

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 1st February, 1934.

	PAGE
Bill: Financial Emergency, Assembly's message ...	188
Ministerial statement	189
Adjournment, special	189

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT took the Chair at 7.30 p.m. and read prayers.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had considered the amendments made by the Council, had agreed to amendments Nos. 8 and 9, but disagreed to amendments Nos. 1 to 7 and 10 to 13.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

No. 1. Clause 3—Strike out reference to Part V. and insert "Part V.—Variation of contract of service."

No. 2. Clause 5, line 32—Strike out "twenty" and insert "sixteen."

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest to the Honorary Minister that these two amendments be postponed until later.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, amendments Nos. 1 and 2 postponed.

No. 3. Clause 6, Subclause (1).—Strike out the words "eighteen per cent., twenty per cent. or twenty-two and one-half per cent.," in lines one and two on page 6, and insert "fourteen per cent., sixteen per cent. or eighteen and one-half per cent."

The CHAIRMAN: The reasons advanced by the Assembly for disagreeing to all the amendments with the exception of Nos. 8 and 9 are as follows:—

It is not desirable that the Bill should interfere in any way with the Arbitration Court in the fixation of the wages of Government wages employees. With regard to the 4 per cent. remission on salaries, it is not equitable to grant the same relief to highly paid employees of the Government as to the lower paid employees.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—
That the amendment be not insisted upon.

I move this motion for the reason the Chairman has just read out.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

No. 2. Clause 5, line 32.—Strike out "twenty" and insert "sixteen."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—
That the amendment be not insisted on.

I do not think this amendment would really do what the Committee intended as regards giving relief to certain persons. The effect would be to penalise those persons to the extent of 4 per cent. That is another reason why the amendment should not be insisted on.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

Nos. 4 and 5:—

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—
That the amendments be not insisted on.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendments insisted on.

No. 6. Add the following paragraph after paragraph (iv) of the proviso:—(v) Where the application of the provisions of Subsection (1) of this section would result in the rate of salary of an officer classified in one grade being reduced below the rate of salary (as reduced under this Act) of an officer classified in a lower grade, then in such case the rate of salary of such first-mentioned officer shall not be reduced below the said rate of salary of such last-mentioned officer.

The CHAIRMAN: This amendment is not consequential.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—
That the amendment be not insisted on.

I do this for the reason already stated.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The paragraph in question has been inserted in another clause of the Bill as it left this Chamber. I do not know whether that fact has been overlooked by the Assembly.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendment insisted on.

Nos. 7, 9, 10, and postponed No. 1:

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move—

That the amendments be not insisted on.

Question put and negatived; the Council's amendments insisted on.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

Ministerial Statement.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I desire to make a brief statement. The message with which we have just dealt will not be finally disposed of by the Assembly this evening, owing principally to the fact that the Minister in charge of the Bill in the Assembly is out of town on urgent State business and will not return until to-morrow. It is therefore the Assembly's intention to adjourn until to-morrow, when this message will be considered there. We shall then be advised as to the attitude taken by the Assembly. I therefore suggest that it is necessary for this Chamber to meet to-morrow at the usual hour, but naturally I must leave a motion to that effect to be moved by the Leader of this House.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [7.57]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until to-morrow at 4.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 7.58 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 1st February, 1934.

	PAGE
Question: North-West hospitals	189
Bill: Financial Emergency, Council's amendments ...	189
Financial Emergency, Council's Message	194
Adjournment, special	194

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

QUESTION—NORTH-WEST HOSPITALS.

Mr. COVERLEY asked the Minister for Health: When will leased hospitals in the North-West revert to Government control?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Health) replied: No date can be indicated. One hospital has already reverted to departmental management, and the same policy in respect of the others will be pursued in due course.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of thirteen amendments made by the Council now considered.

MR. SPEAKER: Before proceeding with the consideration of this Order of the Day, I desire to make a statement regarding the Council's amendments to the Bill, and particularly to the amendment commonly referred to as "Part V." because that particular amendment raises the very important question of the admissibility of an amendment that is beyond the scope of a Bill. Had the amendment been moved in this Chamber, I feel sure that it would have been ruled out of order as irrelevant to the subject matter of the Bill. I understand the amendment was accepted in the Legislative Council on the ground that it was not new matter, having been previously before members when considering the Financial Emergency Bill of 1931, which became an Act and lapsed at the end of last year. With all due respect to the Chairman of Committees of the Legislative Council who, incidentally, is Deputy President of that Chamber, it seems to me there is a great difference between a matter that is already part of a Bill, as was the position in 1931, and one respecting which the Bill contains no reference, that being the position with the Bill before the Chamber at present. Naturally, the question could not have been raised in 1931, when Part V. was part and parcel of the Bill. That is not the position regarding the Bill under discussion now. It is inconceivable to me that a Chairman has power to take into consideration the provisions of an Act that has lapsed, in determining the admissibility of amendments. The Chairman had nothing before him but the Bill as presented to the Committee for consideration. In my opinion, on that Bill alone must he determine what amendments