those boys each year, through the intimate knowledge imparted to him at the school, to take up a veterinary course at the University.

Another matter that will have to receive attention is that of the salaries the Government is prepared to pay veterinary surgeons and the facilities provided for them. We have a wonderfully good man in Dr. Bennetts. I do not say he is the only good one, but he is certainly an excellent man. Yet he is quartered in a back room in a tin shed that is like a refrigerator in winter and a hothouse in summer. That has to serve him for an office. To see Mr. McKenzie Clark one has to go into a sort of henhouse and there one finds Mr. Clark cooped up with a little bit of an office here and a little bit somewhere else. This is the sort of accommodation provided for highly qualified men. When the superphosphate rationing was on, Dr. Teakle was in Government House ballroom sorting out papers or doing something like that. He is a soil specialist and to employ him in that way is not to use his skill to the best advantage.

Coming to salaries, I find that the Chief Veterinary Officer is on a range of £635 to £735 and is drawing the maximum. The Chief Pathologist is on a range of £666 to £699 and is drawing the maximum. The Senior Veterinary Surgeon is on a range of £510 to £558 and is drawing the maximum. Other veterinary surgeons are on a range of £414 to £486 and are drawing various amounts from £438 to the maximum. A prominent firm recently advertised for a veterinary surgeon. I do not know what was offered to the chief man, but the salary offered for his assistant was £700. Even that amount is nothing wonderful when we consider that a man has to undergo a five years' course to qualify in veterinary science. A medical officer is paid at least £1,000 a year, and yet the highly qualified veterinary surgeons to whom we look to effect so much improvement to our stock, are paid £600 or £700.

The Premier: Plus the cost of living allowance of £60 or £70.

Mr. SEWARD: All of them?

The Premier: Yes.

Mr. SEWARD: I have no hesitation in saying that we are lucky to retain the services of these men and I think the Minister for Agriculture will agree with me. We have to endeavour to get our stockraisers into the position of being able to compete with the world in what will probably be very animated and even fierce competition after the war.

The Minister for Lands: You will be pleased to know that the Premier has recently approved of the funds necessary for the construction, to commence immediately, of an animal health laboratory.

Mr. SEWARD: I am delighted to hear it. I hope the Premier will give us a detailed statement in the near future of what our post-war works are going to be, especially the earliest ones to be undertaken, so that the people will be satisfied that at all events we are not behindhand. In the newspapers we read of big programmes being approved for the Eastern States. Trespassing on the Loan Estimate for a moment and speaking from memory, I think Western Australia is to receive about £330,000 while other States have been granted millions, the total for all the States being £21,000,000. From those figures it would not appear as if Western Australia's interests are being looked after properly. I appeal to the Premier to give us a detailed statement in the near future so that the people will know what the post-war programme is going to be.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.8 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 17th October, 1944.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1, Dried Fruits Act Amendment.
2, Life Assurance Companies Act Amendment.
3, Northam Cemeteries.
4, Local Authorities (Reserve Funds) Act Amendment.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

The PRESIDENT: I have received from the Auditor General, in pursuance of Section 53 of the Audit Act, 1904, for presentation to the Legislative Council, a copy of Section A of his report on the Treasurer's Statement of the Public Accounts for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1944. It will be laid on the Table of the House.

QUESTIONS (3).

COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

As to Terms of Appointment.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP asked the Chief Secretary:

(i) What were the terms of the appointment of the Commissioner of Public Health?

(ii) Has the Commissioner of Public Health administrative control of both the Health and Medical Departments?

(iii) Has the Commissioner administrative control of the 25 hospitals which the Medical Department manages, and is he the adviser to the boards of the 60 other hospitals which the department supervises?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(i) Dr. C. L. Park was appointed under Section 29 of the Public Service Act and under the provisions of the Health Act, subject to medical examination and insurance, at a salary range of £1,180-£1,300, plus basic wage adjustment.

(ii) No. He is the professional head of the combined departments.

(iii) No. He has professional control of all departmental hospitals, and is professional adviser in respect to all board hospitals.

RAILWAYS.

As to Working Costs and Mileage.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary:

In connection with the report of the Railway Department will the Minister please lay on the Table of the House a statement compiled as in Appendix "F," page 70 of the report for 1939 showing cost of working, loco. mileage, and cost per loco. mile for the past four years?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

With a view to saving paper, the Appendix referred to is not now published in the Commissioner's annual report, but a copy of the statement in question, covering the last four years, is attached for laying on the Table of the Legislative Council as desired.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL FRANCHISE.

As to Tabling Crown Law Rulings.

Hon. H. SEDDON (without notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Will he lay on the Table all Crown Law rulings referring to the Legislative Council franchise since 1928?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: Yes.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Natives (Citizenship Rights).
2, Pawnbrokers Ordinance Amendment (Hon. H. Seddon in charge).

Received from the Assembly.

BILL—SHEARERS' ACCOMMODATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Reports of Committee adopted.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 11th October. Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—New sections; administration, interpretation:

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 2, to which Hon. J. G. Hislop had moved an amendment to add at the end of the definition of "mental nurse" in proposed new Section 1B the words "and those declared to be in need of nervous treatment."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have no objection to the amendment.

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

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 2:

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (a) of proposed new Subsection (4) after the word "nurses" the words "on the staff of a nursing training school or hospital" be inserted.

I ask for these words to be inserted because I wish to emphasise strongly again that this Bill is not strictly for nurses. It is one for those in control of the training and the conduct of nurses in general. The people who should be on this board are those who have had years of experience and are in touch with the actual training of nurses. I believe that if they are not to be matrons they should be nurses on the staff of a training school. I have phrased my amendment in this way because we may in time have a training school quite apart from a hospital.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is no great objection to this amendment but we may have a highly qualified representative from a training school on the board. She may leave the training school, in which case we would lose a highly qualified officer and might get someone not so well qualified. The nurse who leaves the training school might still be available for duties on the board but according to the amendment she would have to resign. There is no other objection to the amendment.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I designed this amendment for the very reason given by the Honorary Minister. The members of this board should be in active touch with the training of nurses. If a person leaves a training school and goes into private practice she is then not so much in touch with modern nursing as is a person at a training school. This gives an excellent opportunity for the senior members of the staffs of the training schools to become appointed to the nurses registration board.

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

Clauses 4 to 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—New section, appeal against decision of board:

Hon. J. G. HISLOP:—I move an amendment—

That in lines 8 and 9 of paragraph (c) of Subsection (1) of proposed new Section 11A the words "a judge of the Supreme Court sitting in Chambers" be struck out and the words "an appeal board the chairman of which shall be a Judge of the Supreme Court sitting in Chambers, and on which shall be an in-patient physician or surgeon of the Perth Hospital and the matron of a metropolitan hospital approved for the training of nurses" inserted in lieu.

I propose to provide for an appeal board rather than for an appeal to a judge. I agree that a judge is trained to take and sort evidence but I feel that he needs professional assistance in deciding the incompetency or otherwise of a professional person. Experience in workers' compensation cases has shown that it would have been advantageous to have a medical assessor sitting alongside the magistrate, and something of the sort here would make for better legislation. I have inquired what happens in other States. In Queensland there is a difficulty when a judge is appointed sole arbitrator as to professional standing. Some time ago we brought in a register of specialists in the medical profession. Queensland has done the same thing and an appeal against the board's finding is to a judge. I am informed that this has ended almost always in the judge granting the appeal because, when a member of the profession works in a specialist way, even with two or three colleagues, he is regarded as a specialist. The result is that an appeal board without professional advice upon it gives rise to considerable difficulty.

When "incompetency" is not defined in the Bill but is left in general terms it might be difficult to prove in a court presided over by a judge alone. I can imagine a nurse who had been regarded as incompetent stating that she had been qualified for 20 years and had qualified with the matron of the senior training school, that she had carried out her work in the same way, but had differed in essence on one point. I can understand the judge being in difficulties to decide between the type of work done by one of two professional people. He would quite likely have to accept the testimony showing competency instead of incompetency, whereas a professional board of appeal would probably regard it as incompetency. If the Committee prefers it, I

would not be averse to substituting the word "and" for "or" to provide for an in-patient physician and surgeon of the Perth Hospital who, with the matron, would make a board of three. However I have provided for one senior doctor and one matron, and the matron must be occupying that position in one of the senior training schools of the metropolitan area. With two such advisers sitting with a judge, we would have a more satisfactory appeal board.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I strongly oppose the amendment. Firstly, it is too cumbersome, and, secondly, no appeal is provided in the Act of 1922. Under that Act, the name of a nurse may be erased from the register for grave misconduct, and surely what is good enough for the ordinary registered nurse should be good enough for a midwife. I take it that the registration board would be very careful to make all possible inquiries and that full and sufficient proof would be required before the name of any nurse was erased from the register. A judge trained to sift evidence would hear the case presented by a qualified board, and he is the best man to determine whether the decision of the board were sound or unsound.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: This is a principle that might well be adopted. We have seen the need for a medical assessor sitting beside the magistrate in workers' compensation cases. Here is another example of where some professional assistance to the judge might be of extreme value to His Honour in making up his mind. I do not think it is any reason for the negation of this proposal to say that it is something we have not done before. It is the correct method of dealing with appeals in professional cases.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I favour the clause as it stands. What is contemplated is a dispute between the proposed board and the individual nurse. The nurse would have an opportunity to place her case before the judge. If a board of three is appointed, is there to be a majority decision with a dissenting minority? I do not see that the judge can be any better instructed in the matter by having on the bench with him these other people than he would be by having the advocates in the two cases presenting their views to him.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am not going to fight the matter of principle at this stage, but I still think it is the one that sooner or later will be adopted. I have heard evidence accepted by a layman in workers' compensation cases that would not have been accepted if the magistrate had had a professional adviser sitting alongside him.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I cannot agree with Dr. Hislop. The judge is the man to decide the appeal. We should leave the clause as it stands. There will be difficulties if the proposal is adopted, and in any case the decision of the judge will be final.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: This will be regarded as an appeal by one of the rank and file against the heads. If the proposed board is formed, will the appellant not feel that the court is loaded against her because she would then have to face the members of the board as well as the judge?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I am willing to withdraw the amendment and bring it forward in five years' time, when I feel sure it will be the accepted method of appeal.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 10 and 11—agreed to.

Clause 12—Amendment of Part XII. of the Health Act, 1911-1942.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That in line 9 of Subsection (1) of proposed new Section 303 the word "two" be struck out with a view to inserting the word "twenty."

A fine of £2 in the case of a person who conducts a midwifery hospital, unless she is registered, does not seem to me to be adequate.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I admit that it would be unreasonable to impose a fine of £50 in such a case, and I suggest that in lieu of the word struck out the word "twenty" be inserted. For a subsequent offence a fine of £50 might be imposed. That would bring the amending Bill into conformity with Section 297 of the Health Act.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: A monetary fine for an offence in which lives may be at stake does not seem to me to be adequate.

Amendment (to strike out word) put and passed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That the word "twenty" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

Amendment (to insert word) put and passed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That in line 10 of Subsection (1) of proposed new Section 303 the word "ten" be struck out with a view to inserting the word "fifty."

A fine of £50 is not sufficient for a second offence of this character. If imprisonment were made the penalty for a second offence that would act as a deterrent against persons attempting to conduct a midwifery hospital until they had been registered.

Amendment (to strike out word) put and passed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That the word "fifty" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

Amendment (to insert word) put and passed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That at the end of Subsection (1) of proposed new Section 303 the words "or imprisonment for six months" be added.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That in lines 4 and 5 of Subsection (2) of proposed new Section 303 the words "attend or undertake to attend any lying-in woman" be struck out and the words "undertake midwifery nursing" inserted in lieu.

I think these words are a better expression of the term than the words set out in the subsection.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is some danger in this amendment. I am informed that the definition of "lying-in woman" is quite clear, and that it simply means "a woman in labour." Some officious person may be anxious to catch someone else. Some poor woman may be lying in bed and being pregnant is unable to help herself, and so a friend may come in and make some tea for her. Under the proposed definition the friend may get into serious trouble. Dr. Hislop's proposal is altogether too wide in its effect.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I would refer the Minister to the definition of "midwifery nursing" in Clause 2. It is stated that "midwifery nurse" means a midwife or other female practitioner of obstetrics registered under the Act, and that "midwifery nursing" has a corresponding meaning. I drew attention at the second reading stage to the fact that this was a very loose way of defining "midwifery nursing." I want to prevent persons from conducting unregistered hospitals and undertaking work that the midwifery nurses have been trained to do. The expression "lying-in" began to be used in hospitals in 1650 and my contention is that the words "midwifery nursing" should be substituted and that those words should be fully defined in the early part of the Act.

Hon. Sir Hal COLEBATCH: I would like to ask the Minister whether the clause as it stands would not make it an offence for a registered nurse who is not a midwifery nurse to attend some lying-in woman for some other complaint altogether.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not think there is any danger of that. There are two things to be considered. There are women in the farming districts who are 50 or 60 miles from a hospital. Such a woman, who may be pregnant, may call upon a neighbour to look after the house for a day or two while she is temporarily off colour. That is quite in order but it may be a dangerous procedure under this amendment. Secondly, a woman from the outback may come to the city with a view to entering a maternity hospital and in the meantime may rent a room until her time arrives. During that waiting period she is looked after by the lady of the house who attends to her ordinary wants. A smart officer, however, might misinterpret that as midwifery nursing.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I would remind the Minister that Subsection (3) of proposed new Section 303 covers people who reside more than five miles from the residence of a registered midwifery nurse and cases in which a midwifery nurse is not available. Secondly, a woman looking after such a patient would not be regarded as being engaged in midwifery nursing even under the loose phraseology of this Bill. Such people would be regarded simply as housekeepers.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What about the ordinary nurse in attendance, mentioned by Sir Hal Colebatch?

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Almost invariably in every hospital there is a pregnant woman who needs attention for some other condition, and she is looked after by a general

trained nurse. That is not midwifery nursing. When the call for a midwifery nurse comes, a doubly-certificated nurse of that hospital is always available to do the work. Hospitals which did not have doubly-certificated nurses on the staff would not take in pregnant women for other treatment, because the general nurse is quite scared of doing midwifery work and will not undertake it unless she knows something about it.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That in line 6 of Subsection (2) of proposed new Section 303 the word "two" be struck out and "twenty" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That in line 7 of Subsection (2) of proposed new Section 303 the word "ten" be struck out and "fifty" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to Subsection (2) of proposed new Section 303:—"or imprisonment for six months."

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

Clause 13, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 10th October.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [5.27]: I shall be frank from the outset. I am not in favour of adult franchise for the Legislative Council. I am, however, open to conviction on this, as on other matters. It may be that as our electoral system alters, a time may come when I shall be in favour of general adult franchise. In a Utopian world it would be correct that the electors should choose their representatives in the Legislative Assembly and in the Legislative Council on a universal suffrage basis. There, the elector without party strife and without the frailties of human nature, would choose wisely and well, giving due regard, without thought of self or self-interest, to the capabilities of the representative for the task to which he was to be appointed. But in present-day reality the adoption of adult suffrage for the Upper House would virtually mean its destruction. Party methods would soon remove any useful purpose of its continuance.

Is it desired that the Council be abolished? I doubt whether the Government itself desires to see that accomplished. I am firmly of the opinion that this House plays a very useful part in the government of the State. I am not so firmly wedded to my seat in this House as to endeavour to retain it even though its retention served no purpose. Nor am I firmly determined to stay in politics if I cannot personally be of use to the State. In this spirit I still say I consider this State would regret the passing of the Legislative Council. While our present methods continue, it must be a House of Review. I have seen Bills, which have come here, improved immeasurably by the thought given to them in this Chamber. I have seen loose wording tightened and clauses that verged on the dangerous—and may be on the partisan—deleted from the Bill. Not always have our decisions been correct—that is to be expected of human deliberations—but to the deliberations of this Council members have brought the experience of years, practical knowledge and, in most part, success of effort when measured in human endeavour.

But to elect this House on the same lines as the Legislative Assembly would spell doom whilst party strife exists as it does. It is essential for the care of the State's future that there should be a House of Review, where men can give independent thought to measures brought before it. There are in this House many men to whom the loss of their seat would mean little, except that their urge to public service would be curbed. It is this independence, in my opinion, that adds weight and responsibility to their decisions. I do not think that I am in favour of the present form of adult suffrage, even for the Legislative Assembly. I believe that it is in the interests of a country that it be governed by men of mental aptitude and that the electors should also have reached some degree of consciousness of the value of citizenship and public service before being eligible to vote. Looking back on my own lifetime, I am quite certain that at 21 years of age I had neither consciousness of the value of citizenship nor any real interest in the government of my country, but it was only as the years

moved on that I began to see the value of service and to appreciate the need for sound control of the State's polity.

Further, I am convinced that no organisation can exist without men of experience at its head. The man who has gone away to fight for us and has seen the horrors of war, has been led by men of considered judgment and of more mature years. In each family there must be the paterfamilias who, in addition to bearing the responsibility of caring for the young, also acts as guide to the adolescent and the young adult. There is no doubt, however, that the young adult, whilst thinking for himself, naturally relies upon the older man for guidance; that, even though he acts on his own initiative, he very often seeks the opinion of his elders before doing so. I am still somewhat imbued with the faith of the Chinese that the aged must be respected because of the wisdom they have gained.

My point in speaking in such allegorical terms is that I believe there should be some qualification for both the elector and the elected. As I have pointed out, for the elector there should be an appreciation of responsibility to the social system—a responsibility which has grown beyond that of self-interest to one of community interest; for the elected, there should be the qualification that he is capable of carrying out the responsibility which is placed on his shoulders, that he has, by education, fitted himself for this task, and has given, by service in some other form, evidence of his ability to carry out his allotted task. I do not altogether agree that this sense of responsibility or ability moves hand in hand with the acquisition of property, but at the moment I know of no way in which we can lay down for the elector terms or qualifications under which we can grant him the right to appoint the Government of his country. Nor do I believe that the reaching of 30 years of age is sufficient to guarantee that the elected has either the responsibility or the ability to carry out his task.

The only thing which can be said in favour of the property qualification is that the acquisition of property under our present scheme of things does in most cases give evidence of ability in daily avocation through success as measured in material terms. It also gives evidence that the elector who acquires such property regards the area in which he lives and works as being his home; that he has faith in the stability of the future of his land of domicile; and, above all, that he has a sense of responsibility to his family in that he regards such property as being an insurance in some degree of his family's future welfare. These are things which the acquisition of property means; and they outline those ideals of citizenship to which we have asked that an elector attain.

Thus, whilst at present we give the unrestricted right to vote for the Assembly to every citizen reaching the age of 21 years of age, with some slight modifications of that statement, we only ask that those voting for the Legislative Council have a small property qualification. This means that we ask for only a very small proportion of those aptitudes which I have defined as desirable. To say that I am satisfied with our present methods of election would be quite wrong. No-one could be more dissatisfied with our whole form of government. The representation of the people in Parliament calls for the overhaul of our electoral machinery, of our Parliamentary procedure and of our governmental functions. It is for these reasons that I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill and give my support to the appointment of a Select Committee in order that the entire conception of government might be investigated and reported upon.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central): I shall support the second reading of the Bill. The measure before the House seeks to liberalise the Constitution as it affects this Chamber, and specifies very clearly the direction this should take. It seems to me to be monstrous that a man with money can with the expenditure of £500 secure a vote in every electoral province in Western Australia. It might cost him even less than that amount, depending upon the elasticity of his conscience. As a matter of political strategy that course is apparently adopted on a fairly extensive scale. When I was in Geraldton a few months ago I had a conversation with a Nationalist on many matters. Politics naturally were avoided, but he told me that some years ago four members of another place had bought blocks of land situated some distance out from Geraldton. They were considered to be good businessmen and he was astounded that they had spent their money in such a direction.

He told me where the blocks where. I know the locality well. It is four miles from Geraldton. There are no houses within three miles of the blocks, and the country roundabout is waterless from the standpoint of water suitable for drinking purposes. Many years ago experiments were carried out close by but the fluid secured was nearly half as salt as sea water. These experiments were carried out within a few chains of where the blocks were situated. My informant gave me the names of the buyers of those small blocks. I expressed my amazement that they could have blundered to such an extent. Later, other thoughts flashed through my mind concerning myself and my future, should I live long enough, which might be affected very materially. No doubt they felt they were doing their duty to the country by securing enrolment and thereby laying the foundations for a vote against Labour at future elections for the Central Province.

Hon. L. B. Bolton At a cost of £50 each?

Hon. J. M. DREW: I went into this matter very carefully and came to the conclusion that I would be a mug if I paid £5 for each block or even £5 for the whole of the blocks referred to. In my experience this form of property qualification is a menace of the worst type. While the owner lives and keeps out of the bankruptcy court, he has a vote for what is practically speaking an unimproved piece of earth, and no member of this House can justify such a state of affairs. That is the position if the owner seeks to become enrolled, and he will enrol if that is the objective. Throughout the Murchison, the Goldfields and the Geraldton districts, hundreds of men in the early stages of the war were called up to join the Armed Forces. They left their homes to fight for our liberties, and when they did so their names were removed from the electoral rolls. Nine-tenths of the men were householders, but as soon as they left the district they were deprived of their right to vote. There was nothing wrong about that in that the procedure was strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Electoral Act. In those circumstances we cannot blame the electoral officers who were acting in accordance with that Act. The men had left their homes and therefore were disqualified.

The Government submitted legislation in order to remedy that defect, but the Bill was defeated by the action of this House. I cannot think that members really appreciated the position that they created because of their attitude. The Electoral Department did its best in the circumstances. It made an arrangement under which each soldier who believed that he was on the roll for the province in which he lived when he was called up, was able to cast a vote subject to an examination of the electoral roll when the ballot papers were received. That examination took place and what did it disclose? It indicated that 750 persons who formerly were entitled to vote had been disqualified because their names were not on the roll. As they had left their homes their names had been struck off. That was the effect of their actions, and the Electoral Act contains no provisions to deal with such a position.

It was not anticipated that a war would occur. We have had only two wars up to date but, in view of what has happened, no doubt a future amendment to the Electoral Act will remedy the position. When an attempt was made to do so last year the Bill was again defeated in this Chamber. Members surely could not have realised the position they would create. Those with the property qualification, provided they kept out of the bankruptcy court, were safe, because only death ends their qualification. The defeat of the Bill was, in my opinion, a great blunder on the part of the majority of the members of this House. It indicated that while the soldier was good enough to risk his life in defeating Germany and beating back the Japanese invasion of Australia, he was not good enough to have a vote restored to him which he would have enjoyed before he was called up to shed his blood on our behalf, if necessary, and to save us from slavery or worse.

Then there was an effort made by the Government to amend the law to grant the franchise to soldiers 18 years of age if they were fighting in Australia and were called up from Western Australia. But that provision was defeated in the Legislative Council. From my experience of young fellows 18 years of age I can say that they take a keener and more intelligent interest in politics than do many who are already qualified to exercise the franchise. It is not suggested by me or by anyone else that I know of that there should be any general reduction of the age of an elector to 18 years, but that that special considera-

tion should be given to the soldiers who have gone out to fight for this country and to defeat the enemy. That special consideration should be extended to every man who has been called up and has risked life and limb on the battlefield to preserve our freedom. He may escape death only to be maimed for life, or blinded perhaps; and there has been so far no recognition whatever by this Chamber of the disadvantages our soldiers have encountered and the necessity for according them some reward for their services to the country.

Even a vote would be only a very poor reward, but surely it is something that would remind the soldier that he is not forgotten by a grateful people. And how would a soldier face the position? How would he face the rebuff which he would receive upon hearing that this Bill has been rejected? In my opinion the soldier would take it calmly, but it is rather too much to expect that he would be unduly elated, and as merry as a sandboy, when he discovered that, by the gracious decision of a supreme authority, he is to be classed with the outback Western Australian aborigines until he reaches the age of 21 years. Needless to say, I support the Bill.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East): The Bill seeks to remedy a situation dealing with the franchise for the Legislative Council which, in my opinion, and, I confidently assert, in the opinion of the majority of the people in this State, is long overdue. When introducing the measure the Chief Secretary gave a most interesting review of our constitutional history, pointing out how strongly in the past the property qualification had been regarded as the sine qua non of responsible citizenship. Fortunately, down the years this point of view has given way to a more liberal outlook, although the last vestiges of it are retained in the existing franchise for the Legislative Council. Here we have a system which stipulates about seven various property qualifications, the majority of which are difficult to understand, and regarding all of which there is a good deal of legal doubt. The result is that less than one-third of the adult population of this State is on the Legislative Council roll, and that we in this Chamber can claim to represent less than one-third of the people.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I do not agree with that.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The latest rolls show that 274,856 persons are enrolled for the Legislative Assembly, and that of those only 79,889 are enrolled for the Legislative Council.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Whose fault is that?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The percentage of adults on the Council roll thus represents roughly 29 per cent. of those on the Assembly roll.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: We still represent all the other people.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members will have an opportunity to reply to the speech.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I hope that those members who are interjecting will take opportunities of recording their views on this all-important measure. I was about to say that this is palpably wrong, and that our system is one which of its own weakness and futility must give way to some better system. Surely a system which has the net results of giving only 29 per cent. of the adult population the franchise for the Legislative Council is in itself wrong and calls aloud for amendment. I am prepared to admit that, as applying to property interests, the present franchise is fairly liberal, but even so it gives the vote to only 29 per cent. of the people, and this fact, in my opinion, condemns it. During the recent Legislative Council elections only 296 soldiers voted.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: You are mistaken.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: My friend Mr. Bolton says I am wrong, but I have statistics applying to the elections, and I will hand them to him for his perusal. I was saying that statistics of the recent Legislative Council elections show that only 296 soldiers voted.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: By post!

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That indicates the unfairness of the enrolment. When the Chief Secretary referred to the position as it applies to soldiers, some members interjected that it was "sob stuff." However, it appears to me, and I think the great majority of the people will agree, that these men should be entitled to the franchise and that a system which denies it to them cannot be sustained. They may not possess any property qualification, but they have such an

interest or stake in the country that they are prepared to lay down their lives for it.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Yes, and you will not give them work in preference to unionists!

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I am speaking about the franchise for the Legislative Council. What applies to the soldiers goes merely to illustrate how other sections of the people are denied the vote. I could mention the prospectors and others in the outer areas, who are really the backbone of the country. Our electoral system gives a majority of them no voice in electing members to this Chamber. The only fair and adequate method of remedying this inequitable system is to alter the Constitution by adopting an adult franchise. This is a House of Review, and while it forms an integral part of our parliamentary system it should be fully representative of the whole of the people, not merely of 29 per cent. of them. Some members appear to think that if adult franchise is granted, this House will become a mere reflection of the Legislative Assembly. I do not agree with that viewpoint because, by virtue of its different electoral boundaries, the bicameral system of electing its members, and the fact that no-one is eligible for election until he or she is 30 years of age, the Council can never be a mere reflection of the Assembly.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Or we hope it will not be!

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: If adult franchise is granted, this Chamber will become representative of the people; and surely that is what it should be if we are to be true to the ideals of democracy. I hope every member of the House will speak on the Bill, because it is most important and the question involved is clear and unambiguous: Are all the people entitled to a vote for the Legislative Council, or are they not? Without any reservation I find myself in full support of the measure.

HON. SIR HAL COLEBATCH (Metropolitan): I find myself in cordial agreement with a good many of the opinions that have been expressed by the two previous speakers, but I fail to see that they are applicable to the Bill. I have studied the Bill carefully in the hope of finding that it was a measure which might be amended. But it is not. I see no respect in which the Bill can be amended. It is not a Bill to liberalise the franchise for the Legislative Council. It is a Bill to do away with the Legislative Council. I admit that there are great anomalies in the present franchise, and I hope the Select Committee, in support of which members of all parties in this House have spoken, will view it in that light, and will suggest how improvements can be made.

What special occasion calls for this drastic amendment of our Constitution in wartime? Has there been any public clamour for it? Has the Legislative Council thought fit to reject some proposal for the improvement of the country that the Assembly has placed before us? I do not think any of those questions can be answered in the affirmative. There have been appeals over the wireless to electors to write to their representatives urging them to support this Bill. I have received four letters on the subject. One was from a strongly pronounced Communist urging support of the Bill, although he really does not want the Legislative Council at all. Another appeal reached me from a supporter of the Bill. A third letter was from a constituent of mine asking to be informed exactly what the Bill meant. The fourth letter urged me to oppose the measure. Those are all the appeals I have received. I believe a statement has also been made concerning another means by which might be suggested a public interest in the Bill that does not exist. That suggestion appears to have fallen flat.

One argument on which a good deal of reliance seems to have been placed is that nothing is democratic except to grant full political power to every man and woman over the age of 21. It is the strangest definition of "democracy" that I have ever heard. I know of not a single authority which gives that as a definition of "democracy," and I know of no country in the world which has ever adopted such a definition and put it into practice. It does not apply to our Legislative Assembly, and, notwithstanding remarks made by some members, I hope it never will apply. I hope we shall never reach a state of affairs when people engaged in the arduous, risky and sometimes dangerous occupation of opening up our remote areas, will have only the same right in regard to representation in our Parliament as is enjoyed by those who participate in all the conveniences and amenities of city life. I am sure that if we did reach that stage, if we did divide our people for Legislative Assembly purposes into equal numbers

everywhere, it would be disastrous from the point of view of the country. I hope we shall never attempt it. The certainty that that would be disastrous, to my mind disposes entirely of the idea that we ought to favour the Bill because every man and woman of the age of 21 is entitled to full political power.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: I would say, entitled to vote.

Hon. Sir Hal COLEBATCH: Democracy means something entirely different from that. It is something that must be in the spirit of the people. Let me give an illustration of what I mean. Democracy means the rule of law against the rule of force. I do not care whether one is speaking nationally or internationally, that is what democracy means—the rule of law against the rule of force. Now, could there be a greater violation of democratic principles than for the employees in an essential service, having legal provision made for the redressing of all their grievances, to go on strike in defiance of the law and in complete disregard of the comfort and convenience and the absolute requirements of the citizens whom they are supposed to serve? I ask, could there be any more complete abnegation of the whole principles of democracy than that?

Members: No.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: Yes, there is one. For a Government tacitly to allow such things to occur! There could be no greater violation of democratic principles than for a body of men and women employed in essential services to go on strike in defiance of the law and without regard for the interests of the public convenience or requirements.

Member: You win!

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: One might go further and say that it is evidence of a lack of the true democratic spirit in the community that the people regard so lightly this flagrant trespass upon their rights as citizens without anything in the nature of a public protest. Democracy does not mean the right of a majority to force its wish upon a minority; it means the recognition of the rights of all.

Many members no doubt have heard the story of the citizen who was visiting a mental hospital. In the course of conversation with one of the patients he became tremendously impressed by the man's obvious brain capacity. He struck him as a man of superior intelligence, so he asked, "How do you come to be here?" The patient replied, "Democracy." The citizen asked, "Democracy? What do you mean by that?" The patient replied, "Democracy, majority rule. I thought the rest of the world mad and the rest of the world thought me mad. Majority rule drove me here."

In nearly all countries the need is recognised for a second Chamber, a Chamber of Review. There are abundant evidences of a popularly-elected Chamber—carried away by some temporary wave of public opinion—embarking on ill-considered projects which its own members would regret on fuller consideration, and which would have done the country infinite harm if there had not been some Chamber of Review to prevent it. I well remember the period of the Lang Administration in New South Wales. Legislation was introduced and passed in the popular Chamber which would have had not only confiscatory but also repudiatory effect. It would have done infinite harm to all the people of New South Wales, and the Legislative Council blocked it. What happened? The Government was pushed out. It went to the people, and the people by an enormous majority threw that Government out. They endorsed the decision of the Legislative Council, although the Legislative Council was then a nominee Chamber and, to my mind, not by any means an ideal House of Review. Since then the advocate of those policies, Mr. Lang, has been repudiated by his own Party.

I shall probably be told that Queensland has carried on successfully for a considerable period with only one House, but there are one or two things I would like members to bear in mind. I do not know whether many members have enjoyed the privilege that I did of acquaintance with the man who was Premier of Queensland for a long period in a Labour Government, Mr. Forgan Smith. He was a man who would not be dictated to by the Trades Hall or by anybody else. He was a man of great ability and fine courage. It was because of that, I think, more than anything else that Queensland carried on quite well with one House. Mr. Forgan Smith went. What happened? The Legislative Assembly had, almost without discussion, swallowed whole the proposals of Dr. Evatt, but when it

came to the Referendum the people rejected that decision. That is evidence of dissatisfaction with the popular Chamber.

Our own Legislative Assembly—this is a different matter, although applicable—in two sessions carried a resolution urging that the whole cost of the war, public works and social services should be financed by Commonwealth Bank credit without either loans or taxation. This Chamber carried a contrary resolution. It admitted that in wartime the use of what is called Commonwealth Bank credit was forced upon the Government, but urged that it should be used only with great caution. The mover of the Assembly resolution challenged me to a public debate and afterwards declared that if the Commonwealth Government did not adopt that policy he would challenge the Prime Minister publicly to debate it.

What has happened since then? Look at this morning's paper! Members will find two members of the Commonwealth Government—I am not referring to the Prime Minister—who were generally regarded as leaning towards the extreme Left, urging their own people to put their money into the war loan, declaring—rightly—that the war must be financed either by taxation or by loans, and pointing out the extreme danger of post-war inflation and the undeniable fact that such inflation would hit the mass of the people far more hardly than it would hit the so-called capitalists. I quote this passage from a speech delivered at Collie by the Postmaster General (Senator Ashley)—

> Victory in the battle against inflated prices and the loss of the spending power of the people's money was as essential to real victory after the armistice as the military defeat of Germany and Japan. Inflation could be a greater danger to the national economy than the prolongation of the war. The only alternative to the present policy of financing the war was intensified taxation and controls and restrictions. It is to the interest of the wage-earner to protect spending power, and the only way to do this at present is to postpone spending until after the war by putting some money regularly into war loans.

Surely that is an illustration of how our own Legislative Assembly was misled and also an illustration of how this Chamber took a much saner view, a view which today has been endorsed by the members of the Commonwealth Government. I quote Senator Ashley as an illustration that this Chamber was clearly right and that another place was demonstrably wrong, and also as indicating that this Chamber rightly interpreted the will of the people.

To such an extent is the will of the people now demonstrated in that direction that I do not think either the Prime Minister or the Postmaster General is in danger of being challenged to a public debate by the mover of the resolution in the Legislative Assembly. Whilst it is easy to find instances in which major features of public policy have been interpreted by the Council in conformity with the mature will of the people, what instance is there of this Chamber having blocked what can be truly described as the will of the people? I know of none. We held up the Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Bill for one session, not that we were opposed to coalminers having pensions but because we thought the matter required much closer investigation and that it was not a case for isolated action.

The Chief Secretary: That was not the reason given at the time.

Hon. Sir Hal COLEBATCH: In spite of that, the following session we passed that Bill. This might be used as an argument that we were too weak in resisting, but it could not be used as an argument that we were obdurate in opposing legislation passed by another place. The real question is: What should be the franchise for the Legislative Council? Personally, I think it should be merely some evidence of the acceptance of the responsibilities of citizenship. I am quite prepared to see amendments that go practically the whole of the way, that anyone who has given evidence of the acceptance of the responsibilities of citizenship should have a vote. Household suffrage certainly strongly appeals to me and if there is any doubt about it—a question was asked by my friend Mr. Seddon to show to what extent that doubt exists—the doubt should be removed. The housewife should certainly have a vote.

I am not particularly enamoured of the dual property qualification, although I think amendments made in that direction should have some regard to the interests of those engaged in the development of the outlying portions of the State. These matters could very well be considered by the Select Committee which is being sponsored by Mr. Baxter. There are countless examples of the unwisdom of trying to do away with

the House of Review. Perhaps the most conspicuous is that the Legislative Councils of South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania protected the people of Australia against the surrender of their self-governing rights for a long period of years; and the people of Australia wanted to be protected in that way. It was not the Legislative Assemblies—the popular Houses—it was not the Senate elected on adult suffrage that rightly interpreted the will of the Australian people. It was the Legislative Councils of the three smaller States that rightly interpreted the wishes of the people and protected them against something they did not want.

In any circumstances, I shall oppose the abolition of the bicameral system, at all events until there has been some development in the political outlook of the people such as to suggest that a single Chamber might be relied upon to represent the will of all the people and to protect the rights of all the people, whether majorities or minorities. In particular, I consider it entirely wrong to suggest a drastic alteration of our Constitution in time of war. I shall not support the second reading of the Bill. The wish to destroy this Chamber does not spring from fear that it will block progressive legislation, but from a knowledge that it stands in the way of revolutionary proposals by a temporary majority that might be in violent conflict with the wishes of the people, such as the abolition of the State Parliaments, the policy of the advocates of unification, the nationalisation of all industries and many other extravagant doctrines which from time to time achieve a certain measure of sectional approval. To my mind, it is not without significance that it comes from the Party which wants to abolish the State Parliament, the Party which stands for unification, the Party which would force Ministers and members against their better judgment to support Dr. Evatt's proposals; the fact that this is directly asked for is more than significant.

On motion by Hon. G. B. Wood, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 17th October, 1944.

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

QUESTIONS (3).

HAY SUPPLIES.

As to Eastern States' Requirements.

Mr. WATTS asked the Minister for Agriture:

(1) Is the season, in his opinion, developing in such a way that it will be safe to allow any great quantity of hay to be sent out of W.A.?

(2) If not, will his department take steps to acquire, on a cash on delivery to stack basis, a sufficient quantity to protect Western Australian livestock?

(3) Is not such acquisition the only way in which export to other States can be prevented?

(4) If there is any other way, does he consider action should be taken by such other means?

The MINISTER replied: With your permission, Sir, I would like to make a rather lengthy statement in reply to this question. I prepared this statement so that not only members of the House but also the public generally will know exactly what the position is regarding hay and chaff in this State. At a meeting in August of Ministers for Agriculture of all States, fears were expressed as to the possibilities of harvesting in three States sufficient quantities of hay for this year's crops because of the unfavourable seasonal conditions which were prevailing. As the season advanced it was obvious that earlier anticipations were well-founded and the almost alarming conditions in Victoria prompted a request for an inter-