

food. I have heard statements to the effect that dozens of loaves of bread have gone out in the swill, and vegetables as well. One report stated that £10 worth of peas went out and were sold in other places where they should not have been sold.

Mr. Thorn: The military people are very careless with their storage.

Mr. FOX: The farmers will be anxious to deliver the onions as soon as possible, if it is valid for the military authorities to make contracts with the growers. It would be better for the crop to go through the board which would regulate the flow on to the market, and the grower would be obliged to keep the onions in good order and condition, and grade them to the satisfaction of the market inspector. There would then be no waste. If, however, the onions are delivered in the way the military people desire this year there will be considerable waste and shortage of onions for the civil population.

Mr. Thorn: Did not the board waive its control a little while ago?

Mr. FOX: No. It commences to function when the main crop comes in. If the military authorities take 1,100 tons out of the estimated crop of 1,800 tons there will not be a great deal left over for the board to deal with. The crop might not total 1,800 tons but only 1,400 or 1,500 tons. I would like the Minister to look into that aspect and see whether he can do something to conserve the food supplies for the civil population.

There is one other matter on which I would like to say a few words, and that is the position of the market gardeners. They are very much concerned at the present time with their position, which is on all fours with that of the farmers. I have been asked to tell the Minister—in fact I sent him a letter I received from a gardener stating that they cannot do much with voluntary organisation. There has been a lot said in the past about compulsory unionism. The market gardeners now want a little bit of compulsory unionism as well.

Mr. Thorn: Is that Mr. Mountjoy's attitude?

Mr. FOX: No, I do not know him and have not seen him. They want a small levy made on all sales in order to help them organise. It is difficult to do any organising unless the organiser has the co-operation of all the members. A few years ago

these people endeavoured to form an onion board on a compulsory basis. It did not function very well and finally went out of existence, although quite a number of them stood by it. The remainder slid out and sold their onions where they should not have been sold. They complain that at the present time they are having a very rough deal. Some vegetables are over-produced. I do not know of any that are under-produced. We should have a system of planned production. The farmers require some such system also. It would be better if all the wheat farms were run by a commission, such as the Harbour Trust Commission, and the farmers put in as managers.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Nationalisation!

Mr. FOX: The same thing could be done with the market gardeners.

Mr. Seward: Who would be in charge of the rainfall?

Mr. FOX: We should have a planned production. We should know what we want and the amount we have, and each person who grows for sale should have a quota.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 6.25 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 21st November, 1942.

	PAGE
Motions: Traffic, Government petrol buses and stands	1479
Commonwealth and State relationships, as to referendum proposals	1480
Bills: State (Western Australia) Alunite Industry Partnership, 1E.	1480
Local Authorities (Reserve Funds), 3E.	1480
West Australian Meat Export Works, 1E.	1501
Administration Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	1501
Motor Spirit and Substitute Liquid Fuels, referred to Select Committee	1501
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 2E.	1502

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

MOTION—TRAFFIC.

Government Petrol Buses and Stands.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [2.18]: I move—

That the Government is deserving of strong censure for using petrol-driven omnibuses to supplement the transport service to South Perth and Como when the conservation of such fuel is a national necessity and other fuel can be used; and, further, this House ob-

jects to the regulations of the Perth City Council, as to bus stands, having been ignored, and the over-riding of the parliamentary decision in rejecting the State Transport Coordination Act Amendment Bill of 1941.

Members will notice that the motion is couched in very strong terms which, I submit, are necessary to meet the position that arises regarding a Government that has committed so many transgressions against different sections of the community. We know perfectly well that the Government has shirked its responsibility to administer the law and has allowed different sections to operate unhampered, no notice being taken of their actions. That position has been dealt with in the past. When I find, however, that, to suit the convenience of the Canning electorate, the Government has entirely ignored the over-riding decisions of bodies created to protect the interests of the people and to conserve the war effort, I regard it as time to take definite action. No doubt the provision of this particular service will meet the convenience of people residing in the localities affected, but in such matters we have to consider whether the State is financially strong enough to embark on such a new enterprise.

We must consider whether the State is in a position to single out a particular community as requiring facilities to a greater degree than another locality; whether facilities are already available to meet the requirements of the travelling public; and whether the institution of a new service will interfere with the country's war effort. The new bus service from the city to Canning Bridge operates over a distance of six miles and duplicates the service provided by the existing tram service over half that distance. For a further mile and a half from Thelma-street, Como, to Canning Bridge the new bus route is never more than three blocks away from the existing bus service operated by private enterprise. In fact, for one-third of that mile and a half it actually runs along the same route as the existing bus service. The Government buses over the Perth-Canning Bridge route will absorb approximately 33,000 gallons of petrol annually and will use up 78 tyres, to say nothing of the oil and maintenance costs involved. Is this the time for the Government to embark upon such a venture and use up enormous quantities of petrol that are required so urgently for the war effort?

Hon. W. J. Mann: Do the buses use petrol only?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is what the present service will absorb.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Do you know that they are using producer-gas plants as well?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I know what is wrong with the hon. member. The buses will serve the district in which he lives.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You are getting personal from the start! That will not get you anywhere.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The hon. member can have his say later on.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You will not gain anything by being personal.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Has the hon. member finished?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Mr. Baxter has the floor.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Government has a very wise policy aimed at influencing people strongly in favour of installing producer-gas plants on their vehicles instead of consuming fuel that must necessarily be conserved for our war effort. That policy is quite all right when it is applied to others, but when it is a matter affecting the Government and its services, the proposition is quite different. We know that orders were placed in Britain by Melbourne interests for chassis, but the people concerned found they were unable to procure the necessary fuel to put the buses on the road, and they had to dispose of the vehicles. That applies where those concerned cannot procure the necessary fuel, but the Government is in a different position; it has the authority to secure fuel because it administers the Liquid Fuel Control Board. The Government has not hesitated to take advantage of that authority. There is no doubt whatever that people who purchased chassis in England found they could not take delivery of the bodies because they could not get the necessary authority to procure fuel supplies, and therefore their activities had to come to a full stop.

In this connection the Minister for Railways published in the Press a statement lauding the purchasing of those vehicles. Why does not the Government use producer-gas when extending services? To cater for the needs of the people residing in the centre of South Perth, one of the

bus companies applied to the Government for permission, as far back as October of 1938, to deviate its buses along the very roads the Government is now using. The application was refused, despite the unanimous approval of the members of the local road board. When war conditions became serious, the South Perth Road Board ceased pressing for improved transport, well realising that an uninterrupted continuance of existing facilities would be as much as any reasonable person could expect. Other interested parties, however, had a different idea—that the service in question was to be instituted by hook or by crook, notwithstanding the need for conservation of material and manpower. Admittedly, South Perth transport is overloaded during peak hours—as is every other section—but no more so than that of any other district at the present time; in fact, some districts are now in a much worse position.

At the moment the position is this: The tramway buses are largely filled with passengers who were previously carried by the South Perth trams, which are now running nearly empty. Between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. the average frequency of both bus services from Canning Bridge to Perth is 7½ minutes. Let members consider how absurd that is compared with the much less frequent service to the much more thickly-populated areas of Hollywood and Wembley. At the request of the authorities, bus owners are continually, and also quite willingly, overhauling schedules in an endeavour to eliminate other than essential running in order to conserve petrol, tyres, spare parts and oil. On the other hand, the Government is extending facilities. I understand it is now the idea of the Government to extend the bus service from the top of Osborne Hill—which is the old name—to Cottesloe. I should like to be informed whether the rumour in question is founded on fact. Apparently, on the same principle which lays down that the lights from Government vehicles do not attract the enemy, petrol, spare parts, tyres and oil used by the Government are of no moment to our all-in war effort! The most glaring fault of this service is that for 1½ miles from the Canning Bridge terminus it duplicates, and also attacks, the existing service run by private enterprise, as I have already explained. Clearly, this is nothing more than a wasteful and unwarranted attack on private enterprise that pioneered the district.

It may be remembered that in 1924 the Melville and South Perth Road Boards approached the Government with the request that it should run a bus service from Perth to Melville; but the Government would have nothing to do with the proposal. The two boards then combined and called for tenders for the service from private bus owners, and private bus owners have pioneered the district ever since. The extra and wholly unnecessary 1½ miles of route represent an annual aggregate bus mileage of 50,000 miles, requiring 5,000 gallons of petrol and 12 tyres per annum. Another point on which there is room for serious objection is the method and manner in which this new Government bus service has been instituted. Western Australia has a State Transport Co-ordination Board constituted under Act No. 42 of 1933—the State Transport Co-ordination Act. That board is charged with the responsibility of co-ordinating omnibus transport; and, before granting or refusing to grant any license for a bus service, the board is, by Section 23, required to take into consideration the following matters among others:—

(a) The necessity for the service proposed to be provided and the convenience which would be afforded to the public by the provision of such service;

(b) the existing transportation service for the conveyance of passengers upon the routes or within the area proposed to be served in relation to—

(i) its present adequacy and possibilities for improvement to meet all reasonable public demands; and

(ii) the effort upon such existing service of the service proposed to be provided.

It is obvious that the Transport Co-ordination Board would never have approved of the existing route: indeed, one of the prime reasons for the establishment of the board was to eliminate this futile competition between conflicting interests. But it appears that the Transport Board has been entirely ignored, and has not been consulted as to the establishment of this route, just as the Perth City Council was completely ignored in the selection of the route's new and dangerous terminus on the north side of St. George's-terrace. I think every member will agree that the State Transport Co-ordination Board is doing a good job, not only in co-ordinating transport but in many other ways. If, however, we are to have a co-ordinating board, for goodness sake let that board handle and co-ordinate this bus route. It is use-

less to have such a Government board if the manager of the State Tramway Department is to be allowed to flout it. From a reply given by the Minister for Railways to a deputation, I do not think any such power is necessary. The Minister meekly said, "I shall have a talk with Mr. Taylor about this."

Is the Minister for Railways to carry out the Government's policy or is he to allow Mr. Taylor to carry out any policy he pleases? In this connection it may be remembered that in September of last year the Legislative Council defeated a Bill to amend the State Transport Co-ordination Act in such a manner as to exclude Government buses and Government bus routes from the operation of that Act, and also from the control of the Transport Co-ordination Board. The object was to extend power to Mr. Taylor to set up another control, whereas the only means of successful supervision is to have the one controlling body in the State. If the operation of that body was so successful, why introduce any other controlling body? In its eighth report to Parliament, for the year ended the 30th June, 1941, the Transport Board touched upon this question in paragraphs 52 to 56, reading as follows:—

52, With the introduction to service by the Government of motor omnibuses, the question arose as to the effect on their operation of the provisions of the State Transport Co-ordination Act, 1933-40, and the necessity or otherwise for the issue of licenses or permits by the Western Australian Transport Board.

53, There were two aspects to be considered, namely:—

- (a) the use of the omnibuses in conjunction with established tramway or trolley-bus services;
- (b) their use for the conveyance of special parties or other passengers to places situated remote from the area affected by the operation of the tramway system.

54, In regard to the first point, the State Transport Co-ordination Act is somewhat ambiguous in the definition of the term "tramway." Recourse must be had to the provisions of the Government Tramways Act. As the latter provides for the operation of motor omnibuses in conjunction with the tramway system, it has been ruled that the Government motor omnibuses may be included in the term "tramway" and are not therefore, subject to control by the Transport Board.

55, Where the Government operates its omnibuses beyond the effective area of the tramway system, it is the board's opinion that those vehicles are not then operating "in conjunction with the tramway system."

That applies to this present bus route.

If this view is correct—and, in effect, Parliament has recently expressed its agreement by refusing the passage of an amending Bill designed to place the vehicles beyond the board's control—it will be necessary for the Tramway Department to obtain permits before operating.

56, The matter of policy in this regard is one for determination by Parliament, but it is felt that a division of control, while placing the board and the Government in an invidious position should the department conduct trips for which private operators have been refused permits, would not tend towards the effective co-ordination of transport for which the State Transport Co-ordination Act was designed.

The board referred to a determination by Parliament, but there was no such determination. What did the Government think of it? As with other matters of this kind, it was swept aside. The Government was not concerned with what this House thought. When the Bill was before us on the 23rd September last year the Chief Secretary said—

The Government is anxious to give the best possible service to the people in those districts being served by the Government at the present time. The Government has no intention of competing with private enterprise. Apparently quite a number of the members of this Chamber are of the opinion that the word of the Government is not worth very much.

I thought the statement was correct. The Government was not going to interfere with private enterprise! Yet the first thing it did after that was to interfere with private enterprise. However, that is not the ground of my contention. What I object to is the use of public funds to purchase extra buses and the use of petrol, rubber and other things necessary for the war effort. That is the most important point. As I said, that Bill was thrown out. The remarks of the board on this matter put the position in a nutshell. When the Council threw out the amending Bill of last year, it did so with the intention that the Tramway Department would have to obtain a permit from the board before operating buses and in this connection paragraph 55 of the board's report is very pertinent.

The wisdom of paragraph 56 of the report is unarguable, and the sooner Parliament and the Government make it clear to the manager of the Tramway Department that the Transport Co-ordination Board is to be the sole authority for determining bus routes in the metropolitan area, the better it will be for all concerned. Then only can

we look for real co-ordination in transport and the elimination of all wasteful and unnecessary services. I now propose to refer to the committee, representing three sections of the people, that was appointed by the Government to deal with bus stands in St. George's-terrace. It was a committee of the Government's creation, but one of which the Government has taken not the slightest notice in this instance. At the time, its recommendation was accepted; and it has worked satisfactorily ever since. I quote from the report of that committee as follows:—

In consequence of a request from the Transport Board that a committee of three, representative of the Transport Board, the Traffic Department, and the Perth City Council, should give consideration to the whole question of stands and starting and terminal points for omnibuses in the City of Perth we, the members appointed to that committee, desire to state that we have fully considered this matter and beg to submit our report and recommendations hereunder:

At the outset it was unanimously agreed that the convenience of the general travelling public should have preference to that of private car owners in respect to parking facilities in the streets.

During the deliberations of your committee, a deputation was received from representatives of the Omnibus Proprietors' Association, and full consideration was given to various suggestions and requests made by them.

I do not propose to deal with the whole of the committee's report, but only with extracts. The report states—

Buses Operating to and from the East of the City.

Considerable thought has been given to the starting and terminal points of those omnibuses operating between the city and districts east thereof.

Under present conditions it is obvious that many disabilities and much confusion exist and it is agreed that a much better arrangement would be to abolish the existing stand for those buses on the north side of St. George's-terrace between the old post office buildings and Pier-street and provide a stand in lieu thereof on the opposite side of the roadway.

Here passengers coming to the city would alight and the buses would then leave the city via Barrack-street, Riverside-drive, Victoria-avenue and continue eastwards along Adelaide-terrace.

That was the recommendation of the committee set up for that purpose and it has worked very well indeed ever since. Now a state of chaos exists there. I come to another body that had representation on that committee, but was charged with the control of the city area. I refer to the Perth City Council. It is a body that

should not be lightly interfered with by any Government department. The Government should establish a very valid reason for any course of action taken and no such action should be taken until after consideration by that body. In this instance no such consideration was given, apart from the fact that a deputation was received by the Minister. The organisation was simply flouted and the Tramway Department went straight ahead with its project. On the 2nd October, 1942, the Perth City Council decided to enter a strong protest to the Minister against the location of a stand for four omnibuses for the Government South Perth route on the north side of St. George's-terrace, east of Barrack-street, and that a deputation from the council should wait upon the Minister and submit the council's views; further, that the Minister be asked whether or not an over-riding authority had been vested in the management of the Tramway Department over the rights of the City Council. That is exactly what has been done.

The following letter, dated the 22nd October, was sent to the Minister:—

It is noted from the daily Press that the Tramway Department has placed four omnibuses on the South Perth service, commencing on Sunday last, and that the starting point for such buses has been fixed on the northern side of St. George's-terrace, east of Barrack-street in front of the Treasury building.

This council is very much concerned in regard to this action, and at the ordinary meeting held yesterday a strong protest was recorded. I am instructed to point out that under Section 180 (41) of the Municipal Corporations Act the appointing of stands for passenger vehicles, which include any omnibus or tramway car, is a matter for the council. In the opinion of the council the existing stand on the southern side of St. George's-terrace could be extended eastward to accommodate the new service provided by the Government, and it is considered that it would be a retrograde step if the commencing point for certain passenger vehicles were fixed on the northern side of this thoroughfare. This would mean that the Government vehicles would travel in the opposite direction to all the privately-owned services which operate eastwards of the city.

The bus stands in St. George's-terrace were removed from the northern to the southern end of the street in 1937 with the approval of the Traffic Department and the Transport Board. In January last the Transport Board forwarded to the council a letter which had been received from Inspector Campbell of the Traffic Department, in which he stated that the Tramway Department desired to add five buses to the transport service to and from Como and Canning Bridge, which would necessitate allocating extra stands in St. George's-terrace

cast of Barrack-street. Inspector Campbell recommended that all the bus stands at present on the south side of the street be removed to the northern side.

Now we have the Traffic Department reversing the decision arrived at by its own representative and approved of by the Transport Board and the City Council! Does that not look as if it were planned to cover up the removal of the buses to the other side of the street? The running of the commercial buses at present is very convenient to the public. They come up from the east on the south side of the street, take a turn round Barrack-street, without crossing other traffic, and run down Barrack-street into Riverside-drive. There is no interference with traffic going in other directions. But the Tramway Department must have its buses on a different plane! They must come from the opposite direction, namely, just where there is already sufficient congestion on account of the Riverside-drive traffic!

Hon. W. J. Mann: Do not be funny!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Anything detrimental to the hon. member is funny.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. W. J. Mann: I am telling the hon. member—

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I should like to get rid of that parrot-like cry!

The PRESIDENT: Order! I cannot hear what the hon. member is saying. I must ask members to keep order.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Tramway Department is making this arrangement notwithstanding that it is in opposition to existing traffic down Barrack-street and along Riverside-drive. Its buses would have to take a right hand turn across Barrack-street, one of the most congested areas in the city, and where there is already only a limited amount of accommodation available. The letter continues—

The matter was fully considered by the council, but they were unable to agree for the reasons set out hereunder:—

1, Omnibuses entering the city via Riverside-drive would have to cross a tram line adjacent to the foot of Barrack-street, thereby creating a danger point at this intersection.

2, There would be considerable traffic congestion in Barrack-street between the Esplanade and St. George's-terrace, which would result in a wastage of fuel caused by the stopping and starting of the buses, and, in addition, the buses would have to contend with the vehicular and pedestrian traffic cutting across Barrack-street at its junctions with Riverside-drive and the Esplanade.

3, The tram line on the western side of Barrack-street, between St. George's-terrace and the Esplanade, is so close to the kerb that it will not permit with safety the passage of buses between the trams and the kerb in this section.

4, It would be necessary for the buses to make a right hand turn at the corner of Barrack-street and St. George's-terrace, which is considered highly undesirable from a traffic point of view.

5, It is understood that one of the reasons for desiring the change is that the approach on to the Causeway at Riverside-drive is contrary to all traffic laws.

Right through there is trouble with this particular route, that from the Causeway. The letter continues—

From information supplied it appears that during the past four years there has been only one bus collision at this point, in spite of the fact that during that period approximately 150 buses per day proceed eastwards along Riverside-drive to the Causeway.

I now come to another point dealing with poles and other obstructions in the streets. The Tramway Department does not seem to recognise the right of the City Council to control matters of that description whereas, in fact, the city streets are definitely under the control of the council. Without the permission of the City Council, and without the consent of that body ever having been asked, bus-stop posts have been erected on the footpaths in St. George's-terrace and Adelaide-terrace as well as along Riverside-drive. The council strongly objects to that action by the Tramway Department. For many years the City Council has endeavoured to have as many poles and obstructions as possible removed from the streets, and as a result of that campaign a great improvement in the city streets has been achieved. It is to be hoped that all authorities will co-operate with the council in the endeavour to keep the city streets as far as possible free from obstructions.

An inspection of St. George's-terrace and Adelaide-terrace reveals that only in one case was it necessary that a new post should be erected. In all other instances, an adjacent post could have been used. I hope that all unnecessary posts will be removed. The erection of a number of new posts was entirely unnecessary, as was the expense involved. Why erect a number of unsightly posts when bus-stop signs could be erected on posts that are already in place? Some of these Government departments feel it is their duty to go to the

limit. All they had to do was to approach the City Council. They could have come to an arrangement whereby bus-stop signs were placed on the posts that had already been erected by the City Council, without erecting a number of extra unsightly posts, and without incurring the additional expenditure. This is one of the worst cases I have ever known of so many authorities being overlooked. First and most important, Parliament has been ignored. In no unmistakable terms this House rejected the Bill to which I have referred, and declared that the Government must not create any other authority to deal with routes for buses. Within 12 months, however, the Government ignored the very definite stand taken by this House.

Hon. J. Cornell: I did not know that that was the object of the Bill.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Of course it was!

Hon. J. Cornell: The hon. member read that into the measure.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Permission was obtained, under the amendment to the Tramways Act, to run buses in connection with the tramway service. The full effect of that was not known to many of us. The route in question goes outside the tramway service. Furthermore, the effect of that policy was to rob an existing system, which is owned by the public, and which cost a lot of money to lay down and maintain. The Government has established the new system and gone far beyond assisting the tramway service. It is now in opposition to private enterprise, which helped in a large degree to find the taxation necessary to keep our roads in repair. The City Council, as I have said, is in charge of the city streets, and has already provided bus signs on its own posts. The tramway authorities have completely ignored the Transport Board, which indeed was never consulted about the change, and has also gone outside the scope permitted under the Tramways Act.

A special committee was appointed by the Government. It must have been appointed by the Government, because the Transport Board asked that that should be done. The committee was representative of the three important sections concerned, the Transport Board, the Traffic Department and the Perth City Council. It recommended that the buses should be stationed on the south side of the Terrace. That course has proved to be wise, and has

worked smoothly and satisfactorily right through. We now find that that committee has been ignored. The Government has established the buses on the opposite side of the thoroughfare in such a way as to interfere with the existing traffic, and to increase the congestion in that part of the city. I say the Government is deserving of censure. The figures I have given were provided by experts. Whether the total quantity of fuel consumed is 23,000 or 33,000 gallons, it is a large quantity which may be required for the war effort before the struggle has ended. It was wrong at this juncture to establish a line of buses that required liquid fuel. Had it been necessary to establish that line at all it should have been made up of vehicles using producer-gas, which is actually the policy of the Government. If that is the right policy so far as private people are concerned, it is right that it shall be followed by the Government; but when it comes to applying it to the Government, the policy is ignored.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILL—STATE (WESTERN AUSTRALIAN) ALUNITE INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIP.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—LOCAL AUTHORITIES (RESERVE FUNDS).

Read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

MOTION—COMMONWEALTH AND STATE RELATIONSHIPS.

As to Referendum Proposals.

Debate resumed from the 19th November on the following motion by Hon. A. Thomson:—

1, That this House strenuously opposes the alteration of the Federal Constitution as proposed by the Federal 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, camouflaged 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 minds 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.

to which the Chief Secretary had moved an amendment as follows:—

That all the words after the initial word "That" in line 1 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. L. B. BOLTON (Metropolitan) [3.3]: This is a matter in which the people will have to take a hand at an early date, and in the interests of this State, I think it would be wise for the Council to pass a motion which will be of assistance to the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition who are acting on our behalf. I suggest

that the position would be covered more clearly than by the motion or the amendment before the House or the further amendment indicated by Mr. Thomson if it read as follows:—

That this House strenuously opposes the alteration of the Federal Constitution as proposed by the Federal Government and is of opinion that the present time of war is inopportune for a referendum dealing with an alteration of the Commonwealth Constitution, and views with the utmost alarm the proposals contained in the Bill now before the Federal Parliament entitled the Constitution Alteration (War Aims and Reconstruction) Bill.

Any motion passed by this House and any proposals to be placed before the people should be couched in the clearest possible language and without any embellishment. My mind goes back to the year 1900 when, after working strenuously for weeks in opposition to the proposal for federation, I proudly voted against it. Whether I did right or wrong may be questioned by many people, but I have never felt happy under Federation. From the very inception this State received a very raw deal indeed. This may be due to the fact that I am primarily a manufacturer. I say "primarily" because I claim to be interested also in farming and various sidelines. My experience in those directions has often helped me to face a given question from an angle entirely different from that which I might otherwise have adopted. On my 21st birthday I voted against Federation. It was the first time I had ever exercised the vote.

Hon. J. Cornell: How did you get on the roll?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: By being honest and straightforward. I went to the returning officer and explained that I would be 21 years of age before the vote was taken and considered I was entitled to be enrolled. My card was held until the last minute and I was put on the roll. The late Mr. Adams, the then headmaster of the Fremantle Boys' School, was the returning officer. Probably Mr. Miles will remember him. That period then represented one-third of my life; I have added two-thirds to that. I repeat that in the 42 years of Federation I have never been happy under it. I would not go so far as to suggest that we should attempt to amend the present order of things. That would be impossible, and, if possible, would be quite wrong in existing conditions, but I feel it is a pity that after the action taken

by a section of the community a few years ago, something more did not result. By reverting to those days, I may be treading on dangerous ground. I need not mention the word that probably every member has on his lips, but I think we should have got a little further when that issue was before the people.

I am justified in paying a tribute to the far-seeing men who were the leaders of that movement—men who were wise enough to appreciate just what would happen and is happening today. They saw the trend of events from that distance, and what they foretold is coming to pass or will come to pass unless we put up a strenuous fight. Having gone so far, I am justified in saying that the men I refer to are the late Mr. McCallum Smith and Mr. H. K. Watson. They put up a wonderful fight for this State, and, judging by the organising ability displayed by Mr. Watson on that occasion, I think there is no person in the State more fitted to undertake the organising of a campaign against the carrying of the proposed referendum. Seemingly it is almost certain that a referendum will be held. Unfortunately, our delegates will be able to do very little.

Hon. A. Thomson: They may be permitted to make a suggestion.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Yes, but whether it will be carried into effect is another matter. What can be the outcome of a convention such as the one being held at present? The personnel has been nominated by the Commonwealth Government, which is putting up the proposals. In the words of our Premier, what chance is there of doing much when, in the opinion of himself and of most people, the whole matter was cut and dried long before they could arrive in Canberra. Unless this State is alive to the situation, before we know where we are, what few powers remain to the States under the existing Constitution will be wafted away.

I intend to touch principally on the industrial position as it affects this State under the powers taken by the Commonwealth Government. If we consider the industrial position pertaining today under the Court of Arbitration, the unjustified interference with working conditions and wages in this State by the Commonwealth is a much more serious matter than most people realise. This State has not had

the opportunity of industrial development that some of the larger States have had; they have progressed at the expense of the smaller States. This has been made possible by their larger populations and larger outputs. Consequently many of the industrial regulations promulgated by the Commonwealth Government affect this State much more severely than they do the larger manufacturing States. By a mere wave of the magic wand, the Federal authorities, exercising the powers they now have, recently created a Wheat Harvesting Commission, which was empowered to fix wages and working conditions in the farming industry. To say the least of it, those wages and conditions have caused consternation in the industry throughout the length and breadth of the Commonwealth.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And among whom?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Those whom it affects.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You should say that.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: It is a different position when some alteration is made to wages or working conditions in an industry.

Hon. A. Thomson: A manufacturing industry.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Yes. In most of those instances it is possible for the manufacturer to "pass on the buck," as it is termed. Unfortunately, in the farming industry that is entirely out of the question. There is no possible hope, under present conditions, of the "buck being passed on" to the purchaser of the farmer's commodities. For the moment, I shall hold a brief for the farming community.

Hon. A. Thomson: You should, as you are a farmer.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Yes. I feel justified in doing so, because to the best of my ability I have endeavoured in my farming pursuits to cost my farming products in the same way as I cost the products of my factory. I may be perhaps pardoned for saying so, but I have a knowledge not possessed by many farmers of what it costs to grow a bushel of wheat or a bushel of barley or a pound of wool. I have carefully studied over the years that I have been farming the cost of each item, and I say that the position created by the Harvesting Commission—it would probably be wrong for me to express it in the way I would like to do—is altogether ludicrous

To ask farmers to pay, as they are ordered to do by this Commission, £7 18s. 6d. per week to a harvester, header or tractor hand, and at the same time to offer only 11d. per bushel for barley at the port of shipment, is ludicrous. In case somebody reminds me, I notice in today's issue of "The West Australian" that some relief has been afforded in this direction. However, but for that relief granted yesterday, the farmer would have had to pay a harvester, header or tractor hand £7 18s. 6d. per week to harvest his barley or wheat, and the week would consist of 48 hours.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Approximately how many weeks would the worker be engaged?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: By a farmer like myself.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Yes.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Fifty-two weeks a year.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Not harvesting.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: If he is not harvesting, then he is ploughing, seeding or cultivating. He is working the whole year round. There are many farmers employing men in that way. I am only one of them. Mr. Hamersley, who visited the country with me over the week-end, knows there are many farmers employing regular hands.

Hon. C. B. Williams interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must remind the hon. member that Mr. Bolton is addressing the Chair.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I am trying to get some facts from him.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Mr. Bolton will proceed.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I shall mention the barley position, because that is so extraordinary that I deem it wise to bring it to the notice of members. The same working conditions and wages apply to the wheat industry, but even in this industry the farmer is very little better off. I do not particularly hold a brief for the big farmer. I believe in the policy that encourages and assists the small farmer, but I wonder where this and some of the other States of the Commonwealth would be today were it not for some of the big farmers, some of the so-called St. George's-terrace farmers. These farmers have for many years grown a large proportion of our wheat. What is the position today of the big farmer who harvests 30,000 or 40,000

bushels of wheat, as some do? Speaking personally, I often harvest 20,000 to 30,000 bushels. I am to receive, or I hope to receive—nothing is sure in these times; the farming industry has been promised so many wonders—anything from 3s. 10d. to 4s. per bushel for the first 3,000 bushels, and 2s. per bushel for the remainder. I believe it is 1s. 10d. for bulk wheat.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is 3s. 10d. and 1s. 10d.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: A few days ago I was speaking to a farmer who expects to harvest 50,000 bushels of wheat. He has large farming interests in the Wongan Hills and Northam districts. He was fortunate enough to have a family of sons, who assisted to develop his farms, I may add with the help of the farmer's cheque book, which is often very useful in matters of this kind. For the 50,000 bushels to be harvested this year the farmer will be paid 3s. 10d. for the first 3,000 bushels and 1s. 10d. for the remainder. How can that farmer hope to harvest his crop profitably and at the same time pay the wages laid down by the Wheat Harvesting Commission? It would be better for him not to harvest the crop.

It would pay him much better, if it is possible for him to carry sufficient sheep, to utilise the crop for feed. But many of our farmers today have no sheep; they have not the water, nor are their properties fenced. Personally, it does not affect me from that angle. Had not the barley position changed as it has today, then definitely I would not have harvested my barley crop. It would have paid me better to leave it and utilise it for feed. Notwithstanding that the Commonwealth Government has all the powers that it requires at present, it is asking for more. God only knows what may happen to a State like Western Australia if the Commonwealth Government secures those additional powers.

Hon. H. Seddon: Would you give us an idea of what the increased cost would be in your case?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: That is a matter requiring a little thought. I speak now from my knowledge of my own district. The average wage of a harvester hand or a tractor-driver has been £3 to £3 10s. a week and keep, so that one could reckon on the harvesting costs being doubled in consequence of the rates of pay fixed by the Wheat Harvesting Commission.

Hon. T. Moore: How many weeks would a man take to harvest 1,000 bags?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Might I say that the hon. member interjecting knows how long it would take? He also knows that it depends on many circumstances.

Hon. T. Moore: Give us a general estimate.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Supposing the weather is against the farmer, he may, as Mr. Moore knows, not put his harvester into the crop for a fortnight.

Hon. T. Moore: Take a general average.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: A month, with a tractor and header.

Hon. T. Moore: So your wages are fixed for a month.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: That is ridiculous. Replying to an earlier interjection by Mr. Williams, I pointed out that it is nonsense to assert that a harvester hand would be engaged for only one month, or that workers would be employed for only two or three months of the year. Work has to be found for them for the whole year and is often so found by most of the big farmers.

Hon. T. Moore: You are missing the point.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Pardon my contradicting the hon. member, but all the hands on a farm are affected—stack-builders, harvester hands, tractor-drivers; in fact, every person working on a farm. The lowest rate per hour provided in the Commission's award is 2s. 3d.

Hon. T. Moore: For a month.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Nothing of the sort, at least, not in my opinion. Turning now to secondary industries, I would remind members of this State's unfortunate experience regarding development or assistance by the Commonwealth Government, other than assistance rendered to State trading concerns. In my opinion, it is quite certain that the powers-that-be in Canberra have no idea of the requirements of this State as a whole. Another matter against which we Western Australians must be guarded is the manner in which the questions will be set out in the referendum paper. I think that we, representing the people of the State, should pledge ourselves to do everything in our power to place the issue clearly before the electors, so that in the event of the referendum being held the people will thoroughly

understand what they will give away if they support the Commonwealth Government in its requests. For the life of me, I cannot see that any additional powers are required by the Commonwealth Government. So far as I can gather, the Commonwealth Government, if it feels it wants some power, simply takes it. If there is any alteration or anything at all detrimental to this or the other States that the Commonwealth Government imagines it wants, it immediately issues a National Security Regulation to obtain it. What is going to be the position in the business world very soon? What do we find?

Daily some business or other is being, if not pushed right out of existence, at least greatly reduced. Many such firms gave an undertaking to reinstate men who are at present serving their country on their return to freedom. Many of these men are back today, but in some instances—I could quote specific instances—it is utterly impossible for the firm to re-employ those men. At the time it seemed quite fair and reasonable to promise them reinstatement; but today, owing to interference by the Minister for War Organisation of Industry, firms are quite unable to reinstate their former workers. That position is brought about by the Commonwealth Government itself. Why additional powers should be given to it is quite beyond me. I shall oppose them as vigorously as possible. It all boils down to unification and the nationalisation of all industries. In my opinion that is what is behind the whole movement. It appears to me that the Commonwealth Government is using its powers to harass in every direction the large industries throughout Australia. That unfortunately does not apply only to this State. Sooner or later—and I am not the only one to hold this view—I feel that we will wake up one morning to find that a National Security Regulation has been promulgated wiping out all State Parliaments, not only the Legislative Councils.

Hon. J. Cornell: That will come before the Commonwealth Military Forces are made a part of the A.I.F.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: That may be, but in my opinion that is what will happen. This State must be wary and do its utmost to defeat the proposals which will be placed before the people. I have nothing further to add, other than to say that while I do not suggest any alteration to the motion, I feel

that had it been couched in the words I have mentioned, it would have covered the whole matter. I intend to use every power I possess to oppose the Commonwealth Government's request.

HON. J. A. DIMMITT (Metropolitan-Suburban): The more one examines the Commonwealth Government's Bill against which we are protesting today, the more one realises that it is loaded with dynamite. If it becomes an Act, I am perfectly certain the Attorney General will touch off the fuse and blow wide open the whole of our Commonwealth Constitution and thus destroy the federal character of our charter. When one commences to read Subsection (2) of proposed new Section 60A of the Federal Bill, one sees that if it becomes an Act the Commonwealth Parliament, sitting in Canberra, will have power to do anything it wishes. The proposed Subsection (1) states that the Bill is for the purpose of giving Parliament full power to make laws to carry into effect the war aims and objects of Australia. Without limiting the generality of that provision, the Bill goes on to declare that—

the power of the Parliament shall extend to all measures which, in the declared opinion of the Parliament, will tend to achieve economic security and social justice

That simply means that so long as the Commonwealth Parliament makes, as a preamble to any of its Bills, the statement that it is the declared opinion of the Parliament that the enactment will, in effect, achieve economic security and social justice, then anything can be passed. The High Court will have no jurisdiction because any appeal would come back to this all-embracing section. The Bill goes on to give 14 examples of the aims and objects that the reconstruction proposal seeks to cover. It is all political window-dressing and balderdash! It is simply to hide the real facts contained in Subsection (2) of the proposed new Section 60A. What is worrying me is this: What will be the attitude of our Premier in Melbourne today and tomorrow? In his speech in another place he clearly indicated his opposition to this constitutional amendment. The Chief Secretary, in an extremely statesmanlike speech in this House last Thursday, indicated his position. I take it that those two speeches represent the opinion of the State Government. Now we read that at a Federal Conference of the

Australian Labour Party, held in the Eastern States, a motion was passed to the effect that the A.L.P. would support the amendment proposed in this Bill. We find, at our own A.L.P. meeting held in Perth, that a similar resolution has been passed and that the Labour Party supports the amendment.

Hon. J. Cornell: They included some reservation.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: Yes, but I understand the party took the Premier to task for his attitude as indicated in his speech. In view of that, which of the two masters is he going to serve? That is the question I ask myself, and that is why this House needs to be emphatic in its attitude, so as to spur the Premier on to carry out the mandate given him by the Legislative Assembly and one which I hope this House will also give. Reverting to the passing of the resolution at the A.L.P. conference in Melbourne, it is interesting to note that it was passed by 18 votes to 16. If the whole of the party supports the movement, it is representing a very slender majority. It has been stated in the Press—and I understand this is Dr. Evatt's suggestion—that if the States will not agree to the constitutional amendment as proposed in his Bill, he would like, and ask the States to make, concrete proposals.

I hope the Premier will not make concrete proposals of a character that may not suit this Parliament. I trust that any proposals to be made by our representatives at the conference to be held at Melbourne will be subject to parliamentary confirmation, and that the matter will be referred back to us for consideration. What I object to is the Goebells-like attitude of the Federal Attorney General. On the last two Sundays news flashed over and over again over the national broadcasting stations that Dr. Evatt would be speaking at such and such a time. At the appointed time Dr. Evatt poured his poisonous propaganda over the air. At present it is one-way traffic. The people who are opposed to it are not given the privilege of using the national stations. The framers of the Bill are allowed that liberty, and the people are paying for it.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And they talk about the liberty of speech!

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: There is no liberty of speech for the hon. member.

Several members interjected.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: If he or I wish to speak to the public, we must talk over a "B" class station. It simply means that the Federal Attorney General is building up his propaganda along the lines of Hitler in "Mein Kampf." The principle laid down there is that provided one tells one's lie over and over again, the people will take it as a statement of fact. We, in Western Australia, must set out to educate the public mind and build up our own propaganda if we wish to preserve this State. We must pass this motion and develop public opinion.

Hon. L. Craig: At whose expense?

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: At our own. Certainly public opinion will have to be developed in no uncertain manner so that this State may remain a self-governing entity. I hope that if and when this referendum is held, sufficient public opinion will have been developed in our State effectively to defeat the measure. If every member of this House will support the motion, either in its present or in an amended form, we will assist greatly in that direction. I am prepared to support it entirely.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West): I would not like this motion to be disposed of without adding my meed of condemnation to the attitude adopted by the Commonwealth Government regarding its attempt to secure additional powers. I agree thoroughly with the object of the proposal contained in the motion and the amendments. They have the same goal, but I am not sure that they could not be re-framed and made more effective and vigorous. Mr. Bolton, when speaking just now, outlined a motion that appeals to me. Whatever protest we make we want to make it unmistakably clear. We do not want to leave any opportunity for anything contained in the motion to be misconstrued. We all agreed that Mr. Thomson's motion has been put forward with the best possible motives, but it is open to some misconception. The Chief Secretary's amendment is not altogether acceptable to me because it postulates that the Commonwealth Government may be right and we may be wrong.

I am unable to see how a matter of this sort can be satisfactorily dealt with under paragraph XXXVII of Section 51 of the Commonwealth Constitution. The position

would be met by an emphatic protest against the holding of a referendum at the present time on the ground that the Commonwealth Government had completely failed to demonstrate the necessity for additional legislation on the lines proposed. Reference has been made to the lengthy explanations regarding the measure made by the Federal Attorney General, Dr. Evatt. If ever there was a cleverly-designed statement and one delightfully worded and carefully studied, promising all sorts of Utopian things, that was it. If the position were not so serious I could congratulate Dr. Evatt on his speech as reported in "The West Australian" of yesterday's date. I have read many political speeches in the course of numerous campaigns. Many had to be read in connection with the 15 or so referendums that have been conducted since the inauguration of Federation. I cannot recall to mind one that was more subtle or more cleverly designed to hoodwink the people than the speech delivered by Dr. Evatt. He spoke of the need for the attainment of economic security and social justice in the post-war world and for the necessity for the fullest collaboration between the Commonwealth and the States.

I emphasise those words "economic security and social justice," because the phrase is just about as wide and dangerous as could be any other four or five words in the English language when applied to such a position. What does that phrase mean? It means everything—and yet means nothing at all. The words are purely and simply handed out in order that the people of Australia may be impressed with a flowery utterance, and lulled into the belief that they mean something that gives promise of a great deal. Before the people of Australia agree to giving the Commonwealth Government further powers, they have every right to demand the fuller utilisation of the powers already possessed by that Government. If Australia is to become the paradise that Dr. Evatt pictures, then the Commonwealth Government must see to it that it will, in actual fact, rule Australia and not allow itself to be directed by people outside the Commonwealth Parliament, by people who are at present the Government's real bosses.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. G. W. Miles: And not by Beaufort-street, either.

Hon. W. J. MANN: We should not have the humiliating spectacle of which we read last week when the Prime Minister, fully, I believe, conscious of the necessity for the action he was taking, went to the Labour Conference and begged that body to adopt a course that all true Australians regard as absolutely essential, if we are to attain a maximum war effort.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Even so, he only went half way. He only referred to sending troops around Australia instead of as far away as may be necessary.

Hon. W. J. MANN: He attended the conference as a delegate from this State, and asked that the two branches of our Fighting Forces be enabled to function as a single body. I do not wish to discuss that phase, for most of us are prepared to agree that that is what should be. What causes me anxiety and some soreness of mind is that the Prime Minister should, if we accept a paragraph that appears in this morning's newspaper as correct, in respect of a course of action said to be supported by 19 and opposed by three of his Cabinet colleagues, be forced to leave that Labour Conference with a rebuff such as was meted out to him. That is what I mean by saying that we should expect the Commonwealth Government to rule and not permit outside influences to take a hand in matters of such tremendous moment to the nation. If the people of Australia are ready to endorse action such as we have noted during the last few days, then they deserve all that is in store for them.

I hear some people say, "It is all right to give the Commonwealth the power sought; it will do away with State Parliaments." I suppose it would be possible to reach the stage at which that step would not be regarded as the worst in the world, but I think the suggestion to do away with State Parliaments is engendered by a feeling in the minds of some people that State Parliaments constitute an effective brake on some of their aspirations. It seems to me to indicate fear or guilt on the part of those people whose object is to do away with all sources of restraint wherever they may be found. Unfortunately the Commonwealth Government is, I believe, dominated by the people of one particular State. I have long forsaken any idea of being at all tender about making statements that could be described as anti-federal. The federal spirit in Australia at present, if not dead,

is in a comatose condition. I am right when I say that the consensus of opinion behind the present-day movement emanates from New South Wales, a State that has in the House of Representatives 26 members, equalling exactly the total number of representatives for the smaller States of Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia.

For a long time I have felt that the policy of the present Commonwealth Government has been dictated from New South Wales and that the Prime Minister himself has been forced, by pressure brought to bear upon him from representative bodies in that State, to do things that he would have much preferred to have left undone. If that is the position, I can only say that if the Federal legislation is passed and the referendum is held, we shall find soon ourselves in the position of being very humble suppliants to the Commonwealth Government. At present we represent the poor relation of the rest of the Commonwealth, but if the proposed legislation is passed we shall be the indigent and not particularly wanted relation of the rest of the Commonwealth. That will not be to the advantage of Western Australia.

The truth is that the people behind this movement know that in an ordinary normal period a proposition such as that advanced by the Commonwealth would have no chance of being accepted by the people. Hence they are taking advantage of the war situation to present a picture that will work on the minds of the populace to such an extent as to induce them to accept the Commonwealth Government's proposals as indicative of a new world, the accomplishment of which is not to be long delayed. As I say, I believe the bulk of the pressure behind the movement comes from New South Wales.

Hon. H. Seddon: New South Wales has 28 members in the House of Representatives.

Hon. W. J. MANN: That is true, and that makes the position better from my standpoint. I remember that originally there were 26 members, but now there are 28 representing that State. As a sidelight to indicate that the people of New South Wales are very prone to regard themselves as constituting the whole of the Commonwealth, I shall quote from a publication issued recently under the title of "You, Me and

This War." If members have read the book, they will appreciate my comments. It was compiled by a special research staff of the Sydney "Daily Telegraph." As one goes through the pages one notes that the "Daily Telegraph" lets it be assumed that it speaks for the people of Australia, yet towards the end of the publication the writers give the show away rather badly. They adopted a questionnaire with a view to getting the opinion of the public of Australia. The writers said—

As part of our attempt to estimate Australia's war effort we took a survey of public opinion. We asked 1,500 people in New South Wales, town and country, men and women of all income groups, the following questions, with the following results:—

Then are published several graphs indicating the replies to the various questions. The point I want to make is that according to the writers of this book 1,500 people of New South Wales are to be regarded as the people of Australia, and their opinion is indicated as a representative of that of the Australian people as a whole. I shall quote one or two of the questions put to them. The first was:

Are you satisfied that Australia is doing everything possible to help win the war?

The voting was 50 per cent. "yes," 44 per cent. "no," and six did not express an opinion one way or another. That was the voting in the State where, I think I would be perfectly safe in saying, 80 per cent. of the strikes since the inception of the war took place. It is said by half of those who were questioned that they are doing everything possible to win the war. That statement, however, is open to doubt. The next question is interesting—

If you are not satisfied that everything is being done to win the war, do you blame the politicians, the trade unions, big business, public apathy, or any other factor?

And here is the response—

54 per cent. of the people blame the politicians.

I hope members will hold that percentage in their minds for a little while.

33 per cent. blame red tape.

29 per cent. blame big business.

23 per cent. blame public apathy.

18 per cent. blame trade unions.

14 per cent. blame the Government.

6 per cent. blame other factors.

Do members see anything humorous about those percentages? I do. While 54 per cent. blame the politicians, only 14 per cent.

blame the Government. Are not the members of the Government politicians? Where does one get to with such replies? In New South Wales only 14 per cent. of the people blamed the Commonwealth Government, while 54 per cent. blamed the politicians. Members may work out the problem for themselves. The third question is—

Do you do any war work now?

The replies were—

74 per cent., "Yes—doing all I can."

24 per cent., "No—could do more."

And apparently two per cent. of the people did not know anything at all about it. The next ensuing question does not affect the present subject. It asks whether the Government should increase taxation to help pay for the war. Good old New South Wales will not have any of that. New South Wales likes the other States, including Western Australia, to pay the taxes. Accordingly 57 per cent. of New South Welsh men reply, "No"; 36 per cent. reply, "Yes" and 6 per cent. answered nothing. The only other question which I may mention incidentally is—

Do you think that a Federal general election is necessary now?

We ought to have had that question asked a week or two ago.

Hon. H. Seddon: It was asked 12 months ago.

Hon. W. J. MANN: At the beginning of this year. The replies showed 57 per cent. held that such an election was not necessary. I have no wish to weary the House with any further reference to the Bill, or in any other way; but I support the suggestion by Mr. Dimmitt that the Commonwealth Government is making undue use of the national radio. In my opinion, that is quite unbecoming and utterly unfair. It is, however, in keeping with the statement and tactics that are being used. I consider that the many other objections which can be voiced against the Bill we shall have to keep until we get out among our electors, as I hope we shall, and do our level best towards obtaining from our people a resounding negative to this iniquitous proposal.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central): One of the freedoms which the Allies are hoping to obtain as the result of the war is freedom from fear. I consider that no unbiased person listening to the Federal Attorney

General on the air the other evening could come to any other conclusion than that he was engaged in something which would result in a fear-complex among all those who heard him. Those of us who have our boys or girls engaged in the terrific struggle, whether they are brothers or sisters or husbands or sons, entertain a fear that has permeated almost the whole of the Australian people as to what is going to happen to our defenders after the war. I shall not accuse the Federal Attorney General of any unworthy motive; I give him, as a man who has occupied a seat on the High Court bench, every credit for good intentions. He must honestly believe that the powers which he asks the Australian people to grant to the Government of which he is a prominent member are necessary; but I fail to see that he is justified in endeavouring to spread amongst the Australian people one of those emotions for release from which we are fighting; and that is the feeling of fear.

Speaking from memory, I think I can say with accuracy that Dr. Evatt declared that unless the Commonwealth Government is given the powers now sought for, economic disaster will face the Australians who are away fighting for us. I consider that an altogether unjustifiable statement to be made by an hon. gentleman who should know better. Like other members, I have received a small pamphlet directly from Dr. Evatt. In it he gives as a reason why other referendums have been defeated, that they were not specific enough. Though it may seem somewhat of an impertinence for me to criticise a man of Dr. Evatt's intellectual ability, I must say that, in my opinion, nothing could be less specific or more general than the Bill proposed to be submitted to the electors of Australia. The measure is anything but specific; and, if Dr. Evatt is a good judge, only one end awaits his Bill. If the Australian people have turned down past referendums because they were not specific enough, then they have an excellent reason for turning down this one.

There was another thing I was surprised to hear the Federal Attorney General mention. He informed the Australian people that neither in the Commonwealth Constitution nor in any State Constitution was there provision for any degree of freedom of religion. It is extraordinary that any man of Dr. Evatt's standing should tell the Australian people such a tale as that. We all

know that we have had freedom of religion for many years. We also know that we shall always have it. Freedom of speech and expression, freedom of work, freedom from want and freedom from fear! Those are the freedoms the Allies desire to ensure. Yet the Attorney General of the Commonwealth fosters among the Australian people the idea that the Commonwealth Government must possess certain additional powers in order that they may continue to enjoy a freedom which they have possessed since the signing of Magna Charta. While giving the hon. gentleman credit for good intentions, I have not the least doubt that he is seriously misguided.

It is not for me to give other members a lead as to what they shall say when they go into the country, but I consider that we shall do no good by running other people down. Let us give Dr. Evatt and those associated with him credit for good intentions. Nevertheless there comes to my mind the old saying that the way to hell is paved with good intentions. Dr. Evatt, in my opinion, has been so long removed from the hurly-burly of everyday life that he is unable to comprehend that struggle. He is convinced that the Commonwealth Government should have these powers. Like other members I say, "God help this State of ours if we are tied down to a central form of government!" I do not wish to be misunderstood. I agree that there are many functions which it is the Commonwealth Government's duty to undertake. But to come out with vague statements such as the Federal Bill contains is asking us to sign a blank cheque.

If there is one factor from which this State has suffered grievously it is the tariff, which has handicapped our primary producers ever since the disappearance of what was known as the sliding scale. Dr. Evatt, among others, has been responsible for imposing that incubus upon Western Australia. I shall not ask the House to listen to me any longer. This question, unfortunately, will be decided at the present convention. Then it will be our duty to do our best for our people. Let us not impute any motives. Let us simply say that the ideas expressed in the Federal Bill have come from somebody who is an academic thinker, and that an endeavour to put his ideas into practice will bring chaos to this Commonwealth of Australia.

HON. G. W. MILES (North): I am entirely opposed to the taking of the proposed referendum, especially at this stage of the Empire's struggle. If a referendum of the kind is ever taken, certain powers should be specified for exercise by the provincial councils which must be created if we are to have unification. I agree with all other speakers on the motion that the proposal put up amounts to political propaganda. I also agree that this propaganda is being broadcast through the national stations at the expense of the country. I hold that the entire people of Australia should turn the proposal down with a thud. Dr. Evatt talks about freedom of the Press and freedom of speech. Who is opposed to freedom of speech and freedom of the Press today except the Commonwealth Government? The people are compelled to listen to this propaganda at the expense of the Australian taxpayer. People opposed to the Commonwealth Government's proposals cannot use the national stations for that purpose. The situation is the most hypocritical that has ever arisen in Australia. Opponents of the Commonwealth Government's proposal must use a private station.

Hon. A. Thomson: At their own expense.

Hon. G. W. MILES: They must use a private station on a week-night for the purpose of addressing the Australian people. I do not want to delay the House, but merely to make my position clear. In reply to an interjection, I said I was in favour of unification, but I do not favour this kind of unification, which it is sought to bring about under the pretext of war and reconstruction after the war. If we are going to have unification, let it be brought about by a convention; let certain powers be set out, and the rights of provincial councils throughout Australia be defined, and the whole matter put to the people on plain lines that they will be able to understand. I am opposed to the scheme submitted by Dr. Evatt, and to anything that may take place at the conference being held in Canberra today. My opinion is that Dr. Evatt does not want this Bill agreed to in its entirety, but is prepared to take something less. This is just political propaganda, and should be firmly squelched.

Amendment (to strike out words) put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the words proposed to be inserted be inserted.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East): I propose to move to amend the amendment along lines that members will see indicated on the notice paper. The reason why I did not oppose the Chief Secretary's amendment was that I wanted to see if we could get unanimity.

The PRESIDENT: I think we had first better decide whether the words proposed to be inserted by the Chief Secretary are to be inserted. If the words be struck out, Mr. Thomson can then move to insert the words he desires to be included.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do I understand that the question before us is that the words proposed by the Chief Secretary be agreed to?

The PRESIDENT: The amendment is that the words proposed by the Chief Secretary be inserted. If they are inserted, that will settle the point. If they are not inserted, Mr. Thomson has other words that he will move to have inserted in lieu.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The point is that if Mr. Thomson does not explain—

The PRESIDENT: I do not propose to prevent Mr. Thomson from explaining the words he proposes to insert.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Before we vote?

The PRESIDENT: That is so. Mr. Thomson may proceed.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I hope the House will agree to the amendment as it appears on the notice paper. It is not my own, but was submitted in another place by Mr. McDonald, the Leader of the National Party. I understand that a certain number of amendments were moved to the motion submitted by Mr. Watts, the Leader of the Opposition, and, with a view to overcoming the difficulty, Mr. McDonald moved his amendment. That amendment was defeated only on the casting vote of the Speaker. If Mr. Sampson had been able to get into the Chamber, it would have been carried. It is our considered opinion that Mr. McDonald's amendment would strengthen the hands of the Premier and Mr. Watts at the convention in the Eastern States. I do not like that portion of the Chief Secretary's amendment which suggests that an endeavour should be made to reach an agreement between the Commonwealth and the States for powers to be referred to the Common-

wealth under paragraph XXXVII of Section 51 of the Commonwealth Constitution for post-war reconstruction problems, because I believe, with other speakers, that the Federal Attorney General, Dr. Evatt, is exploiting the position to the utmost, not only over the air, but through the columns of the Press, and it seems to me that a common understanding could not be arrived at. Dr. Evatt has been supported in his outlook by a Labour conference which met in the Eastern States last week, and it appears impossible for an agreement to be reached.

The amendment which Mr. McDonald submitted, and which I now submit, expresses a definite objection to the proposed referendum. I do not desire to delay the House. I think members have reached a decision as to which amendment they approve. The one I submit had the considered opinion of another place, and there was a fifty-fifty vote. I feel that if we can show that a majority in this House is in accord with Mr. McDonald's views, as expressed in another place, the hands of the Premier and Mr. Watts will be considerably strengthened. We hear a great deal about an all-in effort to win the war. May I point out what has happened in Western Australia? The Prime Minister and Senator Fraser, the Minister for External Territories, visited Western Australia on various occasions. We saw from a report in the daily Press that they conferred in this House with members of the Labour Party and gave them certain information. I think that shows the danger of the people voting in favour of the proposed referendum. It would have been a matter of courtesy, which members of Parliament would have appreciated, if those gentlemen had conveyed to us all the information they gave to their colleagues in the party room of this House. I do not take any objection to their doing what they were entitled to do, but it would have strengthened the belief in an all-in war effort if they had taken us into their confidence. I shall now move my amendment on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member can move his amendment later on. The question is that the words proposed by the Chief Secretary be inserted in lieu of those struck out.

The Chief Secretary: Is that the question, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT: Yes. The Minister's amendment comes first. Later on, if it is not agreed to insert these words, Mr. Thomson's amendment may be moved.

Hon. J. Cornell: I think you are a bit mixed, Sir. I take it that we proceed with this question as we do in Committee and that the question now before the Chair is that the words proposed by the Chief Secretary be inserted in lieu of the words struck out. Mr. Thomson wishes to move an amendment on the amendment that certain words be struck out with a view to inserting other words. If the Chief Secretary's amendment is passed, Mr. Thomson will have to re-cast the whole of his amendment.

The PRESIDENT: That is so. Mr. Thomson will move his amendment.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I move—

That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after "House" in line 4 and inserting the following words in lieu:—"views with the utmost alarm the proposals contained in the Bill now before the Federal Parliament entitled 'Constitution Alteration (War Aims and Reconstruction) Bill.' That this Parliament of the people of Western Australia considers that such proposals constitute a direct betrayal of and contradiction of the basic principles and conditions on which the then wholly independent and self-governing people of Western Australia agreed in the year 1900 to become associated in a Federal partnership with the other peoples of Australia. That in the opinion of this Parliament of the people of Western Australia the reasons put forward in support of these proposals are unfounded and without substance, inasmuch as no reasonable anticipation exists that the Government of this State will not at all times fully accord to the Federal authority any co-operation and aid asked of it in the carrying-out of post-war rehabilitation, and in particular, in making adequate peace-time provision for all now engaged in the war effort, and especially for those engaged in the Fighting Forces and their dependants."

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not propose to enter into a long discussion of the relative merits of my amendment and that moved by Mr. Thomson. My amendment was moved with the object of obtaining unanimity if possible, between the two Houses. In view of the fact that the Legislative Assembly has already passed a resolution in the form in which I am moving, I think we would be making a mistake if we departed materially from its terms. We should arrive at a decision this afternoon. The convention called by the Commonwealth Government commenced its sittings this afternoon, and if the motion to be carried

by this House is to be of any value, it should reach our representatives as early as possible and certainly before the convention has proceeded very far with its deliberations. While we might be prepared to agree that Mr. Thomson's amendment is more comprehensive than mine, I can claim that both amendments are protests against what is being suggested by the Commonwealth Government. I hope my amendment will be accepted because it will indicate that both Houses are united regarding the necessity for protesting against the Commonwealth's proposals as we know them at present.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East): I hope the House will not accept the Chief Secretary's amendment. It states that this House considers that an endeavour should be made to reach agreement between the Commonwealth and the States. Is it a time to talk in mild terms after the attitude already assumed by the Commonwealth? What is its attitude? It is one of no consideration to the States. Did the Commonwealth authorities ask the States to confer? Not at all. They have come straight out and demanded certain rights. The people of Australia as a whole do not understand the extent of the powers being sought by the Commonwealth. I am satisfied that the Commonwealth has enough power to do whatever is necessary; yet the Chief Secretary's amendment meekly and mildly proposes that the States confer with the Commonwealth! How far would they get at such a conference?

Look at the convention taking place at present! It is loaded with a majority against anybody who is desirous of maintaining State rights. We want to pass a motion that is very definite in its terms. I would much rather see the House adopt Mr. Thomson's original motion. Evidently we have to reach some agreement this afternoon, and in my opinion the motion originally moved by Mr. Thomson would be preferable. The Chief Secretary's amendment goes on to say that if amendments to the Constitution are considered necessary, they should be limited to specific additional legislative powers required for post-war reconstruction proposals for a limited period of years only.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is absurd; it could not be done.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is something that could not be brought about. I hope the House will make the motion worth while so that it will give a lead to people who know nothing about the matter. This milk-and-water proposal by the Chief Secretary would be useless. I understand it was only by accident that there was not a majority of one in another place in favour of Mr. Thomson's amendment.

HON. J. CORNELL (South): I refrained from speaking on the main question because it would have been more or less beating the air. The time for us to pull up our socks will be when the people handling the question—the only ones who can handle it for the time being—have decided whether they will proceed to take a referendum. That is the time when we should loose our guns. Now, however, we are asked by the Chief Secretary to concur in the resolution passed by another place and by our concurrence fortify the Premier and Leader of the Opposition, as our delegates to the convention, with the united view of both Houses. To defeat the Chief Secretary's amendment and substitute Mr. Thomson's amendment would amount to a policy of negation, because the Council would be expressing the opinion that the protest should be so shaped as to conform with the protest submitted in another place and lost. Therefore, it could be nothing but a policy of negation. We have to consider also that Houses such as the Legislative Council have been ignored and have no representation whatever at the convention.

Hon Sir Hal Colebatch: All the more reason why we should make our protest strong.

Hon. J. CORNELL: All the less reason.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: We should not accept the position of being ignored.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I say there is all the less reason because we would be likely to create a rift. A convention has been called of Premiers and Leaders of the Opposition from the six States, all being members of the Lower Houses. The Federal representatives are in the relationship of eight members of the House of Representatives and four of the Senate, and the Government and Opposition are equally represented. The Opposition is represented by four ex-Prime Ministers. If we adopted Mr. Thomson's amendment, what would be

the position of the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition? They would have to ignore our resolution.

Hon. A. Thomson: I do not think Mr. Watts would.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I think he would have sense enough to do so. However we may feel on the subject generally, we have to take the long view. Rather than see this House turn upside down and reject what another place has agreed to, I say we must be reasonable; we must take a reasonable view.

Hon. A. Thomson: Do you suggest that the referendum should not be held?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I suggest there are only two sides to this question. One is whether it is necessary, in the opinion of the Federal authorities, that the Constitution be amended.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Have we no say in that?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Of course we have. We have the same say as has any other citizen in Australia.

Hon. A. Thomson: And we are handicapped from the start.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We may protest as a State Parliament, but we cannot prevent the Commonwealth Parliament from taking the course it proposes to pursue. If the Commonwealth Government intends to hold a referendum, it has to run the gauntlet of both Houses of Parliament.

Hon. A. Thomson: We have a right to protest.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Of course we have. I can write to Mr. Curtin and protest, but the protest of both Houses of Parliament amounts to nothing. Our opportunity would come when the Commonwealth Government endeavoured to implement the constitutional amendments. We could then assert ourselves as citizens. The other alternative is that there is no necessity to amend the Constitution to deal with post-war reconstruction. I certainly agree that we should tell the Premier, or rather ask another place, to adopt that line of reasoning. I, for one, cannot accept the last paragraph of the Chief Secretary's amendment.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. CORNELL: Particularly the words inserted by the Deputy Leader of the Country Party. I will take one case. The Returned Soldiers' League of this State at two conferences definitely resolved that any

future land settlement scheme for soldiers should be entirely a Commonwealth matter.

Hon. A. Thomson: Did those conferences say they should ignore the State?

Hon. J. CORNELL: There are 35 ex-soldiers in both Houses of the Commonwealth Parliament who function as a committee to deal with questions likely to arise as to the rehabilitation of returned soldiers. Those members, too, have unanimously resolved that any future land settlement for soldiers should be wholly and solely a Commonwealth responsibility.

Hon. A. Thomson: Do you mean as to finance?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The whole thing. Now, that decision was not made for a period of years, but for all time. The House, I suggest, should get behind the fact that the referendum is not necessary, and should say that the present time is inopportune to hold it. That is the suggestion I make. We should fall into line with what was agreed by another place. I would suggest that the Chief Secretary's amendment be altered somewhat as follows:—

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 if the Constitution Amendment Conference agrees that additional legislative powers are essential for post-war reconstruction purposes, this House considers that an endeavour should be made to reach an agreement thereon between the Commonwealth and the States that powers be referred to the Commonwealth under Section 51 of the Commonwealth Constitution for post-war reconstruction purposes.

That does not commit us, as the final paragraph of the amendment does. I point out that the Commonwealth Government cannot be deflected from the course it has chosen to take. The alternative is an agreement with the States. Something must be done to strengthen the hands of the Premier.

Hon. A. Thomson: The convention has already decided what it is going to do.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It has decided nothing of the sort.

Hon. A. Thomson: All right.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Even if it has decided what it will do, we ought to be able to get unanimity between our two Houses of Parliament.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Would it meet your purpose if the last paragraph of the Chief Secretary's amendment were struck out?

Hon. J. CORNELL: No, because I think it is essential that part of it should be embodied in this reference. Whatever may be agreed upon, I still think that the matter is one for settlement by negotiation and not by agreement. I counsel the House not to send back to another place something that it has already rejected, for that would get us nowhere. No one is more anxious than I am that the Premier and his colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, should have something that is the voice of both Houses. They should not be forced into the position of saying, "This is the voice of only one House."

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West): I consider there is not much wrong with either of the amendments. I do not think either is so important as to spoil the other. From my point of view, the Government's amendment fills the bill. I think it wrong to say that the Commonwealth Government has no right to hold a referendum. It has a perfect right to do so, if it thinks fit; but I agree this State should say that the present time is inopportune for holding it. We should not say to the Commonwealth Government that it should not hold a referendum; we ought to say that it should not be held now. When the Constitution was framed, provision was made to alter it from time to time. I hope, however, that Western Australia, as well as the other States, will say that it is inopportune to hold a referendum now. I speak because Mr. Cornell raised the question of the settlement of soldiers on the land after the war. I hope this State will in no circumstances shoulder the financial burden of settling returned soldiers on the land.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is not our job.

Hon. L. CRAIG: No. I see no reason whatever why such a settlement cannot be effected under the present Constitution. In effect, rehabilitation will boil down to one thing—finance. We have machinery in Western Australia far more efficient than it could ever be under a Federal scheme, but the Commonwealth Government will have to find the money. I discussed this matter yesterday with one of the heads of a department. He agrees that any rehabilitation scheme will have to be so based as not to compel the returned soldiers to show an interest return on money borrowed. I believe that may be necessary. On the question of land settlement, I hope the State

will take a very firm stand. I personally am opposed to any subsidised land settlement scheme. Nearly everyone I know who lives in the city says that we must be prepared to settle our soldiers on the land. I will have none of it. We wrote off millions of pounds after the last war and broke hundreds—almost thousands—of hearts by placing on the land men unfitted for farming life, by bolstering up an industry which did not require bolstering up and by over-supplying goods to an already over-crowded market. I ask members, particularly Mr. Bolton, what they would say if the Government decided to start a motor body works in direct opposition to Mr. Bolton.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: The Government could have mine; it probably would.

Hon. L. CRAIG: What would the Broken Hill Pty., Co., the Australian Glass Co., or some of those other big companies say if the Commonwealth Government said, "In order to provide employment, we must start a scheme of this sort in direct opposition to one already in existence and one already supplying the full requirements of the market?"

Hon. G. W. Miles: Are you proposing to give the Commonwealth Government that power?

Hon. L. CRAIG: Certainly not. The point is, are we to settle people on the land to provide goods for a market already fully supplied, and are we to supply those people with Government money at very low interest, so that they may carry on in direct opposition to people who have battled for years and years and built up an equity in their property? No! I am not for land settlement at all. Let us find some other means of rehabilitation and not burden the people of the State by providing money which we know will be ultimately lost. There is already sufficient competition in the agricultural industry, without providing cheap money for others to compete with those already engaged in it.

Hon. G. W. Miles: There is room for thousands more people.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Of course, and so there is in Perth.

Hon. G. W. Miles: There should be smaller holdings in the South-West.

Hon. L. CRAIG: What about the markets?

Hon. G. W. Miles: You will get markets.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes, and we will get employment, industry and everything. The people have worked hard enough to get markets now. The main scheme, first of all, is for the rehabilitation of soldiers, and it should be one that deals with public works.

We have to make these men learn to work. I have been a soldier and it is the laziest occupation I have ever undertaken. Such a scheme must be established by subsidies from the Commonwealth Government. Cheap money will have to be found. There are many public works which need to be carried out. If the money can be found this State is quite capable, with its officers, of providing all the work necessary. There is hardly a school in the country that does not need pulling down and another erected in its place. The railways should be repaired and we want new public buildings. We have the land for this purpose the other side of Government House. It is simply a question of finance. I do not think the Commonwealth Government would need any added powers in that respect. It will require added powers for the provision of overseas markets and so on, and they should be given. I am against subsidising and placing on the land people who are not fitted for it. There is no occupation which requires more training and skill than that of a successful farmer.

Hon. J. Cornell: I did not advocate putting them on the land.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The hon. member raised the question of land settlement. Land settlement will grow if it is made attractive. It will require no other assistance. If the products can be sold at a profitable price the expansion in our agricultural areas will be sufficient.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: But there is no question at the moment of land settlement.

Hon. L. CRAIG: It was mentioned.

Hon. V. Hamersley: The Commonwealth Government took a hand in it before.

Hon. L. CRAIG: No. The State bore the burden of it, and I hope that Western Australia will not in the future deplete its resources by promoting any scheme of land settlement. It will be necessary for some men to be returned to the land, perhaps to their own properties. It may in some cases be possible to subsidise small dairy farmers or poultry people, but we should not purchase mixed farming land at £4 and £5 an

acre and instal on it a man who does not know how to put a collar on a horse. Such a scheme does not bear contemplation.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Which amendment are you speaking to; that of the Chief Secretary or the other one?

Hon. L. CRAIG: The Chief Secretary's amendment is all that is necessary. The Commonwealth Government should not hold a referendum if some agreement can be arrived at during the present convention. I take it that it is being held to do something like that. If the Commonwealth states for what purposes it needs these powers, and if they are really necessary, we will give the powers to it temporarily. Personally I would give the Commonwealth Government some powers beyond what it has now, permanently. I would give it control of the Arbitration Court and of education. We might then get some money spent in this country.

Hon. A. Thomson: You are an optimist as far as education is concerned!

Hon. G. W. Miles: The question is whether the words from and including the word "considers" are to be struck out of the Chief Secretary's amendment.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The real question is, which is the better of the two amendments?

Hon. L. B. Bolton: The third one I suggested is the best.

Hon. L. CRAIG: What I introduce into the discussion is a matter for me and no-one else until the President objects. I do not think I have gone outside my rights in talking of land settlement.

The PRESIDENT: I was waiting for the hon. member to connect his remarks.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Some people go by a circular way. In these circumstances I am going to support the amendment moved by the Chief Secretary because I think it covers all that is necessary. The difference between the two proposals is not very important.

The PRESIDENT: The question is that Mr. Thomson's amendment on the amendment be agreed to.

Amendment on amendment put and a division taken with the following results:—

Ayes	12
Noes	12
					—
A tie	0
					—

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. L. B. Bolton
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch
Hon. F. E. Gibson
Hon. E. H. Hall
Hon. V. Hamersley

Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. H. V. Plesse
Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. G. W. Miles
(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. C. R. Cornish
Hon. L. Craig
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. G. Fraser

Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. J. G. Hislop
Hon. W. H. Kilson
Hon. T. Moore
Hon. C. B. Williams
(Teller.)

The PRESIDENT: The voting being equal, I give my casting vote with the noes.

Amendment on amendment thus negatived.

The PRESIDENT: The question now is that the Chief Secretary's amendment be agreed to.

Amendment (to insert words) put and passed.

Question put and passed; the motion, as amended, agreed to.

BILL—WEST AUSTRALIAN MEAT EXPORT WORKS.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

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

BILL—MOTOR SPIRIT AND SUBSTITUTE LIQUID FUELS.

Referred to Select Committee.

Debate resumed from the 17th November on the following motion by Hon. J. A. Dimmitt:—

That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY [5.14]

While I do not agree that there is any real necessity for a Select Committee on this particular Bill, I do not propose to raise any strong objection to the proposal. If the House feels that it will obtain the information it desires more satisfactorily by means of a Select Committee than by a discussion in Committee on the Bill, I do not intend to quarrel with members on that decision. When all is said and done, this

Bill only has to do with the regulation of the sale of motor spirit and substitute liquid fuels. The questions relating to the production of substitute liquid fuels have already been decided by the Commonwealth Government. Nothing we can do or say can alter that fact. Legislation is necessary to enable us to deal with the position that may arise after the war, and therefore the Bill is before the House. In some respects it is highly technical and, as I informed members when moving the second reading, I would be only too pleased to provide all the information in my possession and that I thought all that members could desire would be available to them by that means.

When it is all boiled down, the Bill contains very little other than the provision of means by which we shall endeavour to regulate the sale of motor spirit and substitute fuels. Members may feel that by appointing a Select Committee they will obtain more information than would be available to them during the Committee stage. One point I must impress upon the House. The Government has given an undertaking to the Commonwealth Government to introduce legislation of this type, and New South Wales has already passed its legislation. The other States are preparing to follow suit. If the Bill is referred to a Select Committee, I trust the inquiry will be conducted as speedily as possible so that we may reach finality before the end of the session. The Select Committee could obtain all the information required with comparatively little delay in that the departmental officers and the Minister who deals with this phase have all the facts in their possession. The files could be made available to the Select Committee, and I hope that little time will be spent in finalising the committee's recommendations.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East): I am inclined to think the course suggested by the Chief Secretary would be the better because obviously, on the face of it, the Bill appears to be a little premature. We have to realise that no works are in existence in Western Australia for the distillation or production of motor spirit of any description, and the plant that is proposed to be established is for the production of power alcohol, which is a different process altogether. From that angle, therefore, there is very little to re-

commend the Bill. From the standpoint of control over the sale of liquid fuel, the position is different, and there is a good deal to be said in favour of that course. Obviously, with the manufacture of motor spirit in Western Australia, it will be necessary to utilise the local product in conjunction with metalliferous spirits. From that point of view, control of distribution is essential. On the other hand, the measure may be open to criticism from the standpoint that it seeks to introduce further regimentation by the provision of another board. I take it the Bill has been introduced with the idea of swinging Western Australia into line with legislation introduced in the other States.

The Chief Secretary: That was agreed to at a conference between the States and the Commonwealth.

Hon. H. SEDDON: In those circumstances I am inclined to think we can get all the information we require from the Chief Secretary.

HON. J. CORNELL (South): At this stage of the session, as the Chief Secretary pointed out, there is necessity for immediate action if the Select Committee is to be of any value at all. If the Select Committee does not report before the House rises, it will have to be converted into a Royal Commission if its work is to be of any value for consideration during the next session.

The Chief Secretary: I do not think there would be any need for that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If the Select Committee did not report and the Bill lapsed, it could be taken up at the same stage next session. As the Chief Secretary has no objection to the appointment of a Select Committee, I shall not object. I hope the committee will conclude its work in order to report in ample time to allow the House to consider its representations and amend the Bill accordingly—or else pass the Bill as it stands.

Question put and passed.

Select Committee Appointed.

On motion by Hon. J. A. Dimmitt, Select Committee of five appointed, consisting of Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch, Hon. A. Thomson, Hon. W. J. Mann, Hon. C. B. Williams, and the mover, with power to call for persons, papers and records, to move from place to place, and sit on days over which the House

stands adjourned, the quorum to consist of three members; to report on Wednesday, the 9th December.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY [3.25] in moving the second reading said: This is the annual Bill that provides for the further appointment of the Lotteries Commission for the ensuing 12 months. Members have argued on previous occasions as to whether the Act should be made permanent, but the House has always insisted on its limitation to a period of one year. For some years past the Government has recognised that fact, and this year has introduced the Bill with the same objective. It is usual when introducing this continuance Bill to give members an outline of what has been accomplished by the Lotteries Commission during the year.

I remind the House that an important change in policy has been instituted by the Commission regarding the conduct of lotteries. It will be remembered that over a long period the Commission conducted what could be described as very large lotteries requiring 200,000 ticketholders before the lottery was closed. Early in the present year, a new policy was inaugurated by the provision of smaller lotteries of 50,000 subscribers. It appears that the alteration in policy has met with wide support from the people of the State generally. Under the new policy the prize money totals £3225, divided into 511 cash prizes, including a first prize of £1,000.

It will be noted that, whilst subscriptions now represent only one-fourth of the former issue, the prize distribution, both in number and value, is considerably in excess of one-fourth of that previously offered. Public approval of the Commission's wartime policy, which offers frequent drawings and greatly enhanced prize-winning possibilities, is evidenced by a substantial reduction in the period occupied in filling the consultations, which are now being drawn weekly.

Two consultations of 200,000 tickets—Nos. 97 and 98—were finalised during the year. Subscriptions totalled £50,000, the prize money £25,400 representing 50.8 per cent., and expenses, including 10 per cent. commission to agents, £10,873 9s. 4d. or

21.7 per cent. Twenty-five consultations—Nos. 99a to 124a inclusive—have been conducted under the new system, and in respect of these subscriptions totalled £162,442 10s., prize money £83,720, representing 51.6 per cent., and expenses, which include 10 per cent. to agents, £25,436 13s. 3d., or 15.6 per cent. Perhaps the most satisfactory feature of the new policy is that the average fall in the proportion of income absorbed in expenses since Lottery No. 98—the last of the 200,000 ticket sweeps—is approximately 7.5 per cent.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If you cut another 5 per cent. off the commission, it would be on a business basis.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: But we would not sell the tickets. Expenses excluding agents' commission, in respect of sweeps now being conducted on a weekly basis represent approximately 4.5 per cent. of the total subscriptions. That is a very low expenses ratio, reflecting great credit on the Commission. The profit for the year amounted to £67,012 7s. 5d., which, together with a balance brought forward from 1941 of £22,900 9s. 6d. and bank interest, unclaimed prizes and unexpended grants, £928 6s. 9d., bring the total amount available for distribution to £90,931 3s. 8d. Of this sum donations absorbed £59,337 5s. 10s. and commitments at the close of the year amounted to £13,612 7s. 10d., leaving an undistributed balance of £17,981 10s.

During the year hospitals were assisted to the extent of £35,495 1s. 7d., which includes the sum of £30,000 set aside to meet interest and sinking fund on the loan money used to finance the erection of the new Perth Hospital. This amount, together with previous appropriations, brings the total amount placed to the credit of a Treasury trust account for this purpose to £86,000.

The Hospital Social Service, which was established by the help of the Lotteries Commission, has received £2,977 17s. 10d. this year. The following orphanages have received allocations amounting to £7,009 15s. 4d.:—Anglican Girls', Swan Boys', Castledare, Clontarf, Parkerville Home, St. Joseph's, St. Vincent's Foundling Home, R.C. Orphanage Broome, Nazareth House Geraldton. Maintenance payment to orphanages is calculated upon the basis of 3s. per child per week. Other substantial

grants during the year included the following:—

	£	s.	d.
W.A. Institute and Industrial School for the Blind of W.A.	3,000	0	0
Returned Soldiers' League ..	2,000	0	0
St. John Ambulance Association	2,000	0	0
Aborigines Department ..	300	0	0
Tardun Boys' Farm School ..	1,000	0	0
Silver Chain Nursing Association	1,000	0	0
Infant Health Association ..	1,346	8	9
Christmas Cheer for Hospitals, etc.	1,218	10	0

Those figures cover in the main the larger donations which have been made from the funds of the Lotteries Commission. Thirty-six institutions and organisations other than hospitals and orphanages have been granted sums totalling £16,823 8s. 11d.; 42 hospitals have been granted £35,495 1s. 7d. in all. In addition, numerous hospitals and other organisations have been promised various amounts, totalling £13,612 7s. 10d., representing payments up to the 124A Consultation, which was finalised this week.

I think it can be said that the Lotteries Commission is an institution which would be sadly missed if at any time its discontinuance should be decided upon. Various hospitals and charitable institutions throughout the State have come to rely largely on the donations received by them from the Commission. I think it must be admitted that, perhaps as the result of the long experience members of the Commission have in work of this kind, they distribute the money available from their funds in a way which gives satisfaction generally to the various institutions concerned. I trust that the House will agree to the continuance of the Commission for another year, and therefore I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 5.36 p.m.