

Legislative Assembly,

Friday, 13th December, 1912.

	PAGE
Return: Local Option Poll Results	4696
Auditor General's Report	4696
Questions: Gwalia Hotel Charges	4696
Railway Construction, Wickopin-Merredin ..	4696
Immigration Agents' Bonus	4697
Govt. Pathologist, Resignation	4697
Estate Repurchase, Jelcobine	4698
Timber operations, Jarrahwood	4698
Papers presented	4697
Resolution: Observatory Reserve	4698
Bills: Mines Regulation Act Amendment, 3a.	4698
Govt. Trading Concerns, 3a.	4698, 4717, 4720
Wyalkatchem - Mount Marshall Railway, 3a.	4698, 4717
Workers' Homes Act Amendment, Council's Amendments	4699, 4720
Money Lenders, Council's Amendments	4701
Employment Brokers' Act Amendment, Council's Amendments	4701
Melville Water and Freshwater Bay Road, Returned	4702
Permanent Reserves, Returned	4702
Roads Act Amendment, Council's Amendments	4702
Land and Income Tax (No. 2), all stages	4709, 4717
Workers' Compensation, Council's Pressed Requests	4708
Appropriation, Returned	4709
Rights in Water and Irrigation, Council's Pressed Requests	4709, 4719
Interpretation Act Amendment, Returned ..	4717
Game, Returned	4717
Newcastle-Bolgart Railway Extension, Returned	4717
Hotham-Crossman Railway Extension, Returned	4717
Wagin-Bowdler Railway, Returned	4717
State Hotels (No. 2), Council's Pressed Requests	4717
Complimentary Remarks—Close of Session ..	4720

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3.30 p.m., and read prayers.

RETURN—LOCAL OPTION POLL RESULTS.

Mr. DWYER: On the 28th November the member for Subiaco (Mr. B. J. Stubbs) on my behalf asked that a return be laid on the Table showing the results at each polling booth in connection with the last local option poll. At the time I asked for the return I required it in connection with certain points and arguments on local option. The return was not supplied in time, and cannot be availed of now, and I understand it will be rather an expensive return and will take up a considerable amount of the time of some of the officers in the Electoral Department. With the permission of the House I wish to have this order discharged.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move to that effect.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion was carried, was it not?

Mr. DWYER: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then it is no longer in possession of the House.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It will be simply a waste of money. It is of no service and the compilation will put the State to considerable expense. If the House will permit the order to be cancelled—

Hon. Frank Wilson: Ignore it; the hon. member says he does not want it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is an order of the House and should be carried out.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member who is vitally concerned does not now require the information, and provided the House does not insist upon the resolution being carried out, there is no obligation on the Minister to supply the information.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Now that it has been placed on record I think the matter might be allowed to lapse.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the Table the concluding portion of the Auditor General's report for the year 1911-12.

QUESTION—GVALIA HOTEL CHARGES.

Mr. FOLEY (without notice) asked the Premier: Is it a fact that there is a saloon bar at the State hotel at Gwalia at which a higher price is charged for drinks than in the ordinary bar? If so, will the Premier have inquiries made with a view of abolishing the higher price.

The PREMIER replied: I am not aware whether there are two bars, but if there are and if a person likes to pay double the price in the saloon bar, I see no reason to prevent him from doing so.

QUESTION—RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, WICKEPIN-MERREDIN.

Mr. MONGER (without notice) asked the Minister for Works: Is it a fact that

a number of men have been discharged from the construction work on the Wickpin-Merredin railway? If so, what are the reasons for such dismissals?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: I have no knowledge of any men having been discharged.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Lands: 1, Report on the operations of the Agricultural Bank of Western Australia for the year ended 30th June, 1912. 2, Report of the Surveyor General for the year ended 30th June, 1912.

By the Premier: Return *re* Temporary Public Servants (ordered on motion by Mr. Dwyer).

By Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister: 1, Report of Proceedings by the Registrar of Friendly Societies under Friendly Societies Act, 1894, Benefit Building Societies Act, 1863, Co-operative and Provident Societies Act, 1903, Workers' Compensation Act, 1902, Truck Act, 1899. 2, Report of the Police Department for the year ended 30th June, 1912. 3, Report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies for the year ended 30th June, 1912. 4, Report of the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners for the year ended 30th June, 1912. 5, Report of the Superintendent of Public Charities for the year ended 30th June, 1912.

QUESTION—IMMIGRATION AGENTS' BONUS.

Mr. McDONALD asked the Premier: 1, What bonus is paid per capita to immigration agents in the United Kingdom for securing immigrants? 2, How much for an adult male? 3, How much for adult female?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The Government understand that the bonus paid by the State for each adult immigrant is £1. children under 12 half that amount. As regards nominated immigrants commission is only paid in a few cases. 2 and 3, The bonus payable is as above, irrespective of sex.

QUESTION—GOVERNMENT PATHOLOGIST, RESIGNATION.

Hon. FRANK WILSON asked the Honorary Minister: 1, Has the resignation of Dr. McClintock the Government Pathologist, Bacteriologist, etc., been accepted? 2, What was the cause of his resignation? 3, Who has been appointed Deputy Commissioner of Public Health and Acting Principal Medical Officer? 4, In this appointment were the Medical Officers of the Department consulted? 5, Was the recommendation of the Public Service Commissioner obtained? If not, why not? 6, Has the best available expert in the State been selected? If not, why not? 7, What are the selected officer's records, experiences, and professional qualifications? 8, Has he seen the Colonial Office and other records of Dr. McClintock? If so, does he not think them superior to any others considered? 9, Why was the appointment made without giving other officers in the Service an opportunity of advancing their claims? 10, Upon whose recommendation was the appointment made?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: 1, The resignation has been accepted by Cabinet, but has not yet been dealt with by His Excellency the Governor in Council. 2, Dissatisfied at not being appointed Acting Principal Medical Officer and Commissioner of Public Health during the absence of Dr. Hope on leave. 3, Dr. R. C. E. Atkinson, the senior medical officer at Head Office, who had previously filled the position during the Principal Medical Officer's absence from the State. 4, Yes, the Principal Medical Officer, Dr. Hope. 5, Acting appointments are outside the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commissioner. 6, Not in Dr. McClintock's estimation; he was the one person qualified. 7, Master of Arts, with Honours in Chemistry (University of New Zealand), Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery of Edinburgh University; Diploma of Public Health, Cambridge University; Acting Principal Medical Officer and Commissioner of Public Health, Western Australia, September-October, 1911—Good. 8, Yes. No. 9, The usual procedure was followed. 10,

The Honorary Minister (Hon. W. C. Angwin) after consultation with the Deputy Public Service Commissioner, the Under Secretary and the Principal Medical Officer.

QUESTION—ESTATE REPUR-

CHASE, JELCOBINE.

Mr. HARPER asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is he aware that the repurchased Jelcobine Estate is unused and uncared for at the present time? 2, Also that the buildings and fences may at any time be burnt by a bush fire? 3, Why has the estate not been subdivided and sold in accordance with the Act for the repurchase of estates?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, No; the estate has been under the supervision of the district surveyor since its purchase, and a caretaker has been employed for many months. 2, The caretaker's duties are to take steps to protect the buildings and fences from damage by fire. 3, The delay in dealing with the estate was due to the necessity for amending the original surveys. A plan of the subdivision is now being finally dealt with.

QUESTION—TIMBER OPERATIONS, JARRAHWOOD.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Whether he is aware that Millars' Combine have constructed a railway line into, or adjacent to Crown lands at the back of the combine's Jarrahwood concession? 2, Whether he is aware that it is alleged that the combine are removing logs from the Crown lands for milling purposes? 3, Whether permission has been granted or arrangements made to allow them to do so? 4, Will he have the necessary inquiry made and take proceedings against the combine if it is found they are illegally removing timber from Crown lands?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3 and 4, No special permission is required. The country is open Crown lands, and therefore available to anyone to cut timber under ordinary regulations governing license

and royalty. Consideration is however, being given to the question of protecting timber areas open in this way by reserving them for Government requirements.

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

- 1, Mines Regulation Act Amendment.
- 2, Government Trading Concerns.
- 3, Wyalkatchem-Mount Marshall Railway.

Transmitted to the Legislative Council.

RESOLUTION—OBSERVATORY RESERVE.

Council's Message.

Message from the Legislative Council received requesting concurrence in the following resolution:—"That in the opinion of this House the Government should not transfer any portion of the Observatory reserve to the Federal Government, and requests the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly therein."

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam): I do not propose to do more than formally move—

That the resolution be agreed to.

This is a perfectly reasonable request to make, and I hope the Government will see that no portion of this land is transferred to the Commonwealth, at any rate, not without consulting Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath): I would like to point out to the hon. member that the question of the transfer of the reserve is a matter entirely dependent on the disposal of the Observatory, and as pointed out by the Premier last night, owing to the representations which were made by scientific bodies in the United Kingdom, the question of the disposal of the Observatory has been deferred until the end of the financial year, in order that their desire to make representations to the Federal Government and to others may be carried out. This Government negotiated with the Federal Government in regard to the transfer of the Observatory but they are so far not prepared to take up the offer under the proposals submitted to them. If, however, at any

time the Federal Government decided to take over the Observatory, we have no power to prevent them from acquiring the reserve upon which the Observatory stands. Under a Commonwealth Act, provision is made for the compulsory acquisition of land, and the Federal Government can take that area, or any other area which it requires for public purposes, with or without our consent, and if they decide to take over the Observatory, they would also take over the reserve, and then it would be entirely a question with us of deciding on what terms it should be taken over. We would be powerless to say, "No, you shall not take the reserve." Under those circumstances, the resolution is only a pious expression of opinion.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (in reply): I hope the Minister will endeavour to retain the site in the possession of the State. Of course, I realise that, if the Federal authorities take over the Observatory, they may have the power to take over some portion of the ground, but so far as we can, we should retain it. The Federal authorities, when they take over our properties, we know by experience, are very slow in paying for them.

The Minister for Lands: I think you had better withdraw the resolution.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Let it go through.

Question put and negatived.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's requested amendments.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with a schedule of requested amendments which were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

No. 1, Clause 2—Add the following at the end of the clause:—"By striking out from the definition of the "worker" the word "three" and inserting "four":

The PREMIER moved—

That the amendment be made.

It was reverting to what had been originally introduced in the principal Act, when the salary of the worker was

set at £400. In another place this had been reduced to £300, but now they had reverted to the original figure.

Question passed, the Council's amendment made.

No. 2—Add the following new clause to stand as Clause 8:—Section 24, Subsection (1), paragraph (e) of the principal Act is amended by the insertion after the word "mortgage" of the words "or liability":

The PREMIER: Section 24 gave the board power to make advances for the erection of homes. Under the section there was power to discharge any mortgage on the holding, and now the amendment proposed to add after "mortgage" the words "or liability." He moved—

That the amendment be made.

Question passed, the Council's amendment made.

No. 3—Add the following new clause to stand as Clause 10:—Section 29, paragraph (c) of the principal Act is amended by omitting the words "six per centum per annum (but subject to a rebate as provided by section thirty)" and inserting the words "five per centum per annum" in lieu thereof:

The PREMIER moved—

That the amendment be not made.

The present conditions were that for an advance made from the Workers' Homes Board six per cent. had to be paid with a rebate of half per cent. for prompt payment. In the first place a home secured under the leasehold system only remained in the possession of the applicant so long as he actually resided in it and the applicant could only dispose of it to one purchaser, namely, the board, and the leaseholder could only get for the home what he had paid for it, less depreciation, whereas a freeholder could at any time dispose of his house to whomsoever he pleased, and transfer the mortgage. That permitted dummyming in workers' dwellings. Under the leasehold principle the home really belonged to the board until the payments were complete, and even after that the land continued to belong to the board. The conditions as between the freeholder and the leaseholder were altogether different. The freeholder did as he

liked with his home, just as if he had obtained the money from elsewhere. It was necessary that the board should have a working margin of security, and in his opinion $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. was little enough.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are right, it is cheap enough.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: While sorry to find himself in disagreement both with his leader and the Premier, he thought the freehold applicant should be on the same footing as the leasehold applicant. Why should not a man do as he liked with his own? He objected to discrimination. The man with the freehold had more security to offer than had the man with the leasehold. In the country districts the men who would borrow would be mainly men who owned small freehold blocks, and why should not the Premier treat them generously? If the Premier obtained 5 per cent. and did not make a bad debt he would be doing fairly well.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The reason for the discrimination was a very good one. So far as the leasehold was concerned, the provisions of the Bill were such that it would be difficult for the person holding it to do other than continue to hold it under the proposals embodied in the Bill for the purposes of a worker's home, but in the case of advances against freeholds for the erection of homes, certainly a very large percentage, as the payments increased in number, would pass out of the hands of those who held them and into the hands of persons holding a number of houses, and renting them out.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They must pay off first.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Where conditions were made more stringent in order to preserve the principle, it was obvious that we ought to give a little more consideration to the leaseholder in regard to the actual monetary terms, as against advances on freehold in connection with which it was known that the landlord element would creep in later on.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: One could understand the Premier charging nine

and 10 per cent. to bachelors but six per cent. was an unreasonably high rate of interest to charge married men. The Government should be cheerful givers, and as the Christmas season was approaching the Premier ought to be generous and allow the people who were to have the benefits of the Bill to have their money at as low a rate of interest as possible. There would be very few bad debts made, and very little risk. People ought not to be forced into compounds established for workers' homes.

The Premier: The amending Bill makes provision for that.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: As one believing firmly in the freehold he asked the committee to assist him in reducing the rate of interest.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Whilst the Government were rightly endeavouring to assist those persons who desired to have their own homes, they were by no means a charitable institution and must have regard to the value of money when making advances. The Premier was now borrowing money which would cost the State about $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and after he had paid the administration costs in connection with his workers' homes there would be very little left of the six per cent. The leaseholder was subject to many harrassing conditions, so many that probably he would not take advantage of the Bill, but the freeholder whilst debarred from speculating and required to get the approval of the Board to sell his property, yet had the advantage that he could sell out. Money obtained at six per cent. was cheap to-day for any private borrower, and cheap even if one could only get two-thirds or half the value of the property being mortgaged; and when an individual could get from the Government practically the whole value of his building to be put on his freehold he should pay six per cent., with of course the rebate of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. if he paid his instalments promptly. That was a very liberal provision which thousands of people ought to take advantage of. When money became cheaper, as it would later on when the disturbed state of things in Europe was

settled, it would be an easy matter to amend the Bill and reduce the rate of interest.

Question put and passed ; the Council's amendment not made.

Amendment No. 4 (consequential) not made.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

BILL—MONEY LENDERS.

Council's Amendments.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with schedule of 14 amendments, which were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair ; Mr. Dwyer in charge of the Bill.

Mr. DWYER : Before moving to accept *en globo* the amendments made by another place, he desired to express his gratitude to Mr. Ardagh for the able way in which he had piloted the Bill through the Council. He was accepting the amendments not altogether because he agreed with them, but because he was anxious that the Bill should be saved, for even with the amendments this would be a most useful piece of legislation. The rate of interest in all cases had been raised by the Council, and the coming into force of the Bill had been postponed from the 1st January to the 1st July. Why there should be that delay he did not know, because if there were any merits in the Bill the sooner it came into operation the better. Words had been inserted in the Bill so that a person must prove his bonafides, but now the onus of proof was changed.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Are you going to accept these amendments ?

Mr. DWYER : Yes ; not because he liked them but because he must. In New Zealand, 10 per cent. was the limit, but in Victoria it was 12½ per cent. Another place had seen fit to make the provision 12½ per cent., but had gone still further than the Victorian provision, because in Victoria, any person lending money at 12½ per cent. was

within the definition of a money lender, whereas under the Bill as amended by the Council this was struck out, and a person who lent money at any rate of interest did not come within the definition of a money lender. That was a serious defect. In Clause 5 the Council made provision that a money lender could trade in his own name or under an *alias* as he chose. In Clause 7 an omission had been remedied by inserting the word "material." He moved—

That the amendments be agreed to.

Question passed, the Council's amendments agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

BILL—EMPLOYMENT BROKERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with two amendments which were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair ; Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

No. 1, Clause 2—Strike out (ii.), A definition is inserted as follows :—"Prescribed" means prescribed or authorised by regulation under this Act.

No. 2, Clause 6—Strike out the words "Both such amounts shall be equal in every case, and shall not exceed the prescribed amount" :

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN : The Legislative Council had seen fit to strike out the provision for prescribing fees to be charged for employment brokers, but they had agreed to the provisions by which licensing courts should be the courts for licensing employment brokers, and by which factory inspectors would have control over employment brokers. The Council had also agreed that particulars should be given on every engagement. He moved—

That the amendments be agreed to.

Mr. NANSON : There was practically nothing left in the Bill, One was amazed at the Government agreeing to the

measure in such a disembowelled condition. Even if these people were put under factory inspectors, what powers had these inspectors over them?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It was important that particulars had to be disclosed when a person applied for an engagement. The inspection would be better under the factory inspectors who who would be able to oppose the granting of a license to persons not fit to hold licenses. It was advisable to accept the amendments.

Mr. NANSON: It only meant adding another couple of pages to the statute-book. As to the getting of information, it would be absurd for a man to seek an engagement without getting the particulars at the time, and as for as the other point, the police had ample power to deal with these registry offices.

Question passed, the Council's amendments agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

BILL—MELVILLE WATER AND FRESHWATER BAY ROAD.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BILL—PERMANENT RESERVES.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BILL—ROADS ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with five amendments, which were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair, the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was his intention to move that the whole of the amendments made by the Legislative Council be agreed to.

Mr. NANSON: What are the amendments and what is the effect of them?

No. 1, Clause 29, Subclause 2—After the word "area" in line 2, insert the words "and if so required by the roads board":

Mr. NANSON: That would permit the roads board to allow pocket handkerchief blocks. Were we to agree to that?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This practice gave the right to the roads board to decide, instead of the Bill deciding definitely, what the area should be. The board might alter the area if desirable. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2, Clause 29, Subclause 3—Add the following proviso:—"Provided that where a plan of subdivision embraces allotments both over and under half an acre in area the deposit payable under this subsection shall apply only to such portions of the said roads as abut on allotments of less than half an acre in area":

This would allow the provision in Subclause 3 to apply to an area under as well as over an acre. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 3, Clause 33—Strike out the words, "the end of the year 1913" and insert the words "the thirtieth day of June, 1914":

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This extended the time for the operation of the measure from 1913 to the 30th June, 1914, giving the Government more time in which to introduce a comprehensive measure. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 4—Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 25: "Section 203, Subsection 4 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the word "be," in line 14 thereof, the words "not more than":

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Subsection 4 of Section 203 dealt with valuations of gas mains, electric lines, etc.; the object of the amendment was

to say that the charge should not be more than 5s. per centum. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 5—Add a new clause as follows:—

“Where any rateable property is occupied by or leased to any person who has contracted to pay the rates thereon the occupier or lessee may appeal against any entry in the rate book in the same manner as if he were the owner of the said property and as if his name had been inserted in the rate book as such owner”:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This was giving the occupier the right to get on or off the rate book. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

Sitting suspended from 5.7 to 5.45 p.m.

BILL—LAND AND INCOME TAX (No 2).

All Stages.

Message received from the Governor recommending the Bill.

On motion by the Premier, Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) in moving the second reading said: I merely desire to explain to hon. members that it is now necessary to introduce this Bill imposing a land and income tax for the present year owing to the other measure having been rejected by the Legislative Council. Hon. members will notice by looking at Clause 2 that the land tax will be continued as at present “at the rate of one penny for every £1 sterling on the unimproved value as assessed by or under the said Act on all land chargeable with such tax,” and that the rebates, exemptions and deductions as provided in the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act, 1907 are allowed. In regard to incomes the existing rate is 4d. in the £ irrespective of the amount taxable, but

we propose to make a graduation from 4d. in the £ to 1s. in the £ in the manner suggested by the leader of the Opposition and other members, when the previous Bill was under discussion. Without any further words, I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Point of Order.

Mr. Nanson: A question arises on which it would be well to get a ruling as to whether this Bill is in order. In another place a Bill for imposing a graduated income tax was rejected, and I notice this measure also imposes a graduated income tax.

The Premier: I did not introduce a Bill to impose a graduated income tax.

Mr. Nanson: Undoubtedly the Premier did.

The Premier: That, together with other things. I admit that it included a graduated income tax.

Mr. Nanson: It made specific provision for a graduated income tax and undoubtedly that was the most important principle in the Bill. The Bill has been rejected, and if the hon. member can find a more important principle in the measure than the point as to whether a tax shall be graduated or whether it shall not be graduated I should like to hear it.

The Premier: No exception was taken to the graduation.

Mr. Nanson: It does not matter that no verbal objection was taken to the graduation. As a matter of fact, the Bill was rejected practically without discussion. A speech was made by the Colonial Secretary in moving the Bill, and a speech against it by another hon. member, and then the Bill was rejected without any other member of the House expressing an opinion on it at all; but as I pointed out, there was no more important feature in the Bill than the principle of a graduated income tax.

The Premier: The graduations are not the same. There is a different principle involved.

Mr. Nanson: Well, it would have been better for the Premier to have pointed out the difference.

The Premier : I distinctly said that the provisions in this Bill are on the basis suggested by hon. members, and are a different proposition altogether from those contained in the previous Bill.

Mr. Nanson : Clause 13 of the rejected Bill provides for an income tax at rates specified in the schedule, and previous to that we had an income tax in operation which did not recognise this principle of graduation at all. Now we find that this Bill introduces again the principle of a graduation of the income tax, and whether the graduation is the same, is not the point. The real question is whether the principle of a graduation has not been dealt with in another Bill, and whether this Bill does not also deal with the principle of graduation. It is not the details we have to deal with as much as the principle. The distinguishing feature of the tax hitherto existing and that which the Government wished to see existing was that in the one case it was not a graduated tax and in the other case it is graduated. A graduated tax has already been rejected by another place, and I submit that in accordance with the Standing Orders, the matter being one already decided this session, a Bill for a graduated income tax cannot be again introduced.

The Premier : The hon. member is entirely wrong in asserting that the present measure is the same in substance as the Bill rejected in another place. In the first place it must be remembered that under the existing law we are compelled to annually bring down a measure of this description imposing the rate of the land and income tax. Our proposal in the previous Bill embodied the land and income tax and the assessment machinery in the one measure, repealed the Dividend Duties Act and brought companies under the income tax.

Mr. Nanson : I say that is not a principle, but merely a matter of procedure.

The Premier : Those were the principles embodied in the Bill, namely, that we included in the one measure machinery for imposing a land tax and an income tax ; we repealed the Dividend Duties Act, and we brought companies under the income tax. There is no such principle

contained in this measure. The only principle in this Bill is in accordance with the existing law ; it is totally different from the Bill rejected by another place. In the graduation provisions a totally different system is adopted. If there was not a different principle in the rejected Bill, then there was no justification for the severe attack on the Government and myself by the *West Australian*, by members of another place, and also by members opposite on account of the graduations proposed in that Bill, and if there was a difference, the principles of the two Bills cannot be the same. Hon. members surely cannot argue that they are the same when they have to admit that there was a totally different proposition for graduations in the previous measure. The other measure was a machinery measure, a consolidating measure, and a repealing measure, and it brought about a taxation on a basis totally different from this. If this is the same in substance as the Bill defeated in another place there was no object in introducing another measure ; we could have simply introduced this one.

Mr. Nanson : You have taken portion of another Bill.

The Premier : The hon. member will find that any Bill has certain provisions the same as another Bill. That was so in the case of the Game Bill, the State Hotels Bill, and the Arbitration Bill. We had the same provisions to some extent in each of them, but they must be the same in substance, must have the same object in view, and have the same effect when in operation, but there is nothing of the same effect when in operation in the Bill rejected by the Council and the Bill now before the Chamber.

Hon. Frank Wilson : If we are to have a graduated income tax, then this is the form in which I wish to see it, but I am afraid that the Premier is courting disaster in another place by introducing this measure.

The Premier : We will get it in, don't worry. We will prorogue and then bring it in.

Hon. Frank Wilson : It is just as well that the Premier should know the

danger he runs and the rocks that he will wreck his taxation measure upon. I think my colleague was justified in drawing attention to this point.

The Premier: You are asking for the Bill to be thrown out.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Nothing of the sort. We raised a point of order so that the House may not stultify itself by doing something which it could not legally do under its Standing Orders.

Mr. Turvey: But you want the Bill to be disallowed.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That has nothing to do with it at all. We sent to the Legislative Council a machinery Bill, an assessment Bill including fresh taxation proposals altogether different from the existing law. One of the main features of that Bill was that it proposed a graduated income tax in the place of a fixed income tax to apply to all incomes no matter what the amount might be. Another place has rejected that Bill and by their action have said—"We disapprove of this graduated income tax, and prefer that the existing law shall remain, for this session, at any rate." The existing law passed in 1907 does not give power for introducing in a small measure of this sort a graduated income tax unless we amend the previous Assessment Act. The Assessment Act provides with regard to income tax that "subject to the provisions of this Act and the regulations there shall be charged and levied and collected by the Commissioner for the use of his Majesty income tax at such rate per pound as Parliament shall from time to time declare." It does not say at such rates per pound, but at such rate per pound. We cannot have different rates per pound unless that clause is amended.

The Premier: That is a point for the courts to decide.

Hon. Frank Wilson: If the Premier wants to make the matter perfectly clear he will have to bring in a Bill to amend the Assessment Act, but that is a point which Mr. Speaker is not asked to rule upon. The only other question is as to whether we are going outside the Standing Orders

to consider again something already considered and decided upon, and which is substantially the same. It appears to me that this Bill is substantially the same as the graduations provided in the Bill rejected in another place. Although we have had a ruling here on another measure, the Esperance Northwards Railway, that it was in order, and although I personally accepted that ruling as being correct, yet when it reached another place the Bill was ruled out of order. Are we to expect different treatment so far as this measure is concerned? I want the Premier to see that he gets reasonable revenue under the existing law.

The Premier: Rubbish! You do not want to see anything of the kind.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The Premier can have any opinion he likes. He can have the opinion that I want to block his taxation measure. He is so childish and so irritable that he cannot debate or discuss a question of this sort on its merits.

Mr. Turvey: You know he is correct all the same.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I do not know anything of the sort. We cannot decide important matters on personal feeling between members. It does not matter what I know or what the Premier or the hon. member thinks. We want to discuss the question on its merits from the point of our Standing Orders. At the present time the Speaker is asked to rule whether we are acting in accordance with our Standing Orders in considering a graduated income tax. In my opinion we are not.

The Attorney General: I submit that the ruling given the other night applies in every particular to the case now in hand. It would be absurd to stultify the power of Parliament in the way that has now been suggested. If any accident happens to a Bill, if there should be any flaw, technical or otherwise, and the measure had been sacrificed, to say that Parliament cannot remedy its own errors, cannot pass legislation that is urgent and necessary because of some technical flaw, would be the height of absurdity; but, ad-

mitting it for the sake of argument, I have had some few years experience in Parliament and I have never known a point of this character to be raised before.

Mr. Nanson: The British Parliament has had to be specially prorogued to meet difficulties of this description.

The Attorney General: Not difficulties of this character. There is no analogy in the cases the hon. member refers to. It is where exactly the same Bill word for word, the *ipsissima verba*, has had to be brought in again. But that is not a case parallel with this. In this House in this very session we have adopted the principle; we have followed the course of the Speaker's ruling; we have had the Tramways Bill (No. 2), the State Hotels Bill (No. 2), and other instances in this very session; and now this point is taken—for what purpose is obvious. I submit there is no parallel between the Bill defeated and the Bill now proposed, except that they are both taxation measures. That is the only point there is between them. If we were to adopt the kind of logic that the leader of the Opposition and the member for Greenough (Mr. Nanson) have adopted in raising this point, then I could prove that the leader of the Opposition and the member for Greenough are one and the same person. They have very much in common physically; they have both eyes and noses and limbs and bodies, and they are both animated by the same strong motive—the downing of the present Government; therefore, having so much in common, they are the same in substance, and being the same in substance, they are the same thing. The absurdity of that must strike at once. The taxation measure that was introduced and rejected was a combination measure of machinery and a assessment, and it proposed a certain form, it is true, of a graduated income tax, but with an enormous difference. The first Bill proposed that through the imposition of a tax graduated upwards there should be, as it were, that overlapping that exempted no stage or step from the full application of the highest assessment to

the highest income. In other words the man receiving £5,000 a year should pay the tax on every thousand pounds constituting that £5,000. In the other Bill there are steps where the rate of the tax is so much at such a figure, and after that figure so much more, but only starting so much more where the first assessment ends to the next stage and so on to the end. Will hon. members say that that is not a distinction, that there is no difference even in principle? Everybody must admit it is a prostration of common sense to say that these two are the same in substance. We could easily vote "no" on the Bill that has been defeated and vote "yes" on this, and still be perfectly consistent. There is one point more that was raised by the Leader of the Opposition, and that was the inference that if we passed this measure it would be illegal. Inasmuch as in the original Act the word "rate" is used, he supposes that this Bill implies or imposes rates, the one being singular and the other, as we are using it here, being plural. I submit that is not a sound contention, inasmuch as we fix the rate with a different incidence. It is the incidence that is different, not the rate. We have our rating from the starting point to the terminus, but the incidence varies according to the steps that the gradation imposes. Therefore I submit that on every point common sense business aptitude perceives that the two Bills are separate and distinct ones, and that the ruling delivered the other night is the ruling that must be followed.

Mr. Wisdom: This is really in a sense a discussion on a point of order and I would not presume to debate that aspect of the question, in fact, I would not have risen at all had it not been for the interjection of the Premier that it was the desire of the Opposition to refuse him facilities for collecting revenue through fresh taxation. So far as I am personally concerned, I repudiate that most strongly.

Mr. Speaker: That aspect cannot be discussed. The hon. member had better reserve his remarks in case the Bill comes under discussion, if it does come

under discussion. Since I gave my ruling the other evening I have made further inquiries, and my further investigations convince me that the attitude I took up on that occasion was absolutely correct. I see no reason whatever to depart from the principle laid down in connection with the railway Bill on which I was called upon to express a decision. It has been urged that the British Parliament has had to prorogue because of instances of this character and that this House has had to prorogue likewise. I take it the reference was made to the prorogation when Sir Newton Moore was Premier and the Upper House rejected the land tax, but the circumstances were entirely different. I looked up that matter to-day. Sir Newton Moore brought in a Bill proposing a land tax; it was rejected, and he prorogued, not in order to introduce a Land and Income Tax Bill, but because he deemed it necessary that there should be a prorogation in order that the Government might decide what future action should be taken. I read his speech to-day because I surmised this matter might be raised this evening. I cannot help the decision given in another place, but I think that my judgment is fairly sound; at any rate it is the best I can arrive at. I find that every recognised authority supports the decision I have arrived at. I have looked up the Votes and Proceedings of the British House of Commons and I find actual incidents where there has not been that distinction which can be found in this Bill and yet the British House of Commons has ratified an Act where a difference has constituted little or no distinction. In the House of Commons a Bill to impose a duty on leather was proposed. It was rejected by a majority and so by the usual order of the House of Commons should not be offered again during that session, but after a brief time the same duty was proposed with this variation, that instead of a duty on leather it was proposed that a duty should be imposed on tanned hides and skins. This measure was passed by the House of Commons even in defiance of that objection which has been referred to this evening.

Mr. Taylor: There is a difference.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is a distinction without a difference. There may be a difference, but the distinction is not very great. If that Bill had come under my notice I should certainly have disallowed it because to my mind the question was substantially the same in purpose. I do not wish to weary hon. members with further proof; but since action has been taken in another place, I desire to quote another eminent British authority in regard to this subject, and as to the manner in which this Standing Order has been interpreted by the British House of Commons.

If a Bill be altered in any material point both in the body and title it may be received a second time, or when the Bill has been rejected in the Lords on account of its multifarious provisions the House of Commons can give leave for another Bill to be brought in during the same session for some of the matters contained in the former Bill, others being omitted.

It appears to me that principle has very much in common with the Bill now under discussion. In the rejected Bill were multifarious clauses and a number have been omitted. If the House of Commons, which has the same Standing Order as this House, deems it expedient to allow a new Bill to be introduced and passed in the same session, then I who do not insist that I have more wisdom than the House of Commons, think I should be doing my duty in allowing this Bill likewise. I quoted from an authority a few evenings ago which it is hardly necessary to quote from now, but I will give one instance—

When a Bill has been passed in one branch, the rule is equally peremptory, that no similar Bill can be afterwards introduced. In practice, however, when it has been ascertained that a Bill, which has been passed in one House and sent to the other, is there unacceptable in some particulars, a new Bill may be introduced and passed in the House in which it originated, with such variations from the first Bill, as to make it acceptable to the other House.

That is an authority on the constitutional practice of the British House of Commons. In allowing this Bill I shall not be departing from the principles of the House of Commons as expressed by that eminent authority, *May*, who points out—

It is also possible, in other ways, so far to vary the character of a motion as to withdraw it from the operation of the rule. Thus in the session of 1845 no less than five distinct motions were made upon the subject of opening letters at the post office under warrant from the Secretary of State. They all varied in form and matter so far as to place them beyond the restriction, but in purpose they were the same, and the debates upon them embraced the same matters.

I do not think that I can do otherwise than rule, not altogether from my own sense of what is right or equitable, but from the authorities such as I am able to bring to my aid, that the Bill under discussion is in order and one which can properly be discussed in the House. The question is, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Debate resumed.

Mr. WISDOM (Claremont): When I was ruled out of order by you, Sir, I was desiring to repudiate the suggestion of the Premier, so far as I myself am concerned, that there was an idea or intention of opposing the imposition of the land and income tax in its present form. It is the intention, so far as we are concerned, to offer no captious opposition to it whatever. It is unfortunate in the circumstances that it should be necessary to impose increased taxation, but as it is necessary, personally I am prepared to accept the proposition the Government have now brought down. I think it is a fair proposition in place of the rejected one, and that it is, an effort to meet the wishes of this side of the House. I desire to deny, emphatically, not only for myself, but for others on this side, that there is any intention of opposing this taxation proposal out of sheer party

opposition. Personally, I think the proposals now made ought to be acceptable. For my part, I accept them with satisfaction.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Mr. Holman in the Chair, the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Grant of land tax and income tax:

Mr. GEORGE: Having in view the divergence between the rulings given in the two Houses, the Government might have been better advised to simply reenact the land and income tax of last year

Clause put and passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION.

Council's Pressed Requests.

Message from the Council received notifying that the requested amendments Nos. 7 and 29 were pressed, but that the requested amendments Nos. 2 and 9 were not pressed.

Mr. SPEAKER: This Bill was introduced with a Message and by pressing its amendments another place is going beyond its powers under the Constitution. It is infringing upon the liberties and privileges of this House. I have on a former occasion allowed the House to take that step which it may deem necessary for the preservation of its own privileges.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: With a view to meeting the position you have just declared, I have prepared a resolution which, in an emergency, will meet the case. I propose to make it apply to this particular occasion in order not to establish any precedent. I move—

That in view of the lateness of the session and the necessity for this Bill, this House does not insist upon its

privileges in the matter of receiving Message No. 60, but does not wish by this to establish a precedent
Question put and passed.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair, the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

No. 7, Clause 6, Subclause 2, paragraph (b)—Strike out the words “unless the injury results in death or serious and permanent disablement”:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The clause dealt with wilful negligence. The Council had struck out the words “Unless the accident result in death or serious and permanent disablement.” In consideration of the fact that we wanted the Bill passed and of the Committee having made its objection he moved—

That the amendment be made.

Question passed; the Council's amendment made.

No. 29, [Clause 16, lines 2 and 3—Strike out “either the worker or”:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This amendment dealt with the proposal to commute the contributions into a lump sum. The existing Act gave the power for the employer to commute, and it was proposed to give the worker the same opportunity. The Council had struck out the provision and this had made the clause similar to that in the existing Act. He moved—

That the amendment be made.

Question passed; the Council's amendment made.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

Sitting suspended from 8 to 10.13 p.m.

Resumed at 10.13.

BILL—RIGHTS IN WATER AND IRRIGATION

Council's Pressed Requests.

Message from the Legislative Council received notifying that requested amendments Nos. 7 to 16 and 18 to 21 inclusive were pressed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again I want to say this is another Bill which was introduced by message into this Assembly, and I need hardly say that by again insisting upon the amendments the Legislative Council has infringed upon the privileges of this House. I do not know what action this House proposes to take, but personally if I may express an opinion, I am inclined to think that another Chamber insists on these amendments because this House has up to the present taken no action in regard to several Bills to protect and preserve the liberties of this House. I may tell the House that personally I am expected to preserve the privileges of this House and if similar amendments on future occasions are pressed, I shall have to disallow the Bills and ask the House to support me in any action I may take. I now leave it to the House to determine what action to take in respect of this Bill.

The PREMIER: As leader of this House I appreciate the gravity of the position in this Chamber, being continually called upon to waive its rights and privileges, which have been handed down to it since its establishment. The danger we are drifting into is that by continually waiving our rights we are practically telling another Chamber that those rights do not exist, and the time appears to me to have arrived when this House should lay it down distinctly that we are not prepared to continue to waive our rights merely because another place refuses to give consideration to any other procedure. This particular measure is one of considerable importance; it is one of the most important we have considered this session, and we as a Government appreciate fully the importance of any action which would mean the laying aside of that measure, and it is only because we appreciate that fact that we have already undertaken, subject to the consent of

Parliament, to purchase an estate at Harvey for the purpose of initiating this scheme of irrigation, which will mean more than can be imagined at the present time for the south-eastern portion of the State and the settlers there.

The Minister for Lands: We are actually proceeding with the work.

The PREMIER: And if this measure is laid aside it will mean the withdrawal of a number of men and all the expenditure to date will be completely lost to the State. It is a serious position that we have to face, but, notwithstanding the effect it might have, we are warranted on this occasion in waiving our rights. I want it to be distinctly understood, irrespective of what the position might be in the future, while I am leader of the House, I am not going to continue this practice. I have to consider the position from the standpoint whether, after all, the rights of this Chamber are greater than the privileges that would be obtained by the people under the provisions of this measure when passed. While we must claim that the rights the Legislative Council have shall be maintained, I would not lightly set aside the great privileges the people of the South-West would obtain if this measure became law. I am, therefore, going to ask this Chamber to waive its rights on this occasion. I beg to move—

That in view of the urgency of the Bill referred to in Message 62, this House will not insist upon its privileges but waives them for the purpose of receiving the Message, without establishing a precedent.

Mr. LANDER: Is it a fair thing I ask to allow the Legislative Council to put the boot into us like this? I think it is time that this House took some stand and if it should be necessary for us to go to the country and face our constituents, I for one would be prepared to do so, rather than submit to this sort of thing from the Legislative Council.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Underwood: Mr. Speaker, I—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will resume his seat.

Mr. Underwood: I was hardly up.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for East Perth has not concluded his remarks. I want to ask him not to make any insinuation regarding what is alleged to have happened in another place.

Mr. LANDER: If I have said anything I should not have said I will withdraw it. I would like to say a little more with reference to the treatment meted out to the measure sent by us to another place which does not represent the people.

Mr. George: You cannot say that.

Mr. LANDER: I have said it, and it is my opinion, and it is a correct opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not discuss another place.

Mr. LANDER: Oh, all right.

Mr. GREEN: I do not know that I can throw any constitutional light upon this matter but I wish to say that I feel this Chamber is suffering under a great disadvantage in the present crisis. I recognise that it would suit the members opposite for us to go to the country at the present time.

Mr. Lander: I do not know that it would; they would be tipped out.

Mr. GREEN: It is clear to every member on this side, as it must be to every member opposite, that democratic Government is an institution at the present time and if another place adopts these tactics towards the Assembly it will not be difficult to understand that the people will turn to the Federal Government which is a democratic Government. We have indeed a hard fight to face.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss that matter. The motion before the House is the motion which has been moved by the Premier.

Mr. GREEN: I was proceeding to show why I was disagreeing with the motion of the Premier. During the past campaign, we members on this side, holding the views we do, fought for what we have believed in for years. It is only after many centuries that we have been able to secure one man one vote so far as this Chamber is concerned, and recognising the large amount of tact and care and organisation that has been exercised by the people of Australia to gain our present

privileges, are we now to be flouted and fought unfairly. It is reminiscent of the feudal system and it is time for us to assert our rights. If we want to do anything, we shall have to continue the struggle of our forefathers. I for one am determined to make a fight on this question and therefore I must disagree with the attitude of the Premier.

Mr. TAYLOR: We on this side in the past when sitting on your left, Mr. Speaker, felt very much aggrieved when we had to accept amendments made by another place to legislation which was sent there from this House. This is the third occasion during this session that we have been called upon to forego certain privileges which have been in possession of this Parliament ever since Responsible Government. The privileges we have, have been the privileges of the House of Commons for many years, and they are privileges that we in Western Australia, as a democratic party, are not in any way responsible for. They have been handed down from the old land and I am indeed sorry and surprised to know that our party, with the numbers it has behind it, proposes to give away lightly those privileges. The protest made is not a protest to defend the privileges of a democratic Chamber. Perhaps, the exigencies of the occasion, as pleaded by the Premier, demand that we shall save this Bill—and I am right, I think, in saying as the hon. gentleman pointed out, no matter how sacred the privileges of this Parliament are, the benefits to be gained by a very large section of the community if this Bill becomes law will be great—but the immediate benefits which would be derived from the coming into law of this measure do not justify the leader of the House and this Parliament allowing our privileges to be whittled away. Having been one of those who for years opposed another branch of the Legislature of this State, opposed it in this House and on the public platform, I am not prepared to further assist that branch of the Legislature to usurp the functions of this branch of the Parliament. I am prepared to support the Premier in his contention that this

Bill should become law, and as it is the last night of the session, and as it is the last opportunity we shall have this session of dealing with this measure, I hope all the Premier has said in regard to the great value this measure will be to the settlers will carry some weight. I shall not object to foregoing our privileges to-night but I shall not be prepared if I am spared till next session, and I am still in this Chamber, to again forgo the privileges we have, no matter how important the next measure may be.

Mr. George: What is the particular privilege now?

Mr. TAYLOR: The Speaker made it perfectly clear that it was his duty as Speaker to place his views before the House and leave the matter in the hands of the House as to whether we in this Chamber were going to allow another place to usurp our functions.

Mr. Nanson: What is the privilege to which you refer?

Mr. TAYLOR: This Bill has been introduced in this branch of the Legislature with a message from the Governor. This is one of two Bills that has met the same fate and it is about time we on this side, and I say it unhesitatingly, protested against the whittling away of all our privileges. It will not affect the political views of my friends opposite as to how much the privileges of the House are whittled away. Their political faith is pinned to another place, and the party on this side should bear that in mind and show the robust democracy from this side that they showed when they were on the other side of the House; they have power to do so now, whereas they had only the power to speak about it when they were on the other side. I have no desire that the Bill shall be sacrificed, but I have every desire that the privileges of the House shall be maintained irrespective of what attitude my leader may take up.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I too desire to enter my protest against another place continually defying this Chamber. The Premier and the Government have considered this Bill from all points of view and they have now decided to sacri-

fice the liberties of the people for the sake of some financial advantages to be gained by a few Legislative Council electors. All the same, I intend to support the action of the Government.

Mr. Monger: You have got to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: All I have got to do will not trouble the hon. member much. It comes to this, that Western Australia is in the position that two-thirds of the people elect the members of this Chamber and less than one-third elect the members in another place. The Opposition are only the residue of the votes of the people and their only hope is through the restricted franchise of another place.

Mr. George: Do not make any mistake about it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We did not make any mistake about it last election and we will not make any mistake next time. With all due respect I contend that it is up to this Chamber to make a stand against the Council. It is all right to say that this is not a precedent, but we have said that three times already, and if we continually put that in, it comes to the same thing, and while we agree with another place blocking our legislation they will go on blocking it. So far as this Bill is concerned, I think it is better to put a few men out of work and allow some of the Legislative Council electors to lose some financial advantages than that we should sacrifice the liberties of the people. After all, I hope this will be the last of these special concessions which are not to be taken as precedents. In conclusion I wish to say that the whole of the action of the Opposition and the Council strikes me as being a deliberate attempt to discredit the Government and put them in disgrace.

Mr. Green: The acts of poltroons.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Kalgoorlie must withdraw that statement.

Mr. Green. I withdraw.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: This is not what is called by our friends, the enemy, class legislation; it is class legislation they have been used to for so long. This is a Bill for the advantage of the landowners of Western Australia, and as a very small landowner I am prepared to chuck it out.

Mr. FOLEY: I feel grieved to think that the rights of this House, which is the people's House, are being little by little considered of less importance by another Chamber. I know that the Premier in acceding to the wish of another place is actuated by the belief that the passage of this measure is going to do some good to the people in the State, irrespective of what their political beliefs may be. By passing this Bill into law the Government will be to a little extent assisting themselves in regard to the money they have spent, but the money expended on irrigation has been disbursed in providing an object lesson to many men in the State who have had ample opportunity to irrigate land for themselves with the water that has been available for them all the time.

Mr. George: There has been a lot of private work.

Mr. FOLEY: There has been a great deal of irrigation in the State and there is also a vast area—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member cannot discuss that question. He must discuss the motion.

Mr. FOLEY: I bow to your ruling, Sir. I was referring to what in my opinion is a redeeming feature in the Premier's action in accepting the condition laid down by another place. I consider that the action of the Council in seeking to take away the rights and privileges of this House is not only an attack on this House as the representatives of the people but is a great reflection on the gentleman who now holds the position of Speaker. With the other members who have spoken, I trust this will be the last time we will ever be called upon to give a vote in the direction we are doing to-night. We have known during the last few days, although there is supposed to be a check on legislation passed in this place—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member cannot discuss that matter at all.

Mr. FOLEY: I consider that when this Chamber has finished with a Bill, after having gone into the question at such great length as this Bill was discussed in this House, it is not right that the House should be asked to pass a

motion such as this. As one who does not represent a district which this Bill will in any way militate against or improve, I trust that when the Premier brings down legislation which will benefit one class of the community, representatives of that class will recognise that there are other clauses that need sympathetic legislation and consideration.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have a great admiration of those gentlemen who go into heroics as to the treatment meted out to them by another place and yet are supporting the motion moved by the Premier on this occasion. It is to be the last occasion; it is the third time during the present session, but never again!

Mr. Green: You gloat in your villainy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kalgoorlie must withdraw that utterance and apologise for it.

Mr. Green: I withdraw and apologise.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Members opposite make charges that the members on this side are not jealous of the rights and privileges of this Chamber, that our political faith is pinned to another place, and that we glory and gloat in the discredit which is thrust on the Government by another place. We have no need to gloat and glory in the discredit of the Government; they have discredited themselves all through this Parliament since they have occupied the Treasury benches. Let me point out that members of another place have recognised that they have not the right to ask for a conference on this measure. It is a money Bill, made such by the Government in the drafting by the insertion of certain clauses, very few in number, amongst the proposed machinery clauses and general clauses, which constitute it a money Bill. The Legislative Council has no right to amend such a measure.

Mr. Green: I rise to a point of order. I would like to ask whether the opinions expressed by the leader of the Opposition are not in direct opposition to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given no ruling. The only matter before the House is a motion moved by the Premier.

Mr. Green: I refer to the opinion expressed by you on receiving the Message from another Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was only an opinion. I have given no ruling, although I have threatened to give a ruling.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Legislative Council has no right to amend this Bill. It can, however, request that certain amendments be made. That the Council has done. For our part, we have sent it back again having made certain amendments and refused to make others. They in their wisdom say—"That ends the business so far as we are concerned. The only way we can help the Government to get this Bill further considered is to insist upon our recommendations, send it back to the Assembly once more, and the Assembly can then exercise its privilege of asking for a conference."

The Premier: They have no power to insist.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Very well. This Bill drops, and no charge can lie against the Legislative Council because we have refused to make the amendments. The Government can simply say "we pass this Bill out" or they can give the two Houses an opportunity to come together, confer, and arrange a compromise as was done on two previous occasions.

The Minister for Lands: They took a step precedent to that which prevents us having a conference.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Not at all; a conference can be asked for now.

The Premier: Only by moving this motion.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Well, only by moving this motion. Does not the Minister see that tacking his financial clauses on to a Bill which they ought to be able to consider thoroughly and amend if they wish, as being a distinct branch of the Legislature of this State, is taking away the power from another place. If hon. members want to be reasonable they must appreciate the fact that we in the first instance have made this a money measure in our drafting. We have included several financial clauses which prevent another place from amending the balance of the measure, and there is an obvious way out of the difficulty. The

machinery clauses could have been enacted in one measure, and the financial clauses could have been embraced in another. But the tacking on of extraneous matter to purely financial Bills is the well known expedient to clog the action of the Upper House.

The Premier: It is absolutely unfair to say that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am stating the fact. I am not making a charge. It is a fact known for the last hundred years in British Parliaments.

The Premier: It is not the case in this instance.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do not say it is the case. I say that the tacking on of extraneous matter to a money Bill is a well known tactic pursued in order to clog the rights and privileges of an Upper House.

The Premier: Do you assert it is the case in this instance?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It applies to this extent, that the trouble could have been obviated by leaving the financial clauses out of the measure, and giving the Legislative Council their perfect right to amend some 70 odd clauses outside the financial clauses as they deemed fit.

The Minister for Lands: Where would we put these clauses you take out?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In a special measure, like the Assessment Act in the taxing measure.

Mr. Taylor: You never adopted that all the years you were Minister.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I did. I had the Land Taxation Assessment measure separate from the taxing measure. From the very start the two Bills were kept separate.

Mr. Taylor: Did you have that object in view? Was it not to prevent the review of the assessment Bill each year?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Certainly it was to keep the two distinct, the financial portion from the machinery, the taxing Bill they could not interfere with or amend from the assessment Bill which they could amend equally with ourselves.

The Premier: Was that your reason?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is all very well for the Premier. With the strength of his views and his convictions and opin-

ions, why does he not reject it altogether? What is the use of submitting a motion of this sort? Let him send it back again. Let him toe the mark and stand up to his principles. Rather than get up and revile members of the Opposition—

The Premier: It is not very frequently I take objection to the hon. member's remarks, knowing him so well, but I must ask that he be called on to withdraw that remark, that I reviled the Opposition. It is a deliberate untruth.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Premier must withdraw that.

The Premier: I withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Premier must rise and withdraw.

The Premier (rising): I withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: The leader of the Opposition is not correct in stating what he did.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I did not refer to the Premier, but if I did I withdraw. It was a general reference to members opposite.

Mr. Underwood: On behalf of the members opposite, is it in order for the leader of the Opposition to accuse us of reviling him?

Mr. SPEAKER: If hon. members deem the remarks of the leader of the Opposition offensive, I think he will withdraw it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: They are getting as thin-skinned as a lot of school-girls.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must withdraw.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: They have attacked the Opposition and condemned the Opposition. What does the word mean? Is "revile" offensive?

Mr. George: And they tell us that they "gloat in our villainy."

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. George) is not in order in making a statement which I compelled an hon. member to withdraw, and which he withdrew and apologised for. There must be no further reference whatever to a statement made and apologised for.

Mr. George: There was a statement made by the member for "Texas"—I mean

Kalgoorlie—that you did not hear. It was that we were worms and money bags. I heard it if you did not.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Green) made that statement I did not hear it, but if any hon. member had drawn my attention to it I should certainly have ordered it to be withdrawn and an apology tendered.

Mr. George: The hon. member would not deny it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is passed for taking exception to it. The leader of the Opposition must now withdraw anything that may be deemed offensive.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I withdraw any statement deemed offensive to hon. members opposite.

Mr. Green interjected.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member is once more offensive. Members make these remarks and immediately get up and withdraw them, but the remarks are made and they go into print; and then they repeat other offensive statements; they are continually doing it. I was pointing out, when this unhappy interruption took place, that there was something to be said on the part of another place, and that notwithstanding charges made by hon. members on the Government side, that we are practically in collusion to undermine the rights and privileges of the Assembly, I wish to state at once that it is an absolutely incorrect insinuation, as no one is more jealous of the privileges of the Assembly than members of the Opposition. If I have said that members opposite have used wrong expressions in trying to force their opinions on members of the Opposition, I should certainly have opposed the motion; but it is idle to go into heroics and deny another place all rights and privileges which we claim for ourselves. The Bill is comprised of 75 clauses, if I remember rightly, and two or three of these clauses are financial clauses, the very considerable balance being essential legislation which another place has equal rights with ourselves to criticise and amend. I do not propose to be a stumbling block in the way of the Premier. I do not feel so keenly about it as to ask hon. members

of the Opposition not to agree to the motion. I realise the measure is a measure that is necessary and required in the country, and it is legislation which never, so far as we are concerned, takes any sign of party upon it. It is a non-party measure, a measure in the direction of legislation which we ourselves had proposed. Therefore I agree with the Premier that it is a Bill we would like to see on the statute-book, a Bill that we may fairly compromise on with another place through managers; but it is a bad beginning if we are to condemn legislators of another place because they have proceeded in a manner which they deemed the correct way of procedure in the circumstances, notwithstanding that members of this Chamber perhaps disagreed from them.

Question put and passed.

In Committee.

On motion by the ATTORNEY GENERAL schedule of requested amendments pressed by the Council now considered in Committee; Mr. Holman in the Chair.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved—

That amendments 7 to 16, and 18 to 21 pressed by the Legislative Council be not made.

The PREMIER: We had previously received a message from the Legislative Council requesting us to make certain amendments. Having made certain of them a Message was accordingly returned to the Council, but the Council had seen fit to insist on the balance of the amendments not made by the Assembly. The Attorney General now proposed to ask the Committee not to make these amendments which the Council insisted on, and then at a later stage to take further action.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The reason for taking this course was that he proposed, when we got back into the House, to ask the House to appoint managers to meet the managers from the Council for the purpose of conferring upon their differences and, if possible, arriving at an understanding.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendments not made.

Resolutions reported.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I intend to move that the adoption of the report be postponed pending a request for the appointment of managers.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think you had better move that the report be adopted.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If we adopt this report we shall have settled the whole question. We have declined to make the amendments as requested and, therefore, what are we going to confer about? We should have appointed managers before the Speaker left the Chair.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am going to move that this House appoint managers and that the question of the adoption of the report be postponed until the report of the managers shall have been received.

The PREMIER: I am not quite clear on the point, but I should imagine that, the Committee having decided upon a certain course of action, the House must adopt the report. It is a confirmation of the action taken in Committee. We merely adopt the report of the Committee. If we did not do so the Committee might agree to make those amendments, and there would be no need for the conference. The Committee refused to make the amendments. They report to the House that they are not prepared to make them. The report must be adopted, because it is the decision of the Committee. Then the House asks another place to arrange the conference with a view to getting over the difficulties. That appears to me to be the only possible course.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The point the Premier has lost sight of is that we need not necessarily adopt a report immediately on its presentation to the House. We can postpone the adoption of the report, and as a House we can approve of a certain course of action prior to the adoption of the report, and when the time comes for the adoption of the report we can amend it in accordance with the prior action taken, the prior action in this case being a proposal to ask for a conference. Thus we can make the

adoption of the report contingent upon the result of the conference.

Mr. HOLMAN: I think the procedure taken is scarcely correct. In my position as Chairman I had to put the question as moved in the Committee; I was forced to do that. But the procedure taken on previous occasions has been when the Message was considered in the House. The consideration of that question was held over pending the appointment of managers, and then the question was dealt with by managers, and subsequently, when the question had been dealt with, the report was made to the House and adopted or otherwise. The position is that, on the first occasion the Committee declined to make the amendment, and a Message was sent back accordingly. On the second occasion the Committee decided to make the amendment, and then the House adopted the report. We have refused to make the amendment and can go no further. Unless the same course of procedure is adopted as was adopted on a previous occasion I am of opinion that the Bill is lost. I was loth to put the question for some time although it was desired to appoint managers. In my opinion the thing has gone too far, and we have only to adopt the report to put the finishing touch on it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member is quite right technically, but this is a special occasion and one which should be marked by some special action. It is one in which we are determining to enter, as far as we can, our protest against the conduct of the other Chamber. We have, therefore, gone into Committee to get the opinion of the Committee as to the character of the amendments insisted upon by the other House. We have now the opinion of that Committee, and I say that if we adopt the report of the Committee now without going further we should put an end to the Bill by the fact that the taking of the adoption of the report would shelve the Bill. We could not go further. Therefore it is necessary for us to postpone the consideration of this report until we have conferred with the other Chamber, and until the conference shall have come to some understanding

which we can embody in a resolution to the House on our return.

Hon. Frank Wilson: How will you then proceed with the Committee's report?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: We shall refer it back to the Committee. We have done this by going into Committee. We have the assurance of the Committee that this amendment will not be accepted as insisted upon by the Council. Now it is necessary to defer this report until the conference shall have been held. I therefore move—

That a Message be transmitted to the Legislative Council requesting a Conference on the points of difference between the two Chambers, and that the consideration of the Committee's report be postponed until the conference has been held.

Mr. Nanson: There must be a motion for the adoption of the report and then the Attorney General should move an amendment to the motion.

The Attorney General: No, nobody has moved that the report be adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Committee considered the amendments and declined to make the amendments. The House could not decline to make the amendments. The Committee was the only one which could decline to make them. The Committee must necessarily report their proceedings to the House, but it is not essential that the report should be adopted now. The report can be held over if it is the desire of the House that a conference shall be held with another place. The Committee could not ask for a conference; the House must ask for it. Therefore I do not think there can be anything irregular about the course proposed to be followed by the Attorney General.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You must deal with the report first.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister can move that the consideration of the report be held over.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the consideration of the report be postponed and that a conference with the Legislative Council be re-

quested, the managers to be the Minister for Lands, Mr. George, and the mover.

Question put and passed, and a Message transmitted to the Legislative Council accordingly.

BILLS (7)—RETURNED FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

- 1, Land and Income Tax.
- 2, Interpretation Act Amendment.
- sion.
- 3, Game.
- 4, Newcastle-Bolgart Railway Extension.
- 5, Wyalkatchem-Mount Marshall Railway.
- 6, Hotham-Crossman Railway Extension.
- 7, Wagin-Bowellling Railway. Without amendment.

BILL—STATE HOTELS (No. 2).

Council's Pressed Requests.

Message from the Legislative Council received and read notifying that the Council pressed its requested amendments.

Bill withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is another Money Bill which was introduced by Message into this Assembly. On this occasion, having taken the sense of the House a few moments ago, I intend to disallow this measure and ask the Premier to withdraw the Bill.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the Bill be withdrawn.

Question passed.

BILL—GOVERNMENT TRADING CONCERNS.

Council's Message.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with requested amendments, which were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair, the Premier in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 2, Paragraph (b)—Strike out of lines 5 and 6, "Governor

may by Order in Council" and insert in lieu "Parliament may by specific motion":

The PREMIER: After a conference with the leader of the Opposition certain amendments had been agreed to with the object of preventing any trading concern from being brought under this measure except by the consent of Parliament given to an appropriation. The Bill as introduced contained a provision for issuing debentures and the leader of the Opposition took exception to the Governor-in-Council being able to raise money and begin trading concerns without the consent of Parliament. That objection was removed, and it would be absurd when having trading concerns operating to say which concern should come under the measure. This was not a machinery Bill and did not cause the operations of a concern to change in the slightest. It merely provided that books should be kept on certain lines in order that at the end of the year a profit and loss account should be presented. That profit and loss account would be audited by the Auditor General so that the people would know how the concerns had been operated. No power was taken under the measure to establish a trading concern. This, however, appeared to be the fear of another place. He could see no need for making the amendment and necessitating the re-printing of the Bill. He moved—

That the amendment be not made.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: This was another instance showing how unfortunate it was that we should have measures of this description brought down at the far end of the session and without having sufficient opportunity to consider the clauses in detail as to their application. It was true the Premier conferred with him in connection with the proposed amendments and he had suggested an amendment such as had been made in another place. He had also taken exception to the power given to issue debentures. The Premier agreed to excise these powers, but thought there was no need to take from the Governor-in-Council and transfer to Parliament the power with regard to concerns being brought

under this Bill. He was not sure even now that the Premier's contention was correct. The clause read—

This Act shall apply (a) to such Government undertakings and (b) to such works and services temporarily financed from public funds hereinafter referred to as trading concerns, as the Governor may, by Order in Council, declare to be under and subject to this Act.

His objection to the inclusion of the words was that the Government might, as they had done during the last 12 months, establish Government undertakings.

The Premier: The amendment would not alter that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Government might establish undertakings without consulting Parliament. The Government had established the State steamship service, and by order of the Governor-in-Council that could be brought under the measure without Parliament being consulted. The brickyards, implement works, and State butchery had never been thoroughly threshed out. Amounts had been put on the Estimates but there had been no opportunity to hear a full explanation as to how far the Government intended to go.

The Premier: We have had it every week in the session.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There had been statement after statement that these undertakings were proving a magnificent thing and were doing wonders for the country. We had never had a declaration of policy from the Government as to how far they intended to go in the matter or what capital would be required. These Government undertakings were being established without any direct reference to Parliament and that was wrong. Before being taken in hand these questions should be submitted for the approval and endorsement of Parliament. His aim was to have Parliament consulted before embarking on these enterprises. Were the Premier in Opposition he would be the first man to condemn the Government if they instituted State enterprises such as he was doing, without first submitting the question to Parliament for approval.

The Premier might accept the amendment. It would entail upon him the responsibility that he would first have to submit the matter to Parliament by a specific motion.

The PREMIER: The Bill had nothing to do with the commencement of any Government undertaking. If the Bill was passed the Governor would have power next week merely to declare that the existing trading concerns should be brought under the operations of the measure, and that at the end of each year a proper balance-sheet would have to be submitted to Parliament, as well as a profit and loss account. He would ask the Committee not to agree to the amendment, but he was not concerned whether the measure passed or not. It seemed impossible to discuss these matters without members opposite continuously making references to the State steamers or something else, and the leader of the Opposition declared that if the present Government were in opposition they would be the first to condemn that sort of thing. Would the hon. member turn to a single reference in *Hansard* where complaints had been made by the party in power when in opposition about the Government undertaking such work. Did not the Opposition when in power buy Dalkeith without Parliamentary sanction? Did they not buy Crawley without the authority of Parliament, as well as a station in the North-West and stock it and put it in charge of white people for the benefit of the natives? Did any member of the then Opposition complain? If the hon. member based his arguments on statements such as those his case was a very weak one. The actions of the Government had been completely endorsed by Parliament.

Question passed, the Council's amendment not made.

No. 2. Clause 15, line 3—Strike out "may" and insert "shall."

No. 3. Title—Strike out "rasing and":

The PREMIER moved—

That the amendments be not made.

Question passed, the Council's amendments not made.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

BILL—RIGHTS IN WATER AND IRRIGATION.

As to Conference.

Message received from the Legislative Council as follows:—

The Legislative Council acquaints the Legislative Assembly that it agrees to a conference on the Rights in Water and Irrigation Bill and has appointed Hon. H. P. Colebatch, Hon. E. M. Clarke, and Hon. F. Davis managers on behalf of the Council, the conference to meet forthwith in the President's room.

Sitting suspended from 12 o'clock (midnight) to 1 o'clock, a.m.

Report of Managers.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker): Mr. Speaker, I have to report that the managers have met the managers from the Council, taken into consideration the differences between the two Chambers and given their earnest attention towards coming to a compromise if such were possible. But the attitude taken by the representatives of another place was that no amendments of a nature which could be agreed to by the managers for the Assembly would be acceptable to the Council. I therefore have to move that the following report be adopted:—

The managers report that they have met the managers of the Legislative Council and have taken into consideration the differences between the two Chambers and have failed to come to any agreement.

Question passed, report adopted.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That the report of Committee which was postponed be now adopted.

Question passed, the report adopted and a Message accordingly transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES.

Message received from the Council notifying that the Council no longer pressed its amendments.

BILL — GOVERNMENT TRADING CONCERNS.

Council's Message.

Message received from the Council notifying that it no longer pressed its requested amendments Nos. 1 and 3, but that it pressed amendment No. 2.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair, the Premier in charge of the Bill.

No. 2.—Clause 15, line 3, strike out "may" and insert "shall":

The PREMIER: After all, this amendment was not of very great importance and could be made. He moved—

That the amendment be made.

Question passed; the Council's amendment made.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly sent to the Legislative Council.

COMPLIMENTARY REMARKS — CLOSE OF SESSION.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Seaddan): I beg to move—

That the House at its rising adjourn sine die.

That, of course, will mean that Parliament will be called together at some future date, but the adjournment will permit His Excellency the Governor in the meantime to prorogue Parliament by proclamation.

Mr. Underwood: Could you adjourn if the Council die?

The PREMIER: Whilst submitting this motion, may I convey to you and yours, Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the House and the members of the Ministry, the compliments of the festive season. And may I, through you, convey the same compliments to the Chairman of Committees and the officers of the House, including the *Hansard* staff and the messengers. I desire to express my personal appreciation of

the manner in which I have been treated as leader of the House during the present long and strenuous session. I think it is a record session in the history of the West Australian Parliament, both in regard to the number of days of sitting, and, I feel sure, in regard to the number of measures submitted, and passed into law. It is also a record, I think, for the friendly feeling which has existed between the two parties. It is true that there have been differences of opinion sometimes, and that we have said rather harsh things about each other, but we have said those harsh things purely from a political point of view, and when we left the Chamber we had a kindly and friendly feeling towards one another. I wish to pay a tribute to the leader of the Opposition for the assistance which he has extended to me in many ways, perhaps not noticed by members and by the public, because he has at times given me advice which has materially assisted me in conducting the business of the House. I owe thanks also to members on this side of the House for the magnificent and continuous support rendered to me and the members of the Government during this session. I trust that whilst members will part for a period, during that period they will enjoy their rest, that the festive season will be the best in their experience, and that when we meet again they will recognise that it is desirable to assist the Government even more than in the past to pass their measures and carry on the administration. I again wish you, Sir, the compliments of the season, and trust that you and yours, as well as the members and officers of the House, will fully enjoy the festive season.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): I rise with very great pleasure to second this motion, and also in behalf of members who sit with me in Opposition, to endorse the good wishes which the Premier has extended to you, Sir, the Chairman of Committees, the clerks, the Sergeant at Arms, the *Hansard* staff, and the messengers. The session certainly has been an arduous one. We have sat long and often, but I trust that the result will be satisfactory, when we know exactly what

it is, to the Premier and other members on his side. There is that pleasant feature which the Premier has touched upon, that no matter how acrimonious the debates may be within these walls, we can leave all heat behind when we pass into the corridor. I trust the time will never come when we shall be unable to do that. We endeavour to do our best here, and perhaps at times the language is not all that could be desired, and we are called to order, but that is only in the heat of debate, and there is, I am sure, nothing intentionally personal on either side of the House. I wish you and yours, Mr. Speaker, a happy Christmas and the same to the officers of the House and every member of the Assembly. May it be a happy Christmas, and when the new year opens I hope it will be bright and prosperous for us all.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Premier, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, and hon. members, before putting the motion moved by the Premier, I desire in behalf of myself and officers of the House generally to express our sincere appreciation of the kind words uttered by the Premier and the leader of the Opposition. I wish to personally thank hon. members for the uniform courtesy extended to me as Speaker of the House, and I am sure I can say the same for the Chairman of Committees, and also for the temporary Chairmen who have so earnestly endeavoured to carry out their duties and

with every degree of fairness and credit to the House. My personal thanks are due to the officers for their loyalty and assistance. It is due to their loyalty and assistance that I believe I can say the affairs of this House have been so well and so ably conducted. I thank the hon. gentlemen who have spoken for their kindly references to the chief officers of the House, the *Hansard* staff, the messengers and the other officers generally. Each and all have done their best in the interests of members and in the interests of the business of the country. On my own behalf and on behalf of the officers I reciprocate the kind wishes for a happy Christmas and the brightest prospects in the New Year, and express the hope that members will not only have a happy Christmas and a bright New Year likewise, but that they will return to the House after a well earned rest invigorated to carry on their onerous duties in the interests of their constituents and the country likewise. Again I thank the Premier, Mr. Wilson and hon. members on behalf of myself and the officers of the House. Before concluding I shall be pleased and obliged and honoured if hon. members will join with me in the adjoining diningroom when we shall partake of a glass for auld lang syne.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 1.52 a.m. (Saturday.)

The following notices appeared in the *Government Gazette* of 24th December, 1912:—

It is hereby notified, for general information, that His Excellency the Governor has received a despatch from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, informing him that His Majesty will not be advised to exercise his power of disallowance with respect to the following Acts of the Parliament of Western Australia:—

An Act to amend the Election of Senators Act, 1903.

An Act to further amend the Health Act, 1911.

An Act to adapt and assimilate the Trusts of Methodist Church Properties in Western Australia to the present Constitution of such Church in the said State; to confirm the union in Western Australia of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Western Australia, the Primitive Methodist Church in Western Australia, and the Bible Christian Church in Western Australia under the name of "The Methodist Church of Australasia"; to deal with the Real and Personal Property in Western Australia of the said uniting Churches; to give certain powers to the Western Australia Conference of the Methodist

Church of Australasia; to sanction the Constitution of the New Zealand Annual Conference of the Methodist Church of Australasia as an independent Conference, and for other purposes connected with or incidental to the above objects.

An Act for the relief of Persons whose Relatives liable to support them reside in another State of the Commonwealth, and for other purposes.

An Act for the purchase by the Government of Western Australia of the Undertaking of the Perth Electric Tramways, Limited, and for other purposes.

It is hereby notified, for general information, that His Excellency the Governor has, in the name and on behalf of His Majesty, assented, on the dates specified, to the undermentioned Acts passed by the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly in Parliament assembled, namely:—

An Act to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Four Hundred and Ninety-three Thousand Eight Hundred and Forty-six Pounds; and from Moneys to Credit of the General Loan Fund, Four Hundred and Nine Thousand Five Hundred and Fifteen Pounds; and from the Loan Suspense Account, One Hundred Thousand Pounds to the Service of the Year ending 30th June, 1913. (Assented to 2nd July, 1912.)

An Act to apply out of the Public Account the sum of One Hundred and Fifty Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty-four Pounds for the purpose of temporary advances to be made by the Colonial Treasurer. (Assented to 24th July, 1912.)

An Act to confirm certain Expenditure for the Year ended the 30th day of June. One thousand nine hundred and eleven. (Assented to 19th August, 1912.)

An Act to amend the North Fremantle Municipal Tramways Act, 1907. (Assented to 19th August, 1912.)

An Act to amend the Nedlands Park Tramways Act, 1907. (Assented to 19th August, 1912.)

An Act to prohibit the use of White Phosphorus in the Manufacture of Matches; to prohibit the Sale of Matches made with White Phosphorus; and for purposes consequent thereon or incidental thereto. (Assented to 3rd September, 1912.)

An Act to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Four Hundred and Ninety-three Thousand Eight Hundred and Forty-six Pounds; and from the Loan Suspense Account, One Hundred Thousand Pounds to the Service of the Year ending 30th June, 1913. (Assented to 3rd September, 1912.)

An Act to amend the Election of Senators Act, 1903. (Assented to 27th September, 1912.)

An Act to further amend the Health Act, 1911. (Assented to 27th September, 1912.)

An Act to adapt and assimilate the Trusts of Methodist Church Properties in Western Australia to the present Constitution of such Church in the said State; to confirm the Union in Western Australia of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Western Australia, the Primitive Methodist Church in Western Australia, and the Bible Christian Church in Western Australia under the name of "The Methodist Church of Australasia"; to deal with the Real and Personal Property in Western Australia of the said uniting Churches; to give certain powers to the Western Australia Conference of the Methodist Church of Australasia; to sanction the Constitution of the New Zealand Annual Conference of the Methodist Church of Australasia as an Independent Conference, and for other purposes connected with or incidental to the above objects. (Assented to 27th September, 1912.)

An Act for the Relief of Persons whose Relatives liable to support them reside in another State of the Commonwealth, and for other purposes. (Assented to 27th September, 1912.)

An Act for the Purchase by the Government of Western Australia of the Undertaking of the Perth Electric

Tramways, Limited, and for other purposes. (Assented to 27th September, 1912.)

An Act to amend the Roman Catholic Church Property Act, 1911. (Assented to 10th October, 1912.)

An Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. (Assented to 10th October, 1912.)

An Act to provide for giving publicity to information relating to Unclaimed Funds and for other purposes. (Assented to 10th October, 1912.)

An Act to authorise the Construction of an additional line of Railway from Merredin to Coolgardie, on the Fremantle-Kalgoorlie Railway. (Assented to 10th October, 1912.)

An Act to amend the Elementary Education Act, 1871, Amendment Act, 1893. (Assented to 5th November, 1912.)

An Act to authorise the Fremantle Municipal Council to surrender certain Lands, to be dedicated to the purposes of the Workers' Homes Act, 1912. (Assented to 5th November, 1912.)

An Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1904. (Assented to 5th November, 1912.)

An Act to amend the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act, 1909. (Assented to 5th November, 1912.)

An Act to further amend the Bills of Sale Act, 1899. (Assented to 5th November, 1912.)

An Act to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Two Hundred and Eight-seven Thousand Four Hundred and Sixty-eight Pounds; and from Moneys to Credit of the General Loan Fund, Two Hundred and

Four Thousand Seven Hundred and Fifty-seven Pounds to the Service of the Year ending 30th June, 1912. (Assented to 14th November, 1912.)

An Act to authorise the raising of a sum of Five million six hundred thousand pounds by Loan for the construction of certain Public Works and for other purposes, and the Re-appropriation of certain Loan moneys. (Assented to 5th December, 1912.)

An Act to appropriate and Apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and from Moneys to credit of the Trust Fund and the General Loan Fund certain sums to make good the Supplies granted for the Service of the Year ending the thirtieth day of June, One thousand nine hundred and thirteen, and to supplement Grants made by the present Parliament during its last Session in adjustment of the Vote "Advance to Treasurer, 1911-12," for Charges during the year ended the 30th day of June, 1912. (Assented to 16th December, 1912.)

An Act to constitute a Department for the Administration of certain Acts relating to Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage, and for other purposes incidental thereto. (Assented to 17th December, 1912.)

An Act to amend the Law with respect to Compensation to Workers for Injuries suffered in the course of their Employment. (Assented to 21st December, 1912.)

An Act to amend and consolidate the Law relating to the Settlement of Industrial Disputes by Arbitration, and for other relative purposes. (Assented to 21st December, 1912.)

Parliament was prorogued by Proclamation issued in a *Government Gazette*, published at 11 a.m., on Tuesday, 31st December, 1912, to the 3rd April, 1913.
