terests of personal confidence to divulge all the information possessed by the department, of a person's character. I would like to point out that the proposal in the Bill does not go nearly as far as the provisions relating to road board secretaries and health inspectors.

Under the Road Districts Act the appointment of road board secretaries has to be referred for the consideration of the Minister. In fact, secretaries without previous experience are placed on a probationary period of six months. No local governing authority is permitted under the Health Act to appoint a health inspector without the approval of the Commissioner of Public Health.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is only because they must have the qualifications.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: That is so. It will thus be seen that road boards are required to seek ministerial approval for the appointment of two of their senior officers, and road boards do not receive the amount of financial assistance that the Government extends to hospital boards. In order to ensure that only persons of good repute receive senior appointments to hospitals, and in view of the fact that the bulk of hospital revenue is made available by the Government, I would ask the House to agree that, before making senior appointments, boards be required to obtain the advice of the Minister. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. J. G. Hislop, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.43 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 31st October, 1951.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions: Tram and bus services, as to removal and re-erection of waiting sheds	359
Metropolitan Market, as to checks by Weights and Measures Branch	360
Timber, as to experiments with hybrid pines	360
Forests, as to report of Royal Commission	360
Rent legislation, as to introduction	360
State Brick Works, (a) as to report by Dr. Hueber	360
(b) as to report of Royal Commission	360
Bills: Totalisator Duty Act Amendment, 1r.	361
Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment, 1r.	361
Rights in Water and Irrigation Act Amendment, 3r.	361
Fremantle Harbour Trust Act Amendment, 3r.	361
War Service Land Settlement Agreement, reports	361
Prices Control Act Amendment (No. 2), 2r., Com.	361
Constitution Acts Amendment, 2r., Com.	362
Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment (Continuance), returned	382
Main Roads (Funds Appropriation), returned	382
Parliament House Site Permanent Reserve (A1162), Council's message	382
Gas Undertakings Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	382
Nurses Registration Act Amendment, 2r.	389
Motion: Sitting hours, as to day-time sessions, defeated	382

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

QUESTIONS.

TRAM AND BUS SERVICES.

As to Removal and Re-erection of Waiting Sheds.

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

(1) How many public waiting sheds which are the property of the Tramway Department are there on the old Nedlands and south-of-the-river tram routes?

(2) In view of the fact that the department no longer conducts a service along the route, has any decision been made regarding their removal and re-erection at places to suit the convenience of its patrons and staff?

(3) If so, will he give consideration to the re-erection of such shelters—

(a) at the corner of Plain-st. and Adelaide Terrace in order to serve the pupils of Perth Girls' High School and local residents;

(b) at the corner of Adelaide-st. and Adelaide Terrace, in order to serve employees of the tramway workshops who have to wait for transport at peak periods owing to buses already being filled with passengers?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) The Tramway Department does not own any shelter sheds on the Nedlands route.

Existing shelters south of the river are still needed for omnibus patrons, therefore no sheds surplus to requirements are available.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) Erection of shelter sheds along any route is considered to be the responsibility of the local authority.

METROPOLITAN MARKET.

As to Checks by Weights and Measures Branch.

Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) How many officers of the Weights and Measures Branch visited the Metropolitan Markets last Wednesday?

(2) When previously were checks made at the markets?

(3) How frequently have such checks been made during the past 12 months?

(4) What was responsible for the special attention last week?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) Two.

(2) On 7/7/50.

(3) Once only.

(4) Complaints had been received from interested parties and a check was made of markings and weights of packages as a result.

TIMBER.

As to Experiments with Hybrid Pines.

Mr. MANNING asked the Minister for Forests:

(1) Is he aware that in the United States a considerable field of experimental work is being carried out with hybrid pines, and a fast-growing hardwood pine has been bred?

(2) Are any experiments of this nature being carried out in this State?

(3) If so, where and to what exent?

(4) If not, is he prepared to have such experiments undertaken?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes. Work is mainly concentrated at Placerville, in California, where an Institute of Forest Tree Breeding and Genetics has been established in recent years.

Work is also being done by Syrac Larsen in Denmark and at other centres, including Canberra and this State. The hardwood hybrid referred to is possibly pinus attenuradiata, but all known hybrids are at present under test and seed is not yet available.

(2) Yes.

(3) Strain and species trials have been carried out on a wide scale in all plantation areas.

Technically pure genetical studies have been on an exploratory basis at Ludlow, Somerville and Collier Plantations and in the laboratory.

(4) Answered by (3).

FORESTS.

As to Report of Royal Commission.

Mr. HOAR (without notice) asked the Minister for Forests:

(1) When will the report of the Royal Commission inquiring into forests policy be published?

(2) What is the cause of so much delay?

The MINISTER replied:

The Royal Commissioner who inquired into forestry was in Western Australia about three weeks ago, and he indicated to me then that he would be presenting his report in two or three weeks' time. It is, therefore, expected any day.

RENT LEGISLATION.

As to Introduction.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN (without notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

When is it his intention to introduce the rent Bill for consideration?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

The Bill is not yet ready. This is as far as I can go in that direction.

STATE BRICK WORKS.

(a) As to Report by Dr. Huber.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

Will he table Dr. Hueber's report concerning the State Brick Works in Western Australia?

The MINISTER replied.

No report by Dr. Huber can be found, on the new pressed brickworks at Armadale.

(b) As to Report of Royal Commission.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN (without notice) asked the Premier:

Has he yet received from Mr. A. G. Smith his report in connection with the recent inquiry into happenings at the State Brick Works?

The PREMIER replied:

The report has not yet been received.

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Totalisator Duty Act Amendment.
2, Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Premier.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Rights in Water and Irrigation Act Amendment.
2, Fremantle Harbour Trust Act Amendment.

Transmitted to the Council.

BILL—WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

Further report of Committee adopted.

BILL—PRICES CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 24th October.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. A. F. Watts—Stirling) [4.40]: The only amendment proposed by this Bill is to increase the penalties that can be imposed upon persons who commit offences against the Act. Members must not lose sight of the fact, in considering this matter, that it is possible to make a number of charges out of what really constitutes one offence; that is frequently done. When acting for the Attorney General I have, on more than one occasion, been obliged to authorise the issue of as many as 19 or 20 summonses against one individual for offences which, on perusal of the complaints attached to the summonses, were found to be substantially one offence. That is to say, they were a series of transactions involving the same contravention of the law.

So when one comes to consider the question of penalties, it is obvious that a considerable amount of discretion must be left to the magistrate as to what penalty he shall inflict in respect to each of the charges that are laid before him. No doubt he has to take into consideration what the aggregate will be and what the aggregate offence is in cases where a number of complaints are laid which often happens—involving much the same contravention. While I am in sympathy with the intention of the Leader of the Opposition to give the magistrates, in cases where heavy penalties are deserved, the opportunity to inflict a greater maximum penalty than that now provided in the Act, I am nevertheless, not content that the hon. gentleman should succeed in increasing the penalty from £100 to £500, when the matter is heard by a magistrate and from £500 to £1,500 when the matter is heard by a judge.

The Government is prepared to go some way with the hon. member and when the measure reaches the Committee stage—it is not my intention to oppose the passage of the second reading—I propose to seek to alter the proposition put forward by the Leader of the Opposition by making the maximum in the first instance £200 in lieu of the existing £100 and, in the second instance, making the maximum £750 in lieu of the existing £500. That will give sufficient scope within which the magistrate or a judge of the supreme court may exercise whatever discretion is necessary in the direction of imposing heavier penalties without, at the same time, placing figures in the Act which I consider, in all the circumstances of the case, are unnecessary—particularly in the case of magistrates. So I can readily summarise my views on this small Bill by saying that I shall not oppose the second reading but I shall endeavour to amend it in Committee. If that be successful I shall naturally not oppose the third reading. I leave the matter at that.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Perkins in the Chair; Hon. A. R. G. G. Hawke in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 16:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: For the reasons I gave a few moments ago I move an amendment—

> That in line 3 of paragraph (a) the word "five" be struck out with a view to inserting another word in lieu.

If my amendment is successful I intend to move to insert the word "two" in place of the word struck out. I submit that a maximum penalty of £200 is adequate in all circumstances.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am not prepared to accept this amendment. A maximum fine of £200 might be all right in regard to small traders whose offences are not of very great consequence to the community. However, we must bear in mind that there are other people who could breach the Act and whose offences could be large-scale in character, and who should be punished to the extent of a greater fine than £200. When moving the second reading of the Bill I mentioned that magistrates were strongly disinclined to impose a term of imprisonment upon any businessman who breached the Act. I instanced that as a very strong reason why the maximum fine in the Act should be greatly increased. The Government is almost certain to find that it will have to bring an increased number of goods and services under the control of this Act, because the necessity for a wider spread of price control will become very pressing as time goes by. Under that set-up, it will be probable that commodities of much greater size and value in respect of price

will come under the Act. Therefore, much higher maximum fines would be necessary in connection with offences which might easily occur in that section of the field of trade and commerce.

I would stress to members that the maximum fine suggested in the Bill would be a maximum; that in connection with this part of the clause magistrates would still have endless discretion as to whether they would impose the maximum or some figure below it. As the Act provides no minimum and as the Bill proposes to insert no minimum in the Act, the discretion of a magistrate would be complete. If he found a trader or manufacturer guilty of having breached the Act, a magistrate could impose the suggested maximum of £500 if he thought the breach a very serious one, or he could impose any figure below that suggested maximum of £500 to as low as £1 if he thought the breach did not warrant the imposition of a fine greater than £1.

I think the Government will find that magistrates, and judges too, will require to have the right to impose much higher maximum fines than they have had in the past; otherwise the job of trying to control prices reasonably and to protect the community better than it has been protected up to date will be more or less impossible, unless magistrates and judges, if the maximum in each instance is not increased, finally resort to imposing sentences of imprisonment on those who breach the Act in some serious fashion. However, I am not convinced that magistrates and judges will impose terms of imprisonment upon businessmen. Consequently we ought substantially to increase the maximum fine which a magistrate or judge would be entitled to impose so that the law might be more solidly enforced against those who breach it, and so that the very penalties themselves as contained in the Act will be such as to deter many business people from breaching it who would otherwise be inclined to take the risk of doing so if the present maximum penalty were to remain.

Amendment (to strike out word) put and a division taken, with the following result.

Ayes	....	....	....	21
Noes	....	....	....	20
Majority for			....	1

Ayes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Nimmo
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Owen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Watts
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hill	Mr. Yates
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Manning	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Graham	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Panton
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Read
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. Styants
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. McCulloch	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Thorn	Mr. Needham
Mr. Abbott	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Coverley

Amendment thus passed.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

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

Amendment (to insert word) put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACTS AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 24th October.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. A. F. Watts—Stirling) [5.0]: This Bill to amend the Constitution Acts proposes to make a very fundamental change in the franchise for the Legislative Council. There are Legislative Councils in five of the States at the present time and in only one—and this in very recent days—has any approach been made to undertaking a change such as is proposed in this measure.

In my opinion, even if one were prepared to subscribe to the point of view that some change in the franchise system for the Legislative Council of this State is desirable, one would be extremely ill-advised to attempt an amendment in the manner suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, firstly, because I consider that such a radical change in not desirable and, secondly, because, while there may be some prospect of carrying some moderate and well-considered amendment to the franchise for another place, only those who cherish the belief that forlorn hopes can succeed are likely to believe that this radical alteration would be approved of there. So I say at the outset that we on this side of the House cannot agree to the proposal to repeal Section 15 and substitute a proposition that involves adult suffrage for the Legislative Council.

From time to time when references have been made to the franchise or constitution of the Legislative Council, observations have been offered as to the provision of adult suffrage for the Senate. Of course, there have been many changes in the

work which the Senate was intended to do. It was intended to be a House that represented the States irrespective of their population and irrespective of their size. Each State until quite recently had six representatives in the Senate and more recently ten, with the result, so far as population is concerned, that the vote of a person in Western Australia may be said to be worth about six times that of a voter in New South Wales, while as regards Tasmania, it may be said to be worth possibly 12 times as much, or more.

The Senate has, I consider, to a very great degree lost sight of the original idea. It no longer is a House in which the members representing particular States direct their efforts most strongly to looking after the interests of the States. As time has gone on, it has become more or less a party political House in which, provided the right numbers exist, the Senate, can be expected to reflect the views of the House of Representatives. That, I believe, is all to the bad. The original conception has been departed from and, in my view, we have gained nothing by the process.

As I understand the position here, the original conception of the Legislative Council in every State where it was created was that it should be a House of Review. In the main it represented people who were the heads of households or who held some other very modest stake in the country. Apparently, judging from the age limit of 30 years, it was intended to be a House of elder statesmen to examine carefully the legislation passed by possibly a more juvenile or less thoughtful Legislative Assembly. It was intended to be a check on hasty or ill-considered legislation that might be passed by the Legislative Assembly elected upon adult franchise, and consequently, to ensure that no ill-considered proposition that might fundamentally affect to its detriment the future of the State should pass unchallenged.

Throughout the years that I have occupied a seat in the Legislative Assembly, I have found the Legislative Council frequently wisely, but on rare occasions, in my own personal opinion, somewhat unwisely exercising the prerogatives and objectives of the Constitution Act. I consider that, by and large, its activities have not been other than to the benefit of Western Australia as a whole.

We have often complimented ourselves—and I think with some justification—upon the excellent legislation of many types that is upon our statute book but, if we pause to reflect, it is of no use our complimenting ourselves upon that legislation unless we realise that it has also been approved by the House consisting of the gentlemen whom I was earlier pleased to call the elder statesmen. Seeing that our legislation has been recognised both here and elsewhere as progressive and kept reasonably well up-to-date, it cannot be said with any force that in the main the Legislative Council has been reactionary.

As the Constitution Act stands, the qualifications for the enrolment of electors were such as to place the right to vote within the reach of almost every man who had any real interest in the State or was head of a household in any home. The annual rental of £17 could not pre-suppose more than a very modest home, even when the Act was passed, and today it is safe to say that no householder is deprived of the right to enrol and, if enrolled, to vote. The fact that many people do not trouble to enrol and thus render themselves ineligible to vote, or, after they have enrolled, fail to vote, is a matter for regret, but that is their own business.

It is a well-known fact here that we on this side of the House have considered for some time that certain changes in the right to vote for the Legislative Council should be made. In 1947, as the Leader of the Opposition mentioned in the course of his address, a Bill was introduced for that purpose. That Bill purported to do two major things. The first was to give the spouse of the householder the right to enrol and, therefore, the right to vote. In the main, that would have enabled the wife to enrol and to vote, because it is substantially true that a majority of the householders who are enrolled are males.

When the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, was passed, there were certainly no votes for women for a great many of the parliamentary institutions in the British Commonwealth. I am unable to say accurately whether any had given the vote to women at that time, but it was long after 1899 when the suffragette movement, which ultimately resulted in women getting votes for the British House of Commons, was in full swing. In other parts of the British Commonwealth, as we call it today, similar activity took place in the early part of this century with the same result.

To me it has always seemed as reasonable to give the spouse of the householder the right to vote as it is to give the householder himself or herself the right to vote. That was one of the major provisions of the Bill of 1947. Although it did not pass Parliament, the arguments used in its favour are still valid, and I think it ought to be something acceptable to both Houses. At least, the Government considers that it is reasonable that the matter should be re-submitted for consideration.

The second major proposition in the Bill of 1947 was to class the self-contained flat as a dwelling. In much the same way as there were few women voters in 1899, so there were few dwel-

lings that we now term self-contained flats. Like the enfranchisement of women, the rise of the so-called self-contained flat has been fairly rapid in the last half century or less. So, in the Bill of 1947, we sought to define what a self-contained flat was. It was defined as a separate dwelling in a building consisting of a number of dwellings. On that basis, it was just as much entitled to recognition as a house as was an edifice completely separate from others in which people reside and which had no connection with the others.

Those two amendments, I suggest, were put up not only—or perhaps not at all—with the idea of simply widening the franchise for the Legislative Council, but with the idea, I suggest, of admitting changes that had taken place in customs and methods of living; admitting that the enfranchisement of women was a proper thing; and admitting that modern conditions and architectural ideas had evolved the self-contained flat which, as defined in that Bill, was as much a separate dwelling as an ordinary dwellinghouse.

The third proposal in that measure was that the person who held qualifications in more than one province should be restricted to voting in one province, but that he should have the right to say in which province he would vote. Having qualifications in more than one province, he might have the closest connection with one and little or no connection with the others. He might have the qualification of ownership of a block of land worth £50 in the South Province but have every other consideration he was interested in in the South-West Province. So it was reasonable to permit him to select in which of the provinces he would exercise the franchise.

So it seems to me that my course in this discussion is perfectly clear. It appears to be competent for the House in the Committee stage to amend this measure to make it correspond with the proposal that was brought down in 1947, and it is my intention to ensure, so far as I can, that that state of affairs comes about. I do not intend to oppose the second reading of this Bill, but I do propose to move in Committee the substantial amendments of which I have given notice on the addendum to notice paper No. 7, with the object of ascertaining whether the majority of this House, when in Committee, agrees with me. If it does, the legislation can be submitted to another place for its consideration. If it does not, I shall have to vote against the third reading.

Before I conclude, I would like to say a word or two on one or two other points in this measure. I notice that the Leader of the Opposition, in setting out the disqualifications for aboriginal natives and Asiatics and the like on very similar terms to those that are expressed in the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, itself, has excluded from the re-constituted clause he proposes that part of the Constitution Act which excluded British Indians from the disqualifications. I do not think the hon. member can do that unless he does it contrary to public policy and legislation which has been earlier passed in this State.

In 1947, at the request of the High Commissioner for India, the Government decided to remove from all statutes in Western Australia disabilities applicable to permanent residents in this State—and there are very few here—who were born in India or Pakistan or who are their descendants. In consequence of this decision, amendments were made to the Factories and Shops Act and the Licensing Act, and administrative instructions were sent to the departments concerned that the phrase "natural born British subject" includes an Indian born in what was formerly British India, but which now comprises the Dominions of India and Pakistan.

So it seems to me that we would be well advised to retain the provision which is in the Constitution Act rather than accept the substitution for it which the Leader of the Opposition proposes in the last clause of his Bill. That will give the House the reason why it is proposed, so far as I am concerned, to delete the whole of paragraph (c) at the end of the clause of the Bill which deals with disqualifications. There is a provision in the Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, that no person shall be a candidate who is less than 30 years of age. I do not know that there is any virtue in that provision.

I have noticed it is but rarely that a candidate of less than 30 years of age is elected to either House of Parliament, and I would suggest that if there be some outstanding personality between the ages of 21 and 30 who desires to nominate for the Legislative Council, and the electors find him so outstanding as to wish to elect him at that youthful age, we should have no objection. Therefore I do not propose to oppose that amendment in the Bill. I do not intend to vote against the second reading; but, unless amendments are made to enable the Bill to correspond with the measure of 1947, to which I have referred in some detail, it is my intention to oppose the other stages of the measure.

MR. W. HEGNEY (Mt. Hawthorn) [5.23]: I propose to support the second reading of this Bill. Quite recently I made some remarks about the constitution of the Legislative Council. I have done so on many occasions since I have been a member of the Legislative Assembly, and I make no apology for re-stating my views to the House in the hope that at least a few members opposite who may be inclined to fall for the proposed amendments of the Deputy Premier will see justification for the terms of this measure.

In outlining his views on the Bill, the Deputy Premier referred to the Senate and the fact that that House was set up for the protection of the smaller States when Federation was about to be inaugurated. That is true, but if he follows the proposition a little further, surely he will admit, without any qualification whatsoever, that if the Commonwealth Constitution provides for adult franchise for both the Senate and the House of Representatives, the same should logically apply to both Houses of the State Parliament.

I indicated earlier this session that the Commonwealth deals with matters of an international character—war, foreign relations, immigration, customs, excise, and all the other matters which were referred to it by the States when the Commonwealth Constitution was being drafted. Surely if the representatives of Australia from the various States determine matters of war and defence, and they are elected on an adult franchise basis, it is reasonable to assume that the same principle should apply to the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia.

Ever since the time when I was a very immature lad, I have endeavoured to take an interest in the public affairs of the State, and my first recollection of the Legislative Council was that it was supposed to be a House of Review, a House to check hasty legislation. The Deputy Premier used those very same phrases today to justify his opposition to part of the Bill. Let us for a moment have a look at the statement that the Legislative Council is a House of Review. In my opinion, the Legislative Council is purely and simply a party House, because every member in the Legislative Council today belongs to one of three parties. The members of the Legislative Council belong to the Liberal Party of Australia, or the Country and Democratic League of Western Australia, or the Labour Party of Western Australia. Will any member on the opposite side of the House deny that? There is complete silence!

Members opposite know that the shibboleth that the Council is a House of Review has long been thrown overboard. The Deputy Premier indicated that the Senate was to be a States' House. Without any qualification, however, I would say that the Senate is just as much a party House, or nearly as much a party House, as is the Legislative Council of this State.

The Minister for Education: Rather more I should think.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Yes. The only difference is that the Senate is elected on an adult franchise basis. If the personnel of the Legislative Council were all public spirited, and disinterested so far as politics are concerned, and owed allegiance to no party, there would be some force in the Deputy Premier's statement. But he knows that members of the Legislative Council sit alongside him in his caucus meetings; and the Premier knows that the members of his party in the Legislative Council, though he is not able to control them at times, sit alongside him at his party meetings, the same as members of the Labour Party in the Legislative Council attend Labour caucus meetings. Then there is the statement that the Legislative Council provides a review of hasty legislation.

Mr. Marshall: They hastily review it at times.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I could quote—but do not intend to burden the House by doing so, because it is all in "Hansard"—instances to indicate that very often the Council has not acted as a check on hasty legislation, but has acted as a check on legislation which has been introduced and passed by the representatives of the people of Western Australia as reflected in this Chamber, whether a Labour Government or otherwise has been in office. On many occasions it has not reviewed legislation, but thrown it out altogether. What has it done on previous occassions when measures of a constitutional nature have gone from this Chamber to the Legislative Council? Has it reviewed them or considered them? It has even thrown some measures out on the second reading.

What did another place do to a measure introduced into this House to curtail the powers of the Legislative Council in order to bring it into line with the British Parliament Act of 1911? Did it review that legislation or consider it? No, it simply threw the Bill out. The Legislative Council in Western Australia—with it I couple the second Chambers in Tasmania, Victoria and South Australia—is more strongly entrenched than is any other second Chamber in the British Commonwealth of Nations. What remedy or redress have we, as representatives of the people elected on an adult franchise basis? We have none! What remedy have the representatives of the people if the powers of the Legislative Council are to continue as at present? None whatsoever!

I am pleased to know the Deputy Premier has indicated that he is prepared to accept the proposal that the age at which a person should be entitled to be elected to the Legislative Council should be reduced from 30 to 21 years. I believe that the age qualification of 30 years was inserted into the Constitution 80 or 90 years ago, when education was not compulsory and when few of the pioneers in this State were able to give their children an education, because the facilities for it simply did not exist. That qualification has remained in the Constitution for many years, but it is now due for deletion.

Any person over the age of 21 years is regarded as a citizen and is entitled to nominate for election to the Legislative Assembly. Such a person should have

equally the right to nominate for election and, if successful, to hold a seat in the Legislative Council. Every person over the age of 18 years is obliged to submit himself or herself to the laws of the country, and everyone over the age of 21 years is regarded as having attained his or her majority and is obliged to serve in the Forces either in Australia or oversea. If a person is old and responsible enough to help defend the country surely he or she is entitled to take a seat, if elected, in either of the legislative Chambers of Western Australia. They pay taxes and are governed by our laws, so I maintain that the age qualification for another place should be reduced from 30 to 21 years.

Mr. J. Hegney: In the Forces they get a vote in Commonwealth elections at 18 years of age.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I hope that in the near future our system of education will be such as to ensure that on leaving school boys and girls will have acquired a knowledge of the fundamental obligations of citizenship, and will know how their country is governed and what is its constitutional set-up so that, on attaining 18 years of age, they will be able to cast intelligent votes. Our young people are not at present given a sound instruction in the responsibilities of citizenship and to that has been due the necessity, in both Commonwealth and State legislation, for provisions for compulsory voting. This Bill should be passed in order to give effect to adult franchise.

It is unfortunate that this State is on all fours with three or four of the other States as far as its second Chamber is concerned. Speaking from memory I think that in Tasmania there are, for the Legislative Council, restrictions similar to those obtaining in this State, but there are, in addition, some liberalising provisions, one of which is that retired naval and medical officers and those holding university degrees may vote for the Legislative Council while the bricklayer, shearer and miner, for example, are not so entitled, by virtue of their occupations. The Deputy Premier has indicated that the Legislative Council is elected and constituted by those who have a stake in the country. I have heard that story many times.

Mr. Marshall: It has been flogged to death.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: There are in this State at present thousands of men who fought oversea in the first and second world wars. Many of them, unfortunately, returned maimed and broken in health, but they are not, on that account, entitled to vote for the Legislative Council unless they have what is known as a stake in the country, according to the argument of those who wish to perpetuate the old order of things. There are in the back country of this State men who do not actually own mining leases, but who are prospectors doing a good job in opening up the more remote areas.

There are men droving cattle and sheep, also, but because they own no real estate to the value of £50 it is said that they have no stake in the country. One could go on almost indefinitely pointing out the injustices and anomalies that exist in this regard. The member for Harvey probably owns real estate. I hope he does—

Mr. Manning: He does not even possess his own home.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Unless he can measure up to the qualifications he is not entitled to a vote for the Legislative Council.

Mr. Manning: What are those qualifications?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Is the hon. member on the roll for the Legislative Council?

Mr. Manning: Yes, as a householder.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Then he must have the qualifications, but there are many people who are not householders. There are many who own cattle or sheep stations but, if they disposed of their property and put their money into Commonwealth bonds, they would forgo their right to vote in the Legislative Council elections because they would then have no stake in the country, having no real estate. I say that the Legislative Council of Western Australia—I think that in his heart the Premier knows this is true—is due for a radical overhaul. There are two legislative Chambers in this State and we are supposed to be a democratic Government.

Apart from the fact that the Legislative Council cannot amend Supply Bills or initiate legislation involving a charge on the Crown, it has equal powers with the Legislative Assembly and, in fact, even more power. It can turn this Government out at any time it likes because, if another place refused Supply, the Government could not carry on. I might add that Legislative Councils in some of the other States have done that. Does the member for Canning believe in that sort of thing, or does the member for Cottesloe? Some of the younger members on the Government side of the House would not be entitled to take seats in the Legislative Council.

Is it right that another place should be able to obstruct or reject legislation that has been passed by this Assembly? This House is representative of the people of the State, and not of only one-sixth or one-tenth of them. Yet, if we pass legislation and send it on to the Upper House and that Chamber desires to amend it, the stage may be reached where it is necessary to have a conference of managers. If the Legislative Council managers refuse to agree on the lines desired by the Legislative Assembly managers, the managers from this House must agree to the proposals of the Council managers or the

whole measure is rejected and lost. That is so in spite of the fact that the Legislative Council is not fully representative, as is this Chamber, of the people of Western Australia.

I recently quoted figures to show that there are approximately 300,000 people on the Assembly rolls, while on the Legislative Council roll there are less than 90,000, yet in that Chamber, where there are 30 members, a majority of one can throw out legislation that has been passed by this House. I am not sanguine about the amendments that have been placed on the notice paper by the Deputy Premier as I think they amount only to toying with the matter. They do not go far enough for me. If we are to continue to have two Houses in this State the Legislative Council members should in future be elected on an adult franchise basis, such as applies to Assembly elections. If that were done our parliamentary institution in this State would be on a democratic basis but, as it is now, that is not so. I hope that the second reading is agreed to and that the Bill passes through Committee without radical amendment.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth) [5.43]: It is a matter of disappointment to me that a Bill which contains what are, to my mind, elementary democratic principles, should be debated in this Chamber with such an apparent lack of interest on the part of the younger members on the Government side of the House. I was amazed at the utterances of the Deputy Premier who is, after all, parliamentary Leader of the Country and Democratic League—and I emphasise the word, "democratic." About 35 years ago a war was fought, as we were told, for democracy and yet, in the year 1951, it has become necessary for the Opposition in this House to initiate legislation to give effect to the principle for which we have been told a world war was fought and won.

The Opposition, of course, when it occupied the Treasury benches, made many attempts in several different directions to allow the people of Western Australia to exercise a vote for their parliamentary representatives, as against an exclusive section having that right as is the position at the moment. I repeat, I am amazed that at this time of the nation's history there should be, above all others, members of Parliament who are prepared to deny the people the right to exercise a vote. What is the position at present?

It matters not the mental capacity of a citizen. There is no consideration given to his educational attainments. Irrespective of how distinguished his services in the defence of the country might have been, and no matter how outstanding a citizen is, he is denied the elementary right to vote to elect representatives to the Legislative Council. But, on the other hand, if an individual is intellectually a moron; if he is unable even to understand the King's English; if he is lazy and indolent; if he is a ne'er-do-well but, nevertheless, happens to be associated with bricks and mortar or broad acres, then he becomes a citizen, in the eyes of the Liberal and Country Party members, qualified in every respect to elect members to the Legislative Council where they have supreme right to deny the passage of any piece of legislation, of any clause, any line, or any word of such legislation.

Mr. Manning: We have not many of that description.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps I could make a nomination. Let me state, from my place in this Chamber, that whilst apparently I am regarded as being worthy to represent the people of my constituency, I have not a vote for the Legislative Council. As I pointed out several years ago, when speaking to a somewhat similar measure, a person, to wit, Mr. Kim Beazley, M.H.R., was elected and took his place in the Commonwealth Parliament and sat there for several years during which time, under our antiquated legislation, he was apparently not fit or qualified to take a seat in an outmoded Chamber such as the Legislative Council; a relic of the dim, distant days, but a relic which, unfortunately, survives.

There was a time when all Governments were conservative; when second Chambers comprised certain privileged people who were nominated. Those second Chambers served a purpose because the outlook of the individuals who comprised them was identical with those of the popular Chamber and, when I say "popular Chamber" I bear in mind the fact that that franchise for the people's House was exceedingly restricted during the times of which I speak. I wonder why there is this respect and consideration extended to bricks and mortar and not to flesh and blood. I only wish that members who support the Government would be sufficiently courageous and honest to stand up in their places in this Chamber and inform their constituents that they do not believe in democracy; that they do not believe that the ordinary humble citizen should be entitled to record a vote. No, they merely pay lip-service to democracy and lip-service only.

Perhaps, if we were discussing a Bill which sought to abolish the Legislative Council—a Bill which, incidentally, would receive my fullest blessing—there might be room for an honest difference of opinion, but as this Bill, described by the Deputy Premier as radical, merely seeks to give every adult person in the State a vote to elect members to the Legislative Council, I am at a loss to understand how people's minds work. This House is the popular Chamber. This is the House in which Governments are made

and unmade. However, irrespective of the choice of the people of the State, the Legislative Council goes on in substance and in the same form and is similarly composed whether there is an election or not.

We have the position—as we have had so often—that a Government returned on popular vote does not draft its legislation to suit the requirements of a situation or conform to the pledges given to the people, but drafts it to suit the whims and fancies of the Legislative Council. We all know perfectly well that the new rent Bill, in whatever shape or form it appears before this Chamber, will be drafted with a view to suiting the viewpoint of members of the Legislative Council rather than being drafted for the purpose of dealing with a particular situation. The Legislative Council is able to defy the will of the people as expressed through popular vote.

The Legislative Council despises the people. That is so, because if it were otherwise the Legislative Council would permit the people to exercise their franchise in their election. They are able to despise the people and treat them with contempt because it is impossible for the people to do anything about it. No matter how disgusted the citizens of Western Australia may be with the attitude and actions of certain members of the Legislative Council, they are powerless to move in the matter because, as was pointed out a few moments ago by the member for Mt. Hawthorn, far less than one-third of the people in this State are on the Legislative Council roll. And, after all is said and done, why should any worthy citizen be denied that elementary right.

Surely we are entitled to contrast the attitude of the Deputy Premier with that of his counterpart in Victoria where, as members are probably aware, a Country Party government introduced legislation on similar terms to the measure we are discussing to allow every adult in Victoria to have a vote. Members, particularly those who have been associated with this Parliament for some five or six years, appreciate the tremendous power enjoyed by the Legislative Council and the fact that, whereas in the Commonwealth sphere the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia can be altered by the vote of the people, as expressed in a referendum, here, in Western Australia, no such system prevails.

In the first place, it is impossible to hold a referendum on any matter without such referendum proposal being agreed to by the Legislative Council and, secondly, even if 90 per cent. of the people of this State voted in favour of a certain proposition in a referendum it would make no difference whatsoever to the Constitution of this State. It would still require a Bill to be introduced to pass this Chamber which is responsive to public reaction, and the measure would then have to be transmitted to the Legislative Council where not less than an absolute majority on the floor of the House would have to vote for such a measure before it became law.

As there have been so many Bills and so many debates over the years on the reform of the Legislative Council, several attempts were made to remove the question as a debating subject among members of Parliament, and to allow the people of Western Australia to decide the issue by posing to them two simple questions: "Are you in favour of the abolition of the Legislative Council?" or, alternatively, "Are you in favour of adult franchise for the Legislative Council?" and, not the least surprising to anyone who knows the form of that Chamber, the Legislative Council refused to allow the people of Western Australia to express themselves on those two simple propositions.

We can, when we reach the Committee stage, give some attention to the amendments of which the Deputy Premier has given notice. From my cursory reading of them I should say they will make the position far worse than obtains at present, but perhaps more of that a little later. It seems unlikely that I will obtain a response, but I appeal especially to the younger members who are supporters of the Government to express themselves on this proposition. If they have some consideration for the time factor, each one in his turn could stand up in his place and deliver himself of a short sentence which would suffice and make this declaration: "I am not in favour of the people of Western Australia being entitled to vote for members of both Houses of the Western Australian Parliament." If they felt they could occupy a little more time perhaps they could dilate on wars or democracy and about those "free" nations who are lined up against those on the inside of the iron curtain. "Free," Mr. Speaker!

We have a facade of democracy. We know perfectly well that if Labour were returned to power, whether with a narrow or a substantial majority, it could legislate only so far as the Liberal and Country Party members of the Legislative Council would permit. And we call that democracy! Exactly the same consideration would probably be the order of the day if Labour, by some miracle, achieved a majority in the Legislative Council. I am somewhat amused at the attitude of the two daily newspapers in this State. I recall, as probably all members do, the barrage of propaganda, the abuse and criticism heaped upon the Labour-dominated Senate in the national Parliament—and yet they have allowed, almost without comment, to continue for half a century and more a similar state of affairs under their very noses. One comes to the conclusion that there is no honesty in these matters.

The Bill is actually an issue of—property versus the people. Do we agree that the qualification for a vote should be the ownership or renting of certain property, or do we believe that, because of a man's citizenship here, because of his work and services and because of his qualities generally, he should be entitled to the vote? The answer is—which? The Premier, in his Policy Speech in 1947, raised the hopes of democrats belonging to all political parties in this State when he made a bold statement which led people to believe that he was really sincere in his endeavour to do something about the present shocking state of affairs. When he made that declaration from the platform, surrounded by adherents, including a number of members of the Legislative Council, he was roundly applauded for his utterances, and subsequently his party, in association with the Country Party, formed the Government of this State.

One would have thought there would have been sufficient decency in the Liberal Party as an organisation, and certainly in the parliamentary members of it, even though some of them happened to be occupying seats in another place, to have honoured the utterances and declarations of the Premier, which had been endorsed by the people of the State. I close on the note that the Legislative Council is not concerned with the people of Western Australia. It is not interested in them and their outlook, because members of that Chamber are elected by property and their chief and principal concern is property. I wonder why, instead of endeavouring to pander to them and the interests and influences represented by the Legislative Council, the Government and the two political parties comprising it, did not cooperate and collaborate with the Labour Party with a view to introducing real democracy into Western Australia instead of the mockery that masquerades in its name at the present moment.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [6.5]: I cannot allow the Bill to be passed without expressing my point of view respecting its objective. The measure, as introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, seeks to extend the franchise for the Legislative Council and is a very simple one, the object being to bring the second Chamber into line with the Legislative Assembly. In addressing himself to the second reading, the Deputy Premier gave support to the proposition that the Council represents property interests in this State and consequently, as the second Chamber, should, he claimed, be entitled to review legislation as passed by the more popular House—the Legislative Assembly. We know full well that over the years this alleged House of review, when it suits the book of its members, gives peremptory and short shrift to legislation from the Legislative Assembly, particularly when that legislation does not suit the purposes of the interests of Council representatives.

One instance that comes vividly to my mind is the rents Bill. That measure went from this Chamber allegedly having the concurrence of the Government and members sitting on the other side of the House. After being amended, it was sent to the alleged House of review—and we know just how it was reviewed. An amendment was carried that "The Bill be read this day six months." We know in what difficulty that decision placed the Government. It was forced to end one session and start another immediately—a move almost unprecedented in the history of this State. Many other Bills, after passing this House, have been sent to another place concerning matters to deal with which the Government had received a mandate from the people. When attempts were made to implement such measures the Legislative Council promptly rejected them. It has adopted that course time after time.

When we think of the Legislative Council as a House to Review legislation and to prevent the passage of hastily-drafted measures, the description does not fit in with the line of action so often adopted by that House. As an instance of that, I would draw attention to the experience regarding the Welshpool-Bassendean Railway Bill and its complementary compensation Bill. The latter Bill was passed in a matter of three minutes, and the Bill dealing with the railway itself went through in a very short period. Those two Bills vitally affected a portion of my electoral district and certainly will make a mess of the eastern portion of it, including the districts of Bayswater, Bassendean and Belmont.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Is the hon. member referring to these matters with a view to dealing with the Legislative Council franchise? His remarks are rather far-removed from the Bill dealing with that question.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I will connect my remarks by pointing out that when that legislation went before the Legislative Council, the representatives of the Suburban Province gave the interests of their electorate short shrift. It is suggested that the Legislative Council is a House of review but when the measures I have mentioned went before it for consideration, they were dealt with in a very short space of time and with very little consideration. In such circumstances, the claim that it is a House of review definitely falls to the ground.

Dealing next with the question of the franchise, the Deputy Premier made clear his intention to move in Committee, as the Government did two years ago, with the object of giving the vote to the wife of a householder. When that proposition

was previously submitted to another place, it was rejected and was given no consideration at all. A previous Government submitted a Bill with the object of extending the franchise to ex-Servicemen and to those who were away fighting for their country. When that measure went before another place, this alleged House of review peremptorily rejected the proposition. The Commonwealth Parliament amended its electoral law to give Servicemen over 18 years of age, who were fighting oversea, a vote at Commonwealth elections. If that is good enough in the Federal sphere, where the Parliament exercises much higher authority than does the State Parliament, comparatively speaking, it should be good enough for the State; yet another place rejected such a proposition! It should not be so.

As to the property aspect, should a woman own property and turn it into liquid assets enabling her to invest in Commonwealth bonds or industrial stock, or to put the money in the Commonwealth Bank, she ceases to be eligible for a vote in connection with the Legislative Council. That should not be so. All this indicates that the situation generally is wrongly based. When we note the development taking place in countries adjacent to Australia and the big improvements being effected there with the granting of self-government and so forth, we should recognise the upsurge in those countries and make some advances for the people here. Despite the developments taking place in countries close at hand, we in Australia are hanging on to the archaic proposition that the individual cannot have a vote for the Legislative Council unless he owns property. It is time reforms were instituted. Years ago the Labour Government in Queensland carried legislation, the effect of which was to eliminate the Legislative Council. For many years in that State a single Chamber has been the governing authority. I do not think members will deny that government in Queensland is equally as effective as is government in this State.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: At the tea suspension I was indicating my support of the measure. I pointed out that it is contended that there is a necessity for a second Chamber, which should be a House of Review, and that allegedly it should not have the same broad-base franchise that exists for the Assembly. There is no doubt that the move for reform is not confined to Western Australia. Some years ago, in Victoria, the then Labour Government was refused Supply by the Legislative Council and so was forced to the country. An election subsequently took place and the opposition party came back with a thundering majority. Within a short time it dissolved or destroyed itself. We know there has been internecine strife in the two non-Labour parties in Victoria.

To gain the support of the Labour Party in Victoria, the Country Party, which now occupies the Treasury bench in that State, undertook to reform the Legislative Council. Just whether the problem has been tackled or not I do not know, as my history is not quite up to date in that regard. That undertaking indicates that the trend to bring about reform is not confined to Western Australia. A number of attempts have been made here, over the years, to bring about a broad-base franchise for the Legislative Council. An endeavour was made during the war years to liberalise the franchise so as to give ex-Servicemen the right to vote for the election of members to the Council. Then an attempt was made by the McLarty Administration to provide for wives of householders who have the right to vote for a Legislative Council election.

If we go to the Mother of Parliaments, on which our Constitution is largely based, and from which we get our historical background, we know that for many years there was obstruction and so on, and that the Liberal Government of the day eventually brought down a reform Bill which did away with what is known as the veto of the House of Lords. After the popular Chamber, elected by the will of the majority of the people on a democratic franchise, has submitted a Bill to the House of Lords a certain number of times, and it is rejected it becomes law. No provision is made for that in our Constitution. If there is a firm difference of opinion between the Government—no matter what its complexion—and another place on matters that are fundamental, and the other place continues to reject them, the Government has no redress whatsoever.

The position in the Federal sphere is different. The Senate, which is alluded to as the Upper House there, can be dealt with. If it continues to reject measures or obstruct the Government's policy, the Prime Minister has the opportunity of seeking a double dissolution. We know that has occurred on two occasions in the history of the Commonwealth. We, however, have no such redress here when the Council refuses to pass legislation submitted by this Chamber. It can continue on its own sweet way and defy the will of the people. Therefore the time for reform is long overdue. Having regard to the fact that education is so widespread—it has been compulsory for many years—and that civics and the elements of government are taught in our schools, and the children have a great opportunity to read newspapers and inform themselves of current affairs, it is surely fair and reasonable that when they become men and women at the age of 21 years they should be allowed to exercise the franchise both for this place and for the Legislative Council.

If there is a need for a second Chamber and House of Review, it should be elected on that basis, and not on the basis that a few people can retard development. Pro-

gressive legislation can be submitted by the Government, but the reactionary elements in another place can reject the measures. Members know that there are certain persons in another place who represent vested interests. They represent the big insurance companies and the landlords of the City of Perth. Those interests are oftentimes in conflict with the popular will. Where the people seek reforms through their members in the Assembly, who are elected on a broad franchise, those reforms can be thwarted by another place.

The Deputy Premier said that very few people—males at all events—are denied the franchise. Well, we know that for years many wealth-producers have been denied the right to enjoy the Legislative Council franchise because they were not paying sufficient rent. Here I allude particularly to the timber workers. For many years they have paid a nominal rent of less than 7s. a week and, as a result, although they were men vitally needed in the timber industry—and it would be a great thing if we had more of them today —they were not entitled to a vote for the Legislative Council. The same thing applied in the Goldfields areas. It may be today that because of higher rents many of them will come within the terms of the franchise, but in the days immediately prior to the war they were not entitled to have a say in electing Legislative Council members.

These people are vital to the country. The wealth producers—the workers, whether on farms, in the timber industry or the mining areas, or elsewhere—who do the ordinary toil to keep civilisation going, are the salt of the earth. In the instances I have referred to, these classes of workers were denied a vote for the Legislative Council. Another thing, too, is that the Legislative Council has power, at conferences on Bills, to agree on certain propositions and disagree on others. Finally, what is decided at a conference is brought before Parliament which has either to accept it or reject it. I want to emphasise what happened on the last day of the last Parliament when, after the managers from the Council and the Assembly met, we came to the Assembly Chamber, but not half-a-dozen members had a copy of what was agreed upon. Whilst I know that we either had to accept or reject what the conference had agreed on at that stage, members here were ill-informed as to what had definitely been agreed to.

The time is long overdue for the elimination of conferences between the two places, and in place of conferences—although it is not in the Bill—in like fashion to what occurs in the Commonwealth sphere, there ought to be an opportunity of dissolving another place if it continues to obstruct the will of the Lower House or the Government of the day. There should be provision in the law so that if there is continued obstruction of progressive and democratic legislation, the whole Parliament should go to the country and all members face their masters. But today the Council can continue to obstruct and defy the popular will and then be the looker-on whilst the Government of the day takes the issue to the country and possibly gets an endorsement of its attitude. But again the Legislative Council, constituted as it is on a narrow franchise, can still reject measures sent to it.

The Bill also makes provision for people over 21 years of age and under 30 to be able to become members of the Legislative Council. Under the Constitution Acts today, a man is denied, if he is elected to the Council, to take his seat if he is under 30 years of age. Surely there are any number of men in this State under 25 years of age in various walks of like who would be capable of taking a seat in the Legislative Council. We know of men less than 30 years of age who have been university-educated, and others who have gone abroad and made their mark in other parts of the world. I know of one man—his father is a friend of mine—who has made a great name for himself. He is today in Canada, and I think he is under 30 years of age. He will be returning to the university here. Men of his calibre, with high intellectual attainments, will not be entitled to become members of another place simply because they have not reached the age of 30 years.

The time is long overdue for reform in this direction. As has been pointed out, in times of war the country needs its young men for defence and to go into industry, and so on. They are looked on as being our first line of defence, and must be trained. But when it comes to electing members to another place, or having a vote for the members of the Legislative Council, these people are denied the right to vote because they are under age. The time is long overdue for an attempt to reform the Legislative Council and bring it into line with the democratic Chambers of the rest of Australia. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

MR. STYANTS (Kalgoorlie) [7.45]: I propose to support this measure. I have no very great objection to a second Chamber operating, although it has been proved, by experience in Queensland, that a second Chamber in any State is quite redundant. Queensland dispensed with a second Chamber many years ago and that State has got on quite well without it. But I would not have any great objection to the continuation of the Legislative Council in this State provided it were elected upon adult franchise. I think the recent incident in the Legislative Council revealed democracy at its worst, so far as the Legislative Council in this State is concerned. A Bill was sent up to that Chamber by the Legislative Assembly, and legislation was considered to be most vital because it concerned the welfare of the inhabitants of

this State. It had the full concurrence of the 50 members in the Legislative Assembly who have been elected by some 280,000 electors in this State.

When the measure was before the Legislative Council—a House which is elected on a restricted franchise; a property or a rental franchise—the voting upon it was 12 for and 12 against. The Bill was killed on the casting vote of the President. If one has a look at the electoral rolls for the Legislative Council one will find that there are some 80,000 odd people who are entitled to vote for the election of members of that House. Yet on the rolls for the Legislative Assembly there are roughly 300,000 people. I have taken out figures of the number of people entitled to vote for the 12 representatives of the Legislative Council who voted to kill the measure, plus those who were entitled to vote for the President upon whose casting vote the Bill was killed. The last time these 13 members were up for re-election they recorded a total of 28,423 votes. As opposed to that, the total votes recorded for the 12 members who supported the measure were 28,262. That means that in the Legislative Council there was a difference of less than 200 votes between continuing that measure or killing it. Yet those 12 members, and the President, can dictate to the unanimous wish of the Legislative Assembly which consists of 50 members elected by some 280,000 odd people.

Yet that is called democracy! If that is democracy, then the sooner we dispense with it, the better it will be. It seems remarkable that 13 men, representing only 28,000 voters, can dictate to 12 members, in their own House, who represent almost the same number of voters, plus 280,000 odd people who voted at the Legislative Assembly elections. The Government, and all members of the Legislative Assembly, regard this Bill as vital. It was necessary to continue it for the protection of all persons, and fair and just dealing as between landlord and tenant. When we have examples of that kind I believe it is high time that some alteration was made to the franchise for the Legislative Council. If the members of that Chamber were elected on the adult franchise basis, in the same way as members of the Legislative Assembly, and the Council was, in reality, a House of Review, I would not have any great objection to it; in fact, there might be something to commend it. The Legislative Council has much greater powers than has the House of Lords. Until recently the House of Lords was in the same position as our own Legislative Council in that it could veto legislation put forward by the House of Commons whose members were elected by all the people, while members in the House of Lords took their seats by right of birth.

That position has been altered within recent years to provide that where the House of Commons sends any measure to the House of Lords three times within two years, and the House of Lords refuses to pass that legislation, then the measure, despite the refusal of the House of Lords, becomes law. There is no such provision in this State. Thirteen members of the Legislative Council can over-ride the opinions of the rest of the members of both Houses who represent in all something over 300,000 electors—that is 280,000 for the Legislative Assembly plus 28,000 for the 12 members in the Legislative Council who voted for the Bill. Therefore, I intend to support this measure and hope that it will be passed.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam-in reply) [7.52]: The Minister for Education described the proposals in this Bill as being radical in character. These proposals are based upon, and consist almost entirely of, the principle of giving to every person in Western Australia over 21 years of age the right to claim enrolment for Legislative Council elections, and subsequent to any such enrolment the right to vote at those elections. How the Minister for Education could bring himself to describe proposals of that nature as radical is difficult to understand. They are in no way radical because the principle of all the people having an equal right in the election of representatives to Parliament is one that is well established, not only in Western Australia, but also in all British countries and in many other countries as well.

These proposals can only be regarded as radical if we are prepared to accept as right and proper the existing restricted franchise which now operates in connection with the Legislative Council. Surely the Minister for Education would not argue that the existing franchise for the Council is right, proper and justifiable. As a matter of fact, the amendments which he has foreshadowed in respect of this Bill prove conclusively that he does not accept the existing franchise for the Council as being right and proper in any sense of the term. The Minister for Education suggests that instead of endorsing the radical proposals in this Bill, as he is pleased to describe them, we ought to take some moderate steps for the purpose of trying to achieve some reform of the Legislative Council franchise.

Modest steps of the type foreshadowed by the Minister for Education have been tried before on many occasions; each attempt has ended in failure. Therefore, in my opinion, there is every justification for members of this House declaring straight out, as this Bill asks them to do, that the reform of the Legislative Council franchise should be absolute. We are under no obligation of any kind to members of the Legislative Council to put up to them a proposal in connection with their franchise which would go only half of the distance we think it should go. We are not called upon to be patronising in our

approach to them nor to make a move in such a way as to give them the opportunity of being patronising towards us. We in the Legislative Assembly represent the whole of the adult population of the State; we are acting on behalf of all of the people in making an attempt on their behalf to bring the franchise of the Legislative Council on to the same basis as that which operates for the Legislative Assembly.

As I said when introducing and explaining this Bill, we have to face up to the measure on the basis of the vital principle contained in it; the principle of whether we favour giving the right to every person over 21 years of age to claim enrolment for the Legislative Council. That is the principle beyond any question. Why then should we trim that principle? Why should we retreat from that principle? Why should we say, in effect, as the Minister for Education wants us to say, that the principle should be halved—that we should sacrifice 50 per cent. of it and seek to obtain only 50 per cent. of it?

The Deputy Premier gave no reasons why we should sacrifice half the principles contained in the Bill. In his speech he told us quite a lot about the Senate. He traced its history from the beginning, when it was in fact a States' House, right through until today when it is beyond any shadow of doubt a party House. Just what that has to do with this Bill I am not able to work out. He then went on, in effect, to praise the Legislative Council by saying that it had—by and large by its actions over the years in passing whatever legislation it did pass—benefited Western Australia as a whole.

Obviously whatever legislation was passed by the Legislative Council through the years was in the major part at any rate beneficial. However, what measure could we possibly apply to try to find out how much better off all Western Australia would have been today had all the important legislation sent up by Governments to the Legislative Council been carried instead of much of it being defeated? It is most illogical, in my opinion, to judge the Legislative Council upon the legislation it has passed over the years. It has to be judged in point of justice upon the legislation which it has refused to pass. Let us come right up to date on that basis.

Several members who have taken part in this debate have referred to the rent Bill for the purpose of illustrating why they think this measure should be passed without amendment. They have pointed out that only some four weeks ago the Legislative Assembly unanimously passed a Bill to amend the existing rent and tenancy legislation. When that Bill went to the Legislative Council those members in the Council who had a special axe to grind, either on their own behalf or on behalf of someone else, set to work quickly to kill the Bill, and they succeeded as you know only too well, Mr. Speaker, in doing so. It is true that it was subsequently resuscitated to about quarter life and then promptly killed again in the Legislative Council.

That subjected the Government of Western Australia to the extreme humiliation of having to close down the then existing session of Parliament—which had been in operation only a few weeks—so that it might call Parliament together in an entirely new session.

Mr. J. Hegney: To deal with this one Bill.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Government did that to enable it to bring down a new rent Bill and to ensure that such new Bill would not be subjected to sudden death action in the Legislative Council—under the real or alleged Standing Orders of that House—by those in the Council who evidently want to have Rafferty's rules operating in this State in the future in respect of rents and tenancies for dwellinghouses and business premises.

Now, would the Deputy Premier judge the members of the Legislative Council, and the Legislative Council itself, in respect of this year upon the basis of the Bills which the Legislative Council has passed this year to the complete exclusion of the Bills which it has refused to pass? Would he upon that completely illogical basis say that this year the Legislative Council has benefited Western Australia as a whole? Well, he might do that for the purpose of buttressing up his opposition to this Bill, but he would not do it, I am positive, if he could be brought to a position where he would have to make a judgment upon the whole situation instead of upon the one angle of the situation which he chose to put forward to support the case that he had to present to the House.

We must judge the Legislative Council on the basis of what it refuses to do, on the legislation it fails to pass, and the critical situations which it creates in the State, and for the people of the State when it rejects, out of hand sometimes, legislation of a major character that has been framed for the purpose of benefiting all or the great majority of the men and women of this State. There can be no justification, especially in this year, 1951, for giving to any group of people within the State the right to have a greater say in the passing of legislation than is enjoyed by the people as a whole. Now, that is the vital difference between the proposals as contained in this Bill and the Deputy Premier's foreshadowed amendments.

The Bill proposes to give an equal right in regard to the passing of all legislation to all the people within the State. The amendments proposed to be moved by the Deputy Premier will give to some people within the State—certainly to most people within the State—a stronger say than the remainder of the population in regard to

legislation, and as to what is to happen to it. No one can justify that—no one at all. The Deputy Premier cannot possibly justify it. He is a leader of a party the name of which is the Country and Democratic League.

Mr. Graham: I move to delete the word "democratic."

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: And yet he stands up in his place this afternoon and, in effect, condemns the Bill before us because it proposes to give to the people of Western Australia a complete instalment of democracy in respect of the franchise for the Legislative Council. He told us in effect that we should not do that, but that we should only give a part instalment of democracy to the people of the State in connection with that issue. In my second reading speech I mentioned —and it has been mentioned during the speeches of other members—that the Legislative Council upon its present basis exercises a legislative dictatorship in this State, a dictatorship which should not be exercised by anyone in a State or country that claims to be democratic and claims to be progressive.

How the Deputy Premier and other parliamentary members of the Country and Democratic League in this State could bring themselves to oppose this Bill—even if they oppose it only for the purpose of putting up something not quite as radical —is to my mind a most intriguing line of illogical argument. More especially is that so when the Deputy Premier put up no valid reason why that should be done, and when unfortunately no other member of his party in this House had the slightest thing to say about the Bill. Although the party led by the Premier has not in its title the word "democracy," nevertheless the Premier and the members of that party—the Liberal and Country League—have been very busy in recent years claiming that they are democratic, far beyond even the democratic levels reached by the Country and Democratic League and the Labour Party.

The Leaders and members of the Liberal and Country League have protested to high heaven about their intense belief in democracy; about their intense belief in the rights of the people; about their intense anxiety to give everyone a fair deal and to ensure that the affairs of government and the affairs of State generally shall be carried on without fear or favour —and be carried on upon a reasonable and democratic basis. It is not sufficient to give only lip service to the ideas and ideals of democratic governments; it is the sheerest political hypocrisy to give only lip service to the principle and then in Parliament to vote against that principle. That is what the members of the Government and its supporters will be doing if they vote against the proposals contained in this Bill. One would have thought that some members of the Liberal and Country League would have given Parliament the benefit of their views and ideas, if they have any, on this vital and important subject.

Mr. W. Hegney: They were gagged.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The franchise is such a very vital thing in regard to parliamentary government, and in regard to the rights of people in British communities and in democratic communities outside British countries. It is the very foundation upon which the parliamentary system as we know it has been built. Therefore it can confidently have been anticipated that a Bill of this description, dealing with the foundation of our parliamentary system, would have excited considerable comment, discussion and debate in this House.

Yet, as you know, Mr. Speaker—and you might feel some mental relief on the point—only one member of the Government side took the opportunity to speak to the Bill during the second reading debate. This in itself seems to indicate that supporters of the Government do not regard the question of the franchise as being fundamental to our parliamentary system or a subject of sufficient importance to warrant their study, and some public utterance as to what they really think about such an important principle. Evidently they have not studied the great struggle that occurred in Great Britain or even the great struggles that have taken place in Australia over the years in relation to the franchise.

The only semblance of argument against the Bill advanced by the Minister is that those people who do not own property or do not pay rent above a certain figure per week should not have the right to enrol for or vote at Council elections. That, in my judgment is an untenable argument. In fact, if someone well qualified could be appointed to work out the class of person who had been to a large extent responsible for the development and building up of Western Australia, that one would give great credit to the single men of the State.

I have in mind men who go out into the bush, and live and work under hard conditions at land clearing in order that settlement might take place and primary production be increased. I have in mind men who go out on work associated with the construction of railways, roads and water supplies, and all the rest of the various public and private works that have to be carried out in country districts to enable the State to be developed as it should be and as we wish it to be. Are those men not entitled at least to the same consideration as a person engaged in some more or less useless occupation in the city who nevertheless, by some fortune, happens to own £50 worth of land? There is no comparison between the real service which they give and are giving to the

building up of the State thus making possible the increased production of wealth.

I believe that a lot of land clearing operations are being carried on in the electorate of the Minister. If that is so, he should know that the men who perform that task—and they are usually single men—not only have to work like the very devil, but also have to live hard under conditions that are unknown to most people living in the metropolitan area, and this applies in almost all seasons of the year. I understand that the Government is enforcing on those men piecework or contract conditions in many instances, which imposes upon them much worse conditions than otherwise would be the case.

We know the conditions under which men on construction jobs live and work in the outback areas. To some extent, they are the backbone of the State, and much more valuable citizens than are so many of the people who, because of shrewdness, good fortune or something else, happen to own £50 worth of property and, therefore, are considered to be deserving of the right to claim enrolment for and subsequently to vote at Council elections. Nobody in this State can justify denying to those men the right to enrolment for the Council; no one can justify having a restricted franchise for the Council as against the franchise for the Assembly.

In the circumstances, therefore, it is not possible for members on this side of the House to accept the amendments suggested by the Minister. We shall stand strongly by the Bill. In this situation, it would be a very grave reflection upon the Minister or any Government supporter if he attempted to alter in any way the main principle of the Bill. As I said at the outset, the principle with which we are dealing and which the Bill proposes to put into operation is the principle of giving to the people of the State as a whole full and unrestricted rights in regard to the affairs of the Legislative Council, the same as they have for the Legislative Assembly.

Question put.

Mr. SPEAKER: An absolute majority of members is required to pass the Bill. There being no dissentient voice, I declare the second reading passed by an absolute majority.

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Hill in the Chair; Hon. A. R. G. Hawke in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 15:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

> That all the words after the word "is" in line 1 be struck out with a view to inserting other words.

I do so in pursuance of the intimation given on the second reading and with the object, as I then stated, of submitting proposals for a broadening of the Council franchise by including the spouse of the occupier of every dwelling, by including all self-contained flats beyond question as dwellings, and by the abrogation of the right to vote in more than one province, provided that the elector may select the province in which he desires to vote if he has qualifications in more than one. Those are the major provisions of the amendments I propose to move.

It might be well to make a few other comments so that members may be more fully aware of the effect on the franchise of the Council of striking out those words and substituting others. As at the middle of 1950, according to the "Pocket Year Book," the enrolment for the Council totalled 85,169. There were in Western Australia dwellings to the number of 127,665, and I submit that there were few if any that were not worth the 6s. 10d. per week rental contemplated by the Constitution Act.

Mr. Graham: What about the mill cottages?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Most of the occupants of those cottages are now paying more than they were and that is why I said there were few exceptions. Even if, in order to make a conservative estimate, I allow a considerable depreciation for such instances as might exist, by deducting 7,665—a reasonably generous provision—there were 120,000 dwellings, and it is most unlikely that at that stage they were not all occupied. Thus it would appear that no fewer than 35,000 people who could have qualified for enrolment for the Council failed to do so. That does not make any allowance for those persons who are not qualified as householders but who might be qualified under any of the other qualifications.

So it is more than reasonable to say that there could have been at least 125,000 electors on the Legislative Council roll at that time. Taking my figure of 120,000 occupied dwellings that would come within the ambit of the £17, it will not be an unreasonable assumption, I suggest, that five-sixths of that number will have both husband and wife. So if the amendment I propose becomes law, it is quite apparent that approximately another 100,000 would become eligible to enrol. There would not be less than 220,000 persons at the middle of 1950 who, under this amendment, would have been qualified to enrol.

Mr. Graham: What have the other 100,000 done that you want to penalise them?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Wait a minute; do not go so fast! There were at the same time 310,000 on the Legislative Assembly roll. They were there by compulsory enrolment, so it is reasonable to assume that anything above 95 per cent. were on the roll. But there was no compulsory enrolment for the Legislative Council, and it is quite clear that 30,000 to 35,000 persons who were qualified simply failed to enrol. It is therefore ridiculuous to claim that the measure, as I propose to amend it, would not be a very fair step forward in the direction of increasing the capacity or the ability of electors to claim enrolment for the Legislative Council.

The amendment would provide for a considerable increase in the number of persons entitled to enrol and, if they enrol, to vote for the Legislative Council. It would be a very substantial step towards producing a voting strength, if the people concerned cared to exercise it, which would be at least two-thirds that of the Legislative Assembly. I have no hesitation in asking the Committee, in the interests both of a reasonable proposition and of having some chance of getting the measure at least considered, to agree to the amendment.

I would point out that a measure similar to this amendment was passed by this place in 1947. There is a difference of no more than about 20 words in the two proposals. It would have been possible to include the spouses of freeholders and Crown leaseholders and any other persons who, under existing qualifications, could claim as being a wife or husband. But, as I indicated earlier, it was our intention to adhere to the measure offered in 1947; and although I am perfectly agreeable to the inclusion of persons other than a householder so far as the spouse in concerned, it would be a very considerable further amendment to that measure and that is why it is not included in this amendment.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The obligation upon the Deputy Premier is not to justify granting the right of enrolment to certain additional groups of people. What he must do to justify his amendment is to argue validly that those who will be shut out of the Bill and will not therefore have the right to enrol for the Council should, in fact, be shut out. The Bill aims to give to every person over the age of 21 the right to claim enrolment for the Legislative Council. The Deputy Premier is against that as a principle. He proposes to substitute for it a plan which would give to the majority of those covered by the Bill the right to vote for the Council.

In effect, however, his amendments propose to exclude a considerable number of those whom the Bill includes. In other words, he proposes to say, under his amendment, that a considerable number of people shall still not have the right even to claim enrolment for the Legislative Council. It might be thought that the number that would still be excluded would be small, that they would not run into many thousands. No-one can make a correct estimate; but let us, for the purpose of debating the amendment, say that the number who would still be excluded would be 50,000. In that case, the Deputy Premier has to justify to the Committee, if he expects members to vote for his amendment, his action in trying to exclude that 50,000 people from having even the right to claim enrolment. So far, he has not attempted to do that. If he does attempt to do so—and I would advise him not to make the attempt—he will find it extremely difficult.

I would like to hear the Deputy Premier trying to argue why land clearers, single men, should not have the right to claim enrolment for the Legislative Council. I would like to hear him try to justify his attitude in refusing the right to claim enrolment to single men working out in the bush on railway construction and reconstruction, or on main road construction and reconstruction; on the building of water supply schemes; and on various classes of jobs which single men do in the bush. I would like to hear him justify his attempt to exclude single men who go to the Goldfields and to the North-West to work on goldmines or at prospecting, or on cattle and sheep stations, and without whose work it would be impossible for the activities I have mentioned to be carried on adequately, if at all.

The amendment is one which proposes to differentiate between people over 21 years of age who live in Western Australia and who are in fact citizens of this State. The Deputy Premier proposes to say that if a single man is lucky enough to marry a wealthy widow, or even a wealthy single woman, that man can be enrolled for the Legislative Council and vote at Legislative Council elections.

The Minister for Education: He has not got to marry a wealthy woman to do it, not by a long way.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: But if a single man prefers to remain single, he is not entitled to vote.

The Minister for Education: He would probably buy a £50 block and qualify.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Fancy saying that if a single man buys a £50 block, he should be given the right to enrol for the Legislative Council!

The Minister for Education: Not given the right; it is there in the Constitution Act.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I know; but the Deputy Premier refuses to liberalise that part of the existing law. That is my complaint against his attitude. He

will not face up to the principle of complete democratic rights for our people in regard to this issue.

The Minister for Education: What is democracy?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Deputy Premier wants to get me away from the sticky spot on which I have him.

The Minister for Education: You will be in one yourself if you try to answer that question.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: To reply to his question: True democracy in a British community is a democracy which gives to every citizen equal rights in regard to the election of Parliaments and thereby the election of Governments. If the Deputy Premier has some better definition, I am sure we shall all be glad to have it from him. If he has, and he gives it, I am sure his attitude to this Bill will be shown to be more illogical than ever. The Premier and Deputy Premier should stand by the principle of democractic government as contained in the Bill and should not persist in their attempt to cut it down. They have every justification for supporting the measure as printed and would have no apologies to make to the public or their fellow members in the Legislative Council for doing so.

There is no valid reason why any person or group in the State should have more say with regard to legislation than should any other person or group. No-one could justify that and the Deputy Premier, very wisely, did not try to do so, but merely to excuse his attitude and that of the Government by saying that at this stage it would be too drastic to try to go all the way in one step and that, therefore, they proposed to go a considerable part of the way. We, on this side of the House, have no quarrel with anyone who tries to liberalise the franchise for the Legislative Council. We will support such a move wherever and whenever we can, just as we supported the Bill that the present Government introduced in this House some three or four years ago—

The Minister for Education: In 1947!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —and which was almost identical with the amendments on the special notice paper tonight in the name of the Deputy Premier. The situation now is different and the Bill before the Committee seeks to give equal legislative rights to all the people within the State. It is neither fair, reasonable nor democratic for the Government to try to cut down the Bill to weaken its principal provision by moving amendments which, if agreed to, will deny the people of the State the rights which the Bill, as printed, would ensure to them. I ask the Deputy Premier to think deeply on what I have said because in my judgment his position is untenable in regard to the amendment he has already moved, just as it is in respect of some of the other amendments that appear on the special notice paper in his name. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I am amazed that a measure, which goes to the very heart of the Constitution of our country, should be left in the hands of the Deputy Premier and that no other member of the coalition forces is prepared to expound his view as to whether it is equitable or not. I am dumbfounded to think that the young Liberals and the younger members of the Country and Democratic League are allowing themselves to be gagged on a measure of this nature. Apparently members of both sections of the Government have been instructed to remain silent while the Bill is being dealt with, and that, in my view, is the very antithesis of democracy.

A few years ago the tail-end section of the Government, now known as the Country and Democratic League, was called "the Country Party," but in their wisdom they decided that that name was not sufficiently democratic and so, about seven years ago, they decided, in conference, to add the tag "Democratic," with the result that they are now the Country and Democratic League. My interpretation of "democracy" is government by the people. I understand that the word "democracy" is based on the Greek "demos" which means "of the people," but tonight, when the Leader of the Opposition introduced the measure to liberalise the franchise of the Legislative Council and give the people of the State the right to determine who should represent them, we find members of the Country and Democratic League prepared again to bend the knee to the dictates of the Liberal Party. The Premier can laugh—

The Premier: I cannot help it.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: —but he has the whip hand over members in the back benches.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Although the Premier is laughing his face is very red.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: It will be redder when the Legislative Council deals with some of his legislation in the very near future. The least some members of the Government could have done was to express their views on this far-reaching measure—

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: You are labouring in vain.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: —as to whether they believe in adult franchise or not. I believe that this amendment, to use a straightout phrase, has been cooked up for the purpose of trying to appease members on this side. I say, as I said in my second reading speech, that this proposed amendment does not go far enough for me. Nothing short of the right of the people to elect their representatives in the Legislative Council, as in this Chamber, will suit me.

Mr. Manning: Why is it then that so many do not exercise that right?

Mr. W. HEGNEY: That is their business, but if it is logical and democratic for you and me to be elected by people who are entitled to be on the roll for our respective electorates, then it is only right that the hon. member should vote for this Bill because it merely extends to the same people the right to elect members of the Legislative Council. Does that answer the hon. member's query?

Mr. Marshall: It answers it all right.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I say in all sincerity that the members of the Liberal Party, and the members of the Country and Democratic League, are entitled to do the business of their own parties in their own way, but they should let the public see that they are entirely free and untrammelled as far as the deliberations of this Chamber are concerned. I might be misinterpreting the position but I think I am fairly right in saying that the members of those two parties, either at separate meetings or a joint meeting, have been well and truly drilled not to say anything on this Bill but to leave it all to the Minister for Education.

Mr. Bovell: You are completely wrong.

Mr. Nalder: You are wide of the mark this time.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: We will see whether I am wrong or not. At times the member for Moore is about to rise in his seat to castigate the Government, or express his views, but one side look from the Minister for Education is enough for him.

Mr. Bovell: Do not believe it.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I have noticed that on three or four occasions, and when he has had the courage to rise in his seat and express his views, he has come along next day, or later that sitting, and humbly apologised to the Minister for Education. I am satisfied that the Minister for Education has the member for Moore, physical colossus that he is, well and truly under his little finger, and he has other members of the Country and Democratic League on the same basis. If this Bill were of a minor nature and it did not go to the root of the Constitution, there would be some justification for a number of members on the other side not expressing their viewpoint. But I can assure members that this Bill has been put up in all sincerity for the purpose of trying—

Mr. Nalder: To get rid of the Legislative Council.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: It is not a Bill for the abolition of the Legislative Council. This Bill seeks to establish the right of the people to be given an opportunity to vote for members of the Legislative Council. As the member for Wagin has had the courage to make that interjection, although he remains in his seat, I would mention that, as far as I am concerned, the Constitution should be altered to give the people of this country the right—as the member for East Perth stated—to have a referendum to determine whether or not there shall be either a Legislative Council or a Legislative Assembly. Is that undemocratic? But the proposal of the Minister for Education will prevent the people of this State from having the right to vote for members of the Legislative Council.

Within the short period of 18 months there will be another election and I have no doubt that members of the Liberal Party and members of the Country and Democratic League will go from place to place throughout their electorates, as they are entitled to do, and try to hoodwink the people into thinking that they believe in democracy. I challenge the Minister for Education to say whether this proposal will give to some thousands of young men who fought in World War II the right to vote for members of the Legislative Council. The answer is "no." As the Leader of the Opposition just mentioned, there will be thousands of men who, by virtue of their occupation or work in the country areas of this State, will still be denied the right to vote at Legislative Council elections.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Women, too; nurses, for instance!

Mr. W. HEGNEY: Yes, quite a number of women—

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: And school teachers.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: —who live in the back country, or the city for that matter, and who perform useful occupations will be denied the right to vote at Legislative Council elections because they do not own £50 worth of real estate, or do not pay 6s. 10½d. a week in rent. The Legislative Council was first set up in 1832—119 years ago—on a nominated basis and if members care to go to another place they will see a photograph of members of the first Legislative Council. Many years ago that was changed to the restricted franchise basis of property qualification and all the attempts of the Labour Party, whether it has been the Government or the Opposition, to liberalise the franchise, have been frustrated. Those efforts have been frustrated sometimes by the Liberal and Country Party Opposition in this Chamber and at other times by the Legislative Council. Yet we have an innocuous amendment of this nature being cooked up by the Government and silently supported by members of the Government who have not the courage to rise and express their views.

The Minister for Health: That is not true.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: I put it to the new member for Gascoyne. He knows that what I said earlier is quite correct. If he would speak he would tell members that there are a number of men, responsible men, who are denied the right to vote

for the Legislative Council. For instance, there is the man who discovered the Blue Spec mine, of which the member for Gascoyne was manager for some years. The man who discovered that mine did not have the right to vote at Legislative Council elections. The man who discovered the Comet Gold Mine at Marble Bar, for which the member for Gascoyne was the manager for some years, did not have a vote for the Legislative Council.

Those two men who founded those two mines were responsible for producing considerable wealth in this country, but because they did not own property to the value of £50 they were denied the right to vote. The Government comes along with this thing cooked up for our consumption. Why, it is an insult to our intelligence! So far as we are concerned we want adult franchise for the Legislative Council and nothing else will satisfy me, and I hope that there are at least a few members on the Government benches who will be fair-minded enough to vote this amendment out and ensure that the Bill passes through this House.

Mr. GRAHAM: We could be pardoned for describing this move on the part of the Deputy Premier as a confidence trick. What he seeks to do is to disembowel the Bill. He seeks to delete the substance of it, and that which he proposes to insert in its place is not worthy of a moment's consideration. In this respect I disagree with my leader. I am not willingly prepared to grant an extension to those qualified to vote without qualification. For instance, if the Government brought down a Bill to extend the franchise, but provided that every person who is a supporter of the Liberal Party should be entitled to a vote, that certainly would be extending the franchise but no fair-minded person would support that.

The Premier: No, I would not have that.

Mr. GRAHAM: In the same way, the amendment to be moved by the Deputy Premier, if agreed to, will disembowel the Bill. There will be persons in Sherwood Court and others of that ilk who will be permitted to vote although not enrolled at the moment, but those in shared accommodation will be excluded. With all deference to my colleague, the member for Mt. Hawthorn, who suggests that we on this side of the Chamber are being placated, it is perfectly obvious to me that the Deputy Premier, in his usual shrewd manner, is providing a pretext for his own supporters who, with their tongues in their cheeks, apparently are prepared to say, "Whilst we oppose the proposal of the Leader of the Opposition, nevertheless we believe in gradual steps and we have, in some measure, extended the franchise." Yes, extended the franchise for a certain privileged few! Certainly not to the pioneers, the developers and the workers of this country!

From my knowledge of the machinery under which the Electoral Department works—because there is no specific provision in the Act—the amendment will have the effect of removing from the roll certain people who are now entitled to a vote. Of course, that means nothing to the Government because they are people who live in humble dwellings. If the amendment is carried I will be placed in a difficult position which I may have to resolve some time after the ringing of the bells, but I am appealing to the Committee to retain the principle of the Bill.

I have not heard from the Deputy Premier or anyone else anything approaching an argument as to why the people of the State should not be entitled to a voice in the election of both Houses of the State Parliament. It is also singularly significant that his supporters have been struck dumb on this matter. They realise that there is no such thing as an argument. In the year 1951, talking about democracy! Countries lining themselves up behind the iron curtain! And yet a democratic country of the day says that so many thousands of its citizens shall continue to be denied the right to vote. Surely there is a spark of democracy—apart altogether from the title of the party—in the minds of some of those who sit behind the Deputy Premier. I do not know whether they are bound by any plank in their platform.

Mr. J. Hegney: No, they are free; free as the air they breathe!

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: You're telling us!

Mr. GRAHAM: Not from what we have seen here. Surely it is obvious that thousands of conscientious citizens are denied the right to vote, while veritable scoundrels, because they own a bit of property—probably shadily acquired—are entitled to privileges over and above those people who do an honest day's work. The Deputy Premier knows—

The Minister for Education: You would give them all a vote, so why worry about them.

Mr. GRAHAM: In order to achieve it, it is necessary for us to vote in a certain way on this measure, and I sincerely hope that that interjection was some indication that the Minister for Education himself is anxious to give the worthy citizens of whom I speak the right to vote.

The Minister for Education: The suggestion is that you are giving unworthy persons the right to vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: That remark is typical of the Minister for Education.

The Minister for Education: And of you.

Mr. GRAHAM: I should hate to think that many of my speeches were patterned on those of the Minister for Education.

The Minister for Education: I did not say so. I said, "and of you."

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no attempt, and there has been no suggestion, of any member on this side of the House denying anyone the right to vote. All I was doing was to try to make it as plain as I possibly could that it was ridiculous that this Government should be prepared to deny persons, whom it admits are worthy citizens, the right to their vote unless they have got property. Because they have something to do with property, they are entitled to a vote, whether they be morons, or whether they have never done a day's useful work in their lives. The premises on which the Minister for Education bases his arguments and on which our Constitution is founded—and remains so at the moment—do not make sense. I do not know why the Government voted for the second reading of this Bill if it intended totally to destroy its purpose and intent. Like the member for Mt. Hawthorn, I too extend a hearty invitation to some of the back benchers to indicate to us why they think that people —whether it be 100,000 or 10,000—because of property qualification should be denied the right to vote.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It is very obvious that the Minister for Education realises that the less he says about this matter the better. He knows that his attitude is completely indefensible. As I said before, his amendment proposes to deny the franchise for the Legislative Council to large numbers of people to whom the Bill would give it. I have already mentioned some of the classes of people in this State who would be denied the right of enrolment for the Legislative Council if the Bill were to be amended along the lines which the Minister for Education is now attempting. Allow me to mention a few other classes. I will cite the example of schoolteachers. This should interest the Minister for Health, even though it does not appear to.

Mr. Marshall: I am satisfied if women want any promotion by virtue of legislation, they had better stick to the men. Your nurses' legislation is a good example of it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Nearly every female schoolteacher in Western Australia over 21 years of age is single. Why is she single?

Mr. Marshall: Because she is not married.

The Minister for Health: Because there are not enough "Marshalls" to go round.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I think that nearly every female schoolteacher in this State over 21 years of age is single because she made a decision some years ago to devote her life to the teaching profession, and I should hope that the Minister for Health would agree with that sentiment. Are not those schoolteachers of whom I speak entitled to be enrolled for the Legislative Council elections upon the basis of the valuable work which they carry out in educating and training our children? Would not one think that the Minister for Education would be the last person to make a deliberate attempt to deny the franchise to these people? Could it be claimed legitimately that they are less entitled to be enfranchised for the Legislative Council than the thousands of other women who might be entitled to be enrolled if the Minister for Education's amendment were to become law?

Tens of thousands of these female schoolteachers pay rent well above the 7s. a week—some of them pay a rent well above £1 and 30s. a week—I would be sure. Yet they are not entitled to claim enrolment for the Council because of that fact. The difficulty in their cases is that they pay rent, not for a whole house but perhaps for one or two rooms. In his own mind the Minister for Education knows that he cannot possibly attempt to justify the exclusion of those people from the right of enfranchisement for the Legislative Council. Yet he moves an amendment which, if it succeeds, would deny straight out to those citizens—and very valuable citizens they are—the right to be enrolled.

I would quote the nurses of this State as another example. They are also a group of people who would be excluded from the right to be enfranchised for the Legislative Council if the amendment moved by the Deputy Premier is supported by a majority of the members of this Committee. We know that most nurses over 21 years of age are single, and a big majority of them are single because they too, in their turn, have devoted their lives to what is, without doubt, a very noble profession. If the Minister for Health were electioneering I should imagine she would describe their profession as perhaps the noblest upon earth. But when we deal with legislation to give to those women the right to be enrolled for the Legislative Council the Minister for Health—

The Minister for Health: Is silent,

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —is against it.

The Minister for Health: I am not wasting time.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Minister for Health is silent—that is what she tells us. But the most effective way of speaking in this Committee is when we vote.

The Minister for Health: Absolutely!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am positive in my own mind that when the vote is taken on this amendment the Minister for Health will vote for it.

The Minister for Health: You are quite right.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: So we have the admission of the Minister for Health that she will take away from the nurses the right that the Bill would give them.

The Minister for Health: You cannot take away something they have not got.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The effect of her voting for the amendment would be to say to the nurses, "You are not of sufficient importance, standing or consequence in the State to be given the right to enrol for and vote at Council elections." I say meaningly that the Minister for Health and many other members on the Government side give a tremendous amount of lip service to democratic ideas and ideals, and prove traitors to them when it comes to putting them into operation.

Amendment (to strike out words) put and a division taken with the following results:—

Ayes	18
Noes	18
A tie	0

Ayes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Nimmo
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Doney	Mr. Owen
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Watts
Mr. Manning	Mr. Bovell

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Graham	Mr. Moir
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Read
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Sewell
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Styants
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. May	Mr. Lawrence

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Thorn	Mr. Needham
Mr. Abbott	Mr. Kelly
Mr. Yates	Mr. Coverley
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Panton
Mr. Wild	Mr. Nulsen

The CHAIRMAN: The numbers being equal, I give my vote with the ayes.

Amendment thus passed.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That the following words be inserted in lieu of the words struck out:—

amended by—

(a) adding after the word "person" in line ten the words "proves to the satisfaction of the Chief Electoral Officer that he or she";

(b) deleting the word "sterling" in paragraph (1), line three;

(c) substituting for paragraph (2) the following—

(2) is a householder of a dwelling-house or of a self-contained flat, the clear annual value of which dwelling-house or flat is seventeen pounds, or that he or she is the householder's husband or wife, whose usual place of abode is the dwelling-house or self-contained flat;

(d) deleting the word "sterling" in paragraph (3), line three;

(e) adding after paragraph (ii) of the second proviso the following:—

(iii) No person shall be entitled to be registered as an elector for more than one electoral province. When a person has qualifications, which would, but for this paragraph, entitle him or her to be registered as an elector for more than one electoral province, he or she may, by notice in writing to the Chief Electoral Officer elect to be registered as an elector for any one of those provinces and shall be bound thereby and registered accordingly. The elector may, in manner aforesaid, make a further election under this paragraph once within each period of twelve months next following the holding of a biennial election for the Legislative Council, and shall be bound thereby and registered accordingly until a further election is made under this paragraph or the elector ceases to hold the requisite qualification or becomes disqualified;

(f) inserting after the word "section" in line one of the last paragraph the figure one in brackets, thus "(i)";

(g) adding after the word "claim" in line seven of the last paragraph the following—

(ii) "householder of any dwelling-house or of any self-contained flat means the person responsible for the payment of the rent, and whose usual place of abode is at such dwelling-house or self-contained flat;

(iii) "self-contained flat" means part of any structure of a permanent character which is a fixture of the soil and ordinarily capable of being used for human habitation, provided such part is separately occupied for such purpose and has no direct means of access to, and is structurally severed from any other part of the structure, which is occupied for a similar purpose by any other person, and has separate sleeping, cooking and bathroom accommodation;

(iv) "Chief Electoral Officer" means the person holding that office under the Electoral Act, 1907-1949.

Amendment (to insert words) put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5—negatived.

Clause 6—Amendment of Section 17:

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I explained on the second reading why paragraph (c) dealing with disqualifications should be deleted. I therefore move an amendment—

That the word "or" at the end of paragraph (b) of proposed new Section 17, and paragraph (c) be struck out.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILLS (2)—RETURNED.

1, Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment (Continuance).

2, Main Roads Act (Funds Appropriation).

Without amendment.

BILL—PARLIAMENT HOUSE SITE PERMANENT RESERVE (A1162).

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the amendment made by the Assembly to the Council's amendment.

BILL—GAS UNDERTAKINGS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 24th October.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. D. Brand—Greenough) [9.33]: This Bill amends the Gas Undertakings Act introduced into this House by the member for Melville in 1947. The main purpose is to make a substantial alteration by repealing Section 11 of the Act, which deals with the issue of shares. The provision which it is proposed shall replace Section 11 has been put forward, according to the sponsor of the Bill, at the suggestion of the company. Its purpose is to clarify and make more simple the issue of shares, which experience has shown to be cumbersome under the original provision. There is retained priority as to the issue of shares for employees and consumers, and so on. Having had a look at the Bill, the Government finds itself in complete agreement with it, and I therefore support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

MOTION—SITTING HOURS.

As to Day-time Sessions.

Debate resumed from the 17th October on the following motion by Mr. Graham:—

That in the opinion of this House normal hours of sittings in future sessions should be held during the daytime.

MR. BRADY (Guildford-Midland) [9.37]: I support the motion. This is a matter which affects me personally and I am taking the opportunity to speak about it in the House rather than in the lobbies, at street corners, and in other places, where what I have to say would not be of much avail. I understand there is no good purpose to be served in speaking at length on this matter, because it is a subject which has been before the House on numerous occasions. There are, however, aspects of the subject which occur to me, and I felt that I should ventilate them here in the hope that the Premier and the Government will come to realise the value of our sitting during the daytime rather than at night, which, in my opinion, is most unnatural.

I hope that if the Premier cannot see his way clear to sit during the day on all sitting days, he will have us meet for a portion of the afternoon and part of the night, or compromise in some other way, rather than have us sit till late at night as was the case yesterday. Although I left this House at 10.45 last night, I arrived home after 12 o'clock. I was up first thing this morning and, before I had breakfast, was attending to matters affecting my electorate. In the ultimate I have worked somewhere about 16 or 17 hours

today, and we have not yet finished. I do not think that sort of thing should continue. I am not unmindful of the fact that, while private members work long hours, members of the Government work longer still, and that must be having a physical effect upon them.

I have been in the House for only four years, but I think I can see members of the Government who have aged more than four years. I do not think it is in their interests to continue along such lines. I have not a great deal of time for the politics of members opposite, but I respect members of the Government personally and have a lot of regard for them. If we analyse the hours that members sit in this House, I think it will be found that we average about six hours per sitting. As a rule we sit from about 4.30 p.m. to 10 p.m., 11 p.m., or perhaps 11.30 p.m., on three days of the week, and towards the end of the session, four days. If the Government would give consideration to meeting earlier and sitting until half-past eleven on two days of the week, we would probably get through the business of the House much better. We would then sit from two o'clock until half-past eleven, with an hour and a quarter off for tea. That would catch up the leeway we would lose by not sitting on Thursdays. I believe, therefore, that a certain amount of time would thus be saved to the Government.

You, Mr. Speaker, know as well as I do that sometimes members of the Government come up here for lunch and leave the House about 2 o'clock to return to their offices. By the time they settle down it is half-past two and then they sign some letters and interview a few people, and return to the House by about 3.30. In fact, one sees Ministers arriving here for the sitting at that time. If, instead of doing that on the Tuesdays and Wednesdays, they remained in the House, we could commence sitting at two o'clock and would thus not have to sit on Thursdays, and so one night in the week would be saved. I think, too, there are some advantages to be gained if members of the Government preferred to work at nighttime. They would have the quiet and peace of the night in the office and be able to carry out their administrative work then.

I question whether members can do justice to legislation when they sit here until late at night. I do not want to prolong the discussion on this aspect, but I feel that members getting over the age of 55 or 60 years are not in a fit state of mind to be sitting here until 11 o'clock and 11.30 to deal with legislation. As a consequence, our legislation is probably not up to the standard it should be. There are other disadvantages of sitting until late at night. I am a member of a number of organisations, inasmuch as I am the president or patron of some clubs, and in some seasons I have not been able to attend a single meeting of some of the clubs. Sometimes the electors take a dim view of one's serving on a committee and not carrying out the duties involved.

The Premier: If you are elected patron and you pay up, you are all right.

Mr. BRADY: Some clubs take a different view and prefer to have one's services rather than finance; particularly when it comes to matters of administration. I feel that members in the metropolitan area would be better served if Parliament sat at 2 o'clock on Tuesdays and Wednesdays rather than sitting for three days as we do now, and four days towards the end of the session. It may be that some members of the Government feel they are doing a national work, and that they will go down in history as pioneers, leading statesman, and that sort of thing, but that is not much satisfaction to the members who have to stay around the House waiting for a vote to be taken on matters which do not greatly concern them or their electorates. I said there are new aspects that I would like to raise, and one is that I would remind the Government that during the 1950 session it increased the number of members of the Government by two on the score that the work was becoming so colossal that extra members were required in the Ministry.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: That was not the real reason.

Mr. BRADY: I suppose the Government thought that reason would go down, and it did, and it got two extra members. We know that the Commonwealth Government has taken over quite a lot of work of the State Government, and to some extent must be relieving the State Government of a lot of the governmental work it had to do in the early days.

The Chief Secretary: What kind of work do you suggest the Commonwealth Government is taking over?

Mr. BRADY: Price-fixing is one of the jobs it has taken over from the State.

The Chief Secretary: When did that happen?

Mr. BRADY: It took over price-fixing. Probably the Commonwealth Government has not taken it over completely, but before the Price-fixing Commissioners can make an alteration they generally meet in Canberra to confer with the Federal authorities and get some sort of acquiescence to their wishes. As one member reminds me, income tax is something that must have been a colossal task for the State Government to handle; and migration is another. There are others. It is no good the Government trying to sidetrack the issue by making out that the Commonwealth Government has not taken over these responsibilities. The work in connection with customs and excise is something else that the Commonwealth Government has taken over.

The Premier: It has carried out that work ever since Federation.

Mr. BRADY: The fact remains that there are 10 Ministers now where there were only eight before, and I for one, as a private member, cannot see the necessity for sitting here night after night for six or seven months of the year. It is unnatural to do so and causes a lot of difficulties domestically, electorally and otherwise. The member for East Perth, when introducing the motion, pointed out that in most other States the Parliaments see their way clear to sitting in the day time. The Commonwealth Parliament, which has the greatest difficulties in connection with legislation, sits in the daytime, yet we are perpetuating this old system of sitting at night. I think we could even show some regard for the younger members in the House. It is not natural for young husbands who might wish to make a career as legislators, to have to sit here for five and six months of the year to the neglect of their families.

Parliament is supposed to set an example, but I would say it is a bad example for a young married man to have to neglect his family night after night for weeks on end, and sometimes months at a time. He might try to make this neglect up to his family in some way, but I doubt whether he could. I will agree that the present hours suit country members to a certain extent, but I think that even they would prefer to sit earlier on Tuesday and Wednesday, say from 2 p.m. until 11.30 p.m., and get away early on Thursday morning rather than remain here until some time on Thursday night, and sometimes Friday morning. If country members analysed the position, and the motion, they would see advantages if the Government implemented the idea of sitting at times other than those at which we sit at the moment.

The Premier argues that members of the Government are scattered around the city and it is not convenient, because their offices are not in Parliament House, to accede to the request of members to sit in the daytime. There is some logic in that but I remind the House that a number of Ministers—two or three at least—have their offices quite close to the House; in other words, they are in the Barracks, only a matter of two or three minutes from the House. Modern transport would enable Ministers to reach the House quickly. I do not think all the space available in this building is being utilised to the fullest extent. Even while Parliament is in session there are a number of rooms that are seldom occupied, and they could be used to better advantage. In the front of the building there is a porch, of probably 12 or 15 squares, which could be utilised to provide ideal offices. There are often no more than two or three people in the gallery of this House, except when Parliament is being opened, and even then I think visitors could be accommodated elsewhere—

The Minister for Works: Have you referred this to the House Committee?

Mr. BRADY: If we adopted the attitude of some members, which I favour, and abolished the Legislative Council, we would have any amount of room in this building. The Parliament of Queensland abolished its Upper House, as did also the Government in New Zealand, and so I think the Premier might consider taking a similar course here and bringing down legislation to abolish the Legislative Council. That would save £50,000 of the taxpayers' money, which would go a long way towards building badly-needed hospitals and schools.

I believe some of our staff receive comparatively small wages, and yet they are required to remain on duty till all hours of the night to suit the convenience of Parliament. I think the Government could pay some regard to the position of those officers. It may be that members receive a higher salary to compensate for the late hours they sometimes sit, but I do not think members of the staff receive any such compensation. Their families must be affected by their having to remain on duty till a late hour. If the Government decides that Parliament must sit late in the night we might be able to install some modern method of recording to record verbatim the speeches of members, thus allowing members of "Hansard" to go home and lead a natural life and take part in social activities.

Many responsible local governing bodies, of which I believe the City Council is one, conduct their business in the day-time and that is another argument that may be adduced to support the motion. Parliament seldom meets until late in July or early in August, and it is generally the desire of the Premier to finish the session in the first or second week in December so, if the Government would consider sitting in June, that would allow extra time in which to deal with its legislation while still concluding its sittings early in the evening. We could sit on Tuesdays and Wednesdays from 2 p.m. till 11.30 and there would be no necessity to sit on Thursdays and Fridays, as often happens at the end of the session. That would give country members opportunity to return to their electorates and city members would have better opportunity of attending to their affairs.

During the last three or four years I have received probably a hundred invitations to attend meetings of the parents' and citizens' association, sporting organisations or municipal bodies, but, because Parliament has been sitting, I have had to send an apology for not attending. That is not always acceptable to the people because they do not understand that a member must be present in the House in case a vote is taken. I hope the Government

will support the motion, so that next year our Standing Orders may be altered to allow us to sit in the day-time rather than in the evening.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [9.55]: I support this motion, which I think could best be dealt with by every member expressing his point of view—

The Premier: Not every member?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: Every member should express his point of view at least by casting a vote, and I do not think members on the Government side should be hide-bound and sit behind the Government. The Minister for Works can laugh but, when a similar motion was dealt with by the Labour Government a few years ago, I voted for it. Surely this is an open issue upon which members should express their opinions freely. Of course Ministers will now put up the same story as other Ministers did on the previous occasion, but I do not agree with it. That story is that they could not give proper attention to administrative matters and still attend sittings of Parliament in the daytime.

The Minister for Works: Quite right!

Mr. J. HEGNEY: Then how is it that the Administration in New South Wales—it is three times as large as that of Western Australia—can sit at 11 a.m. on three days a week? The same thing applies to the Commonwealth, where the expansion of the Administration has been terrific in recent years. On a number of days in the week they begin their sittings early. I think they began today at 11 a.m. and on Tuesday they will begin at 2 p.m., and they rise early on Thursday afternoons, except towards the end of a strenuous session.

The Chief Secretary: Are not the administrative offices in New South Wales adjacent to Parliament House?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: No.

The Chief Secretary: Are you sure?

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I am positive, but I have seen administrative officers there consulting with Ministers and doing business in rooms adjoining. It is well known that when a division takes place Ministers must be in the House. I think that daytime sittings would be a good proposition and that it is an archaic custom to sit on into the night. The member for Cottesloe and the member for Nedlands have good eye-sight now but they will find, after a few years, that it will deteriorate to an extent where they will have to attend an eye-specialist. He will ask where they work and will eventually indicate that they need glasses. That will be due to the fact that we work under artificial light at night.

If the motion were agreed to we could sit in the day-time when artificial light would be unnecessary. Another point is that when we sit late towards the end of the session it is often difficult for members to get home, and transport has to be provided for both members and staff. That could be obviated if we sat in the daytime and used the daylight hours for our business. It has been stated that if this motion is carried it will give little relief to country members. One important point is that they would be able to adjourn to their beds much earlier. Also, if they want to attend any amusements, they can do so if parliamentary business is conducted in the daytime and their evenings are free. These country members would not be tied up night after night with parliamentary business.

During his speech the member for Guildford-Midland said that frequently people in his electorate desired to meet their member, and that when Parliament is sitting it is not always easy for him to get away. As a matter of fact Government members will find that it is not at all easy to arrange for a pair if one wishes to attend a function in one's electorate. I sat as a private member behind the Labour Government for 14 years, and I know just how difficult it is to arrange a pair if one wants to get away to attend some social function. The motion does not specify the hours of sitting, but merely says that we should sit in the daytime and I think the time has arrived when that innovation could be made. We need not sit during daylight hours for every sitting day in the week, but at least half of those sitting days could be commenced at an earlier hour. I support the motion.

MR. HUTCHINSON (Cottesloe) [10.2]: I had no real intention of speaking to this motion, but the appeal of the member for Middle Swan to the back benches, has moved me to my feet.

Mr. Graham: You are one item too late.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I had a half feeling that the member for East Perth had moved this motion in a rather frivolous spirit. I do not know whether I am right or not, but if I am wrong I am willing to retract that statement.

Mr. Graham: Then you had better start retracting.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: I thought it possible that the member for East Perth, flushed with success because of his recent win on the Parliament House Site Permanent Reserve Bill, felt that he should add to his victories. I am in emphatic disagreement with the motion moved by the hon. member, because I fully believe that the daylight hours are essential for members of this House to discharge their duties in an efficient and workable manner and in the best interests of their electorates. Since I have been in this House I have had to approach numerous Government departments on many important matters. If the House had been sitting during the daytime I would have found it extremely difficult to carry out that particular duty.

There are also innumerable electors who require to interview a member during the daylight hours. That happens frequently

and on a hundred and one matters. I am prepared to agree to the House sitting earlier one day a week, but to say that every sitting shall be in the daytime seems just too ridiculous. The present method has been adopted and used over the years, and it appeals to me as a very sensible and satisfactory idea. I am in disagreement, too, with the member for Guildford-Midland when he states that on occasions members of certain committees and boards feel aggrieved or incensed at his inability to be present at various meetings. I have never found that with any of the committees on which I hold an executive position. On the contrary, I find that those people are only too willing to see reason, and are quite content to accept an apology when they realise that my attendance is required at Parliament House. So I beg to disagree with the hon. member in that regard. Comparison was made, too, with the sittings of the Commonwealth Parliament. There is a very great difference between that Parliament and our own. Federal members are far removed from their electorates.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: And they sit on Fridays, very often.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: So do we on occasions.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: But not very often.

Mr. HUTCHINSON: In Canberra, members are far removed from their electorates, and there is not the same necessity for them to conduct interviews with their electors who may feel the need for help and advice. With the exception of country members, we are on the doorstep of our electorates; we live within them and we should be available, at reasonable hours, to our electors if they require us. In that one regard alone I would suggest that a comparison between Canberra and this House is ridiculous and adds no strength to the motion moved by the member for East Perth. I reiterate that the present procedure is the best and the most admirable one, and I trust that this House will not agree to the motion. I hope that, with the possible exception I have mentioned, our present set-up will be retained.

MR. HEARMAN (Blackwood) [10.8]: It seems to be the general idea in this discussion to put up one's own viewpoint and, frankly, I would be inconvenienced by afternoon sittings and I think the same would apply to most South-West members. There are some five or six of these members and normally we travel to Perth on the Australind every Monday. Under the normal set-up we have most of Tuesday to attend to matters affecting our electorates. There is usually a party meeting on Wednesday afternoon which gives us Wednesday morning to attend to business affecting our electors. Then, on Thursday until the House sits we can also attend to business requiring our attention. That gives us approximately 2½ days in the week in which we can deal with these matters.

We have to approach Government departments and many other establishments in Perth and, if we were to have daytime sittings, we would have only Tuesday morning and Thursday morning available. That, in my experience, would be scarcely enough. It would also mean, in effect, that I would have to put in an extra day in Perth quite frequently. This would involve travelling up on the midnight train on Sunday to arrive here on the Monday, which would at least give me Monday clear in Perth. Every member who has travelled on that midnight train is aware that everybody who can do so avoids it. We could catch Thursday night's train home if we wanted to but nobody ever does want to, although we nearly always catch it if we have to. Afternoon sittings would be most inconvenient to the majority of South-West members, and would greatly restrict our actual time in Perth. It would mean that some of us quite frequently would have to put in an extra day here.

The adoption of the suggestion made by the member for Guildford-Midland in regard to members attending functions or meetings in our electorates, which we would be very keen to do, would restrict even more our opportunities for doing so. At present we can at least attend such functions on Friday or Saturday and, if necessary, on Monday, which would involve night travel. The suggestion embodied in the motion would reduce the time available to us in Perth during business hours when Government offices are open, and would also tend to restrict the amount of time that we now have in our electorates. Speaking for myself, it would be inconvenient both ways and I think other members who come from the South-West would be similarly situated. Looking at it from a personal angle, I find this motion has little to commend it. However, I would be prepared to consider, say, an earlier Thursday afternoon sitting because I realise that the whole of Parliament cannot take into consideration the requirements of one or two members only. I definitely cannot agree to all sittings being held in the afternoon, which would restrict our time in Perth.

MR. GRAYDEN (Nedlands) [10.13]: Supporters of any motion such as this should be able to prove, as the first essential, a real and pressing need for passing it. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of members opposite, and I submit that the real and pressing need has not been established.

Mr. Graham: Were you here when the motion was introduced?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I was and I listened attentively.

Mr. Graham: That is rare.

Mr. GRAYDEN: Perhaps not as rare as the hon. member thinks. Perhaps he is not here very often to find out. I sub-

mit that a real and pressing need has not been established. All those members are worried about is that it makes it difficult for them to attend certain social functions which are held at night when the House is sitting and, because they are patrons, vice-patrons presidents and vice-presidents of different associations and cannot turn up to every meeting of these associations, they would for that reason abandon night sittings and adopt daytime sittings. From my own experience, I find I have just as many daytime functions as night functions to attend. I had to be present at two functions today; the opening of the Jubilee garden and the opening of a croquet club. I have two functions to attend tomorrow, and another on Saturday afternoon, and in the whole of this week I have not a single engagement for any night. That shows that in my case, which is the only one I can quote, there would be just as much difficulty in attending functions if there were daytime sessions as there would be by holding the sittings at night.

If a member desires to attend a night function, then surely it is possible for him to obtain a pair. It is very rarely that a pair cannot be arranged. Therefore I suggest to the members for Guildford-Midland and East Perth that, if they are worried about that point, they might contact their party Whip to see what can be done. If a member desires to do business in town, surely it is better to have the daytime free because that is the only time one can conduct business in town, but if the House is to sit during the daytime, three days a week, it would be extremely difficult to attend to such business. Members know that deputations and so on are always held in the daytime, and if we sat then on three days a week it would limit the holding of deputations to two days per week. At present, night sittings provide a longer working day so that members, if they have a particularly busy day, will be able to get through all their business and still attend the sittings at night.

The present system also gives a member an opportunity to see his electors. If he is a metropolitan member, he can go around his electorate during the day and attend to his electors' problems, which he could not do at night, and, even if he did so, such an arrangement might prove difficult. The night sittings must permit of more efficient Government administration. Members opposite have tried to point out that Ministers could carry on their work satisfactorily with daytime sittings. Perhaps they could, but not one of them could claim that that would tend for efficient administration of those departments if Ministers were away from their desks.

Mr. Brady: How do you think the departments get on when Ministers are away for a week or a fortnight at a time?

Mr. GRAYDEN: How would they get on if we had daytime sittings? The whole point is that if the Minister is at the department when it is working, it must be more efficient than when he is absent and the officers of the department have to chase around after him.

Mr. Graham: Do you notice any deterioration in the Prices Branch while the Attorney General is absent in the Eastern States?

Mr. GRAYDEN: That is a very curly question, and I suggest that the hon. member should address it to the Attorney General himself and put it on the notice paper. I feel that the supporters of the motion have established no clear or pressing need for its passage. They have failed to prove that the administration of the Government would be at least equal to what it is under the present system, and have failed to show why the members of this House should support the motion. I therefore oppose it.

MR. GRAHAM (East Perth—in reply) [10.18]: Strangely enough, I introduced this motion because of the comments and complaints I have heard so oft repeated, not only this year but also for some years past. Complaints were frequently uttered shortly after I came here in respect of parliamentary salaries, the lack of parliamentary superannuation and so on. Such matters were crying out for attention, yet nobody did anything about them. I claim, with a little conceit, perhaps, that I had something to do with the moves that resulted in the improvement of our conditions, and it occurred to me that the rank and file members should have an opportunity of expressing themselves on this matter because, as I pointed out, the customary thing was for the Government of the day, the eight or ten Cabinet Ministers, to make a decision with regard to sitting hours and, with very few protests, the motion was carried.

This motion is not in any way censuring the Government or interfering with something that it seeks to do, but is merely an indication of our point of view with the object of applying it probably in the new session. I thought there would be a more liberal approach to the question than I have had evidence of during the debate.

The Premier: One of the most telling speeches I have ever heard was made by the member for Murchison when he opposed a motion similar to that which you are moving.

Mr. Marshall: What does it matter what I said yesterday?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it is inconsequential. This is an entirely new Parliament.

Mr. Bovell: I have heard the member for Murchison remind other members of what they have said.

Mr. GRAHAM: If members desire to deal with the member for Murchison I would suggest they go outside where they could have the time of their lives! I am amazed at the attitude of members in view of their repeated complaints, criticism and the anxiety with which they have looked to the Premier hoping and trusting that in a moment he would move for the adjournment of the House. On a number of occasions those members have been disappointed and business has proceeded.

The Premier: I have been pretty reasonable.

Mr. GRAHAM: The only conclusion I can draw is that some of the members here are apparently frustrated or henpecked, or something of that sort, and they see the night sitting as an opportunity of getting away from mother!

Mr. Hutchinson: You are verging on that paternal attitude again.

Mr. GRAHAM: It might be worse—it could be maternal! Notwithstanding the various comments that have been made I am convinced that the most important part of our work is in the legislative field; yet we are expected after a full day's work—and I mean work for the public—to come into this Chamber and closely analyse significant, detailed in many cases technically complicated Bills. That is not fair to members who have been asked to work a 15-hour day; it is not fair to the people whom they represent, because we cannot give our full and proper attention to all that such legislation warrants.

Some half hour or so ago there were two Ministers only in their seats, and there were a total of seven members on the Government side of the House. I am not saying that critically because there are occasions when circumstances make it necessary for us to leave the Chamber for a period. That applies to all of us, but it is significant that that happens as the hours draw on. Bearing in mind that we have to do a night's work on top of a day's work, I think members must have some respite and relaxation. If they remained in the Chamber they would probably be driven "batty." Accordingly they seek release by having refreshments and so on.

Mr. Hutchinson: Do you think there would not be a worse attendance during those daylight hours?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it is placing an unwarranted burden on members to expect them to work the hours they do. It is unreasonable and it is not asked of any other people in the State; if it is they receive a very heavy reward for it. But, of course, we receive nothing of the kind. Members will recall a reference in the Press the other day that because of the lengthy sittings in the Commonwealth Parliament practically all the leaders in that Parliament were incapacitated. We know that a few weeks ago the Premier had a turn, and I venture to suggest that this was largely contributed to by the hours, responsibilities and the burden of the position he occupies. As mentioned by the member for Guildford-Midland, last year the Minister for Agriculture—and more recently the Chief Secretary—had an unfortunate bout of illness, which I would again suggest was brought on largely by the onerous nature of the tasks they fulfil, and also by the inordinately long hours they are compelled to be on the job.

Mr. Hutchinson: It would be more onerous under your system.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are 10 half days in a week to which we have become accustomed, and under my proposal only three of those half days would be utilised for sittings in Parliament, and we would cover as much ground as we do now in the early portion of the session. Members will see that my motion proposes certain things in respect of normal sitting hours, but as I explained earlier it is understood and appreciated by everybody that there are exceptional occasions—more particularly towards the end of the session—when it is necessary to sit on other days and at other hours. It was suggested by way of interjection earlier—when the member for Nedlands was speaking I think—that the work of the State or of the departments does not cease when Ministers are called away.

The Attorney General administers quite a number of departments, but when he is away for a week or a fortnight his departments and also Parliament continue to operate and function. In the same way, if we were sitting in daylight hours and a certain Minister could not attend on a particular afternoon, I am certain we would not all turn on our heels and go home; Parliament would continue to operate. The matter is in the hands of the members; this motion is only an expression of opinion. If members are happy and content to start work at nine o'clock in the morning and still be on the job at 12 o'clock at night, and if they expect the Ministers to do the same, then they have not a great deal of compassion for themselves and their welfare.

I am certain that all of us with seven out of the 10 half days could attend to very many jobs such as caring for individual inquirers—that is our constituents—public bodies, and work of that nature. I repeat, the most important function of a member of Parliament is surely in dealing with legislation. After handling various jobs for our constituents during the hours of the day, our capacity to concentrate must inevitably wane when dealing with the most important aspect of our work at night. While it may be a matter of some concern to people in my constituency to have a telephone

booth at a certain corner, for example, for their convenience, it is surely more important to give attention to legislation which has to be dealt with. The personal matters concerning the district should take second place to legislative action.

The Chief Secretary: You say that the interest of members wanes in the late hours of the night. Have you noticed the long speeches that are made in the late hours of the night?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think that is so, and it would require a little evidence to convince me of it.

The Premier: I remember a four hour operation that was pretty late.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Premier underestimates the position—it was five hours. I think the reason why the Chief Secretary drew that conclusion is because it is usually the action taken by the Government of the day that irritates members and causes them to make a demonstration in a concerted fashion, and the debate naturally drags on because of that. The more lengthy speeches as a general rule are made later in the evening, but this is due to the reasons I have just advanced.

Members will be able to make up their minds without my advancing further arguments because they know how the present hours of sitting affect them, and I daresay they have given some consideration to the proposal. In order that the opinions of certain members who grizzle and complain from time to time may be recorded, it is my intention to call for a division. The records will then show who favoured night sittings, and if we are kept here till midnight or the early hours of the morning, they will have only themselves to thank for it.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	28
Majority against	17

Ayes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Graham	Mr. Marshall
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Moir
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. May
Mr. W. Hegney	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Bovell	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Brand	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Owen
Dame F. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Doney	Mr. Read
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hill	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Styants
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Manning	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Watts
Mr. Nalder	Mr. Cornell

(Teller.)

Question thus negatived; the motion defeated.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 25th October.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [10.35]: I do not propose to make any lengthy contribution on this Bill. I did not intend to speak at all until I ascertained that there were grave doubts regarding the accuracy of the information given by the Minister for Health in moving the second reading, and it is necessary to have a proper picture of the situation in order to cast an intelligent vote.

I think it tragic that Ministers should introduce Bills without first obtaining complete information so that they would be in a position to explain the full effect of the measures. I greatly regret that the Minister on this occasion seemingly has misunderstood the situation entirely, and has not discriminated between the various organisations that play some part or other in relation to this Bill.

When the Minister was moving the second reading, she said that the qualifying periods in the Eastern States in order to obtain a midwifery certificate were 12 months and two years respectively, having regard to the respective categories in which the nurses were classed. A nurse with a general certificate, in order to qualify for a midwifery certificate, serves a period of nine months only, while a nurse who goes in directly for midwifery without other training has to serve 18 months to qualify. Under the Bill those periods are to be extended, in the one case from nine months to 12 months, and in the other case from 18 months to two years.

In view of the period required in the Eastern States, the Minister advanced the argument that it was necessary to increase the period here because, owing to the shorter working week, it was not possible for probationers to become efficient in the time. On the face of it, that seemed to be correct, but inquiry has revealed that it is entirely wrong, because probationers here work 48 hours a week as compared with 40 hours in the Eastern States. Thus the Minister misled the House to that extent.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: We shall have to get a 40-hour week for the nurses here.

The Minister for Health: Can you tell me the number of nurses in the Eastern States who work a 40-hour week?

Mr. Styants: Nearly all of them do.

The Minister for Health: Are you sure?

Mr. Styants: Yes.

Mr. MARSHALL: In some of the States where nurses are obliged to work more than 40 hours a week, due to shortage of staff, they are paid overtime rates. Their

working week is 40 hours and most of them work that period. They do straight shifts, too, not broken periods as do our probationers here.

Mr. Styants: Their award provides for 40 hours.

Mr. MARSHALL: They will be on the Minister's wheel in regard to this measure if it becomes law. The Minister did not understand that the lengthier period in months in the Eastern States is brought about by virtue of the fact that the probationers or qualifying individuals have a shorter working week than exists in this State. When we assess the hours worked by the probationers in the two States, we find there is little difference in regard to the total number. When the Minister speaks in terms of months, what she says appears to be correct. But when it is realised that in the Eastern States they work 40 hours and here they work 48, the picture is altered altogether.

The Minister says that if we do not agree to this Bill and do not make these extra periods possible by statute there will be no reciprocal arrangement between States. She never gave us one instance of where probationers who have secured certificates of recent date have proved to be inefficient or that inefficiency has been due to the shorter working period. She never adduced any evidence of that kind. If she had said that on account of the shorter period many qualifying probations had gone out as professionals and had proved inefficient, and if she had produced one or two cases to prove that contention, she would have had a more convincing argument. But let us have a look at this matter of reciprocal arrangements between the States.

Ever since I have been a member of this Chamber, all the criticism in regard to reciprocal arrangements with other States and other countries has been along these lines. It has been pointed out that we have trained individuals to become professionals and to become experts in various avenues, and immediately they have reached a standard of efficiency they have gone to the Eastern States or elsewhere. We have complained bitterly about this form of confiscating professional experts who have been trained in Western Australia.

Why does the Minister want to make it possible, under this Bill, for that to happen? If the nine months qualifying period is detrimental so far as possible trainees coming from the Eastern States is concerned, I would like to ask how many have ever come here to be trained. I do not think there have been any at all. It is no use their coming from the Eastern States and training here if they desire to return to their home State, because they know they still have to do three months extra when they go back.

The Minister for Health: A great many in the King Edward Memorial Hospital are from the East.

Mr. Styants: They came here because of the nine months' training period.

The Minister for Health: No.

Mr. MARSHALL: I want the Minister to understand where she is going with this Bill.

The Minister for Health: I do.

Mr. MARSHALL: If the Minister increases the period to put it on the same basis as applies in the Eastern States, she will not attract any trainees from the Eastern States, because they can qualify there in the same period. If she leaves the period alone she might decoy some over here.

The Minister for Health: They want to go back home.

Mr. MARSHALL: They know that if they return they will have to labour for three months over there, and for that reason the possibility is that they will remain with us. Does the Minister want to to get rid of them? Does she want to train our own girls and then have them go? That is what she will do if she has her way with this Bill, because there is no obligation on a girl qualifying here under the nine-month period to be examined again in the Eastern States. All she has to do is to go over there, produce her certificate, do three months' additional training and, without further examination, she qualifies under the law there.

The Minister for Health: That is true.

Mr. MARSHALL: We do not want to encourage that, or to encourage the training to a high degree of proficiency of a number of valuable girls so that they will leave us; we want them to stay here. Yet that is what the Bill will do. The Minister said that the nurses wanted this measure, that they asked for it. They did nothing of the kind.

The Minister for Health: I said the registration board.

Mr. MARSHALL: What has the registration board to do with the situation other than to stick its nose into a proposition which has been ill-considered, and to decoy the Minister into introducing a Bill like this, which will provide for qualifying people to go to the Eastern States? The fact is that that board has representation from the Australian Trained Nurses' Association. That organisation is only about 200 strong, but the union concerned in this measure has about 1,200 to 1,400 members. Yet it has never been consulted, and knew nothing about the Bill, and the secretary of the organisation controlling these probationers had no knowledge that it was on the stocks. She rang up the board to ascertain whether there was any prospect of such a measure and was informed that there was none. Yet the Bill was here at that time.

The Minister for Health: And the vice-president of the union is on the registration board.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Not the association's vice-president.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister will insist on going wrong when one tries to put her right! There is not one member of this union on the Nurses' Registration Board at all.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: We have evidence tonight to prove it.

The Minister for Health: You are wrong.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not wrong. The person concerned is sitting in the gallery. I have just finished talking to her.

The Minister for Health: I do not think she is there now. So you are wrong again.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Yes, she is.

Mr. MARSHALL: It is no good the Minister trying to put that over! I want members to know where we are going with this legislation. I advise the Premier to let it go with the slaughtered innocents, because that is what is going to happen.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: I think we ought to hear her at the bar of the House.

Mr. MARSHALL: If this legislation becomes law, the secretary of the union, because she has the right under the Arbitration Court award, will go straight to the court and get the 40-hour week. These people are only working the 48 hours under a mutual agreement, and the court will give them the 40 hours on application. No case has to be put up. The secretary has simply to go to the court and say, "I want now to upset the mutual arrangement, and to have the 40-hour week for my members," and the court has to give it.

The Minister for Health: I will take the chance.

Mr. MARSHALL: Where is the Minister going to house them? She has accommodation for 23.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: At Naval Base, perhaps.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. If these girls get the 40-hour week—and they must—the Minister will have to increase her staff immediately by one-third.

The Minister for Health: We know all that.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister ought to give further consideration to the matter, and not be misled by departmental officers who would lead her into doing something fantastically stupid. I had some experience of these people for a brief period. The Treasurer will not be able to find accommodation for the additional one-third if the union gets the 40-hour week; and it will. The girls, too, will work straight shifts. There will be no broken time as there is now. The Minister is leading the Government into a desperate situation. She will qualify our girls, under this measure, to go to the Eastern States. I have no doubt that the Trained Nurses' Association will agree to the Bill. It is that body which is misleading the Minister. It is about 200 or 300 strong, and its members are qualified nurses. It is natural they would agree to this proposal, because the longer they make the probationary period the longer will competition be kept from them.

The Premier: I do not think that is so.

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, what does inspire these people to advocate such a thing? Why should the Trained Nurses' Association favour this legislation to the detriment of 1,200 girls who do not belong to that association?

The Premier: We want hundreds of extra nurses.

Mr. MARSHALL: Because of this Bill they will go to the Eastern States. A trainee who already has a general certificate will, by virtue of nine months' training, get the midwifery certificate, and the trainee who is going straight out for the single midwifery certificate will get it by working 48 hours a week for 18 months. If they can become proficient in that period—and I agree they can—why should we extend the time so as to qualify them to become more efficient and to go to the Eastern States? This is a silly proposal, and I seriously appeal to the Minister and to the Treasurer not to go on with it. The girls at present are sacrificing their right to the 40-hour week. They could have a 40-hour week with straight shifts, which would mean that the expense of their training would be increased terrifically.

Mr. Styants: If you could get them.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. We shall train them to send them away. If we can hold the period as it is, and maintain the efficiency, we will encourage our girls to qualify and to stay here; and we can decoy girls from other States to come and remain here. But if we extend the period so that it is similar to which obtains in the Eastern States we will all be on an equal basis, and our girls who attain professional status will leave us. I appeal to the Treasurer not to go on with the measure but to have a look at it. There is plenty of time, and we can deal with it next session. The girls are working 48 hours a week, and they are happy and contented. This will upset them, and they will go straight to the court.

When the Premier brought down his Budget he said something about industrial peace. These pin-pricking tactics will upset the girls. The Minister never instanced one case to show that there was inefficiency due to the shorter period; and there cannot be while they work the greater number of hours. So, I appeal to the Treasurer not to go on with the legislation this session. I think we are doing the very thing that every member, since

I have been in the House, has complained bitterly about, namely, building individuals up to professional status and then losing them to the Eastern States. That is what the measure will do. I ask the Minister to let the Bill go overboard. The Trained Nurses' Association has no right to be interested in it because it has as its members only a few trained nurses, whereas the great bulk of the members of the union concerned are probationers. They are three or four times as powerful numerically as is the Trained Nurses' Association. The Treasurer ought to watch closely what he is doing with this measure. I seriously appeal to the Government not to go on with it.

On motion by Mr. Bovell, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.58 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, 1st November, 1951.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Ministers' expenses, as to tabling return	392
Hospitals, as to expenditure at Pinjarra, Dwellingup and Yarloop	392
Assent to Bill	392
Bills : Country Towns Sewerage Act Amendment, 3r., passed	392
Building Operations and Building Materials Control Act Amendment and Continuance, 2r.	392
War Service Land Settlement Agreement, 1r.	399
Gas Undertakings Act Amendment, 1r.	399
Rights in Water and Irrigation Act Amendment, 2r.	399

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

QUESTIONS.

MINISTERS' EXPENSES.

As to Tabling Return.

Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND asked the Minister for Transport:

Will he lay upon the Table of the House a return showing the expenses incurred by each individual Minister of the Crown, for each of the past six years, as follows:—

(a) within the State;

(b) interstate;

(c) oversea?

The MINISTER replied:

(a) and (b) The preparation of this information would require a considerable amount of work. If the hon. member considers this should be undertaken, he should move for the return in the usual way.

(c) The only ministerial oversea visit in the last six years was that of the Premier this year, the cost of which appears in the Estimates now before Parliament.

HOSPITALS.

As to Expenditure at Pinjarra, Dwellingup and Yarloop.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) What is the amount of money expended to date on the erection of the new Pinjarra hospital?

(2) What is the estimated cost of the completed hospital?

(3) How many beds will the completed hospital provide?

(4) How many nurses will be housed in the nurses' home?

(5) How much money has been expended during the last three years on renovations and alterations of the hospitals at Dwellingup and Yarloop?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Hospital, £80,000; quarters, £16,000.

(2) Hospital, £140,000; quarters, £16,000.

(3) Twenty-four, plus eight midwifery and four native.

(4) One matron and 16 nurses.

(5) Dwellingup—New labour ward, kitchen, dining room, x-ray, sterilising, quarters, hot water and sewerage, and general maintenance, £19,605 17s. 2d. Yarloop—New midwifery ward, new kitchen and dining rooms, hot water and sewerage and general maintenance, £19,012 7s. 2d.

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Administrator received and read notifying assent to the Wheat Marketing Act Amendment and Continuance Bill.

BILL—COUNTRY TOWNS SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—BUILDING OPERATIONS AND BUILDING MATERIALS CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT AND CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [4.36]: I have given considerable thought to the question of the control of building materials. As everyone knows, I was born a Conservative and I suppose I will remain a Conservative, within a degree, altering somewhat with circumstances,