

our safety and for our protection from foreign aggression shall have everything possible done for them in the future. So that I shall not lay myself open to blame for failure to do everything necessary to enable any Government concerned successfully to inaugurate, control and supervise the many activities that will have to be set in motion, I shall see to it that the required powers are forthcoming.

Personally, I do not know that the Commonwealth Government has not already all the powers that are essential, particularly when we ask ourselves who was responsible for the repatriation of the men and women who returned from the 1914-18 war. Obviously it was a Commonwealth matter. The Repatriation Department in this State is a Federal department. If the Commonwealth Government handed over some of the activities connected with various operations to the State Government and the State Government did not handle the work in a manner that was regarded as satisfactory, the Commonwealth Government had its remedy. To my mind, repatriation is wholly and solely a Federal matter. However, in order not to incur any risks whatever, I am prepared to give the Commonwealth Government all the powers it seeks, to enable it to do that which we all feel should be done in order to deal expeditiously, energetically and efficiently with the repatriation of all those who are engaged in the task of subduing our enemies. The Bill contains some clauses that I do not favour, and when these are considered in Committee I shall act accordingly. Meanwhile, I support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. G. W. Miles, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.15 p.m. on Tuesday, the 6th April.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.18 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 6th April, 1913.

	PAGE
Assent to Bill	3010
Bill: Commonwealth Powers, 2R., Com.	3010
Adjournment, special	3036

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

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the Public Authorities (Retirement of Members) Bill.

BILL—COMMONWEALTH POWERS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 1st April.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [2.20]: I am supporting the Bill.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: All the clauses?

Hon. G. W. MILES: The hon. member will hear my views as I proceed. I will deal with the amendments on the notice paper on their merits at the Committee stage. Those who are opposed to this Bill missed their strongest argument, which is that a moribund Parliament is asked to give powers to the Commonwealth. That has not been stressed, and that is one of the reasons why I say I will deal with the amendments in Committee according to my discretion. There should have been a properly constituted Convention to go into this question and a referendum should eventually have been taken. The proposed period of five years for the duration of the Act means nothing. Once these questions are referred to the Commonwealth, they will be referred for all time. There has been a lot of criticism of the Bill and of the Commonwealth Government. The last time I made a speech in this House I referred to squealers in Australia against England. Today I will deal with Western Australian squealers against the Commonwealth. They have put up arguments from their point of view.

But there is another side to the question. A lot of good secession arguments have been advanced. While I admit there have been certain disabilities through Federation, those disabilities apparently could not have been avoided. On the other hand, there have been

certain benefits from Federation for which the Commonwealth has never received any credit. That is the point I want to make. I want to say, as I have said before, that Western Australia, in particular, was living on the Commonwealth for a number of years. We did not tax ourselves as we should have done, but used to go cap-in-hand to the taxpayers of the Eastern States and ask for certain grants. We have heard the argument put forward that "You cannot trust Victoria and New South Wales." At a gathering of cricketers, when the Army played the Cricket Association on Saturday, I heard a representative of the Board of Control for Western Australia, Mr. Harold Rowe, extending a welcome to Flying Officer Keith Johnson of the Board of Control for New South Wales. Our representation on the Australian Board of Control is one in 13, practically the same as Western Australia has in the House of Representatives. We have one in five in the Senate, but the point is this: Mr. Rowe congratulated the representatives of the Eastern States on the financial assistance they had always given to the Western Australian Cricket Association. That is a reply to some of the points raised against Victoria and New South Wales. Those two States predominate and have the voting power on the Board of Control.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: That is cricket!

Hon. G. W. MILES: I hope that some of the members of both Houses of the State Parliament will play cricket. I notice, in the State financial returns published for March, that there is an increase. I do not know that it means much, but Western Australia received from the Commonwealth £14,000 more in 1943 than it did in 1942. That is only by the way. It has been said that when we agreed to the Financial Agreement, the Loan Council and uniform taxation, we gave away our birthright. The Financial Agreement is one of the best things that ever happened to Western Australia. Had the State Governments carried out the intention of that agreement, we would not have been in the financial position that we are today. The idea behind that agreement was to force the States to balance their budgets, but they went on in the same old slipshod way and created deficits each year. Instead of paying 4 per cent, into a sinking fund on account of the deficits, they were funded. When the agreement was made the State debts were taken over by the Common-

wealth which agreed to pay portion of our sinking fund on our old debt. It has done that ever since, and on all the new money that we have borrowed the Commonwealth is paying portion of our sinking fund. It received no credit for this.

The sooner these imaginary State boundaries are abolished the better. We should look at things from an Australian point of view instead of adopting this parochial State attitude. I have heard some speeches made on this subject, and with a lot of them I do not agree. I have marked the secession attitude and the bitter Western Australian point of view put forward in this House. I want to congratulate Mr. Craig on the attitude he adopted. The Loan Council was also referred to. That council clipped the wings of parochial State Governments that would have gone on borrowing for all time. Its creation was one of the best things that ever happened to the States and the State taxpayers. Our State Government last year took credit for having reduced its debt by £120,000. It was due to the Loan Council that that debt was reduced. Had the Government had its way the debt would have been increased by a further £500,000. The uniform taxation is also a good thing for Australia and the States. It, together with the unification of other things, will save thousands of pounds. We have duplications of services throughout Australia.

In reply to some of the statements made, I want to point out that we have heard that the State received directly and indirectly very liberal amounts from the Commonwealth Government. As I have said, we are living beyond our means, and we go to the Commonwealth Government for a disabilities grant which has averaged pretty well £600,000 a year. Over ten years it amounts to £6,000,000 that we have received from the taxpayers of the Eastern States to help us along in this State. The Commonwealth has been given no credit for that. To listen to the arguments one would think that we were dealing with some foreign power—Germany—instead of our own Commonwealth Government. In October last Senator Collett asked this question in the Senate—

What amounts of Commonwealth moneys have been paid or advanced in respect of the financial years 1928 to 1942 inclusive for the purpose of assisting primary production in Western Australia? Will the Treasurer supply the information separately for each year and

indicate the purpose for each grant, e.g., drought relief, debts adjustment, fertiliser subsidies, etc.

The answer was given on the 10th December. Up to 1932 the amount is not worth mentioning, only £11,000, but from then on the figures are interesting. According to a table that accompanied the reply the Commonwealth assistance to primary production in this State during 1931-32 was as follows:—

	£
Wheat industry	689,969
Iron and steel products bounty	571
Gold bounty	72,582
Wine exports subsidy	363
Total	£763,490

Then for the year 1932-33 the assistance was as follows:—

	£
Wheat industry	463,002
Fertiliser subsidy	50,823
Iron and steel products bounty	630
Gold bounty	89,054
Wine exports subsidy	1,843
Total	£605,352

For the next three financial years the Commonwealth assistance was as follows:—

	1933-34.	1934-35.	1935-36.
	£	£	£
Wheat industry	639,521	868,181	392,850
Fertiliser subsidy	—	52,000	100,757
Farmers' debt adjustment	—	—	150,000
Fruitgrowers	11,137	14,713	15,713
Pearl shell industry	—	2,500	—
Tobacco investigation	1,000	1,000	1,000
Iron and steel products bounty	1,138	747	746
Wine exports subsidy	774	2	415
Totals	653,665	939,143	607,481

Hon. G. B. Wood: Where do you think the Commonwealth Government got the money from?

Hon. G. W. MILES: From the taxpayers of Australia.

Hon. G. B. Wood: From the taxpayers of Western Australia as well.

Hon. G. W. MILES: And the taxpayers of the rest of Australia contributed towards the assistance of Western Australia on account of its disabilities, because we were not prepared to tax ourselves sufficiently heavy to conserve our own interests. Yet some members are opposed to granting the Commonwealth additional power to deal with that phase!

Hon. T. Moore: Hear, hear! That is right.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Next we come to the financial year 1936-37. Here are the figures for that year—

	£
Fertiliser subsidy	58,327
Farmers' debt adjustment	314,000
Fruitgrowers	19,067
Tobacco investigation	1,000
Iron and steel products bounty	677
Wine exports subsidies	1,855
Total	£394,926

These figures hurt the primary producers who are squealing all the time about what the Commonwealth has or has not done.

Hon. V. Hamersley: I suppose there is none in the Eastern States.

Hon. G. W. MILES: There are primary producers in the Eastern States, and they have suffered just as we have in Western Australia in consequence of the tariff policy of the Commonwealth Government.

Hon. G. B. Wood: You admit that.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes, and the people in the Eastern States are suffering just as we are in Western Australia. Although I am opposed to the tariff policy, I have to admit that it has enabled secondary industries to be established throughout the Commonwealth, especially by private enterprise. Without the Broken Hill Proprietary Co., Ltd., God knows where Australia would be now.

Hon. G. B. Wood: The Commonwealth Government is going to nationalise that concern.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I do not know that it is.

Hon. G. B. Wood: What about Rayner's jam factory?

Hon. G. W. MILES: Rayner's tinpot jam factory! Let us get on with these figures. Here are the figures for the next two years—

	1937-38	1938-39
	£	£
Wheat industry	—	421,296
Fertiliser subsidy	53,028	43,260
Farmers' debt adjustment	300,000	300,000
Fruitgrowers	7,722	1,820
Pearl shell industry	—	5,300
Dairy factory operations	1,400	—
Tobacco investigation	1,250	2,500
Iron and steel products bounty	470	292
Wine exports subsidy	549	—
Totals	£364,419	£774,468

Hon. G. B. Wood: Give us the totals, and have done with it!

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am giving the particulars in detail. This is in reply to some of the squallers that we have in Western Australia.

Hon. G. B. Wood: They are not traitors to Western Australia.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Nor am I a traitor to Western Australia. If anyone refers to me as a traitor, goodness knows what the public will think of him! I can stand on my own feet in this country, and I represent the third generation.

Hon. T. Moore: And a good type too!

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am no traitor.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The advance for the pearl-shell industry was all right.

Hon. G. W. MILES: No, it was not right—apart from the fact that we appreciate what the Commonwealth Government did for that industry, but that is not the attitude adopted by others who have received assistance.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: All the figures you have quoted are a mere bagatelle compared with the sugar business.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must ask hon. members to allow Mr. Miles to proceed without interruption.

Hon. G. W. MILES: These figures hurt some members, but let us see if they can play cricket. They should recognise that there are two sides to the question. The figures for the next three financial years are—

	1939-40.	1940-41.	1941-42.
	£	£	£
Wheat industry	497,888	263,615	294,332
Fertiliser subsidy	320	107,201
Drought relief	450,000	247,000
Farmers' debt adjustment	100,000	65,000	30,000
Fruitgrowers	847	181,984	179,254
Tobacco investigation	2,000	2,000	2,500
Iron and steel products bounty	453	567	360
Gold bounty	111,000
Totals	601,508	974,166	950,656

The Chief Secretary: Are the totals given for the various items of assistance for the whole ten-year period?

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes. The total amounts received under the various headings for the ten-year period were—

	£
Wheat industry	4,530,654
Fertiliser subsidy	561,716
Drought relief	697,000
Farmers' debt adjustment	1,259,000
Fruitgrowers	332,257
Pearl shell industry	7,800
Dairy factory operations	1,400
Tobacco investigation	14,250
Iron and steel products bounty	18,310
Gold bounty	272,636
Wine exports subsidy	5,905
Total	£7,700,928

I have quoted those figures to show that there is another side to the question and that the Commonwealth authorities are not the bludgers that a lot of people would lead us to believe they are. There are two sides to the question and Western Australia has been assisted to the considerable extent that I have explained. In addition, the Commonwealth has a Taxation Department, a Customs Department and an Electoral Department in this State.

Hon. V. Hamersley: And a banking department.

Hon. G. W. MILES: That is so. Directly and indirectly, over two million pounds a year is spent by those departments. We also have the benefit of a road grant fixed on an area as well as a population basis. This is something else that Federation has given us.

Hon. J. Cornell: And we get twice as much as any other State.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Quite so. At a rough estimate that has been worth more than £2,000,000 in ten years. Then there are the old-age pensions paid in this State.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Do we get all of them?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am quoting the amount spent in this State. Both directly and indirectly, this money is of benefit to Western Australia. The estimated expenditure on old-age pensions amounts to £2,000,000, while £1,000,000 has been spent on soldiers' pensions and £4,000,000 on posts and telegraphs over a period of 10 years.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Do not you agree with those items?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I do, but I am quoting them in reply to some of the croakers in this State. I came into contact with the head of a Commonwealth department on Saturday, and he told me there is a telephone line in the country that costs the Commonwealth £65 a year to maintain and there is only one subscriber who pays £3 10s. a year.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Bad business!

Hon. G. W. MILES: It may be, but facilities of the kind have been provided by the Commonwealth for people in Western Australia who are squealing all the time. These figures total £25,000,000, which is the amount that the State has received from the Commonwealth in the last ten years. That is equal to £5 per head per annum for every man, woman and child in the State. West-

ern Australia benefits from this Commonwealth expenditure and the Commonwealth is not given credit for it.

Hon. G. B. Wood: What is the amount of taxation per head?

Hon. G. W. MILES: Now it is the same as in the other States. Before we got uniform taxation, it was lower. The State, by not fixing its taxation high enough, was not playing the game. If the provisions of the Financial Agreement had been carried out and the State Government had paid the prescribed 4 per cent. sinking fund on its deficits, the people would have been awake to the position and would have insisted upon a change of Government. In saying this, I am not blaming the present Government any more than its predecessors. I have said that another Convention, properly elected by the people, should be held to set out the powers to be granted to provincial councils, and then a referendum should be taken. In my opinion, the sooner the present imaginary boundaries between States are cut out and we adopt unification, the better it will be for Australia, especially if we wish to present ourselves to the world as a nation.

Hon. G. B. Wood: If that happened, you would be surprised.

Hon. G. W. MILES: If we had 10 provincial councils in Western Australia, they should be formed on an area instead of a population basis. So far from having three provinces in and around the metropolitan area, one set of members could represent that section. My idea is that each provincial council should have five members, the chairman should be paid £1,000 to £2,000 a year, and each member should be paid a couple of hundred pounds for out-of-pocket expenses.

Hon. J. Cornell: The hon. member is getting on to dangerous ground now.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I am voicing my opinion and am not afraid to do so. In addition to paying each member £200 out-of-pocket expenses, which is the amount that was paid to members when I entered Parliament, I would make it a provision of the Constitution that members, once elected, could not increase their salaries as has been done by State Parliaments, first from £200 to £300 a year, then from £300 to £400 a year, and finally from £400 to £600 a year.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Were you a party to that increase?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I was opposed to it, and it was carried by only one vote in this House on each occasion. In my opinion there was some engineering indulged in to get the increase agreed to. In addition to the £200, I would pay members two or three guineas a sitting. Then we would not have one member complaining of another member's attending to his own business instead of to his duties to the community. There would be a Federal representative for the State who would probably be paid £4,000 or £5,000 a year. We would have no duplication of departments, and the powers would be exercised by the provincial councils throughout the State instead of being centralised in Perth.

Hon. G. B. Wood: You would have them centralised in Canberra.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I want to see provincial councils invested with these powers, and I think we have statesmen in Australia big enough to deal with Australia as a whole.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Do you think this Bill will have the effect of bringing that about?

Hon. G. W. MILES: I do not say it will. I am supporting the Bill. The Commonwealth needs more power than it has at present. The Bill was amended in another place to provide, in regard to employment and unemployment, that industrial unions of workers shall have the right to decide whether their wages and conditions shall be fixed under State or Commonwealth arbitration. That amendment should receive serious consideration when we reach the Committee stage.

The unification of railway gauges is a work that should have been carried out 20 or 30 years ago. In 1910 Lord Kitchener was brought to Australia to advise on the question of defence, and he said that the railways were a menace to Australia and, instead of being a means of defence, might prove to be of assistance to an enemy who had temporary command of the sea.

Hon. J. Cornell: The position is worse today than it then was.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes, but that would not have happened but for inter-State jealousies, parochialists and narrow-minded little-Australians.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Western Australia cannot be blamed for that.

Hon. G. W. MILES: It can, and I have blamed it before. In 1923 when Mr. Bruce went to England as Prime Minister, I had made two trips to the Old Country and consulted the British Government and financial people with the idea of bringing about a unified railway system and of settling our North with people from Malta. Mr. Bruce undertook to put up a scheme to the British Government if the interested Governments would put it up to him. Ministers in other States supported the proposal, but here we were told by the Premier that we could not allow the Commonwealth to come in. My reply was, "You have already allowed it in by permitting it to build a line of railway from Western Australia's eastern boundary to Kalgoorlie. If the British and Commonwealth Governments are prepared to assist us to develop the North, let us bear in mind that they cannot alter the geographical position, and that therefore Western Australia will derive all the benefits from such development without the liability." He retorted, "We will develop the North when the South is developed." I then said, "In that case you will never develop the North as it will take 200 years to develop the South and before then you will have lost the North and the South too!" We have, in fact, been very near to losing our North through petty party politics and interstate jealousies. The sooner those features of our political life are abolished the better it will be for Australia.

Some people say, "Look what the party in power is doing today!" But that party will not be in power for all time. The Australian people are not such fools as to allow Mr. Ward and Mr. Dedman, or men like them, to rule eternally. The Australian people are opposed to socialism and nationalisation of industry. For my part, I want more co-operation between employer and employee to carry on that private enterprise which has built up not only Australia but the British Empire. That private enterprise must continue in peacetime as well as now. Private enterprise has enabled us to fight the war, as the British Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, said in his speech last week. But employers and employees must come together and put an end to all these strikes.

Before concluding, I wish to quote an extract that has come into my hands since last week, when I informed the Chief Secretary that I desired the adjournment of the debate because pressure of work had prevented

me from preparing my speech in time for that sitting. The extract I refer to was sent to me by a pioneer friend, whom I asked, "Do you mind if I make use of this in the House? They are my views to the letter." My friend authorised me to use an extract from a letter written by Mr. M. P. Durack, ex-member for Kimberley, a man who has kept the North on the map despite squealers in our South and in the rest of Australia. After stating that he had read with much interest the pamphlet containing an address delivered by Mr. A. A. Griffiths to the Rotary Club in Toowoomba on the development of North Australia, Mr. Durack said—

Indeed, from a closer settlement point of view, the undeveloped areas referred to westward from Alexandria and out across the Northern Territory-Western Australian border are probably capable of a fuller and more complete development than Western Queensland in that our annual rainfall is more guaranteed and there are many rivers with large supplies of permanent natural waters that would lend themselves to extensive schemes of development under irrigation and, as one extends more towards our Northern Territory-Western Australian border, sub-artesian water appears to be obtained in good measure of flow at comparatively shallow depths.

The soil may, in most or all parts, be classed as equally good as that of Western Queensland, and in this I speak with some knowledge, having been over large areas of the Territory on more than one occasion and having ridden across from Kimberley into Camooweal and thence by coach into Hughenden some years ago.

For the last 35 or 40 years much has been said of our "wonderful potentialities" and the phrase has become so hackneyed that to many it must read as chimerical.

Ministerial parties, Commissions—Royal or otherwise—have come through, extolled the wonderful resources of our North and in honeyed phrases encouraged us to hope on but, alas, a hope deferred so long maketh the heart despair. It is the encouraging outlook and viewpoint of a seemingly practical proposal as outlined by Mr. Griffiths that makes one take heart again.

Have we the statesman in Australia who are prepared to take the long view? Personally I believe we have, but we must first get rid of States' parochialism; otherwise it will kill us. Have we not some evidence of this today in this State where so much opposition is centred in refusing the Federal Government full and unqualified power to deal with post-war problems? I unhesitatingly say, give the Federal Government all the powers they want and, if it brings about the disruption of our so-called sacred State rights and State Parliaments, thus leading us into unification, so much the better.

I am prepared to believe that, with the full responsibility of the development of Australia as a whole thrown upon the one body, more even and more truly proportional development will follow rather than if left to the varying policies of the respective State. We must forget all about interstate imaginary dividing lines which continue to perpetuate interstate jealousies.

The expenditure certainly would be heavy, but it is not a question of can we afford the cost but rather a question of can we afford not to commit ourselves to this cost?

Those are the views of Mr. M. P. Durack, in which I entirely concur.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Do you know that South Australia regrets having handed over the Northern Territory to the Commonwealth?

Hon. G. W. MILES: No.

Hon. G. B. Wood: I do!

Hon. G. W. MILES: We must pull together in the war effort. I trust that every member of the community will do his best to ensure that the £100,000,000 war loan is more than fully subscribed.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. G. W. MILES: I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. F. R. WELSH (North): I had not intended to speak on the Bill; but I feel bound to say, in reply to the speech of my colleague, that I do not look at the matter in the same way that he does. I regard the Bill as highly dangerous from the State point of view. In my opinion, the granting of the powers asked for would be a distinct step towards unification. Unlike Mr. Miles, I am not a unificationist. Looking back over the history of Federation, I fail to see what benefits Western Australia has derived from it. In many cases it did not receive even a fair deal. With the small representation it has at Canberra, Western Australia will never get beyond being what I may term the Cinderella State of the Commonwealth. At least we have a State Government controlling our affairs, but the granting of the powers mentioned in the Bill to the men now controlling Australia from Canberra would mean the loss of all our powers. For my part I fail to see why this Bill should have been brought down at all. To me it looks like a piece of political bushranging. Certainly we should not surrender all these powers, and in the hope that during the Committee stage the measure will be amended so as to render it more acceptable, I intend to support the second reading.

HON. J. A. DIMMITT (Metropolitan-Suburban): It was most interesting to hear Mr. Miles, but from the welter of figures he gave us he omitted one important point, which is that whatever benefits have accrued to Western Australia in the form of superphosphate bounties, wheat payments, old age pensions, or any other of the many things mentioned by him, have also been applicable to every other State of the Commonwealth.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What about the Commonwealth grants?

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I fear that I do not possess that simple faith in the Commonwealth Government which has been expressed by Mr. Miles, and also by Mr. Craig. I think Mr. Craig suggested we should have greater faith in the Commonwealth Government. He suggested, perhaps not in so many words, that opponents of this Bill were rather inclined to look upon the Commonwealth Government as the big bad wolf; while he, on the contrary, felt there was a desire to help and an honesty of purpose on the part of the framers of the Bill. I have tried to be generous in my outlook. I have tried to think along the lines outlined by Mr. Craig; but my mind keeps coming back to the personnel of the committee responsible for this proposed legislation.

Hon. L. Craig: Are you talking about the present Government?

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: Yes. When one realises that the big majority of the members of the committee which framed this legislation are avowed unificationists and that the Bill has received strong support from persons of the Dedman type, one's suspicions are definitely aroused. I at least am compelled to temper any generous instinct I may have had. If the Bill passes, it will, as Mr. Welsh said, be a long step towards unification. I still am afraid of the big bad wolf. I am afraid, in spite of the assurances that have been given us by the supporters of the Bill, that Western Australia, in the guise of Red Riding Hood, will be devoured if the Bill is passed. A brief study of the Bill arouses in my mind very grave doubts and suspicions. Otherwise, why should the framers of the Bill make reference to repatriation? Other members have spoken on this subject and pointed out that the Commonwealth Government has dealt with the personnel returned from the 1914-18 war for the past

26 years and has been dealing with the repatriation of the personnel of the Navy, the Army and the Air Force, for the past three years during the present war.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is, only as regards pensions.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: The Commonwealth Government has dealt with repatriation in every way. No State Government has raised any question about it, nor has any State Government doubted the validity of the actions of the Commonwealth Government with regard to repatriation measures. No State Government has ever suggested that the action of the Commonwealth Government in granting family allowances was anything but valid. The fact—referred to by most of the other speakers to the Bill—that a limitation of five years should be applied to such matters as repatriation, company legislation and uniformity of railway gauges, makes the Bill utterly ridiculous. The more one studies the Bill the more are one's doubts and suspicions confirmed.

Hon. G. W. Miles: If the powers are to be granted for only five years, then the Bill, if passed, will not be worth the paper it is written on.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I agree with the hon. member. Previous speakers have said that once these powers are given, then, despite any limitation to the period that may be expressed in the Bill, the powers will never be returned to the States. So I agree with the suggestion of Sir Hal Colebatch that, if this Bill passes the second reading, all powers, except those which the State is prepared to hand over for all time, should be deleted from the Bill. I do not believe the people of Western Australia have any desire to be governed from Canberra. A few months ago, before the Premier of this State attended the Convention which dealt with this piece of legislation, he made a public utterance. This is what he said—

It is apparent that unless the feelings of the people of Western Australia have undergone a radical change, far from being prepared to grant increased powers to the Commonwealth, they would like to see a reduction of powers already possessed by it.

The Minister for Labour also made a public utterance. Less than two months ago he said—

The State and not the Commonwealth should initiate activities within the State. Control from Canberra has proved to be exasperatingly slow, cumbersome and inefficient.

Yet we find the Premier and the Minister for Labour propelling this Bill through Parliament, speaking in favour of and voting for it, obviously against their own judgment and convictions. "Control from Canberra is exasperatingly slow, cumbersome and inefficient," said the Minister for Labour. So does every commercial man in Western Australia.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You are talking of war conditions.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: I am talking about all conditions. I shall refer to pre-war conditions as well. On Monday of last week a Perth newsagent told me that he delivers two copies of the "Daily News" on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday to the office of the Allied Works Council in Perth. He is not paid for them as he delivers them; he is not paid for them at the end of the week nor at the end of the month. Acting under instructions from the local officers of the Allied Works Council, he submits a statement each quarter. The local office does not pay the account. It is sent to Canberra or wherever the head office of the Allied Works Council is in eastern Australia, and in due course—in due course means two, three or four weeks—a cheque for £1 0s. 10d. is paid to the newsagent in Perth. Exasperatingly slow, cumbersome and inefficient!

Hon. W. J. Mann: He is lucky to get it.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: On the shelves of many merchants in Western Australia—in Australia for that matter, but I am speaking of Western Australia—are frozen goods. I do not quarrel with the Commonwealth for freezing goods, because it is necessary that control should be had so that the defence services may receive the goods in preference to the civilian population. Frozen goods are on the merchants' shelves. There are customers wanting those goods. What happens? The merchant does not go to the local office in Perth; he is required to fill in a form, headed "Application for Release from Defence and Essential Services." The merchant says, "We have a customer wanting these goods," and he signs the form. The customer states that he wants to purchase the goods, and he signs the form, which is then posted to Melbourne, in this case. In the course of several weeks the form of release is sent back to the merchant. The merchant then rings up the customer, who has been urgently requiring the material, and says it is now available.

Weeks after the demand for the goods it is possible to supply them—exasperatingly slow, cumbersome and inefficient! That is control from a central source.

The Chief Secretary: Does that apply in every case?

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: Not in every case, but in many. There are some parts of the coast of the North-West of Australia which today are uncharted. The master mariners who trade along that coast are dependent for hundreds of miles on charts that are more than a century old. These charts are only added to by the master mariners who travel along the coast, and who from time to time supply fresh particulars for the guidance of our ships.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is when they strike a reef or a shoal.

Hon. J. A. DIMMITT: The control of the charting of the coast of Australia has been a responsibility of the Commonwealth for 43 years. The eastern Australian coast is charted. Every inlet, island, bay, creek, or river is on the charts, with the soundings for many miles out to sea. Perhaps it would not be right to suggest that there are hundreds of thousands of voters living along the east coast of Australia. Along the north-west coast of the Commonwealth, from Broome to Wyndham, the part to which I refer, there may be 100 voters, but that part of the coast has remained uncharted for 43 years—exasperatingly slow, cumbersome and inefficient! That is the type of centralised control this Bill seeks to perpetuate, and because of that I intend to vote against the second reading.

HON. T. MOORE (Central): My remarks will be brief and I intend to support the second reading. Up to date there has been no real Australian national outlook, because we have had too many States pulling against each other and the Federation. We shall never get a national outlook until we give the Commonwealth Government more power. In the days gone by it did not seem to matter how great or small the question at issue might be but everyone asked whose business it was, that of the State or that of the Commonwealth. In the wheatgrowing and woolgrowing industries we know the attempts that were made to "pass the buck." That sort of thing was allowed to go on year after year. We have simply been playing with time, we have lost time, and we are still losing valuable time.

Unless something is done at this juncture I am satisfied that the future of Australia will never be what it should be. So far as this war is concerned I believe we are in a situation that we shall not get out of for a very long time.

It is all very well to say we are going to beat our enemies to their knees. I know that there are millions of Japanese. There is a tremendous population in Japan and all the people there are of the one mind. They are all nationally minded; make no mistake about that! The Japanese have a national outlook, one that every country should possess. Without a national outlook we will never get anywhere. What have we done with Western Australia all down the years? It is all very well for Mr. Dimmitt to talk about the things Federation has not brought about! What have we ourselves done? Has there been any marked growth in the population of this State in the last few years? No. The growth has been altogether too small.

Hon. G. B. Wood: We seemed to do better before Federation.

Hon. T. MOORE: We are heading for disaster unless the Commonwealth Government takes over the State and does something with it. Let us visualise what is likely to happen when the war is over. We shall still have to face trouble from Japan. The population of that country is ever-increasing, and is increasing much more rapidly than is the population of Australia; and furthermore that country is growing stronger every day. Our only hope is to populate Australia. How is that to be done? How can we as a State Parliament do anything to bring about an increase in our population? No one believes we can do it. No one believes we can do anything to populate Australia. Then why talk all this humbug? Some members have suggested that there is grave danger that the proposed powers will be retained by the Commonwealth for all time. I maintain that there should be no limit to the number of years during which these powers should operate. If I had my way there would be no more "passing of the buck." We should make these activities a definite responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, not merely responsibilities that it will take over now and for a few years hence.

If the Commonwealth Government is not as successful with these ventures as it is

expected it will be, at the end of a few years there may be a tendency on the part of those in control to pass them back to the States. Do not let us have that! I want to be definite in this matter. Once these powers are given there should be no attempt to pass them back to the States. Let us make a definite stand on the point now. Let us make sure that the Commonwealth is the only Government that can possibly look after the interests of this huge country, and not leave it to the 470,000 unfortunate people who are in it today. What hope have they of populating the State? How are we to do that? We all know that the birthrate is absurdly low.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: Could the Commonwealth Parliament do anything about the birthrate if the question was brought under its control?

Hon. T. MOORE: If the hon. member will allow me I will give him my views. The birthrate is alarmingly low.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: Absolutely!

Hon. T. MOORE: I am glad the hon. member supports me. On the other hand the population of Japan, our enemy, is increasing alarmingly fast. That is the difference between the two peoples. I do not know how any Government is going to make the population of this country stand up to that responsibility. To me there is race suicide in evidence everywhere. It is no use attempting to blink our eyes and deny that that is so. That is the problem confronting us. In the past a family man in this State had a hard row to hoe. Over the years that have passed the only crop that really mattered was the crop of young Australians who unfortunately were never looked after. Some provision should be made for every child that is born in this country. That is what we have neglected all down the years.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Commonwealth has brought in child endowment, and is trying to remedy that situation.

Hon. T. MOORE: That is a step in the right direction. One successful attempt was made by a man who has now been cast down. I refer to Jack Lang who in New South Wales introduced child endowment. That is something greatly to the credit of that State.

Hon. J. Cornell: And it was passed, too.

Hon. T. MOORE: Yes. In this State no attempt was made to do anything for the family. We know what happens in regard to men with families in this country if they

want to rent a house. I need not go over that again. The family man is not wanted. We have had experience of people coming to Perth with children and the fact that they have children debars them from occupying places in the renting of which they should have first preference. I have seen ample evidence of that. It is a shocking state of affairs when nobody wants these people, although we hear a general demand for more population. How do we treat the population we have? We neglect them. That is race suicide. How to stop it at this juncture I do not know, but the authority that can grapple with the problem is not the State Government.

The only body with a possible chance of dealing with the matter is the Commonwealth Government, which has already turned its attention to it. The Commonwealth Government introduced the child endowment scheme and that can be built on. It woke up very late but something has been done. The point I want to make is that outside of that I believe it is possible to attract people to this country from other countries. When the great turmoil in Europe has ended there will be plenty of people of good stock willing to come to this country if provision is made for them. My friend the Honorary Minister smiles when I refer to people of good stock, but they are the best we can expect. There is still plenty of good stock in the British Isles willing to come here provided we can make provision for them in this country. Can this State Government do it at the end of five years? It is ridiculous; it is absolute stupidity to say that anything could be done by the State Government if the powers were handed back after five years.

We made an attempt to settle people on the land before and we know what happened. We made a sorry exhibition of ourselves. The people who come here are no different from our forefathers who first settled the country. They are of the same stock and I am satisfied that, if they were given decent conditions and the right to rear families here, they would populate the country. I do not believe there is one member of this Parliament who considers we would be able to handle the problem at the end of five years. I do not view the possibility of these powers being in the hands of the Commonwealth Government for a longer period than five years as something in the nature of a

grave danger. On the contrary, I would prefer the Commonwealth Government to take over and run this country for many years. We are not going to be the happy, peaceful crowd after this war that we used to be. The scene has changed.

A number of people believe that after the war all our men will be back at work. That is the argument that has been raised: that we must make provision for the men who have been in the Forces and those who have been working in munition factories. In my opinion, however, we shall need a standing Army in this country and a Navy and an Air Force on a large scale and an ever-increasing number of munition workers. We shall have to keep pace with progress in that direction because munitions become obsolete. It has always been so on the other side of the world. In Australia for a long time we lived under the protection of the British Navy. We were feeling quite safe, but the time has come when we know that we have got to learn to protect ourselves. We have been very slow.

Hon. J. Cornell: The R.S.L. said that for years, but nobody believed it.

Hon. T. MOORE: No. I have heard people say that Britain might have done more for us. I have always said we might have done more for ourselves. There is no doubt who should have done most. Britain was in a pretty awkward corner. Instead of feeling secure as we have felt in the past, we must now take a different view and the time is ripe for the Commonwealth Government to be given more power. The scene has changed altogether. I cannot understand the mentality of people who stand up here and say that they are afraid the Commonwealth Government may still have these powers after five years when they know, or ought to know if they have any knowledge at all after their experience here, that there is no possible chance of this State doing what is required. I agree with Mr. Miles that certainly there are a lot of croakers. Mr. Miles has made a very good case, showing how much the Commonwealth has done for this State in the past. I cannot understand the mentality of those in this Chamber who represent the wheat and woolgrowing industries, if they do not perceive who can best look after these industries.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Mr. Miles only stated one side of the case.

Hon. T. MOORE: If the hon. member does not know the other side he ought to know it.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Mr. Miles did not explain it.

Hon. T. MOORE: The hon. member should know that this State has done well out of the Commonwealth Government for years. If it were not for the Commonwealth Government the agriculturists would be wiped off the map.

Hon. C. B. Williams: The hon. member was a member of the Government that banded the State Savings Bank over to the Commonwealth, so he should not be squealing.

Hon. T. MOORE: That was a step in the right direction. I do not find fault with that at all. There should be only one bank, the Commonwealth Bank. It is ridiculous to have State banks. The Commonwealth Government is the one Government that can do something to populate this country. That is the one thing we should be concerned about.

Hon. G. B. Wood: It has already power over immigration.

Hon. T. MOORE: It must have more power to settle people in this country. It has no possible chance of settling people except by making arrangements through the State. Nobody should know better than Mr. Wood that the Commonwealth cannot simply bring people here and turn them adrift. What a ridiculous proposition! What an absurd idea to put up! The State Government is as powerless as a municipal council adequately to attend to the settlement of this State.

Hon. G. B. Wood: There is nothing about immigration in the Bill.

Hon. T. MOORE: The fact has to be faced that we must have immigrants in this country. Surely the hon. member knows that must be done.

Hon. G. B. Wood: I agree.

Hon. T. MOORE: Do we not agree that the Commonwealth must have the right to do more than populate this country by turning people adrift? It must have power to follow up the matter and see that the country is settled. Desiring to have this country held by whites, I see no possible hope of that being done unless the Commonwealth is given the power it needs to populate Australia; and we must populate or perish.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: I support the Bill and congratulate Mr. Miles on one of the best speeches he has delivered in this House.

Hon. G. B. Wood: That is because you agree with what he said.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: To listen to him was like drinking champagne after having been forced to take flat beer.

Hon. L. Craig: Or damper instead of bread.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: I believe the hon. member put up a good case. I do not back up every one of his statements, but he gave a strong exposition of the stand we should take in regard to this measure. I am solidly supporting the second reading, because I think it is the sacred duty of all Australians to do everything possible to make early plans for post-war reconstruction in order that the terrific problems to be solved should be tackled with unity, courage and efficiency. As Dr. Evatt has pointed out, the bulk of the Commonwealth war measures is based on the Commonwealth's "defence power." On the termination of the war that power will be greatly contracted.

I am surprised at the little Australian outlook and the parochial opinions expressed by members during the second reading debate. It is true that the comparative isolation of Western Australia, which accounts for the lack of knowledge of our problems and difficulties by our fellow citizens in the Eastern States, has resulted over the years in this State receiving a very raw deal from the Commonwealth authorities. I am also surprised to hear members express the opinions they put forward. I can go to Sydney, Melbourne and other parts of Australia and be quite at home. If we are broad enough in our outlook, we can understand why this State is comparatively unknown to the Eastern States. The misunderstandings that arise in the Eastern States are due to the parochial outlook of many Western Australians. We still have too much of the spirit that was here before the goldfields were discovered. The small population of this State then looked on the "T'othersiders" as foreigners in the community, and, even today, too much hostility is displayed to the people of the Eastern States.

Hon. G. B. Wood: We do not hear that today. There is nothing against the people.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: We have heard it in this House. This isolation, in

my opinion, will always be an effective bar to efficient and economical government from a central Federal authority. This opinion must be tempered by the possible development of civil air transport after the war. We can reasonably expect as a part of post-war reconstruction rapid progress in civil aviation. A fleet of large air transports to and from the Eastern States within the economic reach of Australians, superseding to a great extent sea and railway transport, must tend to break down the present isolation and its attendant misunderstandings. Such a service must bring all Australians closer together.

This Bill must be considered not from a narrow State viewpoint, but from an Australian perspective. In considering the future well-being of our fighting men and women we must tackle the problem of reconstruction not as West Australians but as blood brothers and sisters of our people in all other States. I think the Premier, Hon. J. C. Willcock, who ably represented this State at the Convention, clearly expressed the opinion of the majority of the people of Western Australia when he stated at the Convention that, although Western Australia does not desire to part with powers it possesses, the people here are anxious to do their best for the men in the Services. "They want these men," he said, "to enjoy every benefit which can be given to them under Commonwealth or State legislation." I repeat that the Premier's statement is correct, and is a clear reflection of opinion of the big majority of our people in this State.

No one can successfully argue that each State can individually, and within its own ambit, successfully cope with the re-instatement of the men and women of the fighting services in civil life when the war is over. Each State could not effectively deal with re-instatement and advancement of these men and women after the war. Therefore, it is plain commonsense to refer this power to the Commonwealth as the Bill provides. Surely the advancement of the dependants of those members who have died or have been disabled as a consequence of the war is a Commonwealth responsibility. I sincerely hope that members who have spoken against the Bill, and have displayed the keenest hostility to everything and everybody in the Commonwealth outside the borders of Western Australia, will reconsider their attitude and their opinions.

To cope with the tremendous task of rehabilitating our Fighting Forces into civil life together with the immensity of the job in transferring to peace production the large army of civil workers—both men and women—now engaged in the production of weapons of war, requires the necessary power to be temporarily referred to the Commonwealth Government. I do not agree that once we hand that power to the Commonwealth it will be there for all time. But once the powers are given, the Commonwealth will have ample opportunity, in the five years, to decide, and so will the respective States too, whether they should be exercised by the Commonwealth or by the State. If any particular power referred to the Commonwealth proves to be in the best interests of both the Commonwealth and the State, when administered by the Commonwealth, then it should be handed over for good. Those powers which may, in the course of five years, prove to be more successfully exercised by the State should automatically revert to the States at the end of the period. I believe that the men giving the Commonwealth's viewpoint at the Convention are persons of honour and can be relied on, just as the men who spoke against referring the powers to the Commonwealth are men of probity and honour, who can be trusted. If the public men who took part in that Convention have expressed the opinion that these powers can be exercised for five years and then transferred back to the States, I believe they spoke the truth and can be trusted.

Hon. G. B. Wood: You do not call that a Convention, surely!

The HONORARY MINISTER: If the Commonwealth is forced, in the exercise of any one of these powers, to take on some tremendous undertaking, it would be folly even to consider interfering with it. I think it is quite safe to pass this Bill and every part of it. I have listened with dismay to some speakers. The speeches made by too many members have been loaded with suspicion and doubt. They are not prepared to trust any member of the Commonwealth Government, or, for that matter, anyone connected with the Federal authorities.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Would you yourself trust Dedman and Ward after the way they have been carrying on?

The HONORARY MINISTER: We are, by the positions we hold as members of this Legislative Council, supposed to be leaders

and moulders of public opinion. Should we not set a better example as Australians, and particularly as Western Australians? What is going to happen to the nations of the world if the majority of their leaders express the same distrust, suspicion and fear of each other as members have expressed when speaking against this Bill? If they do, disaster faces the victor and the vanquished. I appeal to members to alter their attitude, and to show courage, trust and loyalty to others, when I feel sure that a common basis can be found for all the States and the Commonwealth to work together to overcome the tremendous problems that will face the Australian nation at the cessation of hostilities.

I have heard young people talk, but I express the feelings of the older members of the community when I say that the brains, courage and all other attributes that men and women possess will be required to face the future successfully, and overcome the problems with which we will be confronted. We will be in trouble, irrespective of what may happen. I believe with Mr. Moore that we are in grave danger, and I suggest that he has pointed out one or two of our particular weaknesses. His reference to the declining birth-rate shows the necessity for placing power in the hands of the authority best able to work for a betterment of the position. Commonsense dictates that the best brains in all the States should deal with that particular phase under the control of a central authority. If we can accomplish that, it will be to the benefit of Australia as a whole. I trust the second reading will be passed, and that any amendments submitted will be thoroughly thrashed out so that we shall do our very best to accomplish what is essential in the interests of the State and of the Commonwealth as well.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (in reply): Members have taken quite a long time in discussing the second reading of the Bill, and I think the contributions we have heard this afternoon have been the most interesting of all delivered during the course of the debate. The speeches today indicated a much broader outlook than was apparent in the previous speeches we listened to. To me that is very pleasing. In concluding the debate I propose to be somewhat brief in my remarks.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: You are happier now!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not propose to refer in detail to the actual powers that are proposed to be referred to the Commonwealth. Ample opportunity will be afforded to deal with those particular matters during the Committee stage when, I have no doubt, members will exercise their rights in that direction. Rather shall I for a while deal with the necessity for the Commonwealth to have powers additional to those it already possesses under its Constitution. I think it was recognised at the recent Convention that although the Premiers of the various States committed themselves to do their utmost to ensure the passage of the Bill through the various State Parliaments, there would be differences of opinion, and that those differences would vary in the different States and more particularly in the Legislative Councils of the various States. That latter phase has been borne out by the debate in this Chamber.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Opinions varied in the lower Houses as well.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It was recognised that varying objections would be raised by the different States in the Parliaments of those States. During the course of the debate in this Chamber many objections have been raised either regarding the Bill in whole or in part. At the same time, in my opinion, much irrelevant matter has been introduced into the discussion and some quite inaccurate statements have been made. For instance, Mr. Baxter referred to powers taken by the Commonwealth after the 1914-1918 war. He stated that not one of those powers had ever been handed back to the State Governments from whom they had been taken, nor, he suggested, would any such powers be handed back in the present instance. One would assume from that statement that at one time or another the Commonwealth Government had either forcibly taken powers from the States or that the States had handed over to the Commonwealth powers additional to those it already possessed under the Constitution. As a fact, no such powers have ever been handed over by Western Australia to the Commonwealth Government.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I did not say they had, but I referred to what had been taken during wartime.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the hon. member talked about what the Commonwealth Government has taken in wartime,

he is aware that the Commonwealth Government, during the 1914-18 war, took only such powers as it was entitled to under the Constitution.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: No!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Neither on the present occasion will the Commonwealth Government take powers that it is not entitled to exercise under the Constitution. On the other hand, when the present war is ended, just as after the 1914-18 war, the Commonwealth authority in regard to those matters respecting which it has taken power for defence purposes under the provisions of the Constitution, will cease. That, perhaps, is one of the main reasons why it is absolutely essential that at this stage in our history we should be prepared to reconsider the Commonwealth powers. We should, if deemed necessary, allow the Central Government additional power in wartime in order that it may possess similar authority in peacetime. I am not sure, but I think Mr. Baxter also referred to the question of uniform taxation.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I did not touch on that subject.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: One member did. It is a fact that power regarding uniform taxation was taken by the Commonwealth Government in recent times and that was done as a defence measure. Then again more than one member referred to the powers assumed by the Commonwealth Government regarding State borrowings. They had in mind, of course, the Financial Agreement. It is a fact that, under the legislation that brought the Financial Agreement into operation a few years ago, the Commonwealth was granted authority over State finance and that, in the opinion of people, according to their point of view, is either beneficial or otherwise. It must be remembered that the power the Commonwealth Government has obtained regarding finance was secured as a result of a referendum taken under Section 129 of the Commonwealth Constitution, and those powers are defined under Section 105A of the Constitution. So far as I am aware, those are the only two additional powers that have been secured by the Commonwealth Government since the 1914-18 war. One member referred to the question of aviation and suggested that the Commonwealth had assumed power regarding that phase. The fact is that the Commonwealth Government has

taken nothing away from this State regarding aviation. All that has happened is that this State has adopted the Commonwealth regulations and has agreed, to that extent, that there shall be uniformity throughout Australia with regard to aviation.

The State Government was challenged by Mr. Baxter on what he termed its change of front, and in support of his argument he quoted somewhat extensively from statements made by the Premier a few months ago in criticism of the original proposals of the Commonwealth. Those proposals, as members are aware, were dropped by the Commonwealth, and the Bill we are discussing is the result of a Convention subsequently held. I think it most unfair and hardly playing the game to quote the Premier's remarks in the way Mr. Baxter has done in opposition to the measure. There can be no comparison between the original proposals and those contained in this Bill. Of what use would a convention be unless some definite proposal emerged? How could any definite proposal emerge from a convention of the kind I refer to unless we had compromise on the part of the representatives comprising the convention? I think I am justified in saying that it was only on the facts presented at the Convention that the State Government agreed there was a real necessity for the Bill.

I have said that I do not propose to deal with the individual powers proposed to be referred to the Commonwealth by this Bill. Neither do I propose to deal with all the criticism that has been offered. Some members have made remarks, many of which, in my opinion, were quite irrelevant to the subject-matter of the Bill. There cannot be any question that members are entitled to give expression to their viewpoints, and there is no question that this is the place where that should be done. At the same time I hardly think that members are entitled to question, as some have done, the bona fides of those who have been associated with these proposals. For instance one member described the Bill as a diabolical piece of political chicanery. No doubt that sounds a very fine expression.

Hon. G. B. Wood: I really think it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: But surely that is not the way in which to receive such an important measure! Surely the hon. member cannot have taken into consideration the very serious position in which we as a nation find ourselves! I wonder

whether the hon. member really meant what he said. Does he classify all those representatives of the different States who formed the Convention as being parties to a diabolical piece of political chicanery?

Hon. G. B. Wood: They are unificationists; that is my attitude.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The men he criticised in that way are, generally speaking, amongst the outstanding public men in the Commonwealth. Many of them have given years of valuable service to the national life of Australia. Surely when a member speaks in those terms, he should have better grounds for using an expression of that kind than he has on this occasion. If I may descend to the vernacular, we are in a bit of a spot. There is no question about that, and I am distinctly hopeful that, as a result of the Convention, we shall be able to get out of that spot and deal with the problems that will face us in the near future in a way that will be beneficial to Australia as a whole.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Do you know how long the Bill was debated at the Convention? A few hours!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am not concerned about how long the Bill was debated at the Convention, but I am concerned with the facts of the case.

Hon. T. Moore: Yes, with the Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: One might say that the Bill has been debated for a fortnight, more or less, in this Chamber but we cannot say that, because it has taken a fortnight to reach this stage, we have added anything of material value to the solution of existing problems and of those we have yet to meet.

Hon. H. L. Roche: That is a matter of opinion.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Each member is entitled to his own opinions, but I do not think any member is entitled to question the bona fides of all and sundry just because he does not agree with some portion or even with the whole of the Bill. Surely we should give these public men credit for being at least bona fide in their discussions at the Convention, and in their efforts to produce something that will make it much easier for Australia to deal with post-war problems! Other members have cast doubt upon the bona fides of the Federal Attorney General, Dr. Evatt. Yet, when we consider his actions in this matter, I think it must be recognised that he has appreciated the

viewpoints of the States to a degree that has probably surprised some members of this Chamber, more particularly when we compare this Bill with the original proposals introduced by him.

Not only have the bona fides of the members of the Convention and the Commonwealth Government, including Dr. Evatt, been challenged, but one member went so far as to question the integrity of the High Court, by which body constitutional matters are determined. That member expressed the view that we cannot look to the High Court to safeguard the rights of the States as we felt we could do in the past. What grounds are there for a statement of that sort? Can such a statement assist us in giving calm consideration to matters which are of the utmost importance to Australia and to our war effort? What right have we as individual members of this Chamber to cast doubt upon the bona fides of the highest tribunal in the land, unless of course we have something to substantiate the statements made? I venture the assertion that the hon. member referred to has very little indeed that could be considered to be a substantiation of the statement.

May I suggest that the position is too serious and the subject far too important for us to allow our little blind prejudices to affect our attitude to this question. I ask members to take a more realistic view of the position. There appears to be room, as I say, for calm consideration of the views that have been expressed by our various constitutional authorities. While I could quote quite a number who would be accepted, I believe, by this Chamber as constitutional authorities, I shall refer to only one—Sir Isaac Isaacs, as quoted by Mr. Heenan the other day—

The Australia of 1900 is not the Australia of today, and we are not constitutionally equipped for the needs of Australia today.

A very pithy statement, and one which I do not think any reasonable person with a knowledge of the public affairs of Australia as a whole can find fault with! And so it is that just as a tradesman requires to be adequately equipped with the tools necessary for his job if he is to do his best work, so the Commonwealth, in the highest sphere of national responsibility, must be provided with the needful authority through the constitutional equipment referred to by Sir Isaac Isaacs. In wartime the constitutional authority and equipment are there;

otherwise we could not by any means have accomplished the transformation that has taken place for the war effort of Australia. Great problems have been solved, but we still have problems to be faced and solved. Never before in the history of Australia has there been so mighty an effort as is being put forth today. Never before in our history has such a large portion of the population been affected by war, or engaged in the actual war effort! Had it not been that we were constitutionally equipped in order to do what we have done, I am afraid we would have been in far greater trouble than we are at the present time.

Member: What about the secessionists?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I did not wish to touch on the subject of secession. However, one wonders just what could have been done, not what would have been under secession in present circumstances. That reminds me of a few remarks by Mr. Moore. When one considers what would be possible for a population of half a million, with a State such as Western Australia is, it seems as if there were very little indeed that Western Australia could have done without the assistance of others to the same extent as, and perhaps to a greater extent than, we have received so far.

Hon. J. Cornell: We would have been in the same position as Poland; we would have had to give in.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: We did!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Let us consider that possibility. I content myself with saying that we have nothing to be ashamed of in regard to Australia's war effort. While we have had problems to meet in transforming our country from a peace footing to a wartime footing, when peace is declared the transition from wartime footing to peacetime footing will present difficulties as great as those we have experienced in organising the war effort. It requires only a few moments' thought to realise the perfect truth of that statement. It will be necessary for the problems that will arise to be dealt with expeditiously; and when hostilities have ceased, the powers which are possessed by the Commonwealth during wartime having expired or in any event become highly uncertain in extent and duration as well as in character, it will be necessary for Aus-

tralia to have something that will take the place of the powers which are being used now.

It must be remembered that the Commonwealth Government will be called upon to speak and to act for the whole of Australia, and that that Government is and will be pledged internationally to adopt measures and policies which may require greater powers of internal management than the Commonwealth Government now possesses. Our future security and prosperity will be bound up with those of other countries; and only if the Commonwealth Government is equipped with the necessary authority to carry out international policies will it be possible to redeem all our national obligations. To my way of thinking, the problems will be of such magnitude during this period that they will require concerted planning by the Commonwealth authorities and by the State authorities in full co-operation. I am firmly convinced that the problems we shall have to face in the post-war period will far exceed in magnitude anything we have ever yet attempted, and so it is because of that fact it is thought necessary to consider the Bill before us.

As I have already said, I do not propose to go into many details relating to the various powers included in the Bill, but I must point out to the Chamber that the several paragraphs of Clause 2 of the Bill are not isolated heads of power but are closely related and have been designed to serve as a foundation for a national plan of post-war reconstruction to be implemented by Commonwealth and State Governments in co-operation. I think that almost every member who has spoken on the Bill has agreed that there ought to be the closest co-operation between Commonwealth and States in these matters; apparently the only difference, in most cases, is as to which should be the authority to deal with these various matters. I should say that on the principal points of the Bill there can be only one authority, that authority of course being the Commonwealth Government acting, as stated in the preamble to the Bill, with the assistance and co-operation of State authorities and State organisations in every possible way.

I suggest it is essential that the Commonwealth Government should know, before negotiations for peace are begun, what exactly are the measure and the extent of

the legislative powers of the Commonwealth Parliament, so that the Commonwealth Government may understand what commitments it can assume, and how it can meet its obligations, as a party to the world peace treaty. This, of course, is the reason for the measure being brought down in all the State Parliaments at the present juncture; and that, I think, is an answer to those members who have said that there is no need for hurry or haste, and that the war is going to last for a long while yet. My brief reply to that contention is, "It is never too early to be prepared." It is essential that the Commonwealth Government should have full knowledge of all the powers it possesses in order that it may speak as a Commonwealth on behalf of Australia as a whole. International and national policies for the establishment of the new world order, about which we have heard so much from time to time, must of necessity go hand-in-hand. Australia will have to act in co-operation with other nations; as a matter of fact, the Australian Government has already entered into certain commitments.

That reminds me that Sir Hal Colebatch, when speaking to the Bill, charged me with not having made any mention of our international or national obligations. I think he referred to the Atlantic Charter and other matters. I did not see the necessity, when introducing the Bill, to enter into a great deal of detail; but it is a fact that we, as a nation, have been committed by the Commonwealth. It is only the Commonwealth Government which can commit the Commonwealth as a whole. Some of our commitments are, of course, legal commitments. Others are merely general pledges for the adoption of guiding principles of economic and social policies. Among the legal undertakings may be mentioned a very important agreement so far as this State is concerned—the National Wheat Agreement. Argentina, Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States have agreed to conclude a national wheat agreement, which it is proposed to extend to all countries interested in wheat, whether as consumers or producers.

Hon. G. B. Wood: That agreement has already broken down.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member should make sure on that point.

Hon. G. B. Wood: What is the date of the agreement?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Commonwealth has entered into commitments with respect to this national wheat agreement. As I have just informed the hon. member, it is proposed to extend the agreement to countries other than those I have mentioned. Wheat is one of the most important products of this State; in effect, it is the lifeblood of the State to a far greater extent than perhaps is any other industry, with the possible exception of goldmining. Knowing the position as we do, we should recognise it is absolutely essential that there should be one authority speaking for Australia as a whole on this question of wheat. We have had our previous experiences, and no-one knows better than do Mr. Wood and other members who are strongly opposed to the Bill, the difficulties we have had in years gone by, difficulties which will recur unless we can, by means of international agreements, take those steps which will provide protection, and in some cases assistance, to those engaged in the industry.

Another important matter I would mention is the Post-War Requirements Bureau, the object of which is to secure beforehand and distribute immediately on the termination of hostilities food and raw materials for those countries which have been devastated by war. The scheme was originally designed to serve Europe; but with the extension of hostilities to Asia and the Pacific, the scope being investigated is now world-wide. This is a just recognition of the need for the speedy despatch of food and relief to stricken populations over-run by the enemy. That must be a first consideration of the United Nations, and Australia, as a partner in the scheme and a great primary producer, will be called upon to play a most important role, especially in the south Asian area, which directly affects our own interests. May I again point out that our primary producers will be vitally affected by any agreement which is entered into by Australia? Unless we give the Commonwealth the power and the authority to speak for the Commonwealth as a whole, I am afraid our interests—particularly the interests of our primary producers—will be materially and adversely affected.

This world-wide scheme of post-war relief will call for the immediate expenditure of large sums of money. For Australia, it will call for the acquisition, transportation and distribution on the widest national basis of all kinds of commodities. There is thus more in

the suggestion that the Commonwealth should be given greater power than it has than some members believe. We, as a State, cannot very well remain in a watertight compartment. I think Sir Hal Colebatch said that to give the proposed additional powers to the Commonwealth for only five years was senseless. He used some such expression. Nevertheless, it seems to me that, in the interests of Western Australia, the Commonwealth Government should have the opportunity to deal with these matters on a national basis. If, at the end of five years, it is found that some of the powers we are prepared even today to give the Commonwealth permanently, as well as other powers, have been used in such a way as to be of benefit to this State and to the Commonwealth as a whole, there will not be any doubt as to the result. On the other hand, if experience shows that any power has not been used in the best interests of Western Australia, we should have the authority set out in this Bill to withdraw that power, if we so desire.

Hon. H. L. Roche: Are you sure we could withdraw?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I can only accept the advice tendered to me, which is a very definite Yes. In addition to the other matters I have mentioned, Australia has joined with the United Nations in accepting certain general principles of action. Those principles are embodied in instruments such as the Atlantic Charter of 1941, Article 5 of which concerns Australia most in her internal planning. It declares that it is desired to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security. That is most important. Again, there are the Four Freedoms as declared by President Roosevelt on the 6th January, 1941, and subsequently subscribed to by the leaders of most of the United Nations in various declarations. I think we all hailed with delight the publication of what is now known as the Four Freedoms, and all received with pleasure what is known as the Atlantic Charter because it indicated that the United Nations were looking ahead, that they were looking for ways and means whereby this so-called new order could actually take effect; and it is on declarations of this kind we will have to rely. Australia as a nation is and will have to be a party to these declarations.

Are we going to say that as Western Australians we shall refuse to the Commonwealth Government the power and authority to speak for this State in regard to these particular matters, knowing full well that as a State, acting on our own, we would be wholly ineffective? I hope this Parliament will not take that point of view.

Hon. G. B. Wood: We are still in the Federation.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am satisfied from the remarks of some members that they would very much like to be out of the Federation.

Hon. H. L. Roche: We are not out so we would be bound by the Commonwealth Government's decisions in these matters, would we not?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Then again Article 7 of the Mutual Aid Agreement of February, 1942, between the United Kingdom and the United States was formally accepted by Australia in an exchange of notes with the United States Government on the 3rd September, 1942. By this Article the parties, inter alia, agree to promote mutually advantageous economic relations and by agreed action to direct their efforts both by appropriate international and domestic measures to the expansion of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods. By this Article the parties are obliged to direct their efforts to methods to be agreed upon towards certain economic ends very broadly described.

While it is possible for one to speak at much greater length than I have done in reply to members, I have deliberately refrained from criticising what I might call the very parochial point of view exhibited by some. I have particularly refrained from dealing with any particular head of power contained in the Bill because I believe that in the Committee stage it will be easier, or shall I say it will be possible for the actual facts which actuated the Convention in including particular points in the Bill to be discussed. I feel that the post-war period, the period of reconstruction or whatever we may call it, will be perhaps the most vital period in the history of the Commonwealth, and when that time is reached we will have arrived at what was described by one member as the cross-roads. A lot will depend then upon the action we take at that particular time. All members will agree that all Allied countries are very apprehensive as to what will happen in the post-war

period, and are agreed that there can be no return to the pre-war state of affairs. That reminds me of a few words that were quoted by Dr. Hislop when he referred to the poem of Lawrence Binyon. He quoted the words--

The world that was ours is a world that is ours no longer.

What a lot of truth there is in those words and, as suggested to me by the hon. member, what a lot of truth there is in the verse from which those words were taken! I cannot subscribe to the sentiments expressed by Mr. Hamersley. I believe that when this war is finished we shall have to face a set of conditions such as we have never had previous experience of, and on such a scale that it will tax the ingenuity and even the loyalty of every man in this country. In other words, we cannot live in the past. We must live for the future. If I am right, it is necessary that Australia as a nation must be in a position adequately to play its part, not only in the framing of a new world order, but also in the actual implementation of that new order. That, I think, is the real justification for this Bill.

I have gathered the impression, after listening very attentively to the whole of the debate, that while one or two members have expressed the strongest possible opposition to the Bill as a whole and others have expressed their opposition to some portions of the Bill, there is no question of the measure not passing the second reading. I feel sure that those few members who have said they will oppose the second reading are perhaps inclined to think that after all there may be some good in one or other of the proposals contained in the Bill. In any event, I want it to be recognised that only circumstances as they exist today prompted the Commonwealth and State Governments to bring down a measure of this kind. It has not been introduced in order to meet the passing fancy of some particular individual, but because there is an urgent necessity for the Commonwealth Government to have a full knowledge of what its constitutional powers are in order that it might meet, when the time arrives, those very important and far-reaching problems with which it will be faced. For those reasons I hope that, notwithstanding the strong opposition exhibited to the Bill by some members, not only will the second reading be passed by a big majority, but in addition members will give of their best in the Committee stage, and that we will not

delay any longer than possible, in arriving at a decision as to what further powers this State is prepared to give to the Commonwealth Government in this time of trouble.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You think the Council has reformed?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It would take a lot to reform the Council entirely, but I have sufficient faith in members to believe that once they know the actual facts they will be prepared to take a reasonable view and do the right thing.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	7
Majority for	12

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. J. G. Hislop
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. O. R. Cornish	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. F. E. Gibson	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. W. K. Hall	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. M. Heenan	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. H. Tucker
Hon. V. Hamersley	(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYE.	NO
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. V. Plessee

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Reference of matters to Parliament of Commonwealth.

Paragraph (a):

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I must apologise for submitting an amendment which is not on the notice paper, but the matter was not brought to my attention till this morning. The amendment is a very simple one and, I think, both the Commonwealth and State Governments will agree that it is necessary. Paragraph (a) states—

The reinstatement and advancement of those who have been members of the fighting services.

We are all agreed that that power should be given to the Commonwealth. Personally I think it should be given permanently. The

reason for the inclusion of that paragraph is, I take it, that there is some doubt as to the constitutional right of the Commonwealth to exercise full and complete powers on matters in connection with repatriation. That being the case doubt must apply to those who served in the last war, and to those who suffered injury in the last war, just as much as to those now serving or suffering injury as a result of this war. The Title makes clear that this Bill, as it stands, refers to the present war. The phrase used in paragraph (a), "during the war" must, therefore, mean the present war. The final phrase "those members who have died or been disabled as a consequence of the war," also applies to the present war. If any doubt exists as to the powers of the Commonwealth to deal with the repatriation, not only of those serving in the present war but those who served in the last war, it should be removed. For that purpose I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of paragraph (a) after the word "during" the word "the" be struck out and the word "any" inserted in lieu.

A similar amendment, which is consequential, will have to be moved in regard to line 37. The effect of this amendment will be to make the Commonwealth power absolute, not only so far as it affects those serving in the present war but those who served in the last war also.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is a lot of reason in this amendment.

Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch: It has been put into the South Australian Act.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I can see no objection to it. It is very doubtful whether the Commonwealth has all the powers it would desire in order to deal with the repatriation and rehabilitation of those engaged in the war effort. I am advised that there is no question that the Commonwealth Government, under the defence powers, is able to place men in jobs, but there is doubt as to whether it has any power after having done that. As it is desired to go much further than that in regard to repatriation and rehabilitation it is considered necessary that we should make sure of the position by including this power. Might I suggest to members that we endeavour to make as much progress as possible this week? The Government is anxious that we should reach a decision with as little delay as possible. Our Standing Orders provide that we may meet

at 11 o'clock in the morning, and also that we may meet on Friday. I do not wish to ask the Committee to sit during all those hours, if it can be avoided, but I am very anxious that we should complete the Committee stage of the Bill this week. I hope I am not asking of members something with which they cannot comply. In view of the long time we have taken over the second reading stage and the fact that so many members have expressed their viewpoints respecting the individual powers mentioned in the Bill, I trust they will expedite the business and complete the consideration of the measure this week.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a consequential amendment in the last line of paragraph (a), and that will be made accordingly.

Paragraph, as amended, agreed to.

Paragraph (b):

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (b) the word "and" be struck out with a view to inserting the words "of unemployed persons on the construction of national works, public works and local government works, and the relief of unemployed persons by occupational training and insurance against" in lieu.

A similar amendment was moved in the Legislative Assembly but was not accepted. My reason for bringing the matter forward again is that the paragraph as it stands is wide enough to enable the Commonwealth Government to control every field of human activity. It means that not only will that Government have power to provide for employment, which is quite right, but it will also be in a position to interfere to a very marked degree with the activities of established institutions and commercial firms. That might very easily further accentuate difficulties that will arise during the reconstruction period. The problems associated with the unemployment crisis of earlier times were handled by the State Governments under very great difficulty, and at that time the Commonwealth Government disclaimed all responsibility. To make the position clear we should provide that the Commonwealth Government shall have the fullest powers along the lines I have indicated in the amendment, and ensure that we shall not hand over authority enabling it to interfere in any respect with the activities of commercial concerns and private enterprise so long as those people are doing their share in pro-

viding employment during the post-war period. Quite a lot of research work has been undertaken by those people, and while the Commonwealth may be expected to extend every encouragement in that direction, the paragraph as it is worded is far too wide in its application.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Seddon has been perfectly frank in his statement. He argues that the paragraph is far too wide in its application and that there should be some limitation imposed upon the extent to which the Commonwealth may go in dealing with these very important matters. We have had our experience regarding unemployment, and everyone will agree that the relief provided more often than not has been merely a palliative. A dole or something of the kind has been provided in order that a man may keep body and soul together. None of us likes that method of dealing with the problem, yet it has been adopted on many occasions. The Bill proposes to give the Commonwealth an opportunity to provide employment, and the circumstances will be such that it may be necessary for the Commonwealth to do all kinds of things in order to provide employment along lines never thought of before. I understand that at present nearly 1,750,000 people are engaged in connection with the war effort, and when hostilities cease a large proportion of that number will have to be transferred from wartime to peacetime employment. That will be a tremendous task. I do not think anyone can say to what extent it will be necessary for the Commonwealth or State Governments to go in order to meet the conditions that will inevitably arise.

My main argument against the amendment is that the power provided to deal with this phase cannot be too wide. Why place any limitation upon the possibilities that will enable the Commonwealth Government to provide employment? It may be necessary for the Federal authorities to undertake tasks never attempted in the days of peace, and it may be that they will again have to do things that were accomplished in wartime, such as moving large numbers of men, even with their families, from one part of the Commonwealth to another. In order to cope with certain activities that the Commonwealth Government may consider necessary to engage upon in one or other of the States, departures may be taken from anything ever attempted previously in the his-

tory of Australia. Unless the Federal authorities have the necessary power, the position will be hopeless. There is nothing to prevent the Commonwealth Government from dealing with the matters mentioned in the amendment. I have no objection to any one of those matters, but I do not think we should limit the power of the Commonwealth Government along the lines indicated. When this question was discussed at the Convention, an effort was made to define these activities. It was found practically impossible to foresee to what extent the Commonwealth would require this power, and the Convention agreed to make the reference as wide as possible. I hope the Committee will take the same view, and not limit the Commonwealth in this direction.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Under the paragraph the Commonwealth would have complete and sole control over employment and unemployment in every shape and form. I agree with the Minister that the reference is wide; it is the sum total of our life. It will mean handing over everything to the Commonwealth, whereas the amendment will provide for the employment of unemployed persons. What is the meaning of "national" works? This is a Western Australian Bill. Does it mean Western Australian or Commonwealth works? It might mean both, but there is room for doubt. Then the term is used in contradistinction to public works. However, we may disregard this matter for the moment. The paragraph would mean handing over to the Commonwealth every phase of our life, because every phase hinges on employment or unemployment. Those members who desire unification will vote for the paragraph, but those who are opposed to unification must, in my opinion, support the amendment.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: We should not hand over everything connected with employment, lock, stock and barrel, to the Commonwealth. To do so would mean that all our industrial powers would pass to the Commonwealth and be administered by the Commonwealth alone. As Mr. Parker has said, it will mean unification. We should not hide our heads in the sand by saying that the power is being referred for a limited period only. This will be a permanent reference.

Hon. H. SEDDON: My objection to the paragraph is that it does not in any way recognise the factor of private initiative and

enterprise and its relation to the problems that will arise after the war. We must then utilise to the highest degree all personal initiative and enterprise. Because of that, I wish to lay down the lines on which national activity shall proceed. When men are not able to find employment for themselves, the Government will step in, and the amendment will leave the field wide open for the Government to do what is necessary for the unemployed. Individual initiative will still be required to open up other fields probably even wider than those of the Government. Reference has been made to the distinction between national works and public works. Undoubtedly Government activities will have to be exerted internationally to effect the necessary readjustment after the tremendous destruction of wealth and loss of manpower occasioned by the war. There are works which would not come under the definition of public works but which might be national or international works. Meteorology is undoubtedly an international matter; yet it has been approached from the standpoint of individual parts of the world. Meteorology, however, has to be studied as a world science, and there is scope for the employment of educated people in the field of meteorological research. This would be an international work in which each nation would take a part. It could not be defined as a public work.

Public works will be palliatives to tide over the period until private enterprise gets into its stride again and is able to provide employment. We have had experience of Government enterprise being exploited more than was necessary, and to a degree that materially handicapped or discouraged the development of private initiative and enterprise. There has been among the people far too much of the spirit of going to the Government to get this and that done, instead of getting down to the job and trying to do it themselves. Insurance against unemployment should be provided for; had we possessed that factor years ago, the effects of the depression would have been far less severe than actually they were. Our educational system must be such that a man who specialises in one activity shall be able to engage in other activities as well. That, indeed, has been a feature of the war effort. A man will be greatly assisted to meet the problems of life if he is able to engage in one or more activities besides that which

he has specially chosen. After the war such a man would feel himself far better qualified to encounter the battles of life.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I regard this paragraph as perhaps the most important provision of the whole Bill. I agree with Mr. Parker that if the paragraph is accepted we shall empower the Commonwealth to take over practically every activity in Western Australia. Moreover, the paragraph is altogether too vague. We should not insert in the Bill something which even the sponsor of the measure does not profess to understand. However, generally speaking the sponsor of a Bill has a pretty good idea of what it means. The amendment will overcome all the difficulties enumerated by the Chief Secretary.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I shall support the amendment, although I would greatly prefer to see the paragraph knocked out altogether. From the experience of past wars we must come to the conclusion that it is not during the five years after a war that unemployment problems arise. They come much later. In any case, problems of that kind can best be settled by co-operation between the Commonwealth and the States, without giving any specific power to the Commonwealth. The paragraph as it stands does seem to me to assume that post-war difficulties are to be settled by Government action. But that is not going to be the case. They will be settled by the efforts of private enterprise.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Then there will be no new order?

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: There will be no new world. The paragraph in its amended form is dangerous, though less dangerous than as it stands.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The Chief Secretary pointed out that approximately 1¾ millions of our people are engaged in war work. I shall be greatly surprised if we emerge from the struggle without a higher proportion. We shall have to deal with a shattered, war-wrecked system in Australia when the present dreadful calamity comes to an end. If anything is going to be important after the war, to my mind it is the provision and regulation of employment. Surely that will be the paramount aim of the Commonwealth Government if it is going to bring order out of chaos! Railways will have to be re-organised after the war, roads

will have to be built, and countless other nation-wide activities will have to be engaged in; therefore some direction or co-ordination will be absolutely essential. If we say to the Commonwealth Government, "You cannot touch anyone except the unemployed," we shall not be giving it a chance of doing its job. And that is what Mr. Seddon's amendment means. Under the amendment, the Commonwealth Government will not be able to interfere, for instance, with a hundred or two hundred men employed in a new factory.

Members: Why should it?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I think it should. I believe that after the war the Commonwealth Government will want to direct manpower into certain activities which it will deem absolutely essential for the re-establishment of order. I think that Government should be given the necessary authority without the restriction proposed by the amendment. I imagine there will be some sort of new order. We might have different conceptions of it, but no one thinks we are going back to the conditions that existed four or five years ago.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Let us hope they will not be worse.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: There should be some central authority having the power to direct.

The CHAIRMAN: I have allowed considerable discussion on the amendment. The issue is whether the paragraph shall read "employment and unemployment" or "employment or unemployment."

Hon. W. J. MANN: I support the amendment. If we proceed on the lines suggested by some speakers we shall be heading for socialism. Are we to stifle the initiative of the young men who will be returning from the war and who will desire to engage in business to better their lot in life? There is nothing better than healthy private enterprise. I realise that there will be some unemployment after the war and that work will have to be provided. Immediately public works are put in hand, other avenues of employment are created. That happened in a small way in the South-West district when drainage and other schemes were carried out there. The men working on those schemes had to be fed and supplied with tools and other requirements. If majority rule in the

Eastern States is to say what employment we are to have in this State, it will be no good for us or for Australia. I would be sorry if the paragraph were passed in the form in which it appears in the Bill. With other members, I think everything that matters is bound up with employment. Consequently, if we transfer this power to the Commonwealth, then everything that counts in this State will have been lost to us.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Like Sir Hal Colebatch, I would prefer the paragraph to be struck out altogether. I agree with him that in its present form it is altogether too dangerous. The amendment moved by Mr. Seddon will certainly modify it somewhat. If, as was suggested by Mr. Heenan, we shall be in a state of chaos after the war, my opinion definitely is that private enterprise will pull us through. The matter should be left to the initiative of those people who are prepared to put what money they may have left after the war into industry, and develop it on the sound lines of the past. That will be better than the carrying out of public works.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know what members are afraid of. The last speaker said that the paragraph was a dangerous one. I can only guess at what he is hinting. I point out to him and to the Committee that any powers given by this measure to the Commonwealth will be concurrent with the powers the State has. We are not the only people who have found it exceedingly difficult to express in actual words just what power and authority will be required and can be used. Mr. Wood quoted from the proceedings of the Convention, and told us what Dr. Evatt had to say. He argued that because Dr. Evatt said the term was a very wide one indeed and he could not determine its extent, and that probably finally the High Court might be called upon to give a decision, the paragraph was not of any use to him. He also said that Dr. Evatt was the sponsor of the Bill. I am afraid that is a mistake which has been made by more than one member. This paragraph was inserted in the Bill as an alternative to what appeared in the original Bill and it was agreed to by the representatives at the Convention. They found they could not reach unanimity on certain specific matters.

Hon. V. Hamersley: They had only two hours to consider the Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That does not matter. I have said that we have been a fortnight already discussing this Bill, and members can put what construction they like on that statement. I hope we shall not be as long in Committee. This proposed power is necessarily wide; it could not be otherwise. We should not desire to limit the power of the Commonwealth Government merely because we are afraid it will be dangerous to private enterprise. Let us be frank. I cannot see that this power will interfere to any extent with private enterprise. I cannot imagine the Commonwealth Parliament introducing legislation which would have the effect of wiping out private enterprise, as was suggested by some members. The Commonwealth Parliament will be prepared to give private enterprise all the encouragement it wants; and, believe me, it will want a great deal of encouragement when the war is over. It is all very well for members to talk about private enterprise not being allowed to use the money it might have when the war is over. If the war goes on a year or two longer, none of us will have any money at all. At present the Commonwealth Government is the biggest employer of labour in Australia and will continue to be so. We should not attempt to limit that Government. I do not hold the same views as Mr. Bolton and am not afraid, as he is. Whether we like it or not, the Commonwealth Government will have to take action to deal with employment when this war is finished on a scale we have never even visualised, never mind attempted, and we will probably be better off in Australia than are people in other countries.

Hon. W. J. Mann: That would not be saying much.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It may be saying a tremendous lot. Fortunately for us we have not yet been touched by the war in anything like the same way as have other countries, but we will have sufficient problems and they will be Commonwealth-wide. It will not be enough to find employment for men for a couple of months and then say, "We have done our job." Continuity of employment has to be considered. It is all very well to talk about what private enterprise will do. It will only do it so long as there is a profit attached to the doing of it. Private enterprise cannot carry on unless it makes a profit. I am afraid

we shall have to find employment for hundreds of thousands of men and there will be no profit attached.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: The Chief Secretary must admit that it is in the best interests of the Commonwealth that they should make a profit.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am going to admit that the Commonwealth will be expected by Mr. Bolton to put into operation works on a very large scale involving millions of money and hundreds of thousands of men, and he will be the first to say that it does not matter whether a profit is made or not because if there is to be a profit motive behind what we do in the post-war period, nothing worth while will be done. If we are going to have to rely on private enterprise to provide employment and make a profit on the same scale as some of my friends would like, then we will revert to pre-war unemployment conditions.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I am not saying on the same scale.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member is saying that private enterprise will be affected by this Bill.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I am.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I will be surprised if it is not beneficially affected. Men with initiative, opportunity and money to enable them to go ahead with the schemes they devise will find the Commonwealth Government only too pleased to give them all the assistance it can. Why raise bogies of this kind? It is only a bogey. Socialism and nationalism and other "isms" have been mentioned.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Truisms, too! Let us have a few truisms.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Very well. The first is that private enterprise will not be able to cope with the problems with which we will be faced immediately the war finishes. I defy contradiction. Some members have the idea that the Commonwealth Government will introduce legislation which will take into account all sorts of considerations, even down to industrial arbitration and things of that kind. I do not anticipate anything of the sort. The Commonwealth will be quite content to use State instrumentalities so far as possible, and if there is no State instrumentality to cover any particular point the Commonwealth would naturally have to take the power and authority. I think we might look at this in a little more broadminded spirit than has been exhibited today. I

should not like this to develop into an argument as to whether private enterprise or the Government should determine what is to be done in the post-war period. Both will be required.

The two points I want to make are first that Dr. Evatt is not the sponsor of this; and secondly that any limitation placed on the Commonwealth Government will only make it harder for those people requiring employment when the war is over. Mr. Seddon has defined certain things he would allow the Commonwealth to do, but in doing so limits the power of the Commonwealth to those things in particular. That is the last thing we should do. I want to give the Commonwealth Government whatever power is possible.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I am surprised to hear the Minister say that this was not Dr. Evatt's Bill. I shall quote from page 7 of the report of the Convention, on which page the Prime Minister is reported as saying—

After the closest consultation with the Attorney General and the other Government representatives at this Convention, we have come to the conclusion that we should make a great effort to obtain unanimity in achieving the main objective of the Bill, which is to give sufficient authority to the Commonwealth Parliament to assume primary, though not exclusive, responsibility for the problem of post-war reconstruction. In this spirit, the Attorney General has re-examined all the objections which have been raised and has endeavoured to meet the most important of them. Therefore, he will suggest amendments to the Bill and I now ask him to announce them.

Then on page 11 we have this heading—

Draft Bill circulated by the Attorney General of the Commonwealth, the Right Honourable H. V. Evatt, at the Constitutional Convention at Canberra on the 24th November, 1942.

And then on page 12 —

(b) Employment and unemployment, security of employment, the improvement of standards of living and the relations between employer and employee.

That went into the melting pot and came out—

(b) Employment and unemployment.

I think we can safely say that is Dr. Evatt's work, though clipped to a certain extent. The Minister spoke about not trusting the Commonwealth Government. Why will he not trust it? Today we have power to go to the Commonwealth and say, "We want to employ the unemployed but we have not the

money. Give us the money and we will employ them." Why will not the Minister trust the Western Australian Government to have sufficient brains and ability to devise means and schemes to employ the unemployed and trust the Commonwealth Government to be reasonably liberal in the giving of money? Private enterprise has been mentioned. The curious thing is that for the first five years after the last war private enterprise did practically everything. This Bill only provides for five years after the end of the present war. The Commonwealth is not asking for power to deal with the difficult years which come after the first five years. If the Commonwealth builds homes and houses, it over-rides the whole of our building laws and does as it likes. That again shows how very broad the question of employment is. Why cannot the Commonwealth trust whatever State Government is in power?

Hon. T. Moore: It is "passing the buck" again to say whose responsibility it is.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: I am astounded to hear any member say that he will not trust his own Government; the one he supports. It is not our duty to "pass any buck."

Hon. T. Moore: You might be there; that is the trouble.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: If I am there I will not require any bucks to be passed; I will tackle the questions.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I can find no reference to any bucks in the Bill.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: It seems extraordinary to me that this Government seeks to hand over authority to the Commonwealth Government if it trusts that Government to give it more money. Why does it do that, unless, of course, it wants unification? I respect anyone else's views on unification and, if that is what is desired, then this is correct. If we do not intend unification, we must vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN: I intended, in Committee, to keep Dr. Evatt out of the discussion as far as possible. The Chief Secretary brought him in and I had to allow Mr. Parker to reply.

The Chief Secretary: I did not bring him in.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood you did.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Mr. Wood mentioned him.

The CHAIRMAN: We have this statement in the preamble—

It was unanimously resolved that adequate powers . . . should be referred to the Parliament of the Commonwealth.

If blame is attachable to anyone, it is to those who agreed to the draft Bill. This discussion should be general and not particular.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I might question that last statement because it was not unanimously resolved.

The CHAIRMAN: The power is in the Bill; that is all I can go on.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I want it to be clearly understood that there must be a new state of mind if we are to have a new order, and that is what my amendment is aimed at.

The Chief Secretary: That must be well understood.

Hon. H. SEDDON: There has developed in Australia an attitude of looking to the Government to get out of trouble. The spirit that moved our pioneers and developed our country and industries is the one we should develop. The Bill actually continues the policy which has so much led our people to depend on the Government instead of on their own resources. Whether we like it or not, the profit motive is a part of human nature. Unless an incentive is given, we will not get progress but stagnation. The big concerns of this country which have, through times of peace, been constantly extending employment, and through their researches, have discovered the possibilities of developing new industries, are the ones who have gained the confidence of the saving people of the country and it is they who keep it going, and not the Governments.

The Governments definitely lost the confidence of the saving people of Australia years ago and, coincidental with that, there was an increase in the investments of the people. These concerns have trained their men to be capable of extending and developing their industries. The angle of developing self-reliance and initiative and not that of looking to the Government is the one we should encourage. I do not say that the Government is not prepared to do that, but the official mind operates this way: It plays for safety and encourages theorists. Those outlooks are disastrous. We should encourage the men who know the lines on

which this country can safely develop, who have the confidence of the public, and who can pick the men with initiative and self-reliance to carry out this work. The Government should be given powers along these lines so as to train these people and to raise money by national insurance—which should have been done years ago—to carry out these works.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There are those here who would influence other members not to support this amendment on the plea that the Commonwealth Government can be trusted. I will mention two instances with which I was connected. At the latter part of the last war, the then Commonwealth Government decided to erect war service homes. During one of my journeys to Melbourne I was deputed to get in touch with the responsible Minister with a view to arriving at an agreement so that our Workers' Homes Board should carry out that work on behalf of the Federal authorities at a very small rate for its services—not more than 5 per cent., and probably less. I was delayed ten days thrashing this out with the Minister, and we finally arrived at an agreement except on two matters of which I felt sure the State Cabinet would have approved, but I did not like to take the responsibility as an individual. I therefore wired and said that they could be discussed when I returned. As far as the Commonwealth Minister was concerned, everything was in order, and we could easily have reached a compromise on the other two matters, although I thought the necessity would hardly arise. When I reached Perth on my return journey there was a telegram awaiting me stating that the Commonwealth Minister had decided to establish his own organisation here for the purpose of constructing war service homes. Members will remember what a disgrace that sub-department proved to be and the hundreds of thousands of pounds that were absolutely thrown away.

All that arose because the Commonwealth Government had not confidence in one of the best sub-departments of the State—the Workers' Homes Board. The next instance I shall quote concerns the State Savings Bank. Notwithstanding the fact that ample security was available against any advances made or guarantee given regarding the small amount required to counter the rush on the

bank that arose in consequence of statements published in a certain political paper, the Commonwealth Government was adamant. It was not concerned about Western Australia; it desired to take over the State Savings Bank. The State was in such a position that it had to agree to the Commonwealth Government's demands to avoid the necessity for the bank to close its doors. Despite such happenings, the Chief Secretary and Mr. Heenan say we should trust the Commonwealth Government! My remarks have no reference to the present Labour Government but, from my experience of the past, I have learned that we should not trust any Commonwealth Government because Western Australia, in the eyes of the Federal politicians, is back o' beyond and this State has never received justice at their hands. It would be foolish to concede all-embracing powers to the Commonwealth, and we should protect the State against Federal incursions.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	5

Majority for	12
--------------	----	----	----

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. Sir Hal Colebatch	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. F. E. Gibson	Hon. F. R. Welsh
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. R. Cornish
Hon. W. J. Mann	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. W. H. Kitson	(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYE.	NO.
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. C. B. Williams

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That the words proposed to be inserted be inserted.

Progress reported.

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 5.48 p.m.