lose my hearing in one ear than lose the sight in one eye.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Last week I indicated that I would move to reduce the compensation for complete deafness of one ear from £300 to £200. I was glad to hear Mr. Greig's speech; there is nothing like getting information at first hand. He is rather happier than a majority of people who are deaf in one ear. I think a majority of people find the loss of hearing in one ear a considerable handicap just as a majority find the loss of one eye. There again it is relative. A friend of mine, who lost the sight of one eye when a boy, has carried out his vocation through a very long life and is a most accomplished artist. Another man who lost an eye in the war drives about in a motor car and plays quite a good game of golf. Some people overcome their disabilities better than do others. The amount of £75 is not sufficient, but £300 is excessive in proportion to the amounts allotted for other injuries. A fair allowance would be £200.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The framer of the Bill evidently realised that the £75 pro-

vided in the Queensland Act was not sufficient. I should like to see Dr. Saw's suggestion adopted.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Under the existing Act the amount is £50. Mr. Nicholson proposes to make it £75; Dr. Saw suggests £200, and the Bill provides for £300. Whatever reduction is made, a proportionate reduction should also be made in the other small items at the end of the schedule.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The Queensland Act provides for the "total" loss of a thumb, etc.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That would not add to it.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I favour Dr. Saw's suggestion.

Amendment (to strike out "£300") put and passed.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That "£150" be inserted.

That will be double the amount provided in Queensland.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: If the amount of £150 is not agreed to, may I then move to insert £200?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I move an amendment—

That "£200" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Having reduced that item by 33 per cent., we should reduce the remaining six items similarly. I move an amendment—

That the amount of "£225" for loss of a thumb be struck out with a view to inserting "£150."

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: At present the loss of a thumb is assessed at 30 per cent. of the compensation for total incapacity. If we adopt the same ratio, it will be £225, which is the amount provided in the Bill. Of all the disabilities to a hand, the loss of a thumb is far and away the greatest. When a man loses his thumb, the amount relatively to the compensation for the loss of a hand is more than half. The amount of £225 is not excessive.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: There is an item "Loss of part of a thumb £112 10s." In the Queensland Act the provision is for loss of a "joint" of a thumb. We should adopt that term, or it might be claimed that loss of the tip of a thumb or the nail is loss of part of a thumb. I move an amendment—

That the word "part" be struck out and "joint" inserted in lieu.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I oppose the amendment. No court would hold that loss of a thumb nail was loss of part of a thumb, and usually the nail grows again. The loss of a section of flesh and of the muscular portion is a severe handicap to a man. If a man injures the surface of his thumb so as to prevent its apposition to the other fingers of his hand, he must suffer great inconvenience.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clause 21—Addition to Third Schedule:

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We struck out the first portion of the Bill dealing with occupational diseases.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister has intimated that the Bill will again be recommended for the purpose of reconsidering the striking out of Clause 6 and the consequential amendments.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Can we not recommend the Bill and deal with Clause 5 and the Schedule?

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that will be done.

Clause put and passed.

New clause:

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I move—

That a new clause to stand as Clause 9 be inserted as follows:—"Section 13 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the word 'referees' in line 2 the words 'or members of a medical board.'"

The parent Act contains no provision respecting members of a medical board, but provision has been made for the appointment of referees. This new clause is purely consequential, and provides the machinery for carrying into effect that which we have passed.

New clause put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

Further Recommitment.

Bill further recommitted for the purpose of reconsidering Clauses 1, 7, 8, and 21.

In Committee.

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

Hon. J. CORNELL: I would draw attention to an obvious error in the Minutes dealing with Clause 6. The Committee divided, and the Minutes show that Mr. Burvill voted on both sides.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minutes have not yet been signed. I take it they are merely provisional Minutes which have been distributed amongst members.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The figures are correct, but there is someone missing from the division list.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minutes will be corrected.

Clause 1—Short title and commencement:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added:—

"And shall be read as one with the Workers' Compensation Act, 1912, hereinafter referred to as the principal Act."

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

New clause:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I was very surprised last evening at the striking out of Clause 6. Members have promised to do everything possible to make proper provision in the Bill for industrial diseases, and I did not expect that any attempt would be made to excise this clause. All over the world provision is made in workers' compensation Acts for industrial diseases. In Great Britain the list of diseases is added to by regulation. In Australia every State but ours provides for these things. In New South Wales and Victoria there is a list of industrial diseases such as anthrax, various kinds of poisoning, and so on. In Queensland the list includes miners' phthisis, Asiatic cholera, bubonic plague, mumps, scarlet fever, smallpox; arsenic, phosphorus, lead, zinc and other mineral poisoning. The South Australian list includes anthrax, lead poisoning, mercury poisoning. Tasmania has a law relating to industrial diseases, the list including miners' phthisis, but the operation of the provisions has been suspended "until Parliament otherwise directs." The large majority of members of this Chamber advanced arguments in support of the clause. Even Mr. Holmes, who moved its deletion, is not opposed to it. The Miners' Phthisis Act will not be proclaimed until everything is in readiness. I move—

That Clause 5 of the Bill as previously amended, be inserted as a new clause.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I was greatly surprised to find that the clause relating to industrial diseases had been struck out. Mr. Holmes said all along that he did not care how much of the Bill was wiped out so long as the part relating to industrial diseases was retained. I have been particularly unfortunate as regards the discussion of the Bill in not being able to get here at any time when industrial diseases were under discussion. I am afraid that the lack of information with regard to the Government's intentions in this connection is largely responsible for the deletion of the clause. I have had a number of inquiries from men on the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. The men want to know what will happen to the fund when

the Bill goes through? Undoubtedly the fund must be carried on, in view of the large number of men on the fund. Again, what is going to happen with regard to the Miners' Phthisis Act? If that Act is proclaimed, the mining companies will be relieved of any responsibility regarding tubercle. That will be a great relief to them. To wipe out the provision relating to industrial diseases is, in my opinion, altogether wrong, and in doing so the House aims a deadly blow at itself. Members of this Chamber are creating an impression that they are not prepared to give the workers of this State the same relief in respect of industrial diseases as is given in almost every other part of the world. I believe there is more tuberculosis and miners' complaint on the Eastern Goldfields than in any other part of Australia. At Broken Hill there is an Act now operating in this connection. It is to last for seven years, but of course it may be continued. Under that Act single men and single women suffering from miners' phthisis get £2 a week, and married people are allowed, in addition, 8s. 6d. for each child. At Broken Hill the Government and the mine owners carry the whole of the responsibility; the men do not carry any.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Under this Bill the mine owners, and not the Government, will carry the responsibility.

Hon. J. E. DODD: The mine owners will carry the whole of the responsibility if the Miners' Phthisis Act is proclaimed. We mean to give the mining industry all the consideration that we can. I have always advocated that each industry should bear the burden of those who are injured in it. However, our mining industry has gone from prosperity down to adversity. Nobody wants to wipe it out altogether. If we can see our way to give the industry more consideration, let us do it. The men who help themselves are the men who can help themselves. Contributors to the Mine Workers' Relief Fund receive certain payments from that fund; but the men who have not paid into the fund go to the Government departments in Perth and get as much as the contributors to the fund. The men on the fields pay for medical and hospital attention. Surely it is our duty to help those who help themselves. I trust the Committee will not wipe out occupational diseases altogether. Let us not make the fact of the Government not having given us information an excuse for doing an injury to injured workers and to widows and orphans. I hope the Committee will reinstate the provision regarding industrial diseases.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Probably it was unfortunate that the clause had to be struck out, but the Leader of the House is largely responsible for its deletion. Last week I put up to the hon. gentleman certain facts and asked him various questions on the basis of them. Up to the present the Minister has kept silence on the subject. One question I

put to him was, how many miners are working to-day who are suffering from the disease in some form or other?

Hon. J. Cornell: That is impossible to tell.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Subject to Mr. Ewing's amendment striking out the words "coming to Western Australia," the clause would have meant that before the employer accepted responsibility regarding these various diseases, the worker would have to furnish a medical certificate. I was astonished at Dr. Saw's opposition to that proposal, especially in view of his long experience in association with the A.M.P. Society here. The Bill proposes to inflict upon the employer the whole responsibility for the men at present employed on the gold mines, irrespective altogether of the fitness or otherwise of those men. I am heartily in sympathy with the men, and want to do something for them; but it is outrageous to ask the employers to shoulder such a responsibility. The premium required to cover the risk would be very heavy. Assuming that there are 3,500 miners in Western Australia at present—

Hon. E. H. Harris: That is in excess of the actual number.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Assuming there are 3,500 miners employed when the Act comes into operation, the maximum liability, £750 for each man, will mean for the mine owners a responsibility of £2,625,000. It would be a serious blow to the industry if that burden were imposed upon it. The difference between the Bill and the Queensland Act is that in Queensland the compensation for death is limited to £400, or 50s. per week, whereas in Western Australia it is to be £750, or 30s. per week. Despite that disparity, in seven years the State insurance scheme in Queensland has lost £87,000. Of that amount the Queensland Government transferred from other departments £66,000, leaving a loss of £21,000. A large proportion of the miners at work to-day are suffering from phthisis. Without a medical examination of the men, the mine owners will be saddled with a huge bill for insurance covering their risks. Under the Miners' Phthisis Act the Government have to share that responsibility. The clause providing for medical examination would to a certain extent meet the position, but if that clause be not accepted the Bill will mean a very serious burden on the mine owners. Dr. Saw told us that for the medical examination an army of medical men would be required. However, I am sure those medical men would be equal to the occasion; and it is clear that, given the medical examination, the mine owners could take their share of the responsibility.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I hope the clause will be reinstated. It would be of great advantage to the Committee if the Government would indicate what they propose to do and when they are prepared to do it. Mr. Duffell said that, assuming there were 3,500 miners employed, and the risk was £750 per head of those miners, the mine owners would be faced with a liability of £2,625,000. In the first place the total number of men employed in mining in this State is 6,285. Of these there are employed in the gold mining industry 2,592 above ground and 2,755 below ground, or a total of 5,347. Therefore 85.02 per cent. of the men employed in mining are engaged in gold mining, and of that number there are on the East Coolgardie Goldfields 2,870 men, showing a percentage of 53.67 of the total number employed in the industry. It is true that if Mr. Duffell's figures were correct there would be a very large liability on the mine owners, assuming that all the men met with an accident or died on the one day; otherwise the liability would be spread over a period. For Mr. Duffell's supposititious number of 3,500 men the mining companies to-day are carrying a liability of £1,750,000. That is on the payment of £500, and it is proposed to increase it by £250, which would raise the liability by £875,000. However, the actual number of men employed below ground is 2,755, and it is the men below ground who are more particularly susceptible to phthisis.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: It is only the men below ground.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: No, there are other men employed in dusty places on the surface, as, for instance, about the mill. However, it will be seen that the liability of the mine owners, although great, is not by any means as great as Mr. Duffell would have us believe. As regards the statement made by Mr. Duffell concerning workers' compensation in Queensland I have before me the Auditor General's report of that State for 1923-24 wherein are given the figures since the inauguration of State insurance. These include the figures relating to miners' phthisis and we find that for the period from 1917 to 1924 there was a profit of no less than £248,925. There were only two years in which a loss was shown, that loss amounting to £35,740. This latter total deducted from the profit of £284,665 gave the total credit of £248,925. That is an effective answer to the figures quoted by Mr. Duffell, unless of course he extracted his to show exclusively those that related to miners' phthisis. It is difficult to ascertain the percentage of miners affected. The laboratory is the only means by which we can get that information. Members therefore will see the importance of reinstating the clause.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I can only repeat what I said before, that the Government have been considering a scheme, but none has yet been formulated. When the scheme has been decided upon, the proclamation of the Miners' Phthisis Act will be announced. It will also be necessary for the laboratory at Kalgoorlie to be ready for use.

Hon. E. H. Harris: It is ready now.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then all that is needed is the completion of the scheme. The Government have been in office for a few months only and have not had time to properly deal with the question. The proclamation of the Miners' Phthisis Act would mean that a number of men would be thrown out of employment and the Government would either have to pay them wages or find them other work.

Hon. J. Duffell: That is the position.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Therefore it is necessary to have a scheme ready in the first instance. There is no doubt that the Queensland scheme, in its application to the insurance fund, has not been a success, and the authorities there have been advised to increase the rate. I do not agree with the figures quoted by Mr. Duffell. Between 1915 and the end of June 1924, transfers totalling £47,199 were made from the Workers' Compensation Fund to the Miners' Phthisis Fund. Experience in that State shows that the rates originally fixed were too low and they have since been substantially increased. There is no doubt that the rates must be very high. In the first instance the rates imposed were practically on a par with those imposed for other diseases. I assure members that when the Government gets into recess the question of preparing the scheme will engage their attention.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Minister told the Committee that the reason why the Miners' Phthisis Act had not been proclaimed was that its proclamation would mean that a number of men would be taken out of the mines and work would have to be provided for them elsewhere. Exactly the same thing will happen if we pass this clause. Do members think that the mine owners employing miners will accept the responsibility of occupational diseases? Will they keep on those men whom we are led to believe are more or less diseased? If we pass this clause, the mine owners will insist upon examination straight away. We know what happened in Tasmania and New Zealand and the same thing will happen here. Mine owners will have only one defence, namely, examination, and if the men cannot pass it, out they will go. Under Subclause 8 an employer will be obliged to prove that a man did not contract the disease whilst working for him. There is a responsibility to put on the employer! I am satisfied that if the clause is reinstated, the one section that

will not benefit from the reinstatement will be the miner. My object at the present time is to force the hands of the Government in putting the Miners' Phthisis Act into force. If the Government do that, there will be a preliminary examination, and none but healthy men will be employed below in the mines. What will happen too will be that when a man working below is found to be suffering to a limited extent, he will be brought to the surface. The clause will not be reinstated if I have my way. How is the employer to know the condition a worker was in 12 months prior to the examination? Why should the employer be made responsible for an unknown quantity? We hear that practically all these men are more or less affected. Is it to be left to the mine-owner or the pearly, for he will be brought into it as well, to show that the man was physically fit 12 months before the claim was made? The employer will have a much more difficult task than the employee who should know his own condition. In self-defence the worker who finds that his condition is becoming affected should get out of the mine.

Hon. H. STEWART: While fully in sympathy with the object the Government have in view, the more one considers the clause the more it is clear that it will not operate fairly. Occupational diseases should form the subject of a special Bill. Some such legislation is long overdue in connection with the mining industry but, as proposed, the provision will be most severe in its retrospective effect. It will be exceedingly difficult for the employer to prove that the disease had not occurred within the 12 months. It is clear that the condition of the worker may have been built up during a period of years prior to the time when he worked on a particular mine. In addition, he may have worked in many mines. The necessity for some protection for the worker is admitted, but owing to the present condition of the mining industry the question arises as to whether the proposal is in the interests of the employee and of the industry itself. Would it not be a fair thing to start with the present conditions and make those responsible realise the obligations cast upon them? The Government of the day could well impose upon the general taxpayer the duty of meeting obligations consequent upon the formulation of a scheme under which those unable to continue in the mining industry should receive the necessary assistance. In 1917 there were 18,000 men engaged in the mining industry as against the 6,000 now.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That is not so.

Hon. H. STEWART: If hon. members look up the statistics they will find that the figures I quote are correct. When the number of men engaged in an industry is lowest, that is the most favourable time to deal with such a problem. I suggest that

the Minister should take into consideration the formulation of a scheme in preference to going on with the clause.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It is rather regrettable that at this late stage of the proceedings we should have to fight on this all-important question. For the time being we can eliminate all occupational diseases other than those referred to by Mr. Holmes, such as compressed air illnesses and those peculiar to metalliferous mining. It is generally accepted to-day that the other diseases amount to nothing, not three per cent. of the whole. Mr. Dodd, in a few excellent remarks to-day, confirmed the attitude I have taken up before. He said that if the provisions relating to miners' diseases were removed by the Bill, two parties would be more or less equally blameable—those desirous of eliminating the diseases from the Bill, and the Government themselves. Those who desire to eliminate occupational diseases contend that the mining industry should know where it stands and should not be expected to carry an accumulated load. On the other hand, the Minister has stated that the Government are considering a scheme and, although the measure does not make any provision for that scheme, the Act will not be proclaimed until the scheme is suitable to those to whom it will apply. The Government are not in a position to make an announcement regarding the scheme now and it would seem that we are likely to be hoisted on the point of despair. The Minister says that the Miners' Phthisis Act will be proclaimed when that scheme is ready. The question of compensation never entered into the discussion when that measure was being dealt with. The Act was for the specific purpose of discovering men working underground who were suffering from tuberculosis. The duty was cast on the Government to provide men removed from the industry with work elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to discuss the clause of the Bill and not another Act.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not doing so. I am merely dealing with a measure, referred to during the debate, that will probably be proclaimed before the Bill under discussion. That Act imposes upon the Government the obligation to find work for the tuberculous men taken from the mines. That will remove those men from the purview of this measure. If it does not, the Miners' Phthisis Act will not have attained the object for which it was passed. It was not intended that such men should become a charge upon the mining industry. The Minister said that men suffering from pneumoconiosis or silicosis are to be notified of their condition, and it will be optional whether they leave the mines or not. Such men, I think, would have a claim under this measure.

The fate of the Bill will probably depend upon whether the Government are prepared to make a pronouncement as to the future. I appeal to the Minister to make a pronouncement.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: He has already said he cannot do any more than he has done.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Almost half the Committee say the industry should not be expected to carry the accumulated load as revealed by the medical examination. The Government have said the industry will not be expected to.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And the Bill says it will be.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Undoubtedly. If the Government are convinced that it would not be in the interests of the industry to have to carry the accumulated load, they should make a definite pronouncement that the measure will not be proclaimed until a general survey of the miners has been made, and that the men excluded will not be a full charge on the industry. If the Minister would go so far as to say that the men excluded would become only a 50 per cent. charge on the industry, this clause would probably be restored to the Bill. If the Government were prepared to carry half the accumulated load, this vexatious question might be settled, as it was settled in New South Wales. There would be nothing wrong in making a pronouncement such as that. It will have to come sooner or later, and the Government would be applauded for tackling the problem.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you think this Bill, if it passes, will be applied to mining?

Hon. J. CORNELL: We have the definite assurance of the Minister that it is not intended to proclaim the measure until such time as a general survey of the miners can be made.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Then what is the good of the Bill? We shall be sitting again before that comes about.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We have reached the stage in a controversy that has extended over 20 years—

The CHAIRMAN: I wish the hon. member would discuss the proposed new clause and not the Bill.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is practically the Bill as regards industrial diseases, and the inclusion or exclusion of the clause is all that matters to me as a mining representative. We have reached practically a crisis, and it would be regrettable to lose the benefit of the measure for the sake of a pronouncement as to the industry carrying the accumulated load.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: So much detail has been imported into this discussion, that we are losing sight of the real principle involved in the clause. The whole point is whether we are going to bring in a

measure dealing with industrial diseases. I wish to speak of diseases other than miners' phthisis. I think of the pronouncement of Mr. Stewart, who said we could not have a better time for bringing in a schedule dealing with industrial diseases, other than miners' phthisis, than when our industries are in their infancy and we would be inflicting no hardship on anyone by specifying the load for budding industry to carry. If that represents the view of the Committee, it is not necessary to stress the importance of including industrial diseases, other than miners' phthisis, because in doing so we shall only be bringing our laws on to a level with the legislation in other parts of the world, which we undoubtedly should adopt if we wish to be considered a civilised community. Various views have been expressed about miners' phthisis. Mr. Nicholson said this measure had been prematurely conceived. Mr. Holmes last night said he did not think the clause had been given sufficient consideration. I have been fully expecting other members to say the time was not opportune or the question was not ripe. I understand Mr. Stewart considers the question is over-ripe. Mining has been creating this disease for 30 years to my knowledge, and during that time the industry has done practically nothing towards stopping the disease or recompensing the people suffering from the disease. I take the attitude that there is a moral obligation on the industry to recompense the sufferers and their families, and because of that I consider we should no longer dilly-dally, merely because the Government will not declare exactly what they intend to do. Mr. Holmes has argued as though it were the intention of the Government to proclaim this measure to-morrow. The Minister has told us there is no intention on the part of the Government to bring this clause into operation until they have prepared a scheme. For that scheme they will require the assistance and co-operation of the mining industry and of the insurance companies, because any scheme lacking their co-operation is bound to fall to the ground. I have indicated what in my opinion would be the best course for the Government to pursue. If the industry were flourishing then it might be a fair thing to put the whole of the burden on the industry, and say, "You have created this disease; you are to carry the responsibility." Some members argue that a mine which opened only last year will have its men pulled out and will be held liable for compensation, although the men afflicted did not contract the disease in that mine. I ask those members to bear this in mind: The mines are gradually creating this disease, and in the future the burden will have to be borne by the mines. Now that the industry is declining it is not practical politics to put upon it the whole burden of this liability. In spite of that, I do not consider this Committee is justified

in declining to include miners' phthisis in the list of industrial diseases.

Hon. J. Duffell: Without medical examination?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: If there is to be no medical examination, and if we are not to start with perfectly healthy employees in the mines, the Government should assume some part of the load. If members refuse to make miners' phthisis an industrial disease, they will deprive the Government of the power to declare it as such.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What is the objection to medical examination?

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The men will refuse to be examined lest they should be deprived, without compensation, of their means of livelihood. Furthermore, it will take a long time to examine 3,000 men for miners' complaint, and afterwards to grade them, and all the time the disease would be going on and the men would be refused compensation. If there is to be no examination, the Government should go to the assistance of the industry, but the mines should not get off scot free. I hope the Committee will reverse the decision arrived at last night. Mr. Holmes secured the deletion of the clause on a most inadequate speech, and on the score that Malay divers in the North-West should get compensation because they suffered from paralysis. Not only did he invite the Malay to commit suicide, so that his dependants might get the full amount of compensation, but he invited this Committee to commit hara-kiri.

Hon. J. EWING: Those who voted for the elimination of these diseases are just as anxious as other members to do their duty by the miners. My object is to place upon the Government the responsibility of these medical examinations. I want the clause re-instated. It should not be said of this Chamber that it denied to the goldfields miners that which is their due. We have to determine what shall be done in the event of an examination being made of the miners and of many of them being thrown out of employment. Once we have provided for the afflicted men there will be no further difficulty. The Minister said the Act would not be proclaimed until everything was in readiness, and the responsibility rests with the Government to do that which is necessary. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the clause proposed to be re-instated—
"Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this section contained, the provisions herein relating to industrial disease shall have no force or effect until provision has been made for the following
(a) the medical examination of all employees engaged in the mining industry,
(b) adequate provision by the Government for employees who may, by reason of such examination, be deprived of employment in the mining industry.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What will be the good of the Bill if you put that in?

Hon. J. EWING: We will then know that the Government cannot do anything that will injure the industry.

The Colonial Secretary: I could not accept the amendment.

Hon. J. EWING: I shall have to see what is done with respect to the reinstatement of the clause. The carrying of the amendment will settle the policy of the Government regarding industrial diseases. If the amendment is not carried, members will have an opportunity to consider whether, in view of that circumstance, they will reinstate the clause.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I said I could not support Mr. Ewing's amendment. The latter part of it is indefinite, and the amendment itself is an effort to hamper the Government in carrying out their scheme. It shows a want of confidence in the Government, and represents an unnecessary interference.

Hon. H. SEDDON: After what Dr. Saw has stated, every member should seriously consider the step he will take in voting out the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment now before the Chair.

Hon. H. SEDDON: We now have an opportunity to enable the Government to obtain from the Chamber of Mines a reply different from that which was given on the last occasion, when the Chamber of Mines declared that they were not prepared to discuss the matter. If this clause is reinstated, the Government will be able to reopen negotiations with the Chamber of Mines. The present charge on the mining industry for insurance of workers is 52s. 6d. per £100 of wages. The new charge, on the basis of the Queensland figures, would be about 80s. per £100 of wages. Taking the average wage on the Golden Mile at £240, the present charge represents 131s., and the new charge would represent 200s. The new charge would be equivalent to about 8d. per day per man. Parliament has already given the mining industry consideration to the extent of 1s. 2d. per ton. The 8d. per day per man would not be an undue charge on the industry, especially considering the way in which the methods of the industry could be brought up to date. I trust the Committee will enable the Government to get this outstanding evil dealt with.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Mr. Ewing's amendment expresses what was obviously the intention of the Leader of the House when he said it was the Government's desire to formulate a scheme whereby they would undertake certain responsibilities in connection with the mining industry. The hon. gentleman added that the Government had been unable to present that scheme because they had only recently come into power. Taking the clause with the amendment, one

sees that there is not a word about the proposed scheme. I believe every member desires to give relief and compensation in connection with industrial diseases; but, still, we feel that by this clause we are not securing the safety of either the worker or the industry. Though both parties, the one introducing the legislation and the other opposing this clause, wish to achieve the same end, they have been unable to arrive at common ground. As the Minister states that he cannot accept the amendment, obviously the only way to deal with the clause is to adhere to the vote given last night, and exclude the provision. The Government should bring forward a new Bill with a comprehensive scheme setting out the terms upon which they will undertake to see that the miner deprived of his employment shall be compensated for such loss of employment, the industry not being left to bear the whole burden of this industrial compensation, but the Government sharing the responsibility. Under this Bill the Government are not taking one iota of a responsibility in which they should participate. In the circumstances I must vote against the reintroduction of the clause.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	11
Majority against				1

AYES.

Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	(Teller.)
Hon. J. Nicholson	

NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. W. H. Kitson	(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. J. E. Dodd

Amendment on the new clause thus negatived.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I want to reply to what Dr. Saw said just now. Generally he is quite fair, but on this occasion he was unfair and unwittingly misleading to the House. He said that if we did not accept the clause the House would be committing hara kiri. When it is remembered what the House has done in this respect, I do not think Dr. Saw was justified in reflecting on members in that manner. This House dealt with this question in 1922. The Government reserved the right to proclaim the

Miners' Phthisis Act when they thought fit. It has not yet been proclaimed, and now it is attempted to hold the House responsible for the inactivity of the Government. In the Bill before us the House has passed a schedule that has no counterpart in any other country. Yet we are told the House will be committing hara kiri if it does not pass the Bill! All I have to say is that if we keep on in the way we are going, our industries will all be killed, and it will not matter much what the House may do. Dr. Saw says this thing has drifted on for 30 years without anything being done. I repeat that the House dealt with the question two years ago. In any case, the thing will drift on, even if the clause be reinstated, for we know that nothing will be done until the scheme now in the air is finalised. I will oppose the new clause.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I have nothing to retract, and I hope the House will agree that I have nothing to apologise for. I said that I had never known an important clause to be voted out on a more unimportant speech than that delivered by Mr. Holmes. The only thing he had to advance was a story about some unfortunate Malays in Broome, in addition to which he told us what he intended to do for his constituents in the North. However, I do not suppose that anything I may think or say could for a moment influence a single vote in this Chamber, and so it is not necessary for me to take up any further time.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	10

Majority for	1
--------------	----	----	---

AYES.	
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. W. Hickey	(Teller.)

NOES.	
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. J. Duffell
	(Teller.)

PATR.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. J. E. Dodd

New clause thus passed.

Postponed Clauses 7 and 8—agreed to.

Postponed Clause 21—Addition of Third Schedule:

Hon. G. W. MILES: I should like to know whether this compressed air illness is to be confined to the mining industry, or to be extended to cover pearl shell diving. If it be applied to the pearling industry it will represent a big handicap on that industry. I move an amendment—

That to the description of process the words "in connection with mining" be added.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If Mr. Miles wishes to confine this compressed air illness to mining, he should move to transpose it to the group having the common description of process "mining or quarrying, or stone crushing or cutting." If we adopt the amendment we shall eliminate the claim of the white diver.

Hon. G. W. Miles: There is very little white diving done.

Hon. H. STEWART: There are many instances where compressed air is an important factor and therefore we should not restrict its use to mining.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I intend to test the feeling of the Committee as to whether the clause should apply to the pearling industry. I want this industry excluded. We know that diving is done in southern waters, but it is for a different purpose and it is almost invariably done in shallow water.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Why should the pearling industry be excluded?

Hon. G. W. MILES: If it were included it would mean that everything connected with the industry would have to be readjusted.

Hon. J. Cornell: What wages do the divers earn?

Hon. G. W. MILES: They get wages and their keep and so much per ton on the shell they raise and a commission on the pearls they find. Moreover, if we are going to allow the Bill to apply to coloured divers, we shall have broken down solicitors in the North making all sorts of claims. I move an amendment—

That after "compressed air illness: any process carried on in compressed air" the words "other than in the pearling industry" be added.

Hon. T. MOORE: Whilst I believe in a white Australia, I submit that when we allow men to come into this country, I do not care what their colour be, we should give them a fair deal. I am going to vote in the direction of seeing that those people who carry on pearling operations shall come into line with other industries. From what I gathered whilst I was at Broome, divers, or at any rate most of them, will be exempt from the operations of this measure because they earn over £400 a year.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I feel disposed to provide that part of the Bill shall not come into operation until a given date after proclamation. Then we shall probably find out where we are and be able to so circumstance ourselves.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What would you gain by that?

Hon. J. CORNELL: We would find out where we were.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	8
				—
Majority for	5	

AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. A. Greig	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. J. Holmes	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. W. H. Kitson	Hon. E. H. Gray
	(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. J. E. Dodd

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported with further amendments and the report adopted.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Received from Assembly.

As to First Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Before moving the first reading of the Bill, I wish to announce that, as I have been notified by Mr. Lovekin that he proposes to take certain action at this stage, I shall be obliged to make my speech in support of the measure now instead of at the second reading stage.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I thought the Appropriation Bill was the next to be dealt with.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This Bill has just been received from the Assembly by Message.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Will you not let us see that Bill?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then I will move—

That consideration of the Message be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

Question put and passed.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [9.38] in moving the second reading said: This Bill follows the same lines as in previous years and covers the whole of the Government's expenditure with the exception of that already dealt with by special Acts. The total expenditure provided for on the Revenue Estimates is £8,353,272 and on the Supplementary Estimates £7,108, making a grand total of £8,360,380. Of that amount the portion covered by special Acts amounts to £3,334,851, leaving £5,025,529 requiring appropriation now. In addition to this there is in respect of the Sale of Government Property Trust Account, £34,186; of the General Loan Fund Account, £4,413,606; of the Land Improvement Loan Fund, £23,700; and on account of the Advance to Treasurer, £500,000. Thus, the total requiring appropriation is £9,997,021. Of this Supply Bills have already sanctioned amounts covering £4,013,500, leaving £5,983,521 still to be dealt with by the Bill. In addition there is last year's excess expenditure under "Advance to Treasurer" that has to be dealt with. The schedules to the Bill clearly set out the position. Schedule "A" shows the amounts covered by the Supply Bills and by this Bill. Schedules "B," "C," "D," and "E" show the appropriation of amounts included in the revenue, Sale of Government Property Trust Account, Land Improvement Loan Fund Account, and General Loan Fund Estimates and the Advance to Treasurer Account respectively. Schedules "F," "G," and "H" show the excess expenditure last year under the Advance to Treasurer. Last year's transactions on revenue account proved better than was estimated. The deficit was £229,158 instead of £298,683, as was anticipated. Both the revenue and the expenditure exceeded the estimate. The actual revenue was £7,865,595, being £323,304 more than was anticipated, while the expenditure was £8,094,753, an increase of £253,779 over the estimate. A further improvement in the general position is expected this year. Coming now to the transactions for this year, the deficit is estimated at £188,967, which is £46,684 less than the year's contribution to the sinking fund. As compared with last year's deficit of £229,158, this represents a reduction of £40,191. It is expected that the revenue should return £8,164,305, which will be

£298,710 more than last year, and that the expenditure will be £8,353,272, being £258,519 more than last year. To this must be added the amount provided on the Supplementary Estimates, namely, £7,108. Every effort has been made to keep down expenditure, and on the whole this has been done with success. There are, however, a few instances where the expenditure is above that of last year, the principal items being Agriculture, £9,397; Education, £12,347; Public Health, £3,904; Justice and Police, £2,275; and Public Utilities, £37,615. But these are largely balanced by decreases in other departments. The main cause of the total increased expenditure, £8,353,272, as compared with £8,094,753 last year, is the interest bill which is £2,874,934 this year, as against £2,607,416 last year, an increase of £267,518. The sinking fund also shows an increase of £9,090, making a combined total of £276,608, compared with the total increases on the whole of the Estimates of £258,519. The interest and sinking fund payments have grown considerably year by year, the amount in 1914 being £1,384,096 and last year £2,833,977, showing an increase of over 100 per cent. in 10 years. When the Government carry almost the whole burden of the development of the State, as well as conducting various public utilities controlled elsewhere by boards, loan expenditure must increase and consequently the interest and sinking fund payments must increase in like proportion. A few years ago money was fairly cheap and plentiful. Now it is harder to get, and interest rates are in consequence very much higher. The interest bill will get still higher as earlier loans at low rates of interest are converted at a higher rate of interest. A very large proportion of our interest is recovered from borrowers, but there is no way of recovering the increased interest on moneys advanced to them from loans originally at a low rate and now converted at a higher rate of interest. The increased revenue this year comes principally from recoups of interest on account of advances to individuals and from public utilities. The former is included with other revenue under the head of "Treasury," the total of which is £839,000, as against £708,375 last year, an increase of £130,625, almost all on account of interest recoups. There is a heavy falling off in income taxation, due mainly to assessments being more up to date at the end of last year than at the end of the preceding year. The carry over of taxation from 1922-23 to 1923-24 was estimated at £267,586, and from 1923-24 to this year at £167,927; approximately £100,000 in favour of last year. But for that, taxation should have returned as much this year as last. Other direct taxation shows slight increases, the principal being £5,824 under stamp duty. Public utilities show a gratifying estimated increase for the year of £152,061; due largely to railways, £130,106; tramways, £19,598; electricity supply,

£11,204; and metropolitan water supply, £10,133. The only decrease of moment is State batteries £10,435, brought about by a change in the system of placing recoups of tailings advances to a suspense account, instead of as in past years, to revenue. The increase under railways last year was very marked, and this utility came within measurable distance of paying interest and sinking fund in addition to working expenses, the shortage being £30,707. This year we should more than wipe that amount off, there being a margin of estimated revenue over expenditure of £1,000,000. Public utilities as a whole showed a deficiency of £23,709 only, as compared with £250,821 in the previous year, an improvement of £227,112. In 1920-21 the shortage was £715,167. As public utilities are a fair index to the general prosperity of the State, this is considered highly satisfactory. To the end of November, the actual results on Consolidated Revenue Account were £16,200 worse than for the same period of last year. The following statement shows the position:—

	1923/24. 5 months.	1924/25. 5 months.	Increase.
Expenditure ...	£ 3,076,009	£ 3,236,592	£ 160,583
Revenue ...	2,510,066	2,660,443	144,383
Deficiency ...	555,943	576,143	16,200

There are many reasons for the increased deficiency this year. Interest and sinking fund payments for the five months are above last year's by £135,217; and railway expenditure by £29,648; while income taxation collections are lower by £61,580. At the same time there is no reason to believe that the deficit for the year will be greater than was estimated. Interest recoups to revenue will be heavier than last year, and will be greater as the year advances. Very little in this direction comes in before the end of December. Railway revenue, which is at present £56,573 above last year's, will show a much greater increase when the harvest is being handled. Taxation will improve when the taxation Acts are passed and the assessment notices can be sent out. Last year, as I have already pointed out, there was a very large carry over of taxation from the previous year. This accounts for the falling off in the income tax collections for the first five months of this year, as compared with last year. The latter half of the year is always much better than the first half, and this year should prove no exception. There has been practically no change in departmental operations this year. As pointed out, an increase as compared with last year is shown under "Agriculture" of £9,397. This is due to increases of the advisory staff; to the opening of an experimental farm on sand plain country at Wongan Hills; and to the taking over of the Avon-

dale farm previously controlled by the Lands Department. On the latter, it is the present intention to hold dairy stock for the group settlements. The Education Department shows an increase of £12,247 over last year. Everything possible was done to reduce the expenditure. We all know we are faced with an ever increasing expenditure for education as the population increases. The only thing we can do is to see that no unnecessary expenditure is incurred. During last year a further number of group schools were opened, and there are at present 33 in the group areas and seven on the Peel Estate. The opening of the Albany High School also adds to the expenditure for this year. It will be seen that the Medical Department have asked for £3,904 more than last year. This also is largely the result of group settlement. New hospitals have been opened at Margaret River, Karridale, Northcliffe and Denmark, and an additional block has been added to the hospital at Busselton. Hospitals have also been built at Boyup Brook, Kukerin, and Corrigin and one is under construction at Katanning. The expenditure provided for under the Sale of Government Property Trust Account is £34,186 and follows lines similar to previous years. This is an appropriation of Government property sales fund receipts, which amounted to £33,570 last year. Of this amount £19,208 was what is termed loan receipts and £14,362 revenue and trust receipts. These receipts represent sales of all classes of property, both loan and revenue, received outside the year in which the purchase of the property took place. They also include repayments of advances or for services rendered from Loan Fund. From the General Loan Fund last year's expenditure was £3,936,933 as against an estimated expenditure of £4,474,065. There was also an expenditure of £238,563 from Loan Suspense. The estimated expenditure for this year is £4,413,606, slightly less than last year's estimate, and after adjustments on account of Loan Suspense, slightly more than last year's expenditure. Last year's Loan Suspense Account expenditure is included in the total of £4,413,606 asked for. Deducting this, the net estimate is £4,175,043. Practically the whole is for works actually in hand or authorised by the late Government. More than half—£2,229,442—of the total estimate is for the development of agriculture. Group settlements absorb altogether £1,154,000; this amount being made up of £1,000,000 for group expenditure direct, and £154,000 for roads and drainage. Assistance to individuals in various forms accounts for £2,100,157; £750,000 being for Agricultural Bank advances. Railways, tramways and electricity require £629,000 and water supplies £669,000. Expenditure which should be directly interest earning totals £3,389,200, and of the balance of approximately

£800,000, the bulk will earn interest indirectly. The only railway proposed to be started by the Government is the Lake Grace-Newdegate line, to which we were committed by the late Government's land settlement policy. Although the amount asked for on the Loan Estimates is large, it was, in view of the commitments, impossible to reduce it further. Our loan indebtedness is high. At 30th June last the gross public debt was £62,765,782; and at 31st March, 1924, the Sinking fund was £9,373,572; leaving a net public debt of £53,392,210. The net public debt per head is £148 7s. 6d. Although undoubtedly high, it must be remembered that we in this State do things done in the other States by public bodies as for instance—water supplies, harbour trusts, tramways and electricity supply and many others. On the whole, our loan expenditure has been wisely invested. Of the net debt of £53,392,210 we had at the 30th June, 1924, invested in public utilities £30,841,698; Agricultural Bank, etc., £10,752,940; Lands and Works Department and Soldier Settlement £628,622, and trading concerns £2,079,235.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Too much!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Regarding the Land Improvement Loan Fund, this is an appropriation of the amount to the credit of the fund formed by the transfer under special Acts of an amount of £15,000 each year from revenue to loan to compensate for the expenditure from loan each year for land surveys and other improvements. The appropriation of this fund is so far as possible restricted to development of agriculture. During the discussion on the Supply Bill Mr. Ewing and Mr. Lovekin asked for certain information. In reply to Mr. Ewing, by arrangement with the Loan Council, representing the Commonwealth and all States, this State's proportion of the Australian loan of £10,300,000 was fixed at £1,200,000. It was also agreed that all States should be free to go on the London market for their requirements there, which in the case of this State was fixed at £2,300,000. Only a limited amount was to be brought to Australia on account of the exchange situation. We have an understanding by which we can get more than £2,300,000 in London if necessary. Although money can in urgent cases be brought from London, the exchange rates are extraordinarily high, and the banks would not arrange to transfer any large sum. Any large transfers would have the effect of further increasing the exchange rate, and thus imposing a further tax on exporters of primary products. With regard to the point raised by Mr. Lovekin, I have received the following reply also from the Under Treasurer:—

On reference to the Estimates of the sale of Government property for the current financial year you will see that renovations and additions to public

buildings, hospitals, police quarters, are provided for, also that renovations to the Claremont Old Men's Home was charged to this fund last financial year. In the statement of receipts of the fund it will be observed that £14,362 7s. 10d. was paid in last year on account of sales of material charged to Consolidated Revenue, in previous financial years, see pages 122 and 123 of Estimates, 1924-25. A total of £107,994 has been paid into the fund on account of revenue. Regarding the sewerage of Perth to which Mr. Lovekin has drawn attention: the amount of £258,876 5s. 8d. has been paid into the fund, principally on account of repayment of sewerage house connections. The Metropolitan Water Supply has drawn from the same fund the amount of £253,116 13s. 4d., leaving a balance of only £5,759 12s. 4d. unappropriated. The sales of Government property fund which is governed by Act of Parliament, viz., No. 8/1907, consist of proceeds of sales of materials charged to loan and revenue votes of years prior to the last financial year. Until the 1st July, 1904, all such receipts were credited in the Treasury returns to the loan expenditure of previous financial years, a practice which involved the alteration of expenditure totals which had already been given to the world, apparently as final. These moneys are now being re-appropriated from year to year, departments having an opportunity, presented by an annual summary as above, of taking credit in their statements of capital expenditure for all such credits, debiting themselves in turn as for loan or revenue expenditure with payments made on their account from the reappropriation set out on the following pages. No money can be drawn from the fund except by appropriation by Parliament. Estimates of expenditure are submitted to Parliament each year and form part of the general Appropriation Act.

I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. J. Ewing, debate adjourned.

BILL—LOAN (£3,645,000).

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [10.3] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is necessary to enable the special programme of public works and services to be continued up to the end of the financial year, and until such further period as may be necessary pending a further authorisation being obtained. The amount of the loan is £3,645,000, this being £118,000 less than

the authorisation of last year, notwithstanding that £238,564 has been included to cover loan suspense items of last year. The balance unraised on the 30th June last, £1,239,138, will be absorbed by the State's share of the Commonwealth loan which has recently been floated. It is anticipated that a London loan for £2,000,000 will be placed early next year. In the meantime the London requirements are being met by bank overdraft at 4 per cent. The improved position in the London market is apparent by the issue of the £6,000,000 Commonwealth loan at 4½ per cent., the price of the issue being £97 10s. The last loan issued by the State was 5 per cent. at £98. The provision for works and services under this Bill is for an amount of £3,545,000. If we add the unexpended balance under previous loan Bills, this provides a total authorisation as detailed in the Loan Estimate of £7,201,347. The amount last year under this head was £7,593,198. The new works provided for are the Lake Grace-Newdegate Railway £50,000; the Norseman-Salmon Gums railway £20,000; the Brookton and Dale River railway £30,000; the Yarramony Eastward railway £30,000; dredges and dredging (purchase of new dredge) £45,000; State Steamships (new steamer to replace the "Eucla") £40,000; total, £215,000. Provision has also been included for such necessary items as agricultural group settlement £1,200,000; assistance to settlers £280,000; land settlement for soldiers £700,000; development of agriculture £30,000; railways, including £100,000 for rolling stock, £381,000; electric power station £75,000; water supply and sewerage £280,000; development of mining £100,000; public buildings, road and bridges, £155,400; and State Steamships £40,000.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is that in addition to the £40,000 for the "Eucla"?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is only one vessel, £40,000.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: You mentioned the item twice.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: First of all I gave a list of six new works of the present Government, and then a list of the new works in which are included the works approved by the previous Government, the total amount being £3,241,400. In the Second Schedule are proposals for the reappropriation of certain loan moneys. These contain the balances which are not required for the purpose for which they were originally authorised, and can therefore be made available for the works stated in the Third Schedule. A sum of £100,000 has been provided to cover the discount on flotations. Our last London £2,000,000 cost £79,565, or nearly 4 per cent. on the nominal amount, the issue price being £98. It is anticipated that a portion of the present authority will be raised at a lesser cost. The conditions

applicable to the London market are, however, at present uncertain. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

First Schedule:

Hon. J. EWING: There is an item here "electric power station, East Perth, £75,000." Will the Minister explain the policy of the Government with regard to the generation of electricity, and say whether the Collie scheme has yet received consideration? By that scheme we might obviate the expenditure of another £225,000 for an additional unit at East Perth. Mr. Taylor has recently attended a conference in London where all these big questions were discussed. Nothing is of more importance than cheap electricity. We do not know what information has been gathered as to the probable cost of the Collie scheme, or what the policy of the Government is. Is it intended to spend this £225,000 at East Perth, or place it at the disposal of engineers to make a beginning with the Collie scheme? A couple of years ago £300,000 was placed on the Estimates for additional machinery at East Perth. To this I took exception, and moved two motions in connection with the Collie scheme. If we are satisfied that electricity can be produced at Collie for half the rate it can be produced at in Perth, and the scheme is inaugurated, the benefits to the South-West as well as to the city would be incalculable. It will certainly mean cheap current for Perth. The cost of our power is extremely high when compared with the cost in other parts of the world. The Premier said the Government were anxious to do something but had not the money, and advised people in the South-West to carry out the work themselves. At the deputation which waited upon him I asked him if the Government would back this scheme, but he did not reply. He was sympathetic towards it, and his desire was to assist.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: My only knowledge of this matter has been gained from Cabinet discussions. The Minister for Railways, who has charge of the electricity work, stated some time ago that, owing to heavy demands on the power house, fairly large extensions of plant were necessary. That is what the item provides for. As regards Collie, the Minister for Railways has been down there making investigations, but matters connected with the suggested scheme have not reached the stage of coming before Cabinet. The Minister for Railways

may have come to some decision, but so far there is no decision of the Government as a Government.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am absolutely opposed to the policy of State trading, but I know that the Government intend to continue these concerns. During the time the "Kangaroo" was making profits, that money was taken for revenue; and now the Government propose an expenditure of £40,000 to build another ship. That is an entirely wrong policy. Further, if the Government intend to continue their service along the North-West coast, it is necessary for them to have an up-to-date ship, or possibly two up-to-date ships. The "Bambra" is a loss to the whole community; by to-night's paper I see that she is on fire again—for the fourth or fifth time.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not agree at all with the past methods of accountancy in the State Shipping Service. A large amount of profit earned by the "Kangaroo" was taken into revenue, and in a little time the "Kangaroo" was losing money and was being charged interest on an overdraft. As for the purchase of a second ship for the North-West trade, we must consider the state of the finances. Inquiries are being made as to whether some concession cannot be obtained from the British Government in this connection. It has been stated that in connection with vessels built in Britain, the British Government are prepared to grant a remission of three-fourths interest for five years.

Hon. A. Lovekin: If you read the report of the Select Committee on the State Shipping Service, you will see the details of the ships required.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The schedule should give fuller details of the proposed expenditure. There is an item of £150,000 for Metropolitan Water Supply. For group settlement there is an item of £1,200,000, for assistance to settlers £280,000; development of agriculture £30,000, and soldier settlement £700,000.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That money is all spent.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The sums are so substantial that one feels prompted to make some inquiry. I always understood that loans were for reproductive works. Here is an item of £10,000 for the Perth-Armadale road. Would the Minister classify the Perth-Armadale road as a reproductive work, and, if so, in what way is it reproductive?

The Colonial Secretary: I am not responsible for that expenditure.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It would be a benefit if the Minister would make a statement concerning the other items I have mentioned.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Of the amount set down for group settlement, a certain proportion has already been spent, and more will be spent in future. The only

information I could give it I brought down a pile of papers would be how much was spent on each group and how much each settler got. As regards Metropolitan Water Supply, Mr. Nicholson ought to be in a better position than I am in to give information. The question has lately been investigated, and much evidence has been published. I am only too willing to obtain for hon. members any information they desire in connection with matters of this kind, except where, for the time being, it is desirable to avoid publicity.

Hon. J. EWING: I thank the Minister for his explanation. There is an item of £9,000 for the State Brickworks.

The Colonial Secretary: That is for a new kiln.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I am not taking much interest in the schedule, because the money has been spent. An item I know something about is that of £150,000 for Metropolitan Water Supply. It is within our knowledge that Mephan Ferguson's contract for the pipes is £100,000 more than the amount of this item, and that up to the 30th June £50,000 odd had been spent on clearing and other works. Since then there has been a good deal of sinking. Therefore, when we pass these amounts it really does not mean anything.

Hon. H. STEWART: What are the Government's intentions as to the Albany-Denmark railway extension, a Bill for which was passed as a matter of urgency in connection with group settlement? Since that measure was enacted, settlement has extended 26 miles past the present rail head. Simultaneously, Parliament authorised an extension of the Tarnadun railway to junction with the Albany-Denmark line. The two authorised railways have not figured in a previous loan Bill and there is nothing in this schedule for them. I know that the responsibility does not attach to the present Government.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Of course a large proportion of the schedule is the responsibility of the previous Government, and I could not offhand give information respecting it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I expect all these works have been constructed and paid for by this time.

Schedule put and passed.

Second and Third Schedules—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

House adjourned at 10.32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 17th December, 1924.

	PAGE
Standing Orders Suspension	2422
Bills: Forests Act Amendment, Council's Amendments	2423
Traffic Act Amendment, Com., etc.	2424
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, returned	2442
Loan (£3,645,000), returned	2442
Fair Rents, Com., report	2442
Racing Restriction Act Amendment, 2a., etc.	2455

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

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

The PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.32]: I move—

That for the remainder of the session the Standing Orders be suspended so far as to enable Bills to be passed through all their stages in one day, and messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration on the day on which they are received.

This is the usual motion brought forward towards the end of the session. It has been passed generally at an earlier stage than the present. I give hon. members my assurance that the suspension of the Standing Orders will not be used for the purpose of forcing through any new Bills or other legislation against the wish of the House without affording ample opportunity for discussion.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [4.33]: I have no objection to the suspension of the Standing Orders. It is usual to adopt this course towards the close of the session in order to allow business to go through in one day. It is customary, however, to have some information from the Premier as to the business that we will be asked to deal with, and information, too, as to whether any new Bills will be brought forward.

The Premier: There will be no new Bills here. There may be a new Bill from the Council.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I will take a risk regarding a Bill coming from the Council if the Premier has in mind the Bill I am thinking of.

The Premier: Certainly I do not think we shall be overwhelmed with new Bills from the Council.

The Minister for Works: We shall get some new Bills from the Council all right. The titles may be old but the Bills themselves will be new when they come to us!