

was that no publicity at all must be given to the fact that we had to deal with so large a number of prisoners under the conditions with which we were faced. There was necessity for the utmost secrecy in a movement of this kind.

Again, the gaol was required for, and had been occupied for some time by, the military; and at present Fremantle gaol has a much larger prison population than it ever had before. There are matters which the Censor cannot allow to be published. For that reason it has not been—shall I say—advisable to give the matter the publicity that I would welcome. If we could have had a few months' notice of the transfer of the Fremantle prisoners to some other place, the story would have been very different. We would have been able to prepare for the transfer in a more orthodox manner. However, because we were not able to prepare in an orthodox manner, we have improvised in a way which I say will be a credit to the department and to the Government and will give satisfaction to any person who is interested in the question of social reform, and particularly prison reform. With these remarks I have to state that I cannot see any justification for the appointment of a Select Committee, and fail to see in the statement of Mr. Hall anything that would justify the House in carrying the motion.

On motion by Hon. E. H. H. Hall, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.15 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.42 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 2nd March, 1943.

Bills: Vermin Act Amendment, Council's Message	PAGE
Commonwealth Powers, Com.	2613
	2613

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

BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3, to which the Assembly had disagreed.

BILL—COMMONWEALTH POWERS.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 25th February. Mr. Marshall in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Preamble:

The **CHAIRMAN:** Progress was reported on the Preamble, to which Hon. N. Keenan had moved an amendment as follows:—

That after the word "reference" in line 21 the words "unless prior thereto revoked under the power contained herein" be inserted.

The **PREMIER:** I have no objection to the amendment, which follows on what we have agreed to in Clauses 3 and 4.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. **WATTS:** I move an amendment—

That in line 29 the words "in this form" be struck out and the words "in the form in which the Bill for this Act was approved at the said Convention" inserted in lieu.

This amendment was recommended by the Select Committee. The Preamble sets out that the Premiers of the several States have agreed to do their utmost to secure the passage through their respective Parliaments, as early as possible, of a Bill "in this form." The Bill, however, has been amended to comply with certain legal requirements and will no longer be "in this form," but will be in the form in which the Bill was approved at the Convention.

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

Postponed Clause 2—Reference of matters to Parliament of Commonwealth:

As to Procedure.

The **CHAIRMAN:** Standing Order 155 provides that the several rules for maintaining order in debate in the House shall be observed in Committee of the whole House. Standing Order 176 permits the House to order a complicated question to be divided. Standing Order 279, however, places upon me the obligation to put the question "That the clause stand as printed." I am inclined to observe that Standing Order but, when one looks at Clause 2 of the Bill, one may argue that it is particularly complicated and would

definitely cause a great deal of confusion if I adhered to Standing Order 279 and put the question that the clause stand as printed or as amended. Members who propose to move amendments would find themselves confused and the position would be no simpler for others to understand. If there is no objection by any member of the Committee, I propose to put the several paragraphs as if they were clauses and then conclude by putting the question that the clause stand as printed or amended.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I must object to that procedure, which is a complete departure from our practice and will only be inviting delay. We have observed our Standing Orders for years, and to depart from them now on a Bill of this description would be very unwise and quite unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the fact that opposition has been expressed to the proposal, I have no alternative but to enforce Standing Order 279.

Mr. McDONALD: Surely there is some procedure by which an exceptional Bill of this kind may be considered in a common-sense manner! We should not treat the whole clause as one when it involves some fourteen paragraphs each dealing with a separate subject, and each of more importance than would be represented by a whole statute in the ordinary course of events. If we do not consider the clause paragraph by paragraph, it will entail great difficulties for members. Would it not be possible to take a vote on the matter by way of direction? It will vastly assist the prompt dealing with this clause if we take it paragraph by paragraph, because then members' speeches will be directed to the specific matter in each paragraph. Otherwise, speeches may be at large over the nine or ten subjects of reference. Would I be in order in suggesting or taking any steps to ascertain the feeling of the Committee on the matter?

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Committee that there are two ways in which we can deal with this matter. Firstly, we must report to the House, when we can obtain the suspension of Standing Order 279 by an absolute majority voting accordingly; or we can instruct the Committee, by virtue of a resolution, to do certain things as far as Clause 2 is concerned. That, however, cannot be done in Committee. I can only report to the House, that is, if the Committee so

desires, and from then on Mr. Speaker will adjudicate.

The PREMIER: I think the suggestion of the Chairman of Committees is very good. I myself am a great stickler for the Standing Orders because, as the member for Guildford-Midland has pointed out, we are all educated on the method of approaching and getting business through the House and as to what we are entitled to do and what we should do, also as to what latitude can be extended to us and as to the strictness we can expect from the Chair, whether or not the House is in Committee. Consequently, in the ordinary course of events we should not depart in any way from the Standing Orders. Clause 2 of the Bill, however, really consists of 14 paragraphs, and if we were to debate it as it is printed it might take an interminably long time to reach a decision. In any case, I think it will take a day or two to get the clause through Committee. If we are to jump from one paragraph to another and perhaps get one portion passed and then go back to it again, we might occupy two or three days in dealing with it. I do not want that to happen. Now that the second reading stage has been passed, we should confine our remarks to each of these paragraphs in turn. Having reached an agreement on one paragraph, that would be finished with and we would pass on to the next. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I move—

That the Chairman do now report progress and leave be asked to sit again at a later stage of the sitting.

Motion (that progress be reported) put and passed.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [2.30]: I have to report, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee has reported progress and has asked for leave to sit again at a later stage of the sitting. On account of the complicated nature of Clause 2, and bearing in mind that Standing Order 155 provides that the same rules of debate shall apply in Committee as apply in the House, and further that Standing Order 176 provides for a complicated question to be divided, I suggested that some consideration might be given to the advisability of dividing Clause 2 and taking it paragraph by paragraph. Unfortunately, Standing Order 279 conflicts and that places upon me the obligation, as

Chairman of Committees, to put the clause as printed. I had suggested to the Committee that I might refuse to respect Standing Order 279 and put the clause paragraph by paragraph, in order to simplify the procedure, avoid complications and reduce discussion to the substantive nature of the character of each respective paragraph, but that I would do so only if there was no objection by any member of the Committee. Unfortunately, the member for Guildford-Midland raised an objection and I felt it obligatory on me to respect Standing Order 279. Consequently the Premier moved that progress be reported and that leave be asked to sit again at a later stage of the sitting, with a view to having Standing Order 279 suspended, or alternatively of obtaining a resolution of instruction that the Committee will do certain things so far as Clause 2 is concerned.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland): One would not object to that if we did not have knowledge of what is proposed to be done at a later stage of the sitting. We have to think of Parliamentary practice and we are going to discuss Standing Orders. I certainly do not want the House to take up time on that matter, if it can be avoided. If it is essential, although I cannot see any reason for it, we shall have to discuss the Standing Orders, but I regret the delay that will ensue.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison): In reply to the member for Guildford-Midland, I would say that we are not departing from the correct procedure. As a matter of fact, this House has assembled because of the fact that we did not desire to do that. What the House may now do will be strictly in accordance with Parliamentary procedure and Standing Orders, and consequently the attitude taken up by the member for Guildford-Midland is wrong. It would have been contrary to Parliamentary practice had the Committee decided to follow the procedure that I set out. The present procedure is definitely in order and we are breaking no Standing Orders, nor are we violating practice or procedure.

Ordered: That leave be given to the Committee to sit again at a later stage of the sitting.

Instruction to Chairman of Committees.

THE PREMIER: Clause 2 of the Bill is, I consider, very complicated, as tremendous

issues are involved and all sorts of complications would be brought into the debate if the clause were allowed to go to the Committee in the form in which it appears in the Bill. In order that we may discuss and reach a decision on the 14 points in this complicated clause, I suggest that the House should order that it be divided. I move—

That as Clause 2 of the Bill before the House is a complicated question, in accordance with Standing Order No. 176, the clause be considered a complicated question, and that it be considered paragraph by paragraph in its alphabetical order, and that it be an instruction to the Chairman of Committees when the Bill is being considered in the Committee stage.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland): This is certainly a most extraordinary procedure, and not only extraordinary as related to the Bill.

Mr. Sampson: A most extraordinary objection!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Over the years nothing of this kind has previously been attempted. We have had this Clause 2 referred to a Select Committee. Personally I opposed the appointment of the Select Committee because I did not think the clause needed any clarification. It was a clause of the Convention and one passed by other Parliaments of Australia. I did not think, therefore, that there was any need for a Select Committee to take evidence for the purpose of reviewing or clarifying the clause.

Mr. Thorn: Why are you stonewalling now?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Select Committee made its report, and I put in a part of my lunch hour to read that report as it applied to Clause 2. From my first reading of it, I did not quite see the point, but from the next reading it was as clear as daylight.

Point of Order.

Mr. Marshall: Is the member for Guildford-Midland in order in discussing Clause 2 of the Bill when the House is considering a motion to give certain instructions to the Chairman of Committees?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is perfectly in order, because Clause 2 is in the motion, and referred to as a complicated question. I take it the member for Guildford-Midland is endeavouring to show that it is not a complicated question.

Debate Resumed.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Thorn: Your one and only victory!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I was saying that on reading the committee's report a second time the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of that committee became quite clear. There are no complications. It is true that if we go beyond the Select Committee's recommendations and through all the other amendments on the notice paper the matter becomes complicated, because they are all interwoven and overlap. But we have a Chairman of Committees whose duty it is to see that such amendments are dissected and dealt with at the right time and in the right way, so that every member gets his amendment in and no-one will be excluded. It may, therefore, be a complicated question if we go into all the amendments and imagine that the Chairman of Committees is not capable of directing the House. But over the years there has been a Parliamentary practice. During the whole of my experience I do not remember there being a question of raising the particular Standing Orders in Committee in regard to the placing of a clause before the Committee. We have not done that because there is the Parliamentary practice. We have been educated so that we are alert and careful in Committee to see that any amendment, in which we are interested, is not excluded. Again, I repeat, that is the task of the Chairman of Committees. It is his duty to assist members and see that their amendments are dealt with at the right time.

The only part, however, in which I am interested—and I assume the Government also—is the report of the Select Committee. This sitting, and the other sittings since the Select Committee met, were for the purpose of considering the report of the Select Committee. It is true that the Bill, before it comes into Committee, must go to the Select Committee, and therefore the Committee stage of the whole Bill is deferred until after the Select Committee has reported. That report was directed almost wholly to Clause 2.

The Premier: No, it was not.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am just taking the amendment proposed to Clause 2. That clause, to meet the special circumstances

and the Select Committee's desires, was deferred so that it could be approached in a way that would simplify debate and enable greater expedition to be made. I did not oppose the postponement of Clause 2 because I could see that discussions on it would refer to other clauses, and therefore it was commonsense to defer it until we had dealt with those other clauses. But because we did that is no reason to say that it is a complicated question. I submit, in all seriousness, and you, Sir, must realise, that if this Bill and the amendments proposed by the Select Committee are considered, it is so clear that any schoolboy could follow it. I will admit that I will have a word or two to say on the drafting of the amendments, but the object of those amendments and the places where they will come in are quite clear, and there is no complication and no danger of the Committee making a mistake. To get back to the clause-by-clause, line-by-line process is a serious departure, because it will create a very dangerous precedent. Once we introduce that type of procedure there will be no limit to it. During my long experience it has never before been suggested in past years. Are we becoming irresponsible? Are we beginning to lose sight of main essentials in our desire to get some little special advantage? And it must be remembered the special advantage is in favour of those in opposition to the Bill.

Those of us who are in favour of the Bill in toto secure no advantage, but Opposition members have had a glorious opportunity in debate both before and since the consideration of the Bill by the Select Committee. Now we are going to say, "Although you have had all the advantage and have been able to get the Select Committee appointed, and the Leader of the Opposition has presented amendments as a result of unanimous decisions by that Select Committee, we are now going to deal with Clause 2 line by line as if no consideration had been given to the clause at all." Surely we are not a lot of school children! This is no third-rate debating society; it is the Parliament of the State! Surely we have our authorities and Parliamentary practice to follow, and although there may be some little advantage to be gained if we have the leisure to analyse the exact wording of one Standing Order compared with another, are we to get down to those trifling details? It is bad enough now! If the Chairman of Com-

mittees is going to analyse the Standing Orders in that way, we shall lose—

Mr. Marshall rose in his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not reflect on the Chairman of Committees (Mr. Marshall).

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am not.

Mr. Marshall: You shut up or I will hit you. If it were not for your age—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Guildford-Midland resume his seat?

Mr. Marshall: If he was half a man, I would pull him out of the Chamber!

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Murchison will withdraw his remarks and apologise for his action.

Mr. Marshall: I do so. I am sorry I lost my temper. You, Mr. Speaker, will admit there was every justification for it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Guildford-Midland may proceed.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If we start doing what I have indicated there will be no limit as to where we may get, and there will be complications and misunderstandings. We have Parliamentary practice and procedure to guide us. The Chairman of Committees has followed that practice and procedure right up to the present time. We should not depart from that now, particularly in connection with a Bill of this description because if it were merely an ordinary State Bill, it would be a matter of State importance and stop at that. But this is an Australia-wide Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member is in order in discussing merits of the Bill generally.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am pointing out how dangerous it is, in connection with a Bill that is Australia-wide in its application, to do things of an extraordinary character; and surely what is proposed is extraordinary. I have entered my protest. We can see where Parliament is getting to, but nevertheless I have my point of view. I have the right to express it. Even though my views may not appeal to others, no-one can say that I have ever done an injustice to any man in this House although I may have indulged in criticism. I have explained my views and I am justified in doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that phase enters into the question now.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I have entered my protest and I appeal to the House not to follow the proposed procedure.

MR. J. HEGNEY (Middle Swan): I oppose the motion. We should stick to the Bill as it is, and certainly the motion should not be agreed to. The measure has been placed before the House in accordance with the decisions arrived at as a result of the recent Convention, and I, as a Labour man, am in accord with its provisions. If the desire is to angle for support from Opposition members and to see how far we can get with them, the Government will be sadly mistaken. I support the Bill and will have nothing less than the Bill. The Government should stick to the provisions of the Bill and reach a decision on its clauses. If Opposition members wish to disregard the decisions of the recent Convention, well and good. Let them do so—and the public will know about it. For my part I am pledged to give effect to the whole of the provisions of the Bill, and I think every other Labour member is in the same position.

Mr. Thorn: Do not get heated!

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I am not heated at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the House is not discussing the Bill but merely the motion that has been moved.

Mr. J. HEGNEY: I am opposed to the motion. If it is necessary to deal with the clause in the manner suggested, why did not the Select Committee mention that phase? The members of that body could have suggested redrafting the clause and presenting the Bill in another form. Now, when we are half way through the Committee stage, we are asked to consider the paragraphs of Clause 2 as though they were separate clauses. Surely the necessity could have been foreseen by the Select Committee, particularly in view of the large number of amendments on the notice paper. Surely it is possible to reach a decision on each paragraph if we follow the ordinary procedure? Surely it is not necessary to suspend the Standing Orders! I am entirely opposed to the motion.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: I support the motion for the very reason the member for Middle Swan advanced in opposition to it. I am in favour of the Bill as it stands. I want to see the measure placed before the Committee as simply as possible. As for the argument advanced by the member for Guildford-Midland that the method proposed is an extraordinary procedure—

Mr. Marshall: It has been followed several times.

The **MINISTER FOR MINES**: The Standing Orders provide for that procedure, and that clearly shows that there is nothing extraordinary about the proposal. Our Standing Orders are based on the procedure of the Mother of Parliaments. The fact that the Standing Orders make provision for this course clearly shows that the time has arrived when it is necessary to give effect to our Standing Orders, and that is all that is proposed. There is nothing extraordinary about that. The member for Guildford-Midland stated that this had never been done in his time. He is so often away from the Chamber that he may not have noticed that it had been done. To hear him and the member for Middle Swan speak, one would think that the object of the move was to favour the Opposition.

Mr. Thorn: One is the shadow of the other.

The **MINISTER FOR MINES**: The Government of the day can do just as much as this House decides and only one thing counts in that regard. That one thing is not oratory nor yet is it grizzling; it is the votes of members. When the division bells ring and the votes are recorded, that decides the issue. No such issue can be decided on the ground that the member for Guildford-Midland believes in the proposal or disagrees with it. For my part I am getting tired of these lectures from the member for Guildford-Midland who is not the only Labour member in this House—but he is one of the few Labour members who think they are the only ones. For my part I think the Premier has done the right thing in seeking to place Clause 2 before the Committee as simply as possible.

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

Ayes	34
Noes	2
Majority for					32

AYES.

Mr. Berry	Mr. Needham
Mr. Boyle	Mr. Nulsen
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Pantou
Mr. Collier	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Doney	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Fox	Mr. Seward
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Shearn
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hill	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Kernan	Mr. Triest
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Warner
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Watts
Mr. Mann	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willmott
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Withers
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Cross

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Johnson (Teller.)
---------------	-----------------------

Mr. **SPEAKER**: I declare the question 'carried with the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House.

Question thus passed.

Committee Resumed.

Postponed Clause 2—Reference of matters to Parliament of Commonwealth:

Mr. **WATTS**: I wish to move an amendment—

That at the beginning of Clause 2 the words "The following matters" be struck out, and the words "Subject to the limitations and conditions in this Act contained the following matters" inserted in lieu.

This is another amendment unanimously recommended by the Select Committee. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether you would rule that it is right to strike out the words "The following matters" at the beginning of the clause and re-insert them at the end.

The **CHAIRMAN**: One cannot delete words and re-insert them if they have in effect the same substance. The hon. member could move for the insertion before the word "The" of the words "Subject to the limitations and conditions in this Act contained."

Mr. **WATTS**: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

The **CHAIRMAN**: It has not been put.

Mr. **WATTS**: I now move an amendment—

That before the word "The," at the beginning of the clause, the words "Subject to the limitations and conditions in this Act contained" be inserted.

The object of the amendment is quite clear.

Amendment put and passed.

The **CHAIRMAN**: The Committee will now proceed to deal with the several paragraphs contained in the clause.

Paragraph (a)—The reinstatement and advancement of those who have been members of the Fighting Services of the Commonwealth during the war and the advancement of the dependants of those members who have died or been disabled as a consequence of the war:

Paragraph put and passed.

Paragraph (b)—Employment and unemployment:

Mr. **McDONALD**: I move an amendment—

That after the word "employment" the words "of unemployed persons on the con-

struction of national works, public works, and local government works and the relief of unemployed persons by occupational training and insurance against" be inserted.

I have omitted certain words appearing in my amendment as printed on the notice paper; namely "by grants and loans to them of money or goods." We now come to the consideration of the specific heads of power which the Bill seeks to transfer for a period of years to the Commonwealth Parliament. Paragraph (b) seeks to provide that for the time mentioned the Commonwealth Parliament shall have legislative power over employment and unemployment. I seek to amend paragraph (b) as stated in the amendment which I have moved. As my amendment appears on the notice paper it is, I believe, similar to an amendment carried in South Australia two weeks ago. After considering the matter, however, I have omitted the words which I have quoted, because it is my opinion that unemployment should be relieved by employment, and not by sustenance payments or allotments of goods. I do not wish to suggest to the Commonwealth Parliament that unemployment should be relieved by grants of money or by goods. I want the Committee for a moment to consider what would be involved by accepting the paragraph as printed. This paragraph is if not the most important and most far-reaching, certainly the second most important and most far-reaching of all the heads of power set out in Clause 2.

Firstly I desire to refer to evidence given by the Solicitor General, Mr. J. L. Walker, K.C., before the Select Committee appointed by this Chamber. Mr. Walker was asked, in relation to employment and unemployment—

Seeing this matter was referred to the Commonwealth, is there any aspect of employment, including determination of wages and conditions of employment, in respect of which the Commonwealth could not legislate under this power?

Mr. Walker answered—

No. The terms used are so vague and comprehensive that they will include every matter incidental or ancillary to employment and unemployment and every other matter which they can reasonably be deemed to connote.

In other words, the Solicitor General has said that there would not be under this head of power, if granted, any aspect of employment in respect of which the Commonwealth Parliament could not legislate, and that included in the powers referred would be the

power to supersede the Industrial Arbitration Court of this State. Mr. Walker was further asked by the Select Committee this question—

Under this power, would the Commonwealth determine the class or description of employment which could be lawfully pursued in the State by any person or which could be offered by any employer or any person?

The answer was—

In my view, yes.

Again this shows that in the opinion of the Solicitor General the Commonwealth is given power to determine the class or description of employment which could be lawfully pursued inside this State. Again Mr. Walker was asked, specifically—

Would it be competent for the Commonwealth under this power to legislate so that the State Industrial Arbitration Court or any other industrial authority existing under State law would cease to function?

Mr. Walker again answered—

In my view, yes.

Further, the Select Committee asked Mr. Walker—

If the Commonwealth had this power, would it include authority to legislate in regard to unemployment insurance?

The Solicitor General's answer was—

I am very doubtful.

Mr. Walker was further asked—

Has the Commonwealth unemployment insurance power under the existing Constitution?

Mr. Walker answered—

Possibly under Section 51, paragraph 14, but I am very doubtful.

Therefore I say by way of comment upon the replies of the Solicitor General that it seems that at the present time it is possible the Commonwealth has no power constitutionally to set up unemployment insurance, and even if the powers set out in paragraph (b) of this clause were granted to the Commonwealth it is doubtful, even so, if power would be conferred on the Commonwealth Parliament to deal with unemployment insurance. For that reason, in the amendment I have moved, specific power is given to the Commonwealth to provide for insurance against unemployment; and by that means the matter could be dealt with. We have seen, from Mr. Walker's evidence, that this power if granted would cover every aspect of employment and unemployment in the State.

I turn now to the evidence given by Hon. N. Keenan, K.C., speaking as a barrister to the Select Committee. When asked in re-

gard to what was comprehended in paragraph (b), he expressed the following views:—

It may be conservatively defined as embracing every phase of our national life which is associated with the inauguration or carrying-on of industry. It would justify every form of legislation dealing with industrial affairs, what industries are to be established and where, what industries are to be pursued and where, who is to engage in any particular industry and when. Other counsel have expressed the opinion that under this power it would be possible to transfer men by force of law from one district to another and from one State to another, and this power would be in the hands of the Commonwealth Government if paragraph (b) were granted.

Mr. J. Hegney: Men were transferred from one State to another during the depression days owing to economic conditions.

Mr. McDONALD: Dr. Evatt, when asked at the Convention what the power would include, said—

I regard this as a very great power. He would say no more to define it. He refused to define it, but he said—and his words cannot be too much marked by the people of Western Australia—

I regard this as a very great power. I propose to take his word that he regarded this as a very great power. We are considering a matter of great national importance. We want to do so in a reasonable frame of mind. We want to have regard to the responsibilities, present and future, of the Commonwealth Parliament. We do not want to lose sight of the rights and aspirations of our State Parliament and of our State as a self-governing entity in the future. Therefore, I do not want to exaggerate, but I take the word of Dr. Evatt regarding employment and unemployment that this is a very great power, and it is now sought to be taken from the people of this State and transferred to a Parliament sitting in Canberra in which this State has a very small representation. I would suggest that this is like the dismembering of the Constitutional structure of our State. It is like the loss of an arm, or the loss of both arms.

Hon. N. Keenan: It is the loss of everything.

Mr. McDONALD: I am not going so far as that. It may be the loss of everything. We may be reduced to a physical constitutional hulk, but I want to be on the con-

servative side and I say it would be a dismemberment of our State as a self-governing entity. It is the loss of our right arm—perhaps of our right arm and our right leg. We would then have, from a constitutional point of view, the remaining members to carry on with in the future. I am looking at the matter for the time being as if the power is to be transferred permanently.

The Premier: That is very important.

Mr. McDONALD: It is proper that we should consider that by the terms of this Bill the powers are intended to be given for a period, and that with the safeguards which have been put into the Bill on the recommendation of the Select Committee there is a reasonable chance that at all events either of two things will happen: the period safeguard will operate or else the Bill will be wholly valueless.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that he is generalising. I wish he would keep to the question, which deals solely with paragraph (b). Full and liberal consideration will be given to members debating but I do not think they should generalise on paragraphs. I hope the hon. member will not elaborate too long on these lines.

Mr. McDONALD: I was trying to explain to the Committee my view, which is shared by other people, that to pass this power under paragraph (b) is to pass away a very large part of the self-governing rights which this State now possesses and it was my duty, because it is wrapped up with the operation of this power, to refer to the fact that by the terms of the Bill it is to be for a limited period. But I hold the view—and I think I might legitimately mention this without transgressing the rules of relevancy—that if it were not for the days through which we are passing it would be incredible that the people of any State should be asked to give up any part of their self-governing rights without being consulted by a referendum. It would be incredible that this Parliament should assume to itself the right to give away, even if only for a period of years, the rights which every citizen has under the Constitution, without reference to the people. But as things are today it has been agreed by the Convention and by the Commonwealth Government—and I have no quarrel with their decision—that it is not desirable to go to the people with such a highly controversial matter at a time when

we are told the enemy is building up his strength on the northern perimeter of Australia. Therefore, even though it is for a term—an indefinite term as the Bill is now drawn, but perhaps for many years—I feel that without an opportunity for the people to express their opinion, this Parliament cannot even for a term dismember this State as a self-governing body.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that we are only discussing an amendment regarding employment and unemployment. I suggest that when the question is put that the clause as printed or amended be agreed to the general debate in which he is now indulging would be appropriate, but it is premature at the moment because we are dealing only with the question of employment and unemployment under paragraph (b). I would like him to confine his remarks to the subject matter before the Chair and withhold general criticism until later.

Mr. McDONALD: All the words I have said about the extent to which our self-governing rights would be lost relate only to paragraph (b). I am not referring to all the other paragraphs but to the extent of the reduction of power which would be involved by passing paragraph (b). I mention that because I think the first thing I have to do is to show why I think the Committee should not vote for this paragraph in the form in which it is printed. If I may draw one further parallel with regard to the position of our State, should we transfer this power set out in paragraph (b)—this very great power, to repeat again Dr. Evatt's words—I would say that the importance of the transfer of this power from the State as a self-governing authority, subject always to the specific rights of the Commonwealth Parliament, would be comparable to a Bill to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Parliament all that part of the State which lies below Kilmessick.

Mr. Needham: None of the States did a good job with regard to unemployment during the depression years!

Mr. McDONALD: Not to be led into a by-path, I would mention that there appeared to be a very singular determination on the part of the Commonwealth not to lend any assistance during the last depression when unemployment was rife. Like the Pharisee the Commonwealth passed by and said, "This is no job of ours."

Hon. P. Collier: The States were helpless because the Commonwealth controlled finance.

Mr. McDONALD: The Commonwealth held the purse-strings and it passed by and said, "This is not our responsibility; this is a State affair."

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The Commonwealth was given that control by a referendum of the people.

Mr. McDONALD: If we look to the past we shall get very scant authority or precedent for giving away these powers. I do not want to look to the past. If I did this Bill would go into the wastepaper basket in two minutes. I want to look to the future and to give the Commonwealth Government some credit—if it has some additional powers, which I propose to give it—for treating this State more suitably and fairly in the future than it has done in the past. On its past record it would not have a hope of getting tuppence-worth more power from this State. For those reasons I would suggest that without the people having had an opportunity to express their opinion, this Parliament could not take the responsibility nor would it be doing its duty if it did so, even for a definite period of years, of dismembering the Constitutional powers of this State as would be done by passing paragraph (b). But I realise that the post-war problem of returning to civil employment men and women from the fighting services and hundreds of thousands of men and women who have been engaged in war work is a problem of magnitude, and one in which the co-operation and help and financial power of the Commonwealth Government should be associated with the State. Therefore I suggest to the Committee that it should give this power in the form set out in the amendment I have read. We do not want Commonwealth interference when we have 100 per cent. employment. If we have 100 per cent. employment in this State, that is conclusive evidence that the State is doing all it can for its people, but when we have unemployment something is there which should be remedied if possible.

Mr. W. Hegney: How long is it since there has been 100 per cent. employment in any State?

Mr. McDONALD: We have never had it.

Mr. Hughes: We would have 101 per cent. then.

Mr. McDONALD: Yes, because we have many people employed who should not be employed, such as married women, but taking normal times into consideration we do not want the Commonwealth to interfere or to help us when we have full employment of all employable persons. But when we are not able to employ all the employable persons there is something to be remedied, and by this amendment we give the Commonwealth power to come in and by national works, by public and local government works, and by vocational training to fit people for employment, and by unemployment insurance to co-operate with and help the States in remedying any position of unemployment that may exist. I think that for the time being that is all Dr. Evatt and the Commonwealth Parliament require or that they need ask for. Let me add this further word. This is possibly not the last reference of power that this State will ever make to the Commonwealth Government. If at some future time the Commonwealth Parliament and the Commonwealth Government come to the States and say, "You have given us certain powers"—such as this sought by this amendment—"but they are not sufficient"; if they say, "We want this specific definite power, the meaning of which we have clearly explained to you," and if they explain the reason they want the power and the way it is going to be exercised, I think they are entitled justifiably to believe that the State Parliaments will be prepared to co-operate.

If it can be shown that any further powers are required to meet emergencies and difficulties, let the Commonwealth Government say what it wants, and this State, which has always taken a national viewpoint in any matter that is worth while, will not fail to do any duty which may be cast upon it to recognise the particular condition that may exist. This power Dr. Evatt will not attempt to define, because it is so comprehensive. The term "employment and unemployment" relates to every industry in Australia. On this vitally important paragraph, the second most important in the clause, we cannot consult the people, and we should not, therefore, go to the extent of the power asked. We know there is a large volume of opinion in the State which is opposed to any further transfer of powers to the Commonwealth. Only ten years ago we had the vote of the whole of the people of the State who, by a two to one majority, said they preferred to

leave the Commonwealth altogether. We should not take the responsibility of giving away such a tremendous portion of the self-governing rights of our people but, because we cannot consult the people properly by referendum we can for a period justify the responsibility of transferring the power in the terms of my amendment.

The PREMIER: The question of employment and unemployment covers the whole of the ramifications of our future well-being. I do not desire to restrict the powers of the Commonwealth Government to deal with this highly important national subject. The depression of a decade ago was a catastrophe which was beyond the capacity of the States to deal with in a satisfactory way. That could only be dealt with adequately by the Government of the nation. The position after the war, when it is proposed that these powers will be utilised, will be even more serious than it was during the time of the depression, because about half of the working population of Australia—those who are able to undertake remunerative employment—are either on active service or engaged in some kind of war work which, at the conclusion of hostilities, will very quickly terminate. It may be that for the purpose of convenience soldiers will continue to be mobilised for a year or two because there is nothing else to do with them. It may be that some of the munition factories will continue to make munitions because it is desired to build up a surplus of munitions of war.

When peace does come, there will be almost half the working population of Australia to be fixed up in employment, and a huge transfer of population from various places. In Western Australia that position may not be so bad as in the other States. In the other States there has been an almost complete denudation of the population of country districts, because of the large numbers of persons who have come into the metropolitan areas and become engaged in the production of munitions. That class of employment will not be available at the conclusion of the war. I do not propose to limit the power of the Commonwealth Government in that respect. The amendment says that the Commonwealth Government can only deal with unemployed persons. It may be necessary for those who are in employment to be transferred from some useless work to work that will be to the economic benefit of the Commonwealth. Upon

the successful and remunerative employment of the people of the nation depends its whole prosperity, its future and its outlook. Because the problem is of such magnitude and because so much depends upon it, I think we would not be wise to limit the power of the national Government to deal with a question that must be considered in a national way.

In the past an endeavour has been made by the State to deal with this question. Here, we have had people living on sustenance allowances. In South Australia about £1,000,000 was spent in one year in doling out money to people who otherwise could not have existed. In this country we spent hundreds of thousands of pounds on doles. After two or three years of that sort of thing, we ultimately emerged into the stage when the position had improved, and we were subsequently able to employ our people full time. We want to be able to ensure the full-time employment of all the people from the very commencement of peace. We do not want the economic waste of hundreds of thousands of people not being in remunerative employment. We cannot tackle such a problem in a piecemeal fashion through the resources of the States, which have to go to the Loan Council for all the money they spend. During the last 12 months we had our ability to raise revenue circumscribed by the Commonwealth Government, which took over income taxation. I do not agree with that but it is a fact, and we cannot ignore it.

If we desired to give relief payments to an army of unemployed, and the Treasurer brought down a scheme for taxation which the country could bear, and which would result in a certain amount of money being made available to the unemployed by way of sustenance, that could not be done. The Commonwealth Government has taken away the right to levy income taxation, and we depend upon what can be obtained through the Commonwealth Government by means of grants, if we get to that stage. Even though a Commonwealth Government did say that, so far as the States are concerned, unemployment is their responsibility, the Commonwealth Government now says that it will be responsible for employment and unemployment. Having suggested that it should undertake the responsibility, and in view of the magnitude of the task, I consider the States would be well-advised to give that

power to the Commonwealth. If we find that it is abusing the power in a way that was not expected and is detrimental to the States, I point out that it is only for a comparatively short time. Every single thing that is to be done in regard to this power will have to be legislated for by the Commonwealth Parliament. During the time when that legislation is going through, if we think the powers will be detrimental to us, or will be used detrimentally to us, we can make an effective protest. I do not think the Commonwealth Government is out to victimise the citizens of any State.

Mr. Doney: We are not too sure upon that point.

The PREMIER: Although I might be opposed to some party that may be in control of the national Parliament, I do not think it would be so small-minded as deliberately to set out to do any injury to the people of Australia.

Hon. N. Keenan: What did you think last November?

The PREMIER: Last October, it was. In order to impress the Commonwealth Government in regard to some power which it was proposed to take for all time, we had to discuss what had been done, what might be done, and what could be done. I do not think any of those things could be done in five years. Those things that have worked out detrimentally to Western Australia under Federation have been evolved over a long time. Five years is a short time in the history of the country in which political events can occur. While people have short memories, I think their memories generally last for five years in regard to most political events.

Mr. Seward: It did not take the Commonwealth long to bring in the wheat restriction regulation against Western Australia.

The PREMIER: No, but farmers in Western Australia are getting something that is not being given to farmers in other States; they are being paid for the restriction of areas.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the attention of the Premier to the fact that this paragraph does not deal with primary products.

Mr. Thorn: And our farmers are still waiting to be paid that compensation.

The PREMIER: I oppose the amendment because the provision must be very wide and we must not circumscribe the power of the Commonwealth to deal effectively with the problem of unemployment. The

Drafting Committee at the Convention wanted a limitation, but all the suggestions were open to objection. We could not get agreement in the matter of limitation. In view of the magnitude of the problem confronting us, that of re-instating in remunerative employment the men engaged in the war, we would be unwise to limit the power beyond the present restriction.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The member for West Perth pointed out that Dr. Evatt, speaking on behalf of the Commonwealth Government, described this as a very great power. I agree with that. The hon member desires to limit that power whereas I wish to make it full and complete.

Mr. Doney: And, I take it, permanent too!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If we give complete power, the authority that accepts it must accept complete responsibility. This means that the matter of employment and unemployment will become the prerogative and the responsibility of the Commonwealth. During the depression period, we broke very badly. We could not do justice to those who were in a pitiable condition, and could not go elsewhere for assistance to do what was merely human justice. The member for West Perth went further and said the reference of this power would dismember the Constitution. I want it to be dismembered. Over the years we had poverty in the midst of plenty and I believe this will cure that condition of affairs. We must stop for all time attempting the seemingly impossible task of adjusting production to the needs of the community. There is only one way to do this and that is to concentrate the responsibility for adjustment in one central authority. The States cannot do it and, if we do something that will dismember what has existed in the past, we shall be doing something to relieve unemployment which has proved so disastrous to the people.

This is one portion of the Bill that should not be limited. The reference should be made comprehensive and wide. Generally speaking words limit the scope and, the more words we put into the paragraph, the less the scope will be. The fact of this being a very great power is due to the brief reference contained in the paragraph "employment and unemployment." I am proud of this paragraph; I am glad that it is wide and comprehensive. I believe that when this power is given to the Commonwealth,

poverty in the midst of plenty will no more prevail in this country. It will give power to the Commonwealth to regulate the position not only in the States but also as between States, and to do everything humanly possible from an Australian point of view to relieve distress. On the second reading debate I pointed out the troubles we experienced during the depression and the privations that accompanied unemployment, and the need for new activities and for a central authority to introduce them. There was no authority to put works in hand to relieve unemployment.

Knowing that we failed on that occasion, that tens of thousands of people suffered, that children were undernourished, that many homes were under-furnished and lacking in beds, that men were unable to work because of the weakness of their frames, all this on account of poverty prevailing in a country of plenty, let us not repeat the mistake. The only way is to centralise this responsibility and let the Commonwealth stand up to the job. Let us give the Commonwealth an opportunity to carry out this responsibility by passing the paragraph in the words which came from the Convention, and which in my opinion were deliberately inserted so that there would be no limit upon the responsibility of the Commonwealth in regard to employment and unemployment.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The paragraph consists of three words "employment and unemployment" and the object of the amendment is to elucidate the subject-matter to be transferred to the Commonwealth. This is referred to as the transfer of a power, but it is really a subject-matter. That however, is merely a matter of precision of language. What is the meaning of "employment" in the Bill? From the observations of the Premier one would imagine that it related to the provision of employment, and I notice in his report that it is thus spoken of. But that is not the meaning of the word as it stands in the Bill.

The Premier: It could mean that.

Hon. N. KEENAN: It means that and a lot more.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It means everything.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The Premier and the Minister for Labour spoke of it as implying the provision of employment, but in the Bill it means everything connected with industry. As the Solicitor General told the

Select Committee, it means the right to determine what industry is to be followed in Western Australia and what is not. We would be foolish if we did not recognise that fact. It might go so far as to say that the alunite deposits in Western Australia shall not be worked. Already the statement has been made that these deposits are located too far from the coast. It would give the right to say what individuals shall be employed in industry. In fact, there is no possible limit to the meaning. It is as wide as the sky and there would be no function left for the State Government to discharge. The job of the member for Guildford-Midland would disappear; we would have no right to remain sitting here. What would be the position of the State if we in fact had no power whatever regarding industrial development, granting assistance to industries or any matter connected with the following or pursuit of industries. We as a Parliament would have no right whatever to exist. We would be drawing our salaries on the fallacious idea that we were governing the State, but the people would realise the true position. They would not keep members here and pay them for nothing.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: To say nothing about another place.

Hon. N. KEENAN: There would be no power whatever to influence the destiny of the State. We are to make this reference under the idea that it is for the purpose of providing employment, to use the language of the Premier. The reference, however, must be interpreted in its general sense—a sense that has not been defined. It embraces everything. Every possible phase of our industrial and commercial life—because employment extends beyond industry—would be entirely under the control of the Commonwealth Parliament and there would be no justification for our existence as a Parliament. It may be difficult to bring before the minds of members the colossal ambit of this term. I ventured before to refer to a matter which illustrates it. The whole matter at Canberra was a tactical struggle. A document was handed to the delegates—the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition—which had been furnished by Professor Bailey, Sir Robert Garran and Sir George Knowles. In that document they gave an explanation why this wide indefinite term should be used.

What is the explanation they gave? They said that under the defence power, which at present is operating and will operate until peace is declared, very great powers are enjoyed by the Parliament of the Commonwealth, but not enough, because the Commonwealth had had an experience, in the course of the exercise of the defence power, of certain regulations promulgated under it.

One regulation prohibited public holidays, except where such holidays were allowed by the Manpower Commissioner of a State. The regulation prohibited the allowance of statutory holidays unless, as I said, they were allowed by the Manpower Commissioner of a State. A holiday was not allowed in Victoria, and the Victorian Government, through the appropriate channels, made application to the High Court to have the regulation disallowed on the ground that it did not refer to and was not based on any possible construction of the word "defence," the civilians concerned being admittedly not connected in any way with war work. This is the position that was taken up by the Manpower Commissioner in Victoria. He said, "It is immaterial to us altogether whether the worker is engaged in war work or not engaged in war work; we order him not to have a holiday, notwithstanding that it is a statutory holiday, and we say our word is the law and must prevail." But the High Court held the opposite view. It held unanimously that there was no possible reason for saying that war work would be in any way affected by the granting of the holiday and that the Manpower Commissioner had no power to interfere, whether the person who could have enjoyed the holiday was a servant of the State or a servant of a private employer. That point was immaterial. The workers were not within the scope of any action of the Commonwealth Parliament under the power of defence. The three learned gentlemen to whom I have referred complained of that decision and said it was handicapping—handicapping!—the power of the Commonwealth Government and the power of the Commonwealth Parliament. In the reference which they made to it they said, "This deficiency would be remedied—remedied!—by the adoption of this statute," which was then being discussed.

Mr. Patrick: They did not want that for the post-war period. They want it now.

Hon. N. KEENAN: The moment this Bill becomes law, if it is passed in its present

form, then according to Professor Bailey, Sir George Knowles and Sir Robert Garran the Commonwealth Parliament will have power to do what I have just said the High Court ruled it could not do, and the Commonwealth Government would have the power not only in wartime but so long as this statute remained effective. In other words, the Commonwealth Parliament would have it for many years in peacetime; in my belief, for ever.

The Premier: What a terrible calamity!

Hon. N. KEENAN: Is it not a calamity?

The Premier: No. Is it a calamity for a State employee to be kept at work in wartime?

Hon. N. KEENAN: Does the Premier understand that? Does he not find fault with an outside power that can come in and say to the State, "We have no right to interfere on any ground of war consideration, but we are going to interfere and we are going to order you, a public servant or a public worker, or the worker for a private employer, who is entitled to a statutory holiday, notwithstanding that you have no work at all to do in connection with the war and notwithstanding that your taking of the holiday will make no difference at all to the defence of the country, we are going, in the exercise of this power, to order you to continue working. If we pass this Bill, we will over-ride all State laws and regulations and take charge. We will not allow the State Government to have any say in industrial matters." And the Premier is going to defend that! He is going to tell the people that he is prepared to hand over to an outside authority, to one they will never be in touch with, to one 2,000 miles away, a right which they at present enjoy and which has been given to them by their own Parliament and Government under circumstances as the law stands today. I am not prepared to take up that position. It means giving up every vestige of authority. It means the complete surrender of our State rights. It means that we have acknowledged we are unfit to govern; and if we acknowledge that we are unfit to govern, why do we stay here?

Why do not we get out and say, "We are unfit to govern; let us go, and let those fit to govern come in"? What does the member for West Perth want to do by his amendment? He does not want to limit in the slightest degree the right of the Com-

monwealth Parliament to take every step which in its wisdom it may deem right to provide employment, to use the words of the Premier and the Minister for Labour. But he does want to prevent the Commonwealth Parliament from using this wide and indefinite term. Dr. Evatt would not pretend to interpret it. Why should he? He said, "Go to the High Court." How on earth that was allowed to be said to this Convention without being challenged I cannot understand. Dr. Evatt says, "Go to the High Court."

The Premier: If the Commonwealth uses the power wrongly.

Hon. N. KEENAN: This exceedingly docile Convention bowed its head and said, "That is sufficient for us, we accept it." Then we are asked to end the Government of this State by the people of this State by passing this particular paragraph. It means the end of the Government by the people of the State. There was a depression in 1930 which arose not from the previous war, as has so often been said, but from conditions in the industrial world that would have occurred had there never been a war. It arose from the discovery of many new and improved methods of manufacture, which unfortunately led to the dismissal of workers and the substitution of machinery for the hand of man. That is what brought about the depression. The colossal output which took place and for which there was no possible buying power, coupled with the dismissal of a very large number who were engaged in industry before the machine age had been fully developed, led to the depression.

The Premier: We have had all those labour-saving appliances since the depression and still we are not in depressed conditions.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I like to hear what the Premier says, as it is pertinent and full of sense; but interjections from other parts of the Chamber are not so. Unfortunately those interjectors have a louder voice than has the Premier. I do not wish to be discourteous to the Premier, but I did not hear what he said. This is a very serious matter and one with which we should not deal for one moment in any joocular vein. I repeat, once we pass this Bill in its present printed form, we shall commit suicide as far as the government of this State is concerned. We had better recognise that and say that that is what this proposal amounts to. We want

to commit suicide, like the soldiers of Japan, who seem to deem it a great honour and pleasure to commit suicide. But we want to commit suicide at a time when we have no authority from the people of the State. The only authority we have is that which we have given to ourselves by an extension of our life, and we are proposing to throw away the rights of the people by a bare majority of a rump Parliament on the floor of this House.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I am sorry I have to say my few words in the heavy and depressing atmosphere which always exists following upon the pronouncement of a death sentence, which the member for Nedlands has just passed upon this Parliament. His speech, in its general argument, has some merit, but this was entirely destroyed by the feeble example upon which he spent some time, the example being that of a Commonwealth regulation in respect of compulsory holidays for public servants in Victoria having been subsequently found by the High Court to be non-enforceable. That was really a terrible happening! It was a frightful misuse of the Commonwealth's war-time power, or of a power which the Commonwealth believed it possessed during war-time!

Mr. Watts: It indicates a great desire to interfere unnecessarily, all the same.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I think not. If the Leader of the Opposition were more fully aware of the reason for a general prohibition of holidays to everybody, he might appreciate the motive behind the action of the Commonwealth Government in prohibiting the granting of holidays to anybody.

Mr. Watts: In that particular case it was prohibition. The Victorian Government had granted the holiday.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: It was a prohibition of the taking of a holiday on a certain day by the Victorian Government servants. The Commonwealth Government sought to prohibit those public servants from having a certain statutory holiday. It matters not! The fact is that the Commonwealth Government issued a regulation to say that on what was a statutory public holiday in Victoria, the workers to whom it applied should work.

Hon. N. Keenan: It did not say that the workers on war work—

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I am not talking about war work. The Commonwealth Government issued a regulation to say that the workers in the State of Victoria, irrespective of whether they were engaged in war work, and entitled to a statutory holiday, should not have it; that they should work on that day.

Mr. Seward: When the cause of the holiday was removed.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Why was the regulation issued?

Mr. Watts: Goodness only knows!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I hope I shall be able to give the Leader of the Opposition some idea of the motive behind it.

Mr. McDonald: Are we going to have five days at Easter?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I am not aware of what we will have at Easter. As members know, workers engaged in war industries get very few holidays and they work a good deal of overtime and become weary, discontented and dissatisfied at times.

Mr. Seward: So do the soldiers.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Yes!

Mr. Seward: They do not get paid overtime.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: We need not bring them into this argument. If liberal holidays are allowed to public servants, for instance, and other workers not engaged on war work, especially when the holiday is given for the purpose of allowing these non-war industry workers to go to the Melbourne Cup—

Mr. Seward: It was not being run on that day.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: It might not have been.

Mr. Seward: It was not.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Irrespective of whether it was or was not, the fact is that the public servants of Victoria would have been given a holiday for nothing—a holiday to wander around and do anything that they cared to do. It is only natural that if public servants and men engaged in industries not of a war character are given all the statutory holidays that operated in peacetime, the workers in the war industries would become even more dissatisfied with being deprived of a number of such holidays and being called upon to work overtime.

Mr. Watts: But you have it the wrong way round.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: No, I have not. The Commonwealth Government in an endeavour to see that people in this community did more work in wartime than in peacetime cancelled, or sought to cancel, a number of peacetime public holidays, so that the public servants and the like would not have as many public holidays in wartime as in peacetime.

Mr. Watts: The Commonwealth Government did not seek to cancel it on this occasion, but sought to grant it against the wish of the Victorian Government.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: That may be. What I am trying to point out to members is that, in connection with the cancellation of public holidays by the Commonwealth Government under its regulations, the main motive has been to ensure that workers outside of war industries shall be employed more fully than they were in the days of peace. That applied at Christmas when the Commonwealth issued its holiday regulations under which January 1st, New Year's Day, was not a holiday for the first time in the history of Australia. So it can be understood that the use of powers of this description have behind them altogether praiseworthy motives. They are put into operation in an endeavour to obtain from every worker in the community—especially those not engaged on war work—more service than they were called upon to give in peacetime. The member for Nedlands appealed almost entirely to the doubts and fears of members and the general public. He told us that if the reference set out in the Bill is made to the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth may do all sorts of terrible things. He did not tell us of anything very terrible that it had done, or might do.

Mr. Watts: It has never had such a power as this.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: If it did have the power, what could it do?

Mr. Watts: Heaven only knows; we will find out too late under your scheme!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: That is the answer—Heaven only knows!

Mr. Patrick: That is practically what Dr. Evatt said.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: That simply goes to show that in spite of all these terrible things which the member for Nedlands has spread before us this afternoon,

and as a possible consequence of which he has pronounced the death sentence upon us, no-one is able to suggest anything specific of a terrible nature that the Commonwealth is likely to do in the exercise of this power.

Mr. Seward: There are a terrible lot of things that it might do that it would not do.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I take it that this Parliament, for the last 40 years, has had this power in regard to employment and unemployment. What terrible things has it done in the exercise of this power?

Mr. Watts: That is quite a different story.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: It seems to me that it is not a different story at all.

Hon. N. Keenan: We are answerable to the people of Western Australia.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: And the Commonwealth Parliament is answerable to the people of Australia.

Hon. N. Keenan: Not of Western Australia.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: The people of Western Australia are part of the people of Australia. I cannot imagine that the Commonwealth Government, or any State Government, would do such terrible things under this power. I cannot imagine what the Commonwealth could do that would create the calamity running so wildly in the mind of the member for Nedlands. We can all remember the last depression period. The member for Nedlands ought to remember it very well as he was a member of the State Government at the time. Unless some power is given to the Commonwealth authority in respect of employment and unemployment we will see another period of depression after this war, as we did in 1931-32 and the following years.

Mr. Watts: It did not take place until ten years after the war.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: It did, as a matter of fact. There was very severe unemployment in Western Australia soon after the last war, and in several of the other States.

Mr. Watts: I am referring to the depression.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: There was an early or immediate post-war depression.

Mr. Fox: In 1921!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Yes, and I think it might well be said, despite what the member for Nedlands told us, that

the depression of 1931-33 was a legacy of the war intensified, may be, to some extent by the factors he mentioned. In the past the Commonwealth has had the financial ability and power to deal with unemployment, but the legislative and administrative responsibilities have always been vested in the States. Previously, therefore, in respect of unemployment and employment, we have, as it were, had divided authority, with the result that unemployment has never been dealt with to the extent we would all desire. We hear a lot in connection with this paragraph about the possibility of the liberty of the individual being interfered with. We are told that someone might be ordered by the Commonwealth authorities to go to Lake Campion and work in the potash industry, and what a terrific interference that would be with the liberty of the individual. I would like members to turn over in their minds for a moment just what the liberty of the individual was worth in the years 1931-33.

The Minister for Mines: He was at liberty to starve.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Yes, he was, and his wife and children were at liberty to suffer all the grievous consequences of unemployment and absence of income. So I say that, whilst we can all agree with the definition of the member for Nedlands, this paragraph gives tremendous power to the Commonwealth in the matter of employment and unemployment. Unless tremendous power and authority were given to the Parliament or Government concerned it could not adequately deal with the problem of unemployment, or provide against it. If we limit this and hand over to the Commonwealth Government some lesser power with which to deal with employment and unemployment, we will find the same grievous trouble existing soon after this war that we found soon after the last war, and again in the terrible depression period from 1930 to 1936. The Commonwealth Government will have to pass legislation after this power is referred to it, and it will obtain from that legislation—

Mr. Watts: Power to make regulations by the million.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: It may obtain power to make regulations if the Commonwealth Parliament grants that power, just the same as the Government of the State could obtain power to make regu-

lations if the Parliament of the State were willing to give the power.

Mr. Watts: But not so easily, from past experience!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: I still submit that all the terrible things the member for Nedlands suggested could or might be done under this power is an appeal to the fear and doubts sown widely in this State in recent weeks. The Commonwealth wants this power to ensure that in the future—particularly in the post-war period—Australia will not be cursed with an unemployment problem such as was experienced in the depression period and after the last war. It wants power to provide against that contingency. We cannot give it too much power to provide against that possible calamity which is the one I see and fear, and which most people in Australia see and fear. I think nearly everyone in the community visualises the probability, soon after this war ends, of a terrible unemployment problem in Australia, and that is what the people are anxious to provide against. They want some authority with financial power and ability to be loaded with the responsibility of providing against the development of a tragic unemployment problem in the early post-war years.

We all know that under this power the Commonwealth, if it was mad enough to pass legislation, could do so to provide for all sorts of crazy things. It could say in one of its Acts of Parliament, or regulations, that the member for Nedlands should be transferred to some job in the middle of Australia. If we, as a State Parliament, during the last 40 years had been mad enough we could have provided for things of that description under the employment and unemployment legislative power that we had. Such things have not been provided for, and are not done. They are not likely to be done by any Commonwealth Parliament. It would not be mad enough to attempt to do anything of the sort. The Committee should take a sensible view of this proposal.

Mr. Watts: That is what I want it to do, too.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Every member should keep in mind the reason why this power is sought by the Commonwealth Government. Its main reason is that the Commonwealth should have power to legislate and thereby be able to ensure that after

the present war there shall not be an unemployment problem of any consequence in Australia.

Mr. WATTS: I am sorry that there have not been more Government members in the Chamber to hear the observations made by the Minister for Labour. I am sure they would have derived much comfort from them had they been present to hear the very satisfactory explanation—satisfactory to the Minister but, I fear, to no-one on the Opposition side of the House—regarding the considerations surrounding the proposal embodied in the Bill. I do not want to dwell on the peculiar things one might anticipate a Commonwealth Parliament or a Commonwealth Government doing, irrespective of the political colour that may attach to it, if it had the powers sought to be conferred on it. On the other hand, I cannot lose sight of the fact that the Commonwealth Government has done some extraordinary things under the powers it possesses by its defence authority. There is the case of the Victorian Public Service and the public holiday question, which has been made almost a cause celebre by the Minister for Labour who, however, presented the case the wrong way round. He endeavoured to prove that the Commonwealth Government sought to prohibit the public servants of Victoria from taking a holiday, and he instanced sound reasons why that prohibition should have taken effect because of the dissatisfaction that would have been created amongst many war workers, who would not have enjoyed the holiday. If that had been the real position, there would have been some justification for the views expressed by the Minister; but it was not the position at all.

Here are the actual circumstances, which are well known to very many people, and which I ascertained for my own satisfaction when I was in the Eastern States. First I was given the five judgments delivered by the judges of the Federal High Court. I read each of them and each of the judges made some reference to this particular case. Subsequently I inquired further on the subject when I visited the offices of the Crown Law Department of Victoria. As members are aware, Melbourne Cup Day has been for many years a Tuesday. Races on week days have been prohibited or prevented by the Commonwealth Government. Under Victorian legislation, there is authority for the Governor to proclaim, in addition to

certain statutory holidays, any particular day a holiday. In years past, Melbourne Cup Day, which has been almost a national day throughout Australia, has been a Tuesday, and it has been the custom of the Victorian Government to proclaim that day a public holiday.

Mr. Seward: Within a radius of 25 miles from the G.P.O., Melbourne.

Mr. WATTS: I believe there was some provision to that effect. The point is that the Victorian Government proclaimed that particular day a public holiday year after year. Last year it was decided that there should be no Melbourne Cup run on a Tuesday and, under the Commonwealth National Security Regulations, the race had to be held on a Saturday, or not at all. The Victorian Government declined to proclaim the Melbourne Cup Day holiday on a Tuesday, as in former years. The Commonwealth National Security Regulations were promulgated setting out that that day should be a public holiday, and against that provision the Victorian Government appealed successfully to the Federal High Court. The Victorian Government held that if Melbourne Cup Day was to be proclaimed a holiday and the race was to be held on a Saturday, that was the day that should be proclaimed as a public holiday. Hence, it would not proclaim the Tuesday as a public holiday. The High Court agreed with the view taken by the Victorian Government. That is an example of the type of experience we are likely to have if the Commonwealth Government should be vested with this proposed authority in peacetime. This instance was brought forward apparently by the member for Nedlands as an example of what we may expect.

When the Convention was sitting in Canberra, I was anxious to ascertain from Dr. Evatt, as far as I could, exactly what he had in mind when he included this particular power in the proposed legislation. He had made a statement earlier in the proceedings, which statement has been referred to by the member for West Perth, and I had expressed at various times my dissatisfaction with the idea of the Commonwealth Government having power of this character. I therefore moved an amendment that the power should not include the determining of wages and conditions of employment. Dr. Evatt asked me not to press my amendment. If he did not want the amendment

pressed, must it not be clear to members, as clear as the sun in the sky, that he intended to use that power for the purpose of fixing wages and conditions of employment? If it was an unsuitable amendment to his mind, it was obviously so because he intended to use the power for the purpose I have suggested. One can arrive at no other logical conclusion, and the amendment was not moved with any anticipation of its being carried. I had sized up the position as it was when the Drafting Committee had returned to the Convention. The Federal members were talking about its being a matter for the States. The State Premiers and Dr. Evatt and Mr. Hughes were alleged to be unanimous regarding it, and the rest of us were not in the running. In those circumstances, the amendment, from the standpoint of amending the proposed legislation, was useless; but I wanted to ascertain if I could what were Dr. Evatt's views on this question, and I thought I could perhaps achieve that object by moving an amendment which seeks to circumscribe the powers sought by taking away some measure of control respecting the fixation of wages and conditions of employment.

So I say it is intended to utilise these powers that have been referred to for the very purpose I have suggested. Some years ago it is alleged that the hon. member who so ably preceded me in my present seat on the front Opposition bench suggested that it might be advisable, in the interests of the industries of this State—I did not agree with him and have not done so on the point—if there were a Federal basic wage applicable to those industries. That is what I have been told; I was not present to hear him make the statement at the time, but it has been suggested to me that that was the point of view he expressed. Government members, both on the hustings and in the House, made frequent references to that observation. Why? Because the Federal basic wage was then and has usually been lower than the basic wage determined in Western Australia by the State's own tribunal.

Hon. P. Collier: That helped us win one election.

Mr. WATTS: Precisely. The Federal basic wage, as I say, has been, and usually is, lower than the State basic wage. Although there may have been nice calculations carried out as to the cost of living on the Federal basis, from the point of view of

the worker who has to buy the goods he requires for himself and his family, the basis on which he has to pay and the prices charged for those goods are what concern him. The fact is that, irrespective of differential calculations, the Federal basic wage today is 4s. or 5s. lower for the Perth district than is the State basic wage for the same area. Notwithstanding that fact, we have this extraordinary change of front. No-one for one moment would accuse the Opposition of not wishing to retain the power and authority of the State Arbitration Court. We wish to ensure that that authority cannot be taken away from our State tribunal. I have already said that Dr. Evatt himself may desire to interfere in these matters, and I have always claimed that such interference is unjustifiable.

Presumably, although the actual considerations have not changed, members opposite are prepared to accept the idea of altering their point of view and accepting, notwithstanding the facts before them, the distinct possibility of the workers of Western Australia being committed to a basic wage controlled by the Federal authority, which wage has been, and still is, considerably less than the basic wage fixed by the State authority. I cannot for the life of me appreciate why there has been this change of front. I cannot understand why it is that now there should be such enthusiasm and energy displayed in taking action that is definitely detrimental to Western Australia and which I believe is detrimental, and will continue to be detrimental, to the workers concerned. I have no guarantee, nor has any other member here any such guarantee, that under the Federal proposal in regard to the determination of wages and working conditions, the position will be any better, and it could well be worse, than the State determinations which have existed in the past and which exist today. Not because I have any fear of anyone being transferred to Alice Springs or elsewhere against his will, but for the reasons I have given, I propose to continue opposing the transference of the powers covered in this paragraph. Turning now for a moment to the amendment moved by the member for West Perth, the Minister for Labour said that the reason this power was desired was to prevent Australia being cursed with unemployment as it was after the 1914-18 war. I submit that the amendment moved by the member for West Perth

will give the Commonwealth Parliament every opportunity to legislate along the lines desired.

If members accept my point of view that it is essential not to give the Commonwealth Government power over the determination of wages and the regulation of conditions of employment, then all that is required is the right to legislate for and about unemployment, and the amendment will give the Commonwealth Government ample opportunity to do just that very thing. The amendment will also cover another point respecting which the Solicitor General expressed doubt as to whether authority was given to deal with another matter affecting employment and unemployment—I refer to unemployment insurance. The member for West Perth has remembered, as I did, when dealing with that section of the Bill, the doubt expressed by the Solicitor General and we have asked the Committee to include unemployment insurance as well as the power to deal with employment and the relief of unemployment. I believe the Commonwealth Government will be well served if it secures the powers proposed in the amendment moved by the member for West Perth. The people of this State, and especially the workers of this State, will have cause to thank the member for West Perth if he prevents the paragraph from going through as printed.

Hon. N. KEENAN: I wish to ask the Premier and the Minister for Labour what they had in mind when submitting a special report in the course of their duties as members of the Select Committee. Paragraph (b) contains the words "provide employment where necessary." We on this side have no objection to power being given; on the contrary, we approve of power being given to the Commonwealth Parliament to provide employment; but we object to handing over the whole subject of employment to the Commonwealth Parliament, since that subject includes other matters of far-reaching importance. I would also like to refer to an observation of the Minister for Labour when he was commenting on the fact that the State Parliament possessed this power and had possessed it ever since it received responsible Government in 1899, and had never abused it; and the hon. gentleman went on to ask why should the Commonwealth abuse it? The answer almost

stares one in the face. If the State Parliament ever dared to abuse the power, it would have to answer for that abuse to the people of Western Australia, who have the power to turn Parliament out and instal another Parliament which would immediately alter everything that had been done by the previous Parliament. But the opinion of the Western Australian people would not matter in the slightest regarding what was done by the Commonwealth Parliament. Every single Parliament of Western Australia is based on the approval of the people of this State. If a Parliament does not receive and retain that approval, it will very soon end. Whoever controls Western Australian industry, controls the whole destiny of the State.

Mr. SEWARD: If the Bill goes through containing this paragraph as it now appears, it will be a dire calamity for Western Australia. Accordingly I have no hesitation whatever in supporting the amendment of the member for West Perth. The Minister for Labour has repeatedly interjected asking "What dire things will the Commonwealth Parliament do to Western Australia if we give it this power?" I am not half as much concerned with that aspect as I am concerned with the aspect of the things the Commonwealth will not do for the benefit of Western Australia if it should get this power. In view of the activities of Commonwealth legislation over past years, we cannot wax enthusiastic about the manner in which it has assisted industries, and particularly secondary industries, in Western Australia. A case in point is the shipbuilding industry during wartime. That should be a vital source of employment. Therefore I unhesitatingly oppose the paragraph as it appears in the Bill. During wartime thousands of our men, either competent artisans then or attaining competency before the close of the war, are engaged in other States on war work. What guarantee have we that if we give the Commonwealth Government this power of employment, our men will ever come back to Western Australia? The more competent and efficient they are, the greater will be the desire of Eastern Australian industries to retain them, to the great detriment of Western Australia.

I want the fullest possible opportunity reserved for this Parliament to advance industries, and to find full employment for those of our people who have gone East during the war, and who will be highly com-

petent workers thanks to experience gained in eastern Australia. The member for Guildford-Midland has no hesitation whatever in granting the proposed powers. He would give the Commonwealth Parliament any power it desires, so that there may not again be poverty in the midst of plenty. He says we should make the Commonwealth Parliament stand up to its job. How shall we do it? There is no chance whatever of making the voices of our five members heard in the House of Representatives. Despite all the precautions we have taken over this Bill, there remains a very serious doubt whether the measure will prove a temporary or a permanent one. To transfer industries from eastern Australia to Western Australia would prove enormously difficult, in view of the political pull of the more populous States. The Commonwealth Meat Commission consists of five Eastern States members, with a Broken Hill tailor as chairman. Even our own Minister for Agriculture gave information which proved misleading with respect to the meat industry of this State. So what hope is there of Eastern States authorities nursing and promoting the Western Australian meat industry? Even now, after all the protestations of the Minister for Industrial Development against products that can be made here being imported from the Eastern States, we still have the stuff being sent over here, as instanced by a consignment of beer.

The Minister for Labour: The instances are very isolated.

Mr. SEWARD: There should be no instances if the Priority Committee were cognisant of its job and were doing it. Things that happened during the last depression have been instanced, but that depression did not occur as the result of the last war. It was more correctly attributed to the self-sufficient policy embarked upon by the nations of the world. They refused to take commodities from this country, and our depression resulted. Such a depression we had not experienced previously. I would not condemn those who had the task of handling that depression. In the light of their experiences then they would be able to preserve our industries much better, should such circumstances again occur, than was the case in the former depression, and would also be able more effectively to prevent unemployment. But with its financial resources, the Commonwealth

Government undoubtedly is in a better position to deal with the question of unemployment, so I am agreeable to assist in giving the Commonwealth additional powers to deal with that subject; but I am opposed to handing over all the powers to deal with employment in the various industries that we have here.

Only on Saturday I had the pleasure, in company with one of the Ministers, of inspecting a factory established in the country. If I remember rightly the Minister for Employment took part in the opening of this factory, which is now providing employment for 200 men in a town that 10 or 15 years ago was fast going out of existence. The size of the township has doubled since the factory was established. A new school and hospital have been erected, and there is continuous employment for 200 men in the factory which is working the clock round every day of the week. Members opposite, who so frequently give instances of the advances Russia has made, should follow the example of that country in establishing industries inland. That is the policy Russia adopted, namely, of getting industries established throughout the country, of having them established right in the interior instead of in the big cities close to the borders, as is the case in Australia. There is no power equal to that of the State Parliament to create these industries in our country districts, and I want to preserve that power.

Mr. DONEY: I dislike the paragraph under discussion. I shall dislike it a little less if the amendment of the member for West Perth is accepted. The Minister for Labour finished with a plea for us to give the right to the Commonwealth Government to legislate and plan so that there may be no post-war unemployment problem. His remarks, from start to finish—and the same I suppose might be said of the remarks of the Premier and certainly of the remarks of the member for Guildford-Midland—showed a touching faith in the Commonwealth Government to work miracles. It would indeed be a miracle if the Commonwealth Government after the war found it possible to stop the ebb and flow of unemployment and the dole and strikes in the manner in which they seem to crop up after all major conflicts. Neither of those gentlemen seems to have the tiniest reservation of doubt but that if employment and unemployment questions were handed

over to the Commonwealth Government continuity of employment would be assured. I cannot for the life of me see whence they derive that beautiful assurance.

The Premier: The Commonwealth Government will be able to get the money, for a start.

Mr. DONEY: Yes. Equally of course—if that were the only trouble—it could hand the money to the people better able to disburse it. The Premier will surely agree with me that there would be a lessened laxity of control if instead of that control being exercised from far-off Canberra the ability of the Premier's colleague were put to the test. I think the Minister for Labour would do a better job. The fact that at the moment finance is the perquisite of the Commonwealth Government need not affect the position. I was saying that history in respect of unemployment following the war is dead against the opinions held by the Premier and his colleagues. Following the last war the Old Country, with vastly greater revenue and resources than our Commonwealth Government possesses, was unable to find work for everyone. As a matter of fact, the unemployed and those on the dole could be counted by millions for something like 15 years following the last Great War. I ask the Committee whether we have any grounds for anticipating a better fate than that. I do not see that we have. I would like to ask members opposite exactly what are the factors that lead them to think that if the Commonwealth Government is in control of everything in the industrial garden it will all be lovely. I repeat that if the job were handed over to the Premier's colleague, the Minister for Labour—I refer to the matter of unemployment—a vastly better job would be done than if it is allowed to be controlled from Canberra.

Mr. W. HEGNEY: As I see it, the problems of peace will be no less acute than those of war. It has been said that peace hath her victories no less renowned than war's. What will it avail the Commonwealth of Australia if, in conjunction with the other Allied Nations, it wins the war and loses the peace? We must think of the future and be guided as to the action to be taken by what has happened in the past. I have heard this afternoon remarks by various speakers on the opposite side of the Chamber in which they have endeavoured to prove that the de-

pression was not war-caused. To the unemployed men, of whom there were thousands during the short interval between the end of the last war and the commencement of this one, the cause of the depression matters not. The problems of unemployment, with their attendant difficulties, are just as acute. While our present social system continues so long will there be war and unemployment. Unemployment is a result of war and that is part of the present economic system. While the profit motive actuates employers in industry generally there will be competition, and it is necessary for a vast army of unemployed to be present. Taking the years from 1919 to the present time I for one would not like to see in this country a return to the old order of things.

It has been said by speakers opposite that there were no unemployed immediately after the last war. If the official statistics are perused it will be found that within 2½ years after the end of the last war no less than 150,000 men in this country were unemployed, and even 12 months after the present war had begun we had in this State some thousands of men not enjoying the basic wage as declared by the Arbitration Court in Western Australia, but endeavouring to maintain their wives and families by working on a part-time basis. I have here a statement in which it is shown that the basic wage was £4 6s. 6d. in this State in 1940, approximately 12 months after the war began. But a man with a wife and two children on part-time work in the country earned on an average only £3 15s. 7d. a week. I have had experience over a number of years in regard to employment and industrial conditions. I have been on deputations to the previous Leader of the Opposition when he was acting as Premier and to the Lieut.-Governor who was then Premier, to the present Premier of this State and to his predecessor, Hon. P. Collier. Each of them passed the remark that the solving of the unemployment question was a Commonwealth Government responsibility. "Bovrilised," the main reply of every Premier and responsible Minister to whom I submitted requests on behalf of the unemployed, was "We have not the money; it is a Commonwealth Government responsibility. If we had control over the financial system we would be able to solve the problem."

As a representative of the Australian Labour Party I went back on innumerable occasions to the ranks of the unemployed to

point out the position from the Government's point of view. At the height of the depression we had no less than 480,000 employable men in this country out of work. But what do we find? Once the war organisation of Australia is oiled and well under way, labour is at a premium. There is not enough manpower to carry out the requirements of the war effort. We are engaged in war and the nation is organised on a war basis. No one would suggest that the organisation of the war should be left to the different State Premiers. There is only one army of defence in the Commonwealth and that is the Australian Army and Air Force and Navy. If it is necessary in time of war for the Commonwealth Government to have complete power, as it has, over employment and unemployment, it should have it in the days immediately following the cessation of war in the problems that will inevitably confront us.

It has been said that if the Commonwealth Government is given the power it will be able to transfer men from one district to another. From 1929 to 1940 there were men who had previously worked as shop assistants, clerks, accountants and in other callings of an academic or non-manual character, but who were sent to all parts of the State. They had to register at the unemployment depot at West Perth and pass the means test. Some member interjected that they could starve. It was true that that was their only alternative. If they passed a certain medical test during the depression they were sent to any part of Western Australia that might be decided upon. Why? Because certain public works were being put into operation that were necessary to the State, and required a great amount of labour power and a lesser amount of machinery and material. Consequently those men were sent there from the metropolitan area. We must recognise that the problem of transferring approximately 1½ million men and women from the Defence Forces of this country to peace-time industry is not going to be a matter of five minutes. It is only natural that there should be psychological and other aspects of the problem that must be grappled with by the Commonwealth Parliament. It is not likely we shall be able to demobilise 500,000 men today and put them into industry tomorrow.

What would happen if the amendment with all its limitations were carried? It

would mean a reversion to the old order of things. The Commonwealth Government would have to collaborate with the States, the States would outline proposed works, and the Commonwealth Government would finance the States. That is what was done before, and I do not want to see any more dual control in the matter of employment and unemployment. From 1930 to 1940 I saw so much degradation, poverty and undernourishment that I cannot now stand idly by and countenance dual control in the post-war years. I appeal to members not to be insular in their outlook. I suggest that their vision should extend east of the No. 1 rabbit-proof fence, and that they should recognise that the Commonwealth Parliament is more democratic than ours and that it represents the Australian people. I am prepared to trust the representatives of Australia with this power. The member for Nedlands pointed out that this Parliament is answerable to the people of Western Australia. This section of the Parliament is certainly responsible to the people, but the Legislative Council is responsible to only certain interests, and the interests of property can over-ride those of the people.

The member for Pingelly made a cogent remark in mentioning that tradesmen who had gone from this State to the Eastern States would not return after the war. The Commonwealth Government prevented many tradesmen from leaving this State. Before the National Security Regulations were introduced, tradesmen, on account of inducements received from employers in the Eastern States, went there, but now the matter of their transfer is under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth. If the Commonwealth Government, after being relieved of its defence powers, has no power to control employment and unemployment, I have no doubt that there will be one and a half million people thrown on the hands of the States, and we shall then have seven authorities instead of one trying to deal with the position. So I say in reply to the member for Pingelly that, if the Commonwealth is not given this power, those tradesmen who have gone to the Eastern States will not return here, because employers there will offer them more than the arbitration rates to remain. I believe that Mr. Curtin and other members of the Commonwealth Parliament are just as good Australians as we are, and that, if the interests of Western Australia demanded a

transference of men here, arrangements would be made to get them over. If there is no control by the Commonwealth after the cessation of hostilities, the tradesmen still here will soon go to the East, because the inducements will be there.

My experience of the problem of employment and unemployment leads me to believe that the people of this country are entitled to have this matter placed in the hands of the Commonwealth so that the problems that will arise on the restoration of peace may be successfully grappled with. I would not object to the Commonwealth's having authority to legislate regarding luxury industries, zoning and other matters such as the employment of so many commercial travellers, which employment necessitates the charging of higher prices for foodstuffs. Admittedly the words in the paragraph cover a vast field, one that is almost limitless; but I am prepared to trust the Commonwealth Government, knowing full well that the Australian people, living in the most democratic country in the world, may take action to secure whatever kind of Government they desire to have.

Mr. PATRICK: I agree with practically all the arguments advanced by members opposite, though I believe most of them have been submitted under a misapprehension, because practically all of them are met by the amendment of the member for West Perth. There is no better way of meeting the position. The amendment would give the Commonwealth full power to find employment for workless people after the war. But I object to the very wide scope of the words, "employment and unemployment." Undoubtedly they cover the whole question of wage fixation. There is considerable doubt amongst unionists in this State as to whether they would be better off under Commonwealth or State jurisdiction. There is a Federal Railway Workers' Union, but the railway workers of this State have always preferred to be under State jurisdiction. The Timber Workers' Union, another large organisation, nearly broke in pieces a few years ago because some of the heads tried to force the members to come under Commonwealth jurisdiction. Thus it would be dangerous to give the Commonwealth such wide power. When a previous speaker remarked that the granting of this power as proposed in the paragraph would mean the

taking over of the whole of the State, the member for Guildford-Midland interjected, "Hear, hear." The hon. member stands for unification and, not being able to get it, he is prepared to whittle away the State's powers by degrees. I think the hon. member, in referring to Dr. Evatt's statement, called it the new technique of politics. I prefer to call it spider and fly tactics.

Mr. Seward: Infiltration.

Mr. PATRICK: Yes, that describes it. Once these powers are transferred it will be very difficult to recover them. The Premier said that it was only a matter of granting the powers on probation and that we could then see whether they would be abused. The powers might not be greatly abused during the next five or six years, but nobody can bind future Governments of the Commonwealth. The words contained in the paragraph are not original. Such words have been submitted to the people of Australia on three occasions and rejected each time. They were originated by the Hon. W. M. Hughes in 1911 when the words used were "labour and employment." In 1913 he added to the phrase by making it, "labour employment and unemployment." There was a keen debate in the Commonwealth Parliament on each occasion and the keenest criticism was focussed upon the limitless way in which the words could be interpreted. On the third occasion a time limitation was proposed, but even so the proposal was rejected by the people. When Mr. Hughes introduced the question into the Commonwealth Parliament he was no more able to define the meaning of the words than Dr. Evatt has been. Mr. Deakin, in his speech in 1912, said—

The then Attorney General, Mr. W. M. Hughes, in introducing constitutional amendments in 1912, said, "It gives the Commonwealth power to make laws in respect to employment and unemployment. It declares that included in that power, whatever it is, there is here no limitation or restriction." This may apply to everything and anything.

Mr. Archibald: Subject to the limitation of the High Court.

Mr. Deakin: The High Court is well within the terms of this endowment, and if the hon. member could find vaguer, more general or more comprehensive terms, I would like to hear them and to be shown how the High Court will have an opportunity of restricting them. It is impossible to set any limits to the interpretation that may be placed on these phrases, and yet it is thought fair to the public to ask them to give us a power, which we cannot ourselves define.

Whatever else may be said for the words chosen, it is quite certain that they embrace everything it is possible to embrace; how far the effect goes its authority does not know, does not care, and will not attempt to say.

These men were trying to slip things like this into the Constitution that were opposed to the Federal system of government. This is one method of attempting to break it down. I agree with the member for Nedlands; he only supports views expressed in 1912 by Mr. Deakin, who was a great Federalist. There is no limit that can be set to the interpretation of these words, so I support the amendment of the member for West Perth, which supplies members who have spoken on the other side of the House with everything they want, and sets a limit to the interpretation that can be placed on the words "employment and unemployment."

Mr. McDONALD: The Minister for Labour asked what reason there was to fear that the Commonwealth would exercise powers to the prejudice of the State of Western Australia. Fortunately, we are in a position to give him answers from two authoritative sources. The first source is the Case for Secession, which was prepared for the State Government, headed by the member for Boulder, the then Premier, for presentation to the Imperial Parliament. The Case for Secession is a documented statement of the position of this State in relation to the Commonwealth Parliament. It was presented to both Houses of this Parliament for approval before being submitted to the Imperial Parliament, and it received the approval of both Houses. As to the possibility, therefore, that the Commonwealth Government or the Commonwealth Parliament might use powers contrary to the interests of Western Australia, we can read, on page 54 of the Case for Secession, this statement—

Generally speaking, every disability mentioned is suffered by the State as a direct result of Federal legislative enactment or administrative action pursuing a policy which is framed to suit the conditions prevailing in the States in eastern Australia, with little or no heed for the action necessary to preserve the best interests of Western Australia.

On the same page it is stated—

The gradual growth of Federal power has so narrowed the borders of State functions that the State is powerless to improve a condition which steadily grows worse year by year.

On page 19 of the Case, we read—

The working of the Constitution as proved by practical experience, together with the steady growth of the policy of centralisation adopted by successive Commonwealth Governments, has placed Western Australia in that unenviable position that if it remains a party to the Federation it will ultimately cease to exist.

That is a statement not prepared by any propagandist, but by a high officer of the State Government, with documented evidence for everything in it. It was presented to the Parliament of this State by the Premier's predecessor, passed by both Houses and submitted to the Imperial Government. We have also, as I said, another authoritative statement, and this was made by the Premier in speaking two or three months ago in this House. In reply to the question asked by the Minister for Labour, I think it my duty to refer to that statement. The Premier said—

It is apparent that unless the feelings of the people—

that is, the people of this State—

—have undergone a radical change, far from being prepared to grant increased powers to the Commonwealth they would like to see a reduction of the powers already possessed by it.

He went on to say—

There is a feeling that the people of this State do not desire further to place themselves in the hands of the Commonwealth Government by granting to that Government additional power. That hostility has been accentuated since the outbreak of war.

Those authoritative statements are sufficient to indicate that our experience of Federal control in relation to State affairs has been such that we can reasonably apprehend danger in parting with almost the last of our self-governing rights. The member for Pilbara said—very properly—that the term "employment and unemployment" represents a limitless field of power. So it does. The powers proposed to be given by Clause 2 of this Bill, taken as a whole, would I think deprive the people of this State for all practical purposes of all their self-governing rights, while the power proposed to be transferred by paragraph (b) would take away a large measure of their self-governing rights. Without delaying the Committee, I personally ask myself the very simple question: Was Section 51, paragraph (xxvii)—a power to transfer specified matters to the Commonwealth Parliament—ever intended to

be used by any Parliament to abdicate its own functions?

The Premier: It could not be used in any other way.

Mr. McDONALD: Was it ever intended to be used by any State Parliament to hand over to the Commonwealth Parliament the self-governing rights of the State, possessed by the people and guaranteed to them under the Constitution, unless by Section 128, by their own vote—the vote of the people of Australia—they abrogate the powers which they possess? I venture to say, although I do not know of any authority on it, that even under Section 128 of the Commonwealth Constitution it is very doubtful whether a majority vote of four or five States and of the people of Australia could destroy the Federal nature of the Constitution. I myself think, when it comes to an issue between federalism—which is the foundation, the indissoluble union set out in our Constitution—when it comes to an issue between federalism and unification, between the Federal system of the distribution of powers and the centralisation of power in one Commonwealth Parliament, then it is probable that that can only be achieved by the consent of the people in every State, and it should not be achieved even under Section 128. In any case, it would be quite beyond the spirit of Section 128, which at all times aims at the maintenance of the distribution of powers between the central legislature and the State legislature.

So I come back to this, speaking with all sobriety: Can I, in effect, taking this power with other powers, even for a time deprive the people of this State of their self-governing rights under the Constitution and without any reference to them? I care not whether it is for a long or a short period, whether for five minutes or for five years: Can I, and can we, without referring to the people, by this Bill in effect take away their rights as a self-governing community? Can I, and can we, take away from the people their extensive, important and I think very cherished rights, which they still possess under the terms of our Constitution? If the people, on the matter being referred to them, said, "Away with the State Parliament, away with our powers to Canberra," then they are perfectly entitled to do as they please. But this is no time, we are told, and with good cause, to go to the people and submit to them all these contro-

versial matters. I, for one, feel that I cannot do what everyone agrees would be done by this Clause 2, in conjunction with the enormous power contained in paragraph (b); that is, virtually abrogate the self-governing rights of the people of Western Australia, even for a term, without their consent and without their being consulted. That is how I stand. I have some feeling that, on democratic principles, that should not be done.

There will be difficulties after the war. There are some things which the Commonwealth Government must do and in which they must lead and must help. Therefore, I turn to the Commonwealth Government and say, "Since the people of the State cannot be consulted, I shall restrict my vote to a transfer only of those powers which the Commonwealth Government should so clearly have that there cannot, in my opinion, be any reasonable argument about them." I will not give any powers which will in any material degree diminish the self-governing rights of the State. In this amendment, on the same basis as with other amendments, it has been my endeavour to preserve that principle, that nothing will be given except powers which I think all reasonable people might agree should be national powers. Nothing will be given which would entitle the people of this State to say that they have been betrayed by their State Legislature, which has given away, without reference to them, self-governing powers affecting materially their future right to control their destiny. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment, this very real power, but at the same time a power that will not expose us to the challenge or the reproach that we have given away the rights of our own people.

The PREMIER: The member for West Perth has, to his own satisfaction, stated that we have no right to give away any powers to the Commonwealth Government. I point out that the people of Australia agreed to the Commonwealth Constitution, which includes paragraph (xxxvii) of Section 51.

Mr. McDonald: The people did not agree.

The PREMIER: They did.

Mr. McDonald: This Bill was never put to the people.

The PREMIER: The Commonwealth Constitution was put to the people.

Mr. McDonald: Yes, that was.

The PREMIER: The member for West Perth said that we have no right to transfer any of these powers to the Commonwealth Government. But the people of Australia who voted for Federation also voted for the Commonwealth Constitution, which gives the right to the people of the States to hand over to the Commonwealth certain powers at any time. Section 51 provides—

The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to—

and now we come to paragraph (xxxvii)—

—matters referred to the Parliament of the Commonwealth by the Parliament or Parliaments of any State or States, but so that the law shall extend only to States by whose Parliaments the matter is referred, or which afterwards adopt the law.

You cannot get away from that.

Hon. N. Keenan: Will you read Section 128?

The PREMIER: The hon. member knows Section 128. He does not need me to read it. That gives another method. It provides for a referendum.

Hon. N. Keenan: It provides that no alteration of the Constitution shall be made except by a referendum.

The PREMIER: Oh!

Hon. N. Keenan: Look at it!

The PREMIER: The hon. member can say, "Look at it" and put his own interpretation on it. But here is a simple statement in Section 51 which deals with the powers of the Commonwealth, and says that the Commonwealth may legislate on matters referred to it by the State. What does that mean?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It does not alter the Constitution.

The PREMIER: It gives the State the right to alter the Constitution if it so desires. There is an alternative method of altering the Constitution provided in Section 128. A referendum may be taken and, even though two States disagree, if a majority of the States pass it those two States are just wiped off and that can amend the Constitution. Although only one Parliament may refer a power to the Commonwealth that is part of the Commonwealth Constitution so far as it affects the relationship between the Commonwealth and that particular State. We cannot get away from that. The hon. member would give the impression that we had no right to do this. He

says we cannot do it except under Section 128.

Mr. McDonald: I say you have no right to do it.

The PREMIER: We have the law. I do not know whether the hon. member says the law is right or, like Dickens, that the law is an ass. The law says we can do this.

Mr. Watts: Have we a right morally and ethically?

The PREMIER: What is the difference between power and right? If you have the power you have the right.

Mr. Seward: Various referenda that have been taken should guide us.

The PREMIER: That does not affect our right. We have the right, if we think it proper, to do these things. It is there plainly in the Constitution. The hon. member also implied that by passing this particular provision we surrender all our self-governing rights. Apparently he is at variance with everybody who attended the Convention. The Convention met in an atmosphere of utter hostility to the Commonwealth Government's proposal. The members said, "You are taking away our self-governing rights in too great a degree." Because of that, the proposals were modified in a new Bill presented to the Convention. Even that went too far in regard to the surrender of State powers. It was only after a conference and a tremendous amount of conciliation and bargaining that this reference of powers was agreed to. To say that one of these references is sufficient to make us surrender all our rights, when every member of the Convention said that this Bill was a very big modification of the original proposal—

Hon. N. Keenan: In what respect?

The PREMIER: In the first case the Commonwealth Government was empowered to do exactly what it liked. In the second case it was permitted to do so only provided it linked its proposals up with post-war reconstruction. This is a very severe modification. To say extravagantly that by this one provision we surrender the whole of our self-governing rights is an exaggeration of language that should not be indulged in during calm debate of a proposal of this description. It is not correct. The hon. member may say it but that does not make it right, and it would not be right if half a dozen members said it. This particular provision deals with a subject which most people in Australia consider one of the most im-

portant aspects of our social and industrial life, namely the mitigation of the tremendous evils that can attack a country because of unemployment. And because we are endeavouring to give the Commonwealth Government power to mitigate that evil as far as possible—

Mr. Seward: And also to control all conditions governing employment.

The PREMIER: I think it ought to have power in regard to employment. How are we going to undertake industries if the Commonwealth cannot do something to control the conditions of employment?

Hon. N. Keenan: No-one objects to giving the Commonwealth power to employ.

The PREMIER: We propose to give it power to employ in any way it desires and not merely to relieve unemployment. We could relieve unemployment by employing everybody in picture shows and other luxury industries, and go down in a welter of bankruptcy through extravagance. But we want to direct the way in which the production of this country should be undertaken and we want some control over the way in which industries are developed. That can be exercised only by a National Parliament. Because we want to do this it is said we are handing away all our self-governing rights. As a matter of fact we are doing something which will build this Commonwealth up in a way that will enable it to take its place with the other nations of the world. The liberty allowed in regard to the expenditure of money and the provision of employment in tiddlywinking ways and luxury industries and catering for people with silly ideas has got to stop.

In a period of post-war reconstruction our policy must be to do things that will count, that will make this nation great and that are necessary for the benefit of this country, and somebody must have power to direct these matters financially and industrially. There must be direction by a co-ordinating authority with some idea of what the future development of this country should be. These powers are necessary. For the hon. member to say that we have not the right to do this, when the Commonwealth Constitution gives us the right, is to make use of extravagant language with no logic in it. If the people of this State desire that we should not use our power, that does not mean to say we have not the right to do so if we feel that we have the right to exercise our

discretion in that way. If in the exercise of our right we can do something to alter this Constitution to the ultimate benefit of the people of Australia and of this State it is not only our right but our duty to do it. I hope we shall hear no more about our having no right to do this.

We are exercising our rights in a statutory way by power granted to us under the Constitution to refer powers to the Commonwealth. If we exercise that right we are engaging in a legal act properly done under the Constitution, and nobody can take exception in the High Court or the Privy Council or anywhere else. It is wrong to delude the people into thinking that we on this side of the Chamber are seeking to do something that is constitutionally wrong. That is the interpretation which might be placed on the hon. member's words. I hope he will not persist in saying we have no right to do this. We have a right and a duty. If, however, on reference to the Parliament or people, they decide they want to, they have a right to make a decision in that way. If on the other hand they exercise their right and do refer this power in a constitutional or statutory manner, they have exercised a right that is conferred upon this Parliament by the Constitution of Australia.

Hon. N. KEENAN: With all due respect to the Premier, he has interpreted wrongly the remarks of the member for West Perth. As I understand those remarks, with which I agree, paragraph (xxxvii) of Section 51 is not at all a paragraph enabling the Constitution of the Commonwealth to be amended. It simply enables one State out of all the States, to grant to the Commonwealth a subject-matter in respect of which the Commonwealth may make a law or laws, and that does not affect in the slightest degree the position of any other State. That is fully expressed in Section 51, paragraph (xxxvii) which states—

Matters referred to the Parliament of the Commonwealth by the Parliament or Parliaments of any State or States, but so that the law shall extend only to States by whose Parliaments the matter is referred, or which afterwards adopt the law.

There could not be a Constitution for one State different from that for another State.

The Premier: You could have constitutional powers exercised in one State under the Constitution.

Hon. N. KEENAN: It is impossible to imagine a Constitution of a hybrid character, by which one subject-matter could be dealt with in Queensland and not Western Australia, and another in Western Australia and not in Queensland.

The Premier: Whether you can imagine it or not, it is a fact.

Hon. N. KEENAN: No, it is not. No constitutional lawyer has ever suggested that it is a fact. When I was speaking on the second reading I pointed out that I had made an error in that respect. The position is made clear in Section 128 which states—

This Constitution shall not be altered except in the following manner:—

It is prohibited. No alteration is to take place in the Constitution except in the manner set out in Section 128 and that is what the member for West Perth pointed out. Any alteration of the Constitution is provided for in one section only, and that is so explicit that it cannot be a matter of any doubt. The result is that what the member for West Perth said is perfectly correct. I am sorry that the matter has been misunderstood by the Premier. I have said, more than once, that we have no objection whatever to giving power to the Commonwealth to do what the Premier set out in his memorandum, as one of the members of the Select Committee, where he recommends that the Commonwealth should have the power to provide employment. We have no objection to the Commonwealth having that power. But that is entirely different from what is in the Bill; it is only a part of what is contained in the Bill. It is not only to provide employment, but to deal with the whole subject-matter of employment. As a witness before the Select Committee I kept clear of any matter of political complexity, but still it might be supposed that my opinions are governed to some extent by my political views, but that is not the case with the Solicitor General, and he absolutely agreed with me in the matter. In fact, he could do nothing else. This will enable the Commonwealth to pass any law it chooses dealing with industry, or employment, not only in industry but in any social sphere. If we give it that power, then we shall hand over all powers of Government because the Premier will agree that if that right is taken from the State there is little left.

The Premier: I entirely disagree with that.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Let me say that the Premier would agree with me in his more sober moments.

The Premier: No!

Hon. N. KEENAN: I do not use the expression with any bad intent, but with the ordinary English meaning. It means, of sound mind!

The Premier: First you imply that I am not sober; then that I am mad. I will be in the hands of Don Chipper next!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Don Chipper is not mentioned in the amendment before the Chair.

Hon. N. KEENAN: If this amendment were framed in the phraseology used by the Premier in his minute as a member of the Select Committee it would have exactly the same effect except in different words—"Provide for the employment, or take steps to deal with unemployment." He does not for one moment question that that is his view because we have it in print.

The Premier: That is part of my view.

Hon. N. KEENAN: That is all of the part that is pertinent at the present moment. It is the part in the Premier's report dealing with paragraph (b). If the amendment were in that form, how could he resist it? Yet it is in that form but in different words. It is to give the Commonwealth power to provide employment, and not to deal with the wide meaning that the term "employment and subject matter" embraces. If one were entitled to ask a member to vote in any particular direction, I would be entitled to ask the Premier to vote for this amendment. It is in his report as a member of the Select Committee.

The PREMIER: I want to clear up a point in regard to the Constitution. I am not going to have it go out of this Chamber that we have no right to do this. I would like to ask the member for Nedlands, through you, Sir, if, under the power contained in his amendment, the Commonwealth passed a Bill saying it would give sustenance to some people unemployed, does he think that, if he challenged that legislation in the High Court, the High Court would declare it unconstitutional?

Hon. N. Keenan: No!

The PREMIER: Therefore it must be constitutional.

Hon. N. KEENAN: If Western Australia passed a proper Bill giving sustenance to unemployed as a subject-matter to the Commonwealth, of course the Commonwealth could do it, but could not give it to the unemployed of South Australia, Victoria or other part of Australia. It would not be part of the Constitution; the Commonwealth would be exercising a reference by a particular State.

Mr. McDONALD: I did not say that to grant the powers contained in paragraph (b) would be giving up the self-governing rights of the State but I do say that, by granting all the powers contained in Clause 2, we would be substantially giving up the self-governing rights of the State. What powers were left to the State would not be worth having. To grant the powers in paragraph (b) would represent a large part of the devolution of the self-governing rights in our possession. If a measure, as passed, contained this clause—that the Parliament of Western Australia refers to the Commonwealth all the self-governing rights we possess—that would not be a kind of exercise of reference contemplated by Section 51 (xxxvii) of the Commonwealth Constitution. It would not be within the spirit of the Constitution, and probably would not be constitutional, for any State Parliament to pass legislation referring to the Commonwealth all the powers it possessed. No State Parliament would be entitled, under Section 51 (xxxvii), to give away the self-governing rights of the people of that State. This being so, and as this measure in practice would enable the Commonwealth substantially to take over the self-governing rights of the people of the State, such a reference of power is outside the scope of Section 51 (xxxvii). I am wholly in accord with the Prime Minister, though when he made the remark I am about to quote, he had in view the original Bill contemplating the transfer of powers permanently. However, he struck the right note when he said—

I repeat that the questions are essential questions for the Australian people, whose future may be determined by the course of these deliberations.

If we intend to part with a degree or volume of the self-governing rights of the people of this State, those are questions for the decision of the people and, in the absence of consultation of the people, I suggest that we should and need go no further than

granting the powers proposed in the amendment.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	18

Majority against 1

AYES.					
Mr. Berry					Mr. Sampson
Mr. Boyle					Mr. Seward
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver					Mr. Shearn
Mr. Hughes					Mr. Thorn
Mr. Keenan					Mr. Warner
Mr. Kelly					Mr. Watts
Mr. Manu					Mr. Willmott
Mr. McDonald					Mr. Doney
Mr. McLarty					

(Teller.)

NOES					
Mr. Collier					Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley					Mr. Pantou
Mr. Cross					Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hawke					Mr. Tonkir
Mr. J. Hegney					Mr. Triat
Mr. W. Hegney					Mr. Willcock
Mr. Johnson					Mr. Wilson
Mr. Leahy					Mr. Withers
Mr. Needham					Mr. Fox

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Paragraph put and passed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 3rd March, 1943.

	PAGE
Questions: Booklet, "Industrial Development of Western Australia," as to cost of publication ...	2642
Apple and Pear Acquisition Board, as to disposal of surplus apples	2643
Bills: Public Authorities (Retirement of Members), report	2643
Coal Mine Workers (Pensions), 2R.	2643
Adjournment, special	2648

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

QUESTIONS (2).

BOOKLET, "INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA."

As to Cost of Publication.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER asked the Chief Secretary: Will he state the total number of booklets printed under the title of "The Industrial Development of Western Australia"? 2, What was total cost of such production? 3, Was any charge made for the advertisements contained in such booklets? 4, If so, what is the amount?