

is not right in 1942 to penalise the metropolitan area to the extent that the consumers will be penalised unless some alteration is made, and unless some trees that are being wasted today are made available for cutting by the sawmills established in the metropolitan area.

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

Ayes .. .. . 22

Noes .. .. . 14

Majority for .. .. 8

#### AYES.

Mr. Berry	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Boyle	Mr. McLarty
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Needham
Mr. Cross	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Fox	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Thorn
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Warner
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Watts
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Triat

(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Coverley	Mr. Panton
Mr. Doney	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Seward
Mr. Hill	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Wise
Mr. Millington	Mr. Withers
Mr. Nulsen	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

*House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

*Wednesday, 18th November, 1942.*

	PAGE
Paper : State civil requirements, Ministerial statement	1388
Bill : Local Authorities (Reserve Funds), 2R., Com.	1389
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report	1391
Motion : Commonwealth and State relationships as to referendum proposals	1395

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

### PAPER—STATE CIVIL REQUIREMENTS.

#### Ministerial Statement.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY [2.18]: I wish to lay on the Table of the House a most important report, and in doing would like to make a statement. Members are no

doubt aware that on the 14th November, the following motion was moved in the Legislative Assembly by the member for West Perth:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into any existing or threatened shortages in the supply of essential requirements for civil consumption in this State, and as to the allocation to this State of a fair quota of the Australian production of such requirements, and as to the shipping and other transport services for the carriage of such supplies to this State, and to report thereon to this House.

The motion was amended, and it was agreed that a true picture of the position would best be obtained if a report were submitted to the House from departmental and governmental sources. During the course of his speech, the Minister for Lands said that if when the reports were made available to the House it was apparent from them that there was not sufficient recognition of the State's interests in various directions, there was any laxity, or anything had been overlooked, or if it could be shown that the State's requirements were likely inadequately to be met, then would be the proper time to take definite action in respect of any arrangements which appeared to be weak. Although one or two members suggested that such an inquiry would go the way of all such investigations, and that the Minister would accept no responsibility, the report now submitted, which I feel sure members will find to be tremendously informative, has been carefully prepared. Considerable endeavour has been made to present in this way to the whole of Parliament, as quickly as possible, such information as might even permit further inquiry, but which would facilitate decisions being reached.

The motion I have read mentions "the supply of essential requirements for civil consumption in this State." In preparing this report, "civil consumption" has been taken to mean not merely the inclusion of commodities that are for consumption as food. The comments and tables submitted in regard to goods of local production are based on almost measurable quantities in spite of the extreme manpower difficulties, and although they will vary in actual practice they are as reliable as investigations at this stage can make them. Imported commodities must of necessity be subject to various transport difficulties. Censorship restrictions in regard to the information to be found in this report were discussed with

the State Censor, and a letter was addressed to him on the subject.

In his reply he makes it clear that information contained in this report is not to be used in any newspaper or on the air. It is to be considered a confidential report to Parliament. Shortages must not be discussed, and anything which would give valuable information to the enemy, or alternately, create panic buying, is to be avoided. For National Security reasons it is important that members treat much of the information with the utmost discretion. The report is, therefore, submitted with the request that it be not used in any way for publication, but simply to enable members to allay fears in the public mind and to assist in any way they can to overcome some of the difficulties being experienced. A committee, operating in conjunction with the Minister for Lands and representing many interests, has been responsible for this report. The Minister, therefore, desires to extend the courtesy to this House of placing the report in the possession of members. It is strictly for perusal and not for publication. I desire to lay this statement on the Table of the House. Each member will be supplied with a copy at a later stage of this sitting.

### **BILL—LOCAL AUTHORITIES (RESERVE FUNDS).**

#### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**HON. A. THOMSON** (South-East) [2.25]: This measure has been introduced with the idea of providing for extraordinary circumstances brought about by the war. I have only one or two objections to raise. While it is proposed to give local authorities power to establish reserve funds, seemingly they will be hamstrung in that the Minister may direct them to establish such funds which cannot be closed without the consent of the Minister. Too much reference to the Minister has been provided for. The local authorities are carrying on their work very successfully and should be trusted a little further in the administration of these funds. I shall not oppose the second reading, but in Committee will suggest amendments.

**HON. H. TUCKEY** (South-West): I support the second reading of the Bill, which is necessary in the interests of the local

authorities throughout the State. Under the provisions of the Road Districts Act, a road board may not collect more revenue than is required to cover the expenditure for the current year. Thus when there is little work to be carried out, a local authority must not impose a high rate that will produce an excess of revenue. This Bill will permit of road boards building up funds in order that work may be put in hand after the war. I agree with Mr. Thomson that the provisions of the Bill are rather strict.

Most local authorities should be able to carry out their works without having first of all to submit their plans to the Minister for his approval. The money in these reserve funds will be only ordinary revenue such as is being collected at present, except that the amounts will accumulate during the war. Thus instead of spending £2,000 or £3,000 in one year, a local authority will need to expend a much larger sum to carry out necessary works in the district. Clause 8 is open to grave objection. It provides that no money may be taken from these funds until a written statement has been submitted to the Minister detailing the proposed works and the amount desired to be taken from the fund. In Committee that clause should receive consideration.

**HON. J. G. HISLOP** (Metropolitan): I am wondering whether it is essential to have these funds established for post-war purposes. I ask the Minister in his reply to state whether, in view of the fact that so many individuals are paying so large an increase in income-tax, it would not be better to relieve the burden on income-tax payers by reducing the amount of taxation charged by local bodies and not accumulate these funds for post-war needs. That is the only comment I wish to make. At present we must do what we can to lighten the burden of taxation on those who are already heavily subscribing to our needs.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER** (in reply): In my opinion it would be very unwise if the local authorities put into effect the ideas outlined by Dr. Hislop. Any one who is in close contact with local bodies knows how hard pressed they are to meet normal needs, and if the rates were reduced it would be very difficult to raise them later on without causing a storm of protest from the ratepayers. It would be a mistake to reduce the powers of local government

and permit the services to the people through municipalities and road boards to deteriorate because of the war. Obviously if the reserve funds are not established, local authorities will have to reduce their rates.

Hon. H. Tuckey: They can still do that.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. There are no very highly rated districts in Western Australia such as there are in the Eastern States.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Many are quite high enough.

The HONORARY MINISTER: We can form a very good idea of what will happen after the war and should insist upon local authorities maintaining their standard of rating.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Governor may require a local authority to close and wind up a reserve fund:

Hon. A. THOMSON: Subclause (1) contains ample provision to meet all needs. I move an amendment—

That in lines 5 and 6 of Subclause (2) the words "according as the Minister may direct" be struck out.

With the deletion of those words a local authority would either transfer money in a reserve fund to its revenue account or utilise it for any of the purposes authorised by its Act. To empower the Minister to order the winding up of a fund and insist upon the adoption of this course, probably against the considered opinion of the local body, would be harsh. The local authority should be in a position to allocate the funds to ordinary revenue or to utilise them in such a way as it deems best in the interests of the ratepayers.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I oppose the amendment. For many years past there has been complete co-operation between the department and the road boards. It would be a mistake to strike out the words. I think the local authorities would welcome the provision as it stands, as they would then be in a position to withstand pressure that might be brought to bear on them by the ratepayers.

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

Clause 6—Local authority may not voluntarily close and wind up its reserve fund without consent of Governor:

Hon. A. THOMSON: I would like an explanation from the Minister why a local authority may not voluntarily close and wind up a reserve fund. If the local authority deemed it advisable to do so, surely it should be permitted to wind up the reserve fund without having to approach the Minister. I do not, however, raise any strong objection to the clause.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The provision is designed to give a local authority additional power to resist pressure which might be brought to bear upon it by the ratepayers. The matter might be made an election issue with a view to securing a reduction in the rates.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: We need not be too particular about this measure, as it will continue for the duration of the war only. The Minister for Works will do all he can to assist the local authorities. When perusing the Bill I was rather struck by the provision that local authorities should submit a plan of expenses before using the money at the conclusion of hostilities. Not much can be said against this and other clauses.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 4 of Subclause (2) the words "according as the Minister may direct" be struck out

Hon. L. CRAIG: It would be a mistake to accept the amendment. Members will observe that the provision relates merely to the income from the reserve fund. The income would not amount to much. Some boards have £3,000 or £4,000 on fixed deposit or invested in war loans, and the interest per annum would not amount to a large sum. Members should be mindful of the fact that the reserve fund will really comprise rates collected which have not been expended on roads. Pressure may be brought to bear on a local authority to use the reserve fund for the purpose of building a new hall or office, the expenditure on which should be provided out of loan funds. Such a tendency should be resisted. In my opinion, the power should be left in the hands of the Minister, who I have no doubt would be guided by the request, or recommendation, of the local authority.

Hon. H. L. ROCHE: Mr. Craig seems to have misunderstood the clause, which deals

with the winding-up of these reserve funds. Members of local authorities, which do so much voluntary work for their districts, should be allowed a certain degree of responsibility. We can safely trust them to guard the interests of their districts and the ratepayers concerned. Why should we be afraid that ratepayers will bring pressure to bear upon members of road boards in a manner that would be unwarranted?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The rates which go to make up these reserve funds have been paid for certain purposes. There may be a danger of some local authority yielding to the pressure of one section of the ratepayers, and using these funds for purposes other than those for which they were intended.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Only within the scope of the local government Acts.

The HONORARY MINISTER: This Bill has been brought forward at the request of the local authorities, and it would be unwise for the Committee to interfere seriously with any part of it.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I have received letters from local authorities, who feel that they should be trusted to do what is right with these funds. I point out that a good deal of the plant belonging to road boards has already been taken over for Commonwealth undertakings.

Hon. H. L. Roche: It will not be much good when they get it back.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Possibly that would be one direction in which these funds could be used. The local authorities can be trusted to spend the money wisely; in any case, the ratepayers would see that that was done.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I support the amendment. In a few years many of the roads will be in a bad condition and will require to be put in order. Road board plants in several instances have been taken over by the Commonwealth authorities, and new plant will be required in due course.

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

Clause 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Surplus moneys to be paid into reserve fund and withdrawals to be approved by Minister:

Hon. A. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (b) be struck out.

That paragraph is now unnecessary.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I oppose the amendment. It would be wrong to allow any local authority to take money out of its reserve fund unless a good case for so doing had been made out. It is essential that the paragraph be retained.

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

Clause 9, 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—Local authority prohibited from raising loan while it maintains a reserve fund:

Hon. A. THOMSON: If a road board requires money for some useful purpose, how is it intended that such money be raised?

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is obvious that a road board would not want to raise a loan during war-time, more especially if it had a reserve fund that could be called upon.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 12—agreed to.

Clause 13—Duration of Act:

Hon. A. THOMSON: Should not the words "in accordance with the directions to be given by the Minister" be struck out in view of the amendments the Committee has already agreed to?

The CHAIRMAN: The amendments already agreed to will operate while the reserve funds are going concerns. This particular clause deals with the winding-up of a reserve fund.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I will have this clause re-committed at a later stage.

Hon. A. Thomson: I am satisfied.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

## **BILL—MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT.**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 12th November.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY [2.58]: This small Bill has been introduced by Mr. Wood, who seeks to amend Section 3 of the Marketing of Eggs Act, 1938-39. That Act deals with the appointment and constitution of the Western Australian Egg Marketing Board. The section in question provides that the Governor may, on the receipt of a petition signed by not less than 50 egg producers, issue a proclamation fixing the day for the taking of a

poll of egg producers in Western Australia on the question whether a board shall be constituted. If on the taking of this poll, more than half of the votes favour the constitution of a board, the Governor may, by a subsequent proclamation, declare that a board, to be known as the Western Australian Egg Marketing Board, shall be set up and may thereby appoint a day for the election by producers of the elective members. It is provided in the Act that those elective members shall number two, each of whom must be a producer. In addition, three other members are to be nominated by the Governor and one of those members shall be the representative of the consumers, while another will be a man of wide experience in commercial and mercantile activities. The Act also provides that the chairman of the board shall have a vote and, if the members are equally divided, he shall have a second and casting vote.

The Bill, however, provides that the constitution of the board shall be altered so that instead of there being two representatives of the producers there shall be three. That proposition is quite in accord with the efforts made from time to time by Mr. Wood in connection with boards of this description. To date, no board has been constituted and therefore the board as contemplated in the Act has not yet been given a trial. A petition was presented to the Governor praying that a poll be taken for the constitution of the board, and that poll has already been taken. As pointed out by Mr. Wood, a most unusual result was recorded, in that the voting both for and against the proposition was equal. There was a tremendous number of informal votes but I believe they were mostly informal from a technical point of view.

Many were so recorded that when the ballot papers were placed in the envelopes, they disclosed the names of the voters. For that reason the ballot papers had to be set aside and, as I have said, the poll resulted in a tie, in consequence of which no election for a board has yet taken place. The point has been raised as to whether it would be possible for another poll to be taken at any time, or whether a period of two years should elapse before any such poll was taken. I understand that the question has been resolved by the Crown Law authorities who rule that no disability exists and that

another poll can be taken at any time. There is every possibility of another poll being taken in the very near future. I must point out that this House has not been successful in the past in persuading another place to agree to the constitution of a board along the lines suggested by Mr. Wood.

Hon. G. B. Wood: We have not put this up to another place yet.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Act as it stands has not yet had a trial. It seems to me that before we agree to amend the principal Act, we should give the producers an opportunity to test the board as provided for in that measure. I do not see any reason why at this stage we should desire to alter the constitution of the board. The producers themselves have shown conclusively by their votes in the poll that has been taken that they are quite satisfied to have a board constituted in accordance with the provisions of the Act. In view of the circumstances as I have narrated them, I feel that members should agree that before any further amendment is contemplated regarding the constitution of the board, an opportunity should be taken to ascertain whether or not the board as at present constituted would prove satisfactory. For the reasons I have outlined, I oppose the second reading of the Bill.

HON. SIR HAL COLEBATCH (Metropolitan): I find myself in some difficulty regarding the Bill. If I thought that by the measure being agreed to the Government would be deterred from taking any action regarding the establishment of the board, I would certainly vote for the Bill. On the other hand, if I considered that the Bill being agreed to would make the producers more anxious for the establishment of a board, I would vote against the measure. I am entirely opposed to boards of this description which eventually became practically Government departments, particularly when such boards apply to industries of this kind. Apart from that, it must be within the knowledge of members that for the past two years and three months there has been a voluntary egg stabilisation committee, operating, I believe, to the complete satisfaction of all sections of the trade, as well as, I venture to assert, to the advantage of the consumers.

I remember reading a little while ago of the operations of an egg marketing board working along similar lines to those con-

templated in the Act and carrying on business in the sale and distribution of eggs in New South Wales. That board incurred enormous losses. The voluntary egg stabilisation committee, which has functioned from 1940 until the present time, has, at the end of operations extending over two years and three months, shown a surplus of £6,512. That is a very substantial and useful sum when the stabilisation of prices in an industry that fluctuates so much in the matter of consumption and production as the egg industry, is taken into account. The voluntary egg stabilisation committee is composed in this fashion: Three members represent the poultry section of the Primary Producers' Association; one member represents the commercial poultry farmers; one represents the merchants interested in the egg business, while the remaining three members represent the agents who handle the product of the industry. The effect of that constitution of the committee is that four members represent the selling side of the business and four the producing side.

In addition, there is a chairman appointed by the members themselves, and I think they very wisely chose Dr. G. L. Sutton for that position. That committee has been operating for two years and three months to the advantage of the industry and the community generally. I know that the members of the committee have had occasion to complain recently that they have not been allowed to charge the same prices as have their competitors in the Eastern States. There again I think the committee acted perfectly correctly in attempting to secure the right to charge the same prices here as are permitted in the other States. In an industry of this description, it cannot be pretended that it is in the interests of the consumers that the price of eggs shall be maintained at a level that makes the industry unprofitable, for that inevitably means that production must decrease.

But all the price fixing in the world is of no avail if there is not enough of the commodity to sell. I am in agreement with the desire of the voluntary egg stabilisation committee to induce the Price Fixing Commissioner to allow that body to charge a price equal to that obtained in the Eastern States in order that production may be stimulated. It is essential that production be increased so that there shall be a plentiful supply for the community at a price that will be within the reach of all sections of the public. The

Chief Secretary said that the board contemplated by the Act had not yet been constituted. Why bother about any such board? Why interfere? Why not allow the industry to proceed under existing conditions, controlled on what amounts to a co-operative basis?

Why seek to have a board the majority of the members of which will be Government nominees? Why bring such a board into existence when already the job is being done satisfactorily? What is that job? It is merely to try to iron out difficulties that may arise in regard to the price of eggs between the slack season and the period of high production. That is what the voluntary egg stabilisation committee is endeavouring to achieve. It is attempting to prevent the price of eggs dropping so low that producers will be forced out of production and at the same time to prevent the price from going so high as to become prohibitive to the consumers. What could any board do in addition to that? What reason can be advanced for the establishment of the board, particularly as the job is now being done satisfactorily on a voluntary basis?

Hon. G. B. Wood: Who said it is being done satisfactorily?

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: Why should we interfere with the present position? Consider for a moment the expense involved in the work of the voluntary egg stabilisation committee. The expenses of the nine members over a period of two years and three months totalled £363. How does that compare with the ordinary expenses of a Government-nominated board? Another illustration relates to office expenses. Over the period of two years and three months the office expenses of the egg stabilisation committee in dealing with returns running into over £12,000, totalled only £595. That refers to an organisation which is practically on a co-operative basis and it has carried on its business efficiently and cheaply.

Why bother about establishing a Government-controlled board in its place? Do members think that such a board would do the job as well and represent the interests of the producers as well as this organisation of producers themselves, with sellers, is already doing? The interests of those associated with the industry is what matters, and I ask members to consider whether those interests will be conserved better under a body that

will be subject to Government control in lieu of the co-operative and voluntary committee that is already doing so well.

**HON. G. B. WOOD** (East—in reply) : I am amazed at some of the arguments advanced by Sir Hal Colebatch. He asked, "Who wants the proposed board?" I say that the people who desire the establishment of the board are the producers themselves. As Sir Hal remarked, a voluntary committee has been operating, but the producers are not satisfied with the way their business has been carried out. That is why they want the creation of a new board. Sir Hal referred to the expense attached to the committee's operation and the expense incurred by other boards. I understand that the expenses of the committee represent about one-twentieth of a penny per thousand eggs, and I anticipate that the expense of the proposed statutory board would be practically on that basis because everyone in the industry would be affected. Under the voluntary system only portion of those engaged in the industry are directly involved.

If the egg producing industry is not placed on a properly established basis, there will be a shortage of eggs in Western Australia. I was told today that a man at Swan View who has 800 birds is going out of the industry. He is selling up because he considers egg production is not worthwhile. He intends to get a better job. We cannot expect to retain producers in the industry if they cannot secure a fair price for their output. Why should people in the Eastern States receive more for their eggs than our producers can obtain for their supplies. I approached the Price Fixing Commissioner with a request that he should do something in that regard because the producers were not getting anything out of the industry. Nothing was done. I was requested to take a deputation to the Minister concerned in an endeavour to get some action taken. I honestly believe that if a statutory board were created, the existing difficulties would be overcome.

The whole industry would then speak as with one voice. Sir Hal Colebatch said that there were representatives of both the selling and producing sides of the industry on the committee. Both those sections desire the creation of the statutory board. A poll was taken—a most unsatisfactory poll, I believe. Some years ago a Labour Government estab-

lished the Dried Fruits Board. On that board there were five producers. I venture to say there is no board in Australia functioning better than that board. Today, of course, the board has a chairman who is not a producer; but still there is a majority of producer representation. Sir Hal asks who wants this board. The producers want it.

**Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch** : The ballot did not show that.

**Hon. G. B. WOOD** : I do not think we can take account of that ballot. As the Minister said, the ballot was a kind of technical dis-appointment on account of the extraordinary nature of the ballot paper, or the way in which the ballot papers were placed in the envelopes. This was not due to ignorance. There were 142 informal votes out of the total of 500 or 600. That indicates something was wrong. I understand that one of the leading officers of the poultry section of the Primary Producers' Association has admitted today that the ballot was informal. Therefore I take no account whatsoever of that ballot. Sir Hal further said, "The consumers are satisfied; why interfere?" Of course the consumers are satisfied, for they are getting their eggs at a cheaper price than the return ruling in the Eastern States. Does Sir Hal want to see Western Australia placed in the position of having to import eggs from the Eastern States? I hope not.

**Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch** : I am asking for something in the opposite direction, and you know that very well.

**Hon. G. B. WOOD** : The producers are going out of the industry, like that man with 800 birds. The secretary of the Primary Producers' Association told me this morning that dozens of other poultry farmers were leaving the industry. Too many producers have already retired from our food industries.

**Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch** : A lot were driven out by your branding provision.

**Hon. G. B. WOOD** : The Government introduced the branding. I had nothing to do with that. It was instituted by a Government regulation. In my opinion the provisions as to candling and grading should be waived during the war. Our association did not introduce those things; the Government did. As to the Minister's contention that this House has not persuaded another place of the desirableness of the

amendment, my reply is that we have not asked the other place to agree to it. This House has always stood for majority representation, and I hope the Minister will note the fact. Majority representation has been rejected by another place. On this occasion we merely ask for equal representation.

The Chief Secretary: What about three out of five?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I ask merely for majority representation. I am leaving the consumers equal on a board of six. On two previous occasions I asked unsuccessfully for majority representation of producers. On this occasion I am asking for equal representation. Either the Minister is under a misapprehension, or a mistake has been made in the drafting of the Bill. That is the important point.

The Chief Secretary: How will Subsection (4) read as you propose to amend it?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: That there shall be three producers and three appointees of the Government—which will mean equal representation of producers and consumers. I am glad that point has been cleared up. Apparently the Minister had a mistaken view of what we were asking for. On two occasions this House agreed to majority representation of producers on the board. That proposal having been rejected twice by another place, we now ask for equal representation.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; Hon. G. B. Wood in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 3:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I rise merely to say that Mr. Wood is quite right. If Section 3 of the Act is amended as desired by the hon. member, it will provide for three producers' representatives, who will be producers.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the reported adopted.

## **MOTION—COMMONWEALTH AND STATE RELATIONSHIPS.**

### *As to Referendum Proposals.*

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. A. Thomson—

1, That this House strenuously opposes the alteration of the Federal Constitution as proposed by the Commonwealth Government, on the following grounds:—

- (a) That the suggested amendments are apparently not genuinely aimed at necessary alterations to the Federal Constitution but will undoubtedly have the effect of ultimately destroying the Federal system of the voluntary union of six self-governing and sovereign States.
- (b) That such proposals are designed to bring about unification, camouflage as a war necessity. They would result in a distinct breach of faith with the States, which entered into a Federal union, and would not only be destructive of the best interests of Western Australia, but of every other State of the Commonwealth.
- (c) That it is impossible to govern Australia wisely and justly by a huge bureaucracy controlled from Canberra and that the passage of such proposals would only cloud the future of Australia by bitter home rule agitations from its distant parts.
- (d) That while this country is fighting for its very existence and people's mind are distracted by the war, it is in the highest degree improper to divide the nation by highly controversial questions. With the people again leading normal lives free from the stress of war emotions in a period of calm reasoning and clear thinking, a genuine verdict might be obtained.
- (e) That the Commonwealth Government at present possesses ample powers to deal with all matters arising out of the war, and these powers could, by arrangement with the States (if necessary), be extended for a period after the war.

2, That Western Australian members of both State and Federal Houses, and all Western Australian citizens, be urged to defeat the Federal proposals.

3, That the Premier be requested to forward this resolution to the Prime Minister and the Premiers of the other States.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** [3.25]: The introduction of this motion by Mr. Thomson gives the House the opportunity to discuss a very important matter. The proposals of the Commonwealth Government embodied in the Constitution Alteration (War Aims and Reconstruction) Bill, as introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament by Dr. Evatt, are the most far-reaching an



most important alterations to the Federal Constitution ever to be submitted for the endorsement of the people of Australia. It is therefore not surprising that Mr. Thomson's motion has been brought forward. A similar motion was moved in another place; and the Government, having a full realisation of the effect of the alterations to the Federal Constitution if put into operation, has given them most careful consideration, with the result that the Minister for Works, with a view to obtaining unanimity on the part of all sections of Parliament, moved an amendment, which was agreed to by the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. H. Seddon: A pity it was not a bit stronger!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I believe the desire is to have a unanimous resolution, one on which both Houses agree. I do not know that there is any need for me to read the amendment, since it appears on the notice paper. However, that is the amendment made by another place. Before concluding my remarks I shall submit the same amendment for the consideration of members of this Chamber. It is obviously necessary that we should have a full and complete understanding of all the implications of the proposed amendments to the Commonwealth Constitution; and to that end the Premier requested our Solicitor General to give his considered opinion as to the effect of these proposals if put into operation. I would like to follow the lead given by the Premier in another place by quoting from the Solicitor General's opinion, in order that this Chamber may have a clear conception of exactly what the proposals mean.

It is not my intention to read the whole of the Solicitor General's lengthy opinion, but I do propose to quote paragraphs which I feel sure will prove of great value to members here. The Solicitor General states—

1, This Bill, the Constitution Alteration (War Aims and Reconstruction) Bill, expressly provides for the alteration of the present Federal Constitution by inserting therein as Part VI of Chapter I thereof a new Section 60A.

2, Part V of Chapter I of the Federal Constitution and principally Section 51 thereof enumerates by means of definite and particular items the matters in relation to which the Commonwealth Parliament may now make laws, and accordingly at present the legislative powers of the Commonwealth Parliament are limited to those matters. This observation of course does not take into account the extraordinary power of the Governor General to make regulations under the National Security

Act, 1939-1940, under the present war conditions.

3, With the legislative powers of the Commonwealth Parliament limited to those matters expressly enumerated in the Federal Constitution, questions can and have in the past arisen regarding the validity of laws made by the said Parliament when doubts are held as to whether the matter in relation to which the laws are made is a matter specifically included in the legislative powers of the Commonwealth Parliament under the Constitution, and as the Constitution now stands those questions can be determined finally by the High Court of Australia.

4, Compared with the Federal Constitution as it now stands, the proposed new Section 60A will make two very radical and revolutionary changes in the constitutional law of the Commonwealth.

5, In the first place, Subsection (1) of the proposed new Section 60A will give to the Commonwealth Parliament powers which it does not now possess, to make laws in relation to matters which are not specifically defined, particularised or identified, but which are covered by expressions of a general, very vague and most comprehensive nature, which by reason of those very characteristics can be applied to cover every matter imaginable.

6, In the second place, Subsection (2) of the proposed new Section 60A extends the revolutionary departure from the present Federal Constitution still further. Under Subsection (2) it will be sufficient for the Commonwealth Parliament itself to declare that any matter in relation to which it is asked to make a law is a matter which comes within the general purposes for which laws may be made as provided for in Subsection (1).

7, Thus under the new Section 60A the Commonwealth Parliament—

- (a) will be given legislative powers which are not defined, but merely indicated in general terms; and
- (b) will be the sole judge of the validity of the laws which it makes under Section 60A. That is to say, the High Court of Australia will have no jurisdiction to determine the validity of such laws.

8, In the third place, in order to make it certain that the laws made by the Commonwealth Parliament under Section 60A shall not be subject to any limitation at all, and that the said Parliament's powers to make such laws shall not be in any way restricted, Subsection (3) of the proposed Section 60A provides that, as from a date to be proclaimed by the Governor General, the Commonwealth Parliament shall be empowered to exercise the powers given to it by Section 60A notwithstanding anything contained elsewhere in the Federal Constitution as it now stands, or in the Constitution of any State.

This means, for example, that a law made by the Commonwealth Parliament under the proposed new Section 60A would be valid notwithstanding that it is repugnant to Section 92 of the Constitution (freedom of trade and intercourse between the States), or Section 99 (prohibition against giving preference to one

State over another State), or Section 106 (saving of State Constitutions), or Section 107 (saving of power of State Parliaments), or Section 117 (disability of or discrimination between persons residing in different States). The Solicitor General has expressed in very clear, definite language just what the proposals of the Commonwealth Government, if agreed to, will mean. Then he deals with the recent adoption by the Commonwealth Parliament of Sections 2 to 6 of the Statute of Westminster. He proceeds to examine their effect and arrives at the following conclusion:—

11, The Commonwealth Parliament recently passed an Act adopting Sections 2 to 6 of the Statute of Westminster, and thus Subsection (2) of Section 2 thereof now operates so as to empower the Commonwealth Parliament to make laws on matters within its authority under the Constitution, notwithstanding that such matters are within the authority of the States, and to the extent by which the proposed new Section 60A will bring within the legislative powers of the Commonwealth Parliament matters which hitherto have not been within such powers, but which have been within the legislative powers of the States, the saving provisions of Subsection (1) of Section 9 of the Statute of Westminster will be rendered completely ineffective.

Subsection (1) of Section 9 reads as follows:—

Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to authorise the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia to make laws on any matter within the authority of the States of Australia not being a matter within the authority of the Parliament or Government of the Commonwealth of Australia.

That is most important. Then the Solicitor General goes on to say—

12, Inasmuch as the entity of the State as a colony in the Empire, and the constitution of the State as such a colony with responsible government were established by Acts of Parliament of the United Kingdom, and Subsection (2) of Section 2 of the Statute of Westminster empowers the Commonwealth Parliament, acting within its legislative powers under the Federal Constitution, to make laws repugnant to the said Acts of Parliament of the United Kingdom, it follows that if the proposed new Section 60A becomes law as it stands, and provided the Commonwealth Parliament declares that a matter of destroying the entity of the State as a State or of abrogating the Constitution of the State is a matter of post-war reconstruction, the Commonwealth Parliament will be able to make laws which will destroy the entity of the State as a State, and will abolish or completely nullify the Constitution of the State.

There again I think we have to appreciate the fact that the Solicitor General has expressed his opinion very clearly.

Hon. A. Thomson: I am glad you had it. He endorses my views.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We have here the real reason for the passing by the Commonwealth Government of legislation to adopt Sections 2 to 6 of the Statute of Westminster. It is an integral part of the referendum proposals. The Solicitor General, in summing up the position, again sets it out very clearly when he says—

13, The cumulative effect therefore of the provisions of the proposed new Section 60A, and of Subsection (2) of Section 2 of the Statute of Westminster, insofar as they—

- (a) leave virtually unlimited the number and variety of the matters upon which the Commonwealth Parliament may make laws;
- (b) constitute the Commonwealth Parliament the only judge of the validity of the laws which it is asked to make;
- (c) give to such laws an operation superseding all provisions of the Federal Constitution and the Constitution of any State which are inconsistent with such laws; and
- (d) empower the Commonwealth Parliament to make such laws under the proposed Section 60A even though they be repugnant to the Acts of Parliament of the United Kingdom—

is to place in the hands of the Commonwealth Parliament power completely to destroy the federalisation of the States, which was the expressed intention and object of the Constitution of Australia Act passed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

There we have a full review of the proposals from their legal aspect.

Hon. A. Thomson: It shows how disastrous it would be for Western Australia.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is no room for doubt as to the result if the Commonwealth Government's proposals are given effect to. His conclusions are inescapable. The Federal aspect of our Australian Constitution will be destroyed. It is necessary, however, that we should face these proposals with a clear and open mind. We cannot lose sight of the verdicts which the people of this State have given on numerous occasions in recent years. In the past this State has expressed itself very definitely when increased powers have been sought by the Commonwealth Government. As recently as 1933, nine years ago, the people of this State gave an overwhelming vote in favour of secession from the Commonwealth. I think we have vivid recollections of the campaign that took place on that occasion. It

is just as well to be reminded of the figures that were recorded. They were as follows:—

For secession .. .. .	138,653
Against .. .. .	70,706

Hon. C. B. Williams: The figures in favour of secession would be double if a vote were taken now.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think that can be rightly described as an overwhelming majority. At the same time, on the proposal for a convention to consider constitutional alterations the result was 88,275 votes for the convention and 119,031 against. These figures demonstrate very clearly how dissatisfied the people were with Commonwealth control. More recently, in 1937, a referendum was held on the question of giving Federal powers in respect to marketing and aviation, the result being:—

**Marketing:**

In favour of constitutional alteration .. .. .	57,023
Not in favour .. .. .	148,308

**Aviation:**

In favour of constitutional alteration .. .. .	100,326
Not in favour .. .. .	110,529

Those figures show that the people realised that aviation was one of those matters in respect of which it is quite reasonable that the Commonwealth Government should have overriding powers.

Hon. L. Craig: The figures did not indicate that.

Hon. A. Thomson: The voting was much closer.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I should perhaps qualify my remarks by saying that the difference in the voting on that particular question and on that of marketing was so wide that it indicated that the people of this State were prepared to give fair consideration to matters of this kind, so much so that they were willing to alter their vote in regard to aviation as compared with marketing by something like 100 per cent. Fifty-nine thousand voted in favour of the Commonwealth having powers in regard to marketing, but 100,000 were in favour of the Commonwealth having full powers in regard to aviation. It is clear, therefore, that unless the feelings of the people have undergone a complete change, far from advocating increased powers for the Federal Government in peace-time they would like to see a reduction in the powers that that Government already possesses. I want to stress those words "in peace-time."

The people of this State feel with every justification that the older established and more populated States have exploited the smaller States, and particularly Western Australia. They know that the tariff has operated adversely on our primary industries, and that our secondary industries have, without doubt, been retarded. In this connection many enquiries have been held in an endeavour to assess the detrimental effect on this State. That Western Australia has suffered serious disabilities has been recognised by the payment of the Disabilities Grant over many years by various Commonwealth Governments, before the decision of the Grants Commission to change the basis of the grants from disabilities to needs. Our experience has been such that we feel a sense of frustration in regard to State policy and a strong aversion to giving to the Commonwealth any extra powers which might also be used to our detriment.

On the other hand, none will deny the patriotic sentiments of the people of Western Australia. Our figures for enlistments are the highest in Australia, and we more than hold our own in cash contributions to the war effort. There is an unqualified desire to do all within our power to further the war effort, but unfortunately we have not participated in the record industrial expansion of the nation, and it is a regrettable fact that the number of men and women in industry in this State is decreasing rather than increasing.

There is good ground for the contention that those States with war industries will reap most of the benefits when the period of post-war reconstruction arrives, and this State will lag further behind. It is, of course, recognised that the creation of a large war organisation will disclose frequent instances of incompetence and sometimes worse, but there is no excuse for the refusal of Commonwealth departments to make full use of the greater experience and local knowledge of State officers in most important matters.

Hon. A. Thomson: They get into a mess and ask our fellows to pull them out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That has occurred on some occasions. It is inevitable, in view of the fact that we have had to create our war organisations to such a large extent and in such quick time. But, nevertheless, I claim that we in Western Aus-

tralia have set up over the years departmental organisations which can give the best possible service to this country. It seems to me to be a mistaken policy to bring, shall I say, strangers into the war effort of this State to do work in which local knowledge is essential and where the State is possessed of men with capacity and qualifications to do that work in the best way.

Hon. A. Thomson: The same principle applies to post-war reconstruction.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. We have had to make a strong protest to the Commonwealth on numerous occasions, and one can enumerate many important matters upon which Commonwealth decisions have seriously affected this State. Without going into a lot of detail, I would refer to our experience with the Western Australian War Industries Committee, from which we hoped for so much. Its material results have been negligible; its recommendations have been side-stepped by the Commonwealth, and, in short, it might just as well never have been established. That committee entered upon its duties conscientiously and spent a tremendous amount of time and caused a lot of people also to spend time and energy in providing the information it required. Recommendations have been made by it from time to time on most important matters, but unfortunately it was only an advisory committee and we do not seem to have got very far with it.

The goldmining industry, which has meant so much to this State, has been subjected to a special type of taxation not applicable to any other industry in the Commonwealth. It has been singled out for a form of taxation which has produced large sums of money. As a result of war conditions that industry has been affected as much as and perhaps more than any other industry in the Commonwealth. It is still carrying on and endeavouring to keep itself afloat. Where it is possible to secure manpower, the industry is going forward with a hope for better times after the war. Our wheat production has been restricted on a different and more drastic basis than that applied to other States. Our secondary industries have been severely handicapped by the misuse of shipping and railway space, raw materials and goods vitally needed having been excluded in favour of Eastern States manufactured goods—in many instances of a type we already possess.

I could elaborate on matters of that kind. I suppose almost every member has had brought to his notice some instance where some secondary industry in this State has been severely handicapped on that account. Hardly a week goes by without it being necessary for us to bring some matters to the notice of the Commonwealth authorities. Frequently our representations have been successful, but these representations could never have been made but for the existence of the State Government. If by any chance this State Government should go out of existence as a result of the Commonwealth proposals, it is a moot point as to what representative authority there would be capable of making the necessary representations on matters which may vitally affect this part of the Commonwealth.

On the question of defence which, of course, is the prerogative of the Commonwealth Government, the State Government has found it necessary to make complaints and has not hesitated to draw attention to defence deficiencies in Western Australia. Many conferences have taken place with the local defence administration, while the Premier has discussed these problems with the Prime Minister and Army Chiefs on each occasion he has been in the Eastern States. It was necessary for the Deputy Premier to make a special trip for a similar purpose.

For security reasons it has not been possible to publish these matters in detail, and it is very pleasing to be able to say that, as a result of the very strong representations made, our position today is immeasurably better than during the early months after Japan entered the war. Because it is not possible to give publicity to activities of this kind in detail, I am afraid there is an inclination to minimise the part played by the State Government in its efforts to ensure the adequate defence of this part of the Commonwealth.

We cannot overlook the adverse effect which the Commonwealth proposals will have on the industrial and social conditions of this State. We are penalised each year by the Commonwealth Grants Commission because our social conditions are considered to be superior to those of other States. To conform to the standard laid down by the Grants Commission, those conditions would have to be reduced. Because we are penalised it can be assumed that the standard elsewhere is indeed lower than in this State.

It is well-known to members that each year this State has to fight for bare necessities insofar as our loan programmes are concerned. The Commonwealth Government, year by year, has compelled the States to reduce their programmes. The establishment and expansion of secondary industries has been retarded and the future, if experience is any guide, will see them brought to an end, and we shall have the same experience as in other parts of the world where the centre of government is so far away.

We can agree that even in this State those districts far distant from the seat of government have every right to think that because of that distance they do not receive the same consideration as is extended to centres closer to the metropolitan area. It is not because of any deliberate intention on the part of those at the seat of government, but that is how it pans out. It frequently happens that the requirements of these far-off districts are not fully recognised. These remarks could apply to Western Australia if we are to be governed in the way that these new Commonwealth proposals suggest. We will be thousands of miles away from the seat of government, and we have local conditions here entirely different from those prevailing in the Eastern States.

Just as it has been stated in the Old Country that there is no real need for the City of London to be represented in the Imperial Parliament, because its people are on the doorstep all the time, the same can be said of certain parts of Australia. Those near to the seat of government do not need representation to the same extent as do those in areas further away. So I am justified in saying that misunderstandings and dissension will undoubtedly arise, mainly on account of the lack of knowledge of local conditions.

It is necessary also to consider the grounds which have been urged for the proposed amendments to the Constitution. Briefly, it is proposed that the power of the Commonwealth shall extend to all measures which, in the Commonwealth Parliament's opinion, shall tend to achieve economic security and social justice. This includes employment, the provision and manufacture of goods and services, the development of the country, national works and services, etc. What more is left? I agree with the opinion of

the Solicitor General that the proposals cannot be described as anything less than an attempt to destroy the Federal aspect of our Australian Constitution.

The Commonwealth Government admits that it has all the power it needs for the prosecution of the war. The claim is that it needs additional power for post-war reconstruction. It does not make any statement of specific powers which it will need but does not now possess. If we agree to powers which will permit the destruction of our industries and the elimination of our future industrial progress, what are the prospects for the men of Western Australia when they return? Instead of a new deal which is so often spoken of, it would be a raw deal indeed.

Members: Hear, hear!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Long experience has shown us that in the exercise of total Commonwealth powers, any reconstruction for Australia would mean everything for the two States which return 48 members to a House of Representatives of 75, and exploitation for the three States which between them can muster only 16 members. Therein lie the grave disabilities of the smaller States. The proposals submitted are accompanied by no suggestions for more equitable representation in the national Parliament for the smaller States, or any safeguard for their future welfare. The proposals are nebulous, but all-embracing.

If additional powers are required by the Commonwealth for reconstruction, they should be specified. If we are told what those powers are, this State can consider them. If we agree they are necessary, we can refer them to the Commonwealth without a referendum in just the same way as we did in regard to aviation. Failing agreement, the specific subjects could be determined by a referendum. The word "refer" has a particular meaning when used in this way. It means that the State may voluntarily give the Commonwealth power to do those things which it desires to do but which are a responsibility of the State. Thus it was on the question of aviation. Although this State did register a vote against Commonwealth control, the State Parliament eventually referred those powers to the Commonwealth, and they are being exercised by the Commonwealth today. This seems to suggest one

way in which the questions covered by the proposals could be dealt with. Under the National Security Act the Commonwealth has all the power it needs for the duration of the war. Is it not possible for that Act to be continued for two or three years thereafter, during which period the Commonwealth could ascertain the specific powers needed for its reconstruction proposals?

The reconstruction period, I suggest, will not be a short one. It is not going to be a question of a few months; it will be a question of a few years. In view of the fact that we, at the end of this year, will have a much larger percentage of our manpower engaged purely on war work, either in fighting services, making munitions or building military undertakings, we can appreciate the tremendous problems that will face the Commonwealth and each of the States also; but during that period of two or three years, surely it should be possible to devise ways and means whereby these problems could be adequately met with satisfaction and justice to those who have made sacrifices in one form or another during the war. On the expiration of this period the Commonwealth and States could confer, and the proposals could be submitted to the people. These are alternatives which could possibly resolve some, if not all, of our present difficulties.

Then there is the question of a war-time referendum. Can it be said that the present atmosphere is conducive to a clear-thinking and proper decision? Is this an opportune time to divide the people on highly controversial issues? I submit it is not. It is quite conceivable that people in this State and other States would support the proposals of the Commonwealth and afterwards be extremely sorry for their hasty judgment. The more we examine the proposals, the more are the possibilities that present themselves by which some alternative may be adopted to obviate the situation that would be created by the submission of the proposal to a referendum during the war period.

Unificationists see in this their opportunity to exploit the present unsettled conditions and achieve their object, but this would be unification with all its disadvantages and none of its benefits. Co-operation of the State with the Commonwealth has been freely given since the war began and has been unreservedly acknowledged by

successive Prime Ministers. That self-same co-operation should enable us to meet any present difficulties until the time is more opportune for such a revolutionary change. Just how likely dissension is to arise may be seen from the fact that, whereas the people of this State may be two to one in favour of seceding from the Commonwealth, they may be forced by the votes of others to lose their independence altogether.

Those are the considerations with which the State Government faces the forthcoming convention. The Premier and the Leader of the Opposition will leave today to attend that convention. The Premier has already stated that, so far as the Government is concerned, this convention will be approached with an open mind. We hope the same position prevails in Commonwealth circles. If it does, and the Commonwealth is prepared to co-operate and discuss the position from every possible angle, this Government feels that an agreement can be reached. If, however, the matter is going to be approached by the Commonwealth in the same way as was the recent so-called convention on uniform taxation, then I am afraid the forthcoming convention is doomed to failure.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You will find that will happen in this case, too.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: As stated by the Premier, if the Commonwealth insists on the proposals indicated in the Constitution Alterations (War Aims and Reconstruction) Bill as at present drafted, then, for the reasons stated by me, this Government will be unable to support them.

I have probably gone as far as I can at this juncture. I suggest it is highly desirable that we should have unanimity of action by both Houses on this most important matter, and therefore, as another place has already agreed to the amendment I have placed on the notice paper, I trust this House will follow suit. The amendment may not meet with the full approval of some members or go so far as other members desire, but it is an amendment to which all can agree. I hope the House will realise, with the Government, that unanimity is highly desirable. I move an amendment—

That all the words after the initial word "That" be struck out, and the words "in the opinion of this House the present time of war is inopportune for a referendum dealing with an alteration in the Commonwealth Constitution, and this House considers that an endeavour should be

made to reach agreement between the Commonwealth and the States for powers to be referred to the Commonwealth, under paragraph XXXVII of Section 51 of the Commonwealth Constitution, for post-war reconstruction problems. Further, that if, after the holding of the forthcoming convention, amendments to the Constitution are considered necessary, they be limited to specific additional legislative powers required for post-war reconstruction proposals for a limited period of years only," inserted in lieu.

**HON. A. THOMSON** (South-East): I have no objection to the amendment, but I give notice of my intention to move a further amendment. Before moving it, I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the Chief Secretary on the excellent and well-considered statement he has submitted to the House.

Members: Hear, hear!

**Hon. A. THOMSON:** If ever a serious indictment was made against the Commonwealth Government, it has been delivered by that hon. gentleman today. I suggest that the Government would be wise to have the "Hansard" report of the Chief Secretary's speech printed in pamphlet form, so that the people of Western Australia shall have first-hand knowledge of the work the Government has done and its apparent lack of success.

**Hon. J. A. Dimmitt:** It should also be sent to Queensland and South Australia.

**Hon. A. THOMSON:** Yes. I can truthfully say that I have never listened with greater attention to any speech in this Chamber than I did to the speech of the Chief Secretary. We certainly want unanimity if it is possible to achieve it. The motion which I submitted was identical in terms with that moved by the Leader of the Opposition, to which an amendment moved by the Leader of the National Party was defeated only on the casting vote of the Speaker. One member who was unfortunately detained reached the Chamber door just when it was closed, otherwise the motion would have been passed.

I do not propose to discuss the matter further now, as I shall later submit an amendment in terms of that moved by Mr. McDonald which, as I previously said, was lost in another place. The Chief Secretary's statement must carry considerable weight with the people of Western Australia; but as he rightly pointed out, although we may vote against the Commonwealth's proposal by an overwhelming majority, we may find

ourselves in such a position as may make us feel sorry for ourselves. At least there is one word in my motion upon which we are unanimous, and it is the word "That." What we shall subsequently agree upon is something that I hope will receive due consideration by members. The matter is one of vital importance to the State and I am glad action is being taken. It is time we began to educate the public of Western Australia regarding the danger that Dr. Evatt's proposal has for the State.

On motion by Hon. H. Seddon, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 4.19 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Wednesday, 18th November, 1912.*

	PAGE
Paper: State civil requirements, Ministerial statement .....	1402
Questions: Fruit industry, as to apple and pear acquisition scheme .....	1403
Potato industry—(a) as to license fees, (b) as to prices, storage, etc. ....	1403
Pastoral industry, as to Debt Adjustment Committee's operations .....	1404
Bills: Loan, £310,000, 1R. ....	1404
Road Districts Act Amendment (No. 2), 1R. ....	1404
Constitution Acts Amendment, 1R. ....	1404
Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act Amendment, 1R. ....	1404
Criminal Code Act Amendment, 2R., defeated .....	1423
Motions: Alunite deposits, as to Mr. J. Chandler's services .....	1404
Railways, Mr. Watts's inventions, to inquire by Select Committee.....	1410
Army distinctions and control .....	1417
Post-war reconstruction, to inquire by Select Committee .....	1419
Betting, as to closing S.P. premises .....	1422
Grasshopper menace, to inquire by Select Committee .....	1424
Traffic, as to St. George's-terrace bus stand .....	1428

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

## PAPER—STATE CIVIL REQUIREMENTS.

### Ministerial Statement.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** [2.18]: I desire to place some papers on the Table of the House, but before presenting them I wish to make a statement. The papers are those that take the form of a report which I promised members two weeks ago today I would furnish to the House. They deal with many matters that must be treated as extremely confidential. I consulted the