

be put out of employment once more. The time is coming when attention must be given, not to the question of a specified number of hours of work per week, but to the specified work that must be performed to produce the goods that are required for the use of the people, and not for the profits that can be made out of the people. If we give attention to that aspect, then undoubtedly there will not be prescribed a week of 48 hours, or anything like that number of hours, in order to supply the world's requirements. You may have a little lawn to attend to. Previously the cutting of the grass, with clippers or a scythe, took you eight hours; but with the improved lawn mowers of the present day it takes you only two hours, and the work is done better than before. If I were to tell you, Sir, that though with the improved machinery you could cut the lawn in two hours, you must still take eight hours to do it, or at any rate remain on the lawn for eight hours instead of two, you would consider me to be on the direct road to Claremont. To-day the system of work is machinery with human effort. In effect, we are telling mankind that the inventor is not a benefactor but a malefactor. Nowadays as regards any new invention we ask, "Is it going to put Smith or Brown or Jones out of work?" The reason is that we have endeavoured to tack on to a machine system certain considerations which had force prior to the invention of machinery, but are of no force now. The Government are continuing that mistake. This trouble of unemployment has to be faced in a different manner; and until that is done, justice will not be rendered to the people whom we represent.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.26 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 18th August, 1932.

	PAGE
Personal explanation: Hon. J. J. Holmes and the Lunacy Act	102
Address-in-Reply, fourth day	102
Temporary Chairmen of Committees	103
Motion, suspension of Standing Orders	103

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Hon. J. J. Holmes and the Lunacy Act.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: With the permission of the House I should like to make a personal explanation. When Mr. Moore was speaking yesterday, he referred to legislation passed by this Chamber and held some of the measures up to ridicule. As a compliment to Mr. Moore, who has been absent from this House for the last six years, I interjected that we had also amended the Lunacy Act. I did not intend to cast any reflection upon Mr. Moore; I merely followed up his comments on this Chamber respecting legislation passed by us, and which he ridiculed. I understand that Mr. Moore has regarded my remarks as personal. They were intended in exactly the opposite direction. Because of his absence, it was necessary to amend the Lunacy Act! Apart from his political views, which I agreed with in my younger days, but from which I departed in my maturer years, there is no man in this House I respect more than Mr. Moore.

Hon. T. MOORE: I thank Mr. Holmes for his remarks.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fourth Day.

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from the previous sitting.

On motion by Hon. A. Thomson, debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 4.35 to 9.55 p.m.

TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with Standing Order 31A I have nominated as temporary Chairmen of Committees the Hon. J. Nicholson, the Hon. W. H. Kitson, and the Hon. V. Hamersley.

MOTION—SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.

Supply Bill (No. 1) £2,225,000.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended to enable the House to pass through all stages at one sitting a Bill for "An Act to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of one million three hundred thousand pounds, and from moneys to credit of the General Loan Fund six hundred thousand pounds, and from moneys to credit of the Government Property Sales Fund twenty-five thousand pounds to the service of the year ending 30th June, 1933, and to apply out of the Public Account the sum of three hundred thousand pounds for the purpose of temporary advances to be made by the Treasurer."

The PRESIDENT: It is necessary that there should be an absolute majority of members present before the motion can be carried. Apart from the President, there are 16 members present in the Chamber; that is an absolute majority.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Is the Bill before us, or is there any guarantee that it will reach us to-night?

The PRESIDENT: If the hon. member will look up Standing Orders 422 to 424 he will find that the first reads—

In cases of urgent necessity any Standing Order of the Council may be suspended on motion duly made and seconded, without notice, provided that such motion be agreed to by an absolute majority of the whole of the number of members.

Hon. members will agree that that is quite clear. What is urgent is that which, in the opinion of the President, is urgent. The question is that the motion be agreed to.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have no desire to oppose the motion, but I should like to point out that the action we are about to take is unprecedented. As you, Mr. President, have pointed out, Standing Order 422 provides for cases of urgent necessity. The President is the judge of the urgent necessity. The position now is that the title of a Bill has been read to the House, and the Bill in question has not yet, so far as we know, passed another place.

Of course, I have no doubt about the Bill passing another place.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: But when?

Hon. J. CORNELL: We are creating a precedent in this House by suspending the Standing Orders and waiting until another place passes a Bill. The title of that Bill may be amended. Assuming that another place amends the title, our position will then be that we have carried a resolution suspending the Standing Orders to deal with a Bill the title of which does not square with the title set out in the motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders. So far as my association with this House is concerned, the position is unique, and the older members should endeavour jealously to protect the rights we possess. If, for the sake of convenience, we are to create a precedent, we should be very careful.

The PRESIDENT: If the title of the Bill that will be sent to us is different from the title described in the motion, then of course the suspension of the Standing Orders will not apply to that Bill. The suspension will apply only to a Bill with a title as set out in the motion. As members are aware, there is a period in every session when we suspend all Standing Orders to enable any Bill that comes forward to pass through all stages at one sitting, and when it is allowable to suspend the Standing Orders for that purpose, it is allowable to do the same thing with regard to the title of a Bill as set out. Any hon. member may object to the course of action proposed, and the motion will not then be carried.

Hon. J. T. Franklin: Would it not be better to adjourn the House until to-morrow morning?

The PRESIDENT: The Standing Orders distinctly set out "Unless otherwise ordered the House shall sit on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays." We cannot sit to-morrow without giving notice of a motion to sit on the additional day.

Hon. J. Cornell: If it is competent to suspend one Standing Order, is it not competent to suspend the Standing Order that provides that we shall sit on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays?

The PRESIDENT: It would be a still more unusual course to sit on a day without notice having been given to all members. Some members are not now present and they would have no opportunity of knowing that it was intended to sit to-morrow. I would strongly oppose that course as being not quite fair. However, it rests with members.

I do not know what the Leader of the House proposes to do—whether to sit on to-night and await the arrival of the Bill from another place. Is that the intention?

The Chief Secretary: I understand that the Bill will be in our hands very shortly.

The PRESIDENT: The motion before the House is in order. If any hon. member considers that it is not in order, or that it is improper, he can object to it and it will not be carried.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If this action were going to get us anywhere, I would not have anything to say. We cannot meet until Tuesday and the suspension of the Standing Orders is a departure from the usual procedure; we are breaking new ground for no purpose whatever. I am as certain as I am sitting here that we cannot get any further to-night, and that we shall not have the Bill before us until Tuesday. Then why break away from recognised rules? I have told the Leader of the House that I am not concerned about the question of urgency; I am not prepared to sit after 10 o'clock at night. I start my work at 5 o'clock in the morning and when I go on until 10 o'clock at night I have finished for the day. If the business is going to be rushed through, as is usually done towards the end of the session, it will not be rushed through with my assistance, because I shall not be here. We have been hanging round all the evening and now we are asked to wait still longer on the off-chance of another place passing the Bill so that we might deal with it to-night. We shall be establishing a precedent which I think is dangerous.

Hon. J. Cornell: I should like to ask the Chief Secretary whether anyone will suffer in the event of the Supply Bill not being passed before next Tuesday.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Even on Tuesday next we shall still require a statutory majority unless I give notice of the motion to-night. In view of the objection on the part of several members to the suggested procedure, I will, with the permission of the House, withdraw the motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders, and give notice of my intention to move it at the next sitting of the House.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I now give notice that it is my intention to submit the motion at the next sitting of the House.

House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 18th August, 1932.

	PAGE
Questions: Distraint auction	104
Unemployment—1, Foreigners on sustenance; 2, numbers picked up for work	104-5
Education, sick leave	105
Bill, Supply (No. 1), £2,225,000. Committee of Supply, etc.	105

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

QUESTION—DISTRRAINT AUCTION.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Attorney General: 1, In the matter of Theresa Hunt v. Edwards, on what date was the property of Mrs. Hunt put up for auction by the bailiff at Fremantle? 2, What was the amount of the bid received? 3, On a subsequent date was the property again submitted for auction by the bailiff? 4, What was the bid on that occasion? 5, Did the bailiff receive the cash on the fall of the hammer? 6, If not, when did he receive payment? 7, What amount did the bailiff pay into court? 8, Will the Attorney General have a full investigation made into this case?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: (for the Attorney General) replied: 1, On the 26th November, 1931. 2, No bid. 3, Yes. 4, Bid, £87 10s.; paid, £52. 5, No. 6, £52 paid on 18th January, 1932. 7, £52, the full amount collected. 8, No. Mrs. Hunt brought proceedings against the bailiff under Sections 21 and 24 of the Local Courts Act for dereliction of duty. These proceedings were brought before the magistrate of the Local Court, Fremantle, and were dismissed by him. The matter has therefore already been adjudicated on.

QUESTIONS (2)—UNEMPLOYMENT.

Foreigners on Sustenance.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Railways—1, What is the number of foreign recipients of State sustenance, juveniles as well as adults? 2, What is the number of naturalised foreigners in receipt of sustenance under the State sustenance scheme?