ment for those locomotives and the rolling-stock has been put on one side in order that it may be used for providing additional rollingstock and locomotives when the opportunity offers. There are many things which are not generally known but which could be quoted in refutation of some of the criticism indulged in by various members who spoke on the motion.

I realise that members do not intend to vote against the motion, and that they have merely utilised this opportunity to vent their dissatisfaction regarding one item or another connected with the administration of the railways. We allowed the Commissioner of Railways and our Chief Mechanical Engineer to be seconded to the Commonwealth for war work at a time when they were very urgently required here; and I believe that they have done very good work indeed for the Commonwealth Government in that regard. The State Government has been so seized of the necessity for proper attention and supervision being given to the working of our railways that we have decided that both the Commissioner and the Chief Mechanical Engineer shall remain in Western Australian to do the work for which they have been appointed, the war situation having improved to such an extent that it is possible for them to be retained in their positions here rather than be allowed to remain in the Eastern States for indefinite periods.

If I am to believe all that they have said, I am afraid that some members are just a little complacent with regard to the present position. I am not one of those who believe that, the war being now a few hundred miles away, there is no necessity to be as keen on the war effort as we have been in the past. I think the time is coming, and coming very quickly, when it will be necessary for us to take our full share in the common war effort of Australia. So far as our railways are concerned, while possibly the peak period in regard to their service is past, nevertheless there are many ways in which we shall be requiring the most efficient service possible from them; and I believe that with the staff we have at our disposal we are getting the best return that we can expect in the circumstances. So, having referred to just a few matters mentioned by members, I express the hope that the motion will be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the resolution agreed to, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 10th October, 1911.

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

QUESTIONS (5).

ALBANY HARBOUR.

As to Greater Use for Shipping Produce.

Mr. HILL asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Has any effort been made to ascertain if the British Ministry of War Transport desires or is willing to make greater use of the Port of Albany?

(2) If so, with what result?

(3) If not, will he make such an effort?

(4) Does the Railway Department desire to encourage the railage of wheat and flour to Albany?

(5) If not, why not?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) It is not considered to be a matter coming within the jurisdiction of the Railway Department.

(4) Yes, but the Commissioner of Railways is aware that this matter is one controlled by the wheat and flour owners and shippers and can convey traffic to the port only as consigned.

(5) Answered by No. (4).

STATE BRICKWORKS.

As to Production at Byford.

Mr. McLARTY asked the Minister for the North-West:

(1) Are the State Brickworks at Byford working to full capacity?

(2) If not, what are the reasons?

(3) What has been the average monthly output of bricks during the past three months?

(4) Are sufficient bricks being made to meet present demands, and to assist in building up a reserve for the post-war period?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) Works are not fully manned, skilled truckers, setters and machine men in addition to physically fit labourers being required.

(3) Approximately 800,000.

(4) Orders received are being dispatched as required, but production at present is insufficient to build up stocks for future requirements.

HOUSE VALUES.

As to Adjustments of Increased Rates.

Mr. CROSS asked the Minister for Works:

Recognising that only some of Perth City Council valuations were increased in 1943, involving both increased municipal and automatically increased water rates, will he please say—

(1) If the Government proposes to introduce legislation to ensure that the Perth City Council will make equitable adjustments to those people penalised?

(2) Does the Government propose to make adjustments based on the pre-pegged period for those people who paid increased water rates, because of the City Council's valuations in 1943?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The Perth City Council's valuations were made under the provisions of the Municipal Corporations Act. Any ratepayer dissatisfied with the valuation of his property had the right of appeal to the independent Appeal Board constituted under the City of Perth Rating Appeals Act of 1940.

(2) In accordance with the provisions of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act, rates levied under that Act were adjusted accordingly. In instances where the valuations were reduced by the Council, water rates were also reduced.

STATE INSTRUMENTALITIES.

As to Staffs and Absenteeism.

Mr. CROSS asked the Minister for Works:

Will he give details of one-day absences from the Tramway service, the State Implement Works, and the Midland Workshops due to (a) sickness, (b) other causes, for the period 1st January, 1944, to 31st August, 1944:—

(1) For the Perth Electric Tramways—(a) motormen, (b) conductors, (c) other staff?

(2) What is the total number of staff?

(3) (a) The number of one-day absences due to sickness, and other causes of employees of the Midland Workshops; (b) the total number of staff?

(4) (a) The number of one-day absences due to sickness and other causes in the State Implement Works; (b) the total number of staff?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) (a) Sickness 38, other causes 65; (b) sickness 70, other causes 390; (c) sickness 75, other causes 25.

(2) 725.

(3) (a) Sickness 3,430, other causes 2,604; (b) 2,084.

(4) (a) Sickness 380, other causes 368: (b) 555.

SHIPBUILDING DISPUTE.

As to Investigation.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON (without notice) asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Whether he is aware that General Motors Ltd., of Western Australia are responsible under contract to the Commonwealth Government to construct small ships required by the Navy for operational purposes?

(2) Does he know that the production of these essential ships is held up owing to a dispute between the company and some of their employees regarding wages?

(3) Is he aware that over 30 tradesmen are idle as a result of the dispute and that they cannot secure the release to work for other employers who are short of men?

(4) Will he make urgent representations to the proper Federal authority to arrange for Mr. Craig, the Industrial Commissioner, to investigate the dispute with a view to the resumption of work?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) I understand this is so.

(2) and (3) Yes.

(4) The Commonwealth authorities are fully aware of the position. However, the matter will be brought specifically under the notice of the Commonwealth Conciliation Commissioner in this State (Mr. Craig) through the State Secretary for Labour (Mr. Fisher).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motions by Mr. Wilson, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Hon. J. C. Willcock (Geraldton) and Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Gascoyne) on the ground of urgent public business.

On motion by Mr. North, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Mr. McDonald (West Perth) on the ground of urgent public business.

BILL—EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 3rd October.

MR. SEWARD (Pingelly) [4.38]: When he introduced the Bill, the Minister for Justice made some rather astonishing statements and at all events he made one assertion that indicates just where he stands and what he is aiming at. He stated that most people had been waiting for an alteration in our bicameral system. We know that the political party to which the Minister belongs stands for the abolition of the Legislative Council, and the Bill, although not exactly designed to bring that about, aims at securing the same result by an indirect method.

The Minister for Justice: This measure is merely consequential on another Bill.

Mr. SEWARD: I will deal with that point later on. I do not agree that the single Chamber system is better than the bicameral system. In my opinion, we have ample evidence of the advisability and desirability of having in existence a second legislative Chamber. It provides, as has been stated frequently, a very useful check on hasty legislation and, in addition, when the members of the Upper House are elected, as they are now, by those who have invested their money in property or industries in the State and have been subject to taxation accordingly on a basis differing from that applicable to those without property, they are able to approach the legislative programme from a standpoint dissimilar from that of those not in that position. As regards being a check on hasty legislation, one can easily recall, even during the short time that I have been here, instances when very important Bills elicited very little debate; and, strange to say, the more important the Bill, the less the debate it provoked. I can bring to mind some highly important Bills which have passed through this House with scarcely any discussion at all, the reason probably being that many members have not sufficiently studied the Bill to be able to debate the matter under review.

The stage at which a Bill receives most consideration in this Chamber is undoubtedly the Committee stage. Then the various matters dealt with and the implications of the measure become known to the general public; but, of course, that is too late for this House. We have by that time passed the measure through the Committee stage, and the Bill has been read a third time. The result is that by the time it reaches the other House the members there have a wider knowledge of the subject and bring forward important amendments. If there were only one Chamber, many measures would find their way on to the statute-book in an ill-considered form. Therefore for that reason alone I favour the retention of the bicameral system. Only a few months ago we had a very instructive instance in point. Members will recall the convention held in Canberra to deal with certain amendments of the Commonwealth Constitution. When that convention rose, and before even the Western Australian delegates had returned

to this State, Queensland's single Chamber had passed the Bill which resulted from that convention; and a few weeks later the Queensland Government desired the return of certain powers it had handed over to the Commonwealth through that measure. However, the Bill having been passed by the single Chamber, there was no means to secure the return of these powers.

Point of Order.

Mr. W. Hegney: On a point of order—my first point of order—I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is entirely out of order, inasmuch as he is discussing a question that is not before the House. The question before the House, as I understand, is as to the relationship between these two Houses of Parliament, and not as to the abolition of another place. The hon. member is directing his remarks to the abolition of another place.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Pingelly is getting away from the subject matter of the Bill. There is no doubt about that. However, so long as he keeps somewhere within skirmishing reach of the Bill, very well.

Debate Resumed.

Mr. SEWARD: I believe that if the member for Pilbara had recently studied the Bill, he would be aware that it seeks to give this House power to put measures on the statute-book without their having been passed by the other Chamber. If the hon. member can show me that that is not one way of introducing a single Chamber system here, I shall be pleased. Accordingly I am pointing out disabilities that have arisen in a State which has a single Chamber, and which possibly would arise here if we were to pass this measure as it is before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the Bill does not provide for the establishment of a single Chamber, but practically for the adoption of British legislation in relation to the House of Commons and the House of Lords.

Mr. SEWARD: Very well, Mr. Speaker; I shall not touch on that aspect again.

Hon. P. Collier: There is ample time to obviate hasty legislation.

Mr. SEWARD: In introducing the Bill the Minister said that he was governed largely by precedent, and that the precedent he had taken was the House of Commons or the British Parliament. I recall that some little time ago an Australian statesman, describing a Bill, did so in more flowery language than I can command. He said that the sponsor of the measure had thrown it on the Table of the House, saying, "There is the Bill; now you can consider it." It seems to me that that is what the Minister did in this case. He stated that the Bill was in conformity with the measure passed by the Mother Parliaments. It is, in fact, nothing of the kind. It differs in many material respects from the British legislation, as I shall point out. If the Minister cares to look through the British Act, he will find that this Bill diverges from it widely.

The Minister for Justice: There is not much difference!

Mr. SEWARD: There is another Bill which is much more in keeping with this measure than is the British Act. I am comparing our proposed legislation with the British Parliament Act of 1911. In fact, if I had my wish today I would start off by moving that the debate be adjourned. As I mentioned in connection with the other Bill, I consider that the time has not arrived when we should deal with this measure. The Minister should bear in mind that he is asking us to pass this legislation when we do not know what the composition of the other House may be. There is an Electoral Bill before that Chamber, the fate of which has yet to be decided. If we are to take power to this House to enable legislation to be put on the statute-book without the consent of the Legislative Council, we should at least know how the Legislative Council is to be composed, whether the franchise for the House is to be the same in future as it is today. We have not that information. A Bill now before the Legislative Council seeks to alter that franchise very materially.

The Minister for Justice: This Bill, too, will go before the Legislative Council.

Mr. SEWARD: The Bill contains two clauses, one of which I entirely agree with, but the second of which I cannot be in agreement with until we know what is the position as regards the other House. If the Council is to be elected on the same franchise as this Chamber, that second clause is not needed; but if another place

is to remain as it is today, that clause, possibly amended, may be necessary. I have to give reasons why I think the Bill should be held up temporarily, until we know what the result of the debate elsewhere will be on that particular matter. The Minister says that as regards this Bill he was guided by the legislation of the English Parliament. He said he wanted a democratic measure, but he appears to have overlooked one highly important fact, that his guide, the British Parliament, is a Parliament elected on a property franchise. The House of Commons is not yet elected on a one person, one vote basis.

There exists in Britain a requirement that to become an elector a person must occupy premises of the annual value of £10. Moreover, a person can have two votes, but not more, and in different constituencies. And there are, besides, the Universities of course. So that the Parliament which the Minister has taken as his guide is elected almost on a property franchise in the same manner as is the Legislative Council of this State. The Minister appears to have overlooked that fact. He made a great deal of play with certain figures that he quoted regarding the franchise in this State, in an endeavour to make out that this was a democratic House whereas the other place was not. I think it has been pointed out before that if members of the party opposite were to devote some time to getting on the roll those who are eligible to be on it they would find that the discrepancy pointed out by the Minister does not exist. One of the Minister's colleagues in the Legislative Council explained that the other night. The figures he quoted are not half as striking as the fact that if he had looked up the result of the elections in the Goldfields province on the last occasion——

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is getting on to the other Bill, which is now in another place.

Mr. SEWARD: Very well. I will not pursue my discussion of the Minister's figures any further but will turn my attention to the Bill before the House. As the Minister explained, there are two main provisions. One is to give this House power over money Bills to prevent the Legislative Council from amending or altering them. If I were assured that the Legislative Council were going to be constituted as it is today, I would be in agreement with him. I think this House should have that power.

The Minister for Justice: We have that power now; the Legislative Council cannot amend a money Bill.

Mr. SEWARD: There are certain differences between this Bill and the English Act quoted by the Minister, and he gave no explanation for those differences. There is the provision for a Bill to be endorsed by the Speaker. He did not explain the reason for that. That is dealt with in a separate section in the English Act, but it is incorporated in another clause in this measure. This measure also states, under the definition of "money Bill," that the expressions "taxation," "public money" and "loan" do not include any taxation money or loan raised by municipal corporations, road boards, boards of public health or other local authorities or bodies for local purposes. That is not stated in the English Act, and he did not give any reason for its inclusion in this Bill. I leave it to legal members of the Chamber to decide whether that would have any effect on the Bill should it become law.

There is another striking divergence in this Bill to which I would draw attention. There is reference to "any Bill other than a money Bill," etc., having to become law in certain circumstances, whether rejected by the Council or not. The English Act refers to "any public Bill." That is another big alteration concerning which the Minister gave no explanation. One can conceive of very minor matters going through. If there is going to be a difference between the two Houses, the point of difference might not be of sufficient importance to warrant the Bill being passed into law without the agreement of the other place. A matter which is not dealt with by the Bill and which it is essential should be dealt with concerns ordinary disagreements between Houses. Had the measure provided some means of overcoming the boring conferences that are held at the end of the session, as a result of which we sit all night and meet at breakfast time without any decision having been reached, it would have found much support in this House, but no such provision has been incorporated. That is a grave defect which should be remedied. There is another

problem that has arisen in other Parliaments.

I cannot recall the particular instance at present, but on occasion a money Bill has been introduced and another measure tacked on to it. The measure has then been submitted to the second Chamber and has been regarded as a money Bill. I do not want to see provision made for anything of that kind to happen. It should be clear that a money Bill is a money Bill, and nothing else. There is another provision of this Bill that is not sufficiently liberal, though I dare say we can deal with it in the Committee stage. It is provided that a Bill must be submitted to the Council a month before the end of the session to enable it to be dealt with under the provisions of this measure. That is too short a period. We all know what happens in this Parliament within a month of the closing of the session. There are many measures before Parliament. We have a Government printing staff working at high pressure; we have to consider amendments to Bills that have been sent back from the Council. Those amendments are not printed, and we do not know what we are dealing with. I therefore hope an amendment will be moved to increase the period stipulated in the Bill in order to ensure that important measures will be a sufficient time before the second Chamber to be properly digested. However, I do not think it is in order for the Bill to be discussed at this stage, although the Minister says it is consequential upon the other Bill.

The Minister for Justice: I made a mistake; it is not.

Mr. SEWARD: I think it is. If the Legislative Council passes the Bill to liberalise the franchise for that House, that action will govern considerably the provisions that ought to be included in this Bill. Consequently I move an amendment—

> That the words "the Bill be now read a second time" be struck out and the following words inserted in lieu:—"the second reading of this Bill be not further proceeded with until it has been determined whether the Electoral Act Amendment Bill becomes an Act or otherwise."

MR. WATTS (Katanning—on amendment): The amendment moved by the member for Pingelly is most logical and reasonable. I want to say quite frankly that I desire to be fair in this matter. My attitude towards the Bill would be quite different in two different sets of circumstances. If the Electoral Act Amendment Bill which has left this House, and which proposes that the Legislative Council shall be elected on a universal adult suffrage basis is to become law, then the proposals in this Bill, with the exception of the proposal regarding money Bills——

Mr. SPEAKER: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that we are discussing the striking out of the words "the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. WATTS: If you, Sir, are going to restrict me to a discussion of those words without my being able to discuss in any way the reasons why I support their deletion, I shall have to resume my seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to ask the Leader of the Opposition to confine himself to reasons why the Bill should not be read a second time.

Mr. WATTS: I was endeavouring to do that to the best of my ability by explaining that it should not be read a second time because, in my opinion, it is unfair to members to ask them to come to a determination on this measure until they know the fate of the Electoral Act Amendment Bill, which is before Parliament but not before this House. If that Bill meets with one fate I can support the second reading of this measure; if it meets with another fate I cannot support the second reading. That, shortly, is the position in which I stand, and it is for that reason I suggest that the House should carry this amendment. If that is done and the second reading is proceeded with after the fate of the Electoral Act Amendment Bill has been determined by Parliament we shall all be in a position to know exactly what we are working on. At the moment this House has determined that adult suffrage shall be the future basis of election to the Legislative Council.

If adult suffrage is to be the basis of that election the Legislative Council will be a House equally as representative of the people as is the Assembly, so that to carry the second reading of this Bill at present, without knowing whether that is to be so or not, seems to me to be definitely unreasonable. If on the other hand the Legislative Council is to continue to be elected upon a property franchise then there is no question whatever but that certain types of amendments, particularly the one having

reference to money Bills, should be passed by this House. I think that is the fair and reasonable way to look at the question of taking the second reading now. I was surprised when the Minister moved the second reading of this Bill, because he must realise that it is this House he is working on, and the verdict of this House has been given in regard to the Electoral Act Amendment Bill, so that as far as we are concerned the Legislative Council is to be elected on adult suffrage.

Now, if it is elected on adult suffrage it will have the same rights as representing the adult electors of Western Australia—all those persons over 21—as this House has got with the possible exception, as I say, of money Bills. So unless we are in a position to know what is to be the fate of the Electoral Act Amendment Bill I do not think that we can in this House be asked to record an intelligent vote on the measure now before us. In some circumstances it might be moved that the second reading be at this day six months, or something of that kind, but that would be an attempt to defeat the measure. The member for Pingelly shows his fairness by not suggesting that the Bill be read this day six months, with a view of defeating it, but simply that it be postponed until we know exactly what type of franchise the Legislative Council is to have in the future.

Mr. Withers: It might be longer than six months.

Mr. WATTS: That would be a very unfortunate set of circumstances. I suggest that the Legislative Council will manage to determine its attitude on the other Bill before many weeks have elapsed. In any event, is this House to be asked to vote on the second reading now in the sure and certain knowledge, according to the member for Bunbury, that we cannot know what is going to happen to the Electoral Bill? If that is so, then we are simply stultifying our intelligence.

We are asked to record a vote on something when we have not the faintest notion whether the Electoral Act Amendment Bill will become law. In these circumstances it is more preposterous than ever. I was assuming—the member for Bunbury may have a more intimate knowledge of the matter than I have—on the perfectly reasonable assumption, that the Legislative Council would deal with the Bill now before it in the course of a very few weeks. That being the case we shall know what to do, because I assure the Minister that my attitude on this measure will be very different in the varying circumstances that may arise. It will receive a substantial measure of support if the other place turns down the Electoral Act Amendment Bill, but will receive no support at all if the other place accepts that measure.

So I ask the Minister to agree to suspend the discussion on this measure until we have some knowledge of the determination of another place in regard to the Electoral Act Amendment Bill. That would be fair to everyone, and would enable us to come to our conclusions in the full knowledge of the circumstances, and would not deprive the Government of the opportunity of having the measure discussed and put upon the statute-book, if Parliament thinks proper; and it would, I think, have been far wiser of the hon. gentleman had he retained this Bill in the cupboard, or wherever it is that Bills not proceeded with for the time being are kept, until the fate of the other measure had been determined. He would then have come here with a clear front instead of, as he was in his second reading speech, working on the assumption—and he had no right to do so—that the Legislative Council would continue to be elected on its old franchise when he did not know whether it would or would not. He does not know now. He knows that as far as this House is concerned it will not be, but that it will be elected upon some quite new system.

But the Minister did not make any reference to that system in his speech on the Bill. All he dwelt on was the fact that the Legislative Council was elected on the property qualification, and a few days before he had passed through this Chamber a Bill which altered that system. In fairness to himself, let alone to me and those associated with me, it would be wise for him to postpone the further consideration of this measure until we know what sort of a Legislative Council we are going to be asked to deal with in the future. So I reiterate the hope that the hon. gentleman will see fit to postpone the discussion on this measure until we can arrange our ideas in accordance with the true facts and not some imaginary state of affairs, or past history.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (on amendment): The Leader of the Opposition is usually very logical in his argument, but he is making very heavy weather of this. I can see no analogy between this Bill and the one that the Leader of the Opposition has been discussing. Irrespective of the composition of the Legislative Council it is quite conceivable that there will be deadlocks.

Mr. Watts: This Bill will not stop deadlocks.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That is a matter of opinion. I understand that the Bill makes provision to overcome the deadlocks that have been going on for years. If I have read it properly I understand the Bill to tell the Legislative Council, irrespective of its composition, that in certain cases the Governor, or the King's Representative, will be requested to sign the legislation as passed by this House if carried three times with an interval between. What has that to do with the composition of the Legislative Council?

Mr. Watts: Quite a lot. It would not be reasonable if elected on adult suffrage.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not see that that makes any difference. Before an election a man would be rather diffident about betting too many pounds at even money on what the composition of this House would be on adult franchise. It is conceivable that with adult franchise for the Legislative Council the opposite Party from the one in power here will have the majority there. The same position, although perhaps not quite so bad as today, could arise, particularly as 50 members go out of this House when there is a general election. But the Bill that has gone to the Legislative Council does not provide for the whole 30 members of the Council to go out together. One third of them will still be elected every two years.

Mr. Watts: But still they will be elected on adult suffrage.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, and whether they are elected on the adult franchise, or any other way, because only one third of that Chamber will be elected at a time, the composition of this House will have a big bearing on the Council elections. It is easily conceivable that we could have the Labour Party on the Government benches here and the Opposition in the majority in the other House, or vice versa.

Mr. Kelly: It is a non-Party House!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie may be so unsophisticated as to believe that.

Mr. Watts: Which adult suffrage do you take the most notice of—the one that elects this House, or the other?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Bill takes more notice of this House, and that is what the Bill is for. The Legislative Assembly will dominate the position if the measure is carried, irrespective of the composition of the other House. I am beginning to think that the Opposition is not so unsophisticated as I had first believed, because its leader has mentioned two factors that may arise with regard to the Bill in the Legislative Council. One is that it may be defeated and the other that it may be carried. But he knows as well as I that there is a third possibility, namely, that the Bill may very easily go through this session and a request may be made for an Honorary Royal Commission to sit after the session has concluded, in which case we shall have no electoral reform Bill.

Mr. Watts: Do you think that it is a waste of time to bring down this Bill?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That may be so, but we can get all these Bills up to the Legislative Council and it can please itself what it does about them, and the public of this country will know what it is doing about them. I see no reason to carry the amendment. I do not see any analogy between this Bill and the one that has already gone forward. Whatever the composition of that House, if the Bill is carried—and I am optimistic enough to believe it will be—there will still be deadlocks, and that is what this measure aims to overcome.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Pilbara): I support the second reading of this Bill. The member for Pingelly suggested that I had not studied it. I think that members generally will agree that actually there are two main provisions set out in the measure. The first, as I see it, is that if a money Bill is passed at least one month before the end of the session by the Assembly it becomes law no matter what action another place takes. The second is that any Bill, other than a money Bill, if passed in three successive

sessions, and sent to the Council at least one month before the end of each session and the Council rejects it, then becomes law. The object of the Bill is practically the same, despite the suggestion of a previous speaker, as that of the Parliament Act of Britain passed in 1911. The Legislative Council has unlimited power to veto the wishes of the representatives of the people of this State generally. We have been told that there is no provision to overcome a deadlock between the two Houses, and that this House, when any measure it has passed is sent to another place, must in the final analysis bow to the will or rule of the Legislative Council. If the Council is adamant on any particular issue, the Bill as passed by this House must be accepted as amended by another place or dropped altogether. This is a state of affairs that has prevailed over a long period of years, and I am sorry to find there are some representatives of the people who would still contend that the time is not ripe for reform so that the Assembly will not have its wishes thwarted at the whim of members of another place.

There was a time in the British Parliament when the House of Lords, which is a hereditary Chamber, had the right to veto any legislation passed by the House of Commons, but on the 19th August, 1911, a measure was assented to providing for an appropriate restriction of the powers of the House of Lords so that the representatives of the great masses of the people of the United Kingdom might have their wishes translated into effect by any Bill passed by the Commons. In order that there may be no misunderstanding as regards members on the Government side of the House, I say this is not an indirect method of attempting to abolish the Legislative Council, and I do not think that the member who contended it was really believed it. This is simply an effort to ensure that the representatives of the people will be able to have any legislation they want passed into law instead of being vetoed by another place.

Let us consider the position that has faced us times out of number. We have been told from the public platform by members of another place that the second Chamber is a House of review, and that it has been set up under the Constitution as a check against hasty legislation. This Bill is a complete answer to those who would endeavour to justify the continuance of the second Chamber on a restricted and privileged franchise, because it definitely provides that a particular measure must be passed by this Chamber in three successive sessions and that a period of two years must elapse following the Council's refusal before the Bill becomes law. There is nothing hasty about that. Members of another place and of this Chamber might meanwhile confer with a view to provision being made for any desirable or reasonable amendment, but if this Chamber, which is representative of a majority of the people of the State, desires legislation in a definite direction—and I point out that, though a Labour Government is in power today, an anti-Labour Government might be in power tomorrow—and is going to be thwarted for two years, the democratic and reasonable way out is to provide that the will of this Chamber shall prevail against that of the privileged place.

Mr. Watts: Why wait two years?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: A member of the British House of Commons, John Buchan—I have forgotten for the moment the constituency he represented——

Hon. P. Collier: Battersea.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: That is right. He represented Conservative interests and was afterwards made Governor-General of Canada. Some years after the Parliament Act was passed, an effort was made in the British Parliament to restore to the House of Lords some of the power taken from it in 1911. When John Buchan made his maiden speech in the House of Commons, a Bill for the restoration of certain powers to the House of Lords was before the Commons. In a book entitled "Memory Hold the Door," he said—

> My maiden speech, delivered two months after my election, was something of an occasion. The Lord Chancellor had introduced in the Lords a Bill to amend the Parliament Act, which proposed a reformed second chamber and the restoration of certain powers lost in 1911. To me and to many of the younger Conservatives, this seemed to be a policy which would rouse endless controversy in the country. The Parliament Act was working well enough, and we did not believe in the cry about the need for barriers against revolution; if the people really wanted revolution, no paper safeguards could stop them. I arranged to make my debut in the Commons on Lord Cave's proposal, and to my consternation my purpose was advertised beforehand in the Press, so that I

had a double reason for nervousness. I lunched that day, I remember, with Mr. Neville Chamberlain, who said that he thanked Heaven that no such fate had befallen him.

When the moment came, it was worse even than I had feared. I spoke fourth in the tea hour, and rose in an almost empty House. I had prepared a careful speech, but my first sentences sounded duller than human nature could bear, and my voice a hideous croak. Then my nervousness departed and boredom succeeded. I feared that I might have to stop and yawn. But suddenly I realised, from the surprised look of the only occupant of the Treasury Bench, that I was speaking against the Government and my own party, and that gave me a slight fillip. Then I perceived that the House was filling up, and presently that it was packed, with a crowd below the Bar. After that I began to enjoy myself and, greatly daring, I ventured to conclude with a solemn rhetorical appeal to respect the spirit of the Constitution. Mr. Lloyd George, who followed, did me the honour to repeat my argument in his own words. No more was heard of the Lord Chancellor's scheme, for the Whips knew that if it had been pressed, several hundred Conservatives would have joined me in the Opposition lobby.

That is the statement of a former Conservative member of the House of Commons who, when an effort was made to restore some of the powers lost by the House of Lords in 1911, was very definite that he would not have the restoration made if he could avoid it, and the indication is that a number of Conservative members realised the obligation of Parliament to the masses of the people.

I shall support the second reading. I think the time is overdue for an alteration of the relationships existing between our two Houses. If there is going to be a continuation of the bicameral system on the present basis or on a modified basis, this Chamber should have the last say which will be truly representative of the will of the people. It will be very interesting to note how members of the Country and Democratic League in another place react to this measure. A test will be applied to them whether they believe in democracy, or in the rights of property as against the rights of the people. I will leave it at that, expressing the hope that the Bill will pass the second reading and shortly be placed on the statute-book in the same way as the Parliament Act was placed on the statute-book in England.

On motion by the Minister for Works, debate adjourned.

BILL—NATIVES (CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 5th October.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [5.25]: I support the second reading, although I frankly confess that the Bill does not go as far as I should like it to go. It does however, conform in a great degree to the opinions I expressed when dealing with the Native Administration Act. On that occasion I suggested that the legislation adopted for the natives of Western Australia was wrong in principle. I cannot understand why, when the obligation is imposed upon us to care for the natives of this State, we should single them out for special consideration in the matter of legislation. I pointed out on a previous occasion that in my humble judgment those natives should be educated, and any who possessed a drop of white blood should not be brought within the scope of such legislation. They should all be exempt, and only when misdemeanours committed by them indicate that they are unworthy of citizenship should we act. I still maintain that that is the most logical viewpoint to take.

I do not share the view of some members who have spoken on this Bill, and I can visualise the repercussions that would occur if we singled out whites who commit certain misdemeanours for special legislation over and above the punishment provided by the laws with which all citizens have to abide. I venture to say that not one member who has spoken on this Bill would agree to special legislation imposing a second penalty on any white individual who made it a habit to indulge in intoxicating liquor. Not one of those members would say it was right and proper to introduce special legislation and provide a special penalty against a habitual misdemeanant. Therefore I ask whether it is fair that we should do this to the people we are pleased to call natives. I think we do an injustice to a great many of those people when we constantly harp upon their failings. Have we, as whites, no failings at all?

Mr. Watts: We practically gave the natives a great many of them.

Mr. MARSHALL: Is there none in our midst who is an habitual drunkard? Is there none in our midst who looks with great disfavour upon hard work or the system of task livelihood? Of course there

is! But these persons are subject to one law only, so why single out the natives for a second penalty? If they are granted citizenship rights, will they not be subject to the same laws as you, Mr. Speaker, and I are subject to at the moment? Would you or I like to know that there was a second penalty awaiting us in respect of which all the other members of this Chamber would be exempt?

Mr. Withers interjected.

Mr. MARSHALL: The member for Bunbury can speak for himself. I know he has a guilty conscience, hence his interjection.

Mr. SPEAKER: A member must not reflect upon another member.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not reflecting on the member for Bunbury, Sir. I am suggesting he has a guilty conscience. This measure proposes to confer upon some natives full citizenship rights. If granted, those natives will have the same status as every other citizen of the State; they will be subject to the same laws, no matter what those laws may be, and they will be liable to the same punishment if they offend against those laws. Surely that is sufficient. Why should we say to a citizen, "Although you enjoy full citizenship rights, if you commit only one offence, you will be punished under two laws. You will be punished, for instance, for habitual drunkenness, and then you will, for the same offence, be deprived of your citizenship rights." I contend that is a wrong principle, more particularly if it is to be applied to natives who have white blood in them. Many full-blooded natives are well educated and thoroughly understand what would be required of them as citizens, yet we always seem pleased to refer to them as natives.

Some people argue that natives have no initiative and no desire for work. There may be some truth in the contention, but what encouragement do we give them, except to work? One member referred to a native who had laboured for many years for a certain employer and who, on one occasion or more, vanished. He went for what is usually termed a "pink-eye." How many whites are there who do not enjoy an annual holiday? Some whites have more holidays than they are entitled to.

The Minister for Mines: Speak for yourself.

Mr. MARSHALL: No comment whatever is made on that fact, but because a native "goes bush," which is his way of enjoying a holiday, he is subjected to much adverse criticism. Where else can he go? He usually earns merely a pittance. We do not encourage natives to do anything better than go on a "pink-eye," which is as much as they can afford and which in some cases is but little better than the holiday enjoyed by many whites. Some whites have no holidays at all; they work all the year round, they cannot go even for a "pink-eye," but I suppose that is their mode of living. They are really but little better than natives in this respect. We are constantly legislating for the native and telling him that we do so for his protection.

Mr. J. Hegney: It is no use "going bush" while an election is on.

Mr. MARSHALL: No; still, the native would be subject to the same laws as would be the hon. member himself if he "went bush," and this Bill were passed. My argument is that we do not encourage the natives to improve their lot. We look upon them with some degree of scorn because of the colour in their make-up. Nevertheless, we should not be unmindful of the fact that it was our own people who gave the native part of his colour. What we complain of in the natives is due to the example set by us, and when I say "us" I mean the whites. There must be a big change in our outlook on the natives. We see Allied servicemen of all colours in our midst, and the strangest fact of all is that we proffer them the hand of hospitality. Yet here we are legislating to impose another penalty upon those of colour born in the country!

Another remarkable contradiction is that we have other coloured persons from various countries residing in Australia, some of whom are full-blooded negroes. We have no second law for them, yet for those born in the country we propose to have two laws always. I cannot ally myself to that principle at all. If we were more considerate to the natives, especially to those who have white blood in their veins, and if we were to encourage them, we would find that they would readily respond and would aspire to higher things. In my opinion, none of these natives should come under the Native Administration Act at all. Whatever good that Act may be, it should apply to those who are

known as myalls, to the real native living as such. Wherever possible we should try to induce such natives to give up their tribal habits and live according to our standards.

I rose to say that I disagree with the principle that one class of native can migrate to our country and reside here and be subject to one law only, while the natives who are born here and cannot leave the country shall be subject to two laws, under the theory that it is for their edification and benefit. The Bill goes some way along the road to a contention which I have held for a long time; and I feel sure that if we treat the natives as citizens we shall find that many of the things to which we now take exception will rapidly disappear. This should be the line of procedure we ought to adopt. I support the Bill.

MR. DONEY (Williams-Narrogin): The member for Murchison went to much trouble to make out a case against drunken whites, his object appearing to be to show that they were not deserving of the citizenship rights to which they were born. He may be right or he may not, but what has that to do with the Bill? If this Bill sought to take away the rights of citizenship from whites because of over-drinking there would be some point in what he has been trying to tell the House, but since the Bill does not deal with that phase at all, I hold that there is no point whatever in his remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Speaker will decide whether the hon. member is in order or not.

Mr. DONEY: I realise that, Sir. I recall another speaker to the measure who said that there should be a period of probation before the native or the half-caste became a citizen. Provision for that is, of course, quite unnecessary, for the reason that the native applying for citizenship must prove —under the terms of the Bill—that he has been for two years of good behaviour. As one can see, that in itself is a suitable substitute for probation. Under the Bill, it must be realised too that, after all, a native who becomes a citizen always remains, as it were, under probation, for the reason that he is liable at any time to have his citizenship revoked. One member—I think it was my colleague on my left—said he thought that the fact that the native had been a soldier would not beneficially affect his title to citizenship. If that is so, plainly that would not be the fault of the native. I will agree that Army life would not improve a native. I do not see how it could. On the contrary, it makes him an adept at two-up, housey-housey, crown and anchor and so forth; but I think that in general we are prone to disregard that particular phase of a soldier's life and to regard him, whether black or white, as entitled to compensation of some kind for his sacrifices and for his display of loyalty to his land.

If in the case of native soldiers that compensation should take the form of the gift of citizen rights, I do not think anyone can afford to grumble. For myself, I cordially welcome the Bill. To me its main purpose is highly laudable, but I cannot help thinking that it will meet with a great deal of opposition, particularly from people who live in those towns where natives are apt to foregather, and where the more unsavoury aspects of native life are constantly before the eyes of the people. It is a sound idea to make citizenship contingent upon good behaviour over a lengthy period, and further to ensure that the natives have a smattering of education. Under the Bill they are required to speak and understand English. I think, and I commend this by way of an amendment to the Minister, that the native should also be required to read English. Let him be that much more encouraged to improve himself, for, on the assumption of citizenship, he becomes liable not only to certain privileges but also to certain duties. I cannot help thinking that the ability to read the King's English as well as to speak it would be of very sensible benefit to the native. I do not say that he should be able to read English to the same extent as would be required of an ordinary white person, but he might be called upon, at the discretion of the magistrate, to show his ability to read at least a few words or letters, or to sign his name.

Mr. W. Hegney: Many white people cannot either read or write.

Mr. DONEY: The weaknesses that some white men of a certain type have do not affect the situation with which we are dealing. The native should be in a position to demonstrate his knowledge at least of the alphabet. I recall that the member for Roebourne considered that citizenship should be made a great deal easier than it

will be under this Bill. I do not look at the matter in that light. If we make it too easy the native will not take any great pride in his new status.

Mr. Withers: You have evidently got the silent support of your party.

Mr. DONEY: I thank the hon. member for pointing that out. Let this be something which the native will need to strive for so that what he ultimately receives may appear as a reward for well-doing. The least acceptable part of the Bill, to me, is where it requires a native to forgo all association with his tribal friends. That is rough on him. I hate the idea of forcing him for the rest of his life, if he becomes to all intents and purposes a white man, to keep away from relatives and others with whom it has been his wont continuously to associate.

The Minister for the North-West: Evidently you did not read the clause dealing with that.

Mr. DONEY: Of course I understand the restriction will not apply to the native's own relatives, his mother, his father, his brothers or sisters, or his children.

The Minister for the North-West: Will you tell the House the meaning of "tribal associations"?

Mr. DONEY: It means, to associate with those members of the tribe who have been his friends.

The Minister for the North-West: Who follow tribal customs!

Mr. DONEY: If the Minister can read "tribal customs" into "tribal associations," I suppose he is entitled to do so, but it does not necessarily stop at that or go so far. As the Minister knows, from my talks with him, I have had a great deal of experience of natives in many parts of the world. I cannot think of anything more likely to render the idea of citizenship unpopular than to force our natives to forgo association with those who all their lives have been their friends. If this condition in the Bill be insisted on, I think it will restrict citizenship largely to those who live in camps near civilised centres. I agree that there are many natives in the camps now who can qualify. I know of many myself.

I recall once being in the town of Williams. A great many natives congregate around there. I was on the station in the darkness awaiting the train. Two men began to converse with me out of the darkness upon the manner in which the war was proceeding and the conduct of the war. I found myself engaged in an interesting conversation with these two men. When the train came in and lighted the platform I found to my amazement that I was talking to a full-blooded black and a half-caste. There was nothing in their conversation to indicate that they were blacks. Many natives of that type should qualify quite easily under the Bill. I know of many natives and half-castes of high mentality. In the Mullewa district there were two with whom I was closely acquainted. Their names were Phillips and Marsh. Those two full-blooded natives were boss drovers, and had white men in their employ. That and many other cases of the same kind I have come in contact with indicate to me that there is a large number of natives who would qualify quite easily.

When introducing the Bill, the Minister went into the question of child endowment. I think he said that there were 400 blacks or half-castes in the State who had qualified to receive child endowment. I fancy he said that only 17 of them had the endowment withheld on account of misspending it. I do not know whether the Minister has made any close investigation into the matter, but I do know that in and around Narrogin and further to the west, where natives live in fairly large numbers, the common thing is for the husband to collect the money and thereafter to slip around the corner with his mates and, after an hour or two of two-up, the money has gone and the family receives nothing. Having regard to the large number of cases of that description, it might be a good idea to withhold the child endowment from the natives.

The Minister for the North-West: If you have been told that the husband has drawn the child endowment, I think you have been misled.

Mr. DONEY: Does the Minister say that is not so?

The Minister for the North-West: The money would not be paid to him.

Mr. DONEY: I cannot say that I have been at the post office, or wherever the money is paid, and have seen the husband collect it; I can only say that that sort of thing is the constant comment in the two towns I have just mentioned. I cannot help thinking that there is something in it, after all.

The Minister for the North-West: You remind me of my pet phrase about "idle gossip."

Mr. DONEY: In conversation with the Minister on one occasion I told him he was all too prone to regard talk which was in any way harsh upon the department he administers as idle gossip. That term is not justified. I am sure he would hear quite a lot of good about his conduct of the department, quite a lot that is complimentary. I do not think he would hear either from members or the people generally much in the way of criticism of the manner in which Mr. Bray, the Commissioner, carries out his work. To my mind, he measures well up to his responsibilities, and I would be the last to say anything harsh as to his conduct. The Bill has my support.

MR. WATTS (Katanning): I support the second reading. The Minister ought to be very pleased generally at the reception his proposals have received. No-one has quarrelled with him at all as to the objective he is endeavouring to achieve. As we go through the State, we realise that there are natives and natives. There are some whom one would readily admit are sufficiently equipped, both mentally and morally, to warrant them in taking their full part in all affairs connected with the government of the country. We see also a great number who in no circumstances would be in that position for a long time. A measure of this kind will undoubtedly influence some of the latter the better to equip themselves for citizenship. I find it very difficult to agree with those members who compare natives who would be eligible for citizenship rights under this Bill with members of the white races. We have quite different antecedents. The white races have fought for their present citizenship, if not actually with weapons at least with every political device that one can imagine over hundreds of years. They have the background of training and experience which has bred in them those attributes which make for citizenship.

Natives, on the contrary—it is not their fault—have just risen from the order of Nature, and have as their background their tribal associations—I do not think any other phrase would cover it better. Only in recent years have they been in touch in any way with the institutions and methods of government, the condition of affairs in which the white races, to a greater or lesser extent, have participated for hundreds of years past. It is obvious, therefore, that we have to look upon the native as a child in citizenship, as one who should be kindly treated, who should be given every opportunity to improve himself and who, when he becomes worthy with that ripe experience and mature knowledge which should be the responsibility of the white citizen, and which the white citizen has come to at this stage in the world's history, may then join with his white brethren and take part as fully as they do in the every-day affairs of government, in the management of civic matters, and in citizenship generally. I think it is very necessary to draw that distinction.

One cannot suddenly take an individual from his nomadic state, without any responsibilities and without any obligations, and say to that individual that he is just as entitled and as well equipped to accept the responsibilities and obligations of citizenship as are white people whose background, training and whole history has been the acquisition, by slow and devious means, of those rights and, incidentally, therefore, of those responsibilities. I view the native question as one requiring the most sympathetic handling in the world. Those people should not be subjected in any circumstances to conditions that are unfair or degrading. It should be our very great effort to lift them from the state in which they have been, to help them avoid as far as possible the evils that we know have been communicated to them as a result of their association with the white race, and to enable them to occupy in life positions that are worth while—and then encourage not only their improvement but, perhaps by comparison with the good state they reach, encourage greater efforts among those sections of our white people that were referred to by the member for Murchison. I think the first need in order to bring a greater number of our native population to the stage where they can participate reasonably in the rights that are proposed under the Bill, is to ensure that they are educated.

Steps to educate the native and half-caste population, particularly the latter in Western Australia, have not, during the last decade or two, been particularly encouraging. On the contrary, we find that there has been no systematic method pursued to that end.

There have not been many teachers appointed to deal en bloc with the natives and more particularly with the half-caste population. Some of the youngsters have managed to get into schools provided for white children and have picked up a smattering of education. In a great many cases, however, the children have little or no such opportunity. It is vital indeed that an opportunity should be given to them as quickly as possible. Some 18 months ago I was able to visit the Carrolup Native Settlement quite unannounced and accompanied by my colleague, the member for Pingelly. In the course of our inspection and discussion with the superintendent, we were taken to the school where we found some 30 children. One of the lads, who was about 13 years of age, was studying for his Junior examination. He was not a full blood but in appearance he was blacker than a half-caste. He was indeed very dark. I had an opportunity to talk to the lad and inspect the work he had been doing. I also talked with the teacher about him. It was quite obvious that if that young fellow continued in the way he had begun, he would become a citizen of credit to himself and to Western Australia.

There were others not so advanced as that youngster but still on the way to learning those things that are desirable and necessary for anyone to know that aspires in these competitive days to participate in the affairs of this or any other country governed under the methods of the white civilisation. These are the natives that have to be looked after, and education is what is required. It must be provided because the number of half-castes in this State is rapidly increasing. A great number of youngsters should be brought together and trained in accordance with a curriculum suitable to their likely pursuits in after-life. If this is done then the provisions of the Bill under discussion will, in the course of the next 20 years or so, prove to be of great advantage to the native population and to the State. If we do not adopt that course, we shall not play fairly with the natives nor yet with the white population. We shall merely say to the full-blooded native and the half-caste, "You can scratch along and do the best you can with a view to taking advantage of the privileges enjoyed by the white people, and then if you are able to satisfy a magistrate that your qualifications are in accordance with requirements of the law, you can have a certificate of citizenship. But we are not going to do more to train you towards that end. You will have to acquire in your wanderings knowledge that has been garnered for us and bred into us as white people for centuries past, and you will have to acquire it in a casual and accidental manner."

If that is to be the position, it will not work out. The native people are entitled, just as we are, to an opportunity. If we provide them with that opportunity and they have taken advantage of it, then when they are knowledgeable and wise in the ways of the white people we should give them the rights of citizenship and give them freely. We should not be anxious to take those rights back again. Until that stage is reached, there must obviously be some restrictions and the right to withdraw the certificate of citizenship when proper to do so, because we shall not know at that stage whether the natives have really qualified for ascendency—I use that term advisedly—into the sphere of industrial and civic life into which they will be introduced the moment they receive their certificate. I think these are the ideas the Minister has in mind. He does not intend to rush blindly into the granting of citizenship to all and sundry but will give those of the native population that seek citizenship rights the opportunity to prove that they are able to behave themselves and to take further advantage of the opportunity to carry on and improve. If that is the intention, I believe the blessing of a large section of the community will be on the Bill. I believe that every pressure should be brought to bear upon the authorities in charge to institute a system of education that will more quickly and in a suitable manner equip the half-caste population in particular to acquire the obligations of citizenship at the earliest possible date.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco): In his opening remarks the Minister said he hoped the Bill would be passed so that natives who were prepared to adopt a higher standard of living would have the opportunity to gain full citizenship rights. I am quite sure that the Bill will be passed, but I am not confident that very many natives will be able to qualify for citizen-

ship. The Minister said that about 400 natives had enlisted as soldiers in the Army and I hope some provision will be made so that all those men may secure citizenship rights without the need for further qualification. The mere fact that they have become soldiers should be sufficient guarantee for their citizenship. As the member for East Perth so ably remarked the measure may be described as a "Thou shalt not Bill." The natives, according to the measure, cannot become qualified if they suffer from certain diseases. I believe that yaws is a dirt disease acquired mostly because the natives in their childhood days had not been washed. I have ascertained that the disease is not so prevalent among natives who have been brought up in districts where there are rivers and pools. If we were to go round the various hospitals in this State we would find many people suffering from skin diseases caused by dirt. I do not think, viewing the incidence on the basis of numbers, we would find such diseases more prevalent among the natives than among the white population.

The Bill also provides that natives seeking citizenship rights cannot attain them if they are suffering from syphilis but does not specify whether the syphilis must be congenital or acquired. If the former then the native would have no chance whatever of securing citizenship. If the disease is acquired then in nine cases out of 10 the disease has been acquired through associations with the white race. Then again a necessary condition is that the native shall understand English before he can secure citizenship rights. In my electorate I know of one or two people who cannot speak English at all. How they ever passed the test that enabled them to gain admittance to the country I cannot say. Then again I know some soldiers who have enlisted but cannot write a word of English. Notwithstanding that fact they are citizens. Yet the native must understand English!

The most outstanding portion of the Bill so far as I can see is the provision that says the natives desiring citizenship rights must not associate with other natives. In this particular regard I do not know what meaning is attached to the words "associate with." That qualification is one that it will be most cruel to insist upon, and when the Bill is at the Committee stage I shall endeavour to have that provision altered. Who would be better qualified to educate natives than an educated native? Yet if the latter were to associate with other natives his citizenship would be revoked. The Minister informed the House that the amending Act of 1938 had greatly improved the status of the natives. If that is so, then their condition must indeed have been deplorable before that year because it is most deplorable now. I understand there are about 28,000 natives in Western Australia, including about 6,000 half-castes. As the Minister informed members that there was no obligation upon parents to register half-caste children at birth, I do not see how those figures could be verified.

I propose to indicate that the Bill represents a good deal of window-dressing and may be described as a sop to those who have criticised the administration of the Department of Native Affairs. I do not say that I am not appreciative of the introduction of the Bill, but I believe it has been placed before Parliament because of the criticism that has been levelled at the department. The Minister said that he did not take any notice of adverse criticism that appeared in the Press, but I think that notice should be taken of it. That represents the only means by which departmental officials can gain knowledge. I propose to read a few of the letters that have been sent to the department and to various persons in authority. They have been written by people who criticise the existing system and indicate how it will be almost impossible for the natives to qualify for citizenship under the provisions of the Bill if they continue as they are at present under the Department of Native Affairs.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: At the tea adjournment I was saying that I would endeavour to prove tonight, by reading two documents, the almost impossibility, under present conditions, of making natives qualify for citizenship. I now intend to read those documents. The first is a letter written on the 8th August, 1944, from the Moore River settlement, to an Archdeacon. The contents are—

> I feel that a strong representation should be made at Synod on behalf of the young people of this settlement for whom the future holds no prospect. I want to make it quite

clear at the outset that the present Superintendent and Matron have only been in charge a matter of two months, therefore cannot be held responsible for this situation which has been permitted to grow steadily over a considerable period, and which now threatens to overwhelm the entire youth population unless some drastic action is taken immediately. Some time ago I made a report at the request of the chairman of A.B.M., a copy of which I am enclosing for your perusal. Since then subsequent events have served to confirm my opinion. Education is still at a standstill, after 16 months, and all the boys and girls of school age have become absorbed in the low activities of the older natives and degenerates sent in from all parts of the State under warrant. During the past week a scandal has occurred which would shock the public. Here are the facts: Eight working boys from the camps were discovered after midnight in two dormitories occupied by girls from eight to fourteen years of age, and working girls respectively. I interviewed these boys next day with the Superintendent and those not under warrant were dismissed from the Settlement. This sort of thing has been going on for months past. I drew the Commissioner's attention to it last year (14th June) and his reply was that it was regrettable that the boys and girls could not be trusted—that he would take steps to have it rectified, and the matter ended there. Since then the institution has simply developed into an all-night and all-day brothel and the various members of the staff have expressed to me concern and disapproval which I feel I should convey to Synod. There is a constant stream of girls absconding and being brought back under escort and warrant. At the time of writing there are 17 girls missing and five more returned today. The entire method of handling native affairs is a ghastly failure and an indictment on the whole Commonwealth. I think it is time we realised our responsibility in a more practical way than sympathetic remarks and masterly inactivity. Much publicity has already been given to this place but, believe me, the half has not been told. If the honour of the Church represented here is to be maintained, something must be done to protect the children and young people from the perverts and delinquents committed here—the reasonable solution being segregation.

I now proceed to read another communication, dated the 1st March, 1944—

Early in December you wrote to me with reference to a national policy for the aborigines under consideration, and asked me to express my personal views. I am sorry I have been so long in answering your letter but in the light of events during the past six months and their far reaching repercussions it would have been difficult to present what I wanted to be a fair and unbiassed statement. I have given careful thought to the proposal and from my own knowledge and experience here I do think that Federal and State co-operation is essential to the successful pursuance of a native policy for this State. The native population is out of all proportion to the population and resources of the white people. No fixed policy ever seems to have been developed because no real survey has ever been made—expediency seems to have always been the watchword. The very first qualification in dealing with natives is a first-hand knowledge and a permanent staff of specially trained officers, both of which are completely lacking in the Department of Native Affairs and their reserves. So acute has become the feeling of inadequacy of this department that fair-minded and decent people do not care to be associated with the odour which surrounds it and it is difficult to even get applications for any position advertised. This state of affairs existed long before the war and manpower problems. If I just add here alone in the past two years there have been five different matrons, three superintendents, numerous nurses, storekeepers, and compound attendants—that with one exception every member of the staff has changed in the last nine months—I need hardly labour this point any further. Such changes are not conducive to good management and discipline. This applies equally to Carrolup. The Hon. Minister has visited the settlement twice to my knowledge in about four years and each time stayed only a matter of about two hours. His only solution is that a match be put under the whole place—not a very practical or helpful suggestion, you will agree.

Education: This is a situation about which I feel very strongly, and one which I think leaves much to be deplored in those who have been acquainted with the fact that for the past nine months here, and more recently at Carrolup Settlement in the South-West, there has been no school in operation and apparently no prospect of re-opening in the near future. There are about 150 children here of school age and they are growing up without even the first rudiments, and who spend their days playing two-up and marbles and wandering from camp to camp. The adolescents are a tremendous problem and are fast degenerating into an immoral, loafing camp life, and they will be condemned in later years for the very tendencies we are encouraging in them today. I understand efforts are being made by the Teachers' Union and the C.C.M. to compel the department to hand over the education of the natives to the Education Department, but so far without success. An "official" visit is a rarest occasion and, of course, no effort of "white washing" and "window dressing" is considered too great to beguile the department or representative bodies whom the department sees fit to send up. Recently we have had the "Sunday Times" reporters here making attempts to justify the work which the Department of Native Affairs is doing, and I am enclosing some of the cuttings published during the past few weeks, which can only be labelled lying propaganda. Nothing can ever justify the conduct and irresponsibility of the people sent here in an administrative capacity. The charge cannot altogether be laid to the unproductiveness of the soil, and consequent lack of suitable occupation of the natives. One glance at the state of the buildings, fences, roads would be sufficient to convince one that

there is enough repair and maintenance work needed on this place alone to keep several gangs of men working for the next twelve months and, far from being soured as the "Sunday Times" claims through lack of occupation, I find the men enjoy the unrestrained freedom and laziness of camp life which provides them with food, tobacco, clothing and the few amenities of life they find necessary to their present outlook and environment. While playing "two-up" and co-habiting with the numerous native girls who idle about all day long are the main attractions, it is not likely that they will be anxious to go out to employment or even work on the place except under strict supervision. There is very little actual work done by the men after 11.30 each day, excepting by perhaps half a dozen cutting wood and three or four engaged on building work. This is the outcome of an apathetic attitude which is content to spend thousands annually to keep natives out of sight and out of mind without any regard for their development and responsibility as citizens.

Reserves: The "Sunday Times" regards M.R.N.S. as "a costly failure," and so it is in every way. It has apparently taken over 25 years to discover this. A more barren, desolate spot could hardly be imagined. It is suitable only as an institution for old indigent natives or else for young children of kindergarten or primary school age. As it is now it is an orphanage, reformatory, penal settlement, vocational training centre (so-called), a camping place for indigent natives and a general dumping place for all the undesirables who are unwanted elsewhere—a disastrous setting for the character building of the younger generation whose upliftment we are claiming to accomplish. Until some segregation is made it is an almost hopeless task. I realise that lack of finance would be the outcry, but eventually a very big change will have to be made in the policy if we are to fulfil our obligations to these wards of the State. I have tried many times to draw attention to the deplorable conditions under which natives are expected to progress towards the impact of white civilisation, but apparently my Church feels that this is a matter of State concern rather than of Church. I fail to see where you can draw the line between the material and spiritual welfare of these people. It is impossible to expect any cultural or spiritual response in such sordid surroundings and it is time we, who represent the missionary work among the aborigines, made the matter of the education and vocational training of the children one of primary importance. I feel ashamed that our Church is identified with this place as it exists today, and if the real facts were made known there would be a hue and cry from all decent-minded white people and the Church rightly criticised for tolerating the depravity which exists. I honestly think we are doing more harm by herding these people together under such impossible living conditions than allowing them to live their own lives outside. We have a crowd of tribalised natives here at the present time from the Northern Territory, and the contrast between them and our own detribalised natives is a blot on our native administration. Since making the above report my Rector has visited the settlement, and on reading this through he asked me to add that he wishes to associate himself with and endorse my remarks.

I am supporting the Bill, but at the same time I wish definitely to state that there will be very few natives able to qualify under our present administration. I have here another report from a different person. I am referring to the remarks of different people because I want it to be understood that it is not merely one person who is criticising the department.

The Minister for the North-West: Who wrote that first report?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: This report reads—

> I have been trying to do something about Moore River——

The Minister for the North-West: You have not told us yet who wrote the first report.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: What would the Minister do if I told him?

The Minister for the North-West: I want to know who wrote the report.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: This report reads—

> I have been trying to do something about Moore River——

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member kindly resume her seat? I think the hon. member is criticising the department rather than speaking on the Bill. Criticism of the department does not come into the Bill and I would like the hon. member to keep to the point.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Very well, I will speak to the Bill. When we are discussing the Estimates I shall have an opportunity to continue the remarks I was making. I support the Bill simply because I think it is the best that can be done for the time being, but it is not a good Bill. I want to reiterate that we will never, under the present administration and the existing circumstances, get sufficient natives to qualify for citizenship, and therefore the Bill will hardly be worth while. I intended to deal with some information that appeared in tonight's paper but doubtless I should be ruled out of order, so I think I will leave the rest of my remarks until the Estimates are under consideration.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland): I have not taken a great interest in this Bill except as an ordinary member. What I mean to convey is that it does not affect my electorate and I have left it to other members who know more about the subject and are able to obtain first-hand information and, with their practical experience, assist the Minister in an effort, such as he is making in this Bill, to help the natives. However, I listened with a great deal of interest to the letters read by the member for Subiaco and I want the Minister to deal with that phase of the question relating to the education of the natives at the Moore River settlement—I think that was the place mentioned. It was stated that the education there is being neglected. It is no good talking about giving the franchise to natives if the educational side is neglected. I am quite astonished to find that the authority—and this is where I want the Minister to assist me—states most definitely that education is not given in the sense that I think members would like it to be given.

If we are going to elevate the natives, there is only one way to do it. We cannot elevate them by environment because they are not mixers. We must isolate them and, when we isolate the natives and send their children into isolation with them, we cannot expect them to qualify as citizens unless, in that isolation, we do attempt to educate them and make them appreciate the efforts that are being made by their white friends to ensure that they shall respect themselves to a greater extent, and try to elevate the social surroundings in which they live. There is no other way of doing this than by education and, if that is being neglected, it is a scandal. This is the first time I have heard a charge made so definitely that the education of young children eligible for education is not being attended to at Moore River. I do not know who is responsible for the charge, but it is a crime and I want the Minister to satisfy me at least on this question.

Mr. Cross: It may not be true.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is why I am appealing to the Minister to check up on the charge, because it is too serious to allow to pass. It is no good merely saying that we are going to take more interest in the natives by giving them rights of citizenship, and extending to those who do try to qualify an opportunity of becoming real citizens in the sense that they will be able to take part in the election of representatives to this Chamber for the general good of the country in which they are residing. We must start on bedrock and get down to the children. Is it true that the children are not being educated and that only now are we going to ask the Education Department to attend to their education? I would like to know whether that is correct, whether it is a new development and whether only recently the department has been appealed to, because that is what the letter conveys. It is suggested that it is now thought advisable for the Education Department to come into the picture. That is a phase on which I should like further information. Whoever wrote the letter evidently wrote about something he understood. A letter like that could not have been compiled by other than a practical person with a knowledge of the subject. The reading of the letter was an education to this House, and as a result of it I think the Minister will be able to clear up the point whether we are doing our job well. If we are not, the sooner we get on with it the better. If it is possible, I should like to see this place for myself now that I have heard so much about it, because I would like to know whether I am guilty, with others, in just taking a casual interest in a subject of this kind rather than applying myself to understanding it.

The Minister for the North-West: Did you listen to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition who went to Carrolup without an invitation?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes, but I should like to go myself because the letter has impressed me. I do not know who wrote it, but it has the imprint of a practical personal knowledge and I think members should be told whether it is founded on fact.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I would not have intervened in this debate had it not been for the remarks of the member for Guildford-Midland on the subject of the education of the natives. He has taken a point which is very vital in regard to giving citizenship rights to the natives, but he has built a case upon grounds that really do not exist. As a matter of fact, the Native Affairs Department has been for some time very much concerned about its

inability to provide essential education for native children. To say that the department was concerned about the matter is to put it very mildly. It was extremely worried and was at its wit's end to find a remedy, because the teaching of native children requires special teachers and it was almost impossible to obtain teachers of any kind, let alone special teachers for native children. One of the difficulties of the Native Affairs Department was that under its setup it was not possible to offer sufficiently attractive terms to obtain teachers for the desired purpose. Therefore the Government decided that, in order to make it possible under wartime conditions to obtain teachers, it would be advisable to transfer the education of the native children from the Native Affairs Department to the Education Department. That was done quite early this year, the object being that with our better salary range we would be able to secure satisfactory teachers to do the necessary work.

Unfortunately, we have been no more successful so far than was the Native Affairs Department, because of the extreme shortage of teachers. Members know that we have had to call back into the service of the department women who had previously left it for as long as 20 years. These women had been teachers previously, had married, and had given up teaching. I will say gladly that their response to our appeal was very satisfactory, and they have come back in large numbers to assist the department to keep the schools staffed during this very trying time. But we are still very short of teachers because we are not training nearly the number we should train each year, and we have so many in the Services. It has therefore not been possible to obtain those teachers who are essential for this job. But the department has not been idle. We have had men busy giving consideration to the drawing up of a special curriculum which will be introduced into the native schools. The director has had inquiries made in the other States to ascertain the lines upon which the education of native children is carried on in those States. As soon as we are in a position to supply the teachers, we hope to be able to educate these native children at the standard at which we believe they are entitled to be educated.

All I can say is that, with our serious limitations under existing conditions, we are making the necessary preparation to give attention to that education as soon as possible. While we must admit that for a time these children have not received education in that respect, they do not differ from some white children who have not been able to get proper education as a result of the shortage of teachers prevalent in this State. I might add that our experience is by no means unique. All the other States are experiencing the same trouble, because of the way in which the teachers answered the call of the country and volunteered for service. The Education Departments of Australia have been left very short of staff indeed. It is unfair to use existing conditions as a basis for argument and to say that the Government is falling down on its job so far as the education of the native child is concerned. We are very worried about the position, but have been powerless so far to remedy it. I can assure members that we keep the matter constantly in mind, and all that can be done is being done in the hope of making adequate preparation for the proper education of these children when circumstances permit.

THE MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST (in reply): I want to thank members, with the exception, of course, of the propagandist who never misses an opportunity to belittle any decent efforts made by anyone of a political colour other than her own. Members have given the Bill a very reasonable reception. Each member who has spoken in a critical way has been slightly critical of the Bill itself. The member for Subiaco raised nothing but criticism against the administration of the Native Affairs Department, and said nothing about the Bill. I remind the House that the member for Williams-Narrogin asked certain questions on the 21st September in reference to the particular business connected with the alleged scandals of the Moore River Native Settlement. My reply was to the effect——

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister for the North-West is not in order in referring to "Hansard."

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I am not; I am just refreshing my memory. My reply was to the effect that my attention had not been drawn to the scandal, but that a departmental investigation was then being held and that a

statement would be made to the House at a later stage. That departmental inquiry has been completed and I intend to give the history of the whole business when I introduce the Estimates. I have no desire to mix up a departmental inquiry with this Bill. But I do want to say, so that members will be under no misapprehension, that that letter was written by deaconess Heath, of the Moore River Settlement.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: It was not.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: A similar letter was.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: That means there were two of them.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I cross-questioned the hon. member on several occasions as to who was the writer of the letter and she refused to answer. I asked her if it was an anonymous letter and again she refused to answer. I had the right to have the letter laid on the Table of the House, but I did not ask for that to be done because I was fairly sure of my ground. That, or a similar letter, was written by the deaconess of the Moore River Settlement. If there is any truth underlying this scandal, then the deaconess's efforts of a spiritual nature have failed because she has been the resident missioner of the Moore River settlement for ten years. That is all I desire to say at the moment. I will leave the rest of my reply until I introduce the Estimates.

No great criticism has been levelled against the Bill. Some members have differed from my opinion with reference to certain precautionary measures. Other members have had placed on the notice paper amendments that they desire incorporated. I can deal with those amendments much more fully in the Committee stage. If I replied to them now, I would have to repeat myself in Committee and members do not desire a repetition of my arguments. The Minister for Education has replied to the criticism of the educational system. His reply was to the effect that the educational system of the Native Affairs Department has not failed. It has certainly deteriorated, owing to the war. There was at each of the settlements referred to a fully qualified teacher until recently. I am not prepared to argue as to the extent of the time mentioned by the member for Subiaco.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: It is 16 months.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I am fairly sure it is not as long as that since we had a teacher at Moore River, but I will have all the facts when speaking on the Estimates. As a matter of fact, the Native Affairs Department planned to get teachers and, as a matter of Government policy, we were going to provide experts. Unfortunately we have not been able to get teachers to go to these places. We have no teacher at Moola Bulla in the north of this State because the man who was there enlisted and we have not been successful in getting anyone to replace him. I do not know that the department is to be criticised. We cannot get teachers or force them to go to the Moore River Settlement and other places. We can only make application in the Press and offer the best conditions that we can afford. If no-one volunteers to take up the position, we have no power to commandeer anyone. So I say that we are not altogether responsible for the conditions that have caused the criticism that has been levelled against us. Some members have taken exception to certain of the precautionary measures in the Bill. Those provisions would not be there if, after my experience, I did not think they were absolutely necessary. When we are in Committee I shall be able to give a fuller explanation as each item comes forward. I am thankful to members generally for the reception they have given the Bill. I am satisfied that if it becomes law, it will be an incentive for the half-caste population, in particular, to aspire to something higher.

Question put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have counted the House and assured myself that there is an absolute majority of members present, and there being no dissentient voice I declare the question duly passed.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; the Minister for the North-West in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Adult natives may make application to a magistrate for certificate of citizenship:

Mr. WATTS: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of Subclause (1) the word "magistrate" be struck out and the

words "resident or stipendiary magistrate or Government Resident" be inserted in lieu.

My reason for moving this amendment is that the word "magistrate" does not make the position clear. Justices of the peace are frequently referred to as magistrates. What is intended and required is that these applications should be dealt with by the persons appointed by the Government to deal with all court matters in their respective districts. The districts mainly concerned with this measure have stipendiary or resident magistrates, but some of the northern districts have what are known as Government Residents. It is with the intention of including these people that I move the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I have no objection to this amendment. I was assured by the Crown Law officers that the word "magistrate" would suffice. The amendment embraces what I want. I do not desire a justice of the peace to try any of these cases, and the Crown Law officers assured me that justices of the peace would not be permitted to do so if the word "magistrate" were left there. No harm can be done by specifying the stipendiary, police or resident magistrate. I am willing to accept the amendment. I notice that the Leader of the Opposition has not added the word "magistrate" at the end of the words he proposes to insert. I hope that will not be overlooked, because if we strike out this word and do not re-insert it after the proposed amendment, it might leave room for doubt. If the Leader of the Opposition moved to insert the words he proposes to insert in the same line after the word "a," he would save striking out the word "magistrate" and re-inserting it. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of Subclause (2) the words "and native" be struck out.

The native who becomes educated is the one who would be most likely to educate and help his own people. Under the Bill his citizenship would be revoked if he went amongst his own people.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I hope this amendment will not be agreed to. If it is, it will ruin the whole purpose of the Bill. It is necessary to retain the word "native" because it includes not only the half-caste but other coloured persons such as quadroons, or lighter coloured people, over the age of 21 who are automatically white people unless they make claims to the Aborigines Department to be classed as natives. If the words are struck out, the object of the Bill will be defeated. We are dealing with both tribal and semi-educated natives. The half-caste is deemed a native under the Native Administration Act, just as is a full-blooded native. The member for Subiaco said she did not believe that many natives would qualify. Whether that be so or not, we do not want to handicap those who have a possibility of making advancement. The applicant must declare that he has dissolved all tribal and native association except with respect to lineal descendants or native relations of the first degree. Thus we are not debarring half-caste people from associating with their own relatives. It is to prevent them from drifting back to native habits or tribal customs that these precautions are necessary.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. LESLIE: I move an amendment.

That in line 2, paragraph (a) of Subclause (2), after the word "Commonwealth," the words "for a period of not less than two years" be inserted.

On the second reading I quoted from the report of the Commissioner of Native Affairs, in which he said that a number of natives who had served in the Forces were found to be unsatisfactory and were discharged. They were discharged before they had completed their period of service, and the Commissioner's remarks about them were not complimentary. The amendment will provide a qualifying period to show that the natives are worthy of receiving the rights of citizenship. We must have a safeguard. Otherwise service for perhaps a week or two would count.

Mr. Triat: Do you think that six months' service should qualify?

Mr. LESLIE: I admit that this is a difficult matter, and I am not wedded to the period of two years, but it will be easier to ask Parliament later on to remove the qualifying period if it is not required than to have to admit an error and take away something that has been granted. To grant these rights immediately will not achieve the object of making the natives good citizens. We want to impress upon the natives that

this right is something that they should aim at securing.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Where does the two years period come from?

Mr. LESLIE: As I have said, I am not wedded to that period, but it has relation to a subsequent clause.

Mr. NEEDHAM: The suggestion is that before we give a native the right of citizenship, there would have to be a war.

Mr. Doney: A native could qualify in some way other than by service.

Mr. NEEDHAM: We should get away from the idea of making service a qualification. Let us regard the native as a man made by God like the rest of us. We should not demand of him that he has served in any war before becoming entitled to citizenship. We should consider the whole question from the manhood point of view. If he has served in the war, all the better, but that should not be a governing factor in determining whether or not he is entitled to citizenship.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I cannot accept the amendment. The fact of a native having enlisted in the Forces and received an honourable discharge would be merely a contributing factor. Service is one thing; the alternative is that he is otherwise a fit and proper person to obtain a certificate of citizenship. The mere fact of his having been a soldier would not entitle him to a certificate. There are many reasons for which a soldier might be discharged from the Services in a month or less and if we provided a two years' period, the privilege we propose to confer would be taken away and the object of the clause would be defeated. The Army does not discriminate in the discharges granted for service unless a soldier has been unsatisfactory.

Mr. RODOREDA: I fully agree with the Minister that the clause as printed should be accepted. The qualifications are that a native has dissociated himself from tribal and native association, that he has enlisted, or that he is otherwise a fit and proper person to receive a certificate. If a native is accepted as a fit and proper person to be a member of the Armed Forces, he should have become accustomed to our ways of living and be granted a certificate, whatever his period of service may have been.

Mr. DONEY: The Minister has given a fair and proper explanation of Clause 4. I consider the amendment would be too harsh upon the natives. I believe it was the mover who, during his second reading speech, said that many native soldiers were poor soldiers, indicating—and this is true—that frequently they cannot stand up to shell-fire. This is a fact, but it is owing to the kind of life which they have lived and does not suggest deterioration of character. In the circumstances, I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. BERRY: I support all that the Minister has said on this clause. It seems to me the amendment is unnecessary, because if members will read the clause they will find provision is made that this particular soldier, sailor or airman must receive an honourable discharge. Again, there is the case of the soldier who may not enlist until six months before the war is over. Even if he does not leave Australia, he is clearly as much a returned soldier as is any soldier who has left our shores.

Mr. HOLMAN: I oppose the amendment, especially in view of some of the remarks made by the mover. An agreement has been reached at Canberra regarding land settlement for soldiers. Those soldiers eligible to benefit under that scheme will be servicemen who have served in the Forces for six months or more. Yet we say that a native must be a soldier for a period of two years! I draw the attention of the mover of the amendment to the fact that the draft Bill prepared by the Returned Soldiers' League does not mention any specific period.

Mr. Leslie: But that has nothing to do with the amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN: It has. The only stipulation in that Bill is that a soldier must have served in the Naval, Military, or Air Forces of the Commonwealth in a combat area. It is quite possible that a native may serve in a combat area for less than two years. The member for Perth objects to the clause and says it should not be included in the measure. His criticism was that there would have to be a war in order to give the native the necessary concession. At present we have a war and so that point should not be considered. The native may have had only 18 months' service.

Mr. Berry: He may have had one year and 11 months.

Mr. HOLMAN: Yes, or one day less than two years. The fact remains that if the amendment is passed, he will be denied the

right which the Minister seeks to give him by the clause.

Mr. LESLIE: I am afraid this has been a question of everyone sailing a ship around the ocean and touching at no port. Members have evaded the real point at issue. The amendment is not designed to inflict any penalty on a native desiring to secure citizenship rights. I do not know whether I am in order in referring to a subsequent amendment.

The Minister for Mines: You can do anything you like.

Mr. LESLIE: There is another amendment which is designed to make it easier for the native. I am taking it for granted that the Committee will pass the subsequent amendment. The question of the Returned Soldiers' League's qualification of membership does not enter into this position at all. I see the danger to a man who has not had service.

Mr. Holman: Do you not expect the soldier who has seen service to get some benefit out of the soldier land settlement scheme?

Mr. LESLIE: That has nothing to do with the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Mt. Marshall must address the Chair.

Mr. LESLIE: The question of soldier land settlement is not involved in this clause at all. The Commissioner of Native Affairs, in his report, says that a large number of half-castes were discharged from the Army because of their unsuitability for sustained service, with its attendant Army discipline. They were half-castes of native habits and inclinations and were unsuited for service in the Armed Forces, due to the disabilities of their native ancestry.

Mr. Berry: Did they get honourable discharges?

Mr. LESLIE: The Commissioner went on to say that the authorities acted unwisely in enlisting these half-castes and taking them away from their rural employment. They got honourable discharges. It is quite possible, however, as the Commissioner points out, that they will carry into their civilian lives the qualities which made them unsuitable as soldiers. I want to see that position guarded against by providing that there shall be a qualifying period in the Army which shall prove that they are suitable, as a result of their Army service, to receive the benefits of citizenship. In that case they should not be expected to produce any other qualification. It has been pointed out that a native may have but a limited period of service as a result of his having been wounded. In such a case I realise that the two-year period will be a handicap. I confess I would like the clause to be redrafted so as to make sure that the native who, through no fault of his own, has had his services terminated at an earlier period than is provided for in the Bill, will not be penalised by that fact. That is fair and reasonable. We must make sure that no mistake is made.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. LESLIE: I move an amendment—

> That in Subclause (2) a new paragraph be inserted as follows:—(b) "That he has for two years held a certificate of exemption under the Native Administration Act, 1905-1911, and."

I am aware that a native has to provide proof that for two years prior to his application he has dissolved all tribal and native associations except with respect to lineal descendants and relatives. I have moved the amendment because I think that if the native is able to show that for two years, in consequence of holding the certificate of exemption, he has enjoyed all the privileges of the white man, all his duties and most of his responsibilities, and is then desirous of acquiring the full rights of citizenship, we should be able to grant him that certificate with a clear conscience. The amendment will afford an inducement to natives to attain to higher standards. It will provide him with the benefit of a two year period during which he can demonstrate that he is a suitable individual to be granted rights enjoyed by his white brother.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I hope the amendment will be rejected. Under the Act at present, a native may apply for a certificate of exemption. I again remind the member for Mt. Marshall that that certificate does not give the native any rights of citizenship or remove the native from the application of the Native Administration Act. He will still be a native in the eyes of the law and he will not have any rights such as are possessed by the ordinary white man. Many of the natives who would apply for citizenship in accordance with the provisions of the Bill would not, on principle, apply for a certificate of exemption.

Mr. Leslie: Don't you think that——

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I think the wise man from Mukinbudin has already had a fair go, and he should now listen. A certificate of exemption will not remove a native from the application of the provisions of the Act. The type of native that would seek to rise to the enjoyment of full citizenship rights is the type that will refuse to apply for a certificate of exemption. The approach by way of the amendment is as if we were dealing with foreigners and not with people who have been all their lives in this country, the land of their birth. Many of them already possess an elementary education while there are white men in our midst who have no education at all. On the other hand, many of those natives and half-castes have as much ordinary intelligence and wisdom as most whites. I do not blame the native who refuses to apply for a certificate of exemption. The member for Mt. Marshall seeks to provide what he terms a qualifying period. I regard it as a disqualifying period. Why should the native possessed of all the requisite qualifications be kept back for two years before he can apply for full citizenship?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. If the object is to have a qualifying period, the member for Mt. Marshall should read Subclause (2) of Clause 5, which provides all the precautions necessary to safeguard the position. Under that subclause objection may be taken by those in a position to say that the applicant is not a fit and proper person to enjoy the rights of citizenship. The Department of Native Affairs has files dealing with each and every native, and that is the best assurance that full details will be placed before the magistrate who will deal with applications from natives. That is a necessary precautionary measure. The amendment will merely provide a disqualification for another two years for many half-castes and natives. I have in my possession a letter that members may peruse. They will find that the hand-writing is better than most of them can boast of. The half-caste who wrote the letter is one who refused to apply for a certificate of exemption under the Act. Why penalise a man of that type for another two years?

Mr. Leslie: The amendment will give him an opportunity to show that he can live for two years as a white man.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: The necessary provisions in that respect are already in the Bill. I again advise the hon. member to peruse Subclause (2) of Clause 5.

Mr. Leslie: But it will be too late then. That applies only after the native has been granted the rights.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: If I did not want to give the natives these rights, I would not have introduced the legislation. I know that half-castes have refused to apply for exemption certificates under the Native Administration Act because they regard them merely as dog licenses. They do not want the certificate to enable them to visit hotels to get beer. That is practically the only privilege that the exemption certificate provides them with. These natives desire full citizenship rights so that they may exercise the franchise, so that they may secure blocks and engage in farming, or secure a mining lease and engage in mining operations.

Mr. Watts: Do you not think that the issue of a certificate of exemption is sufficient qualification for the magistrate to work on?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: Yes, but I do not want to penalise the natives who will have to wait for a further two years.

Mr. Watts: You could possibly overcome that by including the word "or" in place of the word "and."

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I think the whole amendment is unnecessary. I do not want further to disqualify natives for another two years merely because they have not complied with the provisions of the Native Administration Act by securing certificates of exemption. I want to encourage natives to get away from their old conditions. We have found during the course of years that the Act has failed in certain directions, and we now ask that it be amended to remedy that position.

Mr. Seward: In certain cases the certificate of exemption would prohibit natives from associating with their own people.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: That is another point. The Bill provides that the natives will still be able to associate with their relatives while yet holding a certificate entitling them to the rights of citizenship.

Mr. DONEY: I concede the Minister a wide knowledge of this and allied problems, but I still think that the amendment should succeed. Certificates of exemption are not easy to secure, and I hold that they have a definite value. The Minister seems to suggest that they are of no value at all. When a native applies for the certificate the departmental officers and the police have every opportunity to show that the man is, or is not, entitled to it. I do not like the wording of the amendment. It appears to refer to a native who has held a certificate of exemption for two years and has lost it; but the intention is to refer to a native who has held and still holds that certificate. There is very little difference between the qualification mentioned here and the qualification referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b).

Mr. WATTS: I do not propose that the amendment shall be pressed, having heard what the Minister has said. A certificate of exemption would be a document of some value, issued by the department as to the native's conduct, and would be conclusive proof to a magistrate that the native was a person fitted for citizenship. I know, however, that numbers of natives do not regard that certificate as of much value. They say that after the granting of the certificate they would still be natives and not white men—neither one thing nor the other—and that in such circumstances they prefer to remain natives.

Mr. LESLIE: I see nothing in the Bill which will permit a native, once he gets citizenship rights, to associate with his relatives. Moreover, Section 39 of the Native Administration Act would debar him from associating with them. If a native can show that for two years under an exemption certificate he or she can dissociate himself or herself from tribal customs and habits, we know that he or she will be able to lead a life of white citizenship. The period of two years is a period of trial. Let me point out that once a native gets citizen rights, he cannot have a native in his house. The intention of the Bill is to cause a definite segregation of the native from his relatives and friends. Holding an exemption certificate, a native is watched until he gets full citizen rights and says, "I am now a white man, and I cut myself off from all my old relationships." When a native takes up the white man's burden, he accepts a heavy responsibility. How many natives could understand what voting on the Referendum was about?

The Minister for Mines: How many white people could?

Mr. LESLIE: That is the standard we ask the native to come up to. He should have a period in which to adjust himself to new circumstances.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: The member for Mt. Marshall has misinterpreted the Native Administration Act. He appears to believe that the certificate of exemption is of some virtue, but the certificate is a handicap to its holder because it prohibits him from visiting his relatives and friends. The Bill gives the native an extra privilege which will not debar or frighten him from visiting his friends and relatives.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. McLARTY: I move an amendment—

> That in line 2 of Subclause (3), the words "reputable citizens" be struck out and the following words inserted in lieu:—"a justice of the peace or police officer or constable in charge of a police station."

The term "reputable citizen" covers a very wide range. My amendment would be a great help. Many references are not worth the paper they are written on, and therefore I want the magistrate to know the class of person giving the reference here contemplated. If we limit it to such persons as a justice of the peace or a police officer or a constable in charge of a police station, we limit it to responsible persons. Should one of the three persons mentioned give a reference and thereafter it is found necessary to deprive the native of rights under the Bill, the Commissioner of Native Affairs will be able to say to the person who gave the reference, "Your references are not worth much; you should exercise more responsibility." But there is no hold over an ordinary person giving a reference. There are people who will give a reference to anybody who asks for one, and it would be difficult for a magistrate to know whether a reference was really from a responsible and reputable person.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. If the hon. member will look at Subclause (3) of Clause 5 he will see that it is within the power of the magistrate to call witnesses and examine papers;

and take all precautionary measures to make sure that the reputable citizen has told what he believes to be the truth. No special virtue applies to a declaration by a constable because the constable may have been in the district only two or three months. A native approaching such a constable may, to all intents and purposes, have been a desirable citizen during the sojourn of the constable in the district and in the circumstances the constable might be inclined to give him a reference. On the other hand, if he were cautious, he would say, "I do not know you well enough," and would not give the required reference. There are many towns throughout Western Australia in which a justice of the peace is not readily available, and it would be necessary for the native to waste time travelling about to find such a J.P. to sign the declaration. Moreover, I do not think that a local J.P. or police constable is as well able to testify to the character of a native as would be, say, a grocer or a butcher or some business person in the particular town where the native dwells. A justice of the peace will probably make up his mind on the fact that he has never had the native before him in court.

Mr. Watts: And the grocer on the fact that he had sold the native a pound of tea!

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: No, that the native had been dealing with him for some time and had honoured his obligations. It is a known fact that people in business know the true character of every citizen in their district. They know to whom they can supply a few things "on the nod." I have not lost faith in human nature and my experience teaches me that most business men are reputable, decent citizens. It might be said that there are exceptions and that it is possible to find butchers or bakers and such people prepared to sign any declaration, but that might apply equally to justices of the peace and to police constables. Few natives will willingly approach a constable for any purpose, because they fear constables. That does not apply to all policemen, some of whom take a very sympathetic interest in the natives and render them good service.

Mr. DONEY: I do not think that it matters a great deal whether "reputable citizens" remain in the Bill or whether justices of the peace and police constables are substituted. Everything depends on the wisdom of the magistrate, who would decide for himself whether the reference was reliable or not.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clause 5—Evidence to be adduced in support of an application under this Act:

Mr. LESLIE: I move an amendment—

> That at the end of paragraph (c) of Subclause (1) the following words be added:—"and if the application is made after the first day of July, One thousand nine hundred and fifty, is able to read and write in the English language."

That allows a period of six years from now. Any person who is unable to read and write is hardly capable of managing his own affairs properly. If these people are to assume the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, the least we can expect is that they should be able to read the law and understand communications sent to them. It will not impose hardship on those who wish to apply immediately for the rights of citizenship. I have no idea of restricting the application of the measure, but merely desire to assist the natives themselves at a later period and to help the Government to induce them to educate themselves to undertake the responsibilities of citizenship.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I hope the amendment will be defeated. It has been mentioned on many occasions that the Bill is in the nature of an experimental measure. If the amendment is agreed to, the Bill cannot have any effect until the 1st July, 1950. I submit that in or before six years' time the House can amend the measure in the light of experience. Even under our modern system of education, which is free and universal, we find young white people and others of middle age unable to write. They simply make their mark, which is witnessed, and that is quite legal. There are many men who are unable to write one word but whose intelligence is keener than that of many other people. They are capable of managing their own business and understand public affairs. This loading of the Bill will give to the applicants an idea that they have to face up to more requirements than are reasonable. I would be in favour of abolishing the paragraph altogether and leaving it to the discretion of the magistrate. Obviously the applicant must speak to the magistrate and explain his case, and for us to

include in a Bill of this character some provision to operate in six years' time is to border on the ridiculous.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I hope the amendment will not be pressed, for the simple reason that there is no need for it. If agreed to it will not have effect for six years. If I am anything of a prophet this Bill, if it becomes law, will have to be revised before then. If by experience we find that a clause of that description is necessary either one side of the House or the other will introduce it. It may never be necessary, and I oppose the amendment on principle. I feel that illiteracy is no bar to citizenship.

Mr. Watts: Well, it ought to be.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: If we examine that statement we find it does not apply. It did not apply to soldiers who were called up to defend their country. The statistics published in the Press showed that illiteracy in the Army is about two per cent. That did not debar those men from becoming perfect soldiers and defending their country, and illiteracy ought not to debar a native under this measure. Under the part of the amendment referring to reading, a magistrate could set such a high standard that many whites could not pass the test. I hope the amendment will not be passed. Many opportunities will arise in the next six years to deal with this.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Complaints were made in the second reading stage about the restrictions contained in the Bill to prevent a native from becoming a citizen. The further we go in Committee the more attempts are made to increase the severity of those restrictions. If the member for Mt. Marshall desired to destroy the Bill he could not do it better than by pressing this amendment, which means that six years from now a native who is otherwise industrious and reputable could only apply for a certificate of citizenship provided he could read and write. That is one of the most severe restrictions in the Bill. If that qualification were imposed on all the white people, resident in the Commonwealth, in the strictest term——

Mr. Leslie: We do not intend it to be applied in the strictest term.

Mr. NEEDHAM: It is possible that neither the member for Mt. Marshall nor I could pass such a test in the English language, although we are members of this Chamber.

Mr. Leslie: It depends on the standard.

Ms. NEEDHAM: In the past we have done nothing to help the natives to qualify. Although we have helped them in many ways we have not given them the proper opportunities to be educated in the English language, nor have we given opportunities in connection with any other matters of greater importance. These owners of the country have not been given the opportunity to qualify. This, as the Minister has said, is experimental legislation, and to insist that to be a citizen of this State a native shall be able to read and write is not helping him to reach that state of citizenship.

Mr. LESLIE: I am surprised to hear the member for Perth speak in the way he does. The whole tone of the debate, and the publicity accorded this Bill, has been founded on the idea of raising the standard of the native, not merely to bestow some honour on him. Surely the least we can do is to encourage him to acquire the rudimentary elements of education. My amendment does not state the degree of English that the applicant is required to write. I take it that the magistrate would naturally hold as acceptable the fact that a native could read and write English in the most elementary way, because the Bill does not say that he has to obtain such a high standard as that suggested by the member for Perth when he questions whether he or I could pass the test. I would not expect a native to attain such a standard as that, unless his education was acquired in a proper educational institution. The Minister said that there would be time enough during the next six years to add the necessary amendment to the Bill to make it apply at the end of that time. My object in submitting the amendment is to give the native an opportunity before that time, should it be necessary, to learn to read and write in the English language. Why not let him know now instead of springing it on him later?

The Minister for Mines: Should not Europeans do that when being naturalised?

Mr. LESLIE: They have to do that when entering the country, but I grant that some are pretty bad. The measure is to raise the educational and every other standard of the native. Why then oppose this amendment? Surely a native in six years can learn suffi-

cient to show that he has that rudimentary knowledge of the language that I suggest.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I move an amendment—

> That in line 2 of paragraph (d) of Subclause (1) the word "syphilis" be struck out.

A medical certificate is required to be submitted by the applicant, and if it shows that he has that disease in his system he is automatically denied the rights of citizenship. The applicant may be entirely innocent. Can anyone suggest, apart from geographical considerations, why an applicant under this measure should be at a disadvantage compared with a person already a citizen of this country? It is making the position impossible for an applicant. There are cases no doubt where a medical certificate will disclose that an applicant is suffering from syphilis.

The Minister for the North-West: He is not compelled to produce a medical certificate.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: The magistrate has to be satisfied that the applicant is not suffering from syphilis. How can he do that if a medical certificate is not produced? I can understand the position with regard to leprosy and other diseases which are peculiar to the native population, but syphilis is not. If the magistrate finds that an applicant is desirable from every point of view other than the one under consideration, he must refuse him the certificate. That may be because some two or three generations prior in his ancestry syphilis was contracted and has been handed down as a hereditary disease. Why should he have to suffer for the sins of his ancestors? It might be said that an applicant would hesitate to report that he was suffering from the disease. If a man is otherwise considered to be a proper person to have citizenship rights why should he be so debarred when a white man in the same circumstances is entitled to citizenship?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I support the last speaker. I mentioned when speaking on the second reading of the Bill that there was no opportunity of knowing whether the Bill meant congenital or acquired syphilis. If it is congenital the applicant might be a perfectly good citizen, and through no fault of his own be condemned to non-citizenship. The fault may be that of his parents or his grandparents. Even if it is acquired syphilis I do not think he should be debarred because, as the last speaker said, many whites suffer from this particular disease. It is curable, and it should not be a bar.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: The Native Affairs Department considered that this point would be covered by Subclause (3), in which provision is made for the Commissioner to produce all the evidence before the magistrate. This was provided in order to save the native the expense of securing a medical certificate. The department has a travelling medical officer who has inspected every native in the State at least once a year for the past three years, and so the department has a full medical history of all the natives. However, if the amendment is pressed, I have no objection to the deletion of the word.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Cancellation or suspension of certificate of citizenship in certain cases:

Mr. LESLIE: I move an amendment—

> That a new paragraph be inserted as follows:—"(d) has since the issue of the certificate of citizenship been twice convicted of an offence under Section 65 (1) or Section 65 (3) of the Police Act, 1892."

Those provisions in the Police Act relate to vagrancy and the begging of alms. A native could be repeatedly convicted of these offences and the most that could happen to him would be to be treated as a habitual offender.

The Minister for Mines: That might happen to a white man.

Mr. LESLIE: Yes; but I would not like to see any native declared a habitual offender because of a weakness naturally inherent in him. To make a law apply to a particular section is not exceptional and in such cases the penalties are usually provided as a deterrent. This should be an inducement to natives to become good and useful citizens and, if through some inherent weakness they are unable to do so, they should not be branded as habitual offenders.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I oppose the amendment. It rather looks as if we are seeking to make the applicant walk a tight-rope. The natives will want a halo around their heads before their applications could be granted by the magistrate if all the amend-

ments on the notice paper were passed by the Committee. The provisions in the Bill are stringent enough now so far as they relate to the retention of citizenship by the natives. Some natives are respectable, dignified and intelligent in their relationship with their fellowmen; many of them are almost white. These are entitled to citizenship rights. Members should bear in mind that the measure is designed to raise the status of native men and women. Why overload the Bill with all these veiled threats? Enough safeguards have already been passed. I hope the Committee will vote against the amendment.

Mr. DONEY: I cannot understand why the two last speakers are seeking to condone vagrancy. That is an offence if a white man is guilty of it. I see no reason why a native also should not be punished if he is guilty of the offence.

The Minister for Mines: Why punish him twice?

The Minister for Justice: Why discriminate?

Mr. DONEY: Surely members opposite would not regard a habitual vagrant as fit to possess citizenship rights.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 8 and 9—agreed to.

New clause:

Mr. WATTS: I move—

That a new clause be inserted as follows:—

(6) Objection to the granting of any certificate of citizenship may be made personally to the magistrate—

(a) by any resident in the Magisterial district in which the applicant resides;

(b) by any police officer stationed in such district;

(c) by any person acting with the authority and on behalf of the Council of the Municipal District, or the Board of the Road District within which the applicant resides.

Any one or more of the following objections may be taken to the granting of any such certificate of citizenship—

(a) that the applicant is of bad repute;

(b) that the applicant has been convicted of an offence under the Native Administration Act, 1905-1941;

(c) any other objection which appears to the magistrate to be sufficient.

It shall not be necessary to give to the applicant any previous notice of objection, but the applicant on any objection being raised of which at least three days' previous notice has not been given to him, shall be entitled to adjournment.

By this provision the magistrate is asked to give consideration to the reputation of the applicant and to any convictions against him under the Native Administration Act. Any other objection which appears to the magistrate to be sufficient is entirely a question for him. The Bill provides that the Commissioner of Native Affairs may lodge an objection if he so wishes. The measure contemplates that in some cases he will not do so, but undoubtedly there are many large areas in Western Australia of which the Commissioner, with the limited staff at his disposal, would not have sufficient knowledge to judge completely as to the character and reputation of an applicant. Conceivably, in many cases he would have that knowledge and so could make the objection himself; but in other cases it seems to me reasonable that the citizens of the district, particularly those holding the positions mentioned in the proposed new clause, should be heard on any application for citizenship rights by a native. If special provision is not made in the Bill for this purpose, they could not be heard. If any objection raised is frivolous it will be dismissed by the magistrate with contumely, as it should be; if it is not frivolous, he will give it consideration and arrive at his decision. This clause is not intended in any way to restrict the right of the native who qualifies under Clause 5 for a certificate of citizenship. It is to prevent the possibility of facts concerning his antecedents or his character not coming to the notice of the magistrate which ought to come to his notice. Provision is also made that the applicant shall be entitled to an adjournment if the objection is made without giving him previous notice. A similar provision is contained in the Licensing Act. I hope the Minister will agree to the new clause.

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST: I do not propose to agree to the insertion of the proposed new clause. The explanation given by the Leader of the Opposition is different from the interpretation I put on the clause, which seemed to me to be rather drastic. It appeared to suggest a whispering campaign, and to make possible a charge that could not be

substantiated in open court. Secondly, I think that most of the things desired by the Leader of the Opposition are already provided for. We have provided for the person of bad repute. The applicant convicted of an offence under the Act ought, in my opinion, to be left to the Commissioner of Native Affairs, because there are so many sections in the Act that may be breached by the natives prior to their applying for citizenship that would be of little or no consequence at all. For instance, the Commissioner, on behalf of a native, might arrange for him to do some shearing for a farmer, and the native might break the agreement. That would be a breach of the Native Administration Act, and the native could be penalised by the Commissioner. That might be held against him, but in certain instances I do not think it would be serious enough to debar him from getting his certificate of citizenship, because he might have had a legitimate reason for breaking the agreement.

Again, I am fearful that if we permit a municipal council or road board to authorise somebody to raise objections on its behalf against the issuing of a certificate of citizenship it will be a hindrance to the native concerned, because there is no gainsaying the fact that there are local authorities that hold a colour prejudice and do everything possible to keep natives out of their town. Some boards have even tried to chase natives from their districts in recent months. I have taken all the necessary precautions I thought I should take to debar those not likely to be successful if they obtained a certificate, and I have included provisions to deal with those who break faith. It is provided that their certificates shall be suspended for a period or for good, at the magistrate's discretion. It has also been provided that the Commissioner can produce the records of any individual native. I think we should leave it at that. In the course of next session or the session after, if any country members can submit legitimate amendments and prove that the measure is a little slipshod, and that natives are being admitted to citizenship too easily, I shall be prepared to make any amendments I think necessary.

New clause put and negatived.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—FRUIT GROWING INDUSTRY (TRUST FUND) ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 10.13 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 11th October, 1944.

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

QUESTION—GOVERNMENT TRAM AND BUS SERVICES.

As to Industrial Disputes, etc.

Hon. A. THOMSON asked the Chief Secretary:

(i) How many stoppages of the Government tram and bus services in the metropolitan area have occurred through industrial disputes in the last 12 months?

(ii) How much revenue, is it estimated, was lost to the Department by such stoppages?

(iii) What were the complaints giving rise to the stop-work meeting on the 7th October last, which caused much public inconvenience and suffering?

(iv) Were these complaints of a nature that could be submitted to the State Arbitration Court and, if not, why not?

(v) Was the State Arbitration Court approached on the matter? If so, with what result?

(vi) If the State Arbitration Court was not approached, was there any sufficient reason why it should not have been?

(vii) Is the Government content to allow stoppages of the nature mentioned to take place without taking action to prevent them?