

BILL—OPTOMETRISTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 15th October, 1947.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H.

S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) [7.35] in moving the second reading said: This is a short Bill, the purpose of which is to correct one or two anomalies in the matter of dates and to strike out a section which provides that all surplus funds must be paid to the Treasury. Why that provision ever got into the Act is hard to say. Section 16 of the Act provides that certain funds of the board, which consist of these prescribed by or under the Act and payable to the board, and grants by the Government or the State and all gifts and donations made by any persons to the board, all other moneys, and so on, shall be charged with the payment of various matters. Subsection (3) provides that at the end of the year all surplus funds shall be handed over to the Treasury, and it is desired to strike out that subsection.

The other amendments are for the purpose of correcting various anomalies. Section 25 provides that during January of each year there shall be published in the "Government Gazette" a copy of the register of optometrists corrected to the 31st December. That date should really be the 15th January, as otherwise it would be the previous year's list that would be published. That is the purpose of the other alterations. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H.

S. W. Parker—Metropolitan-Suburban) I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 21st October.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 7.40 p.m.

	Page.
Questions: Apple scab, as to occurrence in Manjimup areas	1259
X-ray examinations, as to plant and charges at Kalgoorlie	1260
Housing, as to allocation of War Service Homes	1260
J. J. Cracknell, indeterminate sentence, as to tabling papers	1261
Banking nationalisation, as to early adjournment of House	1261
Select Committee: Hampshire & Sons cattle and T.B. report presented	1261
Leave of absence	1261
Bills: Municipal Corporations Act Amendment (No. 2), 1R.	1261
Road Districts Act Amendment (No. 2), 1R.	1261
Companies Act Amendment, reports	1261
Western Australian Bush Nursing Trust Act Amendment, 3R.	1261
Water Boards Act Amendment, 3R.	1261
Town Planning and Development Act Amendment, 3R.	1261
Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 3), 3R., points of order	1262
Electoral Act Amendment, 2R.	1278
Stipendiary Magistrates Act Amendment, returned	1261
Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment, returned	1261
Public Service Act Amendment, returned	1261
Street Photographers, Com.	1263
Motions: Gold, as to treatment of refractory ores	1261
Gold, as to stimulating production from low-grade ore, passed	1261

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

QUESTIONS.

APPLE SCAB.

As to Occurrence in Manjimup Areas.

Mr. HOAR (on notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Is he aware that apple scab was discovered in the Manjimup fruit-growing areas recently?

(2) That the trees in question are alleged to have been imported from Tasmania last season, and that the powers under the Plant Diseases Act were not sufficiently used to ensure that the trees were free of disease?

(3) That the following resolution was carried by the Manjimup Fruit Growers' Association:—"That the appropriate authorities be approached to have a full inquiry made into the recently imported apple tree stocks being allowed to pass to growers whilst apparently affected by disease (apple scab)?"

(4) In view of the above resolution and request, will he cause such inquiry to be instituted without delay, and if not, why not?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The plants in question were imported from Tasmania. They were closely examined after arrival and showed no evidence of disease. They were fumigated before distribution to country districts. The Act was used sufficiently, short of total prohibition.

(3) Yes.

(4) A full inquiry has been made by specialist officers of the department into the origin of the disease-infected plants. Consideration is being given to methods to be adopted, other than total prohibition, which might allow the introduction of these plants and minimise the possibility of such an occurrence in the future.

X-RAY EXAMINATIONS.

As to Plant and Charges at Kalgoorlie.

Mr STYANTS (on notice) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Is the x-ray plant in use at the Government Hospital, Kalgoorlie, the same model as that operating at the Royal Perth Hospital?

(2) Is it capable of doing all x-rays required at the hospital?

(3) Are patients frequently sent from the hospital to the Commonwealth Laboratory for x-ray examination?

(4) If so, why?

(5) Are patients charged for these examinations?

(6) If so, will she endeavour to have the charges made for x-ray examinations of a patient in the hospital (that is considered necessary by a doctor to be taken at the Commonwealth Laboratory) brought under the free hospital accommodation scheme?

(7) Is there a qualified radiologist at the Kalgoorlie Government Hospital?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) Yes, with few exceptions.

(3) Yes.

(4) Answered by No. (2).

(5) Yes, if they are a doctor's paying patients; No, if they are not.

(6) This is believed to be part of the next stage in the Commonwealth Hospital Benefits Scheme.

(7) No. A doctor has been sought for some time by the Commonwealth but is not available yet. Temporary arrangements are being made for the use of the Commonwealth portable plant.

HOUSING.

As to Allocation of War Service Homes.

Mr. GRAHAM (on notice) asked the Premier:

(1) Are War Service homes still allocated in the order of lodgment of applications?

(2) If not, when was the system altered?

(3) What is the present basis of allocation?

(4) What is the date of the application of the last War Service home approved for erection under the system of permits granted according to the date of application?

(5) Are applications lodged at demobilisation centres at the time of discharge from the Forces accepted as proper applications?

The PREMIER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) A direction has recently been received from the Director of War Service Homes to allocate on a basis of hardship (coupled with date of lodgment), subject to outstanding commitments.

Applications are now being examined to ascertain outstanding commitments. Present permits are still issued on a priority of date of lodgment.

(4) In the case of—

(a) ordinary War Service Homes application (plans, etc., by Housing Commission), 14th December, 1945;

(b) special War Service Homes building programme (plans, etc., by private architects), 6th September, 1946.

(5) Interim applications lodged at demobilisation centres establish a date for priority purposes.

J. J. CRACKNELL, INDETERMINATE SENTENCE.

As to Tabling Papers.

Mr. GRAHAM (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

Will he table the papers relating to the imprisonment and subsequent indeterminate sentence of J. J. Cracknell?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

No, as the file contains matter of a confidential nature. It will, however, be made available to the hon. member should he care to peruse same.

BANKING, NATIONALISATION.

As to Early Adjournment of House.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN (without notice) asked the Premier: In view of the great importance of the Bill for the nationalisation of banking, which is to be introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament this evening by the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister, and as the Government in this State intends to hold a general election on similar lines to that taking place in Victoria if the results there are sufficiently encouraging, will he arrange for an early adjournment tonight to enable members to hear the Prime Minister's speech, or does he intend to imitate the behaviour of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament and do his utmost to prevent as many people as possible from hearing Mr. Chifley and learning the facts about the banking proposals?

The PREMIER replied: The member for North-East Fremantle handed me a copy of this question, without notice, just as I took my seat.

The Minister for Lands: It is like a comic opera.

The PREMIER: No, it is not the intention to adjourn Parliament any earlier than usual tonight.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: You will have to sit pretty late, then.

The PREMIER: I have no knowledge of any intention to hold a general election, whatever the result of the Victorian election may be. As to the behaviour of the Opposition, I can only say that we behave very well here, and we will not take the example of any other Parliament.

HAMPSHIRE & SONS CATTLE AND T.B. SELECT COMMITTEE.

Report Presented.

Mr. Hoar brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with a type-written copy of the evidence referred to in the report.

Ordered: That the report be received and printed and its consideration made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Rodoreda, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Hon. P. Collier (Boulder) on the ground of ill-health.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Municipal Corporations Act Amendment (No. 2).
- 2, Road Districts Act Amendment (No. 2).

Introduced by Mr. Graham.

BILL—COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Reports of Committee adopted.

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING

- 1, Western Australian Bush Nursing Trust Act Amendment.
- 2, Water Boards Act Amendment.
- 3, Town Planning and Development Act Amendment.

Transmitted to the Council.

MOTION—GOLD.

As to Treatment of Refractory Ores.

Debate resumed from the 1st October on the following motion by Mr. Kelly—

That in the opinion of this House because of the urgent need for increased gold production, the Government should give early and favourable consideration to the erection of refractory ore treatment plants in all districts where proven refractory ore bodies exist in sufficient quantities, and of sufficiently high grade, to warrant the erection of such plants.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. A. V. R. Abbott—North Perth) [4.42]: The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie seeks to obtain the opinion of this House on the question of early and favourable consideration being given to the treatment of refractory ores. As the hon. member will probably be aware, the Government has already given serious consideration to the matter and has been doing so for some little time. The establishment of a satisfactory plant, however, presents considerable technical and scientific difficulties because anyone who has a knowledge of refractory ores appreciates that the success of a treatment plant depends upon its ability to deal with a particular ore. There is an infinite variety in the contents of the various refractory ores that occur in the State.

Whereas a plant can be fairly easily established to obtain a certain percentage of extraction, to obtain successfully a much greater extraction presents great difficulty. At one time, as the hon. member pointed out when he moved his motion, the South Kalgurli Consolidated had a plant at which all ore of a refractory nature was treated but the process used was very expensive and in consequence the plant has been closed down. It is therefore necessary to ascertain, if possible, whether a satisfactory plant to treat a large variety of ores could be set up on an economical basis so as to secure a reasonable extraction. The departmental advisers have suggested that even an experimental pilot plant would have some hope of success only if there were available for treatment not less than 1,500 tons a month. The Minister for Mines has requested the Prospectors' Association to ascertain whether such quantities of ore would be available in the vicinity of Kalgoorlie in the event of such a plant being established.

Investigations in that regard have not yet, I understand, been completed. However, the Government intends, if ore is available in the quantities I have suggested, to set up an experimental pilot plant at Kalgoorlie. It is hoped, and thought, that with experience such a plant will be able to treat successfully a majority of the refractory ores available on a basis that will be reasonably economical. Should the pilot plant prove to be a success, it is the inten-

tion of the Government to establish other plants in districts where the requisite quantities of ore are proved to be available. It is hoped that the pilot plant will be erected within a reasonable time after an intimation has been received that a sufficient quantity of ore is available for treatment by it.

On motion by Mr. Nalder, debate adjourned.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT (No. 3).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 1st October.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. R. McDonald—West Perth) [4.47]: This Bill deals with a subject that has been before Parliament on many occasions, namely, the extension of the franchise of the Legislative Council. In this instance the measure provides that the franchise shall be extended to the husbands or wives of householders although such husbands or wives would not themselves be qualified at the present time as electors for the Council. It further proposes to bring in as qualified for the franchise, the occupiers of flats. The definition of "flat" is very wide and would cover the occupation of a room. Normally the accepted definition of a flat has been rigid and, in my opinion, rather too rigid because, by the interpretation placed upon it by the Electoral Department, it has been taken that a flat means something equivalent to a dwelling and having means of direct entrance from a street. There has, however, grown up in recent times a large number of flats, sometimes in very big buildings, that are dwellings in the fullest sense of the word but do not comply with the definition of "flat" as accepted by the Electoral Department.

There is room for consideration of the definition of "flat" to assist those who occupy what are sometimes large flats commanding high rents, to obtain an opportunity to vote for the Legislative Council. The matter was the subject of a Bill introduced into the Legislative Council last year by Sir Hal Colebatch, who sought to widen the franchise for flats and to give an extension of the franchise to wives and husbands of electors. He made provision in his Bill for certain other amendments to the Con-

stitution which he considered it would be desirable to be passed into law. Sir Hal Colebatch's Bill, as members will recollect, did not find acceptance. In the Premier's Policy Speech at the last elections he made specific reference to some items of Government policy which are the subject of this Bill. Among other things, he said—

We intend a review of the constitution of the Legislative Council, including the extension of the franchise to dwellers in self-contained flats.

He also said—

Under our policy, all wives of Legislative Council electors will be added to the number of those entitled to vote at elections for the Council.

Those two items of Government policy have, with variations or extensions, been incorporated in the Bill of the member for Northam which is now before the House; and, while the Government may feel it has been subtly flattered by the endorsement of the hon. member, at the same time it considers that these matters, being Government policy on which the Premier went to the country, should be matters for a Government Bill. It has been the intention of the Government to bring down a Bill to implement these matters of policy which were expressly stated in the Premier's Policy Speech. They are matters of policy which the Government regards as of importance and as being features of substance in the Government's policy on which it presented its case to the electors last March.

The Government feels, therefore, that it has a duty to the people to implement its own policy and I think few people will cavil at that point of view. I therefore propose to suggest to the House that the Bill of the member for Northam should be postponed until consideration of the Bill which the Government intends to bring down. That Bill will be introduced without delay; I think it will be presented for the consideration of the House not later than next week. In those circumstances, I do not think it necessary for me to spend any time in dealing with the aspects of the Bill now before the House. I propose moving to delete the word "now" in the motion before the House, and if that is accepted to add words to the motion as follows: "after consideration of a Bill to be introduced by the Government this session to extend the franchise for the Legislative Council to the

wife of an elector for the Council and to the occupier of a self-contained flat."

Those two items represent the points of policy which were specifically given to the people in the speech of the Premier at the elections last March. The motion will then be to this effect: "That the Bill be read a second time after consideration of the measure which the Government intends to bring down in implementation of the policy on which it went to the people." I accordingly move an amendment—

That the word "now" be struck out of the motion with a view to inserting the words "after consideration of the Bill to be introduced by the Government this session to extend the franchise for the Legislative Council to the wife of an elector for the Council and to the occupier of a self-contained flat."

Point of Order.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: I desire to ask for your ruling, Sir, whether the Attorney General is in order. His amendment will practically mean that there will be two Bills dealing with the same subject before the House.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Another point I would like to raise is whether the amendment is quite in order in view of the subsequent amendment which the Attorney General foreshadows. I think it would probably be quite out of order, because it would be related to something which does not exist and which might or might not exist in future. Therefore, I think, Sir, that while you are considering the point raised by the member for Fremantle, you might at the same time consider the amendment which the Attorney General has foreshadowed and which he proposes to move if the amendment now before the House is carried.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Fremantle intimate that the present Bill would be similar to the new Bill?

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: As far as I could understand the Attorney General, the two Bills will be similar. I could not quite catch what the Attorney General said.

The Attorney General: There is nothing to prevent two Bills which deal more or less with the same subject-matter being introduced in the same session, as far as I understand Parliamentary practice. If the House has dealt with the first Bill, then of course that would be the end of the subject-matter dealt with by it. If the House defeats a Bill on a certain point, then it is not

possible to bring in Bill after Bill dealing with the same matter during the same session.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: What is the amendment? I could not catch it.

The Attorney General: The amendment was to extend the franchise for the Legislative Council to the wife of an elector for the Council and to the occupier of a self-contained flat. Whether or not the two Bills may deal with the same subject-matter more or less, there is, I think, in Parliamentary practice no bar whatever to a second Bill, provided the House has not dealt with the first Bill. Without going into arguments on this point, I think there are very good reasons for that; otherwise some member might be bringing in a Bill to prevent the same subject from being dealt with at all and thus deprive all the other members of an opportunity to put forward a Bill which they might wish to introduce dealing with the particular subject-matter.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I do not want to overload you with queries, Sir, but I wish to put another question to you. The Attorney General said that it would be out of order to bring in a similar Bill if a Bill of the same nature were defeated. Let us assume that the amendment of the Attorney General is carried and the Government brings down its Bill, which is passed in this House and transmitted to the Legislative Council and defeated there on these two particular points, that is, extending the franchise to the wife of an elector and to the occupier of a self-contained flat. Those two points are dealt with in the Bill now before the House. Suppose that happens—similar measures have been defeated and history may repeat itself on this occasion—would the member for Northam then be entitled to bring in his Bill in view of the fact that a Bill containing those two provisions had already been defeated? That may happen even here. But assuming that those proposals were defeated in the Legislative Council, I am inclined to think, on the arguments of the Attorney General himself, that the backbone of the member for Northam's Bill would already be gone for this session, too.

Mr. Speaker: I consider the first amendment is in order. I give my ruling to that effect, and will put the amendment.

Debate Resumed.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam—on amendment) [5.2]: I certainly oppose this amendment by the Attorney General. It seems to me that the Attorney General and the Government are adopting a strange attitude towards this Bill which was introduced two weeks ago. Every member has had ample opportunity to study the measure and come to a conclusion about it. The suggestion of the Attorney General that the Government itself will be introducing a similar Bill in the reasonably near future is not in my opinion sufficient justification to delay consideration of the measure which is before the House. The Government has had plenty of time during the portion of the session that has elapsed to bring down a Bill of this kind. It has found time to introduce many other measures not nearly of the same importance as this one. This Bill goes some distance further than the one referred to by the Attorney General which the Government itself proposes to introduce, and on that account is better than the one the Government has on the stocks. In any event, where is the necessity or the justification for postponing consideration of this Bill simply because the Government intends to introduce one which includes practically everything contained in my measure? Everything that is in the Government's Bill is in this Bill, can be discussed on the second reading of this Bill, and can be debated and decided in Committee in connection with this Bill.

It is all very well to say, as the Attorney General did, that the introduction of this Bill by me subtly flatters the Government in connection with the election policy it put forward a few months ago on the question of liberalising the franchise for the Legislative Council. If the suggestion of the Attorney General is that this side of the House has followed the Government's lead, then obviously the Attorney General is very wide of the mark in making such a suggestion. The Party represented by members on this side of the House has always advocated and fought for a liberalisation of the franchise for the Legislative Council; whereas the Party represented by the Attorney General has never, at any stage in its history until perhaps the last election campaign, done anything at all in that direction. So if there is any subtle flattery in existence in connection with this matter I think it was contained in the Pre-

mier's Policy Speech and was a subtle flattery of the ideas and policy of the Labour Party in this State over the years in connection with the franchise for the Legislative Council.

There is no reason at all, either on the ground of commonsense or of general procedure why consideration of this Bill should be postponed until the Government is in a position to introduce a Bill that will be almost exactly the same as this one or at any rate very similar to it. Therefore I oppose the amendment of the Attorney General and trust that the majority of the members will vote in such a way as to enable the Bill to be considered forthwith.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: In reply, I do not think I need add—

MR. SPEAKER: I think there is no need for the Attorney General to speak at this stage.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle—on amendment) [5.7]: I do not know why the Attorney General wants to strike out the word "now." The Bill contains what the Attorney General proposes to introduce in a subsequent measure. Instead of striking out the word "now," why not allow this Bill to go through and amend it in Committee? Is it that the Attorney General wants to say that the member for Northam is not going to be allowed to do what he has been trying to do for many years but that he himself is going to have the credit for doing it? If the Attorney General wanted to take the credit he has had plenty of time to bring down a Bill and there was no need to leave the introduction of such a measure until as late in the session as this. If the Government had been as sincere as he tried to make out, it would have introduced the Bill so that the franchise would have been liberalised for the next Legislative Council election. It seems to me that the Attorney General is trying to push the member for Northam out of the road and is saying, "You are not going to do this, but we will take the credit and will give you part of the Bill you have brought down." I think the word "now" should remain and if the Attorney General wants to do what he says he does, he can do it in Committee.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth—on amendment) [5.9]: I will be disappointed if the House agrees to the amendment. It will be a matter of regret to me if we establish in this House a principle whereby a Government, irrespective of its political complexion, can consider Bills that have been introduced from the other side of the House and, in a fit of impetuosity or for some other reason, decides that it wants the credit for introducing such measures, and by force of numbers achieves its object. To follow a procedure which it is proposed to initiate this afternoon would be distinctly wrong. If there is any virtue in a Bill to achieve certain things, it matters not from which side of the House or from which hon. member that Bill emanated. Every measure should be discussed on its merits. I realise that the whole programme of the Government cannot be effected or submitted to the House in the first few weeks of a session or even in the first session of a new Parliament. But this is a Bill which deals with a matter of some urgency.

A general election for the Legislative Council is to be held next year and it is only a matter of months before the rolls will close. If what is sought by the hon. member is agreed to—though my knowledge of the Legislative Council will not allow me to believe that anything worthwhile will be achieved—if we can let our imaginations run riot for a moment and believe that the other place will become democratic for one brief period, even then time will be required for both Houses to consider a measure of this kind fully; and not only that, but certain machinery steps will have to be taken by the Electoral Department and will have to be given effect to from one end of Western Australia to the other. People in remote places will have to become aware that they are entitled to be enrolled and will have to go through the procedure of enrolling and so on.

I appreciate that the Attorney General has stated it is his intention shortly to introduce a Bill to give effect to a part of what the member for Northam seeks to achieve. I might be pardoned for supposing that that particular measure has gained early consideration from the Government because of the fact that the member for Northam has introduced a Bill to broaden the franchise for the Legislative Council. But I repeat what I stated at the outset: That if Parliament is in accord with certain proposals, it

does not matter whether the member responsible for those proposals sits on one side of the House or the other. If we concede the point raised by the Attorney General it means that we are faced with the prospect that every single matter mentioned by either of the leaders of the Government Parties in their Policy Speeches will not be able to be covered wholly or in part in legislation introduced by members on this side of the House. If that is to be the procedure it means that the Leader of a Party which is ultimately successful at the polls need only touch indirectly upon not 101 different questions, as is the case at the present moment, but on any and every conceivable question; then, working from the same premises that the Attorney General argues, and by using the weight of numbers which the Government Party would possess, the Government could on every occasion have the word "now" deleted with the object of preventing members of the Opposition from proceeding with Bills. That is a most undesirable practice which should not be countenanced by the House.

I hope that irrespective of the merits of the Bill introduced by the member for Northam—for they can be discussed in due course—members of this House will have some regard for the dangerous principle that would be introduced in such circumstances as I have mentioned and that they will have some regard for the rights of private members—and there are very many private members on the other side of the House—and that over and above that it will be realised that in the course of time, and I do not presume to hazard a guess as to how short or long the period will be, those on the Government side of the House at present will be occupying seats over here. In those circumstances they may be exceedingly jealous of their rights as private individuals. Accordingly I trust that the rights of members will not be circumscribed as proposed by the Attorney General but that this matter will be regarded impartially so that a proper decision is made and no dangerous precedent established.

HON. F. J. S. WISE (Gascoyne—on amendment) [5.15]: I hope that the good sense of the Attorney General will prevail. I would be regretful if he were to press this motion before the House. It is not

only an attack on legislation introduced from this side of the House, but a method quite new in this Chamber, although covered under the Standing Orders and quit within the Minister's rights. It is an innovation which does not do the Government credit. Every private member, whether on this side of the House or the other, has the right to introduce legislation which, in his view, contains subject-matter valid to be considered by this Parliament, subjects many of which may be dealt with from time to time by the Government itself. The fact that this matter was mentioned in a Policy Speech is no argument at all and I would suggest that if we study the notice paper and consider the stage of the session in which we are, and the innocuous kind of legislation that has been brought down there is little promise of the important legislation suggested at election time being introduced during this session. I could name many such matters.

I think the Premier should be tardy about introducing this method. The Bill, if it is to be dissected in this way and shelved in this manner, may be incorporated, later in the session, in a Bill to be introduced by the Attorney General, and if the whole of that Bill, when under consideration in the Legislative Council fails to pass, these two matters will not have been considered—or that would be approximately the position. We can imagine that the whole Bill might be thrown out, because it is possible to visualise the circumstance of the Government introducing into its Bill some clause that would not be passed by the Legislative Council. I therefore hope that the Attorney General will consider the rights of all private members when thinking of the danger—as I have expressed it—of introducing these two matters, that are the principles in the Bill separately, and embodying them in another Bill which may finally be rejected. I think that this Bill, being properly before the House, should be permitted to go into Committee.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands—on amendment) [5.20]: This procedure has been referred to by the Leader of the Opposition as being unique. It is unique, in this respect, that this is the first time in my experience that an Opposition member has attempted to bring down a measure which

was clearly indicated as being a Government measure, and which the Government, as soon as the time is opportune, will itself bring down. Who ever heard of a measure forecast by the Premier being brought down by the Opposition? It would be intolerable and would be resented by the present Leader of the Opposition, if he were in power. He forecast to the electors a certain programme and asked the electors to return his Government on that programme. Had he been returned he would not have been agreeable to having little bits of his programme stolen by members on the Opposition side of the House. The Leader of the Opposition knows that he would not tolerate it for one moment if he were sitting on this side of the House. I ask him to take a commonsense view of the matter and leave in the hands of the Government the matters which it has promised to bring down, not at an indefinite date, but next week.

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

Ayes	23
Noes	19
	—
Majority for	4
	—

AYES.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Bovell	Mr. Nimmo
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Doney	Mr. Read
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Seward
Mr. Hall	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Leslie	Mr. Watts
Mr. Mann	Mr. Wild
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Yates
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Brand
Mr. Murray	

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fox	Mr. Panton
Mr. Graham	Mr. Reynolds
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Styants
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Leehy	Mr. Triat
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wise
Mr. May	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Needham	

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Hill	Mr. Collier

Amendment thus passed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. R. McDonald—West Perth) [5.23]: I move—

That the words proposed to be inserted be inserted.

Point of Order.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: When we were questioning the first amendment moved by the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, I asked you to give consideration to the question whether the amendment that he then foreshadowed would be in order.

Mr. Speaker: I can give that ruling now. I have looked through the Standing Orders on that point and members will see, if they read the Standing Orders relating to second reading procedure, that motions of this kind, as long as they are relevant to the Bill, are quite in order. I therefore rule that the particular wording referred to is in order. The fact that another Bill might be introduced, and might be ruled out of order if introduced, would not prevent this amendment being permissible, as I read the Standing Orders.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Would you advise me, Mr. Speaker, as to what would be the position in the event of the Government for some reason failing to introduce the Bill referred to in the motion?

Mr. Speaker: In that case there would be no Bill left to deal with.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I think the Government is adopting an attitude in this matter that does it no credit at all, an attitude of which it ought to be thoroughly ashamed.

Debate Resumed.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam—on amendment) [5.26]: I suggest that all the words moved by the Attorney General be struck out and the words "the next day of sitting" inserted in lieu. That will mean, if my suggestion is followed, that the Bill now before the House is capable of being considered at the next day of sitting. That is the best course open to me in an endeavour to preserve the rights of private members to introduce Bills into this House. If we are to allow a situation to develop where the Bill of any private member can be side-tracked by the simple process of having moved and carried a motion to delay consideration of such a Bill until some future date, private members will be placed in a position most unfair to them and one which many private members who may be supporting this move today will regret in future years. If it is of any satisfaction to the Premier or any member of his Government, I say to him that I did not read in his policy

speech any reference to this matter nor had I in mind the slightest idea of anything the Premier may have said in his Policy Speech regarding the franchise for the Legislative Council.

The ground which caused me to have prepared the Bill now before the House was the fact that Sir Hal Colebatch last year brought down in the Legislative Council a Bill similar to that now before this House. His Bill received a fair measure of support, considering that it was introduced into the Legislative Council. The fact that it did receive that measure of support led me to believe that the Council was gradually softening its attitude towards the liberalisation of the franchise for the Legislative Council. It therefore seemed to me that this would be an opportune time for a Bill to be introduced into the Legislative Assembly including most of the proposals that were contained in Sir Hal Colebatch's Bill of last year.

It is all very well for the member for Nedlands to allow himself to become excited over the fact that a private member has introduced into this House a Bill about which the present Government said something during the course of the last election campaign, but I assure him—I think he will accept my assurance—that I had no idea in mind regarding any undertaking given by the Premier in connection with this matter during the election campaign. Had that been so I would most certainly have put it forward during my second reading speech as an argument in favour of the Bill, as it would have been very helpful to the case that I presented to the House to be able to say that the Premier had committed himself, every member of his Government, and every member supporting the Government, to favour the principles—or two of the main principles—contained in the Bill. Therefore there was no thought in my mind and certainly no attempt on my part to forestall the Government in this matter. I believe that members of the Government, if not the member for Nedlands, know me well enough to accept my assurance on that point.

There are only three principles of any consequence in the Bill. The first is to give the wife or husband of an elector already enrolled for the Council the right to become similarly enrolled; the second is to give to

an occupier of a flat the right to vote at Council elections, and the third is the abolition of plural voting.

The Minister for Education: And compulsory enrolment.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: There is nothing in this Bill about compulsory enrolment.

The Minister for Education: That is in the complementary Bill.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The provision dealing with compulsory enrolment and voting is in the Electoral Act Amendment Bill, and finds no place in this Bill.

The Minister for Education: That is so.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: There are only those three points in the Bill, and I could believe that all members of the Government and all their followers could support the third point that aims at the abolition of plural voting for the Council. I should be very disappointed to find that they were still prepared to stand for the principle of giving more than one vote to any person at a Council election, even though the second and third and additional votes might be recorded in separate provinces.

The Government would be doing the right thing if it agreed to the amendment I have suggested to the Attorney General's amendment. I am extremely sorry and disappointed that the first amendment moved by the Attorney General was accepted by the House. That was most unfair and, in my opinion, most unfortunate. I am sure that had the Government been in a position to give careful consideration to the situation that has developed and to all its implications, it would not have forced this position upon the House. Why should the Government take action against a Bill introduced by a private member for the purpose of preventing that Bill from receiving consideration at a time when it is morally entitled to be considered? Why should the Government say that this Bill, although it has been introduced in accordance with constitutional practice and the usages of the House, and although it is now due to receive further consideration, is to be sidetracked, and perhaps permanently sidetracked, so that the Government might, at its convenience, introduce a Bill of its own containing some of the same principles?

What sort of procedure is that? What sort of treatment is that for the Government and its supporters to hand out to pri-

vate members on this side of the House? It is a pretty solid taste of Hitlerism, as we must admit if we analyse the position closely. It is taking away completely from a private member a right which is undoubtedly his and which he should be not only allowed but also encouraged by the Government to exercise. Every member of Parliament should have this right. No Minister should have any greater right than has a private member in regard to the introduction of legislation and to its subsequent consideration, except that the Government business should receive precedence on certain days and, towards the end of the session, complete precedence unless the Government, in its generosity or mercy, should make some time available to enable uncompleted private members' business then to be completed.

It would be most unjust and immoral for the Government to prevent the further consideration of this Bill in the very near future. What is the objection to members being given an opportunity to consider the Bill further? What is wrong with allowing members the ordinary liberty to conclude the second reading debate and then discuss the Bill in Committee? This Bill contains everything that the Government proposes to include in its measure. Where is the merit or justification for saying that although this Bill contains certain principles which the Government believes in and which the Government itself will introduce in a Bill next week, or at some other time, further consideration of this measure must be held up until such time as it suits the Government to introduce its Bill?

If this measure did not contain the principles that will be included in the Government's own Bill, there might be some argument, although not a very strong one, for the point of view put forward by the Attorney General and for the attitude adopted by him. If the Attorney General could say to the House that the views of the Government are so and so, and that it proposed to include those views in a Bill, and that many of those views would conflict with what is in my Bill, and that consequently it would be unwise to consider and reach a decision on this Bill until the other measure is before the House—

The Attorney General: As we do.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —there would be some argument, although not a strong one, for the attitude adopted by the Attorney General. I sincerely hope that members on this side of the House, and at least some on the Government side, will realise that a great principle is at stake and I trust that, if the amendment I propose on the Attorney General's amendment is carried, the Government will do the right thing and restore this Bill to a position that will enable it to receive tomorrow a measure of discussion equal to that which it would have received today had the Attorney General not taken the unfortunate and unfair attitude he has. I move—

That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after the word "after" with a view to including words that will enable this Bill to be considered at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: As at first indicated, the actual wording of the amendment would have been a direct negative but, by leaving in the word "after," as is now proposed, further words may follow.

HON. A. H. PANTON (Leederville—on amendment on amendment) [5.40]: I appeal to the Attorney General to accept the amendment on his amendment.

The Attorney General: I shall appeal to you to agree to it.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: If the Attorney General waits to hear my appeal, he might reconsider that statement. During my 20 years in this Parliament, both sides have worked together fairly harmoniously. The leaders on both sides for years have consulted on many matters—

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: And trusted each other.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: That is so. The Attorney General's proposal is an innovation that I am very sorry to see introduced. Surely he must appreciate the fact that he has a majority behind him. He has just proved, with his brutal majority, what can be done, so why not use that majority in accordance with the custom of the House? With his majority, he could at any time have the debate adjourned or, if the Bill were in the Committee stage, have progress reported, and thus defer finality from one week to another. Had he adopted that attitude at the outset, he could, with

his majority, have kept the Bill on the notice paper for three or four weeks. To act in that way would have been in accordance with the custom of the House, and no-one would have had any kick coming to him. We might have complained, but such procedure would have been in accordance with the practice of the House, and while that is observed fairly, no-one has much to complain about. The Attorney General is aware that that is what he could have done. Meanwhile, he could have introduced his Bill.

You, Mr. Speaker, have ruled that his Bill will be in order. I do not intend to dispute that ruling now. Had the Attorney General adopted that course, he would have been acting in accordance with the accepted method of carrying on the business of the House. The method he has adopted, however, is not the right one, and I remind the Premier and his supporters that there is such a thing as a swing in politics, as they discovered on the 15th March last, and there may be another brutal majority on the Government side consisting of members now sitting on the left of the Speaker. The Attorney General is introducing a practice that will probably have repercussions on members sitting on the Government side today, and I for one should be very sorry to see that happen.

Over the years, the standard set by the Hon. P. Collier and Sir James Mitchell is a high one that could well be followed by any leader on either side of the House. Tonight that standard has been badly broken down and the only way I can regard it is as a piece of clever trickery bolstered up by a brutal majority. The Attorney General could be generous in this matter and accept the amendment of the member for Northam, have the Bill restored to the notice paper tomorrow and carry on in accordance with our usual practice. Then, during the next three or four weeks, while this Bill was being debated, he could introduce his own measure. If that were done the usual procedure of the House would be observed, and I think members would feel more satisfied than they do now.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. R. McDonald—West Perth—on amendment on amendment) [5.45]: I accept the assurance of the member for Northam that he was not aware of what was in the Premier's Policy Speech. On the other hand, we on the Government side were very much aware

of it and very much aware that it conferred upon us certain obligations to the people. I appreciate the remarks of the member for Leederville. I am the last person to desire any system to be established that will defeat the rights of private members. I will go further and say that in doing this I felt I was doing the candid and fair thing. Instead of manoeuvring with my brutal majority, adopting delaying tactics and putting the matter off from day to day, and seeing that this item appeared at the bottom of the list, which happened on an occasion in connection with a constitutional Bill brought down by the then member for East Perth and which never saw the light of day—

Hon. A. H. Panton: We have often had to put up with that sort of thing.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:—instead of doing that, what I desired to do was to tell the House quite candidly and fairly that we had in intention a Bill which to some extent would cover the field in question and was directly an implementation of a pledge given to the people.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That might have been brought about by a simple adjournment of the debate.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I did not want to defeat a Bill which in a partial respect has some merit in it.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: If the debate had been adjourned the Bill would have gone automatically to the bottom of the list.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I might have used my brutal majority to defeat the Bill but I did not want to do that. What I said was: "Let the Government introduce its Bill and adjourn the other Bill until the Government measure comes forward and this House has that other Bill before it." Reference has been made to principle. I also have a principle and an important one. I could conceive the position of any Government, whether the present one or one led by the Leader of the Opposition, becoming difficult if it was contemplating bringing down legislation and other Bills came forward from any part of the House dealing with pledges and undertakings that had been given by the Government to the people. The people elected the Government on the understanding that it would bring down certain legislation in accordance with the promises that had been made.

Mr. Hoar: Private members may have given pledges, and this is private members' night.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The main thing, as one hon. member said, is the object of the Bill. If the Government has put certain matter into its policy speech it has to bring down the legislation covering that matter. A private member might say the main thing was the reform that was involved. If the Government is going to bring about that reform there would be no need for him to endeavour to do so, especially if the Government has promised the people that it will do this and has been elected on that basis. If the matter was one not covered by Government policy and the Government had no immediate intention of bringing down a Bill, the legislation might well have been introduced by other means. I remind the House that I sat on the opposite side of the Chamber for 14 years. Were I sitting there now I would take the same view that I have just enunciated. If I were about to introduce a Bill, sitting opposite, and the Government said, "This is Government policy and we are just about to bring down the Bill ourselves; will you defer yours?", I would have said, "Certainly, that is what you are elected for."

Hon. A. H. Panton: Did you say that to the member for Northam when he brought down his Bill?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I would have said that the reform was what I was interested in. I would have said to the Government "If you were elected to bring down a Bill on that subject and tell me categorically that you are about to do so, it is your duty and right to bring down that Bill."

Hon. A. H. Panton: Why did you not tell the member for Northam when he first introduced the Bill?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: We might have discussed the matter before. If there has been any discourtesy, then I must take the full blame for it. I did not think the matter would involve a discussion of this kind. I thought if I informed the House that we were about to bring down a Bill on a matter of Government policy that would have been understood by the member for Northam and other members opposite. I agree that this is a matter of

principle, but I think the principle which I have mentioned, from the point of view of the Government's duty to the people who elected it, is quite as important as any other factor. I venture to say that were I in Opposition I would unhesitatingly have recognised that in a matter of policy on which the Government went to the country and if it were about to introduce a Bill dealing with that policy, and the Government said it was about to bring down that measure, I would at once have acknowledged its right to do so.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I do not think the member for Northam would have taken the action he did if you had told him all this before.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If that is so, the blame rests on me. If I have been remiss at all, then I am to blame. The question of principle has been raised. I desire to make it clear that I, too, refer to the matter as one of principle.

MR. SHEARN (Maylands—on amendment on amendment) [5.52]: I do not know whether my hearing is bad but I do experience difficulty in hearing some Ministers. I rose not to discuss the subject-matter before the Chair but the equally important matter of when the Attorney General proposes to bring down the Bill to which he has referred. I was struck by the observations of the member for East Perth. I agree with him that if this Bill is to have any relationship to next year's elections for the Legislative Council, it is obvious it should be brought down without delay. I am therefore interested to know whether the Attorney General has the Bill prepared, and if so, when it will be introduced. That is something we should know.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. A. F. Watts—Katanning—on amendment on amendment) [5.54]: The position is, I am assured by the Attorney General and so assure the House, that the measure in question will be introduced tomorrow and the second reading moved within the next seven days. I was hopeful that an amendment might have been arrived at on this motion other than that of the member for Northam to make provision accordingly, namely to place the period of seven days in the amendment so that the House might

have an assurance of that nature on the records, quite apart from anything I might say. The situation is that the hon. member has moved to strike out all the words in the Attorney General's amendment after the first word. In consequence it is difficult now to do other than to oppose the amendment moved by the member for Northam with the idea if possible, as a result of the vote, having the words that are in the Attorney General's amendment left therein so that further down in the amendment words can be inserted to ensure that this House shall have the Bill which the Attorney General will introduce, say, within a period of seven days. If it is possible to arrive at a compromise on these lines without submitting the present amendment to the vote I shall be quite pleased. I am sure, too, that my colleague, the Attorney General, will be in exactly the same position, for that is what he desires.

Unfortunately in the present state of affairs I am obliged to vote against the amendment on the amendment moved by the member for Northam because, so far as I can see, if it is carried that places the Bill of the member for Northam still in priority to the measure to be introduced by the Government. In consequence, as I see it, it will nullify the resolution already carried by this House in a division a little while ago. This would mean, in effect, that although we said we had postponed the Bill until the Government Bill came down, we would not, in fact, have postponed it except until tomorrow, and that would not give the Attorney General the opportunity to bring his Bill down. In the circumstances he could only give notice of it tomorrow. I am extremely hopeful that some amendment can be arrived at that will compromise these two schools of thought. I have either to defeat the amendment on the amendment, which is a course open to me, or alternatively the hon. member could withdraw his amendment and let us arrive at some other that will compromise these two schools of thought in a satisfactory manner.

When I said that the present amendment, if carried, would nullify the vote of this House a short time ago I think I am borne out by the fact that you, Mr. Speaker, observed that had it not been that the word "after" had been left in the amendment it would have been a complete negative or as near as possible to being a complete nega-

tive. It would only result in a 24-hour postponement which would not be practicable from the point of view of the Attorney General. Having heard all the debate and realising the contending views I still hope that we might arrive at a compromise that will not nullify the vote of this House and yet will enable an assurance to be given, one that was sought by the member for Maylands, that within seven days the other Bill will be introduced, or, alternatively, the one now before it will go on without delay.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle—on amendment on amendment) [5.58]: I do not know what value can be attached to the promise that has been given that the Government will introduce a Bill tomorrow. What I ask myself is, would the Government have brought down such a Bill if the member for Northam had not introduced his measure? Would it have come down this session or next session or would it ever have come down? Because of the measure brought down by the member for Northam the Government has awakened. It would have been very much better if the Attorney General had introduced the Bill he referred to a few weeks ago instead of bringing down measures dealing with tortfeasors, Crown suits and other matters of that description that were making a holiday for lawyers. Such an action on his part would have been very much better for the country. How long is it since the Government has claimed to have a monopoly on the liberalisation of the franchise for the Upper House? The party to which I belong has been trying to bring that about in season and out of season for many years, but we were not able to get anywhere.

Because a reference was made to this matter in the Policy Speech of the present Government it still cannot claim to have a monopoly on this question. If any party is entitled to a monopoly we on this side of the House, who have been trying to bring about a reform for many years, have the prior claim. The member for Nedlands knows that if such a step as this had been taken on the Goldfields those concerned would have been called "jumpers," and they would have been kicked to death for jumping another man's claim. That is precisely what has happened in this case. When members on this side of the Chamber were trying to get through legislation dealing with another

place the members opposite merely sat smugly in their seats and said, "Thank God for another place; let them kick it out." The promise that has been made on the Government's side is not of any great value. If it had been made a few weeks ago and put into effect it would have been of much better value.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth—on amendment on amendment) [6.0]: I do not like the amendment on the amendment moved by the member for Northam any more than I imagine he likes it, because it still establishes the principle of a private member having to stand down on account of something the Government seeks to do. But in the circumstances I feel compelled to support the member for Northam. It has been stated by the Attorney General that the Premier in his Policy Speech announced that certain reforms in the Legislative Council franchise were to be brought about. As the member for Nelson interjected, many of us have mandates from our individual electorates. We have a right to submit matters of this kind in accordance with the pledges we gave to our electors.

I am unable to say, from memory, whether I observed the particular point in the Premier's speech, but I venture to say that it was not featured by either of the Government parties or their supporters. At the same time, I do emphasise that every member of the present Opposition who contested the election made an issue of this matter. Therefore, by that particular fact alone, we have a greater right to submit this matter to Parliament than has the Government. If the Premier did make a statement to the effect that the Government would take certain steps with regard to the Legislative Council franchise, he is the leader of one Party only, and I am unaware as to whether the Minister for Education, who led another Party, and his 10 or 12 supporters, were bound by the Premier's statement or gave any undertaking that they would take the steps outlined by the Attorney General as being the intention of the Government.

The Minister for Education: I can assure you that the question of women's votes was in my Policy Speech, and I made a specialty of it, too.

MR. GRAHAM: That is certainly news to me. The Premier's statement, however, merely commits the 12 or 13 members in this Chamber who support him. But the whole

public of Western Australia knows that every member of the Labour Party not only believes in the extension of the franchise of the Legislative Council, but is pledged to support it until such time as adult franchise operates. Yet, the Government continues to insist that the member for Northam should not have submitted a Bill in accordance with the platform and pledges of his Party, and in conformity with something that the Labour Party has sought to give effect to for many years. Indeed we have had to fight the Government Parties who, on occasions, have rested secure in this Chamber in the knowledge that their supporters in another place would certainly defeat the measure which they now claim they have a prior right to introduce. They are also seeking to defeat the rights of private members to proceed with legislation that they, the private members, have initiated.

As was truly stated earlier, when the Government first obtained knowledge that the member for Northam was introducing a Bill and knew its provisions and what it sought to achieve, the Attorney General could have immediately taken steps to acquaint the House that it was the Government's intention to bring down legislation which, in part, would seek to achieve what is set out in the Bill. Apparently this is an inspiration on the part of the Government that has come at this stage, and not a week ago, for the purpose of the Government's endeavouring to secure some kudos, and so that it can say to the electors of Western Australia that it is not, as we have so frequently charged, guilty of being opposed to some measure of reform in the Legislative Council. I throw back to the Attorney General what he mentioned—because I stated it first this afternoon, although there is no particular merit in that—that the important thing is what is embodied in a Bill and not who introduced it.

There is a Bill already before the House seeking to do certain things, and if the Government is in agreement with it, in part, that is all that is needed. Surely, there is no valid reason why the member for Northam on this occasion, or any other member on some future occasion, should have to give way to a Minister because he seeks to bring down a Bill for a similar purpose. I notice in this evening's Press that the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament is criticising the Government, and making all sorts of demonstrations and accusing the

Labour Government of endeavouring to do extravagant and perilous things. We who occupy the Opposition benches in this Parliament are certainly entitled to protest as vehemently as we can against this decision of the Government. We already have an indication that it will be supported by all of its "Yes-men," and in that expression I include the two so-called independents.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: Independents, nothing!

Mr. GRAHAM: This step by the Government is a direct threat to the rights of private members and, as everyone knows, private members have not many rights in Parliament. They suffer under all sorts of handicaps. There are certain types of Bills that they are not allowed to introduce; their business can only be discussed on certain days; the rights they do enjoy can be limited and circumscribed by the Government when it thinks fit. This amendment does not mean that the Bill will be considered tomorrow, because this is a private member's Bill and therefore will not come before us again, although it will be on the notice paper, until this day week.

Mr. Rodoreda: It might not do so even then.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so. I must confess to not having paid the closest attention to the Premier when he gave notice that he would move that henceforth certain Standing Orders would be suspended.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That was for the Supply Bill only.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not follow very closely what was said, but I thought certain Standing Orders were to be suspended so that certain processes could be completed in the one day. I am emphatic in my protest, and I will continue, for as long as there are amendments or any other opportunities, to criticise, and to prevail upon the Government not to circumscribe the rights of members or to interfere with their deliberations. This is a Bill properly before Parliament. We have a right, therefore, to proceed to give consideration to it. We, as private members, should not be compelled to stand down to enable the Government to introduce a Bill which, by and large, is for the same purpose as one introduced by us. I still express the hope that the independent members, so-called, will exert their influence in this House for the purpose of defending the rights of the

individual members. After all, if one who calls himself an independent member is not prepared to do that, then it is time that this dishonest facade was removed and those members stood revealed in the position they actually occupy.

It is idle in these circumstances to make use of labels and endeavour to get people to believe certain things as a consequence. On the other side of the House there are private members and today they are admittedly supporting the Government, but in due course they will be private members occupying the Opposition benches. They will then, perhaps, pay some heed to what is being said to them this afternoon. If they persist in their negative attitude—and I say this in no threatening way at all—they can expect scant sympathy from the Labour Party when it again becomes the Government and they, in their turn become the private members. They should seek to preserve a few of the rights at present enjoyed by private members.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	24

Majority against 4

AYES.

Mr. Coverley	Mr. Needham
Mr. Fox	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Graham	Mr. Panton
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Reynolds
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sierman
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Styants
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Triat
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wise
Mr. May	Mr. Rodoreda

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Murray
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Bovell	Mr. Nimmo
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Doney	Mr. Read
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Seward
Mr. Hall	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Leslie	Mr. Watts
Mr. Mann	Mr. Wild
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Yates
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Brand

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Cornell
Mr. Collier	Mr. Hill

Amendment on amendment thus negatived.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle—on amendment) [7.30]: The Minister should not be allowed to get away with just a portion of the Bill, if he is anxious to have it. He should have the whole of it or nothing, and not pick out little bits here and there. I move—

That the amendment be amended by adding the following words:—"no elector possessing qualifications entitling him to be registered as an elector in more than one province shall be registered as an elector in more than one province, but such elector shall by notice in writing to the Chief Electoral Officer make choice of the province in which he desires to be registered as an elector and having made such choice and becoming so registered for a particular province no further choice shall be permitted or such registration be changed to another province unless such elector shall cease to possess the qualifications entitling him to be registered as an elector in the province for which such registration has been effected."

If the Minister will accept that amendment, it will mean that we will get some of the things we want in addition to that which he desires. I am not prepared to allow the Minister simply to pick out what he wants here and there. There is no justification for people in this State to have 10 votes at an election. I cannot guarantee that it applies now, but we do know that there have been people who could exercise a vote in every province, and quite a number who could exercise the franchise in a number of provinces. The Minister should accept the lot or none at all. I hope the House will agree to what I suggest. I do not know that the Minister's Party will agree to it. They call themselves Liberals but they are not always liberal in their attitude towards the electors or the workers in particular.

The Chief Secretary: Like Mr. Chifley.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I think the other half of the Government Party, which calls itself the Democratic and Country League, is sure to support my amendment. The members of that league describe themselves as democratic and surely they will see the wisdom of cutting out those people who are able to exercise a vote in every province in Western Australia.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. McDonald—West Perth—on amendment) [7.33]: I think the hon. member's amendment is irrelevant to the issue involved. The question raised is the right of the hon. member concerned to pro-

ceed with the Bill and, on the other side, the right of the Government to proceed to implement the terms of the policy on which it was elected. This proposition introduces something which is not within the scope of the Government's policy as announced at the general election. It will carry the matter no further. It is something that the Government cannot very well accept because it would seek to graft on to an undertaking by the Government to introduce a Bill matter which is not within the announced policy of the Government. I feel that the amendment is not acceptable.

HON. F. J. S. WISE (Gascoyne—on amendment on amendment) [7.34]: I think the amendment on the amendment is quite relevant. My concern at this stage is that it is a rule of practice in relation to parliamentary procedure that we cannot go back. The most regrettable thing that has happened was the carrying of the amendment for the deletion of the word "now." The proper course then, and it would be still if we could retrace our steps, would have been for the debate to have ensued, and for the Attorney General to have explained, as he subsequently did, the Government's intentions, after which the debate could have continued and been adjourned. That not only would have met with no objection from the members sitting on the Opposition side of the House for they would have had a clear understanding of the position, but would have followed the normal and proper course, one which would have contained no degree of disturbance of the generous attitude that has always existed between the Government and the Opposition. The course suggested by the Government is very improper. If Ministers are determined that private members are to have their rights threatened in this way and that the business of private members is to be taken charge of by the Government in the manner indicated, then the situation that arises will be very unfortunate for the future relationship between private members and the Administration.

Although the wording of the amendment, moved by the member for Fremantle meets with my concurrence, I think the simpler form would have been to have added the words, "and to provide for the abolition of plural voting." The Attorney General has indicated that, in his opinion, the member for Fremantle's amendment is irrelevant to that which he himself moved, but I cannot

follow that argument at all. It is all very well to say that the matter was not mentioned in the Government's Policy Speech. Many matters were mentioned in that speech as legislative prospects that did not appear in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech and His Excellency's Speech contained matters not mentioned in the Government's Policy Speech. For the Government to endeavour to get out of the position with such an argument is of no avail. Many matters specifically mentioned as of great urgency were not referred to in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech and even now, in the middle of October with the parliamentary session having two months to go, noticeable omissions from the notice paper are the short titles of many Bills forecast by members opposite before they took office as a Government. I hope that even at this stage the Attorney General will attempt in some way to have this Bill still kept under consideration, particularly with a view to having private members' business fully considered.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam—on amendment on amendment) [7.39]: The member for Fremantle's amendment on the amendment would have the effect, if agreed to, of ensuring that every principle embodied in the Bill now before the House would be contained in the Government's measure when its Bill is presented to the House. That, of course, would be a duplication of effort but would only tend to make even more unfair the attitude which the Attorney General has adopted in the House this evening. The stand that he now takes against the amendment of the member for Fremantle is too inconsistent for words.

The Attorney General: You do not really mean that.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Attorney General condemns the member for Fremantle for trying to engraft upon the Government's Bill, which has not yet come to life, which is still in the process of being made and is not yet in the process of being born, something that the Government might not agree should be in its Bill. That is the stand he takes in opposition to the member for Fremantle. Yet this afternoon he had no hesitation in initiating action that would sidetrack permanently a Bill brought before the House in the proper manner by a private member. Therefore it is difficult for me to understand how the Attorney General can

be self-righteous and almost indignant at the attempt of the member for Fremantle to tack something on to his amendment when earlier this afternoon he himself was evidently quite happy to take action to prevent a private member from having his Bill considered any further. I suggest that the Attorney General ought to try to develop an attitude that would contain at least some small degree of consistency. Even if the amendment of the member for Fremantle is accepted, it will not make the Attorney General's amendment any less objectionable to me. During the discussion I have stood solidly on the ground of principle and I continue to do so.

The Attorney General: So do we.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The more important of the two principles that have been put forward is the right of a member, who has introduced a Bill to have the measure considered in the ordinary way. The Attorney General this afternoon, in a sort of way, did apologise for the manner in which he had approached this matter.

The Chief Secretary: Just the reverse.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I should not expect the Chief Secretary to understand the point. It is true that the Attorney General, in effect at any rate, did express regret and in effect did apologise for the manner of his approach to the matter.

The Chief Secretary: The member for Leederville suggested that, if he had done it in a different way, it would have been acceptable to the House.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am sorry the Chief Secretary is incapable of understanding the position. At the moment I am not disussing anything said by the member for Leederville, but I am discussing the attitude of the Attorney General. The Attorney General suggested that if he had had a talk with me privately regarding the Government's intentions, this matter might have been settled amicably and everybody might have been prepared to see the Government's Bill and what it contains before the House was finally asked to consider my Bill. If that procedure had been followed by the Attorney General, the problem now before the House might not have arisen. However, the fact is that the Attorney General this afternoon threw a bombshell in the House by making a short second reading speech on the Bill and then moving the extraordinary

motion that the Bill be sidetracked until such time as the Government's Bill was introduced and considered.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: And he did not even give you a copy of the amendment.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I want members to realise that, if the principle in the Attorney General's amendment is accepted, it will mean the permanent sidetracking of the Bill now before the House. In fact, the Bill will never be considered again.

The Attorney General: Not necessarily.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I say that will be the logical outcome. So, in effect, the action taken by the Attorney General, if approved by a majority of the members, will mean sudden death to the Bill. The member for Maylands did not seem to understand the point of principle involved. He seemed to think that if the Attorney General gave an assurance that the Government would bring down a Bill containing certain principles, nothing else would be required to meet the circumstances. That is not the situation at all.

In view of the attitude adopted by the Attorney General and the steps taken by him, unprecedented steps so far as this Parliament is concerned, the principle that members have to face up to and decide is whether a Bill brought before the House in the proper way is to be sidetracked and almost certainly sidetracked permanently. That is the main principle. The Government might have its lesser principle as to whether a private member is to be permitted to have a Bill considered that contains in part some of the principles which the Government put before the people at election time, but that is a principle of far less importance than the one I am concerned about. I trust, therefore, that the member for Maylands will face up to the real and the more important principle involved.

I shall state the principle again. It is the principle as to whether a Bill introduced by a private member is, by an unprecedented step, an unjustifiable step, an unfair step, to be sidetracked and probably sidetracked permanently. If that is to be the rule of the road in this House, then I am afraid it will in the future lead to very serious and perhaps very unpleasant repercussions. That is the last thing I would desire and I should hope it is the last thing that the members of the Government would desire. I pay them the compliment of expressing the belief that

it is the last thing they would desire to develop in this House. I quite realise that we on this side of the House are now in an exceedingly difficult situation by virtue of the fact that the Attorney General, with the aid of Government supporters and the two Independents, was able to delete the word "now" from the motion originally before the House.

I quite see that, irrespective of whether the amendment of the member for Fremantle is passed or defeated and irrespective of whether the Attorney General's amendment is passed or defeated, this Bill is undoubtedly sidetracked. It is finished with. Nevertheless, although I see that and appreciate it to the full, I would much prefer to see the whole Bill go by the board, standing by the principle I have expressed, to compromising the principle by accepting some amendment that would pledge the Government to bring its Bill into the House in fourteen days, seven days or one day. That is not at all the point to be considered by members; it is a minor point. It is not a point of principle. The vital point, the main principle before the House, is whether a majority of the members of this House do agree that this Bill, now properly before the House, should have a sudden-death action applied to it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put the amendment on the amendment, I wish to point out that it is necessary, in the interests of English, to insert at the beginning of the amendment the words "and provided" or some such words.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I am quite agreeable to the addition of those words.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the words be added?

Members: Aye.

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

Ayes	22
Nocs	21

Majority for 1

AYES.

Mr. Coverley
Mr. Fox
Mr. Graham
Mr. Hawke
Mr. Hogney
Mr. Hoar
Mr. Kelly
Mr. Leahy
Mr. Marshall
Mr. May
Mr. Needham

Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Read
Mr. Reynolds
Mr. Shearn
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Smith
Mr. Styants
Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Triest
Mr. Wise
Mr. Rodoreda

(Teller)

NOES.

Mr. Abbott
Mr. Ackland
Mr. Bovell
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver
Mr. Doney
Mr. Grayden
Mr. Hall
Mr. Keenan
Mr. Leslie
Mr. Mann
Mr. McDonald

Mr. McLarty
Mr. Murray
Mr. Nalder
Mr. Perkins
Mr. Seward
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Watts
Mr. Wild
Mr. Yates
Mr. Brand

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Collier

NOES.
Mr. Cornell
Mr. Hill

Amendment on amendment thus passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that the amendment, as amended, be agreed to.

The PREMIER: I move—
That the debate be adjourned.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Premier cannot do that. Surely, this is an astounding development. Is the Premier really serious in moving for the adjournment of the debate?

The Premier: Yes, I am. You defeat the motion for the adjournment and I will show you whether I am serious or not.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I will do my best.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There cannot be a debate on a motion of this nature.

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

Ayes	22
Noes	21

Majority for	1
--------------	------	------	---

—

AYES.

Mr. Abbott
Mr. Ackland
Mr. Bovell
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver
Mr. Doney
Mr. Grayden
Mr. Hall
Mr. Keenan
Mr. Leslie
Mr. Mann
Mr. McDonald

Mr. McLarty
Mr. Murray
Mr. Nalder
Mr. Perkins
Mr. Seward
Mr. Shearn
Mr. Thorn
Mr. Watts
Mr. Wild
Mr. Yates
Mr. Brand

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Coverley
Mr. Fox
Mr. Graham
Mr. Hawke
Mr. Hogney
Mr. Hoar
Mr. Kelly
Mr. Leahy
Mr. Marshall
Mr. May
Mr. Needham

Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Read
Mr. Reynolds
Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Smith
Mr. Styants
Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Triat
Mr. Wise
Mr. Rodoreda

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.
Mr. Cornell
Mr. Hill
Mr. Nimmo

NOES.
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Collier
Mr. Pantou

Motion thus passed.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Maylands rabbit saved the Government!

BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 1st October.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. R. McDonald—West Perth) [8.2]: This Bill does not include any item of Government policy.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: What a shame!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The member for Maylands is going out to commit suicide.

The Chief Secretary: You are very ungracious, anyway.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is all right, big man.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This Bill can be dealt with in a simple way.

Mr. Rodoreda: Cut out the word "now," eh?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It represents a desire on the part of the member for Northam to make voting or enrolment for the Legislative Council compulsory, with certain exceptions. The hon. member candidly stated, when introducing the Bill, that he could find nearly as many arguments against compulsory voting as he could in favour of it; and I am in full agreement with him that it is a very serious question as to how far we should place compulsion on any citizen to exercise a duty such as the franchise when he is either unwilling to do so or takes so little interest in the subject that he is not interested enough to cast a vote.

I think it can be said that the question of compulsory voting for any Parliamentary institution has not yet been decided. An institution such as the House of Commons in England, with a long record of Parliamentary democracy, has still retained the voluntary system of voting. Nor is it regarded as alarming in any way by the members of the House of Commons or

the people of Great Britain that on occasions the vote is cast by a comparatively small percentage of the electors enrolled. I think that in some elections in recent years the voting has been as low as 20 to 30 per cent. But there has been in that country, as far as I am aware, no move by any Government to exercise compulsion on people to go to the polls either for the popular chamber or for the second chamber of the Legislature. There is, I understand, one State in which there is a measure of compulsion applied in the case of voting for the Legislative Council; that is, the State of Victoria. But I am not aware of any other State in which there has been a demand to force electors to go to the poll or to be enrolled, who otherwise would not wish to do so.

In the case of voting for the popular chamber in any Legislature—that is voting by people who qualify by adult franchise only—the position is quite simple. There is no question at all as to their qualifications. The mere fact of their being natural born or naturalised citizens and being of the age of 21 years is all that is needed, apart from residence for a certain period, which varies according to the Legislatures of the different countries, in the district in which they propose to record a vote. It is therefore a simple matter for compulsion to be exercised in the case of adult franchise, quite apart from the general question as to whether it is justifiable to use compulsion at all in the case of those who exercise their franchise.

But I feel that different considerations apply to the Legislative Council. For one thing there are a series of qualifications which depend upon interest in property, occupation of property, and on the annual value of property, or, in the case of freehold land, the capital value of the property. There are people of small means, those who may pay £17 a year, or about 7s. a week rent—a modest rent to pay in these days—who become qualified as electors of the Legislative Council. If a householder does not realise, as he may not realise, whether his rent amounts to £17 a year, it is at his risk whether he enrolls or not. If he fails to work out the necessary figures to determine whether the rent amounts to £17 per annum clear,

he fails to make that calculation at his own risk.

It may quite well be that a number of people might thus unwittingly bring themselves within the penalties of the Act, because they might not appreciate that they came within the obligation to enrol as electors. In the same way, when it comes to the capital value of a block of land, there may be some question as to what that value is. Again it would be at the risk of the elector whether he decided rightly or wrongly the question of whether he was qualified or not. So whatever may be said for the compulsory franchise in the case of the popular Assembly, depending on adult franchise, no case has been made out by the hon. member for extending the same principle to the Legislative Council franchise. It represents a more complex situation. It represents some difficulty of investigation and judgment which I agree people should exercise but which in fact, in a fair number of cases, they do not exercise to determine whether or not they come within the qualification which is prescribed by the Constitution Acts. In my opinion, the extension of compulsion, in the case of the Legislative Council, would not be a desirable matter for this House to agree to. I do not think it would be a desirable obligation to impose on citizens, under penalty. We should not impose on them an obligation to accept what may be a penalty in respect of a matter to which they do not wish to address their minds, or as to which they may fail to address their minds, in order to determine whether they possess the necessary qualification or not.

Mr. May: It should not have to be an obligation; it is a duty.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I agree that it should not have to be an obligation. The more we can through education and otherwise instil a sense of civic duty into the people, the less trouble we shall have about the exercising of the franchise. But that comes back to the broad principle to which I have referred, namely, as to how far it is desirable, in the case of any franchise, to bring people to the polls by compulsion to exercise what may be, in some cases, an uninformed and unwilling vote. The voluntary

elector will mostly be one who has given some intelligent thought to the question he is called upon to decide. The forced elector may be a person—and sometimes is—who has no incentive and no sense of responsibility beyond ensuring that he will be free from prosecution for any breach of the Electoral Act.

While, therefore, we may continue with the principle that we have adopted in the case of compulsory voting and enrolment for our popular Chamber, based on adult franchise, I am not able to see that any case has been made out by the member for Northam for the institution of a system of compulsion, either wholly or in part, for elections for the Legislative Council. I appreciate that he feels that there is a solid argument against the imposition of compulsion in any case, and if there is a solid argument against compulsion in the case of popular franchise, I think there is a formidable argument against the imposition of compulsion for the franchise of the kind prescribed for the Legislative Council. The principle in the Bill is a short one. It is, however, a matter on which quite a lot could be said, but the issue, on which members have to make up their individual minds, is a comparatively short and simple one. My feeling is that a case has not been made out for the Bill, or for any degree of compulsion in the case of the franchise for the Legislative Council. I therefore propose to oppose the Bill.

MR. HEGNEY (Pilbara) [8.15]: I desire to indicate briefly my support of the Bill. While it is true that in every State in the Commonwealth, as far as the Assembly is concerned, compulsory voting applies, and also to the National Parliament in both Houses, we should endeavour to bring about uniformity and apply the compulsory voting provisions to the Legislative Council. The Attorney General mentioned that no case had been made out for compulsory voting. Strong cases must have been made out for it to warrant the Legislatures of all the States of Australia introducing such measures. Earlier in the sitting the hon. gentleman indicated that it was the intention of the Government to liberalise the franchise for the Legislative Council by extending it to the wives of householders, and also to

those occupying self-contained flats. I believe that the Legislature should endeavour to impress on the people generally the necessity for realising their obligations to the State of which they form a part. It is true that under the provisions which obtain in the Legislative Assembly elections, a certain amount of compulsion takes place.

The Legislative Assembly is elected on the adult franchise and compulsory basis, and the same principles should be applied to the election of members for the Legislative Council in order to bring about uniformity. It has also been said that those who vote without any compulsion exercise an intelligent vote. I say, and I think everyone will agree with me, it is deplorable that, in a country like Australia, it was necessary to place compulsory voting on the statute-book. If the vote were taken away tomorrow, there would be a revolution for its retention. I think the people of this State, in common with the rest of the people of Australia, should realise just what a wonderful heritage they have compared with what applies in some of the European and Asiatic countries. It would be a good thing if compulsory voting and enrolment were extended to the Legislative Council. I do not like to sound notes of pessimism—on the contrary I like to be optimistic—but I believe that if this Parliament is to function for many years to come—and I mean both Houses of this Parliament—there must be a radical reform in the franchise of the Legislative Council.

There has been some reaction as a result of what has recently taken place in Victoria where a Chamber elected on a restricted franchise was able to upset the Government of the country. Was that Chamber representative of the people of Victoria as a whole? It certainly was not. It represented only a section of the community and, for certain reasons, which will not bear investigation, it forced the Cain Government to the country. The reaction to that in the future will be very important. I hope the people of this State will realise that the time has arrived when there must be a radical alteration to the franchise for the Legislative Council, and that not only must it be extended by the Government to provide for wives of householders and occupiers

of self-contained flats, but to every citizen over the age of 21 years, as it does in the Commonwealth Parliament. I believe that if this Parliament is to function and retain the confidence and respect of the people of Western Australia, there must be that radical alteration in the Legislative Council franchise. In order to do that and to create the necessary interest in the Legislative Council, this measure is timely. I therefore have much pleasure in supporting it.

On motion by Hon. F. J. S. Wise, debate adjourned.

BILLS (3)—RETURNED.

1, Stipendiary Magistrates Act Amendment.

2, Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment.

3, Public Service Act Amendment.
Without amendment.

MOTION—GOLD.

As to Stimulating Production from Low-Grade Ore.

Debate resumed from the 1st October on the following motion by Mr. Triat (as amended):—

That in the opinion of this House:—

- (1) Gold production in W.A. can be greatly accelerated, and the quantities won greatly increased, provided the large low grade ore deposits can be exploited.
- (2) Greater availability of gold is an important part in Britain's future, in regard to dollar exchange, and therefore greater gold production in Western Australia is vital to the Empire.
- (3) The attention of the British Government, through the Commonwealth Government, should be drawn to the enormous areas of potential gold producing country in Western Australia and the large known deposits of low grade ore, and both Governments should be asked urgently to consider ways and means of assisting in the production of gold from low grade ore in Western Australia.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [8.22]: I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, who is representing the Minister for Mines in the Chamber this evening. One of my

first utterances in the Chamber this session was to the effect that when we came to mining questions we would find it difficult to get satisfaction from the Government's representative. We have now to work in the dark, as it were. I am doubtful whether one would get any satisfaction if the Minister were present in this Chamber, but he would at least know what has happened since the previous Government left office. I find no difficulty in offering my support to this motion. Even if it does no good, it cannot possibly do any harm, and it may be instrumental in inspiring some degree of enthusiasm into the Imperial Government regarding what might be said to be an asset of value to that Government.

I want the Minister for Mines to inform this House, as early as possible, what has happened as to the negotiations that were taking place between the then Premier of the State and the Prime Minister of Australia regarding the price being paid for gold produced in this country. When the member for Leederville was Minister for Mines I took this matter up as a private member, and the Premier of that day communicated with the then Prime Minister and asked why it was that the price being paid for gold on the world's market was higher than that being paid in Australia for gold produced here. The reply received was particularly unsatisfactory. From memory, the Prime Minister indicated that, although there was available a higher world market price for gold, for some reason—evidently unknown to him—producers in Australia were not permitted to take advantage of the price ruling on that market. In that minute there was also reference to the fact that only a small quantity of the gold produced within the British Empire was permitted to go on the market in India—which I think was the country referred to.

The reason for that was to assist Britain to liquidate some of her liabilities in India. That was of great importance to Great Britain in paying for war requisites, and only a small quantity of gold was permitted to be sold there. The limitation on the export of gold to that market was by a decree of the Imperial Government. If the Imperial Government was sincerely anxious to secure greater supplies of gold I think it would long since

have endeavoured to expand gold production within its Dominions. While it may have been difficult for the Imperial Government to get gold from foreign countries, there should have been no difficulty in obtaining greater production of gold within the boundaries of the Empire. Evidently the Imperial Government was too fully occupied in other directions to bother about that aspect, or, alternatively, it did not place on gold the importance that we, in this country, place on it.

From my reading about the price of gold I understand that the present price is fixed by the Central Reserve Bank of America, and that the 32 other reserve banks throughout the world buy up gold at a price fixed by that central bank, which practically dominates the economic life of the world today. Just how those banks arrange to get possession of gold produced in all the various countries, at a price fixed by the central bank, is something for the Minister for Mines to endeavour to ascertain. Who buys the gold that is produced in Western Australia? How is it purchased? Through what agency is it exported, and where does the greater part of it go?

The Chief Secretary: To the Commonwealth Bank.

Mr. MARSHALL: America as a creditor nation no doubt can call upon a debtor nation to pay in gold if it has the gold, and America does that. In consequence, America has about 90 per cent. of the world's production of gold stored away in vaults, and while countries remain on the gold standard, they will be subject to American influence. That is inevitable.

I should like the Minister for Mines to ascertain as early as possible exactly how these manipulations regarding the purchase and export of gold are carried out and by whom. If the producers in Western Australia were permitted, to export their gold to countries prepared to pay almost double the price we are receiving today, undoubtedly there would be rapidly increased development in our goldmining areas. It is difficult to imagine just what might be discovered if gold were bringing double its present price. That we have large auriferous belts of country, most of it goldbearing, is unquestioned, but with the ever-increasing cost of production and

the difficulty of discovering goldbearing ore, the exploitation of our industry is becoming unattractive. Even well-established mines are experiencing extreme difficulty in carrying on in face of ever rising costs—costs that are mounting terrifically. Yet the price of gold locally produced is fixed by institutions that seemingly desire to gain possession of it for no purpose other than to control the economic life of the universe. I venture to say that most of the gold is purchased on their terms and the bank that finally buys it pays for it by honouring its own cheques.

Even well-equipped mines in established centres can exist only by taking from their ore reserves the richer portion of their deposits, leaving in the bowels of the earth huge quantities of ore of lower grade that it would be unpayable to treat. So we have the spectacle of well-developed and well-equipped mines leaving in the ground ore that ought to be extracted. Undoubtedly, if we continue along those lines, there will be a gradual elimination of lower grade ore until we reach a stage where it will be unprofitable to treat any of it and the mines must close down.

I support the motion. If we could get the open market for our producers, it would be an inspiration to many young fellows who now hesitate to go out to explore the auriferous belt, because they feel that the ore remaining will be of low grade and unpayable. If we received the price paid in the open market, men would try their luck at prospecting, and in the process of doing that, we do not know what other valuable minerals might be unearthed, because that is how many of our mineral deposits were discovered.

I hope that if the Imperial Government is anxious to have gold, it will co-operate with us and give us what assistance is required, not only financial assistance but also assistance to equip mines with machinery, and thus aid the men who sacrifice all the amenities of life to go into the bush in their search for gold. The motion might do some good and definitely can do no harm. However, I want the Minister to explain at the earliest possible moment the whole procedure attending the realisation of gold produced in this State. I want to know how it is purchased, through what medium, whether through the Common-

wealth Bank or through private banks or agents, whether companies are obliged to export their gold to certain destinations, who are the purchasers, under what terms and conditions the gold is purchased and why the price is fixed so low compared with the price ruling in the open market.

I realise that if gold were exported to countries prepared to pay a higher price for it, they would soon liquidate their liabilities to some other country, and that is probably something the other country would not desire. If the Imperial Government is desirous of squaring its ledger and feels that gold would be an important factor in the process of gaining that objective, it might be able to give us some assistance.

Question put and passed; the motion, as amended, agreed to.

BILL—STREET PHOTOGRAPHERS.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 24th September. Mr. Perkins in the Chair; Mr. Leslie in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Definitions:

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 2, to which the member for Gascoyne had moved an amendment that the words "but shall not for the purposes of this Act include any street in the city of Perth which is restricted to one-way vehicular traffic" be added at the end of the definition of "public thoroughfare."

Mr. LESLIE: I offer no objection to the amendment, but point out that difficulty may arise because of two streets in the city which are restricted to one-way traffic. I refer to Hay-street, by Wesley Church, where there is not much traffic, and to Murray-street, by the Commonwealth Bank Building, where there is a wide footpath.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Would not the photographers be in William-street and Forrest-place respectively?

Mr. LESLIE: They may be, but what would happen if they trespassed beyond the building line? Does a street commence at the building line?

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Yes.

Mr. LESLIE: In any case, one-way traffic streets are not suitable for street photography. If necessary, the City Council could

make some arrangement under which a street photographer would not be prosecuted if he stepped a yard or two over the building line. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Clause 3—Street photographers to be licensed:

Mr. MARSHALL: Subclause (3) throws the onus of proof on the accused person, which is not in accord with British justice. I take strong exception to throwing the onus of proof on an accused person. Subclause (4) provides all that is necessary in this connection. I move an amendment—

That Subclause (3) be struck out.

Mr. LESLIE: I am in sympathy with the member for Murchison on the principle that he mentioned. A person must be deemed to be innocent until he is proved guilty.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: I hope you always think that way.

Mr. LESLIE: Of course I do.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: That is all right.

Mr. LESLIE: However, unless a street photographer produces his license on demand he will be guilty of an offence under the Act. The member for Murchison said that Subclause (3) was redundant. The advice given to me is that while it may appear to be so, it is necessary if Subclause (4) is to apply as it is intended to apply. The purpose of Subclause (3) is to make sure that two or three persons are not dummying under one license, and it will enable the municipality to control street photographers with a minimum of difficulty. It does not in any way infringe that principle because of the peculiar application of the clause.

Mr. STYANTS: I agree with the member for Mt. Marshall that this does not infringe the policy of the onus of guilt being placed on the accuser. I believe this is a reasonable proposition and is the same as applies in the case of a license to drive a motorcar. If I am approached by an officer of the Traffic Department I am expected to produce my license. If I have not got it with me I am allowed a certain time in which to produce it, but the onus is on me to show I am a licensed driver. In the same way a member of the Police Force can demand to see my car license and I am expected to

have it; and exactly the same occurs in regard to a firearm license. The clause does not say that a man must produce his license immediately he is accosted by someone in authority but that he should have the license with him. So does the Traffic Act say that a driver should have his license with him. But just as a driver may be given time to produce his license, so in this case the man concerned may say, "I have changed my coat and left my license at home but I can produce it at a given time and place."

Mr. MARSHALL: I cannot understand the interpretation placed on these sub-clauses by the member for Kalgoorlie. He is not compelled to produce his driver's license or his car license. He may be accosted by a constable and asked whether he is a licensed driver; and if he says "Yes," he is then asked whether he has his license with him. He may say, "No, but I will produce it at the Traffic Department tomorrow or within half an hour." But that is not what this subclause says. Nothing is more explicit in giving effect to the convictions of the member for Kalgoorlie than is Subclause (4). No man licensed under this measure would dare to go into the street and attempt to take a photograph without a license. If he did so he would breach Subclause (4) and break the law. What Subclause (3) does is to make it easy for any official who thinks he knows something to demand from anybody he believes to be taking a photograph, the production of his license, so that innocent people who were not committing any breach of the law could be molested. Surely I have a right to take a snap of the Esplanade! I am not a street photographer, but surely I am allowed to take photographs without practising street photography.

Mr. Styants: A man accosted in that way, who was not a street photographer, would tell the official that that was so and then the onus would be on the official to go on with the matter if he wanted to.

Mr. MARSHALL: Why should any person who takes a snap of the gardens or some scene in the streets run the risk of being accosted by an official? Ever since the war started there has been somebody or other trying to get power to molest or interfere with innocent members of the community. Every piece of legislation that is

introduced indicates that there is someone with a lust for further power and control.

The Minister for Lands: Yes, they are after our banking!

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: We had it done here tonight. They would push us anywhere!

Mr. MARSHALL: This puts the onus of proof on the person accosted, who must prove in some way or other that he is not a street photographer. I suppose he could be molested because he could not provide such proof and probably, be made to go out of his way to do so. I shall not withdraw the amendment.

Mr. LESLIE: I want to make clear to the member for Murchison the fact that—

The Minister for Lands: That will be difficult!

Mr. LESLIE:—this does not entitle anyone to accost a person who is merely taking photographs in the street. A man will not come under the provisions of this Act until he distributes identification tickets. Provided he does not do that, anybody can take photographs anywhere he likes without being accosted. But once he distributes these tickets to indicate that he is taking photographs for sale he can be asked to produce a license to show that he may practise as a street photographer. The amateur photographer, or even the professional photographer, taking photographs in the street cannot be accused of being a street photographer until the local authority proves that he was practising as such in accordance with the definition of a street photographer in the measure.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I do not think the member for Murchison has misled the Committee. I do not know why the member for Mt. Marshall wants to stonewall the clause. Why not let the amendment go to the vote?

Mr. READ: I cannot see that this clause does any harm. It is to regulate street photographers who ply their trade for profit. We have the professional photographer.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Is not the street photographer a professional?

Mr. READ: They are distinct types. There is the Press photographer, the street photographer and the professional photographer. The professional photographer does not say that street photography is a

profession. The amateur photographer does not come under this in any shape or form.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause² put and passed.

Clause 4—Method of obtaining a license and effect thereof:

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Subclause (1) means that all those, provided they do not exceed the number provided for in a subsequent clause, who apply to a local authority for a license, must be given a license because the word "shall" is used. The local authority has no discretion. If the word "may" were used, it could easily mean that the local authority would never grant a license if it did not desire to do so. As the subclause stands, the most undesirable people imaginable could apply and would have to be granted licenses. The amendment I propose to move is based on some of our licensing laws which provide that should an applicant be a person of good character, and should he supply testimonials in writing as to character, suitability and fitness to have such a license, the local authority can only refuse the license if, in its view, the testimonials do not support his character sufficiently. I move an amendment—

That at the end of Subclause (1) the following proviso be added:—"Provided that every applicant for a license under the provisions of this Act shall, with his application, deliver to the local authority testimonials in writing as to his character, suitability and fitness to have such license granted to him, and the local authority may refuse such application if, in its opinion, such testimonials do not show that such applicant is a fit and proper person for such license.

Mr LESLIE: I am quite happy to accept the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. F. J. S. WISE: My next amendment is designed to enable a local authority to have the right to say in which part of its district a license shall apply. The City of Perth would then have the right to say that a street photographer's license would operate within certain defined limits. If such local authorities as the City of Perth were desirous of nullifying the effect of this legislation they could issue licenses in respect of portions of the city where it would not be possible for street photographers to

operate. But I do not think the Perth City Council would be so small as to adopt such tactics: in fact, I do not believe any local authority would if both Houses of Parliament passed this legislation. I feel sure the Perth City Council would not attempt to evade this legislation by placing street photographers in positions such as at the corner of Harvest-terrace and Hay-street, or outside the Mint. I assume it would select areas where it would not only have control of the photographer, within defined limits, but would generally be able to supervise the effects of this legislation. I anticipate the argument being raised that licenses could be issued for places where it would be hopeless for the photographers to operate. On the other hand I think it is desirable that the Perth City Council or any other council or local authority should have the right to say that licenses shall be issued for limited areas. Therefore, I move an amendment—

That a new subclause be added as follows:—" (3) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act to the contrary, the local authority may limit the operation of any license issued under the provisions of this Act to any portion of its district which it may define."

Mr. GRAYDEN: I oppose the amendment on the ground anticipated by the Leader of the Opposition. As he suggested, it could have the effect of nullifying the intention of the Bill. It should never have been necessary for Parliament to consider legislation to prevent avenues of employment being closed to the men and women of this country. The City Council has decided that certain legitimate avenues of employment must be closed, though that employment is rendering a service to the community. Through the amendment members are being asked to hand back to the City Council all the power it had under its own bylaws. Members from both sides of the Chamber have agreed to the Bill and I can understand them wishing to associate themselves with the principle contained in it—that of opening up instead of closing avenues of employment. Of what use is support of that nature if we hand back to the council the power which it has already obviously misused? The amendment gives the council power to say where street photographers may operate. If it is agreed to, they may be confined to areas in which they could not operate successfully. We might as well

give a man authority to fish in Hay-street, while preventing him from fishing in the Swan River, as give him permission to operate as a photographer in an unsuitable area.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: There are a few sharks in the Swan River.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Permission for street photographers to operate would be useless unless it covered areas in which the business could be carried on successfully. We have already denied them the right to take photographs in one-way streets, which form a considerable portion of the area available.

Mr. LESLIE: In preparing the Bill every endeavour was made to give local governing authorities all the power possible to be exercised in the control of this new business, if one may call it that, while at the same time making it obligatory on them to allow the business to be carried on. The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is the rock upon which the Bill must either stand, for its successful operation if it becomes an Act, or split. The Leader of the Opposition said he did not think the Perth City Council or any other local governing body would be small-minded enough to allow street photographers to operate only in areas not suitable for the carrying on of that business. I have not similar confidence in such bodies. Up to date the Perth City Council has shown itself to be quite unsympathetic in this matter. It has already told the street photographers that they may operate in parks, but not in the streets where it is profitable for them to carry on business.

The amendment, if agreed to, will enable local governing authorities to escape the obligation intended to be placed on them by the Bill. We have already inserted a clause under which certain streets are to be excluded from the area in which street photographers may operate. In order to ensure that local governing authorities shall be in no way circumscribed as long as they permit men to conduct this business in a normal and legal way, there is included in the Bill provision to enable such authorities to make bylaws. I propose later to move an amendment to give the City Council power to make bylaws for the regulation of operations of street photographers to provide that not more than a set number shall operate in any public thoroughfare at stated times. This should

give the local authorities reasonable control.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: There is not much difference between your proposal and my amendment.

Mr. LESLIE: Not a great deal, but my proposal will ensure that a local authority shall not arbitrarily exclude from its area any district which may be most profitable to street photographers.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I think you are running a great risk by allowing it to be done by bylaw.

Mr. LESLIE: I am prepared to trust the Minister to exercise commonsense and not allow any local authority to act unreasonably or against the intention of Parliament. I oppose the amendment.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Previously the City Council had taken action to prevent street photographers from operating in its area. I believe that members of the council were influenced by strong representations made by a number of ratepayers engaged in professional photography in business premises. Naturally the council was impressed by those representations, not necessarily because of their inherent merit, but because of the source from which they came. If Parliament now passes a law providing for the licensing of street photographers and stipulates that they must be licensed by the council in limited numbers and must be permitted to operate in the streets, the City Council would have a complete answer in future to any representations made by professional photographers. The council would be bound to observe the requirements of the law, and it is not reasonable to be suspicious of the attitude the council would adopt.

To leave the council in the position of having no control as to where street photographers should operate would be wrong. If there was no control by the council as to the number to operate in a certain area, probably most of them would operate in the one area. Forrest Place is a busy thoroughfare, especially on Friday, and if the nationalisation of banking should become law, Forrest Place will in future become a terrifically busy place, and it would be most undesirable to allow the majority of the street photographers entitled to be licensed to operate there. The total number of persons licensed would be far too

great to enable them to operate in that area. It would be advisable not only to license these photographers, but to make provision for the local authority to establish a system of zoning. If it be found that the Perth City Council is acting capriciously with respect to the location of each licensed street photographer, then we should be prepared to take such legislative action as might be necessary to meet the circumstances.

We ought to be prepared to trust each local authority to zone its area and allot a street photographer to each zone. The Bill provides that the street photographers are to be licensed to carry on their business in a public thoroughfare. The term "public thoroughfare" is defined in the Bill in such a way as to make it obvious that these men must be licensed to operate in streets or lanes, or in whatever might come within the definition of "public thoroughfare" in the Bill. The amendment should be accepted by the Committee.

Mr. READ: I am not antagonistic to the amendment, but point out that it will still further restrict these unfortunate men. We have a number of men who are making a living by street photography and who are carrying on their business without doing harm to anybody and without detriment to any trader. So far, they have not been restricted in any way and have been doing a useful and pleasurable job. They have now been told by the local governing body that they must cease their business. It is fair that they should be restricted in some way and that their business should be organised; but if we pass amendment after amendment, these men will be operating in strait-jackets. They would not be able to carry on their work at all.

Mr. STYANTS: I voted for the second reading of the Bill because I believed that street photographers should be permitted to carry on their business. If that is the intention of the majority of members, we had better defeat this amendment because, by carrying it, we shall defeat the purpose for which the Bill was introduced. The amendment would give the Perth City Council, or a local authority, the right in a broad sense to veto the objective of the Bill. I was a member of the Perth City Council for some years and have had experience in other local governing bodies.

They do not take kindly to being told by the Legislature what they ought to do.

If the amendment is passed, the Perth City Council or any other local governing body will be able to make street photography so unprofitable as to prevent people from engaging in it. In a narrower sense, it will permit a local authority to allot a stand to one photographer which might perhaps be very lucrative, and at the same time to allot to another photographer a stand not so favourable. The member for Northam pointed out that 11 photographers might be carrying on their work in Forrest-place. I would have no objection to that, because in a very short time, if there were not sufficient business there for the 11, they would quickly depart for other vantage points in the city where they could make a living. I am opposed, however, to giving one person a lucrative stand and relegating another to a point where he would be at a great disadvantage. This amendment, in my opinion, would enable local authorities to prevent street photographers from earning their living. So, as I voted for the Bill in the belief that these men did not interfere with the professional photographers and were entitled to earn a living, I intend to oppose the amendment.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: On the second reading, I said I would support the Bill were it not that I was unwilling further to derogate from the power of the local authority. I voted against the Bill but the majority of members decided to take the opposite view. That being so, I think the member for Kalgoorlie is perfectly right. The Committee must now be consistent and not say to the Perth City Council—having accepted the principle that street photographers are to be licensed whether the Council likes it or not—"You are not to license them in places where they can make a reasonable living." Notwithstanding my views on the principle involved, I feel constrained to stick to the basis that the Chamber has agreed to the licensing of street photographers and should therefore leave it to the local authority to carry out that intention in a reasonable way.

Amendment, put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clause 5—Duration of license:

Mr. STYANTS: I move an amendment—

That at the end of the clause the following words be added "and shall not be transferable."

One of the objections I had to the granting of these licenses and limiting them on a quota basis was that I felt that if we did not prevent them from being transferable we would immediately create an unearned increment to the holder of a license, much the same as unearned increments have accrued to holders of milk licenses or occupiers of licensed premises and we would have trading in licenses. It is much preferable to make a license not transferable so that if one street photographer decides he does not intend to continue the work it will be necessary for him to return the license to the licensing authority who would be in a position to re-issue it. That would prevent trading in licenses. It is said that in Sydney 18 months or two years ago, fabulous sums were earned by street photographers. Certain of them made £2,000 a year. It can be understood therefore that if licenses are transferable and men have particularly good stands in the city which are of considerable value, there is likely to be a selling of licenses.

Mr. LESLIE: I am wholeheartedly in sympathy with the objective of the amendment. I do not want to see trafficking in these licenses. But I am wondering what effect the amendment will have on persons operating as partners in a street photography business or in the case of an individual who is employing one or more street photographers in the course of his business.

Mr. Styants: We propose to prevent that, do we not?

Mr. LESLIE: Not necessarily. Two or more street photographers work in a series of shifts. After one has operated in a place for a certain time, the photos are developed and printed and prepared for public inspection, while someone else takes further photos. The person engaged in photography is the one who must carry the license. If the non-transference clause would not apply to a firm that will be all right but, if the non-transference provision is going to impose a limitation there, I am afraid it will seriously interfere with the operations of street photographers. I am

keen to ensure that there shall be no trafficking in licenses. For that reason, I am prepared at the moment to accept the amendment, but I want to be honest and say that if, after receiving legal advice, I believe it might have the effect of limiting the operations of individual firms, it may be necessary for me to have the clause amended further in another place.

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

Clause 6—Number of licenses to be limited:

Mr. GRAYDEN: I oppose this clause, and also Clauses 7 and 8, for a number of reasons, the chief of which is that I do not think the Bill goes nearly far enough. We admit that neither Parliament nor any other body in this State should restrict or shut down legitimate avenues of employment. But, having admitted that, we are endeavouring to limit the avenues of employment which the measure will make possible. What are the grounds on which we are, so to speak, selling out these means of making a living, after having snatched them, as it were, from the guillotine? The worst that members have said about them is that street photographers are a nuisance in Sydney.

We have almost been led to believe that it is hardly safe to walk down the streets of Sydney because of these street photographers. If that is the best that can be put forward by those who want to restrict this means of employment, then it is very poor indeed. Any argument based on an exaggerated position, as that is, is weak. I can recollect seeing street photographers in Sydney, but only outside the Post Office. They were an asset to the city and were regarded as such. There were no arguments about street photographers before the war. There were not many street photographers there at that time, and I do not think anyone will deny that unemployment did not exist then at least to the extent it does now.

Mr. Needham: There never was less unemployment in Australia.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Before the war there was considerable unemployment, and yet this profession was not overcrowded. I cannot recollect having seen more street photographers in Sydney recently than there were before the war. The law of supply

and demand must regulate the position without our placing any artificial restrictions in the way. The Bill bristles with dangers which would not have arisen if the measure had been a straight out one to allow street photographers to operate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must confine his remarks to Clause 6. He is getting a little away from it at the moment.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I am endeavouring to show that there should be no limit.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is quite all right so far.

Mr. GRAYDEN: We can and should avoid the dangers of which I have spoken by agreeing to strike out this clause, and making the Bill a straight out one to license photographers. If we include this clause, and the next two, we shall be violating the law of supply and demand without going properly into the implications of such violation. If there should be a limit to the number of street photographers to be licensed, we surely could arrive at some better method than is described here. If street photographers are numerous in Sydney, that merely establishes the fact that there is a public demand for them. We have newsboys in Perth, but that does not mean to say they are a nuisance, but rather that there is a public demand for their services.

If we limit the number of street photographers to 20, then the ones who will be allowed to operate will be able to earn practically double the income that they would otherwise receive. We would be creating a monopoly and depriving some people of the right to a livelihood. If we limit the number of street photographers to 20, there is nothing to stop them from getting together and increasing their prices beyond what they would be if there were free competition. They would be firmly entrenched in a monopoly set up by this Chamber. If we limit the number to 20 that restriction will lend itself to graft and corruption. Some of the photographers now operating, who will be given preference in obtaining licenses, may be operating on behalf of some individual who pays them wages and supplies them with equipment. If that is so a monopoly could easily be created. I feel that we should allow any street photographer

to obtain a license, governed only by the law of supply and demand.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7—Preference to established street photographers:

Mr. HOAR: I move an amendment—

That in lines 1 and 2 the words "for the first year during which this Act shall be in operation" be struck out.

I do not remember the member for Mt. Marshall, in his second reading speech, making reference to the reason for the inclusion of that provision in the Bill. He is to move a further amendment, and if that amendment is agreed to it will be restricted to operate for 12 months only, unless my amendment is passed.

Mr. LESLIE: I am grateful to the member for Nelson for having drawn my attention to this omission of reference to members of the Forces, which is an oversight on my part. I accept the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM: As we are anticipating what might occur when the member for Mt. Marshall moves his further amendment, it is difficult to forecast the effect of this proposed amendment. At present the intention seems to be that for the first year in which licenses are granted those who have been operating in the immediate past shall have some claim to preference. If the amendment of the member for Nelson is agreed to it will establish no preference other than for returned soldiers. If the number of licenses is restricted to 20, of perhaps 15 who have been operating only 12 may be ex-Servicemen.

Mr. Leslie: They are all ex-Servicemen. I had that assurance from the men themselves.

Mr. GRAHAM: If there were some, other than ex-Servicemen, who had come under the ban of the City Council, they should have some claim over and above newcomers, at least for the first year. However, if they are all ex-Servicemen there is no danger on that score.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. LESLIE: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 after the word "who" the words "is a discharged member of the Forces as defined in Section 4 of the Re-establishment

and Employment Act, 1945 (No. 11 of 1945, Commonwealth), or of the 1914-1918 war, and who" be inserted.

One of the purposes of the Bill is to protect the ex-Servicemen who were engaged in this business prior to the embargo being placed on them.

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

Clause 8—License to have effect only in districts for which granted.

Mr. HOAR: The clause seems to me to be unduly restrictive. I can imagine that in the course of time a number of ex-Servicemen and possibly others will seek employment in street photography and that will not necessarily be limited to the metropolitan area. Throughout the State there are many large towns where shows and other large gatherings of people are held annually, and those who attend are just as much entitled to this service as are those residing in the metropolis. As the clause stands they will be denied that service. Clause 7 provides that preference is to be given to those who can satisfy a local authority that they were bona fide operating as street photographers prior to the 1st April, 1947. In the circumstances, where will country centres be able to secure the services of men for such a purpose? The clause should be amended or else struck out.

Mr. LESLIE: The member for Nelson has lost sight of the fact that the granting of licenses is in the hands of the local governing authority. The clause merely provides for a restriction on the number to be granted and to prevent those licensed outside the metropolitan area from going to the city to participate in the trade there. As to these men operating at shows and so on, I checked up on that position and the authority in control of the showground or other place will be in a position to grant permission to a man to operate.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Bylaws:

Mr. LESLIE: I move an amendment—

That at the end of the clause the following words be added:—"including bylaws for the regulation of the operations of street photographers to provide that not more than a stated number of street photographers shall

operate or carry on their business in any public thoroughfare or portion thereof at stated times as set out in such bylaws."

In view of the fate of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, I do not know how the Committee will deal with this.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It will be guillotined.

Mr. LESLIE: I am not greatly in love with it myself and shall have no regrets if it is not agreed to by the Committee. I feel, however, that it is desirable to place some control in the hands of the local governing authority regarding the number of photographers permitted to operate in a given area. I want to avoid a situation arising under which the Perth City Council having licensed 10 street photographers, the whole 10 will operate in Forrest Place or in St. George's Terrace. I quite agree that in all probability the volume of business offering will rectify that position but nevertheless it should be safeguarded.

Mr. STYANTS: I disagree with the member for Mt. Marshall for one of the reasons I outlined when I opposed the amendment submitted by the Leader of the Opposition. It would be wrong to give a local authority the right to say that one man should operate in Forrest Place and another should operate only at the corner of William-street and Hay-street. The position has been safeguarded by prescribing a limit to the number of licenses to be granted in accordance with the population at any given centre. The position will sort itself out because of the amount of business offering. It might be that four of, say, 12 men licensed in Perth would concentrate their operations in Forrest Place but they would quickly realise there was not sufficient business for all and one or other of them would seek further vantage points. I oppose the amendment.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11 and 12—agreed to.

New clause:

Mr. READ: I move—

That a new clause be inserted as follows:—

"10 (1) No street photographer shall make or supply or offer or agree to make or supply any photograph or enlargement of a photograph of a size exceeding five and one-half inches in length and three and one-half inches in width.

(2) No street photographer shall act as an agent for any other photographer or canvass or solicit orders for photographs or enlargements of photographs for any other photographer."

The new clause is designed to protect professional photographers. The men who have been operating on the streets for many years were restricted as a result of a protest by professional photographers. I could not agree with a majority of the council in refusing street photographers permission to operate, but I am not unmindful of the protection to which ratepayers are entitled. The new clause would confine street photographers to the class of business they have been doing in the past, and would prevent them from launching out in future in opposition to professional photographers. These men have been selling photographs of post-card size, and by limiting them to that size, we shall be affording the professional photographers the desired protection. I have been surprised that so many thousands of words should be uttered on this Bill and I do not propose to add any more.

Mr. LESLIE: I accept the new clause. The street photographers approve of it as it is not their practice to engage in the sort of business mentioned.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I see no need for the new clause. The member for Victoria Park expressed surprise at the thousands of words that had been uttered on the Bill. I have been surprised at the number of amendments proposed, many of them undesirable, and the least desirable of all is the new clause. We agreed the principle of allowing street photographers to operate and, immediately that principle was affirmed, an endeavour was made to limit their activities in every way. The Leader of the Opposition secured an amendment to require testimonials of character from these men. Why not an amendment to stipulate their personal appearance, or require a permit from the City Council before anybody can have a photograph taken? If these men are to be allowed to operate, why restrict the size of their pictures? If they desired to take larger ones, they have not the equipment, though they could enlarge the small photographs they take. I was in favour of the Bill, but by the time the Committee has finished with it, there will be scarcely any-

thing left in it that has not been altered except the Title. I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment.

New clause put and negatived.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 16th October, 1947.

	PAGE
Questions: Housing, as to cost of materials, requisites, etc.	1291
Education, as to temporary classrooms at Big Bell	1292
Great Eastern Highway, as to Southern Cross Coolgardie section	1292
Railways, as to Coolgardie station approach	1292
Bills: Supply (No. 2), £3,100,000, Message, Standing Orders suspension, all stages	1293
Companies Act Amendment, 3R.	1293
Street Photographers, report	1293
Child Welfare, Com.	1301
Government Railways Act Amendment, 2R.	1301
Wheat Marketing, 2R.	1310
Dried Fruits Act, 1926, Re-enactment, 2R., point of order, dissent from Speaker's ruling, Bill ruled out	1323
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, Com.	1331

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

QUESTIONS.

HOUSING.

As to Cost of Materials, Requisites, etc.

Mr. REYNOLDS (on notice) asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) What was the price of these articles in 1939—Bricks per 1,000—(a) face bricks, (b) common (wire cut and pressed); roofing tiles, per square; cement, per ton; roofing iron per ton (26 gauge); baths, enamel, average size; sinks, enamel, average size; galvanised guttering; galvanised down piping; galvanised roofing nails; nails, 2in., 3in. and 4in., per cwt.; timber, jarrah, 4in. x 4in., 3in. x 2in.; flooring, T. & G.?

(2) What is the price of these items today?