

can safely be said that the people would very much prefer a sound scheme of conversion of all war gratuity bonds rather than they would favour the conferring of a special privilege on one section only of the soldiers. The amendment I have to submit is—

That all the words after "should" in line 3 be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu: "evolve and put into effect some workable measure for the redemption of war gratuity bonds held by persons resident in Western Australia."

Amendment put and passed.

Question, as amended, agreed to.

House adjourned at 8.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 28th September, 1920.

Questions:	Taxation Department—(1) Farmers' travelling expenses, (2) Depreciation on farmers' horses, (3) Sustenance of farmer's son	PAGE
Bills:	City of Perth Endowment Lands, 2a.	748
	Roads Closure, 2r., Com.	748
	Public Service Appeal Board, 2n., Com.	751
	Parliament (Qualification of Women), 2n., Com.	752
	Broome Rates Validation, returned	778
	Annual Estimates, votes and items discussed	778

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

QUESTION (3)—TAXATION DEPARTMENT.

Farmers' travelling expenses.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that the State Taxation Commissioner cuts down the farmers' travelling expenses (the amount usually claimed being from £10 to £15) to £2 or £3, and in the majority of instances it is disallowed altogether? 2, Does he consider this action justifiable? 3, If not, will he have the anomaly rectified in future assessments?

The PREMIER replied: 1, All expenses actually incurred in the production of a taxpayer's income are allowed in full. Where claims are reduced it is owing to the unsatisfactory information supplied or evidence that such claim, or part thereof, is not deductible. 2 and 3, Answered by No. 1.

Depreciation on Farmers' horses.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that the State Taxation Commissioner will not allow depreciation on horses, notwithstanding that those horses are the farmers' working plant? 2, Is he aware that the Federal Taxation Department allow 10 per cent. depreciation on horses as working plant, and do not take into consideration the sale of old stock or the natural increase, and that at the same time they do not allow for loss through death of any horse, it being considered a loss of capital? 3, Is he aware that the State Taxation Commissioner takes in the sale of old horses, also the natural increase, and allows for the loss of horses through death? 4, Does the Minister consider this action justifiable? 5, If not, will he have the anomaly rectified in future assessments and treat working horses in the same manner as they are treated by the Federal Taxation Department?

The PREMIER replied: 1, At the inception of the Taxation Department it was mutually agreed with the pastoralists and farmers' representatives that owing to the difficulty on large stations and farms in differentiating between horses kept for work and for breeding, that they should all be treated as part of trading stock. Farmers therefore get an advantage in being allowed full cost of purchases as a deduction. This could not be done if horses were treated as working plant. 2, Yes. 3, Yes. 4, This is the natural result of treating horses as trading stock. 5, No anomaly exists.

Sustenance of Farmer's son.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: 1, Is he aware that the State Taxation Commissioner in specific instances will only allow a farmer employing his son the sum of £39 as a deduction for the son's sustenance? 2, Is it a fact that the same son is taxed on £52 as the value of the said sustenance? 3, Does the Minister consider this action justifiable? 4, If not, will he have the anomaly rectified in future assessments?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Sustenance to the amount of £52 per annum is allowed to farmers in respect of employees (including sons) when engaged in earning the assessable income. 2, Yes. 3, Yes. Common taxation practice. 4, Answered by No. 3.

BILL—CITY OF PERTH ENDOWMENT LANDS.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. P. Draper—West Perth) [4.40] in moving the second reading said: I should like, first of all, to draw attention to the preamble. As a rule the preamble to a Bill amounts to nothing, but in this case it is important as it sets out the land sought to be affected. The city of Perth holds in fee simple 2,281 acres of land on the ocean beach immedi-

ately to the west of the city. Those lands are coloured green on a plan which I will lay on the Table. They are what is known as the endowment lands, lands given many years ago to the city of Perth as an endowment. The title to those lands provides that any part of them may be sold or leased for any term not exceeding 99 years, with the consent of the Governor first obtained. In 1917 the council purchased an additional 1,290 acres, which is known as the Lime Kilns estate, and which perhaps some hon. members will more readily recognise under the better known title of Perry's paddock. This purchase is coloured red on the plan to be laid on the Table. The land lies between the city and the endowment lands, and of course it was obvious to anyone that, if the city council were to develop the endowment lands they would simply be increasing the value of the Lime Kilns estate. In 1917 they had an opportunity to buy the estate at a reasonable price, and they did so. They have constructed from the west end of Cambridge-street, Subiaco, one of those timber track roads, passing through both estates and on down to the beach. The council now propose to develop their endowment lands and also their recent purchase by the construction of a tramway. The city boundaries were extended in January, 1918, so as to include both the Lime Kilns estate and the city endowment lands. With the permission of the House I now lay the plan upon the Table. In addition to these two properties there is a narrow strip along the ocean beach between the endowment lands and high water mark, which is coloured yellow on the plan. This narrow strip forms portion of a reserve, number 16,921. The reserve is not at present included within the city boundaries, but it is proposed by this Bill to include it as a reserve within the city boundaries. The reserve is at present vested in the city of Perth for the purpose of public recreation. The reserve was made under Section 42 of the Land Act of 1898. At the present time the Council have power, under the vesting order, to grant leases of the reserve up to 21 years. Of course such leases could only be granted for the purposes of public recreation; they could not be granted for purposes inconsistent with the purposes of the reserve. Members will bear in mind that there are three lots of land concerned; the Lime Kilns estate, the endowment lands and this reserve. The Council propose to develop these properties, and they have already constructed a plank road from the end of Cambridge-street to the beach. In addition, they are making a contour survey which is almost complete. It is proposed, if this Bill meets with the approval of Parliament, to invite competitive designs for laying out the property on the latest town planning principles. Provision is made in the scheme for laying out an up-to-date seaside town close to the ocean. Of course, to do this, it will be necessary to provide

means of communication. Probably it will be necessary to construct a tramway or to establish a motor bus service or something of that kind. The most effective means of establishing communication would be by tramway connected with the city. If the tramway is constructed, it will no doubt be operated as part of the metropolitan tramway system under arrangement with the Commissioner of Railways. The plans for the construction of the tramway must be approved by the Commissioner of Railways so as to ensure thorough working.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: This Bill goes further really than giving the council power to deal with the land.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, but not very much further. I shall deal with that point presently.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A great deal further.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is more a matter for the Committee stage. The council ask for sufficient powers to enable them to provide for the people a watering place and a place of amusement and recreation at a point on the ocean which, I believe, is the nearest point to the present boundaries of the city of Perth. As regards the reserve, it is not proposed to alter it very much, but it is proposed, on the reserve which is a very narrow strip, to lay out promenades or gardens and no doubt lawns for playing games, such as tennis, croquet, and so forth, and provide refreshment facilities and general beach amusements. In fact from the amusement point of view, I think we can say that visitors will generally focus upon the reserve which is still reserved for public recreation. I pointed out just now that the council title to the endowment lands enables them to lease up to 99 years, but if the council desire to lease endowment land for a longer term than 99 years, or to sell, they must obtain the consent of the Governor. Power is asked for in the Bill to enable the council to sell or lease any portion of the endowment lands. Of course they already have the power to do this in regard to the Lime Kilns estate. When it comes to laying out a town for residential purposes, it has been found that the power to lease for 99 years is not sufficient. If a success is to be made of this seaside town, it will be necessary to give power to sell the land to people who wish to reside there. We must bear in mind that, at the present time in Western Australia there is a very large area of freehold land available for residential purposes and, if the City Council are to be hampered by a stipulation that they must not sell any of the land for residential purposes, it naturally follows that people will build their houses where they can obtain a freehold title.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: What will the council do with the money they obtain for the sale of the land?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It appears to me that, in order to successfully develop an estate of this nature, the power to sell is absolutely necessary. If the member for North-East Fremantle will look at Clause 30, he will see how the proceeds from the sale of land are to be applied. They are to be applied by the council in such a manner and for such purpose as the council may from time to time determine and, until otherwise determined, shall be accumulated to provide a sinking fund, for the repayment of any moneys borrowed under this Act. I shall deal with the power to borrow later on.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Then these lands will cease to be an endowment?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: With regard to the land sold, the council will have the same power to rate as they have with regard to other land in the municipality. The rates will provide some revenue for the city, and some revenue for the payment of the sinking fund on the money which it will be necessary to borrow. Thus we shall get a possible means of developing an estate which at present is really useless to the community. On the question of finance, members will notice that the council are empowered under the Bill either to spend money out of the ordinary revenue of the council for the purposes of the Act—and I need hardly point out that such revenue will not be in any way sufficient—or to borrow up to a maximum of £250,000 for the purpose of developing their estate. If the council borrow, then the provisions of the Municipal Corporations Act will apply. The council will have to observe the provisions in regard to the demanding of a referendum before a loan can be raised. The general scheme, of course, is to develop the present endowment lands with the addition of the Lime Kilns estate purchased by the council, and to make it of some use to the City by providing revenue which at the present time cannot be done. There are two provisions of the Bill to which I would draw attention. Clause 5 gives the council the option to rate on the unimproved values as regards the lands mentioned in this Bill. Within the city proper they have power to rate on the annual value. Clause 9 which also deals with the same subject, permits a rate to be struck with regard to the land which is the subject of this Bill different from the rate on ordinary lands in the municipality of Perth. Part III. of the Bill is important as it contains the powers which are thought necessary to enable the council to carry out their scheme. One of the principal powers in Part III. is to construct tramways, and all the necessary powers incidental to such work, such as the breaking up of the streets and things of that nature, are provided. Those powers are always provided in a Bill which gives authority to construct a tramway but, in this case, it can really do even less harm than under ordinary circumstances, because we are not dealing with a populated district, but with several thousand acres of land which are at

the present time almost entirely vacant. I do not suppose there are more than two or three small places on the whole of the property. The power is also given to the council, but only with the consent of the Governor, to lease the tramways or sell them but, in practice, I think it will be found that as soon as the Government tramway scheme is extended the Government tramway authorities will probably run the whole of the line. This power to make tramways does not extend to the Government reserve except with the Governor's consent. The Government reserve is only a very narrow strip, but it was thought advisable that power should not be given to run the tramway beyond the present freehold estate on to this reserve except with the consent of the Government; because, naturally, there might be some limitation or some condition which the Government might think it advisable to impose so as to keep the reserve for its original purpose of public recreation. In the same way the council could not even run a motor service through this reserve without the consent of the Government. It is also particularly required in the Bill that all tramways must be constructed so as to comply with the requirements of Government tramways. In addition, a right is reserved to the Government to purchase these tramways after 25 years without payment for any goodwill. Part IV. refers to borrowing powers, with a limit of £250,000. The money of course can only be borrowed for carrying out the works which are authorised by the Bill. The amount may seem large, but hon. members will bear in mind that the estate is also large, and, further, that these moneys cannot be raised if the ratepayers of Perth object in the manner provided by the Municipal Corporations Act. In addition, power is given to strike a special rate to pay interest and sinking fund on any loan which is raised. Various additional powers to the power to construct a tramway are included in Clause 40, to which I would ask hon. members to refer. That clause deals with the various works and undertakings which the council would be empowered to carry out. The effect of the powers would really be to enable the council to lay out a town on modern lines with the usual attractions of a seaside resort. Subclauses 13, 14, 15, and 20 of Clause 40 are important. I think those four subclauses are the most important for hon. members to peruse so far as the second reading is concerned. The council, of course, have no power to sell the lands comprised within the reserve; but they may lease the reserve with the consent of the Governor; that is, of course, consistently with the purpose for which the reserve has been created, namely that of public recreation. I can understand that permission might be granted by the council to a person to put up sea baths or refreshment booths on the reserve; and, in fact, generally to instal there such attractions as are ordinarily seen upon the beach of a seaside town. The only other matter

which I think I need mention is that the Bill contains the usual power to make by laws for carrying out the provisions of the measure.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: In that connection, the Bill overlooks the fact that we passed a Traffic Act last session.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: At this stage I do not think I need do more than explain what are the purposes of the Bill, and what powers it has been thought advisable to include in the Bill in order to enable the objects of the council to be carried into effect. It seems to me rather misleading to grant a large portion of land to a city or an institution or a person by way of endowment without giving any power to make the endowment effective. In a country like Western Australia, where there are large areas which can be bought in fee simple, to grant simply an ordinary power to lease and nothing more may be, and in fact has in this case been shown to be, quite ineffective for the purpose of making any use of the land in question. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. W. C. Angwin debate adjourned.

BILL—ROADS CLOSURE.

Second reading.

Debate resumed from the previous sitting.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [5.8]: I do not know that I can add much to what has been said by the Premier on this Bill, but I may make an explanation in regard to Part 3 of the Schedule, which refers to the closure of certain roads on the Uduc estate, in the Harvey district. All hon. members may not be aware that the Harvey district is one in which there is an irrigation scheme from which great things were expected at the time of its inauguration. I believe considerable good has resulted from that scheme, although not so much as some people originally expected. The resumption of the roads on the Uduc estate is necessary for the purpose of cutting up the land to the best advantage, and also to enable arrangements to be made by which irrigation could be provided later on, should the weir be enlarged. It is necessary that power should now be granted for the closing of these roads, so that provision may be made for future benefits. The other portions of the Bill deal with matters with which I am not acquainted.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Closure of portions of roads:

The PREMIER: I move an amendment—

That Subclause 2 be struck out with a view to the insertion of other words.

The Parliamentary Draftsman has pointed out that this is necessary owing to some formality connected with the wording.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Personally, I see no necessity for the striking out of Subclause 2. If hon. members will look at Subclause 4, they will see that it is similarly worded. However, a portion of the Schedule seems to be wrong.

The Premier: Yes, that is so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I think it advisable to close the street as suggested, but the other matter is merely an exchange of land which can be brought about by the Government and the Fremantle council jointly.

The Premier: This is simply a matter of revesting.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The revesting is merely an exchange of land. When the street is closed, it becomes revested in His Majesty. The intention of the owners concerned is to give another area of land. It is not yet certain whether two streets are to be widened, or only one. If two streets are to be widened, the company concerned will give the necessary land.

The Premier: I am advised that only one street is to be widened.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I think the Solicitor General was of that opinion also, but I pointed out to him to-day that there had been a discussion as to whether two streets should be widened, or only one. If two streets are to be widened, the party owning the land through which the three streets run will, instead of giving the full width of the street which is closed, divide the area into two and give one for each street. That will be better for the district. I think it would be better to let this clause stand as it is and make an amendment later in the Schedule.

The Premier: Would it be more convenient to the people to have two streets widened, or only one?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Some say it will be more convenient to have two streets widened. It is believed that large oil storage tanks will be put up in that locality, and it would be inadvisable to have a street running through the area on which those tanks are to be erected. The council say they have arranged with the Government that this particular street shall be closed. They also say they are willing to give a portion of land to widen the next street to this one. It would be better to close the street and permit arrangements to be made between the Government and the party concerned.

The PREMIER: My only desire was to meet the convenience of the parties. If what the hon. member says is right, it will be more convenient for people to add a little to the two streets. I am perfectly willing to meet the hon. member's wishes. I had not been advised of what he said. In those circumstances I will withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Schedule:

Part 1—In the Fremantle Municipal district:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That the following be inserted to stand as paragraph (4) of Clause 1:—"Save and except the four corners at the intersection of High Street and Parry Street contained by arcs of $39 \frac{3}{10}$ links in length and having radii and tangents of 23 links each.

The object is to avoid a sharp angle at this corner. High-street is very narrow, and so is Parry-street, and the locality is at the foot of a very steep hill. Trams come down there, and there have been narrow escapes from accidents. It is advisable, therefore, that the corners should be rounded off.

The Premier: There can be no objection to that.

Amendment put and passed.

The PREMIER: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of Clause 2 the positions of the words "East" and "West" be transposed.

This is merely a clerical error, and needs to be rectified.

Amendment put and passed.

Part 2—In the North Fremantle municipal district:

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I move an amendment—

That the second paragraph be struck out.

This land is owned by a private person, and it was intended to be given to permit of another street being widened. We cannot close another person's land. The paragraph is obviously an error and should not be where it is.

Amendment put and passed.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 16th September.

Mr. LUTEY (Brownhill-Ivanhoe) [5.28]: The House has been asked to ratify this Bill. We have been told by the Attorney General that this matter was agreed to before the strike of civil servants took place, but evidently that can hardly be so. It is obvious that this was not agreed to, because the object of the Bill is to prevent the unauthorised cessation of work on the part of civil servants. Then, with regard to Clause

14, that must have been inserted after the strike took place. I do not know why the Attorney General told the House that the measure was agreed to before the strike took place. As a matter of fact we know that the civil servants were agitated long before last session of Parliament closed. Do we not remember a stop-work meeting and a procession which took place to this House? It is evident that the Government were lax in not doing something to improve the conditions of the civil servants before the last session of Parliament closed. I can hardly understand the civil servants agreeing to the Bill in its present form. There are some amendments forecasted which have been agreed to between the Attorney General and the civil service since the introduction of the Bill. The Bill sets out that the chairman of the board shall be a Supreme Court judge. I happened to be in court at the time Mr. Justice Rooth stated that in his opinion a Supreme Court judge was unfitted by his environment and education to be a judge of the Arbitration Court. It should be left to the public service and the Government to select the chairman. I do not say the chairman should not be a judge of the Supreme Court, but the choice should be made as wide as possible, so that the best man may be secured. If the Bill was amended in this form I believe it would be in the interests both of the Government and of the civil service. Another point is that a person must be engaged for not less than five years before he becomes a permanent employee in the civil service. That period is too long.

Mr. Pickering: What do you suggest?

Mr. LUTEY: I think six months is long enough in which to determine whether a man should be made a permanent civil servant or not. Five years seems to be extraordinarily long. I hope the term will be considerably reduced. I see no necessity for Clause 14. The strike is over and the Government have promised that those men who did take part in the cessation of work will not be prosecuted. I see no necessity for a special clause being inserted in the Bill. I do not see how any body of men could agree to forfeit the rights and privileges that others enjoy. It would be a dangerous thing to insert a clause of that nature.

Mr. Pickering: They have seen the error of their ways.

Mr. LUTEY: If this clause is passed in its present form, it will mean that the men and women in the civil service will be forfeiting all their rights and privileges. It would be a danger to pass it.

The Premier: Where will be the danger?

Mr. LUTEY: The danger of it lies in the fact that members of the civil service would, perhaps, be afraid to take any necessary action that they were instructed to take by their organisation, because of this clause.

Mr. Pickering: You do not advocate another strike in the civil service?

Mr. LUTEY: It may be necessary, and the time may come when there may have to be another strike. After the officers of the

service had agitated for many months they found it necessary to strike in order to bring the Government to their bearings.

The Premier: That is not so.

Mr. LUTEY: It is evidently the case. There was a procession to Parliament House before the close of last session, and there had been deputations to the Government for many months before. But even all that had no effect on the Government, and matters had evidently reached a climax when the men went on strike. It passes my understanding how the civil servants could have tolerated the position as long as they did. I think they were entitled to take the extreme step they took, and it is possible that such circumstances may arise in the future. As men and women in the community they have a right, when they are kept down, to assert themselves by going on strike if they feel it is necessary to do so. As civil servants they are just as much entitled to assert themselves in this direction as a bottle washer would be. There was a complaint that bottle washers and others were paid even more than the civil servants were paid. If that is so it is because the bottle washers and others have stood up for their rights. I am pleased that the civil servants did make some endeavour to obtain an alleviation of the conditions under which they were working.

Mr. Pickering: There is nothing wrong in paying a good wage to a bottle washer.

Mr. LUTEY: I honour the man who is a worker and takes on any form of employment.

Mr. Pickering: You would not argue that a bottle washer should not be paid?

Mr. LUTEY: I do not say that. All workers are deserving of every penny that they are paid. The civil servants should have been paid a great deal more than they received at the time they struck. The member for Menzies (Mr. Mullany) seems concerned about the fact that the civil servants went along to the Trades Hall, and suggests that they do not go as industrialists but went to get into touch with a political organisation controlled by the Trades Hall. The Trades Hall is much more of an industrial than a political organisation, but it is impossible to strike a line of demarcation between political and industrial affairs. As a matter of fact, the civil servants are industrial workers as much as persons in any other organisation. This Bill proves that this is not only an industrial but a political matter. If the men did go there, they had a perfect right to do so. One would think, from the remarks of the hon. member, that they had no right to go to the Trades Hall. If the dispute had been placed in the hands of the Industrial Disputes Committee of the Trades Hall it might have had a better and very much quicker ending than it did have. Fully 90 per cent. of the time of the officials of the Trades Hall is occupied in industrial matters. Many disputes have been before the Industrial Disputes Committee since Christmas, and out of 36 disputes there were only five strikes. This shows that they are

an able committee, and that they have done splendid service on behalf of the State during that period. The member for Menzies also said that the civil service was 20 per cent. overmanned. My experience of the departments is that the civil servants work fairly well.

Mr. Pickering: The hon. member underestimated the percentage.

Mr. LUTEY: I think his estimate of 20 per cent. is ridiculous. An expert is the only man who can give any idea as to how much the civil service is overmanned, if at all. It is always better to employ a foreman who understands the particular work he is called upon to supervise, because one can always get a better deal from him than from others who know nothing about the work. It has been said that the only way of getting better service from our officers is by re-organising the buildings in which they are housed. There is no doubt that the officers are working in buildings that are spread out all over the city. When the Labour Government were in power, they had the foresight to commence alterations to the old police court buildings in Barrack-street, with the intention of erecting new buildings and housing a considerable proportion of the departments.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We started the work.

Mr. LUTEY: Yes, but the Government who followed neglected to carry it on. It is like praying to the moon to expect better services from our Government departments until the conditions under which the service have to work are improved.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—The board:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to stand as Subclause 3:—"Provided also that if under the rules of the Civil Service Association of Western Australia membership is restricted to public servants within the meaning of paragraphs (a) and (c) of subsections (1) of section two of this Act, and persons to whom subsection (3) of section six of this Act apply, and at any time after the commencement of this Act not less than ninety-five per centum of such public servants and persons are members of such association, the provision of paragraph (a) of subsection (2), whereby one member of the Board is to be elected by the public servants, shall not apply, and such member shall be appointed by the Civil Service Association of Western Australia."

Hon. members may have some difficulty in following this amendment. It has been found

to be convenient and just that the Civil Service Association, substantially representing the public servants having a right to appeal to the board, if the membership of the association is restricted to public servants, then instead of its electing its representative on the board, which will take a little time, the association shall nominate such representative. In Paragraphs (a) and (c) of Clause 2 it will be found that "public servant" includes both permanent and temporary officers. That is why, in the amendment, reference is made to public servants as defined in Clause 2. Then there is another class of public servant referred to in Subclause 3 of Clause 6, which deals with wages men. That clause has been introduced to remedy irregularities in carrying out the provisions of the Public Service Act. The Public Service Act does not contemplate wages men as being within the Act. What has happened? There are in the departments to-day wages men who have been carrying on the duties of ordinary officials of the public service, one of them for at least 20 years.

Mr. Munsie: And still only temporarily employed.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Not even that! He is a wages man on a weekly wage. Under the Bill those persons are given the right to apply to be put on the permanent staff and, so far as I can see, there is no reason why the majority of them, being of long service, should not go on. The amendment provides the safeguard that at three months prior to the date for the retirement of the elective members of the board not less than 95 per cent. of the public servants shall be members of the association. With that safeguard I can see no objection to the amendment. The proclamation of the provisional board was dated 23rd August, 1920. The board was appointed for six months, and so will go out of office on the 23rd February next. For the counting of the membership of the association it is necessary to provide a period before the vacancy occurs. Whereas it would be quite sufficient for the public service if, say, the 1st January were taken, it would not be sufficient if the appointment had to be made by election, for which at least three months would be necessary. Therefore, I have suggested that a period of three months before the vacancy occurs should be taken as the date when the percentage of the public service comprised in the Civil Service Association has to be counted.

Mr. SMITH: I think the proverbial Philadelphia lawyer would have considerable difficulty in understanding the amendment. Possibly the Attorney General knows what he is after, but the average member will scarcely be able to follow him in this. The real question is as to whether the amendment is an honourable carrying out of the bargain made by the Attorney General with the Civil Service Association when the

strike was settled. I think the Attorney General will admit that it is not.

The Attorney General: I will admit no such thing.

Mr. SMITH: Certainly it is not a carrying out of the bargain which the Attorney General made with the association on the 23rd August.

Mr. Davies: Not according to their statement.

Mr. Munsie: Nor according to the "Gazette" notice, either.

Mr. SMITH: Nor according to the understanding most people entertained.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The other man present was another solicitor.

Mr. SMITH: The Committee will be well advised to simplify the amendment by providing for the election of a representative by the Civil Service Association. This would do away with all these provisions proposed by the Attorney General, provisions that are likely to create a great deal of friction. It would be a mistake to pass the proposed amendment, because it will lead to further trouble with the service. Moreover, it is not carrying out the bargain the Government made with the association. Any bargain made by the Government should be honourably fulfilled, no matter the difficulty encountered, and any departure from the bargain should first be agreed to by both sides. I have a letter from the secretary of the Civil Service Association, who had a good deal to do with the settlement.

The Attorney General: Why, he was not even in the State!

Mr. SMITH: Possibly not. Still he knows something about the settlement. The Attorney General will not say that the proposed amendment is what he agreed to with the association at the time of the settlement. Why does he object to the association making the appointment? Why does he impose conditions which are almost impossible to carry out? He insists upon a 95 per cent. membership.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I suppose they would dismiss the five per cent. who are not members.

Mr. SMITH: It is a very unreasonable condition to impose.

Hon. T. Walker: I have never known it to be done before.

Mr. SMITH: It is tantamount to asking for almost a unanimous verdict.

Mr. Pickering: What is the present percentage?

Mr. SMITH: Ninety-eight per cent. of the civil servants are members of the association. Surely a body, composed of such a vast majority, should be a guarantee to the Government that the member elected to represent them would be genuinely disposed to arrive at a just and reasonable decision. It is quite possible that five per cent. or 10 per cent. of the association members might be unfinancial.

Mr. Nairn: What do you suggest?

Mr. SMITH: I suggest no percentage at all, but that the association as a body should elect a representative.

Mr. Nairn: They might represent only a minority.

Mr. SMITH: That could be provided against.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Their rules will provide against that.

Hon. T. Walker: Their choice would be a good one.

Mr. SMITH: If the election is left in the hands of the association, it will simplify the matter and assist to remove the friction.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I must resent the imputation of the member for North Perth that I am acting dishonourably in the matter.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is in writing from the secretary that the Bill is not in accordance with what you agreed to.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If it were stated in that way, it is a totally different matter. If the member for North Perth had asked to see the correspondence relating to this settlement, I would gladly have shown it to him.

Mr. Smith: I did not know there was any correspondence.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Then how does the hon. member imagine that the agreement was made? He would have found that, before the strike took place, there was a letter written by me suggesting that there might be a representative on the board appointed by the public service where the public service were concerned, and a representative appointed by the teachers where the teachers were concerned. In that correspondence the word "association" or "union" was not used. This was accepted, and it was after the acceptance that the strike occurred. The constitution of the board was agreed to before the strike took place. The constitution of the board, therefore, has very little if anything to do with the settling of the dispute. I am not going to take advantage of technicalities, or attempt to avoid carrying out anything which the public service understood. Before the strike terminated another letter was written, not by myself, but by the Premier, in which he enclosed a précis of all points which had been agreed to and, in that letter, which the member for North Perth might have seen if he had asked for it, the words used are "representative of the public service on their board and a representative of the teachers' union on their board." That, of course, was a slip. Anybody would realise that all along reference had been made to the public service and no reference had been made to the association, and that the word "union" was used with regard to the teachers whereas no reference to union had been used previously. That letter was sent on, and the strike terminated. It can hardly be said that the strike was terminated on the understanding that the association was to appoint a representative. What followed? Several

interviews took place between myself and members of the association and their solicitor Mr. Jackson, and I have no hesitation in saying we had no trouble. We got on very well in drafting this Bill to carry out the agreement which had been made.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Were members of the association present with Mr. Jackson?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Sometimes they were; sometimes they were not. At one of those meetings it was suggested that the association should appoint a representative, and I was given to understand that the association practically represented all those who had the right to apply to the board and that the same applied to the teachers' union. In the circumstances I thought it was a very convenient method of appointing their representatives, and I do not mind telling members that those words were included in the first or second draft—I forget exactly which draft; there were several drafts. After that it was discovered that the rules of the association admitted a number of people who had no right to apply to the board at all; and it must be obvious to anyone that if the rules admitted people who had no right to approach the board—I believe the rules are wide enough to include a person working on day wages in the State trading concerns and who is not in the public service at all—it would be unfair to say that the representative of the public servants under the Public Service Act should be appointed by the association. I do not say there are many such members, but there are some. When it was pointed out that a large number of those who were entitled to apply to the board were already members of the association, we discussed a compromise to give effect to what they had understood. I have always tried to do that. I do not say that the question of 95 per cent. was agreed to in such a form that no member was dissatisfied but, for the purpose of drafting this clause, 95 per cent. was accepted, and following on that, 95 per cent. has been included. The member for North Perth suggests that this provision should be struck out. If this is done, his whole object will be defeated. As it stands, the representative is to be elected subject to a rule prescribed by regulation. I am now moving an amendment to stand as Subclause 3.

Mr. Willcock: Has Subclause 2 been passed?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No.

Mr. Munsie: We have not had a chance to discuss the proviso yet.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: In face of what I have told the Committee, the amendment is one which will carry out what the service say they understood at the time. It will prevent those who have no interest in the appeal board from electing a representative, and will also safeguard any small minority of the association. The new subclause will meet the case. The amendment is moved as a proviso following on Subclause 2 because it mentions that, in view of being elected in

the prescribed manner, certain things are to take effect.

Mr. MUNSIE: I suggest that the Attorney General should temporarily withdraw his amendment. My intention, before the member for North Perth rose, was to ask the question that, provided the House did not agree to the Attorney General's amendment, would it still be possible to amend Subclause 2? I do not agree with the Attorney General's amendment.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not desire by technicalities to prevent a discussion of this clause. It is of as much interest to the Government as to anyone else, but at present we are in a difficulty. I do not know whether you, Mr. Chairman, can suggest a way out of the difficulty, because the subclause refers to a previous method of election and must be subsequent to Subclause 2.

Hon. T. Walker: It is subsequent, and has not been put from the Chair, and therefore you can withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the Attorney General should temporarily withdraw the amendment.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If I do so, shall I have an opportunity to move my amendment later on?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.
Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. MUNSIE: With regard to the amendment which the Attorney General has, by leave, temporarily withdrawn, I think I realise the hon. gentleman's object. He wants a guarantee that at least 95 per cent. of the members of the Civil Service Association shall be civil servants before the association have a right to nominate a member of the board.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: And also that the rules of the Civil Service Association shall be restricted to those who are entitled to apply.

Mr. MUNSIE: With that portion of the amendment I do not agree. We should not interfere in any way with the rules of the Civil Service Association. The Bill provides who can and who cannot apply, irrespective of the association's rules. If the Attorney General insists on that portion of his amendment, it will mean the breaking up of the Civil Service Association. Like the member for North Perth, I think that all the amendment that paragraph (a) of Subclause 2 needs is the striking out of the words "elected in the prescribed manner by the public servants" and the insertion, in lieu, of "appointed by the Civil Service Association of Western Australia." In fact, all that is required is to comply with the "Gazette" notice of the 23rd August last, which says, in regard to the appointment of the temporary board—

The hon. Mr. Justice Northmore shall be chairman thereof, and if the appeal relates to matters with which the teaching staff of the Education Department is not concerned, Mr. J. M. Drummond, hereby appointed by His Excellency the Governor,

and Mr. E. A. Mann, appointed by the Civil Service Association of Western Australia, shall be the other members of the board; but if the appeal relates to matters with which the teaching staff of the Education Department only is concerned, the Rev. G. N. Dodds, hereby appointed by His Excellency the Governor, and Mr. F. M. Darcy, appointed by the State School Teachers' Union of Western Australia, shall be the other members of the board. Surely the constitution of the temporary board should hold good when it comes to the permanent board.

Mr. Underwood: What is the matter with the paragraph?

Mr. MUNSIE: I am making an appeal on behalf of unionism. The paragraph does not give the Civil Service Association or the Teachers' Union the right to appoint a member of the board. Members of the public service may not be members of the Civil Service Association.

Mr. Underwood: Is not every member of the public service to have a chance?

Mr. MUNSIE: Not unless he is a member of the Civil Service Association. Neither do I want any teacher to have a chance unless he is a member of the Teachers' Union. Moreover, if the Civil Service Association and the Teachers' Union have the right to appoint a permanent member of the board, they should have the right to appoint the deputy as well. But this clause proposes that the chairman of the board shall have the right to nominate the deputy. I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 2, paragraph (a), the words "elected in the prescribed manner by the public servants" be struck out, with a view to the insertion of other words. The words which I shall move to have inserted, if this amendment is carried, are "appointed by the Civil Service Association of Western Australia."

Mr. PICKERING: In my opinion, the explanation which the Attorney General gave in moving the amendment which he has temporarily withdrawn, is one that should satisfy hon. members. Clauses 2 and 6 of the Bill seem to me to account for every description of public servant. Subclause 1 of Clause 2 embraces the various descriptions of what is generally known as a public servant, while Subclause 2 of Clause 6 extends the definition to "any person employed in the public service at a daily or weekly rate of wages." There seems to me to be no difficulty whatever about the position. Clearly, every class of person who can be described as a public servant is accounted for under this Bill. The question of 95 per cent. might be reduced to 90.

Mr. Smith: Why not 70?

Mr. PICKERING: When the Attorney General assures us that this is practically the amendment agreed to between himself and the representatives of the service, I have no reason to doubt the assurance. It seems to me that the amendment as submitted embraces all sections of the service and I am going to support it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I intend to support the clause as it stands in the Bill. It appears to me to be the right thing to do.

Mr. Munsie: Any Government can prescribe in any way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: They have to prescribe under this measure.

Mr. Munsie: They can appoint whom they like.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: They must prescribe the conditions under the Act.

Hon. T. Walker: And they can make the Act unworkable.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member is putting up a proposition that the Civil Service Association have the absolute right to appoint.

Mr. Munsie: So they should.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Suppose the service struck something like that which we struck a year or two ago on the conscription issue, and they expelled 40 per cent. of their members—the majority expelling the minority.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Where was that done?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The majority expelled me.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Nothing of the kind and you know it. I was in the chair at that meeting.

The Chairman: Order!

Mr. UNDERWOOD: If we struck something like the conscription issue it might be decided that, because some did not view a certain thing in the same way as others did politically, they would be expelled. The clause is absolutely right. Every person employed in the service is entitled to a vote in electing his representative.

Mr. Munsie: But under the clause they do not have the right to elect a representative.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes they have. There is an amendment on the Notice Paper to cut that out of it. It is my opinion that the heads and sub-heads of departments should not be in the association. The heads and sub-heads occupy positions similar to those filled by underground managers on mines, or even a foreman in a boot factory. When I was in a boot factory I worked under the best conditions obtaining in Australia. It was a rule in our union that once a man was appointed foreman he had to leave the union because it would not be fair to the men that he should be present at the meetings and hear what was being discussed. He was the representative of the other side. It is not fair, therefore, that heads and sub-heads of departments, who are really in the position of managers, or underground managers of mines, should belong to the association. When it comes to a question of appointing a representative, everyone in the service should have a voice in the appointment, whether he belongs to the association or not.

Hon. T. Walker: Oh no.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Yes. There are many civil servants who should not belong to the association and, on the other hand, we may strike some sort of issue like that of conscription.

Hon. T. Walker: There is no analogy at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The majority can expel the minority and the minority will have no voice, whether that minority be right or not. I regret that the Attorney General was influenced in regard to altering the clause. The clause in the Bill is, in my opinion, the one that will work best, that is to say that every employee in the service, notwithstanding other extraneous conditions, should have the right to vote to appoint his representative.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: We are not allowed to anticipate a decision on the amendment mentioned by the hon. member, but when the time comes for discussing it, he may receive a fair volume of support. There seems to be a good deal of ambiguity about the understanding arrived at between the Attorney General and the representatives of the service as to what should be the basis of this question. It strikes me that the arguments advanced by the last speaker cannot carry any weight. He has forecasted that a certain crisis might eventuate in the future which would lead to serious trouble, such as the expulsion of a big number because that number may not see eye to eye with others in a political matter. The Civil Service Association is not a political body and never will be. We should consider the reduction of the percentage mentioned in the Bill and, above all things, we should cede that much to an organised body to give it the right to elect its own nominee. After all, there is power in the Bill, I do not say it will be availed of, for a nominee to be appointed who would not be a representative of the service generally. History has taught us in the last five terrible years that we should at all times, if we are to have well ordered control and discipline, strive for that control and discipline by the encouragement of organised groups. If we cast our minds back over the industrial calamities in Australia and in other parts of the world, we see that the big industrial upheavals originated in small beginnings. A man who refuses to join an association is a grave danger to his fellows and to society. He refuses to carry his load which, as a citizen, is cast upon him. He refuses to co-operate with his fellows to secure a higher standard of comfort and a better mode of living. I have heard the member for Pilbara and his associates who now think differently from us, describe a non-unionist as being worse than a garotter, and the hon. member said he was worse because he did not take any risk. A garotter in attacking a man took a risk because the man attacked might be a better man than the garotter. In this case, what sacrifice does he make? A man in the service sees his fellows striving and incurring the risk of victimisation, giving up nights' rest and enjoyment, going out to meetings all the time, negotiating, not for selfish reasons, but to try to help others out of a hole. That is the man who should be encouraged. Legislation that gives the slightest encouragement to the

man who refuses to co-operate for the common good is legislation that should not have the sanction of this House. I am not surprised that the previous speaker should endeavour to bolster up the claims of those who are not always termed men by their fellows because they refuse to share what should be their common duty, a type who are a grave danger and a menace for the peaceful working of an industry. Our troubles are numerous and varied. Many of the social upheavals and industrial calamities have originated because of the selfishness of perhaps a small group who have endeavoured to win all the privileges they could without making any sacrifice in the winning of them. There is not one of them who will refuse to accept a grade increase if that increase is won by the united effort of the organised body of the Civil Service Association. After all, what can an individual obtain, and what can individual effort secure? In every walk of life, whether it be that of the grower of wheat, or the grower of wool, or the worker in a factory, or the producer, it has not been possible for them to succeed, relying on individual effort. All over the world we see efforts made at co-operation and re-organisation, because individual claims, it is recognised, can never succeed. I hope the Attorney General will accept the amendment. He shakes his head. He is more foolish than I thought he was. I put it to him, to his colleagues, and to Government supporters, that although they may not represent the public service by their position in the House, they have sufficient knowledge of human affairs and recent history to prompt them to believe that only by giving encouragement to organised bodies, which are in existence for a specific purpose, are they going to secure the desired results. By holding out encouragement to the individual the Government are going to build up a mode of procedure which will cause endless trouble to any Government which is called upon to administer the affairs of departments.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The question at issue is not one between unionists and non-unionists.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It is a question of organised workers against wasters.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is a question of getting a representative who is appointed by those persons who are endeavouring to appeal to the board, which is to be constituted under this Bill. The suggestion has been made that if an election takes place in accordance with the regulations, the Government must deliberately make such regulations as to prevent an election being held.

Hon. T. Walker: It is a possibility.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is not a possibility that would occur with any Government occupying this bench. When regulations are made, the object is to carry out the provisions of the Act. When this Bill enfranchises certain persons to vote for certain things, if the regulations do not permit of that franchise being acted upon, they would

be declared ultra vires by any court before which they came. It is easy to make regulations which would secure representation on the board by those who are interested in the appointment. It has been done since the Act of 1912 as regards the present appeal board. The board that will be constituted under this Bill is representative of the public service and of the Crown, with a Supreme Court judge acting as chairman. The regulations are being made, and the elections are being carried out from the commencement by the Chief Electoral Officer. That should prove that the election can be satisfactorily carried out under the regulations.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What is your objection to the amendment?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There is no statute or law which can control the rules of either the association or the union. They are neither of them capable of registration under the industrial arbitration court. The rules can be altered by the will of members. I do not think there is anything in the rules of the Teachers' Union to which exception can be taken on the ground that they permit persons to join as members who are not proper subjects of the Bill. When dealing with the Civil Service Association, although no doubt members desire that it should only comprise people who come under the Bill, there is nothing to prevent them from broadening those rules to such an extent as to include any person who is simply engaged in the ordinary work of State trading concerns and working on day wages.

Hon. T. Walker: There is nothing to prevent it, but trust their sense as you say your sense should be trusted.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member will find that their rules do permit of what I suggest being done. Any person in the public service—anyone appointed by the Crown—is eligible for membership. There are a few men of the character I have mentioned who will ultimately become qualified as members of the permanent civil service. The association did not object to alter their rules to meet that point. When it is suggested that the association should have this power of appointment without any restriction as to what their rules may be, it must be obvious that the time may come when the personnel of the association may alter, and we may have a representative of those persons who are entitled to appeal under the Act appointed not by the parties interested but by others who have no interest whatever in the concern.

Mr. Willecock: Why do they want to vote?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The appointment is by the association.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Would you agree to the nominee being elected by members of the Civil Service Association who are qualified to apply under the Bill?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The rules must be confined to those persons who are entitled to apply under the Bill. The association is willing to alter its rules in that re-

spect. The only difference between us is that ultimately the question will arise as to whether the personnel of 95 per cent. is too large. From my point of view it is not. I have no objection so long as the appointee represents those who are entitled to apply, but I am bound to try to protect the small minority who may not belong to the association or the union. If the clause goes through as it stands, we have at any rate a definite measure providing for the appointment of a representative, no matter what the constitution of the union or the association may ultimately be. This is further safeguarded by the proviso I seek to add, that in the event of the rules being restricted in a limited way sufficient for the purposes of the Act and a satisfactory percentage also being mentioned, the association or the union would have the right to appoint a representative. In the circumstances I regret I cannot agree to the amendment.

Mr. SMITH: If the Public Service Act, to which reference has been made, is good enough for one section of the civil service, it should equally apply to another section. Regulation No. 52 made under the Public Service Act lays it down that the Civil Service Association of Western Australia shall be the channel of communication between the public service and the Government, and, except as thereafter provided, no objection or complaint or other communication from any other organised body of the public service will be received. If the Civil Service Association of Western Australia, under the Public Service Act, receives that hall mark of recognition, surely the association should also be good enough in respect of the Bill now before us.

Hon. T. Walker: That is the key to the argument.

Mr. SMITH: This has acted well in the past, and there is no reason why it should not do so in the future. The Attorney General is frightened lest the Civil Service Association is going to put up someone to represent them who will be detrimental to the interests of the Government. The chairman of the Board will be a Supreme Court judge, and the Government have the right to appoint their own representative without consulting anyone. In fact, they have two representatives on the board.

Hon. T. Walker: That is why it will not succeed.

The Attorney General: Do you suggest that the judge will represent the Government?

Mr. SMITH: I do not say that, but he is going to see that nothing detrimental to the Government passes.

The Attorney General: Nothing of the kind. He will act as a judge.

Mr. SMITH: I maintain that the appointment of a judge and a direct representative of the Government will give the Attorney General that security which he is so anxious to get. We have heard that 98 per cent. of the service belong to the association.

Mr. Underwood: Why growl about the other two per cent.?

Mr. Munsie: Why give the two per cent. the right to put the representative on the board?

Mr. Underwood: They have a good chance, have they not?

Mr. Munsie: Under this Bill they have.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SMITH: The other two per cent., I take it, can join the association if they desire. As they have not exercised the privilege of doing so, it may be taken that they have abandoned any right to vote for the appointment of any representative on the board.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They are loafing on their mates.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SMITH: If the idea of the Government were put into practice, how would it be possible for the two per cent. to have an effective vote in selecting a representative? For it does not follow that all of the two per cent. would hold the same views.

Mr. Robinson: What do you wish to do?

Mr. SMITH: Merely to simplify the provision.

Mr. Underwood: It is simple as it stands.

Mr. SMITH: It is not, nor is it as agreed upon. The Government, when they made the settlement with the public servants, had it in mind that they were going to allow the association to appoint their own representative on the appeal board. There can be no doubt about that. It was clearly agreed that the appeal board should be appointed and that the association should have a representative thereon.

Mr. Munsie: That was clear in the "Gazette" notice.

Mr. Robinson: If you did that, it would not represent the persons who did not belong to the association.

Mr. SMITH: At the utmost only two per cent. of the public service would not be represented. I hope the amendment will be carried, for it will simplify the provision and avoid friction with the service, which is the main object of the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Reference has been made to the "Gazette" notice by which the first board was appointed. The explanation is this: it was desirable both in the interests of the Government and of the service and the teachers that a board should be appointed immediately. In order to avoid the delay involved in the conducting of an election, it was suggested by the Government that on this first board the representatives of the service should be appointed by the association. That is why the first board was constituted as it is. It had nothing whatever to do with the ultimate appointment of the board which will come into existence in February next.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Attorney General says the temporary board was appointed to save time. Even if my amendment is carried, the time limit of three months is still

in the Bill; and irrespective of whether or not the Government make regulations, if we give the Civil Service Association the right to nominate or to elect their representative on the board, they will see to it that it is done by ballot. Provision for this could be inserted in the Bill if it is thought that there is any chance of some little clique nominating to the board somebody who has not the support of the majority. The executive of the association would not dare to make an appointment to the board without consulting the rank and file. After all, the Bill is to take the place, in relation to the service, of the Arbitration Court to an industrial union.

Mr. Hudson: But the industrial union is regulated by the Arbitration Act.

Mr. MUNSIE: And the Bill takes the place of the Arbitration Act. Under the Bill the Governor-in-Council has power to make regulations.

Mr. Hudson: Not to govern the association.

Mr. MUNSIE: I want to see the Civil Service Association and the teachers' union invested with the right to say who their representative on the board shall be. If the Civil Service Association and the teachers' union wanted Parliament to say who the Government representative was to be, is it likely that the Government would agree to that?

The Minister for Mines: Rather.

Mr. MUNSIE: The Government would not brook any interference. Why, then, should the Government desire to interfere with the nominee of the Civil Service Association and the teachers' union?

The Minister for Mines: We do not.

Mr. MUNSIE: Then, why draft a Bill like this?

The Minister for Mines: It is evidence of a lack of foresight.

Mr. MUNSIE: I do not know that it is even that. I believe it has been deliberately done.

The Minister for Mines: For what purpose?

Mr. MUNSIE: I want to see the same concessions given to those two organisations as are given to ordinary trades unions. Who is going to represent that small minority who are not members of either the Civil Service Association or the teachers' union? There are only two per cent. of them.

Mr. Underwood: Then why growl about them?

Mr. MUNSIE: I do not want them to have representation while the others have not.

Mr. Underwood: A nice chance they have!

Mr. MUNSIE: Under the Bill they have every chance, and particularly in respect of the teachers. Suppose the clause were to pass as it stands, what position would we be in? Under this provision deputies would be appointed in case of sickness. I do not want the chairman of the board or the Governor-in-Council to have the right to say who the deputies shall be. The Civil Service

Association and the teachers should have that right exclusively. If neither amendment is carried, who will the president of the board look to for the appointment of a deputy? Who but a gentleman not a member of the teachers' union would get the job, and why should he get it? Merely because of his position. I hope the Committee will agree to my amendment, which simply means giving to the Civil Service Association and to the teachers' union the right to nominate their own representative on the board.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have listened to the member for Hannans in the hope that he would set the example which he asked other members to set, namely, explain the reason why he desired the amendment.

Mr. Munsie: Because I did not want the minority represented.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Are we here to legislate for a section or for the whole? If we ask the whole of the civil servants to comply with certain laws, the whole of the civil servants should be entitled to representation on any board that deals with their disputes. I was personally responsible for the recognition of the Civil Service Association. If the hon. member looks at the Notice Paper, he will find that provision is made that so long as the association is a substantial organisation, it shall have the election of the representative, but we insist that it shall be a substantial organisation before we disfranchise any member who has to abide by the decision of the board.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You have altered your opinions very greatly.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have not altered them in the slightest degree. I never was in favour of compulsory unionism.

Mr. Munsie: I am not either.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member is moving in the direction of compelling men who desire to get fair treatment to become members of one organisation or the other.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Is not it the right thing for a man to join up?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is not before the House. If I were a civil servant, I would be a member. I would take a prominent part in the association and would probably make it a better association than it is, but that has nothing to do with the Bill. We merely provide that, in the event of the association representing a certain percentage of the members of the service who come under the Act, they may appoint their representative on the board. I do not think either the Bill as it stands or the amendment will materially affect the actual appointment of the representative, but there is a principle underlying it. If we make a law, we should not disfranchise the persons who have to comply with the law. I have a Bill in draft and am including word for word a proposition emanating from the Trades Hall in connection with the appeal board as affecting the railway employees. There was never a suggestion from the organisation that the suggestion of the

member for Hannans should be introduced in connection with their appeal board. They ask that the railway men entitled to representation shall vote for the representative. They do not suggest that the Locomotive Engine Drivers' Union should appoint a representative or that the W.A. Government Railway Employees' Union should appoint a representative. They suggest that the different sections of the railway staff shall, in the prescribed manner, record a vote for the election of the representative.

Mr. Willcock: All they are doing is to rectify an anomaly which has existed for years.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Then the member for Geraldton knows nothing about it.

Mr. Willcock: Yes, I do.

Hon. T. Walker: What has that to do with this Bill?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Probably the member for Kanowna cannot see past this particular clause. Even in recognised trades union circles there has not been a suggestion that, because a man is not a member of the union, he should be disfranchised in connection with the election of a representative on the board by whose decision he has to abide.

Mr. Munsie: Has the non-unionist a say in the representation on the Arbitration Court? He has not.

Hon. T. Walker: That is a parallel case.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, it is not. Should we disfranchise those who do not belong to the Civil Service Association or to the Teachers' Union? Does the member for Hannans fear that the 2 per cent. will influence the remaining 98 per cent.?

Mr. Smith: Why not stick to the bargain made by the Government?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No such bargain was made by the Government.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Would not recognition lead to a better understanding?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister for Mines has the floor.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There is no question of recognition. The very fact that we are providing for a certain percentage of membership is an evidence of recognition, and that is a step further than we went in 1913.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Lots of things have happened since then.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: In 1913 we first gave the association recognition. Now we are proposing to put it in an Act of Parliament. If that is not a step forward what is?

Mr. Munsie: Does this give them that recognition?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Unquestionably. I am coming to the amendment.

Mr. Munsie: That is not before the Chair.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Minister in charge of the Bill has placed an amendment on the Notice Paper, and this must be accepted *prima facie* as portion of the Bill. While we have gone a step forward in our recognition of the Civil Service Association

and the Teachers' Union, we provide a safeguard that a man who is not a member of the association shall not be penalised by being denied a say in the appointment of a representative on the appeal board.

Mr. Smith: Why did not you put that in the Public Service Act, Regulation 52?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The regulation has nothing to do with the Act.

Mr. Smith: It is made under the Act.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is an entirely different thing. Parliamentary sanction is necessary to amend an Act of Parliament, but a regulation can be put through or amended by Executive Council. Here we provide that the Civil Service Association and the Teachers' Union are recognised bodies.

Hon. T. Walker: And yet cannot be trusted to appoint their own representatives.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is not the question at all. Would it be right to say to the community that, because a few people did not support a certain organisation, they should be refused the right to go to the poll? Would it be right for the Farmers and Settlers' Association to say that farmers must join their union or should be denied the right to vote for a representative?

Mr. Chesson: You say that with the miners now.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No, we do not. We have miners' unions, Chambers of Mines, and Chambers of Commerce, but still we are entitled to insist that there shall be no interference with the proper representation of everybody.

Hon. T. Walker: On that ground you should have no objection to a Chinaman or a lunatic voting.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I would not deny that certain lunatics do vote, for, after all, who is to be the judge of a man's sanity? It is a question of degree.

Hon. T. Walker: Stick to the Chinaman.

Mr. Underwood: All adults have a vote.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Quite so. Here we recognise an organisation and provide that, so long as it has a certain percentage of membership, it shall have the right to make a direct appointment.

Mr. Munsie: If the Farmers' and Settlers' Association is electing a director of a co-operative concern, does it give a vote to a farmer, who is not a member of the association?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is a different proposition.

Mr. Munsie: It is the same principle as is laid down in this Bill.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We do not provide that every farmer shall be a member of a co-operative society and shall abide by its decisions.

Mr. Willcock: Yes; what about the wheat pool?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: In the case of the wheat pool every farmer is on the same footing, but we do not provide that, if a co-operative society is formed, every farmer

shall be compelled to deal through that organisation.

Hon. T. Walker: Neither is there anything in this amendment in the nature of compulsion.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Of course there is.

Mr. Munsie: There is no suggestion of compulsion whatever.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It is either compulsion or disfranchisement. It must be one or the other. The civil servants are in a different position from the people outside. The very nature of the Public Service Act exemplifies that. A civil servant is employed practically for life. Once a man enters the service he generally continues there through life, and is therefore entitled to better protection. An engineer in private employment cannot get an appeal board if he is dismissed; he has to accept dismissal. In the public service the employees have the right to better protection.

Hon. T. Walker: The engineer has the Arbitration Court to appeal to.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We take the view that, having granted an appeal board, we give it to the whole of the public service and not to a section. I would not care if the association represented 99 per cent. of the public service, the one per cent. should not be disfranchised. Are the 99 per cent. afraid of the one per cent? If it came to a question of trying by Act of Parliament to maintain an organisation which was dying, there might be some ground for the amendment, but there is no sign of decay in either the Civil Service Association or the Teachers' Union. We say that, simply because a man declines to be a member of one organisation or the other, he shall not be disfranchised from having a say in the election of a board which he has to obey. In all branches of employment there is such a thing as victimisation.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The measure provides against that.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I know, but only to the point that the Government or the head of the department shall not victimise. There is nothing to specify that, because a man is not a member of one organisation or the other, he may be victimised. I have heard the member for Kanowna make out a better case for victimisation on many occasions. Even in a case of that sort we are entitled to give him fair consideration. If there was unanimity in the service there would be no need to discuss it from this point of view, but there is a difference of opinion as to the attitude that should be adopted and as to that which was adopted during the strike. Many of the civil servants recognise that they must remain members of the association, but are not satisfied with the conduct of affairs. The Civil Service Association can well represent the public service, but I am not going to say that it should be trusted, without any restrictions or control,

to disfranchise any section of the public service.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Put in a proviso that they take a ballot. Nothing more is required.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is the position now, but instead of the civil servants conducting a ballot amongst their own members that ballot is conducted amongst the whole of the service.

Mr. Johnston: And the Civil Service Association should get its nominee.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No one suggests otherwise. In these circumstances we are protecting all the interests of the civil servants without undermining the influence of the Civil Service Association. They can still have a nominee appointed so long as they have a sufficient number of civil servants as members of that organisation.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The civil servants should have gone to the Arbitration Court. There is an important principle at stake in regard to this clause, and that is the principle of affirming an honourable undertaking entered into by the Government with the Civil Service Association. The Attorney General told us before tea that the very words proposed to be put into the Bill tonight were in the draft Bill that went before the association. I thought that the Bill contained all the points agreed upon between the association and the Government, but I am now informed that the Bill has been altered since that agreement was entered into, and that the arrangement made is not now expressed in the Bill. At the eleventh hour, therefore, the Government have altered certain provisions, which is neither fair nor honourable.

The Minister for Mines: That is not correct.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have before me a circular letter signed by the secretary of the Civil Service Association, which states that these words were contained in the Bill as agreed to with the Attorney General on the 23rd August last. The Attorney General informed the member for Perth that the words had appeared in the draft Bill which went to the association.

The Minister for Mines: We do not draft the Bills.

Mr. Munsie: That is what the agreement was made on.

The Premier: There was no agreement made.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The fact that the words appeared in the Bill as originally drafted supports the evidence which I have here in the circular letter. There was an honourable understanding entered into. There are several clauses in the Bill I should like to vote against, but I promised the Government that I would support their honourable undertaking by my vote in the House.

The Premier: We will give you back your promise.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not enter into an undertaking to-day and break it to-morrow. It is the duty of the Government, having entered into that honourable understanding, to keep to it. That is the only principle at stake in the amendment. It was a bargain made by the Government when the civil servants went back to work.

Mr. Underwood: Was this Bill drafted then?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There was a Bill drafted then.

The Attorney General: No, not then. It was not presented as approved by Cabinet at the time.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: This was the honourable understanding entered into.

Mr. Troy: Cabinet was responsible for the alteration.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When two parties agree on a number of points, no one else can alter that agreement.

The Minister for Mines: That agreement was made after the service went back to work.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They went back to work on the agreement that was entered into.

The Minister for Mines: What agreement?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is no doubt that the Bill was drafted in accordance with the agreement entered into. I thought the clauses of the Bill would be along the lines of the honourable understanding arrived at. Is it fair to alter the agreement at the eleventh hour?

The Minister for Mines: What was altered?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Minister cannot bluff me.

The Minister for Mines: You talk about an agreement as though an agreement was made before the strike terminated.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It was an agreement, and the circular letter affirms it and the Attorney General also affirms what I have said.

The Attorney General: I have not said all you have said.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Attorney General said that a Bill had been drafted under which the Civil Service Association should appoint a representative, and that they had received a draft of this Bill. These statements have now been confirmed. Seeing that the Government came to this arrangement they should embody it in the Bill. It has been the custom to recognise the association in the past, and this is shown by the regulations which have been framed dealing with it. It was evidently the intention of the Government to carry on the system which has been in vogue for some years. The Government have now varied the understanding arrived at, and it is their duty to adhere to it.

Mr. FOLEY: I do not know what undertaking was entered into between the Government and the civil service, but I should like

to know if the Government intend to have individual bargaining between individual civil servants, or whether their idea is to deal collectively with the service as a whole. If the amendment as forecasted by the Attorney General is put into effect, it will mean individual bargaining. I believe, however, in collective bargaining. The amendment moved by the member for Hannans means that there will be somebody responsible for the prevention of strikes, and the best body for this purpose is the Civil Service Association as a whole. There will be much more amicable working between the civil service as an association than between the civil service as individuals and the Government. The Government should not fear the Civil Service Association.

The Minister for Mines: We do not.

Mr. FOLEY: Then they should recognise that body as being representative of the civil service.

The Minister for Mines: And disfranchise the balance?

Mr. FOLEY: When the question as to whether there was to be a strike or not was discussed, no doubt the members of the service were consulted, but if that were not so, there is no doubt that the whole of the service fell in with the idea of the executive.

The Minister for Mines: They did not.

Mr. FOLEY: They did, because they left their work—every one of them almost.

The Minister for Mines: No.

Mr. O'Loughlin: The Government are more concerned about the half-dozen, who did not.

Mr. FOLEY: I am not concerned about those half-dozen, although I publicly expressed my opinion against the strike. However, when the strike took place, there was not a public servant in this State who did not recognise the Civil Service Association, and that association should be recognised now that the trouble is over. All risk of trouble between the public service and the Government is not at an end, and there should be some body representative of the public service in future negotiations. And what better body could there be for that purpose than a body representing the union of public servants? The Civil Service Association can be trusted to elect a fit representative on the board. I suggest that the Government introduce into this Bill a clause making it impossible for the public servants to go on strike, or making it a crime for them to do so. That should follow upon the giving to the public servants of the right to elect a representative on the board.

Hon. T. WALKER: I am at a loss to know what the Government are afraid of as regards the elections to the board. I listened to the fervour of the Minister for Mines, but I carry my mind back to the time when he was chiefly responsible for giving status to the Civil Service Association, for recognising them as a distinctive body qualified to speak on behalf of the public service. I quote from the Public Service Regulations

dating back to the days of the Seaddan Government—

The Civil Service Association shall be the channel of communication between the public service and the Government, and, except as hereinafter provided, no petition, complaint, or other communication from any other organised body of public servants will be received; provided that sub-organisations will be recognised on the following conditions: (a) That the members are also members of the association; (b) That any petition, complaint, or other communication of a sub-organisation shall be transmitted to the proper authority through the medium of the association; provided also that it shall be the duty of the association to forward any petition or complaint or other communication of a sub-organisation without any undue delay to the proper authority with such comment thereon, if any, as to the association may seem fit.

The Minister for Mines: May I interpret that? That was to prevent separate organisations entering the field.

Hon. T. WALKER: Quite so. It was to prevent division, to prevent those in and those out quarrelling with each other. It was to make one recognised channel of communication, to make one recognised body that should be the voice of the association and of the whole of the public service.

The Minister for Mines: Did you prevent any individual public servant from approaching you?

Hon. T. WALKER: Never. And neither will the amendment have such an effect.

The Minister for Mines: The amendment disfranchises the individual.

Hon. T. WALKER: Not at all. What does the Bill propose? That all members of the public service shall be entitled to appeal, and that all shall be heard whether they belong to the association or do not belong to it. But when it comes to preparing the case and appointing a representative who shall hear the case, then the recognised organ, the recognised institution, shall do the balloting and elect a representative of not only the association but the whole service. Every member of the public service is entitled to have his voice heard, is entitled to an appeal. It is now only a question of the machinery of getting a representative of the whole of the service. Are those who are not members of the association to appoint? The association represents, in its election, the whole of the public service. No one is disfranchised. The amendment disfranchises no one. It simply recognises a body which already exists, which is an organised body, and which therefore has at its disposal machinery for the election of a representative of the whole of the service, not of any section.

The Minister for Mines: No. Only of its own members.

Hon. T. WALKER: Nothing of the kind. What object can the Government have in

resisting this amendment? The paltry fact that there may be two per cent. of the public service not members of the association?

The Premier: Surely 98 per cent. would not be afraid of two per cent.

Hon. T. WALKER: It is not a matter of fear of any two per cent. on the part of the public servants. What they are afraid of is the recognition by the Government of the right of some public servants to stand outside the association, and to carry out the policy that is introduced everywhere of dividing workers and organisations, dividing them up, splitting them into sections. That is the object.

The Minister for Mines: It is the object of the amendment.

Hon. T. WALKER: The hope of the Government is that the two per cent. will increase and multiply, so to speak, that the two per cent. will stand aloof, under the shelter of the Government, and ignore what is admitted by the regulations of past Governments to be the organised, established, recognised body of communication between the Government and the public servants. The object is to encourage division in the ranks, to encourage what would in vulgar parlance be called the scabs to stand aloof, under the aegis and protection of the paternal Government of the hour. That is what it seems like.

Mr. Underwood: That is what the anti-conscriptionists did.

Hon. T. WALKER: I would advise the hon. member to get medical advice. What are the Government afraid of?

The Attorney General: Nothing.

Hon. T. WALKER: Then why not trust the organisation which they recognise?

The Minister for Mines: What are you afraid of? Why not trust the whole of the service?

Hon. T. WALKER: All that this side is fighting for to-night is to keep faith with the organisation that originated this Bill.

The Attorney General: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

Hon. T. WALKER: Those words are easily said.

The Attorney General: And they are true.

Hon. T. WALKER: Especially when they are said in the snobbish manner that the upstart defender of democracy on that side of the Chamber adopts.

The Attorney General: Does the hon. member feel relieved?

Hon. T. WALKER: I do not feel relieved at listening to any utterance or interjection of the hon. member, who gets on my nerves every time I hear him splutter. The Attorney General tells me I know nothing about it. Do the public service know anything about it? Those who entered into the contract with the hon. member; are they to be taken as ignoramuses? This is what they have said—

The amendments sought are in no way in conflict with the general understanding arrived at with the Government, and it is

hoped they will appreciate their reasonableness and support them.

That is in reference to one of the amendments proposed by the member for Hannans. Then here is another statement from the secretary, to the effect that this very amendment was in the original Bill. They say further—

This is in accordance with the actual wording of the Bill as agreed to with the Attorney General on the 23rd August.

The Attorney General cannot deny it. Those very words were in the original Bill. He has to admit it. Is it of no value to preserve the good opinion and respect and confidence of those who entered into the contract?

The Premier: It was not a contract.

Hon. T. WALKER: It was, and it has now materialised in the shape of the Bill. But in redrafting the Bill the wording, which was assented to by the parties, was departed from. Does it speak well for the future that we should depart from our pledged word? Is it likely to lead to peace with the civil service?

The Premier: We shall never have peace with a few of them.

Hon. T. WALKER: But those few seem to find favour with the Government, while the great body are ignored.

The Minister for Mines: That is not so.

Hon. T. WALKER: But it is. You are asking that the few shall stand out and be protected by the Government. Is it to the advantage of the Government to say to the association, "No, you shall not be trusted with the appointment of the representative of the whole of the service." Is that likely to lead to peace? It is enraging them from the very beginning, it is providing grounds for future trouble. The way to settle the trouble is to stick to the bargain made on the 23rd August last and pass the Bill in its originally agreed upon form.

Mr. Pickering: Peace at any price.

Hon. T. WALKER: The hon. member knows neither peace nor price. We must respect a body which we have given importance to, which we have given responsibility to by regulation, and to do this we must accept the amendment of the member for Hannans.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I move—

That progress be reported.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	20
Noes	14

Majority for .. 6

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Nairn
Mr. Brown	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Davies	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Draper	Mr. Robinson
Mr. Durack	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foley	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Thomson
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Money	
Mr. Mullany	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Smith
Mr. Brown	Mr. Troy
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Green	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Jones	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Lutey	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Munsie	(Teller.)
Mr. Rocks	

Motion thus passed.

Progress reported.

BILL—PARLIAMENT (QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN).

Second Reading.

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from 7th September.

Question put.

Mr. SPEAKER: The passing of the question requires an absolute majority of the House. I have counted the House and I find there is an absolute majority present. However, as there was one dissentient voice, I must call for a division.

Bells rung, the House divided, Mr. Pickering alone going to the left.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am satisfied that there is an absolute majority of the House on the right, so I will not appoint tellers. I declare the question carried.

Question passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Capacity of women to be members of Parliament:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: There has been an omission from subclause 2 of this clause, and I desire to rectify that omission. The subclause provides for the omission of the word "person" from certain sections of the Constitution Act Amendment Act, but the words "from Section 3" have been omitted from paragraph (a) of the subclause, and it is these words that I desire to have inserted. I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (a) of Subclause 2, after "omitting," the words "from Section 3" be inserted.

Amendment put and passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1920-21.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from 23rd September; Mr. Foley in the Chair.

Vote—Legislative Assembly, £1,745:

Mr. TROY: I desire to draw attention to the salary being paid to officers of this Assembly and to the officials in the service of this Parliament. I am endeavouring to make amends for something for which I am responsible in respect to the salary of the Clerk of the Assembly. When I was elected Speaker, Mr. Grant succeeded Mr. Lee Steere as Clerk of the Assembly, and at that time the salary of the clerk was £600. Mr. Lee Steere drew that salary from 1903 to 1911—£450 as Clerk and £150 as Librarian. When Mr. Grant took office he agreed, at my suggestion and for the time being, to accept a lesser amount on the understanding that his salary was to be increased on the first opportunity. Mr. Grant's salary has remained at £550 altogether, since 1911. Yet he has done the very same work that Mr. Lee Steere did during the whole time that Mr. Lee Steere was Clerk of the Assembly. It is surprising to me that no attempt has been made to increase Mr. Grant's salary before this. I suppose the Speaker would be quite willing to assist in this direction, but probably he thought it would not meet with the approval of the House. The increase would have been given before I resigned the Speakership but for the fact that war broke out and everyone felt compelled to make some sacrifice. Now there has been a general movement in regard to salaries, and while an increase is not possible on the present Estimates, I feel it is due to me to put forward the plea that the Clerk should be paid the salary of the officer he succeeded.

Mr. ROBINSON: The time has arrived when consideration should be given by all parties in the House to the question of uniformity. At the present time we have a Federal assessment staff and a State valuation and assessment staff. We also have local authorities doing similar work, and in some instances the same assessment of valuations is made use of, while in other instances it is not. Some years ago, when Mr. Scaddan was Premier, a motion was brought before the House dealing with the question of uniform valuations.

The Premier: We are dealing now with the Legislative Assembly vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The general discussion on the Estimates is finished. The Committee are now discussing the items of "Division 3, Legislative Assembly."

Mr. ROBINSON: Then I may not carry on the discussion I had started. I was not aware that the general debate had closed. However, I will have an opportunity of referring to the matter when the Treasurer's Estimates are before the Committee.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: With regard to the question raised by the member for Mt. Magnet, all I can say is that what he has informed the Committee is in accordance with the facts. The former Clerk of the Assembly drew the same salary as the present Clerk, but he drew £50 a year more as librarian than the present Clerk is drawing, which

made his remuneration £50 a year more. The Library Committee would have to put that extra £50 on the Estimates. If we increase the salary of the Clerk or the Clerk Assistant of the Assembly, we would have to increase the salaries of the officers in another place. That is laid down in the Constitution. To get over the difficulty, the salary attached to the Librarian's position made the salary of the Clerk of the Assembly higher than that of the Clerk of the Council. I discussed this matter with the President of the Council who is Chairman of the Library Committee and also with the Treasurer, but we did not arrive at a decision to place the increased amount on the Estimates. When the member for Mt. Magnet was Speaker, he intended to increase the Clerk's salary by £50, but the outbreak of war and the desire to curtail expenditure accounted for that not being done. This has been the only year since the war when the matter could be considered. The remuneration all over Australia and in other parts of the world has been very largely increased during the last two years, and I am sorry that I was not in a position to recommend the increase in this case. What the member for Mt. Magnet said is perfectly correct, and I hope that whoever occupies the position of Speaker next year will be able to make provision whereby the Clerk shall receive the same remuneration as his predecessor received.

The PREMIER: I entirely agree with the remarks made with regard to the Clerk of the Assembly. I agree that the salary is much smaller than is paid for similar positions in other States. For some time we have preached and practised economy. I was glad to hear the expression of opinion from members because I know it is within the province of the Committee to determine what shall be done with regard to the votes we are now discussing. Unless I hear something to the contrary I shall take it as an indication from the Committee that this salary should be increased to the amount paid to the former clerk in 1911. It must be very difficult for a man to make both ends meet on the salary now paid, particularly for a married man.

Mr. WILSON: May I suggest also that, when the Premier is going into the matter, he should consider the Clerk Assistant, the Chief Messenger and office clerk, and in fact all officers. They should be increased in the same proportion as civil servants have been increased.

Mr. PICKERING: I support the remarks made with regard to the Clerk of the Assembly and the Clerk Assistant. The latter officer last year suffered a reduction of £50 because of the transfer of the position of secretary of the House Committee to another officer. I trust the Premier will consider the matter when the next Estimates are being framed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We are repeatedly told that this House has power to deal with these officers, but apparently we have no power to deal with them on the Estimates. The House Committee have certain power, but if they increased the expenditure, they

would probably receive a rap over the knuckles from the Treasurer. I believe that the House Committee would be willing to pay increased salaries if the funds were available.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The officers do not come under the control of the House Committee.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier said they did. When comparing their salaries with the salaries paid both inside and outside the civil service, the officers of this House are not remunerated commensurately with the cost of living at the present time. In fact, owing to the increased costs, they have gone back 60 to 70 per cent. Almost everyone else has received increases. We members could not live on £300 a year, and I am sure the clerks cannot do so. I hope the Premier will go into the matter with the Speaker and, without waiting for 12 months to elapse, will consider the position of the whole of the officers.

Mr. LUTEY: While I admit that the Clerk of the Assembly must possess high qualifications and have a good knowledge of constitutional law, and that £500 or £600 a year would be little enough remuneration, I am more concerned about those on the lower rungs of the ladder.

Item—Messengers, one at £150, one at £52, two at £24—£250:

Mr. JONES: I wish to call attention to the scandalous and sweating wages which we pay our messengers. I do not know whether it is much use discussing this question, but it would not be fair to allow the item to pass without making an appeal to the Government to raise the salaries of the messengers. There can be no doubt that the hours they are working and the salary they are receiving are not a credit to the Legislature. I submit in all humility to the Government that, if they are unable to raise the salary of these messengers, they should pay them overtime while the House is sitting. They are here until midnight and 1 a.m., and they should receive extra remuneration for it. It is not a fair thing to expect any youth acting as messenger in this House to work until midnight or after for £1 a week. The fact that they get their tea is merely a negligible quantity; their tea would be worth probably 9d. or 1s. If they were paid only 1s. or 1s. 6d. an hour overtime when the House is sitting late, it would be more to the credit of the House and of members. I feel ashamed to sit here knowing that there are boys working for a sweated wage, in fact for remuneration which is not a wage at all. We are paying £1 a week to boys who have to work until the small hours of the morning. If the House Committee are responsible, I would appeal to their sense of decency and ask them to arrange for the payment of overtime.

Mr. GREEN: I wish to refer to the case of Fred Islip, the messenger at £150. This lad started here years ago at £75 per annum, and, when we consider the decreased value of money, he is really on the same footing now as he was when started. He is a

smart lad, very attentive, and nothing is too much trouble for him and, in saying that, I am not saying anything derogatory to the Chief Messenger, because he too is an excellent man. The reason I have not made special reference to the Chief Messenger is that, though I recognise he should receive more, it is probably on account of the stringency of the times that the Committee cannot deal with his remuneration this year. I think, however, that Islip should be given some recognition for his services. "One at £52" refers to the lad Cyril Logan, who is permanently employed here. For 15 months he received 15s. a week, whereas his predecessor started at £75 per annum. This lad is constantly in attendance and has the makings of a smart man. He is in a permanent position, and yet we are paying him only £1 a week. The Premier should consider urgent cases of this kind with a view to bringing in supplementary Estimates to deal with them this year instead of allowing them to wait until next year.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The messenger on £150 this year was receiving £75 about 15 months ago. He has stepped up into the higher position, which carries £150 a year. The other boy at £50 is getting £1 a week. The other two on £24 are only sessional boys. The salaries of these positions are practically the same as they have been for many years.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Have these boys the right of appeal to the Public Service Appeal Board? If not, they should be given that right. They are being underpaid. Other boys in the civil service in a similar position have the right of appeal to the appeal board.

Mr. WILLCOCK: These messengers are not learning any trade or calling, and are really wasting their time in these positions. If we occupy a boy's time in this way, we should pay him sufficient salary to keep him.

Mr. TROY: I always thought it a pity that boys were employed here at all in these positions. They are really wasting the best period of their lives. Positions such as theirs should be held by crippled returned soldiers. When we do employ these boys we should urge upon them the necessity for qualifying themselves for promotion. Parliament is always prepared to pay a fair remuneration to an officer of the House who shows a capacity for doing better things.

Item, Hall Porter, £185:

Mr. NAIRN: The salary paid to the hall porter is entirely inadequate. Mr. Ford has given long and faithful service and fills his position well. He should be paid at least a living wage.

Mr. CHESSON: This officer has had 16 years' service and only receives a pittance by way of salary. The Premier should at least raise this salary to the minimum that is being paid in the Railways, namely £208 a year.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Ford has to be on duty not only at the ordinary time in the morning but has to stay during the session until

11 o'clock at night. The hall porter in the Public Works Department receives £228 a year and the attendant in the Savings Bank receives £204 a year. No doubt both of these officers have the right of appeal to the appeal board. Officers of the House in these positions should not be dependant upon the Speaker for their salaries, but should be classified as a branch of the public service. In the Federal House these officers are dealt with in a different manner. There is a cost of living bonus of £216 for Senate officers this year, and a similar bonus of £352 for the officers of the other House; and in every case there has been an increase of salary as well. It is only regrettable that we have not the same control of finance as the national Parliament has. The President's messenger has been raised from £216 to £250. There are two senior messengers at £212, and one at £200; and an increase of £24 is divided amongst them this year. There are three junior messengers at £182 per annum. No junior messenger in the House of Representatives gets under £182. The highest paid junior messenger gets £196, and the senior messenger gets £212. The Speaker's messenger is down for an increase of £34, raising him to £250. While we cannot pay salaries such as these, we still must recognise that the hours of labour put in by Mr. Ford, and his length of service, and the decrease in the purchasing power of money entitle him to consideration. We should see that this man gets a fair deal, and that he is not neglected simply because he does not happen to belong to some strong organisation.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: What members have said about the hall porter is quite correct, but I wish to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that on last year's Estimates this officer's salary was increased by £10.

Mr. Wilson: Ten pounds in nine years!

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Last year's Estimates were the second Estimates I dealt with, and I increased his salary from £175 to £185. I am not leaving any babies for any Speaker who may succeed me in the Chair. I could not reasonably make a recommendation for another increase this year, considering the officer had been there for so many years without an increase. I do not want hon. members to think that I am responsible for the holding back of any increase. In fairness and justice the officer should not have been left so long without an increase. Taking the work he does, and comparing it with that of people who have no more responsibility, it compares favourably as regards the amount of time spent over it. At the same time he has three weeks' holiday annually at one swoop, and the additional Government holidays that he gets amount to another 1½ weeks. As hon. members are aware, if the ordinary man loses half a day, he has it deducted. Though hon. members may say that £184 a year is not a living wage, I do not feel disposed to recommend any increase this session.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I deeply regret the concluding remarks of the Speaker, because after the observations made by members on both sides I was convinced that he would have seen the fitness of making a recommendation. He points out that this officer, although given an increase of £10 last year, had been neglected for a period of nine years. The Speaker realises, like every one of us, that the necessity for an increase did not make itself so very keenly felt until last year. But then it came very rapidly. The enormous increases in prices that have gone on and are still taking place are, I suppose, unprecedented in the world's history, or at all events in Australian history. The Speaker said that he could not in justice recommend another increase this year. It is only three or four months since the railway men were awarded by the Arbitration Court a minimum of 11s. a day. Owing to the increases in the cost of living coming on top of one another, they were obliged to approach the court again, with the result that they got another increase of 2s. 4d. a day. Mr. Ford gets 4½ weeks' holiday annually, but he has to put in very long hours; of course his work may not be very strenuous. We have to recognise how far 11s. 8d. goes to-day in maintaining a home, and I am quite sure the Premier will, at any rate in this case, make a special effort; and I trust he will have the recommendation of the Speaker to guide him to grant some recognition to this officer. I have heard it said that he could be replaced by a boy, but I feel convinced members recognise that the work he does in negotiating between visitors and members is often diplomatic work of a high order, and that therefore a boy could not fill the bill. We are satisfied with the officer we have.

The Premier: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: In view of the Premier's interjection I feel sure he does not want to see an empty cupboard in this officer's home. So strongly do members feel on this matter, that all sides of the Committee are prepared to support an increase. A salary of 11s. 8d. per day is recognised by the highest tribunal in the land to be inadequate. The lowest pay of a lavatory attendant in the Railway Department is now £4 per week. I put it to the Premier and to the Speaker that this officer should be granted the meed of justice that is due to him. I hope the Speaker will get on his feet and withdraw the remarks he made. If not, I am prepared to talk for a couple of hours on this case of rank injustice.

The PREMIER: It has been suggested to-night that the conditions of the Public Service Act should apply to officers of this House, and I am inclined to agree with that view. Of course I recognise that the control of the officers of the House must be with the Speaker and with the various committees that we have managing our affairs; but it ought to be possible to have the positions defined by the Public Service Commissioner.

I hope that those members who manage the affairs of the House will take that suggestion into consideration. If it were adopted, a lot of discussion would be saved and justice would be done to our officers. Moreover, the boys about whom we have heard so much could pass on to the Public Service.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Pending that arrangement, will you give any immediate relief to this officer?

The PREMIER: I think this is a very excellent officer, and I am surprised to hear that there is any idea of putting a boy in his place. No boy could do the work. I will discuss the matter with the Speaker, and abide by what he says.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The Speaker says he is not going to budge.

The PREMIER: The Speaker does not say that.

Mr. O'Loghlen: If you say you will do it, we will be satisfied.

The PREMIER: I will discuss the matter with the Speaker.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: With reference to the Premier's suggestion that the officers of this House should be placed under the Public Service Commissioner—as regards classification, I take it—I may say I do not think some of the officers would care about it. Let me also say that I have discussed the matter with the Premier and with the President of the Legislative Council. I raised the same question when these Estimates were being framed. I do not want the member for Forrest to think that I have expressed a final decision that this officer will not get any increase.

Mr. O'Loghlen: Will you agree to put him on the minimum?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I discussed these salaries with the Treasurer before I submitted my Estimates. There is no doubt on that point. I say now, as I said then to the Treasurer, that this officer was put up £10 last year, and that I made no recommendation for any further increase on account of the reasons which I have already stated. These Estimates have been passed year after year, and there was no increase suggested when the salary was much lower.

Mr. Green: We put our salaries up £100, you know.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am not worrying about that. If the officers of the House had the opportunity of putting up their salaries, they would not be so gentle about it as members of Parliament were. I do not think the salary of a member of Parliament is at all in keeping with what he should receive. Members have known my opinion on that point for many years.

Mr. O'Loghlen: If the Premier finds the money, will you recommend the minimum?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I will discuss the subject with the Premier, and I think members can safely leave the matter in my hands.

Mr. TROY: Has the Speaker said that he will communicate with the Premier on the subject?

Mr. O'Loghlen: Yes.

Mr. TROY: If so, I need say no more on that point. The Speaker said he was not going to hand any babies on. We will see he does not. I have no doubt that when the Speaker put forward his Estimates, he was opposed by the Treasurer. That has been my experience. But things have changed within the last few years, as pointed out by the member for Forrest. It is only within the last few years that the cost of living has gone up excessively. Nine years ago members of this House received only £200 per annum. It was not until last December that prices jumped so enormously. I hope there will not be any talk about putting a boy in this officer's place. The present officer is efficient, and knows his duty. I am glad to hear the Speaker's announcement that the claims of this officer will be considered.

Mr. MUNSIE: I was pleased to hear the remarks of the Premier in respect of the hall porter. When first I became a member, the salary of that officer was adequate to the position, but it is no longer so. If ever there is a suggestion that the present officer should be removed and a boy put in his place, I trust the suggestion will not be entertained. The officer earns his salary, if only by the care he takes of members' correspondence. The present salary is totally inadequate.

Item, Incidental, £170:

Mr. MUNSIE: I want some information as to what "Other, £60" means in respect of the Assembly. If there is no explanation of it, I intend to move a reduction of the item.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: I am in the same position as the hon. member. When I submitted these Estimates I did not include "Other." That was put in by the Treasurer. I do not know what "Other" covers. "Incidental" covers all that is required by the House. Perhaps the Treasurer can explain it. It can only mean other incidentals.

The Premier: That is what it does mean—other incidentals.

Mr. MUNSIE: Since the attention of the Treasurer has been drawn to this, I hope he will be able to give us some information about it next year.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Joint House Committee, £4,565.

Item, Controller, £263:

Mr. SMITH: As the Committee seem to be in a mood to do the right thing by our own employees, I think the good services of this officer should be recognised. He is paid only £263.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Plus £50.

[Mr. Stubbs resumed the Chair.]

Mr. SMITH: And I understand there are other considerations as well. Even allowing for all those, we must look at the importance of the position. This officer could lose for us considerably more than his salary. The

chief messenger in the Assembly is paid £225, the orderly at Government House £219, and the Sergeant at Arms £354.

Mr. LUTEY: Look at the importance of the job!

Mr. SMITH: The Sergeant at Arms receives £354.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Only £150 as Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. SMITH: And £204 at the Geological Department.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: For which he has to work every hour that other civil servants work.

Mr. SMITH: Still, while the Sergeant at Arms can earn £354, the Controller at Parliament House earns only £313.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Controller with his wife and family live on the premises. He is provided with accommodation, light, wood and food. The house is furnished and he has everything he requires. So far as responsibility is concerned, he has not too much of this. The House Committee have to do all the purchasing and he as controller under our guidance makes the purchases, and scrutinises accounts. There is no doubt he is a very good officer but the Committee think he is being paid sufficiently.

Mr. MULLANY: As a member of the House Committee I appreciate the services rendered by the Controller. At the same time I do not think he has made any complaint about the salary or the treatment he is receiving. The member for North Perth should find more deserving cases to bring under notice.

Item, Gardener, £175:

Mr. PICKERING: I do not know what the conditions are with regard to the house accommodation provided for this officer, but the officer has a responsible position and he carries out his duty satisfactorily. I do not think that the salary paid him is adequate, and a recommendation should be made for an increase on next year's Estimates.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: This officer is provided with house accommodation, light, wood, and water.

Mr. Pickering: But he does not get food!

Hon. G. TAYLOR: No.

Mr. CHESON: The salary seems to be rather small for a skilled man to receive. The head gardener is a married man, and taking into consideration the price of commodities he should receive an increase in his wages.

Item, Wages (garden) £330:

Mr. LUTEY: The number of gardeners employed is not given. I thought it was understood that the number of officers employed was to be stated.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The two men employed in addition to the head gardener are set down as gardeners, but if anyone looked at the grounds around Parliament House, they would never accuse them of being gardeners, that is, if the question of growing flowers were raised. All they have to do is to mow

the grass. I may point out, however, that when the gardeners got an award three or four years ago the wages were increased to 10s. a day. Application was recently made to the House Committee but our men did not come under the heading of gardeners except the head gardener who was receiving more than the award rate. The others were described as garden labourers. Their wages have been increased 3s. a day since 1914-15. Within the last few weeks there has been an increase of another 1s. a day and we shall have to bring our men into line.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The railway award has made all the difference.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: One of the men employed in the grounds is a very old man who is paid 9s. a day. If we have not sufficient money on the vote, we will have to excess it. That is the condition under which the vote is operated.

Mr. MULLANY: The younger of the two men in the grounds receives 12s. a day, but at the next meeting of the House Committee I intend to bring up the question of the wages of the garden labourers, and will move in the direction of giving them an increase even if it involves exceeding the vote.

Item, Wages, Kitchen, Dining Room and Cleaners, £1,700:

Mr. GREEN: I understand that the cleaners are receiving only 11s. a day. This amount might well be increased. These people are working for many hours a day in what is admittedly an unhealthy occupation. Any man who has been a cleaner for some years has always suffered in health. It is almost as bad as mining on account of the dust.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: We had to excess this vote last year by £57 on account of increasing the cleaners' salaries by 1s. a day. Since 1914-15 we have increased their salaries by 3s. a day. When I first entered the House many years ago, cleaners were receiving 6s. a day. The cleaners are now receiving 11s. a day with the exception of the head cleaner who gets 12s. The House Committee can deal with this matter because, if necessary, we can excess the vote.

Mr. O'Loughlen: What privileges do they get?

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Some concession in the way of meals when they are kept here to work.

Mr. LUTEY: Last year we decided that the various items should be separated so that we could see what each person received. This has not been done. I hope that next year the House Committee will set out the individual items.

Item, Members' Postage and Telegrams, £400:

Mr. THOMSON: Seeing that the Commonwealth Government propose to increase the letter postage from 1½d. to 2d. and the charge for telegrams from 9d. to 1s., this item should be increased. Country mem-

bers are put to considerable expense for postages and telegrams.

Mr. O'Loghlen: There is always a distinction.

Mr. THOMSON: But considering the proposed increases, more adequate provision should be made.

Mr. Green: The amount should be increased by 25 per cent.

Mr. THOMSON: It certainly should be increased somewhat. Country members know what a heavy demand this expenditure makes on them because it exceeds the allowance considerably.

Mr. O'Loghlen: You are not objecting to getting insufficient?

Mr. THOMSON: Yes, the amount should be increased.

Mr. O'Loghlen: That comes well from a member who voted against the increased remuneration last session.

Mr. THOMSON: We are not now discussing salaries but I might inform the member for Forrest that I was not present when the vote was taken, although if I had been I should have opposed it because I was pledged to reduce expenditure.

Mr. Green: You are accepting the increased salary.

Mr. THOMSON: Circumstances have altered since the time when I went before my electors. I can do with the increase as well as other members.

Mr. Foley: There has not been a case in which the increase has not been collected.

Mr. THOMSON: We should recommend the House Committee to increase the amount for postages and telegrams.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: Last year £300 was provided, which was the amount put on the Estimates for some years, but the actual expenditure last year was £365. This year we have provided £400, so that we have increased the estimate on what the Committee voted last year by £100. When these Estimates were being framed, we did not know of the Federal Government's intended increases.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They are only following Lloyd George.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: This item has nothing to do with members' salaries. The member for Katanning might refuse to take the increase.

The CHAIRMAN: We are not dealing with members' salaries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: When I entered the House members were not allowed any postage expenses at all. On a motion which I moved, it was agreed by the House that members' letters and telegrams should be franked by the Government, and I protest against the interference of the House Committee. The House Committee have arrogated to themselves the right to say that no member shall be allowed more than £10 for postages and telegrams. The House Committee have no right to do this. It is not within their province. It was the House who gave the instruction. The House Committee have no right to control this vote.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But they had justification.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: This vote is controlled by the House. It is all very well for members representing metropolitan or suburban districts to talk about the allowance which should be made to members for postages and telegrams.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We are allowed only one half.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: What I asked for, and rightly too, was the franking of members' letters and telegrams, and that is what we are entitled to and the House Committee have no right whatever to interfere. What if the legitimate postage of hon. members comes to £50 a year? The House Committee have not been appointed to audit such postage. As I did 13 years ago, I claim that a member should not be compelled to pay his own postage and for his own telegrams when dealing with public business. I tell the House Committee and the Speaker that this question was decided by the House. When the House Committee decides to impose restrictions on members, the proposals should be placed before the House so that members may agree to them or not. I want it to be understood that if my postage account exceeds the allowance the House Committee is to make up the difference.

Mr. PICKERING: I, too, have exceeded the amount which the House Committee has been pleased to allow me on my postage account. If what the member for Pilbara said is correct, the House Committee has no right to reduce the allowance from £10 to £7 10s. on postage connected purely with legitimate political business.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: I have no objection to hon. members deciding the method by which this money should be expended. But is there any other way by which this expenditure shall be supervised except through the House Committee? Is it to be left to anyone to scrutinise the amount which any member should spend on postage?

Mr. Underwood: Have you been elected to scrutinise this?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: The House Committee have been elected to guard against undue or wrongful expenditure. When an hon. member spends £4 5s. on business which is not of a political nature, it is time there was some check on the expenditure. As a matter of fact only three members have exceeded their postage allowance, and the member for Pilbara is not one of these. Members of the House Committee are not Shylocks, and if any member can make out a fair case for an increase in the allowance, they will take that into consideration. Who is to control this expenditure if it is not to be the House Committee?

Mr. Underwood: The House Committee were not elected to do that.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Let some hon. member move a specific motion that this item be controlled either by the House Committee or by some other body. If the House Committee have controlled this wrongfully, my colleagues and I have done so with the ob-

ject of saving Government money. I did not expect condemnation from members because of the endeavour to save the money of the State. Should it be possible for a member to write a telegram costing £4 when a letter would do just as well? Do hon. members agree that anyone should talk on a trunk line for any length of time they like?

Mr. Underwood: Were you appointed to be our supervisors?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: We have no desire to be that. If a claim is made by country members for a further postage allowance we are prepared to consider it and make an increase. When hon. members exceed the amount that is at present allowed, arrangements could be made with some other member who has only drawn 5s. or 10s. worth of stamps to operate on his allowance. Is it intended that hon. members should raise the question every time one of us oversteps the mark? I will leave it to the good sense of this Committee to say whether or not we have been doing the proper thing in exercising a check on the postage expenditure.

Mr. Underwood: What are you? Men? Or what?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Sometimes I am puzzled as to what the hon. member is. If members object to a limit being put on, if they are to be allowed to expend as much as they like, the amount will run into big figures and the time will come when this Parliament will insist that a committee of some kind shall scrutinise the expenditure.

Mr. Underwood: Suppose you wait until Parliament asks for a committee?

Mr. O'LOGHLEN: Let the hon. member move a motion on the subject and see how he gets on. How is Parliament going to decide the question? The Committee took control of the matter because it was found that correspondence was going out under this vote which should not be going out under it.

Mr. TROY: The House Committee was appointed to look after the interests of members of this Chamber, and I myself have had no reason to cavil at any member of that Committee. I agree with the member for Forrest that somebody must control this vote. If not, one or two members may take advantage of it to the detriment of the others. It is reasonable that all members should share equally and fairly in the vote according to their necessities and responsibilities. I have had as much correspondence as any member of this Chamber, and my correspondence has never yet been stopped. The House Committee have not interfered without very good reason. I remember the instance referred to by the member for Forrest, though I was not a member of the House Committee at the time. If the House Committee allowed that sort of thing to go on, they would be doing wrong.

Mr. Foley: How did the House Committee get to know the contents of the telegram?

Mr. TROY: I do not know. We are not discussing that. If the House Committee do not control the vote, who will do it? To say

that there shall not be any control is an impossible proposition, and no one in his right senses could support it.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I suppose I have occasion to use as many stamps as most members, and since the vote has been reduced I have curtailed my correspondence as much as possible. When the House Committee received the Treasurer's request to furnish particulars for these Estimates, they were specially careful to see that every possible economy was exercised and that nothing beyond absolute necessities was asked for. Our idea in cutting down this vote was not at all to dictate to members, but to keep within reasonable limits. As compared with the year 1913-14, for instance, a surprising degree of economy is shown.

Mr. MULLANY: I trust this discussion will have the effect of causing the powers and duties of the House Committee to be defined. My service of five or six years on that committee has shown me that the position in that respect is very unsatisfactory indeed. No one appears to know where the authority of the House Committee comes from or what it is supposed to be. The statement of the member for Pilbara that the House Committee is appointed to see to the comfort and convenience of members within the precincts of Parliament is extremely vague. The whole position needs defining. The hon. member claimed that this vote was instituted some 13 or 14 years ago to frank members' telegrams and letters.

Mr. Underwood: And telephone messages.

Mr. MULLANY: One of the first things brought under my notice as a member of the House Committee was the shameful abuse of this privilege by members of the Assembly. It was then decided that the limit of £10 per annum for a country member and £5 for a metropolitan member would more than cover all legitimate demands. When we were discussing it the point of jurisdiction was raised, and we resolved to put it in order by including the amount on the Estimates, where it could be freely discussed by members as a whole. It has appeared on the Estimates three or four times, but this is the first occasion on which it has been challenged.

Hon. G. TAYLOR: The Joint House Committee controls precisely what is on the Estimates under the Vote "Joint House Committee"—nothing more, nothing less. And that Vote, with its items, indicates the power given to the Joint House Committee. As for limiting the expenditure on postage, the committee was forced to take action when it was found that one member had spent £46 on stamps and telegrams. There is no desire on the part of the committee to curtail legitimate postage, but it is necessary to give all members a fair deal, and so it was decided to limit the individual expenditure. One member spent £4 on a single telegram. Members of the House Committee would be failing in their duty if they neglected to act when they knew that some

hon. members were taking advantage of the vote to use trunk line telephones at 6s. per call for private business. At the time of the Albany election one hon. member told the telephone boy to call up Albany for him. It took some time, and when at last the connection was made the boy found the member playing billiards and not ready to go to the telephone. On being reminded by the boy a few minutes later that Albany was waiting on the telephone, the member said, "Oh I will not bother about it now." That call cost 11s. The Joint House Committee, in limiting the individual expenditure on postage, were protecting members one from another and protecting the public purse from unscrupulous members.

Mr. THOMSON: There is no necessity for any heat. As one of those who drew attention to the matter, I have no objection to the restriction since I have heard the explanation. But when this limited amount was decided upon it could not have been known that postage charges were to be substantially increased. I have had to pay for legitimate trunk line calls, which cost me a good deal of money.

Mr. PICKERING: I regret the heat shown, but I feel that we were justified in alluding to the position. I have had to go to other members for stamps. It is not right to impose a flat rate covering both those members whose correspondence is light and those who correspond largely. I resent the cutting out of trunk line telephone calls, and I find it hard to believe that the system had been abused in the manner indicated. I think that when a member's legitimate correspondence exceeds the £10 he should be entitled to excess the amount.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Years ago I felt the expense put upon me as a member, and I induced the House to carry a motion that members' correspondence should be franked. No authority has been given to the Joint House Committee to interfere with that resolution by the House. The Joint House Committee has simply usurped the position. It is not right to say that because some member went on playing billiards while a trunk line telephone call mounted up to 11s. in cost, other members should not be allowed the use of trunk lines. Who authorised the Joint House Committee to lay down a ruling on the point? I object to this arrogating of power by the Joint House Committee.

Mr. Teesdale: This will be nice reading for the public to-morrow.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Why should I be checked from talking over a long distance on the telephone? Why should I be compelled to pay for a telephone conversation on public business? Has the House Committee the right to lay that down after the motion which was carried in this House? They have no right to do it. Neither have the House Committee any right to alter members' postage allowance. If the House wants this altered, let us have a resolution from the House.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Then you move it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I am going to send my letters and to conduct my long distance telephone conversations irrespective of the member for Forrest or the House Committee. They will not charge me for either, and we shall see how we get on. I accept the position of being elected to this Parliament, and I am a gentleman by Act of Parliament.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You might be under an Act of Parliament.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: When I post a letter on public business I do not think it is right to have a committee appointed to audit my postage.

Mr. O'Loughlen: They do not do it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Then why do they usurp such a position?

Mr. O'Loughlen: To check unreasonable expenditure.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: And to check reasonable expenditure as well. The House Committee have checked my long distance telephone conversations when they had no right to do so. It is time we had a proper understanding as to the power of the House Committee.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Joint Printing Committee, £3,325:

Mr. CHESSON: At the present time members are only permitted to have one copy of "Hansard" and if that copy should go astray they find it difficult to get another. I quite agree that there should be a limit to the number of copies of "Hansard" distributed, but members should be permitted to have say three or four copies of each number.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Joint Library Committee, £425—agreed to.

Vote—Premier's Department, £17,822:

Progress reported.

BILL—BROOME RATES VALIDATION.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.