

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [6.35]: I fully endorse all that has been said by the Chief Secretary and Sir Edward Wittenoom, and I fully appreciate all that you, Sir, as President, have been to us. I appreciate also the services rendered by the officers of the House. The session has passed very satisfactorily. The reason why members all get on so well together is, I think, that we all respect each other and avoid indulging in partisan spirit. I remind those members with nothing to fear that a number of us shortly will have to go before our electors. If I am fortunate enough to be returned once more I shall be sorry indeed to learn that any other has fallen by the wayside.

THE PRESIDENT [6.37]: I very much appreciate for myself, for the Chairman of Committees and the officers of the House generally the very kind remarks that have been made. To the casual observer it may seem a very simple matter to conduct the business of the House, and particularly simple when everything runs smoothly. It is only one like Sir Edward Wittenoom, who has been in the position himself, who knows how easy it is to make mistakes. Only by constant attention is it that errors are avoided. If I have succeeded as President, and if the Chairman of Committees has succeeded to the extent to which you are good enough to say we have succeeded, it is only because we have been assisted by members themselves in observing the Standing Orders. And we have been helped by the Chief Secretary and the Honorary Minister through the consideration they have always paid to us, and we have been helped also by the Clerk of Parliaments and the Clerk Assistant. I join with what has been said as to the gratitude we all owe to the officers of the House and to the "Hansard" staff. I sincerely hope that all members will enjoy a merry Christmas and a happy New Year, and that in the coming year the State will continue progressive and prosperous.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [6.46]: You, Sir, have been good enough to return thanks for me, and so my task is easy. I rise to particularly thank you, Sir, and all members of the House, and the staff down to the humblest employee for the courtesy and kindly consideration extended to my old friend and colleague, the Hon. J. E. Dodd, who has asked me to say that for him. Mr. Hamersley has referred to those members who will have to

appear before the judgment bar of the country early next year. I am one of those who dislike changes. I have a strong preference for the old things and old practices, and the worst luck I wish the retiring members is that they will all come back again.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.43 a.m. (Saturday).

Legislative Assembly,

Friday, 9th December, 1927.

	PAGE
Bills: Dog Act Amendment, Council's Amendments, conference requested	2571
Dog Act Amendment, Conference Managers' Report	2588
Leighton-Bobb's Jetty Railway, returned	2575
Public Service Commissioner's Salary, returned	2575
Parliamentary Allowances Act Amendment, returned	2575
Loan, £4,040,000, returned	2575
Metropolitan Town Planning Commission, returned	2575
Employment Brokers, Council's Message	2575
Meekatharra-Wiluna Railway, Council's Amendment	2575
Meekatharra-Wiluna Railway, Council's Message	2587
Road Closure, Council's Amendments	2586
Appropriation, returned	2587
Workers' Compensation Act, Council's Amendments	3587
Workers' Compensation Act, Council's Message, Conference	2591
Assent to Bill	2575
Close of Session, Complimentary Remarks	2592
Adjournment	2593

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

BILL—DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Bill subject to a schedule of five amendments, which were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; Mr. Latham in charge of the Bill.

No. 1—Clause 2, Subclause 2. In line 1 strike out "to" and insert "as regards dogs in depots registered by"; in lines 3 and 4 strike out "as regards dogs in depots registered by," and add the following proviso:—"provided that this subsection shall not apply to any dogs held on a private holding":

Mr. LATHAM: I move—

That the amendments be agreed to.

The object of the Council is to have the depots registered by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Without the amendment, everyone who is a member of the society would be able to say that he was holding dogs on behalf of the society. The Council's amendment means that the premises of such persons will have to be registered as depots.

Mr. Mann: With whom?

Mr. LATHAM: With themselves. The member's premises will have to be registered with the society as depots.

Mr. Mann: How will that affect veterinary surgeons?

Mr. LATHAM: It will not affect them at all. They do not hold dogs in the sense that the R.S.P.C.A. does, when they hold dogs while they endeavour to find suitable homes for them or until they destroy them.

Mr. DAVY: Has the R.S.P.C.A. any machinery for registering such depots?

The PREMIER: I do not think the society has.

Mr. DAVY: Whose depots are these referred to?

Mr. Latham: The R.S.P.C.A.'s depots.

Mr. DAVY: The clause is clear enough and I do not think there is any necessity for the amendment. How can one register one's own property with oneself?

The PREMIER: The amendments do not seem to be clear. In the second amendment the Council proposed to strike out the words "as regards their custody from time to time" but the subclause reads "as regards dogs in their custody from time to time." Thus the Council leaves in the words "dogs in" and the line would read: "This section shall not apply as regards in depots registered by the R.S.P.C.A. of Western Australian dogs in and held temporarily by them for the purpose of finding dogs suitable homes."

Mr. Corboy: It does not make sense.

The PREMIER: Of course it does not.

Mr. Davy: There is obviously a mistake.

Mr. Corboy: I suggest that we substitute "established" for "registered," making the clause refer to depots established by the R.S.P.C.A.

Mr. LATHAM: Every member of the society might have a depot in which to keep stray dogs, and it is proposed that if dogs are going to be held in that way, they shall be held only in depots of which we have a knowledge. I see no necessity for the Council's amendment, but the easiest way out will be to accept it.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The member for York says there is no need for the amendment. To move that the amendment be not agreed to would be a direct negative, but we can vote against the motion.

Mr. LINDSAY: Individual members of the R.S.P.C.A. collect stray dogs and claim exemption for keeping them pending their disposal.

Mr. Davy: That would be an absurd contention.

Mr. LINDSAY: To overcome that, it has been provided that the depots must be registered and I assume that that means registered with the R.S.P.C.A.

Mr. Corboy: You might assume that, but what will the court say on this big national question of Fido?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Members of the R.S.P.C.A. can collect stray dogs and put them in a depot. The object of the Council's amendment is to permit of such depots being continued. If a depot was established on my farm I would be exempt from the registration provisions of the 1903 Act. The Council's amendment makes the provision broader and wider.

Mr. DAVY: I cannot see how someone can register with himself something belonging to himself. I move—

That the Council's amendment be amended by inserting between "in" and "depots" the word "recognised," deleting "registered by" and adding "of."

Mr. SAMPSON: The Council's amendment is no improvement on the clause as it left this Chamber.

Mr. Pantou: There never is any improvement.

Mr. SAMPSON: The subclause has been differently constructed, but I cannot see that its meaning is made any more clear.

Mr. LATHAM: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. Certain dogs may

be unregistered, and those who are in possession of them may, as members of the R.S.P.C.A., claim that they are holding them temporarily.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is too thin. Would a constable or police magistrate accept that sort of thing?

Mr. LATHAM: I would rather see the clause stand as printed than have the amendment passed.

Mr. MANN: If the member for York would agree to the substitution of the word "control" for "registered" it would overcome the difficulty. It frequently happens that an inspector of the society hands a dog to some person for treatment. If the clause provided that this dog was then under the control of an authorised person, everything would be in order. I do not want to see it possible for some valuable animal to be killed when it is in the hands of some unregistered person for treatment. I only want to help the hon. member.

Mr. Latham: I do not expect help from the whole of this side of the House.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member will get all the help he is entitled to.

Mr. Latham: I do not want any more than that.

Mr. DAVY: As the member for York prefers the clause in its original form to that in which it is now amended by the Council, I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not see why we should not agree to the Council's amendment, which improves the clause. When any matter turning on dogs comes up, we usually display a very lively interest. The amendment does not make any real difference to the Bill, and will not lead to any increase in the number of unregistered dogs.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: The amendment does away with the practice of members of R.S.P.C.A. designating themselves "depots." We desire to protect the industry, while the R.S.P.C.A. desire to protect the dog. A zealous member of the R.S.C.P.A. can pick up a mongrel which is a menace to the district, and can call himself a "depot."

The Premier: No.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: It is so. I do not see any machinery in the Bill as to registration.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The matter is not worth bothering about.

Mr. C. P. WANSBROUGH: It is worth while bothering to ensure that there shall be means of checking some members of the R.S.P.C.A.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 2. Clause 2, Subclause 2.—Add the following proviso:—"Provided that this subsection shall not apply to any dogs held on a private holding."

Mr. LATHAM: In view of the fact that the previous amendment has not been agreed to, there is no necessity for this amendment.

The Premier: It is highly objectionable as well as unnecessary.

Mr. LATHAM: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 3. Clause 4. Strike out the word "sheep" in line four with a view to inserting the word "livestock" in lieu thereof.

Mr. LATHAM: I hope this amendment will have a better reception. In the North, it appears dogs which have gone wild attack young calves as well as sheep. In my own district I have seen calves come home in the morning with their tails bitten off by wild dogs. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

The PREMIER: This amendment strikes at a vital principle of the Bill, a principle that was discussed when the measure was going through. Several members desired to exclude the metropolitan area from the operation of the Bill, and we were informed that the very fact of the Bill referring to sheep owners excluded the metropolitan area. If local authorities are to be permitted to make by-laws for the protection of livestock owners—and livestock includes everything on four legs and possibly many things on two legs—the metropolitan local authorities will be placed in a position to dictate whether one shall own a dog, or how many dogs one shall own, and what sort of dog or dogs one shall own. The Bill was introduced for the purpose of protecting farmers and pastoralists against destruction of their sheep by wild dogs. When the measure was passing through this Chamber, I suggested that it would be wise to exclude the metropolitan area specifically. The amendment throws open the whole State to

the operation of the measure, and I hope it will not be agreed to. On the other hand, I shall have no objection to the amendment if the metropolitan area is excluded. I do not doubt that dogs do a considerable amount of harm to young calves, just as they do to sheep; and probably it is as necessary to protect the cattle owner against wild dogs as it is to protect the sheep owner. However, the amendment is altogether too far-reaching.

Mr. Latham: Will you accept "cattle owners" in place of "livestock owners"?

The PREMIER: There are cattle owners in the city.

Mr. C. P. Wansbrough: Sheep are being killed in the metropolitan area by stray dogs.

The PREMIER: The Bill was introduced to protect country people, not city people. The whole of the trouble is in the country districts.

Mr. SAMPSON: Local authorities in many cases fail to do their duty as to limiting the number of dogs. Dogs are a menace in the city as well as in the country.

The Premier: All dogs are not a menace. I do not propose to let some Bumble decide what kind of dog I may have.

Mr. SAMPSON: Local authorities have been backward rather than forward in carrying out their duty as to control of dogs. It would be a good thing for the metropolitan resident, as well as for the country resident, if the local authorities would do their duty in regard to limiting the number of dogs. It is also their duty to register dogs.

The Premier: They have failed in that respect. Why give them other duties?

Mr. SAMPSON: Large numbers of dogs are wandering about ownerless.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 4. Clause 4.—Add the following proviso at the end of the clause: "Provided that any such by-laws shall be approved by the Governor and shall be deemed to have been made by him."

Mr. LATHAM: This amendment is quite unnecessary, the matter being already provided for in the Interpretation Act. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 5. Clause 5.—Add at the end the following words: "and by adding a new paragraph as follows:—'Notwithstanding Subsection 1, paragraph (j), of Section 4 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1920, it shall be lawful for the occupier of agricultural or pastoral land on which livestock are depastured, to lay poison on his own holding for the purpose of protecting his stock in accordance with this section.'"

Mr. LATHAM: Evidently this amendment is intended to clear up a misunderstanding which has arisen through R.S.P.C.A. inspectors attempting to debar stock owners from laying poison for stray dogs. I do not think there is any real necessity for the amendment, but it can do no harm. In fact, the matter is already provided for by law. However, the R.S.P.C.A. inspectors have bluffed a good many land owners. Laying poison is practically the only means of destroying dingoes. Another place considers it necessary to clear the position up. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I ask your ruling on the following point, Mr. Chairman. The amendment introduces a new paragraph which begins—

Notwithstanding Subsection 1, paragraph (j), of Section 4 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act

The amendment either amends the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, or else nullifies it, which has the same effect for the purposes of my argument. I want to know whether another place, or this House, is in order in amending, under the order of leave to introduce the present Bill, the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. If it does not directly amend a section in that other Act, at all events it nullifies the value of that section. I ask your ruling, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that the amendment goes beyond the Title of the Bill, and therefore is out of order.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of the Hon. W. D. Johnson and Messrs. Latham and Lindsay drew up reasons for disagreeing to the Council's amendments.

Mr. LATHAM: I have to report that the committee have met and drawn up the following reasons: No. 1, Because no provision is made for the registration of depots under the Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. No. 2, Consequential upon the first. No. 3, Because the Bill is intended to protect sheep owners, and if the amendment were made it would be operative throughout the State, including the metropolitan area. No. 4, Because the provision is already made in the Interpretation Act. No. 5, Because it would limit the provisions contained in the Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. I move—

That the report be adopted.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I do not know that we would be right in accepting these reasons off hand. On a question of such importance, when we object to amendments made by another place we should give sound and valid reasons for disagreeing. One could not expect the members of the committee to do justice to the House.

Mr. Lindsay: I object to that statement, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I will withdraw. My reason for saying I did not think those hon. members could do justice to the House was that those three members fought like Trojans in support of the Council's amendments, which the Committee rejected. Then those three members were sent to draw up reasons why the Council's amendments were not acceptable to this Chamber. The member for York placed the other two members in an awkward position. I think we should give sound reasons for objecting to the Council's amendments.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The hon. member should be grateful to the committee for the work they did. The hon. member and others adopted a silly attitude in regard to this Bill and we got them out of it. "Hansard" will never explain their attitude, but our reasons will. They were real and sound reasons for what was done. We took the trouble to make things easy for hon. members, and consequently we should receive expressions of gratitude.

Mr. LATHAM: I am sorry the hon. member considered that the committee did not do justice to the House. The committee did not express their own feelings but the feelings of the House, and I sincerely hope the House will agree to the reasons.

Mr. LINDSAY: When hon. members are appointed to draw up reasons, those reasons are usually based on the arguments expressed in the House. The member for Mt. Margaret has treated the whole matter as a joke. I regard it as too serious to be made fun of. Ever since the Bill has been before us it has been treated as a joke, and I object to that sort of thing. I also object to anything discussed here in which I am interested being regarded as a joke. We expressed, not only our own views, but the views of members generally, when we drew up the reasons, and included in them were the views of the member for Mt. Margaret, if he ever had any, and I don't think he had.

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

BILLS (5)—RETURNED.

- 1, Leighton-Robb's Jetty Railway.
 - 2, Public Service Commissioner's Salary.
 - 3, Parliamentary Allowances Act Amendment.
 - 4, Loan £4,940,000.
 - 5, Metropolitan Town Planning Commission.
- Without amendment.

BILL—EMPLOYMENT BROKERS' ACT AMENDMENT.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it insisted on its amendments disagreed to by the Assembly.

On motion by Hon. J. Cunningham, Message ordered to be taken into consideration at a later stage of the sitting.

Sitting suspended from 5.50 to 9.30 p.m.

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read, notifying assent to Supply Bill (No. 3), £1,363,500.

BILL—MEEKATHARRA-WILUNA RAILWAY.

Council's Amendment.

Bill returned from the Council with an amendment, which was now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Premier (for the Minister for Works) in charge of the Bill.

Amendment—Clause 2. Add the following proviso: "Provided that the construction of such railway shall be effected by private contract following on tenders being called for the construction, in leading newspapers in the State of Western Australia, and shall not be performed by day labour."

The PREMIER: The Council's amendment is in the form of a proviso to Clause 2 and reads, "Provided that the construction of such railway shall be effected by private contract following on tenders being called for the construction, in leading newspapers of the State of Western Australia, and shall not be performed by day labour." I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed.

Report Stage.

Mr. Thomson: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. G. Taylor: Mr. Thomson has been on his feet for some time, Sir.

Ministerial Members: No.

The Chairman: I have declared the motion carried.

Mr. Thomson: I called out, Sir. It is not my fault if you did not hear.

The Chairman: I did not hear you.

Hon. G. Taylor: You were reading, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thomson: If members want to take advantage of an unfortunate error—

The Chairman: It is always the rule to call for the Ayes and Noes, and I did so.

Mr. Thomson: I certainly called out. I was on my feet. I got up the instant the Premier sat down, and I called out "Mr. Lutey." Do you rule that, the motion having been carried, I am too late?

The Chairman: That is so.

Mr. Thomson: I am not going to argue, but I would have been glad of the opportunity of saying a few words.

Ministerial Member: Hop up quicker, then!

Mr. Thomson: Another time, if a member gets up—

The Chairman: The question is that I report to the House. The hon. member must not argue.

Mr. Thomson: I might argue that I disagree with your ruling, Sir.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is the proper thing to do.

Mr. Thomson: I am rather sorry that the Premier moved to disagree to—

The Chairman: The question is that I now report to the House.

Mr. Thomson: I do not want that report to go to the House, and I want to give my reasons why that report should not be made.

The Chairman: You cannot discuss the report.

Mr. Thomson: I think I am entitled to give reasons why the report should not be given. You are suggesting that the question is that you do now report to the House.

The Chairman: You cannot discuss the report to the House.

Mr. Thomson: I should be glad, Sir, if you would show me that the Standing Orders do not permit me to discuss the report. I can give reasons why the report should not be adopted.

Hon. G. Taylor: Dissent from the Chairman's ruling!

The Chairman: My ruling is that the question before the Chair is that I do now report to the House. The custom has been to have no discussion whatever on that motion. It does not admit of discussion.

Mr. Thomson: I disagree with your ruling, Sir.

Hon. G. Taylor: Not on that point, but on the first point.

Mr. Thomson: On the first point.

The Chairman: The question is that I do now report to the House.

Mr. Davy: Am I to understand, Mr. Chairman, that there are certain motions in this House on which no discussion is permitted?

The Chairman: Several.

Mr. Davy: Is it definitely laid down in the Standing Orders that this is one of them? Because I do submit that we were prevented from discussing this very important amendment, whether we are in favour of it or not. Because you do not happen to see a member standing on his feet—

The Chairman: The question is that I do now report to the House.

Hon. G. Taylor: You cannot move yourself out of the Chair.

Mr. Davy: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, whether it is your ruling that when the motion is whether you report to the House or not, no discussion can ensue?

The Chairman: There is nothing relevant to the report.

Mr. Davy: Am I to understand that discussion is permissible provided it is relevant to whether or not you report to the House?

The Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Davy: Then I have something relevant to say on the question whether you now report to the House.

The Chairman: You might move some amendment.

Hon. G. Taylor: The question is that the Chairman do now report to the House. The hon. member can move to strike out the word "now."

The Premier: That has never been done before.

Hon. G. Taylor: But there has never been such a rush before.

The Chairman: I will put the question to the Committee. The question is that I do now report to the House.

Hon. G. Taylor: I have never seen such a scandalous thing done before.

The Chairman: Order! The hon. member will keep order. The hon. member must not make remarks like that.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	12
				—
Majority for	5
				—

AYES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Lamond
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Troy
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Withers
Mr. Kennally	Mr. Panton
Mr. Kennedy	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angelo	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Brown	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Davy	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Thomson
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. Latbam	Mr. North

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

The CHAIRMAN: I have to report, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee have considered the Council's message, and have disagreed to the amendment made by the Council in the Bill.

The PREMIER: I move—
That the report be adopted.

Mr. THOMSON: I desire to move an amendment. According to Standing Order 295—

On the motion for the adoption of the report, the whole Bill may, on motion, be re-committed and further amendments made.

The Premier: You cannot recommit a report.

Mr. THOMSON: I was desirous of moving an amendment, and, unfortunately, while I was on my feet the Chairman of Committees did not see me. Although I called out, the Chairman put the question and, it having been carried on the voices, declared that he could not listen to me. I want the Bill re-committed so that the Committee may be able to consider a further amendment. I object to the adoption of the report. The matter has not been considered by this Chamber. The Premier immediately moved "That the Council's amendment be not agreed to." I am desirous of moving a further amendment so that tenders shall be called.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order. The hon. member is moving to recommit the Bill, practically. Under Standing Order 295—

On the motion for the adoption of the report—

That is after the Bill is reported. .

—the whole Bill may, on motion, be re-committed and further amendments made, but at a subsequent day to that on which the second report is brought up shall be fixed for moving the adoption of such second report

Mr. Thomson: This is a second report.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member need not remind me. He is dealing now, not with the report on the Bill, but with the report on a message on the Bill from the Legislative Council, and that only. There is no Standing Order which permits the hon. member to recommit to this House the whole Bill, which the Bill has left, having been reported on and sent to another place and returned with amendments. There is no provision whatever for such an amendment as the hon. member now suggests being permitted. Therefore, I must rule it out of order. The question before the Chair is that the report of the Committee be adopted.

Mr. THOMSON: I shall move to disagree with your ruling. I regret to have to do it.

at this late stage of the session, but we have to protect our rights in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will withdraw that reflection on the Chair.

Mr. THOMSON: I am not reflecting on the Chair; my remark was in reply to an interjection.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has no right to reply to interjections.

Mr. THOMSON: I shall withdraw the remark, but I hope you will see that members around me do not interject.

Mr. SPEAKER: If my attention is drawn to interjections, I will take the necessary action.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Would we not be in order in giving reasons why the report should not be adopted? The motion before the Chair is that the report be adopted. That motion will admit of discussion, and if that be so any hon. member who desires to give cogent reasons why the report should not be adopted, should be permitted to do so. Will you give me your ruling on that point?

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Katanning has stated he intends to move to dissent from my ruling; I cannot entertain anything else at the moment.

Mr. Thomson: I am willing to give way until you, Sir, have replied to the member for Mr. Margaret's query.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling is distinctly that any subject proposed from the Chair, with the exception of certain motions specifically set out in the Standing Orders, is open to discussion, but a discussion cannot take place on matters that have already been dealt with and passed by a vote of this Chamber.

Mr. DAVY: Would this be in order: the motion is that the report be adopted; would not any argument, cogent to the question, whether or not the report be adopted, be relevant? Suppose an hon. member can show to you, Sir, that through a misunderstanding a decision has been arrived at without proper discussion?

The Minister for Lands: No; the House has decided.

Mr. DAVY: Would it not be relevant to show that the report was not a correct statement of what had happened, and that the reporting to the House gave a wrong account of what actually happened, that owing to a mistake or misunderstanding the House had not considered the matter. I do suggest that at this juncture there is no reason why we should start getting heated.

There is a long night before us and there is no doubt that when the Chairman of Committees put the question the member for Katanning was on his feet with the intention of speaking to the message.

Mr. Coverley: He was not on his feet.

Mr. DAVY: Even if the hon. member thinks I am wrong, surely the House will not stop discussion. We were all perfectly pleasant and happy together, and for some reason the Chairman of Committees failed to see the member for Katanning on his feet, and the question was put and declared carried before anyone on this side of the House had time to open his mouth. For those reasons it would be wrong for us to adopt the report. I suggest we do not adopt the report and that both sides be given an opportunity to discuss this most important message.

The Premier: If we do not adopt the report, can we go back to the previous position?

Mr. DAVY: Would it not be possible by the will of the House to recommit this message?

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Katanning wanted to recommit the Bill.

Hon. G. Taylor: That was only a slip. He meant to refer to the message.

Mr. DAVY: We should recommit the message.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will accept an amendment to that effect.

Mr. DAVY: I move an amendment—

That the message be recommitted.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not think that motion can be accepted for the reason that this House has given a decision on the question. There was a division on it. The message contained an amendment to the Bill in the form of a proviso to a clause, and the Premier moved that it be not agreed to. The House gave a decision on the matter and when the hon. member draws attention to what was done and says that it was wrong, he reflects upon the vote given by a majority of this House.

Hon. G. Taylor: That is not so.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: How can the House recommit something upon which the House has given a decision and has declared that a certain thing shall not be done?

Mr. Davy: What does "recommit" mean? It means to go back on something already done.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Standing Orders do not provide that recommitments shall go on indefinitely.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Standing Orders do not provide against recommitments.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Standing Orders provide how we shall conduct our business. Here we have a message from another place which has been disagreed to by this House, and now we are asked that it be reconsidered.

Mr. Davy: If we had not done it, we could not ask for a recommitment.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: How can we recommit something that the House has said shall not be done.

Mr. Davy: That is the essence of recommitment—putting back something we have already done.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It has never been done before in this House.

Hon. G. Taylor: There was never such an occasion.

The Premier: You cannot recall the time when a message was ever recommitted.

Mr. Thomson: In the circumstances it should be recommitted.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The motion was not carried formally; it was carried by a division.

Mr. Sampson: Through an oversight, discussion was prevented.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That has nothing to do with the case; that has gone.

Mr. Davy: All the more reason for the recommitment.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No hon. member can say that because he did not have a chance to discuss the matter it should be brought on again. It would be farcical if we were always going on recommitting every message. There are the first, second and third stages, and then the recommitment. There must be an end to it; it cannot go on for all time. The House should not stultify itself by doing something it has already said shall not be done.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am amazed at the Minister for Lands making such a statement, that because we have already dealt with a matter, it cannot be recommitted. Let us take our Standing Orders. No. 293 says—

The Chairman shall sign a printed copy of every Bill to be reported, with the amend-

ments fairly written thereon; and also sign with the initials of his name any clause added in the Committee, and the Bill so signed shall be handed by the Chairman to the clerk when he makes his report to the House.

Then No. 294 says—

When a Bill is reported without amendments, the adoption of the report may be immediately moved.

And again in No. 295 we get this—

On the motion for the adoption of the report, the whole Bill may, on motion, be recommitted

We are dealing with a message from another place, and that message takes the same place as a Bill.

The Premier: The Standing Orders you have quoted do not apply.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: They give power to recommit.

The Premier: Not those Standing Orders; they do not apply at all.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I have never seen anything so shocking during my experience in this House.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: On a point of order; when the Chairman of Committees had put the question, the member for Mt. Margaret made use of an expression similar to that which he used again just now. The Chairman regarded it as a reflection on the Chair and made the hon. member withdraw the remark. Now the hon. member has repeated his statement and I ask that he be called upon to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark.

Hon. G. Taylor: I will withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already stated that the Standing Orders quoted by the members for Katanning and Mt. Margaret do not affect the question at all, but I am not able to discover any Standing Order that prevents a recommitment of a message received from another place when it is alleged that there are good reasons for reconsidering it. It is entirely for the House to decide the matter and I shall put the question. The motion is "That the report be adopted" and an amendment has been moved "That the message be recommitted." The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

Amendment put and passed.

Recommittal.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. THOMSON: I move—

That the Council's amendment be amended by striking out the word "private" and all the words after "contract," and inserting the words "and that the Public Works Department shall have the right to submit a tender."

I do not wish to debar the Government from exercising their judgment as to what they consider best, but in the construction of a railway that might easily cost up to £500,000 we should have a check on the department. My amendment might assist the Government to get the Bill passed.

Mr. Marshall: The Government would not have the right to put the railway through at all if I had my way.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Just because of a little trouble for a moment.

Mr. Marshall: People with no responsibility doing that sort of thing! It makes me tired.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I support the amendment on the Council's amendment, which is entirely in accordance with the policy of the Country Party, who stand for the construction of public works by the contract system. There are particular reasons why tenders should be called and why the Public Works Department should have the right to submit a tender. It would be fair to everyone. Quite recently a railway has been constructed by private enterprise from Meekatharra to Horseshoe.

Mr. Lambert: You are absolutely wrong.

The Premier: It was built by day labour.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: But it was not built by the Government by day labour.

Mr. Corboy: It was built by day labour.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The chairman of directors of the company is one of the best known contractors in Australia.

The Premier: He did not have a contract for that railway.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: No, but the company having built the line so successfully, instead of getting the Government to do it, should be in a position to submit a tender for the Wiluna railway.

The Premier: Is this amendment intended to get the contract for one particular man?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Not in the least.

The Premier: It looks like it.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That is quite unfair of the Premier.

The Premier: You say so yourself.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: No, the proposal provides clearly that the Works Department shall have the right to submit a tender.

Hon. J. Cunningham: You want a private company to have the right.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I want both the private company and the Works Department to have the right and half-a-dozen other contractors too if possible. If the contract system were adopted in this and other public works, we should get greater efficiency.

Hon. G. Taylor: And value for our money.

Mr. Corboy: If you did, you would have no Narrogin-Dwarda railway.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The Wiluna railway is one for which tenders should be called. The manganese company have built a good line from the same starting point—Meekatharra—over the same class of country. I am glad that the Leader of the Country Party, who always has the interests of the State at heart and wishes to protect the country, provided in his amendment that the Works Department should also submit a tender. If the Works Department submit the lowest tender, the Government will accept it, and if they do accept it, I hope they will see that the engineers responsible for the tender keep within the estimate. The Government will not be prevented from doing the work by day labour. We are merely asking that public tenders be called and that the best offer shall be accepted. Having seen something of the efficient way in which the railway from Meekatharra to Horseshoe was constructed, I hope the Government will at least permit their engineers to study the methods adopted and see if the Wiluna line cannot be built as quickly, cheaply, and efficiently as the Horseshoe line was built.

The Premier: How do you know what the Horseshoe railway cost?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: We merely want the company to quote for the building of the Wiluna line.

The Premier: You said the Horseshoe line had been built cheaply.

Mr. LAMBERT: The railway to Horseshoe was built not by contract but by the company by day labour, and it was built efficiently and expeditiously.

Hon. J. Cunningham: And with foreign labour at that.

Mr. LAMBERT: The percentage of foreign labour employed, I think, was no more than the percentage of foreign labour sometimes employed on the hon. member's farm.

Hon. G. Taylor: Then he cannot get any advance from the Agricultural Bank.

Mr. LAMBERT: With the exception of a few of us, no one knows the cost of the Horseshoe line, but because people assume it was built by contract, they conclude it was built cheaply. The company could not under any consideration have contracted for the building of the line, and I distinctly set my face against it. We are not in the business of constructing railways; our business is to carry on mining operations. It is only right to say that if the Government desire to have the plant and material used to build the Horseshoe railway, it will be available to them at a nominal price. We have finished with the construction plant, and if the Public Works Department want it, it is there for their use. I do not think the company would charge much for it. I deprecate the idea of any member bringing this company in to construct the line. It takes us all our time to look after our own business. With the exception of two of the directors, no one knows what our railway has cost. I hope the Government will not accept the Council's amendment, or the amendment to it, and that they will place on the Council the responsibility of the Bill being thrown out, as an alternative to adopting it as printed. With proper supervision, a railway can be constructed departmentally and by day labour most economically and efficiently. If the Council desire to block the progress of the State, they must take the responsibility of doing so. I object to these pin-pricking tactics.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to speak to the amendment.

Mr. LAMBERT: The whole thing hinges on whether the Council have the right to dictate to the Government. A certain element in another place will persist in this pin-pricking attitude, which tends only to retard the progress of the State. This is the first big mining development we have had for a long time. It would be a thousand pities if the Bill were lost, and the money already spent in that locality went for nought. I hope there will be no tinkering with the message from the Council and that we shall take up a firm stand regarding it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The amendment says that the Public Works Department may tender in conjunction with other people. If a departmental tender is accepted, the line must be constructed by day labour, for the men employed must be paid by the day. Members should not say that work must be done by day labour no matter what it costs, for the Government have no right to spend more on the work than is necessary. If the departmental methods of control are not satisfactory and the work is not done at the right cost, some other means should be adopted. It is all a question of method.

Mr. Lambert: You would not stand for dictation like this.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No one could object to the hon. member's amendment. I do not agree that we should build the line by contract no matter what the price may be.

The Minister for Lands: That is what the Council's amendment means.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It would mean either that the line would not be built if the price were excessive, or unless this House were consulted again in July next. There is no intention of building the line until we vote the money for it. The Government cannot accept any tenders because the money has not been voted. Day labour is not always satisfactory. If men can do work more cheaply under a contractor there must be some good reason for doing it under that method.

The Minister for Railways: That has not been proved in the past.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, it has.

The Minister for Lands: In some cases railways built by contract have cost the Government a lot of money to put right.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We know what happened in the case of the Wongan Hills-Mullewa line which was built by the Scaddan Government on the day labour system.

Mr. Kenneally: I think rotten half-round sleepers were put into the Mullewa line by the Wilson Government.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No. They are stacked in Northam still and are quite sound.

Mr. Kenneally: I was present when the sleepers were burnt, and when they were taken out of the line.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is not well to be wedded to one system or the other. The day labour system has been adopted in some cases with good results.

Mr. Chesson: Under the contract system you want an army of supervisors to watch the contractors.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: When a work is carried out by contract, the engineers see that the specifications are followed to the last word, whereas under day labour we do not get the same amount of supervision or probably the same amount of work.

Mr. Griffiths: It is the Government stroke without proper supervision.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the same men can do better work for a contractor, then it means that the departmental officers have not the same strong controlling force.

The PREMIER: The Government will certainly not accept the amendment. I do not read into it, nor place the construction upon it, that is indicated by the Leader of the Opposition or the mover of the amendment. It sets out that the construction of the railway shall be effected by contract, but that the Public Works Department shall have the right to put in a tender. The railway must be built by contract! Can anyone enter into a contract with himself?

Mr. Thomson: Of course you can.

The PREMIER: The Public Works Department enter into a contract with itself?

Mr. Thomson: Yes.

The PREMIER: That is absurd! It is rubbish! If I enter into a contract with myself to do something at a certain cost, and I do not carry out the contract, what happens?

Mr. Thomson: Sack the engineer.

Mr. Latham: Or else the office boy.

The PREMIER: The fact that the railway is to be built by contract, and that we can put in a tender, does not mean that the Government would have the right to carry out the work by day labour. It must be carried out by contract. Apparently the Government are to have the right to put in a contract just for fun.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But the Premier is doing it all the time.

The PREMIER: When we carry out work by day labour, we do not enter upon a contract with anyone.

Hon. G. Taylor: If the Public Works Department put in a tender, they could do it by day labour.

The PREMIER: But that would not comply with the terms of the amendment. We could not enter into a contract with anyone.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Of course you could.

The PREMIER: Certainly not.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Then alter the amendment.

The PREMIER: I am not responsible for the amendment. Someone else might attempt to make it clear and intelligible. As it stands, it is not. If the tender put in by the Works Department were the lowest, and we proposed to carry out the work by day labour accordingly, it would be a violation of the amendment because it specifically states the work must be done by contract. We cannot get away from it. What a farce it would be for the Public Works Department, which is the Government, to put in a tender under those conditions!

Mr. Thomson: Are you not entering into contracts for road construction work?

The PREMIER: With private contractors.

Mr. Thomson: Yes.

The PREMIER: What has a contract between the Government and a private contractor to do with this?

Mr. Thomson: You tender for Commonwealth roads.

The PREMIER: But the Commonwealth Government accepts the tender; not the State Government.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, you accept it.

The PREMIER: No, we do not.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Well, let us have the agreement.

The PREMIER: You can have the agreement. The contract has to be approved and endorsed by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Marshall: And then they usually break the contract.

The PREMIER: Apart from that the amendment as it is worded would not permit to be done what the hon. member suggests. Then again, why is it desired to impose this condition in respect to this particular railway?

Mr. Thomson: We have tried to impose it regarding other railways.

The PREMIER: But why this particular railway? If it were the railway to Kelparin or to some other agricultural district no such amendment would be suggested, nor

would its passage through Parliament be endangered.

Mr. Thomson: That is very unjust.

Mr. Marshall: It is absolutely true.

Mr. Chesson: Of course it is.

Mr. Thomson: It is not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Hon. members must keep order.

The PREMIER: I am referring to the Legislative Council. I may not reflect upon that House but this is merely another method of killing the Bill. This is the first gold-fields railway Bill that has been before Parliament for the past two decades, and yet it is sought to impose conditions that have not attached to any other railway and which will mean the loss of the Bill. Instead of honestly dealing with the position—

Mr. Thomson: It is the longest railway that we have dealt with for a long time.

The PREMIER: But not the most expensive. There is a short length of railway extending over 20 miles from Pemberton to Northcliffe that will cost much more than this line.

Mr. Thomson: We have no estimates.

The PREMIER: There is a short length of railway that will cost £20,000 a mile, yet the cost of the railway under discussion will not exceed £3,000 a mile.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I suppose that was Mr. Stileman's estimate?

The PREMIER: No, that estimate was put up by the engineers when the Leader of the Opposition was in office. He should know that himself.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I was merely asking a question.

The PREMIER: The hon. member should not reflect upon Mr. Stileman.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I was not.

The PREMIER: There is a tendency to make out that Mr. Stileman recommends works on an expensive scale. If I were to start making comparisons between Mr. Stileman and other engineers who have been or who are here now, it would be bad for the other engineers. I resent this tendency on every occasion to reflect upon Mr. Stileman.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There was no reflection at all.

The PREMIER: Of course there was. When I said that the estimate was £20,000 a mile, the hon. member said, "Mr. Stileman's estimate."

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Well, was it?

The PREMIER: What was the hon. member's suggestion? Obviously it was that Mr.

Stileman had put in the estimate and that it was absurdly high. As a matter of fact the estimate was put in by engineers when the Leader of the Opposition was in office.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Do you know that?

The PREMIER: Yes, and I know it was not put up by Mr. Stileman.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Well, we shall get the file.

Hon. G. Taylor: Not this session, I hope.

The PREMIER: Why is this condition imposed on this particular railway? The only reason is to kill the Bill. The absurdly ridiculous wording of the amendment itself must appeal to hon. members. A set of second-standard schoolboys would not submit an amendment couched in such terms. If agreed to, it would compel the Government to call for tenders and if only one tender were submitted, no matter how high the price might be, we would be compelled to accept it, or else not go on with the work. We are not to be allowed to do the work by day labour, no matter how high the tender may be. That shows that the desire of the Legislative Council is to kill the Bill—nothing else! To show the inconsistency of the Upper House, only last night they passed a Bill for the construction of another railway and no such condition was imposed then.

Mr. Thomson: No, but only £2,000 is to be spent in connection with that work.

The PREMIER: But they passed the Bill, and no such condition was imposed.

Mr. Thomson: We were told—

The PREMIER: But the fact is that they passed the Bill for the Leighton-Robb's Jetty railway without any such conditions.

Mr. Thomson: Yes, but the expenditure was to be limited to £2,000.

The PREMIER: It does not matter how much money is to be spent; the principle is the same. If it is sound regarding the gold-fields railway to say that it must be done by contract, the principle must be equally good whether it applies to that line or to the shorter line from Leighton to Robb's Jetty. That justifies me in my assertion that the object is to kill the Bill. We have passed railway Bills for years past and no such condition has been imposed by the Council before. Will they insist upon a similar condition regarding the Kalkarin railway?

Mr. Thomson: We tried it before.

The PREMIER: We shall see.

Mr. Corboy: They are not game to try.

The PREMIER: The Government will not have one set of conditions applied to goldfields railways, and different conditions to agricultural railways.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: An attempt was made to impose conditions in connection with a South-West railway.

Mr. Thomson: Yes. I tried it in this House.

The PREMIER: I know the hon. member has always voted for contract in opposition to day work.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, the proposal came from the Legislative Council.

The PREMIER: Why pick out this line?

The Minister for Railways: Yes, two railways in two days and two different sets of conditions.

The PREMIER: Yes, one without the condition, the other with it. The whole object is to prevent the construction of this line.

Mr. Thomson: I do not think you are right in saying that.

The PREMIER: If this principle is to be established, the proper way to enforce it is not by way of an amendment of this description in a railway Bill. The proper way would be to introduce a Bill setting out that all railways authorised by Parliament shall be constructed on the lines laid down in the amendment.

Hon. G. Taylor: It would be a wise thing, too.

The PREMIER: Then we could discuss the principle on its merits, apart from any particular railway. The Legislative Council does not want this railway built to the Wiluna district.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You should not say that.

The PREMIER: I believe it. The Council has inserted conditions that will kill the Bill. If they want a railway that suits them, they do not impose conditions; if they do not want it, they impose conditions. The Bill I suggest would not be a money Bill and any hon. member could introduce it.

Mr. Thomson: I will promise you such a Bill for next session.

The PREMIER: The door should not be left open to allow another place to side-track a railway Bill by the means they have adopted this evening.

Mr. Thomson: That is not fair.

The PREMIER: The method adopted does leave the door open.

The Minister for Railways: What has happened since yesterday?

The PREMIER: We might well ask why the Council have decided to impose this condition, and kill the Bill.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It will not necessarily kill it.

The PREMIER: Of course it will.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Could you not accept the lowest tender?

The PREMIER: The amendment will kill the Bill because the Government are not prepared to accept it. Then there will be no authority to proceed with the work.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There would be, if you accepted the amendment.

The PREMIER: And the Government will not accept the application of this principle to agricultural railways next year. Hon. members should bear that in mind. Never before has it been proposed that the hands of any Government shall be tied in such a way. Then again, we are to be allowed to advertise in Western Australian newspapers only. It does not matter that there may be contractors in the Eastern States who might be able to undertake the work. We must not advertise in the East. And then, having called tenders, we must accept a tender no matter how high it might be, or else not build the railway. With all the railways that have been authorised during the past 20 years, Parliament has never inserted a provision of this kind.

Mr. Thomson: It has been attempted before.

The PREMIER: But Parliament has never adopted it. It would be most improper to tie the hands of any Government and declare how they shall build their railways. The Government are responsible to Parliament for the work, but Parliament has never tied the hands of any Government and declared how they shall carry out a job. This invidious distinction between a goldfields railway and other railways is drawn for the purpose of killing the Bill. Were it not so, the thing would have been done in a proper way by putting up a Bill and making it apply to all railway construction. But to pick out a railway here and another there on'y leaves the door open to the defeat of a Bill when it is desired that a certain railway shall not be constructed. They did not do it in the railway Bill last night, but they do it to-night.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That was only a railway of three miles.

The PREMIER: But the principle is the same, whether the railway is one of three miles or of 300 miles. The Government are not going to accept it.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: This House should have some regard to the expenditure of public money. We have had experience of departmental engineers submitting tenders of £35,000 for jobs that ultimately cost £125,000.

The Premier: But how would that apply to this position? It would be the same engineers who would submit the tender in this case, and the tender might be equally far astray, and the work would cost just as much as if no tender had been submitted.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The amendment is to prevent the Public Works Department from taking on the work without any regard to ultimate cost. If the department tenders for the work, and later the tender is found to be unreliable, then those responsible for it should get their walking ticket. It is time the House took some interest in the expenditure of loan moneys. We have voted nearly five millions of money to be frittered away by irresponsibles in the Works Department. The Government want all State work done by day labour, but when it comes to private work it is done by contract.

The Premier: To whom do you refer?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: To any of the members on that side that I may know of. This railway from Meekatharra to the Horseshoe has been carried out practically by contract. Although it was done by day labour, yet the system under which the contractor carried out his work was totally different from the system employed by the Government.

The Premier: I thought this was the only principle that you still insisted upon.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I stood for the Government carrying out work until I found it was a failure. What about the Trans-Australian railway? It cost millions more than it should have cost.

The Premier: How do you know?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: We had tenders for it.

The Premier: No. Tenders were not called.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: But Smith & Tynms said they would do it for a given sum.

The Premier: They did not.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: It is like the Canning-Fremantle road, mere bluff stakes.

The Premier: It is not bluff stakes.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Yes it is. You know that we have not had value for the loan moneys we have been spending during the last three years.

The Premier: Why not the last 20 years?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Because day labour was not then the fetish it has become. Let the Public Works Department tender, just the same as anybody else. Then we shall see the work completed within a reasonable estimate.

Mr. SAMPSON: I suggest that we amend the Council's amendment by adding to it the following proviso: "Provided further that nothing in the foregoing shall prevent a tender submitted by the Public Works Department from being accepted."

Mr. Kennecally: Just a little further dictation to the Government.

The Premier: The Government are not going to accept dictation in respect of one railway in ten.

Mr. SAMPSON: This proviso would overcome the difficulty. It provides a way out without any loss of dignity in the Government.

The Premier: It is not more acceptable than the other.

Mr. THOMSON: If members of another place had desired to kill the Bill, I am sure they had courage enough to vote against it. I am willing to support the suggestion put up by the member for Swan, which would enable the department's tender to be accepted. In the interests of the State, tenders should be called for the work, the department also tendering. I am sorry that another place has sought to impose on a goldfields railway a condition that has not been imposed upon other railways. I am prepared to accept the same condition in respect of agricultural railways. I regret that another place did not apply it to both the railway Bills. The principle is one for which we as a party stand. As long as I am here I shall favour that principle, because it affords an adequate check on the cost of work done.

The Premier: Big money is spent on harbour schemes and other works. What about those? Why confine the application of the principle to this railway?

Mr. THOMSON: If tenders had been called for the work of drainage on the Peel Estate and at Herdsman's Lake, the eyes of the Minister in charge of the Works Department would have been opened by the circumstance of tenders being double the amounts of the departmental estimates.

The Premier: I do not say there is not something in the argument, but this is not the way to apply the principle.

Mr. THOMSON: I sought to have a similar provision inserted in railway Bills introduced by the previous Government.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	18

Majority against .. 6

Ayes.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Latham
Mr. Brown	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Davy	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. C. P. Wansbrough
Mr. E. B. Johnston	Mr. North

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Lambert
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. Lamond
Mr. Collier	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Troy
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. W. D. Johnson	Mr. Wilcock
Mr. Kennelly	Mr. Withers
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Panton

(Teller.)

Amendment on the amendment thus negatived.

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

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of the Premier, the Minister for Lands and Mr. North drew up reasons for not agreeing to the Council's amendment.

Reasons adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—ROADS CLOSURE.

Council's Amendments.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Bill subject to two amendments, now considered.

In Committee

Mr. Lutey in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 4—Strike out the clause:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I move—
That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: When the Bill was before this House the Minister assured us that the closure of this road was necessary and he added that he had visited the locality and was satisfied that the road should be closed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The North Fremantle Council has taken umbrage at our action to close the road. I have no objection to the amendment. Let the people concerned learn from experience.

Mr. Davy: I would not feel disposed to take such a view.

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

No. 2. Clause 5—Strike out the clause:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: This clause refers to Coventry Parade which is an intersection of Thomson-road, referred to in the previous clause that the Council struck out. I move—

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 Council.

BILL—DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Message from the Council received and read requesting a conference with managers of the Assembly, and intimating that the Council would be represented by three members.

Mr. LATHAM: I move—

That the Council's request for a conference be agreed to, and that Hon. J. Cunningham, Mr. North, and the mover be appointed managers to represent the Assembly.

Question put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 11.15 p.m. to 12.30 a.m. (Friday).

Conference Managers' Report.

Mr. LATHAM: I have to report that the conference met and was unable to come to an agreement.

Hon. G. Taylor: Nonsense: Over one word in the Act!

The Premier: Fancy their not giving way on that!

Hon. G. Taylor: How can they expect you to give way on bigger things?

Mr. LATHAM: I move—

That the report be adopted.

Question put and passed.

Sitting suspended from 12.47 a.m. to 2 a.m.

BILL—MEEKATHARRA-WILUNA RAILWAY.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read, notifying that it did not insist on its amendment.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Bill subject to a schedule of eight amendments, which were now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 1. Clause 2.—Delete "or" and insert "and" in line one. Delete "and" and insert "or" in line two. and delete the words "in line ten of paragraph (b) of subsection two" and insert in lieu thereof the words "where the same first appears in the second line of subsection (1)":

The PREMIER: An important amendment, which the Council are now seeking to alter, was made in the Act of 1924, having been agreed to at a conference of the two Houses. The Council now seek to go back on the position then created. It is a retrograde step. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 2. Clause 3.—Delete all words after "board" in line three down to and inclusive of "employer" in line seven and insert in lieu thereof the words, "consisting of the Principal Medical Officer or a deputy appointed by him, who shall be chairman, and two medical practitioners registered under the "Medical Act, 1893," one to be nominated by the employer and the other by the worker":

The PREMIER: This deals with the composition of the board, which finally decides the cases. Although the Act of 1924 intended that the board should consist of three medical men it did not precisely say so. No Government would appoint a board of other than medical men, so I propose to accept the amendment with a slight modification. I move:

That the amendment be agreed to subject to the modification that the words "the Principal Medical Officer or a deputy appointed by him" be struck out, and "one medical practitioner appointed by the Governor" be inserted in lieu.

It is not desirable that the position of chairman should be confined to the Principal Medical Officer, who may thus be called upon to travel all over the State. The position would be safe if the Council's amendments were modified, and the chairman of the board were a medical man appointed by the Governor.

Mr. Mann: It would be on the recommendation of the Principal Medical Officer.

The PREMIER: In most cases I have no doubt that would be so. But it might well be that Dr. Mitchell, of the Wooroloo Sanatorium, would be appointed at times to do this work. I do not wish to draw comparisons between medical men, but it is possible that Dr. Mitchell might be more qualified than some other physicians. However, the power to appoint should rest with the Government.

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

No. 3, Clause 4. Add the following as Sub-clause 1:—(1) The following words are added at the end of paragraph (b) of the proviso to Section 1 of the First Schedule to the principal Act:—"provided that during such time as the worker may be in a hospital or other place for treatment the value of such

board and lodging shall not be added to his wages for the purpose of assessing compensation."

The PREMIER: I do not know why that amendment has been made. It deals with the case of a man working for, say, a farmer at £2 10s. a week with board and lodging, which would be the equivalent, if the man was boarding himself, of £4 per week. The amendment asks that the compensation should be at the rate of only 25s. per week during the time the man is in hospital.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That would be perfectly dishonest. It would be robbing the man.

The PREMIER: On the other hand, the man receiving £4 a week in cash would, whilst in hospital, receive half his wages, or £2 per week. The intention of the amendment is to deduct the value of board for the purposes of compensation.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is dishonest.

Mr. Davy: Do not use that word.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You do not like it, but it is true.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The PREMIER: Each man gets effective wages of £4 per week, yet the one man while in hospital would receive £2 per week and the other only 25s.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If full wages were paid by way of compensation, the one man would be getting his board to the good; but the Act provides for only half wages as compensation.

The PREMIER: That is so. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Mr. DAVY: With all respect to the Premier, there is a clear distinction. In passing the amendment Act of 1924 Parliament agreed to increase substantially the allowance for hospital charges and medical expenses. At that time the point was raised that all medical expenses should not be included, and it was urged that some part of the hospital charges was for board and lodging. If a man is working in the ordinary way at £4 per week cash and has a household to maintain—as the average normal citizen has—he saves nothing in his household expenses by going into a hospital. True, while in hospital he gets his food and lodging; but the amount an ordinary head of a family would save in that way from his

household expenses is negligible. I do not think a man would make any money out of it if he got his hospital expenses paid, particularly if he were running a household.

The Premier: But do we distinguish anywhere, regarding compensation, between married and single men?

Mr. DAVY: No, we do not. When we were considering the 1924 Act we thought we had provided that the whole of a man's hospital expenses should be paid, but we did not. Surely a man who is receiving board and lodging as part of his wages, gets the whole of his hospital expenses, half wages and full maintenance too, will be in a better position than the man who is a householder and does not get his half wages and maintenance.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: But you are assuming that he is always a single man.

Mr. DAVY: No. We are dealing with ordinary cases and I take it that the man who gets board and lodging will not be one who is running a household in the ordinary way. I think the intention of the Council is that although a man in hospital may save a few shillings, it is not worth worrying about. On the other hand where a man is saved the whole of his board and lodging as well as half pay, it should not be included.

Mr. C. P. Wansbrough: He should not be paid twice.

Mr. DAVY: That is so. I do not think it is fair criticism to say it is robbery and swindling.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is dishonest to take 30s. from him.

Mr. DAVY: It is not taken away from him.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You refuse to pay him.

Mr. DAVY: If the member for Guildford asks me for £1 and I refuse to give it to him, I rob him!

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Be sensible!

Mr. DAVY: Be sensible yourself!

Hon. W. D. Johnson: If your mentality cannot rise above that, it is not worth arguing.

Mr. DAVY: I could retort similarly. The hon. member talked about robbery and swindling.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: No one said it was swindling.

Mr. DAVY: The hon. member referred to robbery and dishonesty. There is something logical behind the amendment and we

should not treat it with contumely. We should accept it.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: A number of these men work on farms for wages and keep, and they have their families to maintain as well. The man who keeps a farm cottage is in a better position than a single man who is on a farm, but there are scores of married men on farms who go there during harvesting and leave their families in the towns. They are the men who will suffer under this proposal. I believe that the Council introduced the amendment to prevent single men from securing an advantage, but if we accept it we will do an injustice to married men.

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

No. 4. Clause 4 Subclause (1).—Insert a letter "m" in line 2 the words "not exceeding ten shillings per day."

The PREMIER: This deals with payments to patients in hospitals and the amendment seeks to limit the amount to be paid for maintenance to the hospital to 10s. per day. I am not sure whether I can accept the amendment. I presume there will be a conference and there may be some information that can be gained by the managers. I do not want to commit the Committee, so that the matter may be discussed. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Does the Premier think that 10s. per day is too little for hospital maintenance?

The PREMIER: I would not like to say.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I think 8s. is the charge at the Perth Hospital. At St. John of God Hospital the charge is £3 3s.

Hon. J. Cunningham: That is not the charge at Mullewa or Wiluna.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Who would the member for Mt. Margaret suggest should pay any amount in excess of the 10s. per day? There may be instances where a man would perforce have to pay more.

The PREMIER: One man may have to pay 7s. per day, and another £2 per day.

Mr. KENNEALLY: If a person deliberately chooses to go to an expensive hospital when a cheaper hospital is available to him, there may be room for argument, but in some instances a man has no option.

Hon. G. Taylor: In those instances whatever the charge may be, it should be paid.

Mr. DAVY: I do not know that that is quite the point. Some of the hospitals regulate the fees according to what they think they can get. I agree with the Premier that we should obtain more information before we decide. There will be no question of a worker having to pay out of his own pocket.

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

No. 5. Clause 4.—Strike out all the words after "Act" in line five down to and inclusive of "paragraph" in line seven.

The PREMIER: The words are, "and incidental to." The First Schedule says, "In addition to the compensation payable under this section there shall be payable a sum equal to the reasonable expenses incurred in respect of the medical or surgical attendance, etc." The Bill proposes to insert after the words "in respect of" the words, "and incidental to." The Council's amendment strikes out the words, "and incidental to." Those words are necessary in order to cover the intention of the section in the Act, to carry out the intention of the Act of 1924. I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

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

No. 6. Insert a new clause as follows:—
(13.) "Subject to the provisions of this section if a worker, disabled by disease from earning full wages at the work at which he was employed, is found to be suffering from a disease to which this section does not apply, and also from silicosis, pneumoconiosis, or miners' phthisis, and his disability is partially caused by such industrial disease due to the nature of his employment, the worker shall be entitled to a proportionate part of the compensation payable under this section apportioned to the degree to which such disability is caused by silicosis, pneumoconiosis, or miners' phthisis as the case may be."

The PREMIER: I have not had an opportunity to study this, and I cannot say offhand what its effect would be.

Hon. G. Taylor: It would be of great advantage to many people.

The PREMIER: It would be. The principle is desirable, if it is practicable. I do not know whether doctors are really able to state the extent of a man's disability from various causes. There have been hardships

in the working of the Act for want of something of this sort in it.

Mr. Davy: Then the old gentlemen are leading a little faster than we want to go.

The PREMIER: Yes, it may be so.

Mr. Mann: They do some good things at times.

Mr. Kenneally: When you find one you require to pay particular attention to it.

The PREMIER: This deals with an aspect of these diseases with which I am pretty familiar. Because there has not been some provision of this sort many a man has failed to get compensation. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 7. Insert a new clause as follows:—The schedule to the principal Act is hereby further amended by inserting a new section after Section 14, to be numbered 14a, as follows:—"If an employer or worker dispute the charges of any medical practitioner for services to a worker under this Act, the clerk of a local court, on application being made to him by either party, shall on payment by the applicant of such fee, not exceeding £2, as is prescribed by any rule of court, refer the disputed charges to a medical referee who shall decide the amount of such charges and whose decision shall be final and binding on such medical practitioner in respect of the services charged for."

The PREMIER: This deals with an aspect of the Act that has been freely discussed in both Houses, namely the charges that some medical men have been making. This will make their charges subject to review in the same way as a lawyer's costs are taxed.

Hon. G. Taylor: They are taxed by another lawyer.

Mr. Davy: According to a scale laid down by the law.

The PREMIER: The amendment is a good one, but there is just the fear that the medical profession, being a very close body that act with great solidarity, may decline to accept this provision to have their charges adjudicated upon by any other body. If they were to take up that attitude and refuse to handle compensation cases—

Mr. Mann: How would it be to make the referee the Principal Medical Officer?

The PREMIER: There should be some provision stating who the referee is to be.

Mr. Angelo: Would it not be better to allow the companies to appoint their own medical man, such appointment to be approved by the Government?

Hon. J. Cunningham: The worker should have the right to select his own doctor.

The PREMIER: According to the amendment, I think the selection of the referee would rest with the clerk of the local court.

Mr. Davy: Or perhaps he would be the medical referee referred to in Section 7 of the Act.

The PREMIER: There should be something in the amendment to decide how the referee is to be appointed.

Mr. Kenneally: Clause 3 of the Bill, which was struck out, provided for a medical referee.

Hon. J. Cunningham: A referee only on the question of disability.

The PREMIER: It would be a good thing if there could be some control of the charges. Whether the profession would be willing to accept such control, I do not know.

Hon. G. Taylor: Has not the Minister for Works made some arrangement with the British Medical Association?

The PREMIER: There is some understanding, but it is not very effective.

Mr. Davy: What about inserting after "referee" the words, "as prescribed by regulation."

The PREMIER: I am not sure that the amendment does not mean that the clerk of the local court shall select the referee.

Mr. Davy: No, he will not select the referee. He will be merely the machinery for referring the case.

The PREMIER: Yes, perhaps that is the machinery to enable a case to get to a medical referee. I think perhaps the hon. member's suggestion to insert the words, "as prescribed by regulation" would meet the case.

Hon. G. Taylor: Are you going to have a conference?

The PREMIER: I do not think it will be necessary, for perhaps another place will accept our amendments on their amendments.

Mr. Kenneally: You are optimistic, are you not?

Mr. Davy: It might do if we added at the end, "The medical referee, for the purposes of this section, may as required be appointed by the Governor."

The PREMIER: If there are two doctors in one district and you dispute the fees of

one of them, you refer it to the other. And if you go outside the district you would have to send a medical man from Perth to Kalgoorlie or to Meekatharra.

Hon. G. Taylor: Could not he decide on the accounts sent in?

The PREMIER: That would be in favour of the doctor because on paper he could make out that the case had been serious and the patient would not be able to answer it.

Hon. G. Taylor: It would be a dispute between the employer and the doctor, not between the employee and the doctor.

The PREMIER: Mostly so, but it would amount to appointing one medical man to sit in judgment on the fees of another medical man.

Mr. Kenneally: Is it necessary to retain the medical referee?

The PREMIER: It would be difficult for anyone but a doctor to assess the value of a doctor's services.

Mr. Kenneally: Courts at different times have to assess the value of such services.

The PREMIER: We might disagree to the amendment so that it can be further discussed. I do not disagree with the principle of endeavouring to control the charges of the medical men, but I suggest disagreeing to the amendment in order to obtain further information.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is necessary to have power to control such charges.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

Question put and passed: the Council's amendment not agreed to.

No. 8. Title.—Insert after "six" in line one the words "and Section seven." Delete the words "paragraph (c) in the proviso to Section one of" in lines three and four. Delete the words "and Section fourteen of the said Schedule" in the last line.

The PREMIER: Another place has made amendments outside the order of leave and then has amended the Title to bring them in.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is of no use worrying about that; we want the Bill.

The PREMIER: To many of the Council's amendments we have disagreed and, if they are not insisted on, an amendment of the Title may not be necessary. If we have a conference and reach an agreement, we shall be able to amend the Title if neces-

sary and to the extent necessary. Therefore I move—

That the amendment be not agreed to.

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

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

A committee consisting of Mr. Davy, Mr. Kenneally, and Hon. P. Collier drew up reasons for not agreeing to certain of the Council's amendments.

Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

Sitting suspended from 3.20 to 4.15 a.m.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read, notifying that it had agreed to the Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment No. 2, and insisted on its amendments No. 1 and Nos. 3 to 8 inclusive, disagreed to by the Assembly.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the House requests a conference with another place, and that the managers for the Assembly be Mr. Davy, Mr. Kenneally, and the mover.

Question put and passed, and a message forwarded to the Council acquainting them accordingly.

Sitting suspended from 4.3 a.m. to 4.15 a.m.

Conference Granted.

Message from the Council received and read, notifying that it had agreed to the Assembly's request for a conference, and had appointed as managers the Chief Secretary and the Hons. J. Nicholson and H. Seddon, the Chief Secretary's room as the place, and the time forthwith.

Sitting suspended from 4.18 a.m. to 6.15 a.m.

Conference Managers' Report.

The PREMIER: I have to report that the Managers met and have agreed as follows: The Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 is not agreed to, and in lieu thereof i

substituted the following: "Clause 2 of the Bill is deleted." The Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 is not agreed to. The Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 is amended by the insertion after the word "shillings" of the words "and sixpence." The Legislative Council's amendment No. 5 is agreed to with the addition of the following words: "Paragraph (c) of the proviso to Clause 1 of the first schedule to the principal Act is amended by the insertion after the word 'of' in line 2, the words 'medicines, medical or surgical requisites, and.'" The Legislative Council's amendment No. 7 is not agreed to. The Legislative Council's amendment No. 8 is consequentially amended. I move—

That the report be adopted.

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

Council's Further Message.

Message from the Council received and read, notifying that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

CLOSE OF SESSION.

Complimentary Remarks.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [6.36]: The business of the sitting being now concluded, hon. members will be able to disperse for the Christmas season; and I should like to express the hope that you, Mr. Speaker, and members generally may have a pleasant Christmas and that all may enjoy the rest which, I am sure, all have earned. The session has been a fairly quiet one, and I have to express the Government's appreciation of the manner in which all members of the House have assisted in the despatch of business. Where there have been differences of opinion, we have been able to compose them in a reasonable spirit, or where we could not agree, we have been able to disagree in a friendly way. To yourself, Sir, I should like to express my gratification at the manner in which you have controlled the business of the Assembly. We have been very free from disorderly scenes and—I was almost going to say—entirely free from interruptions, but that would be expecting too much. But certainly the session has been entirely free from anything in the nature of unseemly incidents. I wish also

to express the thanks of the Government, and, I feel certain, of the House, to the officers and messengers, to the "Hansard" staff, and to all who have assisted in the conduct of business. I hope that all members will enjoy a very pleasant week or two at Christmas; and if we have to return early in the New Year to consider some important proposals, which time has not permitted of our doing during the session now closing, then I can only express the hope that nothing in the nature of a prolonged session will take place during what is generally regarded as the period of recess. Let me again express the Government's thanks to all members, and the hope that if we should come back after Christmas, all will return with renewed strength and vigour to carry on the work of the country.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [6.39]: I wish to add a word to what has been said by the Premier by way of good wishes for the best of seasons. I hope that you, Mr. Speaker, and the Chairman of Committees, and the officers of the House, including the "Hansard" staff, may have a very pleasant time. I am sure all the officers deserve the good wishes of the House. I hope, too, that hon. members opposite will have a very good time and come back in a far more reasonable frame of mind if we have to meet early in the New Year. From the Premier's point of view, of course, it has been a most pleasant session, as he got everything that he wanted. We have been most unsuccessful in our opposition, due to lack of numbers. However, I hope that the position may change before long.

The Premier: Time is on your side.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Time always runs against the Government of the day. That cannot be avoided. If we do have to come back in the New Year, I hope it will not be for a lengthened period. Members will find it necessary to attend, every one of them; and I am afraid we shall be here for some time. We could not have considered the question during this session, as the Premier has said, even if it had been submitted. The proposal is of great importance to the people of this country. I wish everybody a very happy time, and I do sincerely hope that if we have not done very much good for the people of Western Australia, we have not done them

too much harm. However, time will show. I wish a very happy Christmas to yourself, Sir, and to everybody else.

MR. GRIFFITHS (York) [6.42]: On behalf of the Country Party I wish to offer you, Mr. Speaker, the compliments of the season and the hope that you will have a good time during the recess. I suppose it will not be very long before we shall be back here again. To the staff also, and particularly the officers and messengers of the House, and to the "Hansard" reporters—

The Premier: To whom we owe so much.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: —who wipe away many of our little mistakes and make plain what we wanted to say but did not clearly express, I offer the very best of wishes. Apart from that, I wish everyone a good time during the forthcoming festive season. While, as the Leader of the Opposition has stated, the Premier has got all he wanted, the session has been a pleasant one. There was only one fly in the ointment, and that was my little disappointment.

The Premier: You have the last word.

MR. SPEAKER [6.45]: I feel very pleased indeed that we have reached that stage so admirably, successfully, pleasantly and earnestly when these compliments come to the Speaker, the officers of the House and "Hansard." It is true, as the Premier said, we have had a more or less quiet session. That does not mean a workless session. As I have observed from my place in the Chair, much work has been done, and it has been done as by men of deliberation—without passion, acrimony or those weaknesses that too often characterise even the greatest of de-

liberative assemblies. It has made my task a pleasure. While the Speaker is complimented, and also the Chairman of Committees, on the orderly nature of the proceedings from the beginning of the session until close, I venture to say that everyone knows that, without receiving willing and kind help from officers and individual members, such a result would be an impossibility. I feel grateful for the help I have received from the clerks and the assistance of messengers and other officers and functionaries of the Assembly. They have contributed to make legislation that may be really guiding and benefacting factor to the community. I wish you all a merry Christmas and a Happy New Year. It is a time when the heart warms all over the world with a recognition of our relations to our fellow man, when our sense of duty rejoices, when we have pleasure in the fact that we have lived. We are not, I understand, to have a long recess, but it will be sufficient in the mood of Christmas to vivify us and to make us fit to meet again to encounter our duty with renewed vigour a few weeks hence. I need say no more, let my heart go out to you for the enjoyment of yourselves, your families, and your friends and the community at large during the coming Christmastide.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier) [6.45] I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn on Tuesday, the 17th January, 1928.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.50 a.m. (Saturday)

Parliament was prorogued to the 28th February, 1928, by Proclamation published in the *Government Gazette* of 13th January, 1928, and was further prorogued to the 10th April, 1928, by Proclamation published in the *Government Gazette* of 24th February, 1928.
