In that period of 20 years, there were 28 recorded cases. One related to a death sentence on a resident of a Commonwealth Territory on which a question was not permitted as a decision on the prerogative of mercy was under consideration by the Federal Executive Council. In another case, a question regarding a matter, the subject of a coroner's inquiry, was not permitted, and a similar decision was made in connection with a civil case before the Supreme Court of a State.

The remaining 25 cases in these 20 years were divided as follows: three in respect of proceedings in the Australian High Court, nine in respect of proceedings relating to industrial questions before the Commonwealth Industrial Court or the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, and 13 in respect of proceedings of Royal Commissions appointed to investigate such matters of federal concern as espionage and naval disaster.

Of this total of 28 occasions on which the question of the application of the sub judice rule has been raised, the rule was applied on 22 occasions and on six it was not.

Of these 28 occasions, 22, or nearly 80 per cent, related to matters which did not come within the four categories dealt with in the House of Commons Resolution to which I referred earlier, that is, they were related to the proceedings of Royal Commissions or inquiries into industrial wages and conditions, the latter being a particularly sensitive area in federal politics. These matters and others may well be of major interest in the sub judice field in other Parliaments of the Commonwealth, and I hope to hear much of assistance in this context from my fellow presiding officers.

To fill in the statistics, these sub judice cases arose on fifteen occasions in questions without notice, on three occasions in connection with a bill, on five occasions in relation to a definite matter of public importance, twice on a motion to adjourn the House, and three times in other proceedings.

In order to complete the picture, may I touch on the principles followed in my own House in connection with those sub judice matters which are outside those specifically mentioned in the Commons Resolution of 1962-63.

First, let me turn to royal commissions, which gave rise to 46 per cent of our sub judice questions in the twenty years.

In 1954, a bill with the title of "Royal Commission on Espionage" was introduced, *inter alia,* to place beyond doubt the powers of the Royal Commission on Espionage in relation to witnesses refusing to testify. In the course of the second reading debate, the Leader of the Opposition referred to the refusal of a witness before the Royal Commission to answer a question. The Speaker ruled it would not be in order to discuss the proceedings of the Royal Commission and went on to say that his view of the position was that the previous Parliament had passed an Act to establish a Royal Commission with powers to make a certain investigation. The Government now sought to remove any doubts as to the validity of the powers of the Commission. The Speaker was prepared to allow full debate on the question whether the Royal Commission should or should not have those powers but he would not allow any reference to the proceedings before the Commission. The Speaker said he would be failing in his duty if he allowed any discussion of matters which had been deliberately handed to the Royal Commission for investigation. Dissent from his ruling was moved but it was negatived on division.

This ruling of the Speaker was consistent with previous rulings that it is not in order to discuss current proceedings of a Royal Commission, and I have no reason, subject to what I will say later, to disagree with its general validity or propriety. It