

despite the quarantine laws, there is a strong possibility of the introduction of disease by aeroplane. Then before we know where we are there will be a spread of rinderpest which will wipe out all our stock.

The Minister for Justice: No fear!

Mr. MANN: Very well, but you must realise that with modern transport, particularly by aeroplane, these diseases can be brought in here without a moment's notice. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie made an objection to what I had to say. But what does he know about veterinary officers? We have but to realise the value of our stock and at once we see the necessity for a staff of competent veterinary officers. The Minister to-night has given me an opportunity, it is true, but I hope he appreciates the fact that I admire him as Minister for Agriculture because of his qualifications. He may still think that Mr. Sutton is a most competent administrator, but I have still my own views and I will support Mr. Teasdale in his remarks. He is a man who is just and fair and is held in the highest respect, and when he thought fit to criticise Mr. Sutton he was justified in doing so. I was sorry to hear the Minister to-night tackling Mr. Teasdale.

The Minister for Agriculture: I did not tackle him.

Mr. MANN: When I spoke on the Address-in-reply it was not with the intention of putting the boot into the man. I merely tried to draw a comparison between him and another. I hope the wool prices will remain firm, because the season has been a particularly bad one and much stock has died. The increased price may compensate for some of the losses. I was pleased to hear the Minister's remarks about the export lamb trade. I hope it will soon reach 100,000 lambs. Our export lamb trade is a credit to Western Australia. We have put up some of the best lambs to be received in England. This country lends itself to the breeding of a fine type of export lamb. I have seen many flocks in my district and I can say we are growing sheep to-day which, from a wool point of view, are equal to any in the Eastern States. Mr. McCallum, our chief wool expert, has played a prominent part in this State. He has urged men to improve their flocks and by personal touch with farmers themselves he has done immensely good work. I hope

my remarks to-night have not been too hard. The Minister has attacked me on my views, but I still stand by my views and my remarks. I see no reason why I should alter them. I hope the Minister will not think it is a very petty point of view. I have had no falling out with Mr. Sutton. I have never disagreed with him, but I am perfectly justified in my criticism of him. I give Mr. Sutton credit on some points, but on others I do not give him any credit at all.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 6th November, 1935.

	PAGE
Questions: Trolley bus bodies	1559
Bills: Wiluna Water Board Further Loan Guarantee, 3R., passed	1560
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 3R., passed	1560
Pearling Act Amendment, 3R., passed	1560
Loan, £2,627,000, 1R.	1560
Electoral, 2R.	1560
Workers' Homes Act Amendment (No. 3), point of order, 2R.	1563
Financial Emergency Tax, 2R.	1575
State Transport Co-ordination Act Amendment, Com. report	1578
Workers' Homes Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R., Com. report	1579
Motion: Trans-Australian Railway, Kalgoorlie-Fremantle section	1578

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—TROLLEY BUS BODIES.

Hon. A. THOMSON (for Hon. L. B. Bolton) asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What was the cost of the body imported with one of the trolley buses? 2, What was the cost of the locally built bodies? 3, Is it correct that additional orders have been placed in England for trolley buses, including the bodies? 4, In view of the satisfactory bodies built at the Midland Junction Workshops, what is the reason for importing bodies? 5, If it is excessive cost, will the Government

give private enterprise an opportunity to quote for any bodies required?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, £755 (duty free and excluding primage and freight). 2, £1,251 each (including cost of patterns and departmental charges). 3, No. 4 and 5, Answered by No. 3.

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

1, Wiluna Water Board Further Loan Guarantee.

2, Financial Emergency Act Amendment.

3, Pearling Act Amendment.

Passed.

BILL—LOAN, £2,627,000.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—ELECTORAL.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM (South-East) [446]: As we have already discovered to our cost, this is a long Bill. Previous speakers have stated that it is a measure much better dealt with in Committee, and with this I agree. Mr. Cornell's speech of last night was most interesting. The hon. member explained the various points most clearly, and I am sure all hon. members were keenly interested in his remarks. I support the second reading of the Bill and am pleased to have the opportunity to commend the Government on the introduction of a measure representing an honest and efficient attempt to improve the existing Act. On first receiving my copy of the Bill, I read it carefully. As it had been introduced by a Labor Government, I expected to find in it something affecting the Upper House franchise. However, I have discovered very little indeed of that nature. I do not approve of the proposed transfer of electoral qualifications from the Constitution Act to the Electoral Act. I do not like touching the Constitution Act in any way. In my opinion it would be far better to keep the electoral qualifications in the Constitution Act. An amendment of that statute will be forthcoming in the near future, and any necessary alterations could

be included then. Few members of this Chamber, I believe, care to see any interference with the Constitution Act. I have almost convinced myself once or twice that very little difference would result from the transfer of the qualifications, but I have finally made up my mind that that would be a wrong course to pursue. I am indeed pleased that the framers of the Bill have recognised the serious position existing as regards postal voting. The Bill takes a most definite stand in attempting to suppress the gross breaches which have occurred. No more, or at least I hope so, will electioneering agents pursue the tactics of the past. We all have heard rumours that books are taken around at athletic sports and similar gatherings with a view to inducing certain persons to use the postal vote. Such proceedings will be rendered far more difficult in future as ballot papers will have to be obtained from the electoral officer or the electoral registrar in one's own district, and the signatures will have to be witnessed by an elector. Not only will the Bill curb abuses, but it will facilitate voting by persons at a distance from polling booths on election day. Again, we know of instances where cards have been filled in and given to certain people for transmission to the electoral officer, and that transmission has not taken place. The Bill proposes a substantial fine if cards are not sent in. That is an excellent feature, and certainly will tend to make persons entrusted with claim cards far more careful. Members of this Chamber who lately faced the electors know the serious condition of the rolls. To get 30 or 40 or 50 per cent. of the electors to come to the poll is to do well. Mr. Piesse once got 60 or 70 per cent. of his electors to vote, but the usual percentage is between 40 and 50.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Make voting compulsory.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: I am wholly in favour of that suggestion. I believe, however, that the only effective way of achieving it would be to have Assembly elections and Council elections held on the same day. Being compelled to vote for the Assembly, electors would vote for the Council also, somewhat on the lines of the voting on the Secession referendum and for the Legislative Assembly. Mr. Seddon's suggestion that there should be a registrar in every province is excellent, and the Bill

provides for that. The hon. member went on to say that the position should be a full-time one and well paid. I agree with that. After all, the heaviest expense to which a candidate is put is to get people on the roll; and that certainly is an expense which a candidate should not bear but which should be the sole responsibility of the Electoral Department. I regret that after the 30th June it will not be an obligation of the Chief Electoral Officer to transfer names from municipal and road board rolls. The innovation is a mistake. Those names have been checked; and while in some cases they should not be on the roll, in the great majority of cases the proper qualification is there. I do not agree with the proposed innovation, and I hope an amendment will be carried leaving things as they are. Hours of voting are to be from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. Hitherto polling booths have closed at 7 p.m. Now, in nearly all country towns there are evening functions on Saturday, the day on which elections are held, and those functions usually start at about 8.30 or 9 o'clock. From 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. represents a big gap, and the later closing of the polling booths will enable electors to come in at a later and more convenient hour to record their votes. I support compulsory voting for the Legislative Assembly, and regret that I am compelled to consider such a system extremely difficult in connection with the Legislative Council, unless Council and Assembly elections are held on the same day, which is out of the question.

HON. H. V. PIESSE (South-East) [4.56]: In my opinion the thanks of both Houses of Parliament are due to the members of the Royal Commission for the excellent work they have done in connection with the Bill during the recess. I feel sure we all appreciate their efforts. I was pleased when the Minister introducing the measure in another place said that separate rolls would be printed for the Legislative Council. I take it that each Assembly electorate will now be provided with a roll containing the names of persons entitled to vote. In the South-East Province we would have various Assembly rolls printed giving the names of electors. This would save candidates much laborious work and afford them an opportunity to segregate the rolls, a heavy task for candidates hitherto. Regarding compul-

sory voting we have the example of the election when the Secession vote was taken and 90.6 per cent. of the electors voted under compulsion. Compulsory voting is a step in the right direction in the case of the Assembly. I should like to see it provided for the Council also, although I have been told that it is not practicable.

Hon. J. Cornell: You say you would like it. How do you think it could be brought about?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I have said I have been told it is not practicable. I was not here last night, and regret that an attack of influenza prevented me from hearing the lucid explanation of the Bill given by Mr. Cornell. Mr. Wittenoom has said that he is pleased to see the new system of postal voting. I have yet to learn that any grave mistakes occurred at country elections under the old system of postal voting. We have had a splendid lot of men appointed as postal voting officers, men of high repute; and I know of very few cases indeed where the system has not been carried out to the best advantage.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Then your district has been most fortunate.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: I am speaking purely from a country point of view. I know what has taken place in the cities. In any case, I regard the new system as just as likely to be misused. What is to stop any candidate from sending out an agent with typed forms of application and having them delivered to people outside a seven-mile radius of the polling booths, with a request that the applications be signed and sent in? And a fortnight later what is to stop the same good lively agent from going round to collect the applications and bring them in? Every Act of Parliament always has loopholes admitting of breaches or evasions. I would like the Minister, when the relevant clause comes up, to give a little further information as to the new system. The franchise we have always had for the Legislative Council has been quite satisfactory and I would not like to see it further reduced. The suggested hours of voting will be an improvement, because a great number of people do not return from their different avocations until after 7 o'clock in the evening. The extension of the hours of polling to 8 o'clock will enable many to record their votes, and, moreover, the polling period will be brought

into line with that in vogue in connection with Federal elections.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: All do not work on Saturday afternoons.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: There are many who are not free on Saturday afternoon. In any case, it is much better that the hours of polling, State and Federal, should be uniform. Another matter to which reference has been made was the striking off of names from the Council rolls. I attended a show this week and met a man whom I have known for many years, a Mr. Carter, of Woodanilling. He informed me that his mother's name had been struck off the roll three times in the past 20 years, and that she had been a resident of that district all the time. We hear of many such instances when we are fighting elections and it often occurs on election day that a person will say that he is on the roll, only to find later on that his name has been struck off. There are many reasons why names may have been struck off, but I consider that before a person's name is removed from the roll he should receive notice of the intention to do so, but that the person who is seeking to remove the name should make his application in the presence of a justice of the peace.

Hon. J. Cornell: Then you would put up an impossible proposition.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Perhaps, but it is too easy a matter just now to remove names from the roll. A very good canvasser might be acting on behalf of a particular party, and what is to stop him making arrangements to give information that certain people have left the district and whose names should be struck off the list?

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: The department would not accept the bare statement of an individual.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The department have been known to accept statements submitted by road boards or schoolmasters. It often happens, for some reason or other, that letters are not always delivered, and there are quite a number of small post offices in the country that do not deliver letters. I remember on the occasion of my last election Mr. Smith of Denmark—a well-known property owner there who has lived in Denmark practically all his life—reported to me that his name had been struck off the roll. It appeared that the name was removed merely because someone else by the name of Smith had sold property some-

where in Timbuctoo. When the matter was reported by telegraph to the Electoral Department they allowed the Mr. Smith whose name had been struck off to exercise his vote. I am also of the opinion that the Electoral Department should avail themselves of the opportunity to seek advice from country road boards and municipal councils respecting names that should be placed on the roll. I was surprised to hear Mr. Wittenoom say that there was no intention on the part of the department to use road board or municipal rolls in the future. In my opinion, no person is more fitted to assist the Electoral Department in this respect than is a secretary of a road board or a town clerk. As I mentioned earlier, compulsory voting will be difficult to enforce, while with regard to Council and Assembly elections being held on the same day, I can see no serious objection being raised to the proposal. I know that this opinion may not agree with that of a number of members, but I really cannot understand why the country should be put to the expense of conducting two separate elections within a few weeks of each other. We are to have general elections for the Assembly in March next and in the first week in May elections will take place in connection with this House. Why in the name of fortune cannot both elections be conducted at the same time?

Hon. J. Cornell: How will you get on after that?

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: The Assembly elections take place every three years and the double election could take place every six years when the retirement of the members of this House and the Assembly elections would practically coincide.

Hon. J. Cornell: Then you would have the one election for the two Houses every six years.

Hon. H. V. PIESSE: Of course we could alter the Act to provide for the double election on every occasion. I cannot see why the State should be put to the cost of holding a general election for the Assembly in March or April and an election for ten members of the Council in May. If I were standing for election next May nothing would please me better than to contest my seat at the same time as Assembly members were contesting theirs, because there would be a big roll-up of electors, and when there is a big poll a successful candidate knows that

he is representing a substantial majority of the electors. Before concluding I should like to pay a tribute to the good work done in the Electoral Department by Mr. Gordon who was recently transferred to another department. The thanks of all are due to Mr. Gordon for his courtesy and the attention he, as well as his officers, showed to all who had occasion to transact business with the department. I intend to support the second reading, and when the Bill is in Committee I will endeavour to give some of the clauses a little overhaul.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [5.9]: It is not my intention at this stage to deal with the arguments advanced by some hon. members in their opposition to parts of the Bill. It is not a party Bill and, as members know, it is the work of a joint committee of both Houses which was afterwards converted into a Royal Commission. I trust that those members who were on the Commission and were responsible for the production of the Bill will render every possible assistance in the way of explanations in replying to arguments that may be advanced when the Bill is in Committee.

Hon. T. Moore: There is almost a new Bill in the form of amendments appearing on the Notice Paper.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No amendments will be made at the instance of the Government except perhaps a few machinery amendments suggested by the Electoral Department. One provision will deal with compulsory voting, but even that was suggested by the Commission. I hope that when the Bill is in Committee it will be possible to deal with it in an intelligent manner.

Question put.

The PRESIDENT: It is required that this Bill shall be passed by a statutory majority. Therefore, I will ask the House to divide on the second reading.

The House divided.

The PRESIDENT: As there is but one member sitting to the left of the Chair and as the members on the right form more than a statutory majority, I declare the motion for the second reading carried.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES ACT AMENDMENT (No. 3).

Point of Order.

The Honorary Minister: I was under the impression that this Bill was not one that it was competent for a member of this Chamber to introduce. Since then I have had the matter submitted to the Crown Law authorities. I am advised by the Solicitor General, Mr. J. L. Walker, that he is of opinion it is not a Bill that can be introduced by a member of this House. His reasons are as follows:—

1. The question whether or not it is competent for the Hon. Mr. Cornell, M.L.C., to introduce the above Bill is essentially one for the determination of the President; and I certainly think the point should be taken and the President should be asked to give his ruling on the matter, because, in my opinion, definitely the Hon. Mr. Cornell, M.L.C., cannot introduce the said Bill.

2. The Bill is one which can be introduced only by a Minister upon a message from the Governor for the following reasons:—

- (a) Clause 2 of the Bill purports to give to the Minister power to direct the Workers' Homes Board to erect workers' homes in certain specified areas.
- (b) In doing so, the Workers' Homes Board must apply moneys in the Workers' Homes Trust to pay the expenses of erecting such workers' homes.
- (c) Section 6 of the Workers' Homes Act, 1911 (as amended by Section 3 of the Act No. 8 of 1912) provides that the funds necessary for the effectual execution of the Act shall be such moneys as may from time to time be appropriated by Parliament for the purpose, which moneys are to be placed to the credit of an account at the Treasury to be called the Workers' Homes Fund and applied to the purposes of this Act.
- (d) Thus any expenditure of moneys in such fund is an expenditure of public moneys, and the proposed Bill has for its object the expenditure of those moneys by the direction of the Minister.
- (e) Clause 2 of the Bill therefore in effect deals with an appropriation of public moneys in the Workers' Homes Fund.
- (f) Section 46 of the Constitution Act, 1889, as inserted by Section 2 of the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1921, provides in Subsection (1) thereof that a Bill providing for appropriation of public moneys shall not originate in the Legislative Council, and in Subsection (8) that a Bill for appropriation of public moneys shall not be passed unless the purpose of the appropriation has in the same session been recommended by message of the Governor to the Legislative Assembly.
- (g) A message from the Governor can be conveyed only through a Minister and not through a private member.

3. It seems to be clear, therefore, that the proposed Bill can originate only in the Legislative Assembly, and can be introduced by a Minister after a receipt of a message from the Governor.

In view of this statement, Mr. President, I should like to have your ruling on the matter.

Hon. J. Cornell: I should like to make a few remarks, Mr. President, before you give your ruling. I do not wish to be rude, but I regard the statement of the Solicitor General as absurd. In effect the Honorary Minister, backed by the Solicitor General, says that this is a Bill which can only be introduced by Message. That means it can only be introduced by a Minister of the Crown. Mr. Sayer drafted this Bill. When he was good enough to send the draft to me he attached the following memorandum:—

The annexed Bill is I think in accordance with the note I took yesterday. I would say, however, that there is nothing in the existing Act to prevent a home being constructed under Part 3, or an advance being made under Part 4, to the limited amount of £450; or to prevent the payment for a home, or the repayment of a loan being fixed at 10 years by the Minister, under Part 3 or by agreement between the board and the borrower under Part 4. What I understand by your suggestion could be carried into effect under the Act as it stands now if the board thinks fit.

The man who drafted the original Workers' Homes Act, and has drafted all its amendments, is of opinion that there is no necessity for my Bill. Either the board or the Government could do what the Bill says may be done, without my Bill. That is Mr. Sayer's view. I saw him later. I had some idea or suspicion that these points might be raised. They provide a convenient way of getting rid of the Bill. Mr. Sayer subsequently sent me the following note:—

By Section 3 of the principal Act of 1911, "Minister" is defined as the Treasurer or a responsible Minister of the Crown charged with the administration of the Act. By Subsection (7) of Section 4, subject to the Minister, the Act is administered by the board. Under Part 3 workers' dwellings are erected by the Minister on the recommendation of the board. By clause 2 of the Bill workers' dwellings are erected under and subject to Part 3 except as to costs and terms of repayment.

Lower periods are provided under my Bill than are provided in the Act.

As regards Part 4, advances for homes, that part is administered by the board subject to the Minister. Section 4, Subsection (7). The words "and shall if the Minister so directs" in Clause 3 of the Bill only relate to the policy

of extending Part 4 to the goldfields on the modified terms of that clause. It does not affect the function of the board to consider each individual case.

If the Crown Solicitor had depended upon Clause 3 he might have had something on which to hang his hat. What does my Bill say? Clause 2, on which Mr. Walker is basing his objection, says—

Notwithstanding any provisions of the principal Act to the contrary, the Minister may cause workers' dwellings to be erected and disposed of within the Coolgardie, East Coolgardie, Dundas and Yilgarn goldfields, under and subject to Part III. of the principal Act as modified by this section.

That is to say, the cost of erection shall not exceed in the case of any one dwelling the sum of £450, and the capital must be repaid in ten years.

Hon. A. Thomson: Is that not in the original Act?

Hon. J. Cornell: I have pointed out that Mr. Sayer, who drafted the Act, says there is no necessity for my Bill. I do not say that the Minister or the board shall erect homes on the goldfields; only that they may do so. Not by any stretch of the imagination does the Bill appropriate money. If it is passed the Minister or the board may or may not take action under the Bill. Mr. Sayer is of opinion that the Government can do what the Bill says they may do, without the Bill. Clause 3 says—

Notwithstanding any provisions of the principal Act to the contrary the Board may, with the approval of the Minister, and shall, if the Minister so directs,

The word "may" is also in that clause. "May" is permissive. If the Bill is in order and is passed, the Minister and the board can do, so far as the goldfields areas are concerned, under this Bill what they have done under the Act, namely, nothing. There is nothing in the Bill about appropriating money, unless the Minister thinks it ought to be done. If he thinks otherwise he need not do it.

Hon. A. Thomson: In your Bill you state that the repayments must be made in ten years. That is the only difference I can see.

Hon. J. Cornell: My Bill says the amount shall not exceed £450, and that the full period of repayment shall not be more than 10 years.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is the only difference I can see.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is a distinction without a difference. The Bill does not say

the board shall do anything. Would I bring down a Bill knowing that it might be thrown out on your ruling, a Bill to direct that the Minister shall appropriate money for this purpose? It is as permissive as if there were no Bill, and the Minister may still do as he likes. It may be irrelevant to the Bill, but all this goes to show, on the Premier's own letter to the Kalgoorlie Municipal Council, that if there was any substance in the point raised by the Crown Solicitor there is no need to appropriate any money, because money is already available. The Premier, in a letter written to the Kalgoorlie Municipal Council, stated, according to a report in the "West Australian," published on the 29th October--

The Workers' Homes Board already has adequate funds at its disposal and full power to build in any portion of the State that it deems advisable.

According to the Premier, there is no need to appropriate money, even if there were any point in the suggestion that has been raised regarding the Bill appropriating funds. The Premier states that the board has sufficient funds already, without any necessity for an appropriation.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Then there is no need for the Bill at all.

Hon. J. Cornell: As to that, the Bill has been introduced and has given the Government an opportunity to say there is no need for the Bill. But if there were no need for the Bill, it would not have been introduced. As it is, the Government question its relevancy and raise the point as to whether it is a Bill that can be introduced by a private member. I contend there is nothing mandatory about it; its provisions are permissive. If the Minister does not care to spend the money, or the board does not desire to do so, the money will not be spent in the goldfields districts.

The President: If any other member wishes to address himself to this point of order, I am ready to hear him.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: It appears to me that the Workers' Homes Act Amendment Act of 1912 definitely sets out in Section 3, which repealed Section 6 of the Act and substituted a new section, the position regarding funds as follows:—

The funds necessary for the effectual execution of this Act shall be such moneys as may from time to time be appropriated by Parliament for the purpose.

The present Bill has nothing whatever to do with any appropriation. It merely seeks to amend the parent Act by reducing the authority to erect houses on the goldfields to an expenditure of not more than £450, instead of up to £800. It will be seen that it actually reduces the amount.

Hon. A. Thomson: And also the period for repayment.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Yes. I cannot see how the Bill in any way interferes from the standpoint of an appropriation, or compels taxation. It does not interfere in any way with the financial transactions of the Government. As Mr. Cornell pointed out, he has been advised that the Bill is not really necessary. That is a matter that can be dealt with at another time. I submit it is within the competency of the House to take the Bill into consideration.

The President: Does the Honorary Minister wish to reply?

The Honorary Minister: I do not know that I need add to the discussion, except to say that I passed on to you, Mr. President, the Solicitor General's opinion in order that you might have time to consider the point that was to be raised. While what Mr. Cornell said was perfectly true, the Bill goes a little further than he suggested because it lays down the rate of interest at which advances shall be made. As to Mr. Parker's remarks, the Act he referred to did not appropriate any specific amount. Yet it was introduced by means of a Message. That proved that, from time to time, money might be appropriated in accordance with its provisions. Such money has been appropriated. However, it is a matter for your decision, Mr. President. The point is important and interesting and I may add that the action I have taken has not been in any vexatious spirit.

The President: I wish to express my thanks to the Honorary Minister for having notified me some time ago that he intended to raise this point. Furthermore, he sent to me the views of the Solicitor General (Mr. Walker), and I have had the advantage of studying them. The Honorary Minister's action in notifying me that the point of order was to be raised was in accordance with the practice of this House whenever a member knows beforehand that a point of order is to be raised. That course of action gives the President an opportunity to consider the

matter and to endeavour to make what decision he arrives at absolutely in accordance with what is right. I have not experienced much difficulty in forming my opinion on this question. I am also grateful to Mr. Parker for having given me the advantage of his legal opinion, and I was pleased to have the view quoted by Mr. Cornell as the opinion of Mr. Sayer. In looking through the opinion of the Solicitor General, it seemed to me that the whole point he raises depends upon these words: "Clause 2 of the Bill therefore in effect deals with the appropriation of public money under the Workers' Homes Act." I cannot agree with Mr. Walker that the Bill does deal with the appropriation of money. It neither in effect nor otherwise deals with the appropriation of public money. It is a matter that affects the administration of the Workers' Homes Board. That is how I regard it. It purports to remove a restriction that, according to Mr. Sayer, does not really exist. It occurred to me when the Bill was introduced, that there really was no necessity for it, seeing that what it purports to do can be done at present. For instance, it says that the Minister may cause the erection of workers' homes within the Coolgardie, East Coolgardie, Dundas and Yilgarn goldfields areas. The measure, however, does not say there shall be increased expenditure; it simply says that when money is available the Minister may cause it to be distributed over a larger area than hitherto. In other words, it merely provides for the transfer of the powers of the board, either in whole or part, from one locality to another. Therefore I rule that the Bill is in order.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 23rd October.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.40]: In view of your decision, Mr. President, I desire to say a few words regarding the Bill. First of all, I confirm what Mr. Cornell said that Mr. Sayer claimed could be done under the present Act. Everything that Mr. Cornell asks for in his Bill can be done under the present Act. There is no question about that.

Hon. J. Cornell: You raised the point of order.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I raised the point of order because it appeared to

me that the Bill was one that it was not competent to introduce in the Legislative Council. I would not have done right if I had not raised the point, thinking as I did. The position is that the Workers' Homes Board, if they desire to do so, can do everything that Mr. Cornell asks shall be done in accordance with the provisions of his Bill. What does he ask for? He suggests that certain mining districts, for instance, shall be eligible for the erection of workers' homes up to a certain amount per home and that the period of repayment shall be limited to a particular period. There is no question that the Workers' Home Board can do that to-day, so long as the members of the board are satisfied with the security. I have been advised by the board that the reason they refused such applications in the past was because they considered such investments of too speculative a character. It has been suggested that if the provisions of the Bill were acted upon by the board, the repayments over a shorter period would probably prove rather difficult for the persons concerned from the standpoint of meeting their obligations. It is suggested that immediately such persons experience difficulties, they would naturally request an extension of the period for repayment. Of course, their claim would be based on the contention that, as it was competent for purchasers of workers' homes in the metropolitan area to repay their loans over periods extending upwards of 35 years, they themselves were entitled to similar treatment. I am expressing the views of the Workers' Homes Board, and I would point out to members that they are a body of responsible men who have acted as trustees for many years and have had considerable experience in these operations. They say that, in their opinion, investments of this description on the goldfields are not, generally speaking, of a satisfactory nature from their point of view. The history of our mining centres is that they are prosperous for a time; but immediately any signs of depression appear, there is a falling off in the population, which begins to dwindle away. While in many instances the mining centres carry on for indefinite periods with a decreased population, nevertheless it is a fact that people are apt to leave such districts when mining operations decline. They are deal-

ing with a wasting asset and, in view of that fact, seeing that the Workers' Homes Board have only had sufficient money to meet the requirements of applications from more satisfactory sources, they have not been keen on investing their capital in areas such as those suggested by Mr. Cornell. If what I have suggested did take place and when, in the course of time, any goldfields town died down on account of a drop in production and the population drifted away, as they have done in the past, it would then be necessary for the Workers' Homes Board to remove those homes. At present they could only move them down into a country district, because those buildings are suitable only for country districts, and it is not considered that there is likely to be any great demand for homes of that class in country districts during the next year or two. Now we come to the question of the rate of interest that should be charged on the loans. The Bill provides for 5 per cent. on leasehold properties and 6 per cent. on freehold properties. The Workers' Homes Board have been charging $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Hon. J. Cornell: Where?

The HONORARY MINISTER: In the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. Cornell: What on?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Leaseholds.

Hon. J. Cornell: No, 5 per cent. is the figure.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: The secretary told me 5 per cent.

Hon. J. Cornell: I have paid $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member is somewhat fortunate if he gets it at 5 per cent. The board do not favour 5 per cent. Naturally, if 5 per cent. were paid on one property and everybody else on similar properties was paying $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., they would ask, "Why should we pay $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.?"

Hon. J. Cornell: They are not paying $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I am not paying $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and I know dozens of others who are not.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am sure the hon. member does not desire to mislead the House.

Hon. J. Cornell: There are 18 houses in my block, and all leaseholds, and in

each instance 5 per cent. is the interest rate.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Are they war service homes?

Hon. J. Cornell: No, they are workers' homes on leasehold.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Well, I will make inquiries, for I have here the advice of the Workers' Homes Board. I was going to suggest that if the hon. member is referring to war service homes, I agree with him; there are war service homes, and it is possible that there has been some misconception as to the position. I do not know that I need say any more on this matter, except to reiterate what has been said by the hon. member and by the Premier, namely that the Workers' Homes Board have statutory power to deal with the erection of workers' homes under the Act. They are not directed by the Government as to what they shall do, and I understand that on no occasion has any direction been given to them by the Government as to where they should build, or under what conditions they should build. We do not at present feel that we should be called upon to say to the Workers' Homes Board where they should spend their money, or how they should spend it. Any refusals the board may have made to applicants for loans for workers' homes have been made purely as the result of the policy of the board themselves. Of course they are anxious to conserve their funds, and naturally they have taken every step to see that the securities of certain applicants are satisfactory. The board say that on the goldfields it may be possible to build satisfactory houses at from £400 to £450 each. I believe a number of applications have been made to the board from the goldfields from time to time, but in every instance the board have considered it not advisable to approve of the applications, even though on the face of them they did appear to be somewhat attractive. I have endeavoured to give the viewpoint of the board on this matter. The board have full power to deal with any application made to them.

Hon. L. Craig: The Bill will not alter their power at all.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Except that it gives the Minister, not the board, power to direct that certain things be done.

Hon. J. Cornell: So does the parent Act.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Bill gives the Minister power to direct that the board may—"may" is used, not "shall"—erect buildings, workers' homes, of a certain value in certain districts.

Hon. L. Craig: They may do that now.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is so, and consequently there is no need for the Bill.

Hon. J. Cornell: I have an effective reply to that.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [5.52]: I welcome the Bill. It gives members an opportunity to express their views as to whether the building of workers' homes on the goldfields would be of a speculative nature. Some time ago either Mr. Seddon or Mr. R. G. Moore suggested to the House that the workers' homes scheme should be extended to the goldfields. I opposed that suggestion at the time, and I would oppose it to-day under the provisions of the existing Act, namely that the worker should have 30 years in which to repay the cost of a house. I do not think any goldfields town can be depended upon for 30 years. But the Bill is totally different, and I have no hesitation whatever in voting for an extension of the workers' homes scheme to the towns of Kalgoorlie and Wiluna, on the understanding that the homes will have to be paid for in ten years. For we are quite sure of both Kalgoorlie and Wiluna for the next ten years. No doubt there are other goldfields towns just as safe as Kalgoorlie and Wiluna, but I have not sufficient knowledge of those places to confirm that. I suggest that instead of enumerating the various goldfields towns, as Mr. Cornell is doing, he should leave that to the Workers' Homes Board. I do not think there would be the slightest difficulty in getting the board to agree to an extension of their scheme to Kalgoorlie and Wiluna under the conditions proposed in the Bill. I would not agree to an extension of the scheme on a 30-years tenure, but I certainly would agree to its extension on a 10-years tenure. In the same way, I would not agree to £800, but I would agree to £450. However, it should be left to the Workers' Homes Board to decide to which areas the Act should apply under the terms suggested by Mr. Cornell. I should like the board to have the final say as to which of the goldfields shall be embraced in the scheme.

The Honorary Minister: They have that power now.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: A lot of good will arise from the introduction of the Bill, because, if it is passed, it will give the Workers' Homes Board the idea that Parliament is agreeable to the extension of the scheme under the new conditions of repayment in ten years and a value of £450 at the outside. Mr. Cornell, Mr. Seddon and Mr. R. G. Moore have told us what a great number of workers' homes will be required if the Bill passes. I hope those gentlemen are not going to be disappointed, but I should like to give them the benefit of my experience. Some years ago, when I was member for Gascoyne in the Legislative Assembly, an elector of mine wrote to a newspaper saying it was not fair that the Workers' Homes Board should be erecting homes in the metropolitan area, whereas no resident of Carnarvon could get such a home. I went amongst the people and spoke at a public meeting, and I got promises from 16 residents to apply for workers' homes if the Act were extended to Carnarvon. I then came down here and saw the board, and the board, satisfied with the stability of Carnarvon, agreed to extend the scheme to that town. They went further, and prepared special plans of houses suited to the semi-tropical conditions of Carnarvon. Joyfully I went back to Carnarvon, notified the local Press of what I had achieved, told the people who had signed the request that they could now get each a worker's home, and I had application forms lodged with the town clerk. And how many applications do members here think were received—not one! The people had got their desire in having the Act extended to Carnarvon, and that was all they wanted. Numbers of homes have been built up there since then, but all by private money. The banks have been lending money for the purpose, and persons whose security was not quite good enough, and who wanted homes, have been guaranteed by their friends for those homes. I believe if the workers' homes scheme be extended to the goldfields, more will be done by private enterprise than by the Workers' Homes Board in Kalgoorlie and Wiluna. We are assured that those two towns will last, at any rate for the next decade or two. Let me give our friends from the goldfields a suggestion as to how they may be able to get workers' homes built there, even if the Government are not sympathetic; and judg-

ing by the remarks of the Premier the other day it does not look as if there is going to be any immediate extension of the scheme. I noticed in the Press a few weeks ago that the Colonial Mutual Life Assurance Society were offering to lend money to people in the metropolitan area for building homes, the rate being $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The day after Mr. Cornell made his speech on the Bill, I took a copy of the Bill and also a Press cutting of the remarks of goldfields members on the Bill to the local manager of the society and asked what he thought of the scheme. He replied that he would consider applications for such homes.

Hon. G. W. Miles: On the goldfields?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Yes, provided freehold land was available and some little help was forthcoming from the Government in the way of an assurance that the applicant was likely to keep his job.

Members: Oh, oh!

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: That could be arranged if a scheme were properly worked out. The manager would be glad to have a talk with goldfields members to consider whether a scheme could be evolved to enable the company to build the homes required.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Goldfields members could not give a guarantee.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I am not suggesting that they should, but the society want some sort of assurance that the men for whom homes would be built have decent positions and are likely to retain them.

Hon. F. H. H. Hall: They could not do that.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: They would need to be assured somewhat along these lines, "Is Bill Jones a good man? Is his character right? Has he a job that is likely to last?" If goldfields members could give those assurances, some arrangement might be made.

Hon. J. Cornell: Or does Bill Jones go to the races?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: The personal equation often appeals to a financial firm more than the probable life of the town. They want to know with whom they are dealing.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Will you give me the address of the society?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I have mentioned the society; I had the permission of the manager to do so. Why go to the taxpayer for everything? If the conditions on the goldfields are as good as Mr. Cornell said

—and his remarks were endorsed by other goldfields members—surely private enterprise would come to the rescue.

Hon. J. Cornell: There is room for both.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Quite so. The society are lending money at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the metropolitan area. Mr. Cornell's Bill contemplates an interest rate of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. or 6 per cent.

Hon. A. Thomson: They would not advance the whole of the money at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: For the goldfields they want a guarantee as well.

Hon. H. V. Piessse: Perhaps the society would ask the workers to take out a life policy with them.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I am glad of that interjection. It was not suggested by the manager, but would it be any drawback if that proposal were made? I should say it would be an advantage. If a man borrowed £400 for a home, and the company assured his life and held the policy as collateral security, the worker would have the satisfaction of knowing that if he died, his wife and family would have a home free of debt. I think that is an advantage.

Hon. J. J. Holmes interjected.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I do not represent the society in any way; I have not even a policy in the society.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: You are doing very well for them.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I happened to see the advertisement and made inquiries. I have given the information for what it is worth. If goldfields members find that their wishes cannot be met by Mr. Cornell's Bill they might be able to achieve their object by enlisting the aid of private enterprise. I support the second reading.

HON. C. G. ELLIOTT (North-East)

[6.8]: I congratulate Mr. Cornell on having introduced this Bill. Should the measure become law, as I hope it will, a long-felt want on the goldfields will be supplied, particularly for the cities of Kalgoorlie and Boulder. Evidently the chief reason, in fact the only reason, why the Workers' Homes Board are disinclined to extend the scheme of workers' homes to the goldfields is their lack of faith in the stability and permanency of the gold-mining industry. I am prepared to say that if members of the board made a proper investigation into the

present position of the industry, they could come to only one conclusion, namely that any money they were prepared to utilise for building workers' homes on the goldfields would be amply repaid. During the last few years the position in the gold-mining industry has altered considerably and very much for the better. Take the present mining practice: a few years ago the reciprocating or piston variety of drilling machine was in use. That type has been totally discarded and we now have operating the jack-hammer variety of machine, which is more economical in every way and results in development work being done much more cheaply. The treatment process, too, has been entirely altered. A few years ago it was necessary to handle and roast 100 per cent. of the ore treated. To-day, under the new process, chiefly the oil flotation process, it is necessary to handle and roast only 10 per cent. of the ore treated. Those two reasons alone are a very important factor in reducing the cost of mining and ore treatment. The 'Workers' Homes Board should remember that, after 40 years' operations on the Golden Mile, we have stoped down to an average depth of approximately 2,500 feet. As a result of that work, 730 tons of pure gold has been produced, the value being over £100,000,000 sterling. Incidentally there has been paid and distributed in dividends a sum of about £30,000,000. In Brazil payable values are being worked at a vertical depth of over 7,000 feet. The goldfields of Mysore, India, are working payable values at a similar depth, and on the Rand, South Africa, payable ore is being worked at a vertical depth of 8,000 feet.

Hon. T. Moore: They would need niggers there. White men would not go down to that depth.

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT: It will be only a matter of a comparatively few years when they will be operating at a vertical depth of 10,000 feet. Another point for the board to bear in mind is that at our lowest level, 3,400 feet, extending from Chaffers shaft north into the Horseshoe—that is on the Lake View and Star group—it has been amply demonstrated that the width of the ore bodies is maintained, and what is more, the value of the ore is also maintained. In our stoping we have attained only half the depth recorded in other parts of the world, and little imagination is required to realise that at the end of another 40 years mining

on the Golden Mile and probably in other parts of the State, particularly Wiluna, will be just as great and valuable an industry as it is to-day. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the goldmining industry in this State will yet produce more than another 730 tons of pure gold.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT: Before tea I was endeavouring to prove that the present conditions in the goldmining industry and the possibilities of that industry amply warrant the extension of the system of workers' homes to the goldfields. There is another fact I wish to mention, and that is the price of gold. As we know, the present price is in the vicinity of £8 12s. 6d. Financial experts consider that it will go even higher. One gentleman for whom as a financial expert I have a high respect says he believes the price of gold will eventually reach £12 10s. per ounce. Whether that prophecy will be realised remains to be seen; but there is one consolation, that whatever may happen the price of gold in Western Australia is amply guaranteed not to fall below £5 10s. per ounce—by reason of the Federal gold bonus. The conditions attached to that bonus provide that if gold recedes to £5 per ounce, the bonus will come into operation, and an extra 10s. per ounce will be paid. That applies for a period of something like ten years, I believe.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is ten years from the granting of the bonus.

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT: Yes. Summed up, if the Workers' Homes Board require any better guarantee than the present state of our goldmining industry and its possibilities of permanency, they must be sadly out of touch with the conditions prevailing in that great industry. I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [7.35]: Mr. Cornell is to be congratulated on having introduced the Bill, because if the Workers' Homes Board did decide to erect homes on the goldfields—as under the present Act they could do—goldfields residents would have a right to feel dissatisfaction in the event of the board deciding to spend only £450 on a home there. Goldfields residents would rightly ask, why £450 on the goldfields as against £800 elsewhere in the State, and why stipulate that the

cost of the buildings should be repaid within ten years instead of the 30 years applicable elsewhere? I fully appreciate the attitude of the Workers' Homes Board, based on past experience. For many years the main industry in goldfields areas was the removal of houses, at the rate of about two per day. On one occasion I thought it worth while to investigate whether it would pay me to purchase and remove goldfields residences. However, the rail freight to the locality where I proposed re-erecting any houses I bought put the matter out of consideration. But it is that aspect which causes the board considerable anxiety. For that reason, among others, I congratulate Mr. Elliott on the excellent address which he has just delivered, which should inspire the board with confidence, inducing them to provide workers' homes on the goldfields. I desire to offer a practical suggestion. My sincere hope is that Mr. Elliott's forecast will be verified, and that the goldmining industry will be with us for another 20, 30, or 40 years. Undoubtedly a proportion of the prosperity apparent in the metropolitan area is due to the investment of money on the goldfields which is now in process. Not much accommodation in the way of a home can be provided for £450, in my opinion: but presumably Mr. Cornell has given consideration to that aspect and is satisfied that the type of house required by goldfields workers can be provided for that amount. My suggestion is that the homes be constructed in sections, so that they could readily be taken down again. If they are lined with asbestos inside, the asbestos should not be tacked on, but screwed on, so that it can be taken off easily. Those are practical suggestions which may alleviate the fears of the board. Doubtless Mr. Cornell in introducing the Bill would have liked to say, "I propose that the Government guarantee the Workers' Homes Board to the extent of £10,000 or £20,000 against losses incurred through the erection of workers' homes on the goldfields." No new precedent would be created, as the same thing has been done in connection with land settlement, the Government facing a certain amount of expenditure instead of calling upon the Agricultural Bank to bear the responsibility of opening up and developing certain new areas. In my opinion there is no reason why the Government should not say something of the kind to the Workers' Homes Board. I was

surprised to hear the Honorary Minister say, "Let private enterprise provide the money for workers' homes on the fields."

Hon. C. G. Elliott: Private enterprise has already put £150,000 into Kalgoorlie.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Much of the improvement in the finances of the Railway Department is due to the increased goldfields traffic. I see no reason why the Government, while absolutely refraining from anything like dictation to the board, should not say, "If you are prepared to erect homes on the goldfields, we are prepared to guarantee that no depletion of your funds shall occur, to the extent of £10,000." Or the amount might be £20,000.

Hon. C. G. Elliott: Under these conditions?

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes.

Hon. C. G. Elliott: You want to emphasise that point.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Yes. The cost of the homes is not to exceed £450, and the amount is to be repaid within a period not exceeding 10 years. Under those conditions a man on the goldfields could obtain a four-roomed house for his wife and family at a cost of not more than £1 8s. 6d. per week. I understand that such a rent is now being paid for a couple of rooms. The housing position on the goldfields is acute, and the mining industry now appears much more permanent than was the case while houses were being removed. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [7.43]: I congratulate the Workers' Homes Board on the stand they have taken in refusing to commit the country to further risk by building homes on the goldfields. That is a speculation, and it is not the function of the Government to provide money for building homes on goldfields which might last for five or ten or twenty years. In my opinion, private enterprise should find money for that purpose. What astounds me is that numerous members of this Chamber who have always been up against State trading advocate the provision of money by the Government for this speculative purpose.

Hon. A. Thomson: The workers on the goldfields have the same right to obtain

homes as workers elsewhere in the State have.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Workers on the goldfields have an opportunity of securing homes. Mr. Angelo has provided a company which will supply the homes. I am glad that I am not a shareholder in the company to which the hon. member referred. I feel sure he did not intend to say exactly what he did say.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: What did I say?

Hon. G. W. MILES: That an insurance company would provide money at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to build homes on the fields.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Without any security? No.

Hon. G. W. MILES: If the hon. member will excuse me, on referring to "Hansard" he will find that that was the inference from what he said. The insurance company wanted no equity like any other investor would want, together with a guarantee.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: On a point of order, I did not say anything of the sort. Mr. Cornell, when speaking, said that a great number of these people would require only about £200 or £300, that they had some money in hand. Those were the cases to which I referred and it will be remembered I distinctly said a freehold security would be necessary, and also a full assurance that the individual had a job which he was likely to hold. There was no question about equity or advancing the full amount.

Hon. G. W. MILES: As my colleague has explained now, if a man had £200 the insurance company would come along with an advance of £400. I doubt whether any insurance company, or any financial institution in the State would be prepared to do such a thing.

The PRESIDENT: I am sure the hon. member will accept the explanation made by Mr. Angelo.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes. I am glad to know that the company to which Mr. Angelo referred has so much confidence in the goldfields to do such a thing, but from my own experience I know that it is impossible to get a fair rent for houses in certain centres excepting of course places like Kalgoorlie and Wiluna. The Bill, however, refers to Dundas, Coolgardie and other goldfields. One hon. member suggested amending the Bill to include a rising town in the Murchison. Let me relate my own experience of a town on the Murchison. A son of

mine bought land there and, as he could not finance the erection of a building, I went to a leading contractor in this city and said, "I do not wish to take on any further liabilities; I want to get out of debt before I die" and the contractor's reply was that if he were given a first mortgage he would finance my son. An application had been made for a license in the town in question but it was not successful, and it was decided to build a garage and a couple of shops. For this purpose about £150 worth of material was required, and the contractor said to me, "Of course you are backing the bills." This shows that the contractor had very little confidence in goldfields towns as he wanted my signature at the back of a bill. Now Mr. Angelo says that there is an insurance company prepared to invest its shareholders' money, a mutual company, too, in the erection of houses on the goldfields. I thank God that I have no particular interest in that insurance company, and I know that the company in which I have my life insured would not take such a risk even in the metropolitan area, unless they had an equity in it greater than 50 per cent., and then they would require the insurance policy as collateral security.

Hon. H. Tuckey: How do you suggest these houses should be built?

Hon. G. W. MILES: There are private individuals who have sufficient confidence in the goldfields to invest their money there in the direction proposed. Personally I consider that gold mining is as great a gamble as horseracing.

Members: Oh!

Hon. G. W. MILES: There may be established centres where there are substantial ore reserves, but we know that a number of properties have been floated and that men have lent their names to those propositions so as to induce shareholders to invest their money. That is what has happened recently. People have put their money into those concerns, and in many cases there is nothing to show for it. Look at the share lists. There is a board now appointed by the Government endeavouring to conserve the interests of the taxpayers. Who are the Government of this country? The taxpayers. They have to find the money all the time. Yesterday we gave away £49,000 for the purpose of restoring to civil servants and members of Parliament what was taken from them under emergency legislation. We have also another Bill before us

to enable us to borrow £2,600,000. Where is it all going to end? Yet we have members advocating that the Workers' Homes Board should invest the taxpayers' money in building houses on the goldfields on a doubtful security.

HON. J. CORNELL (South—in reply) [7.52]: My remarks in reply will be very brief. The Minister has said that the board can do all that the Bill requires it to do. I say it can but the object of the Bill is this: the board in the past has said that the risk on the goldfields is probably too great and, as the Minister stated, it is too speculative. As the Act stands to-day, in the case of a wooden building, £800 can be advanced, or if it be a stone or brick building £800 can also be advanced either on the leasehold or freehold principle. But in the case of a wooden building 25 years is allowed for the repayment and in the case of a stone or brick building 35 years. I have for a long while sympathised with the board, though they have the power to say "We will not go beyond £450 should we decide to build on the goldfields, and we shall ask that the maximum period in which repayment shall be made shall be 10 years." The board would thus immediately have created a set of circumstances that they were prepared to accept 30 years or 35 years as the period of repayment in the metropolitan area and on the goldfields 10 years. Of course the board could not carry out any such proposal unless the Minister accepted the responsibility. Hon. members will understand that the board in that regard is in a very invidious position. If the Bill should become law, the Workers' Homes Board could then view the goldfields position from an angle different from that in which they have viewed it up to the present, because, so to speak, they would limit the expenditure to £450 and demand the repayment within 10 years. Even then the board need not take the risk. The board would be put in an infinitely better position with regard to the stability of a particular district. I am not going into the question as to whether or not an investment on the goldfields is good; I dealt with all that on the second reading, but I will say that the board has erected homes in 24 different agricultural districts, and built on

what appeared to be quite a good and safe proposition—agriculture. But the whirligig of time I regret to say has brought about a set of conditions in the agricultural districts that are much worse than those applying on the goldfields, and what might have been a good risk a few years ago is to-day a precarious risk. If the board had to face a similar set of conditions again, I doubt whether they would take that risk. The Minister asked what would happen if the bottom fell out of the goldfields. My own opinion is that, even if the Bill became law, I would not make it mandatory for the board to build; I would not counsel the board to go beyond three towns, Southern Cross, which is backed by agriculture, though this industry is just now down in the dumps, and then, say, Kalgoorlie and Boulder. Coolgardie is also possible, because even in that town to-day it is out of the question to expect to be able to rent a house. Then there is the town of Norseman which may be said to be the only other key town. In Norseman the position seems to have righted itself, but the type of building in the residential part of Norseman is comparable to what you, Sir, and I knew to exist on the goldfields 30 or 35 years ago. That type of housing is just what the working man had to provide for himself. Beyond those key towns I would not suggest that the board should operate. It has been pointed out that private enterprise should do the job. Hon. members may have read what the Mayor of Kalgoorlie said on this subject, and there is not the slightest doubt that private enterprise has done a job, and a pretty big job, running into something like £100,000. Unfortunately, as far as my own observations go, the one place where the operations of the Workers' Homes Act could well be enforced is the Premier's own electorate of Boulder. Members know that Boulder is much more the domain of the working miner than is Kalgoorlie; it is, so to speak, the hub of the goldfields as far as the working miner is concerned. And the working miner has not the wherewithal to build. Boulder does not offer the same inducement to invest in building as Kalgoorlie, because we recognise that Kalgoorlie is the distributing centre of other goldfields, and Boulder is not. It is also recognised that the last town of the goldfields to dis-

appear, if they should ever disappear, will be Kalgootie. I have no objection to the rate of interest, and merely took the arbitrary figures of 5 and 6 per cent. It may be $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for some leasehold clients to-day, but it is not $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. so far as many leasehold workers' dwellings are concerned, but 5 per cent. It is 5 per cent. so far as the other 15 or 16 people in the block are concerned. The homes that were built in Fremantle in the early days carry 5 per cent. interest also. I do not recollect the Act being amended. Originally in the case of advances on freehold the interest was 6 per cent., with a rebate of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. if payment was made on or before a certain date, and the rent was kept up. The Act now reads that the board in the case of advances fixes the amount of interest with a $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. rebate if the principal and interest instalments are paid by the due date. I have merely used the figures 5 and 6 to express some figure, and in no mandatory way. If the interest for the worker who takes advantage of the Act in the metropolitan area, or in the agricultural districts, is fair, I do not see why the goldfields man should be charged any higher rate. I hardly think the goldfields resident would object to 6 or 7 per cent. if he could get a loan of £450 and have ten years in which to repay it. No direction to the board is intended by the Bill. If it becomes law, it will be a suggestion to the board, in view of the reduced capital expenditure necessary, in view of the terms for repayment, and in view of the advances made in the last few years in the goldmining industry, that it should regard the situation more favorably than it has done in the past. I have no objection to the inclusion of the East Murchison goldfields in the list of goldfields affected. It is generally accepted that Wiluna has a long life ahead of it. The growth of that centre is miraculous. A little while ago there was no one there, and to-day there is a population of 6,000 people dependent on goldmining there. I remember that, when I was in the Chair in Committee, it was my vote that turned the scale in favour of the construction of the Meekatharra-Wiluna railway. It is like a romance.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Nicholson in the Chair; Hon. J. Cornell in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Workers' dwellings on certain goldfields:

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is my intention to move for the inclusion of the East Murchison and Murchison goldfields.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I should like to include also the North-East Coolgardie goldfields.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the hon. member will support me, I am prepared to include also that goldfield. I move an amendment:—

That after the word "Dundas" in line 4, the following be inserted:—"East Murchison and Murchison goldfields, North-East Coolgardie goldfields."

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: As indicated in my second reading speech, I had intended to move for the inclusion of the Murchison goldfields, only that I was forestalled by the Chief Secretary.

Hon. J. Cornell: I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Hall's suggestion was for the inclusion of Wiluna. I did not think that went far enough.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I should like to see a provision included that the Minister shall direct the board to build homes on any goldfields, but only after full investigation has been made by the board as to the likelihood of such goldfields being permanent. Some new goldfield may be discovered and a further amendment of the Act required to deal with it. Why not leave it to the board, with the approval of the Minister, to decide upon what goldfields its activities shall be devoted. Why enumerate certain goldfields, and omit others?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: There is really no need for the Bill. It is only a gesture to the Minister, and the Workers' Homes Board.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: So long as the two points regarding the restriction of expenditure to £450 per house and the repayment in 10 years are included I am satisfied to allow the matter to go.

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT: If we are to mention different districts, I think the Mt. Margaret district should be included, because there are big mines in that area employing

a large number of men, and also the North Coolgardie district.

The CHAIRMAN: If members want various goldfields districts to be mentioned, I think they should adopt the suggestion made by Mr. Angelo to strike out the various specified goldfields areas and let the Bill apply to the goldfields generally.

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

Clause 3—Advances for homes in certain goldfields:

Hon. J. CORNELL: There will be a consequential amendment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, the words we have just inserted in Clause 2 will have to be inserted in Clause 3.

The CHAIRMAN: Those words will be inserted, so the clause can be passed as including that amendment.

Clause, as consequently amended, put and passed.

Clause 4, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [8.20]: The Premier, when introducing the Bill in another place, expressed regret that he could not afford to grant relief from taxation. As a matter of fact, when we view the condition in which the State finances are to-day, the Premier would have been wrong in the extreme, in my opinion, if he had granted any relief from this form of taxation. Many complaints are heard regarding the weight of taxation and requests are made for relief. On the other hand, many people do not take the trouble to analyse the accounts and items of expenditure, or there would not be those requests. There are two important features in Government policy in recent years that, in my opinion, inevitably spell a steady increase in taxation. The first is the increase in loan expenditure on non-productive public works, and the second is the increased burden of social services that come under Government control. The Premier and others have frequently stressed the manner in which money is expended and the large con-

tributions that necessary expenditure absorbs. As an illustration, there are four important and necessary items that cause a large volume of taxation every year. For instance, last year the deficiency in interest and sinking fund charges in respect of loan assets was £1,485,000. Education cost £665,000, the police, gaols and Crown Law expenditure ran into £311,000 and the Medical and Health Department entailed an expenditure of £64,500, or a total of roughly £2,500,000. That expenditure has to be met every year and it can only be met out of taxation. When we have regard to the number of income earners in this State, the annual figure works out at something like £21 10s. per annum for each income earner. When we add to the figures I have previously given, the mysterious item that stands in the returns as "miscellaneous expenditure," which amounts to more than £500,000, the sum per income earner per annum rises to £22 10s. When we tell the average taxpayer that it works out at 8s. 7d. a week, of which 5s. is due to capital charges on loan assets, he will commence to realise what a tremendous burden has to be borne year by year by the taxpayers as a whole. With regard to the income tax, the rate, of course, increases very quickly as the income rises. The financial emergency tax is also an income tax and, in my opinion, it is the one form of income tax that should be made permanent because it does provide that every citizen who earns something above the basic wage has to make some contribution towards the cost of those necessary services I have enumerated. When we consider the contribution that entails, it will be seen that a man has to collect a pretty high income before his tax reaches a figure at which he can be said to be bearing his just share of the cost of public services in this State.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Being an income tax, do you agree that there should be the same deductions as are allowed respecting the ordinary income tax?

Hon. H. SEDDON: No, I do not. I think that the question of exemptions has been stretched to its utmost limit.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Are you against all exemptions?

Hon. H. SEDDON: I am opposed to most of them. I am opposed to those contained in this Bill because I consider every citizen should make some contribution

towards the cost of maintaining our institutions.

Hon. L. Craig: Hear, hear!

Hon. H. SEDDON: If there is any question of relief from taxation, I think there should be relief from other forms of taxation and not from the financial emergency tax which, in my opinion, is the most equitable form in which income taxation can operate. There are some very interesting figures I will bring before members with regard to collections from taxation during the first three months of the financial year. Members will, I think, be pleased to know that the first quarter of the present financial year has shown a higher return under the heading of income tax than for any corresponding period of a year since 1929. As to the returns on account of the financial emergency tax, the increased returns over last year's figures for the corresponding period represent £46,000. Members will realise from this the enormous income that the Government are receiving from taxation, and that will be particularly apparent if they make a comparison of the figures I am referring to. The total amount of taxation received during the three months ended the 30th September last, with the exception of hospital tax, was £455,686. The figures for the corresponding period of last year were £346,648, or a total of £109,000 less for the three months of last year compared with the three months of this year. If we include the hospital tax in the quarter's collections, we find that no less than £500,000 was received by the Government in the first three months of this year from that form of taxation alone. It is interesting to note the figures included in the estimates of taxation presented by the Premier in his Budget. We find that it was estimated that £230,000 would be received from income taxation. If we take the figures I have quoted for the first three months of the financial year, we find there will in all probability be £263,000 collected from that source, if the experience of the first three months is to be taken as typical of the collections throughout the whole year. As to the financial emergency tax, instead of the estimate of £685,000 being a fair representation of the collections *Ἀρρεφὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ πλῆθους τῶν ἀπορροῶν* reach £733,000.

Hon. L. Craig: And there will be more next year.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The receipts under that heading will reach the latter amount if

we may accept the figures for the first three months as typical of the collections for the whole year. If we have regard to the increase during the first three months of the current financial year as compared with the corresponding period of last year, we find that the Government, working on that basis, can look forward to collecting more like £900,000 from the financial emergency tax alone. Of course, that is based on the assumption that the rate of increase will be maintained throughout the year. It is interesting to note that last year the proportion of the money collected in respect of the financial emergency tax worked out as follows:—

Quarter.	Percentage of total collected.
First	20
Second	19
Third	25
Fourth	35

Taking the monthly figures for the present financial year, we find that the collections of financial emergency tax were as follows:—

	£
July	63,891
August	63,619
September	55,936
October	62,737

So it will be seen that the figures for each of the four months of the present year have been considerably increased by comparison with last year. There is one factor which will materially affect the national income, namely the amount of loan money raised during the current financial year. According to figures given a little while ago in answer to a question in the House, the national income has apparently increased considerably during the last three years. Thus in 1932 the national income was practically £34,000,000; in 1933 it was £36,000,000, and in 1934 it was £40,000,000. For 1935 the figure is not yet available. It is recognised that loan money is supposed to be represented at least twice in the national income. Members will see the important effect that the borrowings, as reflected in the national income, have on the general prosperity of the State. We can however, expect a considerable increase from our receipts from taxation as compared with last year, or else there must be some other explanation for the enormous increase during the first three months of this year as compared with the corresponding period of last year. There are certain features in connection with the financial emergency tax to be commended to every member. The

first is that it means income collected at the source. That is a great advantage. Instead of a man having to pay a very heavy bill for taxation, as he does under the ordinary income taxation, he pays the emergency tax as he earns it.

Hon. J. Nicholson: He is not embarrassed to the same extent.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That is so. The second important feature is that by its collection at the source it catches the man who up to the present has been escaping responsibility in the payment of taxation. There have been quite a number of people evading taxation, and one important result from the imposition of this tax is that those people have been brought under the notice of the Taxation Commissioner, who has been able to get hold of them, and his investigations have caused a considerable increase in the contributions to the revenue.

The Honorary Minister interjected.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes, the Commissioner's taxation returns show the enormous sums that certain defaulting taxpayers have had to pay when found out. There is one feature which one cannot help commenting upon in regard to the taxation position in Western Australia, namely, the remarkable record the present Government have in the imposition of additional taxation. First of all, there was the increase in the financial emergency tax from a flat rate of 4½d. to a rate varying from 4d. to 9d. Then there was the gold profits tax which relieved the shoulders of the Government of a heavy burden hitherto carried in relation to the Miners' Phthisis Act. Then the Government received enormous help from the contributions to hospitals and charitable institutions donated by the Lotteries Commission. Figures given to the House a little while ago showed the enormous amount of money distributed to institutions by the Lotteries Commission. Thus in 1933, there was £81,000 distributed by that Commission; in 1934 the amount was £53,700, and in 1935 it was £55,100, while at the same time a large sum has been retained undistributed by the Lotteries Commission. This has meant very considerable assistance to the Government in the way of relieving them of expenditure which would have had to be incurred by them in connection with the hospitals. Then there have been the receipts from the hospital tax, also very considerable. It is unfortunate that in our quarterly review in the "Government Gazette"

up to the present it has not been possible to see exactly what amount has been received each quarter in the way of hospital collections. We have, however, the annual figures, and they show an increase each year. In 1931, the first year of the imposition of that tax, when it was collected for a period of only six months, the figures were £64,800, whereas during 1935 the collections amounted to £183,398. So members will see the enormous amount of collections made during the year. At the same time when we realise the way in which our expenditure is increasing, especially in the contributions that have to be made from general revenue to make up the loss on loan fund work, relief becomes impossible. It will be seen that in 1930 the loss in our loan assets was just over £1,000,000, that in 1932 it had fallen to three-quarters of a million, that in 1933 it was over a million again, that in 1934 it was a million and one-third, and in 1935 it amounted to £1,485,000. That had to be found from ordinary revenue in order to make up the losses in our loan assets. The Government were considerably benefited by receipts under probate and death duties, while the amusement tax also shows a fine increase. All these taxes could be said to reflect the improvement in the national income, but it is necessary to consider the way in which the country is going, and to realise that it is placing on the shoulders of the taxpayers a continually increasing burden by the borrowing of money to be spent on works that are not likely to give any return for many years to come. The policy of collecting money in the form of taxation is a far better method of financing than is the policy of borrowing. I will support the second reading of the Bill, for my opinion is that this form of taxation should be pursued. The Honorary Minister yesterday pointed out that the exemption of men is higher in this State than in any other State. That statement might well be investigated, because a far larger amount of money can be collected by including those on the lower range of income. By doing that we adopt a principle deliberately set aside in Australia, namely that there should be no representation without taxation. I will support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, debate adjourned.

BILL—STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 17th October.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; Hon. A. Thomson in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported on Clause 2, as amended, and the question now is that the clause as amended be agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 3, 4, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

MOTION—TRANS-AUSTRALIAN RAILWAY.

Kalgoorlie-Fremantle Section.

Debate resumed from the 1st October on the following motion by Hon. A. Thomson (South-East):—

That in the opinion of this House, before any definite decision is arrived at regarding the construction of the Trans-Australian railway from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle, a report should be prepared by the Transport Board in accordance with the provisions of Section 11 of the State Transport Co-ordination Act, and be submitted for the consideration of both Houses of Parliament; the Transport Board to investigate particularly a route from Coolgardie, linking up with the Corrigin-Brookton line, thence to Fremantle via Armadale.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East—in reply) [8.45]: The motion has been treated somewhat lightly and it was suggested that I was asking for the millennium. Possibly I was endeavouring to look further ahead than some members of the public are prepared to do. That might be due to a habit I have of trying to see and plan for the future. Let me draw a comparison. The Premier has gone to the Eastern States to attend a meeting of the Loan Council. During his stay he hopes to confer with the Premiers of Tasmania and South Australia with the object of trying to get joint action by the smaller States that are suffering disabilities under Federation. If members turn up the files of the "West Australian" and "Daily News" for the 25th May, 1925, they will find that at that time I proposed that the smaller States should confer with a view to protecting themselves and obtaining justice from the Federal Government. At that stage, unfortunately,

South Australia was apparently satisfied, but we received communications from Sir Alfred Ashbolt, Senator Ogden and Senator Payne, of Tasmania, who supported the proposal. Perhaps I am in a similar position to that of 10 years ago in my efforts to secure protection for the smaller States. I suggest that the State Government should negotiate with the Commonwealth for the construction of the line from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle, either on the route I suggested or on the route suggested by Mr. Hall, proprietor of the "Narrogin Observer." Mr. Hall has taken an active part in urging the importance of the proposal, though he favours a different route. The Premier has spoken of the difficulty of providing employment for men, and of the further difficulty of finding works for the expenditure of loan moneys that will give an adequate return to the State. Here is an opportunity for the State Government to negotiate with the Federal Government for the construction of a work that would fulfil those conditions. The construction of the line would provide employment and relieve the Government of the obligation of borrowing a considerable sum of money to finance work for the unemployed. According to Federal "Hansard" of the 16th October, 1935, the Minister for Defence, Mr. Archdale Parkhill made the following statement regarding the Red Hill-Port Augusta railway:—

On the 2nd October, the hon. member for Wakefield (Mr. Hawker) inquired whether the Council of Defence had been asked to advise as to the relative strategic value of the Red Hill to Port Augusta railway being built on the 5ft. 3in. gauge.

I am now in a position to advise the hon. member that in the opinion of the responsible officers of the Defence Department, the main defence requirement in this regard is that there should be a standard gauge link between Port Augusta and Broken Hill (preferably away from the coast) and a standard gauge connection from Port Pirie to the New South Wales system. The hon. member also raised the question of the strategical value of extending the 5ft. 3in. gauge to Port Augusta and the conversion of the Commonwealth transcontinental railway to 3ft. 6in. gauge. Any action in this direction would appear to be a retrograde step. It is contrary to the accepted policy, which is, that standardisation of railway gauges should be carried out on the basis of the 4ft. 8½in. gauge. From a strategical aspect it would confer little benefit, as the main defence requirement so far as an east-west railway is concerned is a standard gauge line from Fremantle right through to Sydney by the most direct route.

In moving the motion I suggested that the question of route should be considered by the Transport Board. When the Chief Secretary was speaking to the motion, I could not help contrasting the attitude of the Government to truck owners with the attitude they are apparently prepared to adopt towards the Federal Government when there is a possibility of their constructing a line parallel with an existing State railway. The Minister said it would be absurd to give a magistrate the right to review the decisions of the Transport Board. Then he went on to say that if the Federal Government desired the assistance of the State Transport Board, no doubt the Government would make their services available. My object in moving the motion was to draw public attention to the route along which the Federal Government propose to construct their line. Mr. Hall, of Narrogin, who has been studying the question for years, said that an important factor to be considered was that of the Collie coalfields. He pointed out that those were the only coalfields on the western side of Australia, and that a scheme should be devised to prevent any enemy who might invade Australia from obtaining control of the coalfields. If an enemy did obtain control, railway transport throughout the State would be paralysed. I am not wedded to any particular route. Possibly the route suggested by Mr. Hall is better than the one I propose. He considers the point so important that he recommends the appointment of a parliamentary committee to take evidence which could be submitted to the Federal Government. Let me now deal with the proposal from the viewpoint of employment. The latest estimate of the Federal Government to construct a line running parallel with the State railway, which cost Western Australia a very large sum of money, is £6,200,000. I shall show that the expenditure of that money would provide considerable employment, particularly if a route which will open up and lead to the development of new country were adopted. All the rails and fastenings that would be used would be manufactured in Australia. The sleepers required would be cut from the forests of Western Australia. Thus the whole of the raw material is available in Australia. Not one single item would have to be imported for the construction of the line. The work

of manufacturing the rails, etc., from the raw material and of cutting the sleepers would mean that 75 per cent. of the £6,200,000 would be absorbed on labour in Australia. It is held that in the actual construction of, say, buildings the approximate labour cost is from 40 to 47 per cent. of the total. However, if we add to that percentage amounts for the quarrying of the stones, the preparing of clay and turning it into bricks, the burning of lime, and the sawmilling of timber, the preparation of joinery, the manufacture of iron and glass—all made in Australia—the labour cost from start to finish may safely be estimated at 75 per cent. Therefore let us take three-quarters of the £6,200,000, and we have available for labour £4,650,000. Let us allow £4 10s. per week per man, and the £4,650,000 will provide employment for 9,936 men at that weekly wage for two years on full time. I put forward that suggestion for the Premier's consideration, so that he may negotiate with the Federal Government for the construction of the proposed line on a route which will not bring it into opposition with the line Western Australia has constructed at so much cost. I realise that possibly what I have suggested is not considered to be at present within the realm of practical politics. However, it has repeatedly been stated that the unification of railways to one standard gauge is essential. Certainly I am not one who wishes the Federal Government to build a railway running parallel to the State's line from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle, as this would mean the cutting of the throat of our line. I realise that the motion I have submitted may be considered to be a little before its time. From my standpoint, however, I feel that it is time we placed on record our opinion that the proposed Federal line should not be constructed on the route now accepted by the Federal Government.

Question put and passed.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [9.5] in moving the second reading said: This is a very short, very simple, and long agitated-for measure. It deals with the leasehold part

of the Workers' Homes Act. Under that Act land on which a workers' leasehold dwelling is situated can never become freehold: the holder can never get it in fee simple. After he pays all the capital cost plus interest on the dwelling, he gets a certificate of title as the owner of the dwelling, which then becomes a chattel whereof he can dispose to anyone, the Crown being bound to transfer the lease to the purchaser. The Bill provides that after the tenant of a worker's leasehold dwelling has paid the whole of the capital cost of the dwelling, plus interest, to the Workers' Homes Board, and therefore gets a certificate of purchase making him the sole owner of the dwelling, he can make the land freehold by tendering to the Workers' Homes Board a sum equivalent to the last appraised price of the land upon which the dwelling is situated. That is to say, if the land held in perpetuity is reappraised for 20 years, and if the last appraisal in question was £100, that is the price which the holder must pay to the Workers' Homes Board for the freehold. When he has paid that, the worker's leasehold dwelling is convertible on identical lines with any freehold. Many hon. members for a long time past have advocated that this change be effected. The Bill effects it. I hold a worker's leasehold dwelling myself; whether I convert it or not is a matter I still have to consider. Many more people are in the same position as I am in. The Bill does not make conversion obligatory on the holder of a leasehold dwelling; if he desires to continue paying the 3 per cent. on the appraised value and lease in perpetuity, he may do so, but if he chooses to become a freeholder he can. The measure embodies a principle long desired. I hope that the Bill will be carried without discussion, and that the third reading will take place to-morrow. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [9.9]: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion, and I endorse everything that has been said by Mr. Cornell. There are numerous tenants who have practically paid for their workers' homes and would like to obtain the freehold. Mr. Cornell has pointed out that the Bill involves no compulsion, that if the leaseholder desires to remain under the provisions of the Workers' Homes Act, he can so remain. I hold, however, that provision should be made, as outlined in

the Bill, for the tenant who has paid the whole of the money due to the Workers' Homes Board being granted the privilege of freehold if he so desires and if he has complied with all the conditions laid down.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [9.10]: I also support the second reading of the Bill. While a member of another place I received numerous requests from leaseholders under the Workers' Homes Act to try to secure an amendment of this nature. I regret to say that the Government of the day declined to do it. I am indeed grateful, on behalf of my friends, to Mr. Keenan and to Mr. Cornell for having introduced the Bill and brought it into this Chamber. It will prove a useful measure also for the Workers' Homes Board, because many people who own this class of workers' home, realising that money can now be obtained at a lower rate than that charged by the board, will probably pay off the board by borrowing from some other quarter. That would enable the Workers' Homes Board to go on with the good work they have been doing—providing, with the money so repaid, houses for other workers who require them, and thereby doing away with the necessity, which probably may soon occur, for the Government to increase the amount of capital at the disposal of the board. This is a good Bill, and I am only sorry that it was not introduced long ago.

HON. J. CORNELL (South—in reply) [9.12]: I join with the gentleman who sponsored the Bill in another place in thanking the Government for placing at his disposal and at mine facilities for getting the measure through.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 9.13 p.m.