

are asking for bread, in fact for part of the Commonwealth loaf; and he replies, "Let us give them a lawsuit." The agreement is not all we could wish, but I maintain it is all we can get. I was of that opinion when the Bill was introduced in another place, but in view of the action of another place in carrying the measure by a majority of ten, I am more firmly of opinion than ever that the Bill should be passed. Suppose we carry an amendment, it will first have to be submitted to another place and then re-submitted to all the Parliaments of Australia, 12 Chambers that have previously dealt with the Bill. What is going to happen if an amendment is carried and is submitted to the other Parliaments? It must be submitted to them for their ratification.

Hon. J. R. Brown: It is a money Bill.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Is it a Bill that we can amend?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Of course we can amend it.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: We have the power to request amendments to money Bills, but I am not dealing with that point at present. Suppose we carried an amendment and the other Chamber assented to it, the only way in which it could be dealt with would be to submit it to the other Parliaments of Australia. Thus it would have to run the gauntlet of each Parliament, and each Parliament in turn would want to insert some clause favourable to itself.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Not if we amend only the Bill. We do not touch the agreement.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: What is the good of amending the Bill? The agreement is the essence of the Bill. If the measure has to be re-submitted on account of an amendment by this House, it will have to run the gauntlet of all the other Parliaments. Does anyone imagine that we would be able to get our amendment agreed to and secure unanimity?

Hon. A. Lovekin: Of course that is not so.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I take another point. Mr. Collier and the other State Premiers met in conference and after earnest negotiations—nobody doubts their bona fides—they arrived at an agreement. They really acted as plenipotentiaries from their different States or different Parliaments. They now come and report to us.

While Parliament has it in its power to reject or accept the Bill, I know of no precedent for Parliament amending a Bill so submitted.

Hon. A. Lovekin: This is not a money Bill within the Constitution.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I do not think it is; I think it is a constitutional measure. However, I have not raised the point that it is a money Bill. All I said was in reply to an interjection, that if it was a money Bill, we had the power to request amendments. Under those conditions I maintain that the real duty of the State Parliaments is to accept the Bill or throw it out, not to amend it. More so is that our position now, seeing that the Bill has been passed by a substantial majority in another place. During the course of Mr. Stewart's speech, I said, by way of interjection, that the Assembly had surrendered the outer forts of the defence and we who occupied the citadel must either capitulate or starve. I support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. E. H. Gray, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.58 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 3rd July, 1928.

Adjournment, special	Page 301
--------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-------------

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

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.32]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 10th inst.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 4.35 p.m.