

Parliament is in session and has not adjourned for a longer period than seven days, it is necessary for the House to pass a resolution declaring the vacancy and the cause thereof before the President can issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Writs authorising and directing him to issue a writ to fill the vacancy. In these circumstances I move—

*That the seat of the Hon. H. P. Colebatch, a member for the East Province, be declared vacant owing to his having accepted one of the six principal executive offices of the Government.*

Hon. H. CARSON (Central) [4.34]: I second the motion.

Question passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Honorary Minister) [4.35]: I move—

*That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 19th September.*

Question passed.

*House adjourned at 4.36 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 1st August, 1916.*

	PAID.
Bill: Supply (No. 1) £1,298,000, returned ...	38
Change of Government, Ministerial re-elections ...	38
Adjournment, Special ...	39

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

BILL—SUPPLY (No 1), £1,298,000.

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

#### CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT—MINISTERIAL RE-ELECTIONS.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister—Perth) [4.32]: At the last sitting of the House, as announced by the Hon. Frank Wilson, that gentleman was commissioned by His Excellency the Governor to form a new Administration, and on the 22nd July he submitted the names of the following hon. members to His Excellency the Governor, by whom they were approved:—Hon. Frank Wilson, C.M.G., M.L.A., Premier and Colonial Treasurer; Hon. H. B. Lefroy, C.M.G., M.L.A., Minister for Lands and Agriculture; Hon. James Mitchell, M.L.A., Minister for Railways, Water Supply, and Industries; Hon. H. P. Colebatch, M.L.C., Colonial Secretary and Minister for Education; Mr. W. J. George, M.L.A., Minister for Works and Trading Concerns; Mr. R. T. Robinson, M.L.A., Attorney General and Minister for Mines; Hon. J. D. Connolly, M.L.A., Minister without portfolio; and the Hon. A. J. H. Saw, M.L.C., Minister without portfolio. You have, Mr. Speaker, I understand, received a notification under the Electoral Act from the Attorney General informing you of the acceptance of office on the part of those gentlemen I have just named.

Mr. SPEAKER [4.35]: I have received the following letter from the Attorney General:—

I beg, pursuant to Section 66 of "The Electoral Act, 1907," to notify you that the following appointments have been made by His Excellency the Governor on the 27th July instant to the principal executive offices in the Government, and the acceptance of such offices by the members of the Legislative Assembly named—Premier and Colonial Treasurer, Hon. Frank Wilson, C.M.G.; Minister for Lands and Agriculture, Hon. H. B. Lefroy, C.M.G.; Minister for Railways, Water Supply, and Industries, Hon. Jas. Mitchell; Minister for Works and Trading Concerns, Mr. W. J. George; and Attorney General and Minister for Mines, Mr. R. T. Robinson.

As the hon. members, whose names have been read out, have accepted offices of profit under the Crown, it will therefore be neces-

sary that their seats should be declared vacant.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister—Perth) [4.37]: I move—

*That, owing to the acceptance of offices of profit under the Crown, the seats of the members for Sussex, Northam, Murray-Wellington, Moore, and Canning be declared vacant.*

Question passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister—Perth)—[4.38]: Because of the formation of the new Ministry, which has just been mentioned, I now beg to move—

*That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday, the 19th September.*

Mr. Scaddan: Why?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The reason for the motion is quite obvious. It is necessary, of course, for Ministers to go up for re-election. That will take some time. It does not require the whole of the seven weeks for the re-election of Ministers. That is perfectly true.

Mr. Angwin: It has never been done previously.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I think there is a precedent for at least that time.

Mr. Angwin: Not in this State.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: There are very good reasons for extending the time to at least seven weeks. Indeed I think the Premier was rather moderate in asking for so short a period.

Mr. Bolton: Yes, seven months would have done you.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I did not expect for a moment that there would be the least argument from the Opposition benches in regard to this motion, which should be treated purely as a formal one.

Mr. Underwood: What do you want seven weeks for?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: Furthermore, I did not expect any argument, because the Premier was courteous enough to write to the leader of the Opposition in regard to this matter, and he said to Mr. Scaddan on the 31st July—

With further regard to our conversation by telephone on Saturday morning, I have arranged with Mr. Connolly to move on Tuesday next the adjournment of the House till the 19th September, and thank you for your concurrence.

I presume that is correct.

Mr. Scaddan: There is no need to worry about that. You have not explained the necessity for adjourning to the 19th September.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: Is there any necessity to explain, in the face of that letter?

Mr. Holman: There will be necessity but no ability.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: There is no reason why the hon. member should be rude about the matter.

Mr. Holman: We only want to know the reason for the waste of so much time. We had five weeks, and we had the Central province to contest.

Mr. Angwin: Mr. Rason had five weeks.

Mr. Carpenter: The House is entitled to know the reason.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I am not denying the right of the House, when I am allowed to speak, to know the reason. I have pointed out that it takes some time to arrange these elections. The Electoral Act provides that there shall be at least seven days between the issue of the writ and receipt of nomination, and that this period is not to exceed 30 days, and the same time between nomination and polling day, in order that the time may be fixed by the Clerk of Writs. The matter is, therefore, not in our hands, but it is one for the discretion of the Chief Electoral Officer.

Mr. Scaddan: You could tell us that at one time, but not now.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: In this particular case there is a member of the Ministry who sits in the Upper House, and the period asked for is the very minimum amount of time that could be given for his re-election.

Mr. Angwin: This has not always been so.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: It is the very minimum of time that should be given for nominations and election in such a case. The Act says it must take place within 30 days.

Mr. Angwin: Has that not always been so?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: In addition to the time I have mentioned there would be at least another seven days required for the return of the writ after election. The province in question is a very scattered one.

Mr. Holman: It is not so scattered as the Central province.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: And it would take at least a week for the return of the writ. Granted that this is so, it is not unreasonable that the Ministry should have at least this time, more particularly on account of the Upper House election to which I have referred and at least a fortnight in which to look through their departments, to say nothing of the time needed by the Premier (Hon. Frank Wilson)—who has to lead the House—to prepare matters to place before the House for the session. That is the reason why I have moved this motion.

Mr. Male (Kimberley) [4.40]: I second the motion.

Mr. SCADDAN (Brownhill-Ivanhoe) [4.41]: I am prepared to accept the word of the Honorary Minister that this motion should be treated as formal. On the other hand, I want the Honorary Minister to recognise the fact that the conditions at the present time are by no means normal. We are, therefore, entitled to know the circumstances under which the Government are in office with only 17 supporters in a House of 50 hon. members. We are also entitled to know what is the shortest possible time that is necessary for the purpose of the re-election of Ministers, in order that the House may again reassemble. It is true that the Premier telephoned to me that he found it was impossible to fix an earlier date than September for the reassembling of the House, and through the telephone I accepted 9th September. At the same time I mentioned to one or two hon. members, to my ex-Ministers—and I think they will bear me out—that the 9th September was a Saturday and that I could not understand why that day was fixed for this purpose. The result was that when this was eventually pointed out by letter and intimation, I found from the Premier's letter that the 19th September had been fixed. I had not the slightest objection to the 9th

September, for that would be about the usual time that should be occupied in the re-election of Ministers. I know of no precedent for the adjournment of the House for such a long period as seven weeks. We have previously had the case of the re-election of a Minister in the Legislative Council in a province which is scattered, and as difficult a province as that represented by the Minister who has now been appointed Colonial Secretary.

Mr. Holman: The Central province is far more scattered and difficult.

Mr. SCADDAN: And this re-election had to be carried out in five weeks. I am making my protest entirely from the point of view of the Legislative Assembly. I would like to draw attention to the state of parties, and to point out that at the present time there is no definite agreement between the two parties on the Ministerial side of the House. The leader of the Country party told the public through the Press that no arrangement had been made, and that until the conference of his party could meet in August he was taking the responsibility on his own shoulders of entering into an alliance with the head of the Government for the purpose of tiding over the period between now and when his conference would meet. I am saying something which must be correct.

Mr. Heitmann: To which leader do you refer?

Mr. SCADDAN: If this is not so, and there has not been this alliance, I want to know how it is that the present leader of the Government was able to give His Excellency the Governor the assurance that he could carry on. He could only have given that assurance if he had had an understanding with the leader of the Country party. The Premier must have consulted the leader of the Country party and obtained that assurance, otherwise he would not have been able to go to the Governor and make a truthful statement on the matter. I have no reason to disbelieve the Premier, but the result is that the leader of the Country party has told the head of the Government one thing and the people another thing. I want to know which is correct.

Member: He did not tell them anything.

Mr. SCADDAN: He says that the question of whether the Country party would continue to support them or not would be decided at the conference in August. He says on the one hand that he has not made any arrangement with the present party in power, while, on the other hand, he must have done so, otherwise the present head of the Government could never have given the assurance he did give to the Governor and so have obtained permission to form a Government. Over and above that the public at this juncture are not satisfied with the present position in the critical time through which we are passing.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): They have not been satisfied for a very long time past.

Mr. SCADDAN: They are more dissatisfied now than ever before. In the circumstances, the duty devolves upon this side of the House, and upon all other members of the House, to see that only the minimum time that is necessary for the proper election of Ministers is granted to the Government. I am prepared to agree to what may be termed a compromise in the matter.

Mr. Smith: What about your delay in calling the House together?

Mr. Bolton: Your turn will come directly in the matter of calling the House together.

Mr. SCADDAN: Personally, I think the Government ought to meet the House as early as practicable. We have never asked for more than five weeks. Ever since we have been in office we have met the House earlier in the financial year than our predecessors ever did. That is another point. Over and above that, however, I am prepared to agree on the following basis. It is not very likely, unless possibly hon. members on the Government cross-benches decide otherwise, that the Minister who represents the Government in another place will have a contest. In those circumstances, we might meet on the basis of the contests to be held in Assembly electorates; and, if it is found that the Minister in another place has a contest, I am prepared to pledge this side of the House to agree that the Assembly shall meet merely formally for the purpose of adjourning to a date which will allow of an election being held in the East province. In my opinion, that is a fair pro-

position; and I hope the Government will agree to it. Surely it is not necessary that the Assembly elections should occupy seven weeks; and I claim it is essential that those elections, in view of the present position, should not take seven weeks. I wish to afford the present Government the same opportunity as the past Government had of letting their Ministers be properly elected, and I am willing that the present Government should have five weeks for that purpose. If, later, it should be found that the period of five weeks is not sufficient, owing to opposition to the Minister in another place, I give an undertaking that, so far as this side is concerned, the Assembly will meet merely formally, for the purpose of a further adjournment.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Do you say that you met the House five weeks after forming your Government?

Mr. SCADDAN: Five weeks after our seats were declared vacant.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): That is not the point.

Mr. SCADDAN: I am taking parallel cases. When Ministers from this side of the House have had to go up for re-election, we have met the House five weeks after the date of the elections; and there is no reason why the procedure should be varied at the present juncture. The new Government may have a policy, or possibly they may not. Possibly they require seven weeks for the purpose of gathering together a policy. There can be no reasonable objection to the proposal which I have submitted. Speaking on my own behalf, I would be glad to give the new Government seven months; but I am considering the public point of view—as I am entitled to do—when I say that the public are anxious that the House shall meet as soon as possible in order that the present unsatisfactory position of affairs may be cleared up as speedily as possible. Therefore we ought to meet at the earliest possible date, and to ask for seven weeks under existing conditions is, in my opinion, an absurdity. Accordingly, I trust that the Honorary Minister will agree to an adjournment of five weeks, subject to the undertaking I have given that, if necessary, this side of the House will agree to a further adjournment

if such should be necessitated by a contest in the East Province.

Mr. WILLMOTT (Nelson) [4.48]: In my opinion, the adjournment asked for by the Government, to the 19th September, should be granted. The leader of the Opposition expresses himself as willing, under certain conditions, to meet and then formally adjourn. I ask the leader of the Opposition, and appeal to him to consider, whether it is fair to ask country members to travel 400 or 500 miles for the purpose of a mere formal adjournment?

Mr. Seaddan: You are paid for your public duties.

Mr. WILLMOTT: The point is, what will be gained by calling this House together for the mere purpose of a formal adjournment?

Mr. Walker: There will be a formal adjournment only in case of its being necessitated by a Council election.

Mr. WILLMOTT: In my opinion, quite unnecessary objection has been raised to the motion; and I hope members opposite will agree to adjourn till the 19th September and then get on with the business.

Mr. Bolton: But what is the reason?

Mr. WILLMOTT: If, as the Opposition hope, the elections go wrong for the Government, well and good. We can meet on the 19th, and then go right ahead with business. On the other hand, an adjournment to an earlier date for the mere purpose of a formal meeting will mean that the country members will be dragged from their homes to Perth for nothing.

Mr. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [4.50]: I was surprised to hear the Honorary Minister ask for an adjournment until the 19th September. In 1904 five weeks sufficed the Daglish Government to elect their Ministers, and to place their policy before the country. The Daglish Government, moreover, had a Minister elected for the Legislative Council; and that Minister's election was held in a province far more difficult than that for which sits the Minister representing the new Government in another place.

Mr. Willmott: It was an even go last time.

Mr. ANGWIN: That is a different matter. In 1905 Sir Cornthwaite (then Mr.)

Rason, had only five weeks, and asked for only five weeks.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): But that was very much later in the year.

Mr. ANGWIN: That makes no difference. I am highly surprised that the present Government should ask for seven weeks whereas five have sufficed in the past. The member for Nelson (Mr. Willmott) points out that members do not wish to come here when it is not necessary. But I want to tell the member for Nelson that for those who took office in the past, five weeks was sufficient.

Mr. Willmott: But they were extra smart men.

Mr. ANGWIN: The extra smart men of to-day want seven weeks. Why? The Honorary Minister has not told us why. I say the reason is that the present Government know one of their Ministers is doomed to defeat. That is why they want seven weeks. They have arrived at the conclusion that they wish to remain in office as long as they possibly can, and possibly a little longer than the people wish them to remain there.

Mr. Thomson: You should not say that.

Mr. ANGWIN: Private people say it. Those who observed the people attending His Majesty's Theatre last night can form a very good opinion. However, in times past, under equally difficult conditions, a five-weeks adjournment was considered sufficient. That being so, I maintain that five weeks will suffice to-day. If we on this side desired it, we could have demanded a five-weeks adjournment.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Demanded it where?

Mr. ANGWIN: Here in this House. We have the voting strength, as the House is situated to-day. However, we thought that even a little consideration would be shown by hon. members opposite. Beyond the possibility of an election for the East Province, the Government have advanced no reason whatever for the lengthy adjournment they ask. I believe there is going to be an election in the East Province, but not in relation to the Colonial Secretaryship. The position there will be found difficult when the two parties at present allied fight one another in the one province. It is possible even that

we on this side might obtain the Country party's support against the new Colonial Secretary if we were to put up a candidate against him.

Mr. Foley: But could we rely on such support?

Mr. ANGWIN: I do not see how the Country party could very well vote for Mr. McCabe and Mr. Colebatch at the same time. I regret that the Honorary Minister has been compelled to admit, as he has admitted here to-day, the inability of his colleagues to hold an election and meet Parliament under similar conditions and within a similar period as other Governments have done in the past. I should have thought the present Government would be able to do as well as past Governments have done; but the Honorary Minister has admitted their inability to do so.

Mr. HEITMANN (Geraldton) [4.56]: I wish to ask the Honorary Minister whether it is the desire of the Government to obtain time in order to perfect the rolls? If that is their object, I for my part am prepared to allow them reasonable time. I regret that when I first stood for Geraldton the rolls, owing to extraordinary mistakes on the part of the then Government, were in a very bad state. In my opinion, it is not in the interests of any party, nor in the interests of the country, to hold an election unless the rolls are in something like decent order.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Are you referring to these Ministerial elections?

Mr. HEITMANN: I am referring to the election I myself contested, and am giving an instance of where the public were not properly treated owing to insufficient time being allowed for the purpose of putting the rolls in order.

Mr. Angwin: In this instance time is not wanted, according to the Electoral Act. Your case was governed by Act of Parliament.

Mr. Scaddan: That does not apply, either. The writs must be issued forthwith.

Mr. HEITMANN: In that case I fail to see why the Government should desire seven weeks. Had that period been suggested in order to permit of the rolls being put in order, I could have understood such a demand.

Mr. WALKER (Kauowna) [4.58]: I move an amendment—

*That "19th" be struck out, and "5th" inserted in lieu.*

My amendment suggests five weeks. I do not see why further time is necessary for the new Ministers than has been taken in all preceding cases. The circumstances, particularly now, warrant the House in meeting as early as possible. I know it has been contended that this side of the House should not be the one to ask that the Assembly should meet earlier, the inference being that the late Government delayed meeting Parliament. In point of fact, as the ex-Premier has pointed out, during the whole of our period of office, we have met Parliament at an earlier date after the close of the financial year than did any other Government who have held office in Western Australia. We kept up the habit even in this last instance. But, if that argument against us be good, what can be said about the procrastination of the present Government, about their demand for a further extension of time, for an unnecessary extension?

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): Do not talk about procrastination in meeting the House.

Mr. WALKER: I say there has been no procrastination as regards meeting the House in the case of the Government just gone out of office.

Hon. J. D. Connolly (Honorary Minister): I disagree with you.

Mr. WALKER: We met Parliament sooner than did any Government preceding us—sooner after the close of the financial year—in every case, without a single exception. Therefore, I can talk about the procrastination of the present Government. The Honorary Minister's interjection, however, shows that he puts the fact of our having met Parliament early, down to us as a charge, as an offence. What, then, must be put down to the Honorary Minister's own account when he asks for further unnecessary time, for procrastination? If there be any virtue in the hon. member's interjection, why does he not make amends? Why does not the new Government rectify any possible error on the part of their pre-

decessors, assuming there has been an error? But, no. They want fully two weeks beyond the time that is necessary for the return of members whose seats have just now been declared vacant. Let them show an example; let them make haste to meet the House and get to business, for this interregnum already has taken up time in connection with the appointment of Ministers, and it has delayed Government business. If hon. members opposite were alive to the work which has to be done, they should not hesitate to meet the House at the earliest possible moment. The leader of the Country party objects to being dragged down here. There is no intention to drag him down here. The whole business can be done in five weeks.

Mr. FOLEY: We are trying to lift him up and he will not be lifted up.

Mr. WALKER: It is impossible to lift him up; he is too slippery.

Mr. WILLMOTT: Is the hon. member in order in referring to me as slippery?

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret I was otherwise engaged and did not hear the remark, but if the hon. member applied the term offensively I am sure he will withdraw it.

Mr. WALKER: I only used the word "slippery" to emphasise the fact that we were not sure of it. No one can take exception to the liberal proposition made by the member for Brownhill-Ivanhoe (Mr. Seaddan) that the interval shall be one of five weeks, and that if exceptional circumstances arise, making it imperative in the interests of fair play that there should be an extension beyond all previous precedents, he will consent to the House meeting formally and further adjourning. Goodness knows the House can meet formally and further adjourn without dragging the leader of the Country party down from his fortresses away back in the Never-Never. Even if it were necessary to bring the hon. member down, would he begrudge coming down for the purpose of furthering the interests of the country or the party to which he has attached himself?

Mr. WILLMOTT: Certainly not.

Mr. WALKER: Then, where is the objection? The time asked for is not needed; there is no precedent for it. If an accident should occur to make it necessary then we

can meet the occasion by a formal gathering of members. That, however, will not be necessary, and therefore I have moved my amendment, that the new Government shall stick to all the rules previously laid down by custom, and that five weeks shall be the time allowed to them for the purpose of returning Ministers to the House. We do not desire to keep the House from the judgment of its masters one day longer than is necessary.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret) [5.5]: I desire to second the amendment. I consider that the time asked for by the Honorary Minister is too long. I have been in this House for many years and have seen all the changes of Government which have occurred under similar circumstances, and this is the longest term by weeks that I have heard asked for to enable Ministers to conduct their elections. Going back to 1901, when the first change under similar circumstances occurred, we find that when the Leake Government was defeated, Mr. Morgans took over and he obtained a four weeks' adjournment.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): But you do not say for a moment that the conditions were similar?

Mr. TAYLOR: The conditions were even worse then, and larger areas had to be appealed to. The time granted to Mr. Morgans was from 21st November to 17th December, four weeks or thereabouts. When Mr. Morgans' Government went out and Mr. Leake's Government was returned the period granted Ministers for their re-election was from the 24th December to the 14th January, and Mr. Leake had to go through exactly the same process as the present Government have to go through. Mr. Leake completed his work in three weeks. The next Government that came along was that of Mr. Daglish, of which I had the honour to be a member. Five weeks were granted to us. Now we have a similar position cropping up and my friends opposite are asking for seven weeks, more than double the time that it took Mr. Leake, and considerably more than the time that Mr. Morgans asked for, and two weeks longer than any other Government have required under similar conditions. It is only fair that this House should meet in five weeks for the

transaction of business. The hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches and those who support them, have been languishing for the last eight or nine months to appeal to the people. Not only on public platforms have they declared it, but by correspondence in the Press they pointed out that the Scaddan Government did not represent the people, and it was time that the people said who should be their masters. Now my friends opposite are not willing that the people to whom they then took off their hats should now be their masters. I think five weeks is long enough a period to ask for. If the seven weeks is granted we shall be establishing a precedent, which I am sure no other Government should be allowed to follow. Are there any extraordinary conditions to be dealt with?

Mr. Hudson: If there are they ought to be disclosed.

Mr. TAYLOR: If there are, we ought to be told of them, and then we might perhaps grant the seven weeks. I am not prepared to agree to the establishment of such a precedent. Next time I have no doubt we shall be asked to grant a period of nine weeks. A future Government will have just as much right to ask for nine weeks as my friends now have to ask for seven. I hope the House will grant five weeks and no longer.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister—Perth—in reply) [5.12]: I am much surprised that the motion should have been treated other than as a purely formal one. I do not think it comes with good grace from the Opposition benches to oppose a motion of this kind, particularly as they have just vacated office and remembering that they refused to meet Parliament, not for seven weeks, but for eight months, during which time they were in a decided minority.

Mr. Hudson: You have been reading the *Sunday Times*.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): I repeat that the opposition comes from the leader of the Opposition with very bad grace. The hon. gentleman was leader of a Government who for at least two months were without a majority and for six months were absolutely in a minority.

Mr. Underwood: That is not correct.

Mr. Scaddan: How many have you got supporting you?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The last division list showed that we had a majority of four. The motion I have moved has been supported by the leader of the Country party, and that ought to be sufficient for members opposite. I want to make the position clear to the House and more particularly to the country, that on the first opportunity the Government are met by—

Mr. Walker: Common sense.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): Not by common sense, but by extraordinary and unfair methods.

Mr. Hudson: Never mind about extraordinary methods; tell us why you require seven weeks.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The seven weeks are necessary.

Mr. Angwin: Tell us why.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): Can I give hon. members a better reply than to say that it took the Scaddan Government eight months to make up their minds to meet Parliament?

Mr. Walker: Then set us a better example.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): And now they refuse to grant us a fair and reasonable request.

Mr. Scaddan: Tell us the reason why you require seven weeks.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): The interjection of the leader of the Opposition is too childish. The hon. member who has been leader of a Government knows well that the request we have made is not an unreasonable one, taking into consideration the condition of affairs as we have found them after the administration for five and a half years of the late Government.

Mr. Bolton: You do not know what you are talking about when you say five and a half years.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): I should have said four and a-half years. The House must clearly understand that if the amendment is carried it will simply mean that we shall return here on the 5th September, a fortnight earlier, and we shall have to bring in all the country members and those who live out of town to meet for about five minutes; it could only be for five minutes.



Mr. Scaddan: Wait and see; we will give you the sudden death then.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): It is idle for the leader of the Opposition to use a childish argument.

Mr. Bolton: Wait and see; you will get it all right.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): It is childish, because we have the numbers. We have the motion supported by the leader of the Country party. Therefore it should go without saying that if the Premier has to come to the House on the 5th he will then move the adjournment for another fortnight, because he has made up his mind that he wants that time. Consequently it will be bringing country members back unnecessarily.

Mr. Bolton: You might get beaten on the vote on the 5th.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): Perhaps the leader of the Opposition would like even a longer time. There will be one, and probably two, elections in the electorate which he now represents, and perhaps he would like a longer time so that after he shall have been rejected in the Canning electorate he might have opportunity to get back to his own safe pocket borough.

Mr. Scaddan: I was game to face my own electorate, but you were not game to face yours.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (Honorary Minister): It has been said that we should meet and get on with legislation. But every hon. member knows that this is a time, not so much for legislation as for administration. The hiatus would be justified, if for no other reason than because it will afford opportunity to look into the department recently vacated by the member for Kanowna (Mr. Walker) or that part of it coming within the sub-department referred to by the member for Geraldton (Mr. Heitmann), namely,

the Electoral Department. The member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor) has said that there has just been seven or eight months of administration without the Government meeting Parliament. That is what I complain of—administration by a Government in a minority. I trust to the good sense of the House in the hope that the amendment will not be carried, for it would only result in putting members to the inconvenience of coming here for five minutes on the 5th September. I hope the Opposition will be fair to the Government and give them a little time in which to prepare to meet the House.

Amendment (that "19th" be struck out) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	..	17
Noes	..	..	..	..	19
					—
Majority against ..					2
					—

## AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foley	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Green	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Walker
Mr. Holman	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Bolton
Mr. W. D. Johnson	(Teller.)

## NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Nairn
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Plesso
Mr. Connolly	Mr. Smith
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Veryard
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Male
Mr. E. B. Johnston	(Teller.)

AYE—Mr. B. J. Stubbs      PAIR.      NO—Mr. Gilchrist.  
Amendment thus negatived.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 5.24 p.m.*