Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 7th November, 1944.

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

QUESTIONS (3).

RAILWAYS.

As to Tarpaulins.

Mr. WATTS asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) How does he account for the greatly increased cost of repairs and replacements to railway tarpaulins in the 1943-44 season as compared with the 1939-40 season?

(2) What revenue has been derived from the 6d. a ton surcharge on superphosphate during the period in which such surcharge has been imposed in respect to damage to tarpaulins?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Increase is due principally to—

(a) Considerable damage to tarpaulins in superphosphate traffic—a negligible cost in pre-war days.

(b) Inferior quality of materials in the tarpaulins, giving a considerably reduced life.

(c) Higher cost of the inferior quality material as compared with pre-war.

(d) Heavy wear and tear on tarpaulins used to cover equipment of unusual shape and dimensions transported for defence purposes.

(2) Approximately £2,446 up to date.

EDUCATION.

As to Junior Standard Students.

Mr. McDONALD asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Has satisfactory provision been made for the accommodation and tuition next year through the State Education Services of children who will pass Junior Standard this year and wish to continue their education?

(2) If not, what is the position?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes. Plans now being developed will meet the requirements for 1945.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

POST-WAR WORKS.

As to Western Australian Programme.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Works:

(1) In view of the fact as announced by him that neither Nedlands, Claremont nor Cottesloe have submitted any detailed plans of works for beautifying and improving their districts since November, 1943, will he advise whether their opportunity to participate in these post-war public schemes is now lost?

(2) Were the funds to finance these projects to be State or Federal?

(3) If they are funds other than municipal, will the general public be acquainted with the nature of such proposed works before they are undertaken?

(4) Was the labour for such works to be provided from any particular source?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) If details of works are lodged with the Government by these Local Authorities within four weeks, they will be submitted to the Co-ordinator General of Works.

(2) and (3) Works to be carried out during the first two years after the war must be of an urgent and essential character. The Commonwealth Government considers the State Governments and local Authorities should bear the whole cost of such works out of their accumulated reserve funds or other sources, including new loans.

The State Government is prepared to consider making some financial assistance available to Local Authorities for works within the above category in instances where it is proved that the full financing of same is beyond the Local Authorities' resources.

(4) No.

PAPERS—PRICES CONTROL.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS [4.33]: In response to a motion carried in this House on the 6th September regarding in-

formation covering the expenditure upon and the practice of price-control, I have received from the Deputy Prices Commissioner a short report. I move—

That this paper be laid on the Table of the House.

Question put and passed.

ELECTORAL—SWEARING-IN OF MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am prepared to swear in the member for Kalgoorlie who was returned at the last general election.

Mr. Styants took and subscribed the oath and signed the roll.

BILL—OPTOMETRISTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by Mr. McDonald and read a first time.

BILL—CHURCH OF ENGLAND DIOCESAN TRUSTEES (SPECIAL FUND).

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—RURAL AND INDUSTRIES BANK.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—BUSSELTON CEMETERY.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS [4.38] in moving the second reading said: The cemetery which is the subject of this Bill is contained in an area very close to the town of Busselton and adjoins a recreation reserve. The present cemetery, which is about a mile from the town, was proclaimed about 1928 and placed under the control of the Busselton Municipal Council. This made it an offence to cause burials to be made in the old cemetery except with the approval of the Governor under Section 9 of the Cemeteries Act. In February, 1933, an Order in Council was issued directing that burials in the old cemetery should be wholly discontinued. As it happens the greater portion of the old cemetery was held in freehold by three churches—the Roman Catholic Church holding Lot C5, the Church of England holding C1, and the Wesleyan Methodist Church. The remaining lot was a reserve for the purpose of a cemetery. When the new cemetery was proclaimed under the 1928 Act, the Busselton Municipal Council asked that the other portion outside the area used as a burial ground be set aside for a camping and recreation reserve. With the consent of the denominational bodies interested, that area at that time unused for burials was excluded and vested in the Busselton municipality for a camping and recreation reserve.

The council is now asking that the balance of the cemetery where burials have actually taken place should be put under its control to enable better care to be exercised of the old graves and to avoid the spectacle of the cemetery lapsing into a dilapidated and disused condition. The Bill has been prepared to give effect to the wishes of the local people. It follows the same lines as the East Perth Cemetery Bill of 1935, the East Perth cemetery at that time having been disused as such and handed over to the State Gardens Board, not to the local authority. The Bill contains provision for the Busselton municipality to have full authority to keep everything in proper order. In effect, it will mean that if, as the years go by, those having an interest in the cemetery as now unused desire to exhume and rebury, permission and authority can be given. Members who are acquainted with Busselton will understand the situation of the cemetery. It is quite adjacent to the esplanade and immediately adjoins the camping and recreation reserve. The Bill consists of three clauses and a schedule, and has been introduced to meet the wishes of the local authority. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Willmott, debate adjourned.

BILL—STAMP ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER [4.44] in moving the second reading said: The necessity for this small amendment to the second schedule to the Stamp Act is brought about by all the insurance companies finding it necessary to issue a separate insurance policy for the compulsory third-party risk. The separate policy is necessary for these reasons—

(a) It is compulsory for every car to be covered by a third-party policy before it can be licensed by the traffic authorities;

(b) The owner of such car may not be an acceptable risk to the insurance company for the other insurable risks, such as fire, accident, theft, etc.;

(c) Many cars change hands by way of sale each year and a third-party risk policy can be transferred with the car, whereas the risks covered by other insurance may not be transferred.

When the third-party risk insurance Act was before Parliament last session, it was not anticipated that two policies of insurance would be necessary. The member for Mt. Hawthorn, who was Minister for Works at the time, gave an assurance to the member for Nedlands that a person who had a comprehensive policy would be exempt from the necessity for taking out another third-party insurance policy under the measure. A specific amendment was introduced for this purpose, but unfortunately it has been found that the issue of separate policies is required. In order to honour the promise given to the House on that occasion, and in order not to impose extra stamp duty on the owners of motor vehicles—I think the Leader of the Opposition had something to say on this during his remarks on the Address-in-reply—this Bill has been introduced. While it is compulsory for every owner of a motorcar to take out a third-party risk insurance, on which stamp duty is collected, it is not compulsory for him to take out a comprehensive policy. Under this measure, therefore, those who take out a comprehensive policy which includes third-party risk will get a rebate of the stamp duty that they would have paid this year.

Mr. Watts: Will you give us back our half-crowns?

The PREMIER: I am prepared to listen to a suggestion to that effect, but I do not think many people would bother about it. It is proposed under the amendment that all persons who take out any comprehensive policy, which is optional, in addition to the third-party risk policy, which is compulsory, will be exempt from stamp duty on the comprehensive policy up to an amount of 2s. 6d. which is the duty that the Government would have been paid on the third-party policy. In effect it makes the stamp duty payable on the two policies the same as if they were assessed as one policy.

Mr. Marshall: It means that everyone will have to take out a comprehensive policy in future.

The PREMIER: No; everyone who has a license for a car must take out a third-party risk policy, but we do not insist that such a person must also take out a comprehensive policy. What we say is that if a person does take out a comprehensive policy there will be a rebate of 2s. 6d. in the stamp duty.

Mr. Rodoreda: Does not the comprehensive policy cover the third-party risk?

The PREMIER: That depends upon the arrangement made with the insurance company, but it has nothing to do with the Government. A motorist would probably say to a company, "I have taken out a third-party risk. What rebate do I get on a comprehensive policy?" That is a matter for adjustment between the insurance company that takes the third-party risk and the company that takes the comprehensive risk. In many instances it would be the same company that took both risks. However, that makes no difference to the law, which provides that nobody may get a license for a motor vehicle unless he takes out a third-party risk policy. If he also takes out a comprehensive policy, he will get a rebate of the stamp duty, as I have explained. The member for Nedlands was particularly keen on getting an assurance from the then Minister for Works that double stamp duty would not be charged, and the Government is anxious to give effect to the assurance then given on its behalf, and so the Bill has been introduced for that purpose. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Watts, debate adjourned.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 17th October.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE (in reply) [4.50]: I shall be brief in my reply. Some of the complaints made I consider to be rather shallow and not justified. The member for Pingelly said that if the Bill were passed there would be no check on hasty legislation. I entirely disagree with him and cannot understand his reasoning. If the Bill is passed, there will be ample time for debate and for all investigations that are necessary. The Legislative Assembly will be required to consider legisla-

tion during three successive sessions, and surely in two years there will be ample time to make all necessary inquiries not only in Australia, but throughout the world, into any Bill that might be brought in. On that ground, therefore, the Bill should not be rejected. The member for Pingelly also complained that the effect of the passage of the measure would be to make this Parliament a one-Chamber Parliament. The Bill does not seek to do that; it does not make any provision whatever for the abolition of another place. We must remember that the Legislative Council amends or agrees to many Government and private members' Bills. There is consequently not much force in that argument.

The Bill is designed to allow the passage of progressive legislation which is stubbornly resisted by another place. The legislation that emanates from the popular Chamber is brought forward by the representatives of the greater number of the people of the State. The other Chamber represents less than 25 per cent. of the people who are on the Legislative Assembly roll; and it is obvious that everything will be brought forward to help another Chamber to come to a decision favourable to the legislation brought forward in this Chamber. The other Chamber would probably agree to much of the legislation passed by this Chamber, and it would therefore not be necessary to take away the power of the other Chamber to reject legislation. The Bill should not be rejected on that score. The member for Pingelly also complained that this Bill differs widely from the English Parliament Act of 1911. That is not so. The measures are almost identical. The only difference of note is that this Bill provides for all Bills, whereas the English Act does not.

Another complaint made by the member for Pingelly was that the constitutions of the two Parliaments are entirely different. I point out, however, that the House of Lords is a nominee Chamber, while our Legislative Council is an elective Chamber. As the Legislative Council represents less than 20 per cent. of the people of the State who are eligible to vote, there is but little difference between it and the House of Lords in that respect. It is the principle that we are aiming at; and if this Bill becomes law we shall be on a similar basis. Any money Bill sent to another place a month before the session ends, if not agreed to by the Council, will become law. Any other Bill, if passed by the Legislative Assembly for three successive sessions, even if it be a measure to extend the life of Parliament, will automatically become law if not passed by the Legislative Council. That is exactly what happens in England. We are merely asking to be put on the same basis as our Mother Parliament.

Mr. North: Would a Bill to abolish the other Chamber become law, too?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No. This Bill has nothing to do with the abolition of the other Chamber. There is no intention to abolish it.

Mr. Watts: But if you introduced a Bill to abolish another place, it would have to be passed if rejected three times by another place.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No consideration was given to that point when the Bill was being drafted. However, if that applied to the House of Lords it would apply here also. It was suggested by the member for Pingelly that provision should be made to deal with conferences at the end of the session. No such provision, of course, is made in the Bill. Conferences have not been eliminated, however, and I feel that it is the prerogative of both Houses to call a conference. No such provision is contained in the Parliament Act of 1911, which we are following as closely as possible. It was also contended that if the No. 1 Constitution Bill were not passed, this measure should be held in abeyance for a certain time. That Bill was ignominiously thrown out; it was not even allowed to go to the second reading. But there is no relation whatever between the two Bills, and I feel that that argument was only adduced as an excuse for throwing out this Bill. As that excuse has gone, perhaps no objection will be raised to this Bill on that score. The member for Nedlands made the greatest Tory speech I have heard since I have been in this Chamber.

Opposition Members: Oh!

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: He complained bitterly about the Bill and said that if it were passed there would be social trouble and anarchy. I think the reverse will happen. If this Bill does not become law, what happened in America in 1776 and

in France in 1789 might happen here. The people object to legislation passed by the popular Chamber being swamped by another place.

Mr. McDonald: There is not enough tea now to throw into the harbour.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I feel that the member for Nedlands was not sincere in his opposition to the Bill. Some of his statements were not even facts.

Opposition Members: Oh!

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The hon. member said that Queensland had had a minority Government for years. I took the trouble to telegraph to Queensland to find out the exact position. The figures I have received indicate that the member for Nedlands does not always scruple——

Hon. N. Keenan: Did you get a return in connection with the election of senators for Queensland?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No. I have here the results of elections for the one Chamber—the Assembly—in Queensland. The figures are as follows:—

Year.	Labour.	Non-Labour.	Uncontested Seats. Labour.	Non-Labour.
1932	227,397	224,165	4	1
1935	247,135	215,369	6	1
1938	250,943	281,036	2	1
1941	267,206	252,521	4	1
1944	224,858	278,527	6	1

Mr. Watts: What are you proving?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That the member for Nedlands was wrong in his statement.

Mr. Watts: He was not wrong with regard to the year 1938.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That is only one year. He said "for many years past." In 1944, non-Labour had a majority, but it must be remembered that Labour had six uncontested seats and non-Labour had only one. The only doubtful year was 1938, when probably there was a minority Government.

Hon. N. Keenan: Now tell the House——

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I cannot hear the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Justice will address the Chair.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: If this Bill becomes an Act, this Parliament will be on the same basis as the Parliament of the Old Country. If a money Bill is sent up one month before the end of the session, it will become law; and any Bill other than a money Bill, which is submitted to the Council in three successive sessions and is not approved, will automatically become law also. That principle prevails today in England; the Mother Parliament has adopted it. As for the argument about the swamping of the House of Lords, the Legislative Council has always been swamped against the Labour Party. There is no question of that. Admittedly, there was a bit of trickery, as pointed out by the member for Nedlands, when Asquith wanted to get legislation through that was passed by the House of Commons. There is no need for that so far as the Labour Party in this State is concerned; it has always been swamped. I hope the Bill will become law.

Question put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have counted the House and assured myself that there is an absolute majority of members present. I declare the question duly passed.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; the Minister for Justice in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Definitions:

Mr. SEWARD: I move an amendment—

> That in line 19 of the definition of "Money Bill," after the word "Bill" the following words be inserted:—"and that in this opinion he has the concurrence of the majority of the whole number of the Standing Orders Committees for the time being of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council, which concurrence was obtained at a meeting of the members of such Committees sitting together convened by him for such purpose."

Under the terms of the Bill, the Speaker has to certify that a Bill is a money Bill. The amendment provides that before he can do that he must have the consent or the concurrence of the Standing Orders Committee of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council at a meeting specially called for that purpose. The Minister said that this is an exact copy of the Parliament Act of England. Again I have to tell the Minister that it is not. Subsection (3) of Section 1 of that Act states—

> There shall be endorsed on every money Bill when it is sent up to the House of Lords and when it is presented to His Majesty for assent the certificate of the Speaker of the House of Commons signed by him that it is a

money Bill. Before giving his certificate, the Speaker shall consult, if practicable, two members to be appointed from the Chairman's Panel at the beginning of each session by the Committee of Selection.

The Speaker of the House of Commons is a non-party man. He is not elected just for the term of office of the Party in power. When he is elected, he resigns from his Party and is prohibited from advocating the claims of his electorate while he is Speaker. He is provided with exemption from opposition at elections. So he occupies a different position from the Speaker of this House, who is the nominee of the predominant Party. While I do not say that the Speaker would give a biassed or an unfair opinion, if the question arose whether a Bill was a money Bill or not and it was a Government measure, I suggest the Speaker would lean —unintentionally, perhaps—to the side of the Government. Therefore it behoves us to take extra precautions to ensure that it is definitely established that a Bill is a money Bill. Under this Bill, the Speaker says that a Bill is a money Bill, and that is the end of the matter. Frequently Bills have been submitted which one section of the House considered were not money Bills. That has been decided after consultation and the receipt of legal advice; yet, when submitted, those Bills have been declared to be money Bills. There may be far-reaching effects if provision is not made for something more than a simple certificate from the Speaker. The Chairmen's Panel of the British Parliament comprises the Chairmen of the various Committees of the House of Commons and with that panel the Speaker from time to time consults, as necessity arises—which it does when he has to determine whether a Bill is a money Bill. This provision will take a great responsibility from the shoulders of the Speaker of this House.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It is difficult to understand the reasoning of the hon. member. He proposes to hand over to the Legislative Council part of the power previously exercised by the Speaker. The hon. member wishes the Speaker's position to be made subject to the concurrence of the Standing Orders Committee of both Houses. The amendment is a reflection on this House.

Mr. Watts: I do not think the Minister has read the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That is how I look at it. There is no such provision in the English Act.

Mr. Seward: Yes, there is.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: They do not take power under which they ask the House of Lords to deal with matters that come before the Speaker of the House of Commons. This suggests a slight upon Mr. Speaker.

The Premier: Can you tell me who constitute the Joint Standing Orders Committee?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The members of the Council who comprise the Standing Orders Committee are the President, the Chairman of Committees, the Chief Secretary, Hon. C. F. Baxter and Hon. H. S. W. Parker.

The Premier: They include one Government supporter.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The Assembly members of the Standing Orders Committee are Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Doney, Mr. North and Mr. Withers.

The Premier: There are six to four against.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Independent of the personnel of the Joint Standing Orders Committee, if we were to agree to the amendment we would be acting quite improperly. It would represent a derogation of the prerogative of Mr. Speaker and would be tantamount to a reflection upon this House. I oppose the amendment with all the power that I have.

Mr. WATTS: The Minister appears to expect that Mr. Speaker would, in no circumstances whatever, adopt any party view or fail to do complete justice respecting any proposals that may go before him. On the other hand, both the Minister and the Premier appear to feel that the two members sitting on the Opposition side of the House, who are associated with the Standing Orders Committee of this Chamber, would be prepared to allow party feelings to carry them away in their consideration of whether a Bill was or was not a money Bill. I heard the Premier say by interjection "six to four against."

The Premier: That is right.

Mr. WATTS: Apparently the suggestion is that the member for Claremont and the member for Williams-Narogin would carry their political prejudices so far when considering what is a money Bill, and that their

party bias would lead them so far into the realm of party politics as to lie and vote accordingly.

Mr. North: They might even prove to be radicals!

Mr. WATTS: They are appointed as members of the Standing Orders Committee to uphold the proper prestige and privileges of the Legislative Assembly, and, if I know them aright, they will do so.

The Minister for Justice: Do you think that the Legislative Council members should enter into this?

Mr. WATTS: I think there should be an absolute majority of six out of the ten, and if this is to be regarded as a question of party politics that is what the Minister already has. It seems to me that the amendment represents a fair and reasonable proposition, not because of any resemblance between the British House of Commons and the House of Lords on the one hand and the Parliament of this State on the other. What we are concerned with is the extraordinary idea in this Parliament as to what are money Bills. Let members consider the proposal in the Bill as to what shall be regarded as money Bills! Clause 2 sets out that a money Bill means—

> A public Bill which contains only provisions dealing with all or any of the following subjects, namely, the imposition, repeal, remission, alteration, or regulation of taxation; the imposition for the payment of debt or other financial purposes of charges on the Consolidated Revenue Fund, or on money provided by Parliament, or the variation or repeal of any such charges; supply; the appropriation, receipt, custody, issue, or audit of accounts of public money; the raising or guarantee of any loan or the repayment thereof, or subordinate matters incidental to those subjects or any of them . . .

I wonder where the Legislative Council would stand on a Bill such as that to amend the Crown Suits Act, which was introduced by the member for West Perth and rejected in this House by Mr. Speaker on the ground that it was a money Bill! Are we to be told in future that a Bill of that kind introduced by His Majesty's Government in this State is to be a money Bill, because it seeks to amend that phase of revenue and therefore comes under Clause 2 and not under Clause 4? These are problems that have to be disposed of, not in the nimble and quick-witted way the Minister for Justice would like to dispose of the question of money Bills. He would like us to believe that it is a Bill that seeks directly to raise money by taxation or to spend money raised by loan or in the other directions indicated. But in this House we have so often of late—and I mean also of late years—had rulings that placed aside as money Bills measures that frequently bore but little resemblance to the time-honoured understanding we have had, that it now becomes a question of what really is a money Bill.

There is no member of the Standing Orders Committee of this House who would say that an appropriation Bill or a Bill to impose taxation was not a money Bill. Nor do I think there is any member of the Legislative Council Standing Orders Committee who would say that a Bill that was a money Bill was not, in fact, a money Bill. Even so, only one vote from the Legislative Council members would be required thereby to make up the majority of six out of ten, which is all that the amendment requires. And that would be quite simple, because the Government would have the whole five members of the Standing Orders Committee of this House and only one additional vote from the Legislative Council members would be required to make the Standing Order effective. It would be easy then to say this Bill would come under Clause 4. If we do not safeguard the position as suggested, we shall certainly have certificates granted in future times—and it must be remembered that the Bill, if passed, will apply for a very long period—in respect of Bills that are in fact no more money Bills than you are, Mr. Chairman. I suggest to the Minister that he should view the amendment in a different light and regard it as a genuine attempt to produce a Bill that we shall be prepared to support, and which may ultimately straighten up and bring into proper perspective the relationship that should exist between the two Houses of Parliament. If he does not subscribe to that principle, he will deserve for his legislation the fate that he does not wish it to experience.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: This amendment demonstrates the depths of the convictions of this huge democratic party! It added the word "democratic" to its title and that is where it stays—as a title, not as a conviction that the people's rights shall prevail in the matters of expenditure and taxation. Who carries the burden of expenditure and taxation? The ordinary masses of the community, not the property class! It

is not the latter that pays the major portion of the income taxation. The major proportion is paid by the workers and the middle class, not those who are usually looked upon as gracing the Legislative Council. It is not in accordance with democratic ideals that, with regard to a Bill of this description, this Chamber must go to another place to decide whether this House knows its work. What right has any member to reflect upon the capacity of this Chamber and upon the honesty of its declarations? It is this House that is charged with the responsibility of deciding what is a money Bill and which has to give an account of itself to the people of the State. The other House has no responsibility in that regard at all. Nevertheless it is seriously suggested in the amendment that we shall not consult anybody inside the people's Chamber but that we must, before we determine what is a money Bill, go to another place to consult some of its representatives. I resent an amendment of this description as one trifling with a big principle. The member for Pingelly was able to draw attention to only one detail of difference.

Mr. Seward: That is all we are dealing with.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: What is the difference? It is purely the administrative methods of the House of Commons compared with those of this House. If we had a parliamentary organisation existing inside this Chamber similar to that which obtains in the House of Commons, we might be able to introduce something of the same kind availed of in the House of Commons; but we have no such organisation to which to appeal. We have not similar committees functioning. If we had such committees functioning, we could adopt something along the lines suggested. We have no panel of chairmen of committees such as obtains in the House of Commons. Here we have only the Chairman of Committees and his deputies. In the circumstances, it would not be expected that those members should be consulted. Because there is a limitation upon the rights of members to impose a burden on the State, is there any likelihood of a narrow interpretation of what, under the provisions of the Constitution Act, is a money Bill? That is a slight upon this House. Yet the Leader of the Opposition advanced that as a reason for getting away from the democratic system of giving to the people the right of protecting the public purse—and the purse belongs to the people, not to the privileged property class. The latter does not contribute to the public funds in proportion to the contribution of the common people. It is because of the right of the common people to call the tune in matters of this description that the Bill has been introduced. If we have any democratic tendencies in our composition, and if we are really sincere in our desire to respect the people's judgment and to grant the people the rights that are theirs, then we should be ashamed to introduce an amendment of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not reflect upon any other hon. member.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is so, but they reflect upon me when they suggest that I am not capable of doing what is required of me in this Chamber.

Mr. Seward: You are not the Speaker!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: They want to consult their friends in another place, and yet they prate to me about being democratic. I resent it. This Chamber should shoulder its own responsibilities. It knows its work with regard to declaring the position regarding money Bills. It is just as capable as the House of Commons—no more, and no less. The amendment is a reflection on the Chamber that represents the people.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The Bill is stated to be a copy of the Parliament Act, 1911, of the United Kingdom; and that is correctly stated so far as the main provision is concerned. But the Speaker of the House of Commons holds an extraordinary position in the parliamentary world. He is a person selected by the whole House to uphold the position, with the clear intent that so long as he chooses to occupy it and his competency in the Chair is not challenged, he shall retain the position. He is never opposed in his constituency, and never takes part in any party question.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: He has to be re-elected regularly.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The Speaker of the House of Commons holds an exceptional position and is an exceptional man. He is the most impartial judge one could ask for. Even then the House of Commons takes precautions. In other words, the Speaker, in order that he may certify a Bill to be a money Bill, has to have the concurrence of two of the bodies of Chairmen which are

elected by the House. That body is a collection from all parties. We are not in a position to repeat that position here, as we have no body of Chairmen. In our House the Speaker must entirely be a party man. But that is irrelevant to the position in the Imperial Parliament. If the argument of the Leader of the Opposition were very convincing, the definition which the Bill provides for a money Bill is of such a wide character that it intensifies the difficulties of the position. The definition clause means almost anything. It is made compulsory on the Speaker to decide whether a Bill is a money Bill or not a money Bill. The definition clause would make the position of Speaker a most invidious one. What view might be taken of a Speaker's decision in circumstances of political excitement? The Minister should give this matter his consideration, because the Bill can be condemned very easily by his taking up such an attitude as the amendment indicates.

The PREMIER: I do not agree with the contentions of the Leader of the Opposition. Every single thing that has to be decided by this Chamber in regard to the Standing Orders or rulings, has to be decided by the Speaker; and if the House agrees with the decision of the Speaker, or if the Speaker's ruling is disagreed to, the House has to take the responsibility. On the other hand, in New South Wales the Speaker is responsible at law for any ruling he may give which infringes the rights of members.

Hon. N. Keenan: Do you mean, personally responsible?

The PREMIER: Yes. The Speaker of the New South Wales Parliament has been sued at law for giving a ruling which infringes the rights of Parliament. I do not know how such a law would operate here: the position has never arisen. I remember many decisions given by Speakers which have been against the interests of the Party with which he was allied. Our Speakers have not given party decisions in the sense of decisions which give an advantage to the Party to which they belong. But the proposed amendment to an extent impugns the impartiality of our Speakers. Generally, when the Speaker gives a ruling and the House accepts it, that is an end of the matter. The House can at any time take charge of its own business, and the method of dealing with it. When the Speaker reads out a message from the Legislative Council disagreeing to a Bill, then a motion can be moved that the Bill is a money Bill. It is not in my recollection that there has been any soreness or doubt in the minds of the people as to the opinion expressed by the Speaker being honestly in his judgment correct and right.

On the other hand, members of the Legislative Council frequently vote against our measures because those members are anti-Labour, though they may call themselves Independents. Whether they are of a Party or not I do not know. To me the assertion that they are non-party is mythical, because it is not borne out by the facts. I would sooner trust to the impartiality which has always been observed by the Speaker than I would to people who constitute the various Parties in this Parliament. The Speaker has always endeavoured to give an impartial ruling. It has been said that Speakers' rulings have been governed more by impartiality than by their judgment of the facts. The Speaker informs himself on decisions obtained from "May" and other authorities, and from the officials of the House. His rulings are generally given, I think, after consultation with officers of the House if there is any doubt about them. Rulings are sought and given on procedure that has been laid down for hundreds of years. I feel that we would be breaking away from that tradition which has been so worthily upheld by various Speakers in the past if we adopted the suggestion now before the Committee.

Speakers' rulings have been given on expressions of judgment which have been upheld by the procedure that has been adopted all down the years. We can, of course, object to these rulings if we like. I should be sorry to think it could be suggested that because the Speaker happens to have been nominated by the Government Party—that seems to have been the procedure here for some years past—he becomes a violent Party member. I do not think that can be said of Speakers of this House. I am also sorry that there should be the reflection, which I think is contained in the amendment, that the Speaker's judgment is not impartial and cannot be relied upon. If it is required to refer to a Standing Orders Committee it should

be the Committee of this House. Should there be any question of partiality shown by the Speaker that point could be properly debated in this Chamber, but I do not think we have reached such a stage as that in our Parliament. I am sorry there should have been this reflection upon the Speaker, and that there should be a suggestion of referring his decisions to a body part of which is not asssociated with this House.

If there were 10 members on the Joint Standing Orders Committee, and five were ranged on one side and five on the other, what would be the position? The ruling given by the Speaker would probably stand. We must have an official authority, and what better person could we have than the Speaker who is elected by the members of this House? The whole tradition of the office is that the Speaker shall be a non-Party man. He is not made a non-Party man in this Parliament but he acts as such. The amendent should not be agreed to.

Mr. DONEY: The Premier's views are interesting, but they are wide of the mark. He has gone to some trouble to foist upon us the view that the Speaker is considered by us to be a partial Speaker. There is no such intention on our part, nor can it be read into the wording of the amendment nor assumed from the speeches delivered from this side of the House. There has been no attempt to reflect upon the Speaker when constitutional questions arise. What is suggested, however, is that the Speaker may be guilty of an error of judgment, and it is to meet such a case that the amendment has been brought down. The Premier has said that we are guilty of suggesting that the Speaker may be involuntarily a Party man. No such idea has ever crossed our minds. We have at times disagreed with the Speaker's ruling but we have never regarded him as unconsciously partial. I know of no Speaker of this House whose word has been accepted with greater readiness than has been the case with the present occupant of the position. It should not be urged that we wish in any way to impugn the honour of the Speaker. The strictures of the Premier might well have been directed towards the Minister for Justice, who referred in rather a slighting way to members on this side of the Chamber, namely the member for Claremont and myself. He suggested that we two might be guilty of Party feelings in coming to a decision. Apparently he exonerated members of his own Party from any attitude of that kind.

The Minister for Justice: I am sorry you have taken that view of my remarks.

Mr. DONEY: I am sure the Minister now realises he should not have said what he did. He knows that we can be relied upon to adopt a decent attitude in dealing with any question.

The Minister for Justice: My objection was to the Legislative Council.

Mr. DONEY: It is too late for the Minister to reconstruct his speech.

The Minister for Justice: I have no desire to do so.

Mr. DONEY: The Minister is now saying what he intended to say, but I am not taking much notice of his remarks. The Premier said we were the masters of our own destiny and that on no occasion was there any need to call for assistance from another place. We think, however, it is desirable that we should meet the objection of the Premier and I therefore propose to move an amendment that I hope will be acceptable to him. I move—

> That the amendment be amended by striking out, in lines 5 and 6, the words "and the Legislative Council."

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I have no objection to the amendment on the amendment. Apparently it means that the decisions of the Speaker will be subject to the Standing Orders Committee of the Legislative Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: I accept the amendment on the assurance that a further amendment will be made at a later stage.

Mr. Doney: I propose to move a further amendment later.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am glad the Minister has accepted the amendment on the amendment, because it will bring the amendment more into line with House of Commons procedure. The amendment in its entirety brought in matters outside the influence of this Chamber. It is because I protect the people against encroachments of that kind that I run foul so frequently of the member for Nedlands. His ideas and those of the people of Nedlands are at variance with those of the people of Midland. The hon. member cannot expect me to subscribe to his political beliefs. The objectionable feature of the amendment has been removed.

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

Mr. DONEY: I wish to move an amendment to delete the letter "s" from the word "Committees" where it last occurs in the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should move to delete the letter "s" from the word "Committees" where it occurs earlier.

Mr. DONEY: Very well.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest that we make the deletion of the letter "s" a consequential amendment in each case. I now call upon the member for Williams-Narrogin to move whatever further amendment he wishes.

Mr. DONEY: I move—

> That the amendment, as amended, be further amended by striking out the words "sitting together."

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

Mr. McDONALD: I wish to ask the Minister whether the amendment, as now amended, is acceptable to him.

The Minister for Justice: Yes.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not know whether we want to include the words "by him." We do not want those words unless the clause mentions the Speaker.

Mr. Watts: It does.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. SEWARD: I move an amendment—

> That at the end of the clause the following definition be added:—"'Representative Vote' means a vote of the members of a joint sitting of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council whereat each member of the Legislative Assembly is allowed a number of votes equal to the number of persons enrolled at the date of the last preceding general election of members of the Legislative Assembly for the district he represents, and each member of the Legislative Council is allowed a number of votes equal to the whole number nearest to one-third of the number of persons enrolled at the date of the last preceding general election for members of the Legislative Council for the province he represents."

In order to explain this amendment, I shall deal with a later amendment which provides for this representative vote to be exercised. The Bill makes provision in a subsequent clause that when a Bill has passed this Chamber and has been referred to the Legislative Council for three sessions, and the Council insists on making amendments to the Bill that are not acceptable to this House, it can be sent to the Governor for his assent. This amendment proposes, instead of that procedure, that after a Bill has been passed by the Assembly and sent to the Council and rejected by the Legislative Council, the President of the Legislative Council may, and shall at the request of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, forthwith convene a joint sitting, and he shall there submit to the vote of the members present the said Bill in the form in which it was last received by the Legislative Council from the Legislative Assembly. If there is a majority upon the representative vote in favour of the Bill, it shall be deemed to have been passed by both Houses of the Legislature, and thereupon presented to His Majesty and become an Act of Parliament on the Royal Assent being signified thereto.

The idea of this is to do away with the necessity of having to send a Bill to the Council and having it rejected in three different sessions before it can become law. This is also another means of overcoming the present disagreements which exist between the two Houses and for which there is no adequate solution. It is proposed that when a joint sitting is called the Assembly members shall exercise a vote in proportion to the number of constituents of their electorates, and the members of the Legislative Council shall exercise a vote equal to one-third of the number of constituents of their electorates. If each Council member were given a vote for all of his constituents, he would have three times the voting power of an Assembly member. That would mean that the member for Canning might exercise a vote equal to 13,151, which is the number on his roll at the last preceding general election; the member for Middle Swan, 10,351; the member for Mt. Hawthorn, 12,395; the member for Nedlands, 13,433; the member for Gascoyne, 949; the member for Kimberley, 590; the member for Pilbara, 812; and the member for Roebourne, 492. The member for Guildford-Midland, the outstanding upholder of democracy, cannot find fault with this. He cannot call the Assembly a democratically elected House, because he has one vote and so has the member for Roebourne, and yet there is a difference of thousands in the number of constituents in those two electorates. If this amendment is carried, each member will exercise a vote in accordance with the number of electors he represents.

The Minister for Mines: Is this a new definition?

Mr. SEWARD: Yes.

The Premier: Could not we put the definition in afterwards?

Mr. SEWARD: I do not think the Chairman would allow us to come back to this clause. The amendment simply provides for a joint sitting where each member would be called upon to record a vote, not as one individual as the position is at present where the member for Pilbara represents only 490 and the member for Nedlands 13,000.

The Premier: But if we do not pass the other clause and this is already put in the Bill, how do we get on?

Mr. Watts: You will have to take legal action.

Mr. SEWARD: The matter would be decided on this amendment.

The Premier: It ought to be decided on the principle you advocate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Pingelly may proceed.

Mr. SEWARD: This definition provides for a representative vote in the way I have described, and a later amendment provides that once a Bill is rejected by the Council, the President may, or if he is asked by the Speaker shall, call a joint sitting to decide the fate of that particular Bill.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: This is a peculiar amendment to come from a country member. It means that he wishes to give the voting power to the metropolitan representatives. Had the amendment come from a metropolitan member, I could have understood it. This amendment would mean that the member for Nedlands would have 13,000 votes against a few hundred in the case of a North-West member. The country member would not do very well. I should say the amendment would be gladly accepted by metropolitan members. The definition of "representative vote" was taken from Mr. T. J. Hughes's Bill, and he represented a metropolitan electorate. This is a wide departure from the English Act. This would damn, as it were, the effect of this Bill.

Mr. Doney: Do you not agree that this is wholly democratic?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No. If the hon. member wants something democratic, I am surprised that he seeks to penalise his own constituents in favour of those in the metropolitan area. This amendment has no counterpart in any Act in the British Empire that I know of. It would alter the whole system of Parliamentary voting.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I was pointing out that the amendment would nullify the meaning and objective of the Bill. Evidently the mover did not give due consideration to the effect it would have on country electorates. He proposes that each member should have as many votes as there are electors in his district. I strongly oppose the amendment.

Mr. WATTS: The Minister for Justice started on wrong premises and therefore arrived at the wrong conclusion. He alleges that the amendment would have some serious and unpleasant effect on the representation of country electorates, of which he represents one and I represent another, but he has lost sight of a fundamental fact. This representative vote would have no effect until this House, by the ordinary methods of voting, had decided what it wanted in regard to the Bill in question. The representative vote would not take place until this House had exhausted every avenue of dealing with the measure. It would have passed the Bill, with or without amendment, on the ordinary voting which we exercise every day—a vote taken according to the ordinary representation of every elector in the State.

The Bill would then go to the Council and the Council, if it made amendments, would send them back to the Assembly. Again, on the same system we now employ we would deal with the amendments. The Minister would indicate that he agreed to some and disagreed to others and, by the ordinary methods of voting, we would decide to accept or reject the Council's amendments. The Bill would be returned to the Council, and then the time would be approaching when the procedure laid down in the amendment would operate. Under the present system, the Council might refuse to accept the Bill without the amendments it had previously made. We would draw up reasons for disagreeing and later would appoint managers and hold a conference, which would last nobody knows how long and might or might not achieve results. In many instances a conference achieves no results; the managers report that they have failed to reach an agreement and the Bill goes out.

At this stage the procedure in the amendment would come into operation. The ordinary procedure would have been adopted through all the stages up to the time when reasons had to be given for our disagreement, and the Speaker could require that a joint sitting of both Houses be held in order that the deadlock between the Houses might be ended, not by an abortive conference or a delay of two or three years, but by a representative vote—a vote that would give a sort of shadow referendum of the people. The member for Canning representing 13,000 electors would give a verdict representing their full number in the House. The member for Roebourne, who represents about 495 electors, would be in a similar position. But the rights we already possess and the votes we already possess as representing our constituents, irrespective of the thousands or dozens a member may represent, would not be lost to us. We would have exercised those rights and votes through every stage of the measure.

All we desire is to put an end to the deadlocks; we want to remove the necessity for these unproductive conferences. We want to put a period to a state of affairs which, I believe, every member considers to be unsatisfactory. So, instead of having the one House insisting to the last ditch as against the other House, we submit the question to a vote that takes into account the number of electors represented by each member. The only difficulty I see in carrying out the proposed procedure at that stage is that which would be experienced by the Clerk of the House in adding up the votes.

The Premier: What about the number of people on the roll?

Mr. WATTS: That could be easily ascertained from a return supplied by the Chief Electoral Officer.

The Premier: The rolls might not be up to date.

Mr. WATTS: The Chief Electoral Officer would take the latest roll. I wish the procedure to be as simple as possible, and the only difficulty I foresee is that the Clerk of the House would have to do some arithmetic. That responsibility would soon be met. Consequently the argument of the Minister is worth very little indeed. It shows how weak his position must be when he had to suggest that the proposal would prevent the various centres of the State from having the benefit of their proper representation because, as I have pointed out, this procedure would come into operation only after the ordinary process now adopted had been exhausted. All the Minister's difficulties are nebulous, and are trotted forward to try to make the mover of the amendment think that he is in a difficult position, whereas in fact he is in nothing of the kind.

Mr. McDONALD: In speaking on the former constitutional Bill I said I was prepared to support some means by which future deadlocks between the two Houses could be resolved. The way to resolve such a conflict can consist of various expedients. In New South Wales it is provided that if a Bill is passed twice by the lower House and twice rejected by the upper House, then a joint sitting of the two Houses may be held. Apparently the joint sitting is not mandatory, alternatives being provided by the New South Wales Act. One alternative is that the Legislative Assembly may be dissolved and that, if a Bill in the same form is submitted to the next succeeding Assembly and again sent to the Legislative Council and there rejected, then the Bill may become law. The problem should be solved in some reasonable way, and I am quite prepared to accept the solution offered by the member for Pingelly. The hon. member's solution could be an optional solution, side by side with the methods by which a Bill three times rejected, automatically becomes law if in the meantime a dissolution of the Legislative Assembly has occurred.

The solution of the member for Pingelly certainly offers an expeditious way of arriving at a final solution. The card system used by the Trade Union Conference of Britain has the endorsement of the British Labour Party and also that of the Australian trade union movement. The principle of the representative or card vote is, therefore, a Labour doctrine. Let us be content to have got that far. Having very definitely got that far, there are things to be considered. What possible objections can there be to applying that system here? I see none. If we are to have a speedy solution of deadlocks, then this system seems to me to offer the very solution for which we are looking. The Bill takes the Legislative Council as it stands today. The members of this Committee have been invited to apply some method of resolving differences between the Houses.

The member for Pingelly suggests a method which has been hallowed, endorsed and rendered almost infallible by the practice of very responsible bodies operating in the industrial world. I cannot see anything fairer than that.

The procedure is one which ought to be accepted by the Committee as a means of meeting the particular difficulty which may arise from time to time between the two Houses. I hardly know of any Bill which has been rejected outright, except the recent Bill—which perhaps I am not permitted to mention—dealing with the constitution of the Legislative Council. Otherwise, in the long history of the relations between the two Houses, it seems to me that there has been very nearly 100 per cent. of acceptance of the legislation brought forward from this House. The net result is that the Legislative Council has agreed in the past to industrial legislation which we in this State proudly acclaim places our State in the forefront of countries as regards the industrial conditions under which our people live.

Mr. J. Hegney: We have gone behind a little.

Mr. McDONALD: I read a statement in the Press recently by an eminent gentleman of the same political faith as my friend, in which he said that Australia led the world in the industrial conditions of the people. I presume he spoke with a due sense of responsibility.

Mr. Fox: If you let yourself go a little, we will get ahead further.

Mr. McDONALD: Do not let us dismiss this amendment lightly merely because it does not accord with the ideas of the Minister. I am prepared to give it my support as one means of meeting the difficulty.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: I have often thought that if a vote were taken the member for West Perth would be accorded the Sandover medal for the best all-round player. I see difficulties in the amendment. I can see the member for Pingelly facing his constituents and asking for a mandate in respect of the amendment, and explaining to them that he will have only one-fifth of the vote of the member for Nedlands. Then he will have to explain where Nedlands is situated. I speak out of pure modesty. I represent a populous constituency. Next to the member for Nedlands, I received the highest number of votes in the recent election. This was not due to my superiority; I was fortunate in my opponent and I was elected on the understanding that my vote would be one-fiftieth of the whole. I would like to see the Democratic Party go to the country on this point. It would take some ingenuity to explain the matter and it would be necessary to get legal and other advice in order to justify the Party's action. I cannot believe that the member for Pingelly is serious. I can always believe that the member for Williams-Narrogin is serious, but he is of a different type.

The amendment is put up as a good trade union principle, but the Labour Party does not apply the principle in that way. My opinion is that we had better keep the Houses separate. I cannot think of any scheme which could be devised that would make a decision representative of either place when the votes are mixed up in a sort of egg-beater fashion. As far as the card vote is concerned, we have never declared that every vote in this State is of equal value. The difference in the density of population in a State of our dimensions has made it the policy of all parties to recognise that those distant from the seat of government are entitled to a greater share of representation than those in the metropolitan area. That is the policy of Western Australia; that is what we have been elected on. Now it is proposed to alter that, without any authorisation. The card vote ceases when it is taken in this House, and difficulty arises on an attempt being made to apportion the vote that should be given to members of another place who are elected on a restricted franchise, when mixed up with members of this House who are elected on a full franchise. The card vote does not work out with our constitution and cannot be made to associate with the constitution on which we are elected. No one here has any authority to bring in such an amendment as this or to vote for it. In doing so, members would be turning down their constituents. It would be a mean, contemptible thing for me to declare that my vote was worth that of half-a-dozen of my fellow members.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The card vote has a number of virtues; but this is not the card vote, although the Premier—in a jocular way—said it was. The card vote is to ensure responsibility and full representa-

tion. It is used only in very exceptional circumstances, when a change is being made in special features of the policy of the Labour movement. In order to ensure that that change or the carrying out of some advanced idea is endorsed by the majority of the rank and file of the Labour movement, delegates accept the responsibility of declaring their vote, not as individuals but as representatives of the total membership of the particular organisation. The usually staid, serious and matter-of-fact member for West Perth, if he has said anything, has recommended to the Labour movement that it bring in the Employers' Federation to assist it in arriving at Labour policy.

Mr. McDonald: A very good idea!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Of course, that is what the hon. member believes in: that the Employers' Federation should have a voice in deciding and framing the workers' policy.

Mr. McDonald: And vice versa!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: This proposal has nothing to do with the card vote. If it were a card vote comparable with the Labour card vote, the vote would be taken in this Chamber. We represent one section of the people; though it is true we do not all represent the same political faith. In the Labour movement, where the card vote is used, the members are all of the one political faith. They would not be there unless they declared their belief in the rights of Labour and the privilege of Labour to declare what organised Labour stands for. We could not have anybody else inside the movement but those who believe in the policy of the movement upon which important decisions are made. But the member for Pingelly seriously suggests that the opinions of the workers, expressed by members of this House elected on an adult franchise basis, will mix with the opinions of those elected on a property qualification basis. How can they mix at all? They could never be brought together any more than we could do what the member for West Perth suggests; namely, bring in the Employers' Federation in consultation with Trades Hall in regard to the policy of the Labour movement.

Mr. McDonald: I never suggested that.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Unless the hon. member suggested that, his remarks have no point with regard to this amendment.

Mr. McDonald: I did not mention it; you did.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Of course the hon. member did not; but he supports this amendment, and says it is right to bring in the House of property and privilege to consult with this House on a question initiated by the people's Chamber.

Mr. Seward: That cannot be avoided. The Bill has to be sent there.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We cannot avoid the Employers' Federation making a declaration in regard to trade union policy.

Mr. Seward: There is no analogy.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: But we do not bring them in to frame trade union policy. The member for West Perth said it was right to bring in the property Chamber to help frame the policy of the people, and because he believes in the card vote and got the idea from the Labour movement, the inference is that we must bring in the Employers' Federation to assist us in arriving at what is best for the Labour movement.

Mr. McDonald: I did not mention the Employers' Federation.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: What other inference can be drawn? If the hon. member believes it is right to bring in the other side of politics to make a decision on a political question, nothing else can be inferred than that the other side should be brought in to arrive at what is best for the trade union movement. But the Employers' Federation and the trade union movement are as wide apart as the poles; they are the very antithesis of each other.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: We all own property here.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We cannot have equality of voting strength in the whole 50 constituencies represented in this House—that is rendered impossible by the magnitude of the State—and other factors must be taken into consideration when arriving at just and equitable representation. While it is true that remote areas, over the years, have had special representation, which has never been questioned by the people of the State, the member for Pingelly brings this point in now as a political issue, that the member for Nedlands would have four times the vote of the member for Pingelly. We cannot support an amendment of this kind. It is one of those will-o'-the-wisp things that the hon. member thinks out in his leisure

moments. Country members who live in the city away from their homes go into questions of this kind. This shows how they can manufacture stuff for debate here. When we were dealing with the question of proper representation in the other place there was not much anxiety, but now that the question of vested interests arises members opposite resort to all means to bring the measure into ridicule by amendments of this sort.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The only comment I wish to make on all that has been said by the member for Guildford-Midland is that although I have tried hard to attach his remarks to the subject-matter of the amendment I find they have been wholly irrelevant. This is a very simple amendment and has a very direct purpose.

Mr. J. Hegney: And is very innocuous, I suppose.

Hon. N. KEENAN: No, it is the opposite. This is not an innocuous amendment. It is a praiseworthy one and is designed to avoid the differences between the two Houses which, under the measure, if it is adopted, must last for two years. It only relates, of course, to Bills other than money Bills. In those circumstances it proposes that if the two Houses cannot agree they shall meet and vote on the question on the card system. In other words they shall, as the member for Guildford-Midland said, be agents for their electors. Each member would vote in accordance with the number of electors he represented. That principle is not new in the industrial world or in other worlds. It has worked with great success in England. Its object is to prevent some small number having disproportionate voting power. I understand that in England the Railway Workers' Union is a colossal union. If at a trades union council meeting it meets a small union the two bodies rate the same when a normal question is discussed, but when important matters are being determined the unions vote according to their membership numbers. That is what applies here.

Instead of the two Houses coming to a deadlock it is proposed that they shall have a vote and that the vote shall be given effect to. It is a vote of the people because members would vote according to the number of electors they are agents for. It is, in some sense, a referendum taken through the agency of members. The member for Pingelly has thrown into his teeth the fact that his electorate is only a quarter the size of that of the member for Canning or the one I represent. But the hon. member does not enter into the question from that point of view, but claims that he is the agent of 4,000 electors, or whatever the number is, and I am the agent for 13,000 odd. Could anything be more democratic? We are very fond of talking about democracy but the moment it does not suit our purpose it is thrown out of the window. Here it is thrown out at once. There is no occasion when it could be invoked with greater or more beneficial effect.

This is only a definition amendment. It does not seek to insert in the Bill the particular clause that I have spoken about, but it is necessary if the clause is afterwards inserted. We have discussed on this amendment, with the leave of the Chairman, the merits of the clause which will be moved afterwards. When that clause is moved we shall not repeat ourselves. It will be determined on the result we arrive at in discussing this particular amendment. This provides a solution of what has been a great trouble between the two Houses for many years, namely, when the managers who are appointed fail to agree. It has been necessary, up till now, either to drop the Bill or to have some ridiculous and objectionable compromise. Here we shall have a decision that will be given effect to. It will be recorded on the vote of the electors of the State. Surely no-one in this House will object to it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The fatal weakness in this proposition is that it is most undemocratic! The member in the Legislative Assembly can truly be said to represent an individual elector, but the franchise of the Legislative Council is such that an elector may be on a number of rolls, so that when a Legislative Councillor exercises his vote he may be exercising it for an elector being also represented by someone else. We would have the position that a representative in the Legislative Assembly would give one vote only for an elector, and he could not give any more, but representatives of the Legislative Council collectively could conceivably give 10 votes for each individual elector on the Legislative Council rolls. Any proposition heavily weighted in the way this is savours of the dark ages instead of a democratic age. That

should be sufficient to bring about the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I consider that the amendment seeks to draw a red herring across the trail in that it diverts members' minds from the actual position that the Bill is designed to obviate. In main principles the Bill largely follows the English Parliament Act. The measure proposes to ensure that if a Bill be passed on a certain number of occasions within a certain period and is rejected by another place, it will automatically become law. That would put the Council on much the same basis as the House of Lords in the matter of the powers it might exercise. This is a subtle amendment without any savouring of democracy that I can detect. Apart from the point made by the Minister for Education, I say that, despite the continued protestations of members of another place and of some members here that the Council is entirely impartial, that is wrong. In my opinion the Council is absolutely partial; it is purely and simply a party House.

Under the amendment, Assembly members would represent a constituent once, but Council members would be the means of some electors being represented three times, and on a restricted franchise. The approximate number of electors on the Council rolls is 86,000, so that members of the Council would exercise a vote representing possibly 258,000 electors. On the Assembly roll there are 275,000 electors, and so many of those on the Assembly roll would not be represented by the Council vote. This Chamber need make no apology as regards its representation of the people. It is elected on adult franchise, whereas another place is elected on a privileged or restricted franchise. I cannot believe that the mover of the amendment is serious. I certainly hope that the amendment will be defeated and that the Bill will receive endorsement. Then when it is sent to another place, we shall see whether the Council is democratic enough to place that House on practically the same basis as the House of Lords.

Amendment on amendment put and negatived.

Clause (as previously amended) put and passed.

Clause 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Enactment of legislation by joint sitting or by Legislative Assembly alone:

Mr. SEWARD: I move an amendment—

> That in line 3 of paragraph (1) of proposed new Section 2A the words "one month" be struck out with a view to inserting the words "two months."

One month would be hardly sufficient time to permit of an important Bill—I presume such Bills would be important—receiving proper consideration by the Council.

The Minister for Mines: Not if it knocks off as early as it is doing these days, instead of sitting after tea.

Mr. SEWARD: At the end of the session we have Bills being returned with amendments made by the Council and there is no time to print the amendments. When we deal with the amendments they are read out, and it is difficult to follow what is proposed when they are not in print before us. It is not unreasonable to ask the Government to make the period two months to ensure that such Bills will receive adequate consideration. The Council might not be busily engaged during the early part of the session because it has to wait for Bills to arrive from this House. Later in the session, however, the Council is very busy because, by that time, the more contentious Bills are before it. In my opinion, the period should certainly be extended.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: We have a population of less than half a million people. England has a population of 44,000,000 people and its legislation is at least as important as ours. Yet in England the period stipulated is only one month. If that is sufficient time for the Mother of Parliaments, it is enough for us. Money Bills may not be introduced in or amended by the Council. They have to originate in this House, and there is ample time for the Council to discuss them. If the Council is not satisfied with them, it may reject them. The proposal in the Bill would give the Council ample time to debate a measure. If we provided for two months, it might be difficult to get measures to the Council in time and they might have to be held over for 12 months. What is good enough for the Mother of Parliaments should be good enough for this Legislature.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The proposed subsection provides that the Upper House shall have the right to look at a Bill for a month. The member for Pingelly wishes to

remove the present ridiculous position by allowing another place two months, without its being able to touch the measure—even to amend a comma. Let us not have this pretence of sending the Bill up to another place for a month's delay; let us clothe the move with a cloak of decency and propose two months.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	27
Majority against ..	13

AYES.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. North
Mr. Hill	Mr. Seward
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Leslie	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Mann	Mr. Watts
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Willmott
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Doney
	(*Teller.*)

NOES.

Mr. Berry	Mr. Needham
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Cross	Mr. Owen
Mr. Fox	Mr. Panton
Mr. Graham	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Smith
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Styants
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Telfer
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Holman	Mr. Triat
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Wise
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Millington	(*Teller.*)

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. WATTS: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of paragraph (ii), after the word "any," the word "public" be inserted.

In the British Act private Bills are not included. Private Bills are as a rule not part of any Government's policy. They are usually intended to serve private interests which, by the Standing Orders, are subject to severe restriction.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I see no reason why if a public Bill when introduced is to be subject to this measure, a private Bill should not be. From the inception of responsible government in Western Australia only 32 private Bills have been introduced, as against 1,208 public Bills, exclusive of amendment Bills. If we are to send public Bills up to the Legislative Council, I see no reason why private Bills, some of which may be highly important, should not be dealt with similarly. Private Bills can also be introduced by Governments; and, similarly, a private member can introduce a Government measure provided it does not affect the finances of the State.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. WATTS: I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of paragraph (ii), after the word "years," the words "or a Bill to amend the Constitution Act, 1889, or this Act, or a Bill by which any change in the Constitution of the Legislative Council or of the Legislative Assembly shall be effected" be inserted.

The Minister for Justice has already disclaimed any intention of using this measure as a means to obliterate the second Chamber; but unless he accepts this amendment he will be making the Bill an engine for that purpose: because—as this Bill itself amends the Constitution—unless these provisions are excluded the Constitution Act will then permit of the Constitution being amended without the concurrence of the second Chamber, and therefore will ultimately admit of a measure being passed to amend the Constitution by abolishing that Chamber under the provisions of this Bill. I indicate to the Minister that that is not his intention. In consequence, it is necessary to insert in the clause some such words as these.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The provision sought to be amended is in accordance with the English Parliament Act of 1911.

Mr. Watts: How can it be? England has no Constitution Act.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: So far, there has been no alteration in the law whereby the House of Lords could be abolished. We are really left to the mercy of the Legislative Council, as any amendment can be thrown out by that Chamber. Even the member for Subiaco recently introduced a Bill to provide that clergymen be allowed to stand for election to Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Minister that it is not permissible to refer to any previous discussion on that measure in the same session. It is not a question before the Chair at the moment.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: I oppose the amendment.

Mr. McDONALD: I suggest the Minister would be well advised to accept the amendment. This is not a measure to abolish the Legislative Council. If that Chamber is to be abolished, the matter should be the sub-

ject of a direct measure here, but this Bill pre-supposes the continued existence of the Legislative Council, because it provides means for resolving difficulties between the two Houses. If the Bill remains as it stands, then on passing a Bill for the requisite number of times this House could do anything; it could even abolish the other Chamber. It has only one limitation, which is that it cannot extend its own term beyond three years without the consent of the Legislative Council. Otherwise this House, by passing the Bill three times, could amend our Constitution in any way it thinks fit, and that is something which requires much more authority than Parliament possesses. I suggest very strongly that we have no authority from the people to affect, in the way now proposed, the Constitution under which they have lived for 50 odd years.

The Minister does not suggest that there is any intention of using the powers under this Bill to create one-Chamber legislation in this State, yet he brings in a Bill under which that can be done. If it is desired to have in this Bill power to abolish the Legislative Council, that should be made clear to the people, and it has not been made clear. If the Bill is brought in with the idea that sooner or later it may be used to abolish the Upper Chamber, the people should have time to express an opinion and so guide this House; but in the absence of that, there can be no possible objection to the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition and every possible argument in favour of it, if we are to be honest with ourselves and the people we represent. I am not certain that the term "Constitution Act, 1889," would include the amending Act of 1899, which contains a number of very important constitutional provisions. I therefore move—

> That the amendment be amended by inserting after the figures "1889" the words "and the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899."

Amendment on amendment put and passed.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	25
Majority against	11

AYES.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. North
Mr. Hill	Mr. Seward
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Leslie	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Mann	Mr. Watts
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Willmott
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Doney
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Berry	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Needham
Mr. Cross	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Fox	Mr. Owen
Mr. Graham	Mr. Panton
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Smith
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Telfer
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Holman	Mr. Triat
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Leahy	*(Teller.)*

Amendment, as amended, thus negatived.

Mr. McDONALD: I move an amendment—

> That in line 4 of paragraph (ii) the word "three" be struck out with a view to inserting the word "two" in lieu.

If this amendment is carried, I will later move a further amendment to carry out the intention behind the proposal I desire to submit to the Committee. The amendment is one which I think the Minister may be prepared to entertain. It is in line with the general scheme of his Bill and is, I think, one which is eminently sensible and will be very acceptable to the community in general. As the Bill stands, a measure has to be passed three times in the Legislative Assembly and rejected three times by the Legislative Council, after which it can become law. Those three rejections must extend over two years at least, and obviously the sessions in which the Bill may be rejected three times may be partly in one Parliament and partly in another. A general election of the Assembly may intervene before the Bill is rejected a third time

What I desire to do is to provide that before the Bill is sent up from this House for the third time a general election of the Assembly must intervene. If a general election of the Assembly has intervened it means that there is a new Assembly in a new Parliament, which is confirming a measure that had twice been adopted by the Assembly in the old Parliament. It also means that before a measure becomes law under this proposed legislation the people will have had a chance to pronounce upon its merits. If they want it they will presumably send back into power, in the Legislative Assembly, the Government that introduced the measure twice before.

If, on the other hand, the people change the Government or intimate beyond any doubt in the course of the election that they do not want the measure in question then it would, of course, not be brought up a third time. This amendment gives the people an opportunity to be consulted, and the people to be consulted are not the electors of the Legislative Council, but those of the Legislative Assembly. The general scheme of the Bill is not interfered with.

The requirement that the measure shall be passed three times in the Assembly and sent three times to the Legislative Council and rejected three times by the Council is still included. But whereas it may happen, under the Minister's Bill, that during the period a general election of the Assembly may be held, the amendment I propose ensures that in every case a general election of the Assembly will intervene before the presentation of the Bill to the Council on the third occasion. To adopt a word to which we all attach so many different meanings, there seems to be something a bit democratic about the proposals. I looked this matter up on the occasion of Mr. Hughes's Bill in 1938. The New South Wales Act provides that before a Bill can become law in consequence of being sent up and rejected three times, there must have been a general election of the New South Wales Assembly prior to the Bill being presented to the Council on the third occasion. To this end the first thing for me to do is to delete the word "three" in line 4 of paragraph (ii) of proposed new Section 2A, with a view to substituting the word "two."

The Bill will then provide, as now, that the measure in question will be sent twice to the Council and twice rejected. I would then move to insert after the word "sessions" in line 5 of the same paragraph the following words:

> And such Bill in the same form is again passed by the Legislative Assembly of the next succeeding Parliament, and if again sent up to the Legislative Council at least one month before the end of the session, is again rejected by the Legislative Council.

The clause would then provide that the Bill must be sent up twice, or in two succeeding sessions and rejected, and after there had been a general election of the Assembly it would, if sent up a third time and rejected, become law. The people in the meantime would have had the opportunity, by the Assembly franchise, of expressing an opinion as to whether they desired the terms of the particular law to be enforced or not.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: After an election the members of this Chamber usually come back with a mandate, and when they do so they are entitled to use it. I do not see why such a Bill as is contemplated should be prolonged over another session. If a new Parliament is elected it can repeal the Bill passed by the previous Government if it so desires. I see no reason why, when after an election we are returned with certain mandates to bring down specific legislation, we should submit that legislation to another Parliament. This is in accordance with the English Parliament Act, which has worn well since 1911 without amendment. If it has stood the test for that number of years I see no reason to alter the Bill. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. WATTS: I support the amendment. I think it is a reasonable proposal to ensure that when there is a genuine dispute there should be no insistence by the Government of the day, of whatever type it may be, on the acceptance of the Bill unless it has been referred to the people, at least to the extent of a general election of the members of Parliament. The Minister for Justice seems to imagine that no legislation ever comes into the Government's mind after it has prepared its policy speech for the last election, because he says that it is unnecessary to wait until the election of a new Parliament as all legislation likely to be brought down by the Government was submitted to the people at the last election and, therefore, that the Government has some kind of mandate—bless the word—for all the legislation it introduces in the period of three years before the next election. That may be the position with the present Government. It may not be able to conceive any new ideas between November, 1943, and the 15th February, 1947, or whenever the next election takes place. I do not suggest that is an impossibility, but if this legislation comes into force it will affect Governments other than the present occupants of the Treasury bench, and it is possible that the Government might, between the elections, conceive some quite evolutionary idea or maybe some quite revolutionary idea for which there has been no mandate from the

people because they did not hear of it at the last election.

It is impossible for the member for West Perth, in this amendment, to cope with exact detail, but he asks the Government to accept the general principle. If legislation is introduced and passed in 1944, and again passed in 1945 this amendment provides that there must be a general election before it can become law without the consent of another place. That is a reasonable proposal. Even if the legislation concerned was mentioned distantly in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, at least its presentation to Parliament is the first real indication to Parliament of the Government's intentions. Nebulous references made in the course of a policy speech are not heard by more than one-tenth of the population and may be read by another tenth when the report of the speech is published. But that does not convey much because the public has little conception of the general principles of legislation subsequently introduced. When, however, a measure reaches Parliament and the Bill is distributed, many members take care to send copies to local governing authorities and other representative bodies in their districts, and by that means there is a possibility of the people gaining some knowledge of the details of the measure.

Then the people are given an opportunity at the next election to give consideration to the matter and, if they like the legislation or the Government that sponsored it, they can by their votes indicate that they are prepared to see it become law, irrespective of what happens in another place. If, on the other hand, the people do not like it, it can be assumed that the legislation will not be gone on with, and it will become a dead letter. Whether the matter is mentioned distantly in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech or in the Premier's policy speech before that, or even if it develops in the imagination of Ministers during the currency of a Parliament, I agree that the people should have an opportunity to refuse to endorse the legislation before it is imposed upon them as the law of the land. The only way by which that stage can be arrived at is to accept the amendment. I regret that I did not conceive the idea myself, for I regard it as excellent. Had we adopted it earlier, it would have saved a lot of the argument that has proceeded upon the Bill. It will not disturb the principles of the Bill but will make it more acceptable to those willing to accept it and less objectionable to those who do not. I cannot imagine why the Minister should oppose it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I oppose the amendment for the simple reason that I do not believe elections are won on any single argument.

Mr. Watts: Then away goes the mandate theory!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is so. If the argument advanced by the member for West Perth holds good, there should have been no argument about the adult franchise Bill which was defeated in another place because, at the last general election there was not a Labour candidate who did not advocate the adoption of adult franchise. Assuming that this legislation was in force at present, can there by any reasonable argument advanced in support of the contention that, although every member of the Labour Party supported the principle of adult franchise at the last election, we should wait until another election is held before submitting the adult franchise Bill a third time? I have had to fight a good many elections, and have never had a walk-over. My opinion of elections is that the average elector is not worried about any individual item of policy referred to by the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the National Party. Nearly every member who has carried out his work effectively in Parliament has a large personal vote, irrespective of his political associations. Take the position of the member for Murray-Wellington! I can imagine him going round his constituency and saying, "We are going to have more drainage and more irrigation."

The Minister for Works: More!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, and he will get it all right! I can imagine him telling his electors that there will be no rates paid for the extra works. Would the people of that electorate worry about whether a question was raised about the abolition of the Upper House? Self-preservation is the greatest law in connection with elections, or otherwise. The member for Murray-Wellington will agree that the assistance he has been able to get from the Government over the years has been responsible for his return to Parliament without opposition. His constituents think he is a wonderful worker!

Let members take their minds back to 1933, when there was held what I have always regarded as an outstanding general election. On that occasion that Government of the day went to the country not so much on a policy of what it was going to do, apart from providing work for all, but on the question of a referendum on secession.

At that time members of the Labour Party were branded as unificationists. What did the people do? They gave a huge majority for secession and returned the unificationists with a big majority! Then, in 1917, there was a general election with almost identical results. At that period it was almost impossible to get anyone to declare himself as a member of the Labour Party. That was because of the conscription issue. Labourites were branded from one end of Australia to the other as disloyal. Yet at that stage Victoria was the only State that did not have a Labour Government and the people throughout Australia voted against conscription! Obviously the people are not influenced by any one particular item of policy. Over the last 30 years there has been instance after instance to support that contention. Then again, the member for Subiaco does not occupy her seat in this House because of the National Party's policy but because of her personality.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: So do you!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, but I did not like to say that! It appears that this is now a mutual admiration society. The Party with which the member for Subiaco is associated comes back to this House with its ranks more and more depleted but, because of her personality, she is returned for Subiaco. I do not agree with the contentions of the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the National Party that it is necessary to wait for another year in order to obtain a mandate. Once we put up a Bill we have the right to go on with it.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I have very seldom heard a more complete demonstration of the fact that there is no such thing as a mandate than was embodied in the speech by the Minister for Mines.

The Minister for Mines: You can take it that way so long as you defeat the amendment.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The Minister very properly pointed out that the people do not give mandates. They sometimes elect people to Parliament on small issues, sometimes a mere personal issue. To imagine that a mandate is given in respect of all items mentioned in a policy speech is, as the Minister properly pointed out, an absurdity. When a Bill is dealt with at the second reading stage, only then is public interest taken in it and the opportunity is afforded for the examination of its provisions. It is then examined not only by members of this House, but by the public, through the reports appearing in the Press. For the first time there is an opinion expressed on the part of the general public in favour of or against the measure. All that the amendment asks is that such an opinion should be given an opportunity of expression and not be ignored, as it could be ignored under the terms of the Bill. The public, when it first knows what legislation is intended to accomplish, should have an opportunity to express an opinion. I might quote the recent voting in other parts of Australia as showing that a false impression existed as to the opinion of the people on a very big issue. The Bill would mean that when a majority was returned for all kinds of reasons, many of them personal, the electors would not be allowed an opportunity to express their opinions on a measure. Perhaps not one-third of the electors would be in favour of it. It is not desirable to invent machinery to accomplish that result.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	23
Majority against	9

AYES.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. North
Mr. Hill	Mr. Seward
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Leslie	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Mann	Mr. Watts
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Willmott
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Doney
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Coverley	Mr. Millington
Mr. Cross	Mr. Needham
Mr. Fox	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Graham	Mr. Panton
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Smith
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Telfer
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Holman	Mr. Triat
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Leahy	*(Teller.)*

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—LAND ALIENATION RESTRICTION.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1944-45.

In Committee of Supply

Debate resumed from the 26th October on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and on the Annual Estimates, Mr. Marshall in the Chair.

Vote—Legislative Council, £2,265:

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [9.27]: I congratulate the Premier on the fact that for the fourth year in succession he has balanced the Budget and shown a surplus. During the debate on the Estimates some members have urged that it would have been much better had he shown a deficit, just as the sister State of South Australia is doing, instead of a surplus. I consider that such a policy would be an unsound one for the State to adopt. If we pursued such a policy there would be no alternative to bankruptcy, having regard to the position of the State, its population and its productive capacity. The revenue for the financial year 1943-44 increased to nearly £13,600,000. The expenditure during the same period was £13,551,000, and the surplus was £38,021. The public debt of the State stands at £96,000,000 odd, which works out at £201 9s. per head of the population. That was the net debt per head of population in 1943. It showed a slight decrease on the previous year. If we were involved in a deficit, however, it would mean adding to the total public debt and thus raising the net debt per head of population.

From perusal of Government accounts I find that we have a substantial burden of interest to bear, the revenue having had to find some £3,480,000 for servicing interest. That figure amounts to about 39 per cent. of our revenue. So that if we continue to increase our debt by way of deficits, which have to be funded and on which interest has to be paid, it would show that we were heading for bankruptcy, having regard to the fact that our population is not increasing. There has just been a slight improvement owing to the fact that the Treasurer was able to reduce the public debt during last year by virtue of provision for sinking fund amounting to £509,000. Thus the interest charge was reduced by nearly £11,000 per annum. This amounts to some measure of improvement on the position previously existing. As regards our finances, we have to bear in mind that our population is practically stationary. Having regard to the fact that our revenue possibly has reached its peak, and that taxpayers are complaining of excessively high rates, it is not likely that any Government in power when uniform taxation possibly passes away and the State resumes its own power to tax, will be able to refrain from the imposition of severer taxation on the people than prevails at present. If that proves to be so and the population does not increase, we shall find ourselves in a very difficult position.

The total population in 1942 was 497,882, which according to the figures of the Government Statistician shows a net increase on the natural increase of population equal to .33 per cent.—an increase of less than ½ per cent. We have also to realise that as there are no young persons coming along to take the places of the old and the dying, the time is fast approaching when difficulties will be encountered. Then we shall not have money to spend on such things as old age pensions and State services, unless we obtain an increase in the number of our young people who will engage in productive industry here. Otherwise a day of reckoning is at hand for Western Australia and for the rest of the Commonwealth. Some people, having regard to our small natural increase of population, predict that we shall die out.

Mr. North: Storks are on strike!

Mr. J. HEGNEY: That is a fact, and points to something in our present civilisation that we must investigate and solve. The Treasurer, as I have remarked, has shown increases and surpluses. In days gone by it was said that Labour had not the capacity to govern, knowing nothing about finance. It has been said that "finance is government." The Treasurer has been able to finance the State and his surpluses have increased, but it has been alleged that Labour has no capacity in finance and that the present Government, similarly, has no notion of finance. Yet the adjacent State

which has not a Labour Government estimates that it had a further substantial increase in deficit. On the other hand our Premier and Treasurer has governed Western Australia with considerable success. There has been reduction in the public debt, and a slight increase in interest payments. We certainly cannot afford to go on increasing our interest bill, which, as I have remarked, is now 39 per cent. of the revenue. If the percentage increases much more, members of this Chamber will not be able to obtain money for such purposes as education, hospitalisation, etc. The time is fast approaching when money for those services will be scant, because of the fact that the Treasurer will have to get payment for the money that has been spent on State services. That is a difficult phase for the State, and one of the problems confronting modern industry. Another important factor is the debt burden that our industries and our State have to bear.

One war has come and gone, and colossal debts were piled up in fighting it; but our interest payments are still of crushing weight. As a result, posterity is being asked to face a financial problem of gigantic magnitude. The Treasurer of Western Australia, however, has done a good job and has shown the people of this State that he has husbanded his resources. I draw attention to a leading article published in "The West Australian" of the 31st October in connection with the population question. In that article the Labour Government was taken to task because of the fact that it had not given proper attention to many problems of post-war reconstruction, including the question of population. Apart from the natural increase of our own people, the best immigrants we can fetch to our shores would be the children who have been orphaned in European countries because of the war. They could be settled in the open spaces of Australia and given the opportunity to live under better conditions than those in their home countries. In our own State many factors are affecting the increase in population, but whatever these factors are, unquestionably more attention should be given to this important matter. I recently read a book which was sent to me. In it appears a statement that bread had been definitely deteriorating and the author submitted that because of the lack of certain vitamins in bread over a period of years, sterility definitely set in among our own people.

Mr. North: In this country?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: Yes. A statement of such importance should be investigated. We should ascertain what effect our bread might be having upon our birth rate. People also point to the Services, which distribute prophylactics to the soldiers. These are also credited with causing a decrease in the birth rate. The reason advanced for the issue of prophylactics is that they preserve health. Nevertheless, we know from experience that their use definitely causes a decrease in population. I recently read a speech on this question by Mr. Nelson T. Johnson, United States Ambassador to Australia. He states—

> "Let us face the fact that birth-control is an escape from responsibility, an act of despair, and the result of an impoverished philosophy of life," said the United States Minister to Australia (Mr. Nelson T. Johnson), in opening an exhibition of American Housing and Planning in Melbourne recently. The exhibition was produced at New York's Museum of Modern Art, and is being shown in the main Australian cities, through the courtesy of the U.S. Office of War Information.
>
> "The modern city," said Mr. Johnson, "is proving one of the most potent sterilising influences that society has ever had to contend with. Children are not wanted in modern cities. The school, which should be an adjunct of the home in the building of personality and character in the child, tends to become a convenient place, conducted by the State, to which children can be sent to get them out of the way.
>
> "A gentleman of our modern city is as embarrassed by the presence of a child as if he were caught without any clothes.
>
> "A man or woman has to shed all pretence under the steady gaze of a child.
>
> "Let us face the fact that birth-control is an escape from responsibility, an act of despair, and the result of an impoverished philosophy of life.
>
> "The children and young people of society possess the imagination, hope, enterprise, inventiveness, and the energy on which society grows," he said.
>
> "Eliminate youth from society and society will die, as it had always died through the ages.
>
> "If we are to raise the birth-rate we must give youth something to live for, other than frustrated old age. We must give youth a share of our lives. We must not put youth in opposition.
>
> "The dry rot in the family begins very close to the kitchen stove. Therefore, the kitchen or the hearth, where much of the

family life is planned and lived, should be emphasised. The kitchen should be made the largest and most attractive room in the house.

"In this room should be put all the mechanical slaves which modern science and ingenuity have devised for taking the drudgery out of family life."

We know that in our own State the basic wage is fixed to provide for a man, his wife and two children. Statistics show that the average family does not even comprise two children. If Australians are not prepared to have children, and if the State is not prepared to assist in their nurture, then Australia must become decadent. We must do our utmost to increase our population. Western Australia is the least populated of the Australian States, but one; and, bearing in mind our huge area, we should try to secure as many of the orphaned children of Europe as possible. That is the only way by which we can build up our industries and secure more people to help to carry the burden of debt. Statistics show that in all countries there is a steady decline in population. We have as neighbours the teeming millions of coloured races in countries adjacent to Australia, and if we do not populate Australia we certainly will not be able to hold it. Our people should be encouraged to marry young and have children; and every encouragement should be given to the mother to help to rear the children. If we are not prepared to do that, the future possibilities of the State will be definitely limited. That brings me to certain items I wish to discuss.

With others, I have made representations, over several years, for proper provision to be made on trams for the carriage of prams. I have been on several deputations from the Labour movement to the Minister for Railways urging that hooks should be placed on trams for that purpose. Time and again I have seen a young woman with a baby in her arms and a child standing on the kerb waiting to board a tram. A tram has come along but, because it has carried a pram already, the motorman has been unwilling to take another. All kinds of objections have been raised, but I think they have been surmounted and I do not see why hooks cannot be placed on the trams.

Mr. McLarty: Where would they put them?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: Where do they put them on the trams in Fremantle? Where do they put them on the trolleybuses? Has the hon. member not observed what takes place in the city? Every petrol-bus in the metropolitan area has hooks for prams and I fail to see why hooks cannot be provided on our trams. If one goes from Parliament House late in the afternoon—about 4.30 o'clock—one can see mothers standing at the corner of William-street or Murray-street or near the post office—three or four of them—because tram-drivers can only take one pram on board. These women have to wait for half-an-hour to board a tram. Having a knowledge of how important it is for young women to have children, I suggest it is important that we should encourage them. With a little application, these disabilities could be removed. During my last election campaign, I came across many women who made this matter an issue, and there is no doubt it is one on which action should be taken. The Labour movement has made several representations over the last couple of years to the Minister for Railways, and a promise was made that a trial would be given, but as yet I know of no try-out. I have not seen any tram with hooks.

The Premier: It has been done. I understand that three trams have been provided with hooks.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: Are they fitted now? I am very pleased to hear that. I feel certain that, with willingness on the part of tramway workers and a little courtesy for these women, this difficulty could be solved. Women with young babies have to make visits to the city from time to time and have to attend clinics, and sometimes have appointments with doctors. They cannot leave their babies at home. It is often 2 o'clock or 2.30 before a mother can get out. She has so many routine jobs to do that it takes her all her time to get away from the house. Then she has to be home before 6 o'clock to feed her child. This is a very important matter, so far as I am concerned, representing—as I do—a large electorate with a good many young people, including mothers with babies, and having regard for the fact that it was a matter raised during the last election campaign by many of my electors. I am pleased to know that a move has been made in this direction and I hope it will not be long before all the trams have proper provision in this respect. I feel certain that the Government, the Tramways Department

and the Commissioner of Railways will earn the commendation of all young mothers. I can assure the Minister for Mines that I have a mandate—a first-class, straight-out mandate—on this matter from my electors. I would urge also that Mr. Taylor, the manager of the Tramways Department, should be asked to do his utmost in London to bring about a great increase in trolleybuses for Western Australia.

Mr. Thorn: He has gone there to get some hooks!

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I suggest that the trolleybus system should be taken along the Guildford-road, Maylands, and into the Bayswater district. The time is opportune for the institution of a fast and commodious service for the people of those suburbs. The Bayswater district is at present served by a petrol-bus. There have been complaints that when a bus came from Bassendean into Bayswater it was full and unable to pick up more passengers, so that many were compelled to wait for another bus or walk a fair distance to a tramline. Wembley, Claremont and Nedlands are served by trolleybuses and I urge that the eastern suburbs be given a share of this form of transport which could proceed along the Guildford-road and extend along Beaufort-street as far as population has reached at present.

There is an agitation by the Bayswater local authority and the people concerned for a transport system to be inaugurated from Beaufort-street to Guildford-road, or else that a siding be constructed at Meltham. This is a hardy annual. Over many years, I have introduced deputations in connection with this proposition. If a siding were constructed, it would serve many people in addition to those revealed by a census taken by railway officials. It would serve people further away—probably half-a-mile—who travel by the railways and have to walk to Maylands, and who would use such a convenience if it were provided. At present, the proposition is before the Commissioner of Railways. An alternative proposal has been made by Mr. Sullivan, of the United Bus Co., that a route should start from Meltham and go as far as College-street and join the Morley Park service. Neither the Commissioner of Railways nor the Transport Board—who have had these propositions before them for some months—have been able to make up their minds to endorse the ideas or inaugurate some other service to meet the needs of those people. However, I am reminding the Minister that at least two months have gone by during which the Commissioner has had that proposition for examination. The local authority has been pressing to know whether any decision has been reached. I have followed the matter up with the transport authorities, but they are unable to give me anything definite yet. This is of importance to the people concerned, and I hope that before long a decision will be made either to inaugurate a cross-country service, or at all events to establish a siding at Meltham Heights. While I do not expect the siding to be established near the wheat silos at Ashfield between Bayswater and Bassendean at present, nevertheless one is needed there also.

The Workers' Homes Board has a considerable area of land over the hill near the Swan River. If transport facilities were provided, or a railway siding put in there, the Workers' Homes Board could, immediately the war ends, go ahead with post-war reconstruction homes on that site and so build up a big population there. Apart from that, large numbers of workers are employed at Cresco's, and others work at the silos. They would definitely use a siding if one were constructed between Bayswater and Bassendean. It is a pity to see that length of railway line from which the Railway Department could get revenue but does not. That brings me to another matter that I mentioned a little earlier. Most members received a booklet dealing with the question of bread. Bread is the staple diet of the community, but it is a fact that our bread has deteriorated during the period of the war. It is also a fact that we cannot buy wholemeal bread in Perth. In England certain vitamins that are in wholemeal bread are put into all bread so that it will have wholemeal value. But here the bread has deteriorated in spite of what the bakers might say. I know that the member for Maylands had a complaint only recently in respect of bread delivered in his electorate. In the area I represent the people complain about the quality of the bread provided. We have the Bread Industry Review Committee and I have submitted these views from time to time to the chairman. The time has arrived when

more attention should be given to this matter from the point of view of the health of the public.

A controversy raged some few years ago as to the merits or demerits of wholemeal bread compared with white bread. I remember a doctor writing to the Press and saying that those incarcerated in the gaols in England 100 years ago got better bread, from the point of view of wholemeal value, than we get today. The author of the pamphlet mentions the fact—I make the statement for what it is worth—that so far as its food value is concerned the wholemeal bread in this State causes sterility. I do not know whether that is so or not, but, from a medical point of view, it is urged that one of the causes of many of the ills of the younger generation is white bread. I am told that white bread causes more constipation in children than anything else. School children mostly have sandwiches for lunch. They may have other things, but the base of their lunch is bread. As a consequence, constipation affects the general health of the children. The Commonwealth Government has set up nutritional councils in each of the States, and we have the different health authorities in the respective States. We have propaganda directed towards the correct diet for the people. I suggest that the Minister for Health could not tackle a more important issue than that of seeing that wholemeal bread is made available to the people. More propaganda should be used in this connection.

Mr. Thorn: Who is responsible for this?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I suppose that custom is, to a large extent. The bakers have gone on refining bread because it looks well to have nice white bread. But the food value of our bread is such that the time has arrived when we should look into the matter with the idea of getting better bread. Since zoning the bakers have become practically a law unto themselves. One or two bakers operate in a particular zone, and there is no doubt that deterioration in the bread has taken place. I did see the other day where it is proposed to set up a bread institute for the purpose of dealing with this question. Tonight is not the first time that I have raised this matter. I am not a crank on the issue but, having regard to the vitamin value of the bread and the fact that the British Government has incorporated into the bread in England today, whether it is white bread or any other sort, certain vitamins to give it the full value of wholemeal bread, I am prompted to make these remarks. It is said that the health of the people in England was never better than it is today, notwithstanding the fact that they have been through an arduous war period. Another question of importance to the population is that of the supply of ice.

Mr. Cross: Do not pinch my thunder!

Mr. J. HEGNEY: The member for Canning has had that much thunder here and such a fair go during the last few months that he must excuse me if I steal some of his thunder. This is an important matter in the electorate I represent. Whilst in my immediate neighbourhood there is a fairly decent ice supply, women outside of it are continually ringing me about the question of ice. I know that last year was a pretty difficult one, and I know too that in previous years large quantities of ice were stored in order to meet the peak period demands. But, because meat and other perishable products must be stored for the Services, that stand-by cannot be built up. As a result all the concerns in the metropolitan area that are involved need to increase their storage capacity to overcome this difficulty. We have no guarantee that the war will not last for another two or three years. It appears that quite a long period will elapse before we defeat the Japanese, and this problem will arise each year. It is strange that the military authorities can secure ice supplies whenever they want to.

To maintain civilian morale is most important. Under existing conditions ice supplies cannot be obtained for invalids or young children. Civilians are entitled to a just share of the ice available. The member for Guildford-Midland endeavoured to improve the situation at Midland Junction and persuaded a Mr. Button to get his plant in going order. As soon as that gentleman did so the military authorities stepped in and commandeered a large proportion of his output. My parents and some of my relatives live in the district and they could not get any ice last year until well after Christmas. One complaint voiced by the ice vendors was that their deliveries were restricted because they could not get sufficient petrol for their trucks. Accompanied by

Mr. Speaker, I waited on Mr. Taylor, the Chairman of the War Organisation of Industry Committee, and urged that increased petrol supplies should be made available, but the request was refused on the ground that there was an agreement between the vendors and the ice people themselves. On one occasion a man was told that if he put on another vehicle he could get more petrol, but he could not do so because on account of the distance he would have to travel with the truck the ice available would not be adequate to meet the needs. Something should be done to increase the capacity of the existing iceworks adjacent to the city with a view to building up adequate reserves of ice. That should be done during the winter months.

Under prevailing conditions many people are put to a great deal of inconvenience because of lack of ice supplies. The womenfolk, particularly during the hot weather, make preparations over the week-end but when the ice deliveries fail them the food goes bad. The position is getting worse, and I urge that something should be done along the lines I suggest, particularly the building up of reserves to meet the extra demand during peak periods. Then there is the question of refrigerators! To me it is most remarkable that for a person in Western Australia to secure a refrigerator it is necessary for him to obtain a permit from an official in Sydney. I made representations on behalf of the owner of one premises where there were nine persons, including three young women with bottle-fed babies. They kept milk in a cooler but the children pulled the flannels off and they were experiencing great difficulty. No ice was delivered in their street. They certainly could go to the butcher whose shop was a quarter of a mile away, but they had to collect the ice in a pram. Organisation would get over difficulties like that.

Mr. Marshall: Did you get them a refrigerator?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I certainly did not. I tried to get a refrigerator for myself, but as I have only two children I was told I did not have a dog's chance. Western Australia should be entitled to a proper share of the refrigerators that are available. When the Minister for Trade and Customs, Senator Keane, was in Bassendean I discussed this matter with him. I understand that there is a suggestion that the factories that have been turning out munitions will be devoted to civilian requirements after the war. I am told that the Welshpool factory may be used for the manufacture of refrigerators for Western Australia at a reasonable cost, which will bring them within reach of people on ordinary incomes. Plant of this description is essential in a climate such as that of Western Australia. The member for Murchison lives at Redcliffe, and he knows that there is no ice available in that district. I made representations to a man at Guildford who used to deliver ice there, but he told me that he could not possibly undertake the work again merely for the sake of the few people, including some who were sick, who would take the ice. Something should be done to rectify that position.

Mr. Marshall: There are refrigerators here but the authorities will not permit them to be sold.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: That is so. There are one or two matters regarding schools that I desire to mention. When the present Premier was Minister for Education the condition of the Bayswater school grounds was discussed. Some years ago the portion at the back of the school was attended to but the front portion of the grounds is now in a dangerous condition. I suggest to the Minister for Education and the Minister for Works that at the first opportunity when labour and materials are available, the playground should be put into proper order. I have also been informed that the verandah at the Eden Hill School is in a state of disrepair. These matters are of great importance to the country and therefore I took advantage of this occasion to mention them.

MR. CROSS (Canning): My remarks will be brief. One matter to which I wish to draw attention is that of the City Council's rating for 1943. Recently I asked a number of questions in the House because I consider that a great injustice has been done. I heard a member say tonight that the Premier had received a wonderful increase of revenue this year. I know that the workers of Victoria Park have contributed unjustly £5,000 or £6,000 of extra revenue by way of water charges for 1943, because of the fact that the water rates automatically

increase when the capital values are increased by the Perth City Council. This has also happened in Leederville, but it did not happen all over the city. In my opinion, the Perth City Council was entirely wrong in increasing the capital and annual values in 1943. The capital values were pegged as from early in 1942. I could have understood the City Council had it increased values in those instances where improvements had been effected to property, but the council made the increase fairly general in the working class districts.

It is unfortunate for Victoria Park that its representative is in New Guinea. As a result of the increases in that district the people paid £5,000 or £6,000 more to the City Council by way of rates than they should have paid, and they automatically paid £5,000 or £6,000 more in water rates also. The City Council has decided this year to revert to the 1942 values for rating purposes, but it does not propose to make any adjustment or refund for the excessive rate which it, in my opinion, illegally extracted from some people. Had the increase been imposed everywhere——

Mr. Rodoreda: Why was it not?

Mr. CROSS: The City Council might be able to tell the hon. member; I cannot. Wrong has certainly been done and a lot of people resent it. Further, the increased money collected has not been spent, because the City Council has a large accumulation of funds. It has been collecting its rates as before, but has not been able to spend the money. Only a portion of the people have been unfairly rated and, in my opinion, illegally rated because rents and capital values were pegged. The Government, even at this stage, should introduce legislation to compel the City Council to make an adjustment and the Water Supply Department should make an adjustment, too. Alternatively, the capital value of property throughout the city should be increased proportionately. What was done is distinctly unfair and to me savours strongly of class distinction because the favoured portions of Perth were subject to no such increase in capital and annual values. I hope the Minister is listening and will bring down a Bill to compel the City Council to make an adjustment.

Mr. Doney: The Minister for Water Supplies is not here and so is not listening.

Mr. CROSS: He is not far away. The member for Middle Swan voiced complaints about the shortage of ice. In my area also, this is a cause for complaint. I have received quite a lot of complaints about the non-supply of ice, particularly in the Applecross, Melville, South Como and Canning Bridge districts. People in the Queen's Park area do not complain so much because they have never had a supply, and the people there also cannot afford to buy refrigerators. I have made attempts to get refrigerators for 23 people this year, but it is possible to get a permit only for a confirmed invalid who must have special food.

Along the Canning road there reside people who are four or five miles from a butcher's shop and who have to travel to Fremantle or South Perth to get supplies of meat. They can get butter only about once a week. There are women and young children living in the scrub away from made roads. The husbands of some of the women are at the war. These people should be able to get refrigerators. The member for Murchison, by interjection, said there is a supply of refrigerators in Perth. I know that there is a considerable number of refrigerators in Hay-street; I have seen them. Yet one cannot get a permit to buy one. The Procurement Board in Sydney decides who shall have the refrigerators. Most people in this State with whom I have come into contact seem to favour the Electrolux make of refrigerator for which Mr. Baker, at the corner of Hay and Irwin streets, is the agent. The military authorities have taken the whole of the supplies of Electrolux refrigerators. Some 700 or 800 orders for refrigerators have been lodged with that one firm and for that one make. There is something radically wrong that these refrigerators should not be made available. Supplies are held by other firms and they have had them here for 12 months. Yet a permit cannot be obtained to buy one.

Mr. Thorn: What is the trouble?

Mr. CROSS: I do not know, unless it is a matter of Eastern States control. We generally find that that is the cause of our troubles. I saw one of the Commonwealth Ministers six or eight weeks ago and he promised to look into the matter, but so far as I know, nothing has been done. Though I have been able to get five or six permits for special cases, the people gene-

rally cannot get delivery. The Minister for Health should take an interest in this matter because people who live in the bush and have to make a journey of four or five miles to get supplies of meat, milk, etc., should have this convenience in their homes. Those commodities have to be kept cool. Coolgardie safes, also, are unprocurable. I appeal on behalf of the kiddies particularly. It is unfair that our people should have to put up with this sort of thing and I think we should refuse to tolerate it. Because of the incapacity of people in the Eastern States, the people of this State suffer far more than they should, and this is one direction in which they suffer.

On the subject of refrigerators a few weeks ago I obtained some information from friends in Sydney. They had just bought a refrigerator and it appears there is no trouble in getting one in Sydney, for they are manufactured there. In Western Australia, however, we have to put up with procurement boards and many other difficulties. I hope the day is not far distant when refrigerators will be manufactured here. There is no reason whatever why we could not make them. In bygone years we have depended far too much on the Eastern States. It looks to me as if one of the hottest summers on record is coming. It has made an early start. I would like to know from the Government, if Ministers do reply to this discussion, what it has done regarding last year's wholesale complaints concerning ice. The trouble was that the Western Ice Co. would not deliver ice on the other side of Canning Bridge—owing, the company said, to manpower trouble. People living well away from the centre, and especially women with young babies, ought to be able to obtain refrigerators; and that remark applies also to invalids.

Mr. Marshall: The Electrolux refrigerator is made in Perth.

Mr. CROSS: But the agents cannot give delivery, although they have orders for 750 or 800 refrigerators. I trust the Minister will look into this matter, because during the past three or four weeks lack of refrigerators has been the commonest complaint. In the back country, on the farms, Coolgardie coolers are used; but the people I have in mind have been accustomed to obtain supplies of ice, and now they cannot get either ice or a refrigerator or a Coolgardie cooler. If these conveniences are not made available, there will be an epidemic among children, owing to this neglect. The matter should be given first priority. Steps should be taken to ensure deliveries of ice, and of the utmost possible number of refrigerators, and to release refrigerators that have been in stock in the cities for 12 months. That is all I intend to say on these Estimates. I hope that what I have said will carry some weight.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.34 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 8th November, 1944.

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

QUESTION—BARLEY BOARD.

As to Superintendent's Salary.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (for Hon. G. B. Wood) asked the Chief Secretary:

(i) What is the average yearly salary paid to the Superintendent of the West Australian Barley Board?

(ii) On what basis is the amount of the salary arrived at?

(iii) How much time per year is devoted by the Superintendent to the affairs of the barley industry?

(iv) Will the Minister lay on the Table of the House the balance sheet of the operations of the W.A. Barley Board for the 1943-44 season?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(i) The Superintendent of the West Australian Barley Board is not paid on an annual salary basis, but on a commission