Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 6th November, 1946.

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

QUESTION.

CITY PROPERTIES.

As to Purchase or Lease by Government.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER asked the Chief Secretary:

1, (a) Is it the intention of the Government to purchase or lease the premises known as "Forrest House" at 221 St. George's Terrace? (b) If so, for what purpose?

2, (a) Is it the intention of the Government to purchase or lease the premises known as "The Cloisters" at 200 St. George's Terrace? (b) If so, for what purpose?

3, (a) Is it the intention of the Government to purchase or lease the premises known as "Adelaide House" at 214 St. George's Terrace? (b) If so, for what purpose?

4, (a) Has the Government leased premises known as the "Orphanage" at 108 Adelaide Terrace? (b) If so, for what purpose?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

1, (a) and (b) This matter is now under consideration.

2, (a) and (b) The Perth Hospital Board has leased "The Cloisters" for temporary housing of nurses.

3, (a) and (b) There is no intention to purchase or lease "Adelaide House."

4, (a) and (b) No. These premises were purchased by the Government on the 1st March, 1945, and are now in use by the Department of Agriculture.

OBITUARY—LETTER IN REPLY.

The PRESIDENT: I have received a letter from Mr. Preston Hamersley, son of the late Hon. Vernon Hamersley, thanking the Council for the resolution of condolence which was passed and forwarded to him and his sisters. It will be laid on the Table of the House and members can peruse it at their leisure.

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

BILL—MILK.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. J. G. Hislop, Bill recommitted for the further consideration of Clause 59.

In Committee.

Hon. H. Seddon in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 59—Provisions relating to claims for compensation:

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Last night I made it evident that if we eliminated the Minister from this clause, he would be prevented from having any say with regard to compensation payable to persons for the destruction of cattle and in connection with the revocation of licenses. I understood that the Chief Secretary desired time to consider the implications of such elimination.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I did as I undertook to do and had this clause examined from the point of view of the compensation involved, both in regard to the revocation of licenses and for the destruction of diseased cattle. I have had drafted an amendment which I think will meet the wishes of Dr. Hislop. I understand that he desires compensation regarding licenses to be a matter for a magistrate to deal with, and that compensation for diseased cattle

that are destroyed should remain, as provided in the Bill, with the Minister. I move an amendment—

> That at the end of subparagraph (i) of paragraph (i) the following words be added:— "and the decision of the magistrate shall be final and conclusive: Provided that where the claim is made in respect of the destruction of diseased dairy cattle, the appeal (if any) shall be made to the Minister, who shall appoint a competent person to act as arbitrator and hear and determine the appeal in the manner prescribed by regulations, and the decision of the arbitrator shall be final and conclusive."

I understand Dr. Hislop desires to strike out subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (i), which provides that the decision of the arbitrator shall be final and conclusive. If the Committee agrees to the amendment, I think the position will be made clear.

Amendment put and passed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

> That subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (i) be struck out.

I inquired further into the matter raised by Dr. Hislop yesterday as to the policy of the Milk Board in arranging contracts with producers and others for the supply of milk above the standard laid down in the Health Act. I said there were many such contracts. I have here copies of over 100 such contracts, which Dr. Hislop may see, if he so desires. I hope he will accept my word that the policy of the Milk Board is such that numerous contracts of that kind are in existence.

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

Bill again reported with further amendments.

BILL—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN TROTTING ASSOCIATION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. S. W. PARKER (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.47]: I am pleased that the Government took the action of appointing a Royal Commission and obtaining such an excellent report, which has entirely cleared the atmosphere and has, I believe, put the sport back on a proper basis. This Bill will help to clear up all matters over which there has been friction in the past. There are a few minor amendments that might be made, and of course the schedule to the Act will no doubt be altered when the new association is formed and fresh and up-to-date regulations are drawn up. It hardly seems necessary for the regulations to be amended on the passing of this Bill, because due consideration can be given to them by the incoming committee, to bring them up to date.

The Chief Secretary: There is one alteration that you might make.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: It matters little about altering it here, and it might only delay the passage of the Bill, which I would like to see passed quickly.

HON. SIR HAL COLEBATCH (Metropolitan) [4.48]: I know nothing about trotting and will neither criticise, praise nor condemn the Bill in a general sense, but there is one portion to which I take the strongest exception. I refer to the second portion of the schedule, which would have the effect of legalising betting on trotting courses. At this stage I will not express an opinion as to whether bookmakers should be legalised on trotting or race courses, or in the public streets, but I point out that, although there is a sort of tradition that we in this House know nothing of what is being done in another place, we do know that the Government has introduced a Bill dealing comprehensively with the matter of bookmakers. It is in that Bill that matters of this kind should be decided. We should not be asked, while dealing with this Bill, to say that bookmakers should be legalised on trotting courses because, if we do that, we commit ourselves to an attitude on the Bill dealing with bookmakers generally. If we passed this Bill and rejected the Bookmakers Bill, the extraordinary position would arise that bookmaking would be legalised on trotting courses and not on racecourses.

The Chief Secretary: I think the hon. member is under a misapprehension.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: In what way?

The Chief Secretary: Will he kindly point out to what he is referring?

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: In Part II of the schedule the following appears:—

> The committee may, in their discretion, from time to time register any person to carry on the business of a bookmaker on the association racecourse.

I take it that the Bill does not contemplate authorising the committee to do something that is contrary to the law of the land. If we pass the Bill, we will in effect make bookmaking legal on trotting courses. I do not care whether bookmaking is to be made legal or not, but the whole question of bookmakers is being dealt with in a separate Bill now before another place and I object to this provision being brought in as a side issue in this measure. Knowing nothing about trotting, I do not offer any remarks about the Bill, but I strongly oppose that portion of the schedule.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [4.52]: Twelve months ago I offered considerable opposition to the Trotting Control Bill then being considered by the House. On this occasion I am glad to say I shall be able to support this measure subject to some amendments being made in Committee. There is one point on which I should like information when the Chief Secretary is replying. According to the Bill the metropolitan area means the area within a radius of 15 miles of the Perth Town Hall. In the Racing Restriction Act, however, the metropolitan area is defined as including all land within a radius of 30 miles of the Perth Town Hall. It is very important that this matter be clarified. If the Armadale Trotting Club, for instance, were included in the metropolitan area, it would not be able to operate because of its inability to get any racing date, whereas otherwise it would be very happy about the position. Further than that, I have nothing to say on the Bill.

On motion by Hon. W. J. Mann, debate adjourned.

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 3).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 29th October.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.54]: This Bill is intended to run an industrial steam roller over employers not at present governed by industrial determinations. It attempts, by legislative action, to prescribe a fancy award exceeding in many instances standards set up by the Court of Arbitration for industries which are governed by industrial determinations, standards that have been arrived at after lengthy and exhaustive hearings during which both sides have been heard and complete evidence has been placed before the court, thereby doing for the unions concerned a job of work which those unions are unwilling to undertake for themselves or which they are not sufficiently interested in to embark upon.

The principle of the Government's setting up industrial standards between employer and worker by means of direct legislation is one that strikes at the very root of our arbitration system. If it could be said that the Court of Arbitration had at any time refused to hear and adjudicate upon any dispute referred to it for settlement, some reasons could be advanced in support of the Bill. As, however, the court's record for dealing expeditiously and fairly with all the disputes that come before it for settlement is one of which it may be justly proud, there can be no justification for any of the amendments contained in the Bill bearing on any section of the principal Act over which the court has jurisdiction. For the foregoing reasons, the Bill should be rejected.

When moving the second reading, the Honorary Minister pointed out that the main purpose of the Bill was to ensure that the benefits of modern working conditions should extend to those persons not fortunate enough to be protected by an arbitration award or agreement. He went on to say—

> This is mainly due to the widely distributed population of the State, which has made it difficult for many workers to organise and to obtain the benefit of industrial arbitration legislation.

A perusal of the clauses in the Bill will indicate that the Minister could, without exaggeration, have said that the main purpose of the Bill is to ensure that workers not governed by industrial awards or agreements are to receive the benefits of ultra-modern or streamlined working conditions which the court will not grant to workers governed by its awards. The Minister's statement about the difficulty workers in

country districts have to organise and so obtain the benefit of industrial arbitration legislation carries no weight at all. There is no need for them to organise. There are many unions registered in the court that cover very extensive areas of the State. Amongst these may be cited the West Australian Shop Assistants and Warehouse Employees' Union, the Federated Clerks' Union and the Amalgamated Road Transport Workers' Union. These are big unions and they cover the whole of the South-West land division. The majority of the workers for whom the Bill seeks to cater would be workers who could conveniently belong to the unions named and who could, without any need for organisation, compel those unions to secure an award for them. The Minister further stated—

> In order that there shall be consistency, the more important amendments in the Bill are designed to conform with similar provisions contained in the various awards and agreements.

That statement is very misleading. The important amendments referred to by the Minister are not similar to the concessions granted to workers by the court in its awards. They are greatly in advance of those concessions. Whilst the Bill contains greater benefits to the workers than those granted by the court, it does not contain any of the qualifying conditions laid down by the court before those concessions may be claimed under an award.

In the case of a worker dismissed summarily for, say, theft, he would, under an award, lose all rights to holiday pay. That is a penalty prescribed by the court. The Bill does not include such a penalty, and so an employer would be compelled to grant holiday pay to a thief. If a motor mechanic unlawfully used a customer's car during the week-end and smashed it up, he would be dismissed summarily by his employer and would lose his holiday pay. Under the Bill, however, that man would collect his holiday pay, despite the fact that he had used the car without authority and damaged it so that the employer had sustained severe monetary loss.

The court also prescribes in its awards that, if a worker leaves his job without giving his employer the necessary notice under the award, he loses his holiday pay. The Bill is silent on this point. It has also been laid down by the court that workers must complete one month's continuous service with the employer before they become entitled to any holiday pay. By the Bill employers will be compelled to pay a worker, not governed by an award, pro rata holiday pay if he is employed for less than one month. In the sick pay clauses prescribed by the court in its awards, the following provision appears:—

> A worker shall not be entitled to receive any wages from his employer for any time lost through the result of an accident not arising out of or in the course of his employment or for any accident, wherever sustained, arising out of his own wilful default or for sickness arising out of his own wilful default.

The Bill omits this important safeguard. It also short-circuits an important safeguard found in the court's sick pay clause, which prescribes that a worker shall not be entitled to the benefits of sick pay unless he produces proof satisfactory to the employer of his sickness. The Bill commands the employer to pay sick pay on production of reasonable proof of his sickness. Who is to define the word "reasonable"? The court's standard clause has been departed from in this measure. It can be said with safety that the court's clause has operated smoothly for many years, and that owing to its construction abuses do not occur. The foregoing sets out a few examples to prove that the Bill is not "designed to" nor does it "conform with" the "provisions contained in the various awards and agreements."

A "factory" is defined in Section 4 of the principal Act as "any building, etc., in which four or more persons are engaged . . . . in any handicraft or in preparing or manufacturing goods for trade or sale . . . . " Normally, the principal Act as it stands would not govern any establishment in which less than four persons are engaged in any handicraft, or preparing or manufacturing goods for trade or sale, whether such persons be in partnership or whether workers, paid or not, are employed in such an establishment, unless in such establishment steam or other mechanical power or appliance exceeding one horsepower was in use in the process of preparing, working at or manufacturing such goods or packing them for transit.

While labour is employed by an employer there can be no objection to the workers concerned being safeguarded under the

health, sanitation and safety sections of the Act. In fact, it is necessary that they should be so protected. There is, however, strong objection to their wages, hours, and other working conditions being regulated by Act of Parliament, whilst there is an established and properly constituted tribunal, set up by Parliament, for the express purpose of dealing with the hours, wages and working conditions of employees in any industry. The obvious object of this Bill is to short-circuit awards of the Arbitration Court. Clause 3 of the Bill seeks to repeal Section 28 of the Act which sets the hours of work for male workers of 16 years of age and over at 48 per week. The repeal of Subsection (2) of that section and the effect of this on bakehouses, and other trades mentioned in the Third Schedule of the Act, were apparently not considered when the Bill was drafted. I shall make further reference to this when I come to deal with Clauses 4 and 5.

Clause 4 seeks to amend Section 29 of the Act which at present sets the hours of work for females, irrespective of age, and males under 16 years of age, not covered by awards, etc., at 44 per week. The amendment only affects the preamble to that section which will, if amended, include males over 16 years of age and will read as follows:—

"29 (i) Subject to the provisions of this Act a man woman or boy shall not be employed in or about a factory."

Then follow paragraphs (a) (b) (c) (d) and (e), and Subsections (2) and (3), which remain unaltered. The effect of this simple amendment is to reduce the hours at present prescribed for males over 16 years of age and not governed by awards, etc., namely, 48 per week, to 44 per week. Whilst admitting that the standard hours for the vast majority of workers in this State are 44 per week, I point out that a reduction of working hours by direct legislation is wrong in principle and strikes a blow at our arbitration system.

In the preparation of the Bill gross carelessness is apparent, and a complete lack of knowledge of industrial matters is disclosed. A glance at paragraph (b), if amended as proposed in the Bill, will show that in the case of establishments working a five-day week, such establishments, though permitted by paragraph (a) of Section 29 to work a 44-hour week, will be prevented from doing so by paragraph (b) which will only allow workers to be employed in or about a factory for 8½ hours per day. This will not permit of the working of 44 hours in any five-day week establishment. Such interference with and intrusion by Parliament in industrial matters will lead to chaos. The Government's arrogant and amateur attempts to over-ride the functions of the Arbitration Court must be vigorously opposed.

Clause 5 seeks to repeal Section 30. If that repeal is allowed, in the light of the rigid restrictions of paragraph (b) of Section 29, if amended, all factories not governed by industrial determinations will be regimented to observe the same conditions. In practice this will not work out. When an industry has gone to the court for an award, the award that is issued contains conditions which suit the particular requirements of that industry. Awards of the court, where necessary, provide spreads of hours, apart from overtime, to suit particular trades and industries. Bakehouses may be mentioned as one example. The repeal of Section 30 would remove the only section in the Act under which spreads of hours in certain industries can be worked. The absurdity of the proposed legislation is apparent when it places a boot repairing establishment in the same category as a bakehouse.

Clause 6 aims to amend Section 39, in that it proposes to distribute largesse, in the way of more holidays to workers at the expense of employers. The proposed amendment of the Act is a result of a misconception by the Government of a recent decision of the court on the matter of holidays. The Bill proposes to add two more days, Australia Day and Foundation Day, to the eight public holidays at present prescribed in the Act for factories. The Bill goes one better than the court's proposal which is that each industry shall be allowed as public holidays the Australian standard of public holidays in the industry concerned. In many instances not more than nine such holidays will apply under the court's proposal. The Bill seeks to impose ten holidays on industry generally, not covered by awards, regardless of what public holidays are granted under the court's ruling to industries which are governed by awards.

The Government intends by waving a wand in the shape of a Bill to do what the court will not do.

Before workers can enjoy the additional public holidays, as some will under the court's ruling, each union must apply to the court to have its award amended to incorporate the new public holiday standard now set up by the court for Western Australia, and which will be based on the Australian standard in each particular industry. The fixation of public holidays will thus be brought about by the court in its awards in an equitable, well thought-out and scientific manner. That is the court's method. There is not the slightest objection to all workers being governed by industrial determinations. This will ensure suitable provision regarding wages, hours and conditions in Western Australian industry. There is, however, every reason to object to the Government usurping the functions of the court and in the process "handing out" more to the worker than the court, after hearing all parties, is prepared to award.

Clause 6, Subclause (2), seeks to add a new provision to Section 39 and provides that all workers in factories shall receive two weeks' annual leave. The proposal of the Government has been prompted by the court's recent order, granting two weeks' annual leave to all workers governed by awards, etc. Here again, the unions have to apply for amendments of their awards before the workers governed by them can participate in the new standard of annual leave. It is noted that whilst the Bill incorporates all the benefits of the court's annual leave decision in favour of the workers, it is significantly silent on the court's stipulations precedent to the granting of such two weeks' annual leave. These stipulations have been prescribed by the court as follows:—

(a) Except as hereinafter provided a period of two consecutive weeks' leave with payment of ordinary wages as prescribed, shall be allowed annually to a worker by his employer after a period of twelve months' continuous service with such employer.

(b) If any award holiday falls within a worker's period of annual leave, and is observed on a day which, in the case of that worker, would have been an ordinary working day, there shall be added to that period, one day being an ordinary working day for each such holiday observed as aforesaid.

(c) If after one month's continuous service in any qualifying twelve-monthly period, a worker lawfully leaves his employment, or his employment is terminated by the employers, through no fault of the worker, the worker shall be paid one-sixth of the week's pay, at his ordinary rate of wage in respect of each completed month of continuous service.

(d) Any time in respect of which a worker is absent from work, except time for which he is entitled to claim sick pay, or time spent on holidays or annual leave as prescribed by this award, shall not count for the purpose of determining his right to annual leave.

(e) On any public holiday not prescribed as a holiday under this award, the employer's establishment or place of business may be closed, in which case a worker need not present himself for duty and payment may be deducted, but if work be done ordinary rates of pay shall apply.

(f) In the event of a worker, being employed by an employer for portion only of a year, he shall only be entitled, subject to Subclause (c) of this section, to such holidays on full pay, as are proportionate to his length of service during that period with such employer, and if such holidays are not equal to the holidays given to the other workers, he shall not be entitled to work or pay whilst the other workers of such employer are on holidays on full pay.

(g) A worker who is dismissed for misconduct or who illegally severs his contract of service shall not be entitled to the benefit of the provisions of this clause.

(h) The provisions of this clause shall not apply to casual workers.

Here again it must be pointed out, that it is not the Government's function to regulate industrial conditions for workers. It would appear that the Government is setting itself up as a big trade union to embrace all workers not governed by industrial determinations. Using its powers, it has formulated an award to govern these workers without giving the employers the right to be heard in the matter. The Arbitration Court does not do business on those lines. The object of Clause 7 is to introduce a new section to be numbered 39A in the principal Act which will provide a limited amount of payment to a worker who is absent from work on account of personal ill-health. The principle of granting limited sick pay to workers who absent themselves from their employment because of personal ill-health was established by the court many years ago. The clause framed by the court, and which it

incorporates in its awards, reads as follows:—

Absence Through Sickness.

(a) A worker shall be entitled to payment for non-attendance on the ground of personal ill-health for one half (½) day for each completed month of service: provided, that payment for absence through such ill-health, shall be limited to forty-four (44) hours in each calendar year. Payment hereunder, may be adjusted at the end of each calendar year, or, at the time the worker leaves the service of the employer, in the event of the worker being entitled by service subsequent to the sickness to a greater allowance than that made at the time the sickness occurred. This clause shall not apply where the worker is entitled to compensation under the Workers' Compensation Act.

(b) A worker shall not be entitled to receive any wages from his employer for any time lost through the result of an accident not arising out of or in the course of his employment or for any accident, wherever sustained, arising out of his own wilful default or for sickness arising out of his own wilful default.

(c) No worker shall be entitled to the benefits of this clause unless he produces proof satisfactory to his employer of sickness, but the employer shall not be entitled to a medical certificate unless the absence is for three (3) days or more.

The Government, which appears to be blossoming forth as an industrial authority, conveniently omits the safeguards contained in the sick pay clause inserted by the court in its awards, and which it found necessary so to prescribe in order to prevent abuses by workers which took place before such safeguarding clauses were incorporated in the sick pay provisions of awards. Some industries, governed by awards of the court, do not have any sick pay allowance prescribed. These awards are based on the principle of "no work—no pay." The Bill would, where there are no awards in force, go one better than the court's ruling.

Clause 8 is the only one in the Bill which does not purport to undermine the Court of Arbitration, but the proposed amendment places too much power in the hands of the Chief Inspector. The right of appeal against any decision of the Chief Inspector was inserted in the Bill during its passage in the Lower House. Appeals cost time and money. There is no necessity for the proposed amendment. As with previous clauses in the Bill this is another inroad into our arbitration system. Clause 9, Subclause (1) seeks to amend Section 116 of the principal Act and will give the Minister power to proclaim holidays without limit in warehouses. The Minister has that power at present in respect of shops; and a shop is defined in the Act as any place, etc., in or from which goods are exposed or offered for sale by retail.

Apart from the primary objection to prescribing industrial conditions by legislation, there is a justifiable objection to placing more power in the hands of the Minister for the following reason: Before the war, retail shops observed a late shopping night each Xmas Eve. Shop assistants worked the late shopping night without payment, and for this they were granted by the employers an extra day's holiday on full pay on a day either before or following New Year's Day. With the black-out conditions imposed by the war, late shopping nights could not be continued. Despite this, the Minister decided to continue to proclaim the extra day as a paid holiday and has done so ever since, notwithstanding that the shop assistants' award does not contain that day as a holiday, and that the shop assistants are not entitled to it as they no longer give their services to the employers late on Xmas Eve. Because of this abuse of power the inclusion of "warehouses" in the subclause should be opposed.

Subclause (2) is a new provision by which shop assistants not covered by awards, etc., are to receive two weeks' annual leave. The same remarks apply here as to Subclause (2) of Clause 6. A fortnight's annual leave is handed out by the Government to all shop assistants at the shopkeeper's expense, irrespective of the qualifying conditions laid down by the court in its annual leave order. The subclause should be opposed for the reason that it cuts across the functions of the court, whose lead in the matter is set aside by the Government for political purposes. Clause 10 introduces a new section into the principal Act by granting a limited amount of sick pay to shop assistants not covered by awards, etc. My references in Clause 7 apply equally to this clause.

Paragraph (a) of Clause 11 is the highlight of the Bill. It seeks to amend Section 138 of the principal Act to provide payment of higher rates of wages to junior workers, namely, workers under 21 years of age, than the wages prescribed in the principal Act by paragraph (g) of Section 138

for adult workers or workers 21 years of age and over. The following examples will illustrate this: The rate of wage prescribed in the metropolitan shop assistants' award for a male junior worker between the age of 20 and 21 years is £5 2s. 4d. per week. Under paragraph (g) of Section 138 of the principal Act, the rate of pay for a worker 21 years of age and over, a senior worker, who is not governed by an industrial determination is £5 1s. 6d. per week. The discrepancy is even more marked in the case of females. Under the same award a junior female shop assistant between 20 and 21 years of age, other than one employed in soft furnishings, manchester, dress and silk departments or shops, receives £2 19s. 8d. per week.

Under Section 138 paragraph (g) of the principal Act, a female 21 years of age and over receives only £2 14s. 10d. per week. If, however, the female junior, at any age under 21 years, is employed in soft furnishings, manchester, dress and silk departments or shops, she will receive under the proposed amendment £3 14s. 7d. per week, whereas a female 21 years of age and over employed in the same department will receive only £2 14s. 10d. per week, or almost £1 per week less than her junior counterpart. No further comment is needed on this paragraph to prove its absurdity. Stupid blunders of this kind make clear what can happen when Parliament attempts to set itself up as an industrial authority.

Paragraph (b) of Clause 11 proposes to introduce a new paragraph, to be lettered (h), in Section 138 of the principal Act. This new paragraph lays down that the contract of hiring shall, unless agreed to in writing to the contrary between the employer and the worker, be a weekly one, terminable by one week's notice. It is presumed that the Bill intends such notice to be given on either side. It does not say so. Here again, the court always takes into account the requirements of an industry when it prescribes the contract of hiring between employers and workers. Such contracts of hiring vary between hourly, daily, weekly and sometimes monthly ones, according to the requirements of the various industries or vocations. The matter is one to be dealt with by the court. It does not behove Parliament to interfere in matters about which it knows little or nothing.

For several years now, different Labour Governments, or the one Government with different heads, has brought forward a number of amending Bills to deal with our industrial legislation. Most of the Bills, if passed by this House, even with amendments made to them, would have reflected adversely on the people whom they profess to assist by killing the industry in which they are employed. I can remember one Bill to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act that was sent here by the Government. This House amended it in 12 different places. Another place dealt with those amendments and agreed to three of them, but disagreed to the remaining nine. The Bill was finally taken to a conference, when the whole of the nine amendments were agreed to. Surely that shows that the Bill was a poorly thought-out one, practically on the same basis as that which we have before us today, because very little knowledge has been applied to this Bill.

We have good working conditions in this State, a splendid Industrial Arbitration Act, and we can be proud of our Arbitration Court and our Factories and Shops Act. Why is there this continual tinkering; this continual putting forward of amending Bills which, if passed, would mean that our Industrial Arbitration Act would go on the scrap heap? That Act was brought into being for the benefit of the wage-earner and it has been a godsend to him. The Act should be protected in every way and not amended so as to kill the industries that provide the work for those who earn a living in trades and other such callings.

I trust members will give close attention to the Bill and study it fully. If they do so, they will not agree to the second reading of a measure that will make such inroads upon the Industrial Arbitration Act and the work of the Arbitration Court. They will find that it will place those who are not working under any award in a much better position in many ways than are those whose employment is governed by Arbitration Court awards. Above all, the passage of the Bill would mean that Parliament will be called upon to legislate upon wages, working hours and conditions. That is a function of the Arbitration Court, not of Parliament; it is for those to deal with who understand the work and have the necessary evidence before them, whereas we are not in that position. I trust that members

will realise how far-reaching legislation of this description will be if it is allowed to find a place on the statute-book. I oppose the second reading.

On motion by Hon. A. L. Loton, debate adjourned.

BILL—VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [5.32]: The Bill has been introduced because of certain recommendations made by the Royal Commission on the Vermin Act. The Government adopted some of the commission's recommendations but ignored others. I am glad that the Government, or the Minister concerned, ignored the recommendation relating to the provision of mobile gangs of men who, it was suggested, would go round the country destroying vermin, particularly rabbits. That would have been a very expensive method of dealing with the pest, and the expense involved would fall on the shoulders of the producers and landowners. I commend the Minister for not falling for that proposal. Another suggestion the commission advanced was that the responsibility for destroying vermin should be removed from the land owner and placed upon the local board. Here again the Minister did not fall for the proposal, and he is to be commended for adopting that course. I feel sure that whatever method is adopted, the cost will eventually have to be borne by the owner of the land, and I believe the best person to deal with the problem is the landowner. He knows his country best and the local conditions; he is aware exactly where the rabbits are and where the foxes go. Surely he is the best person to deal with the vermin! However, I am glad that that proposal of the Royal Commission was not embodied in the Bill.

I take great exception to one recommendation that the Government has adopted. I refer to that which will require vermin boards to impose a minimum rate. I regard that as highly undesirable, and intend to ask members, when dealing with the Bill in Committee, to reject the proposal. True, the Royal Commission suggested that this course should be adopted, but I believe the commission had in mind a local authority that would be dealing with rabbits. I can see no reason at all why Parliament should adopt a dictatorial attitude towards local vermin boards and say that they must impose at least a minimum rate of ⅜d. in the £ on the unimproved value of their land. When introducing the Bill, the Minister said that some boards had not done their job and now had not enough money with which to tackle the vermin problem. That is not the reason why the boards did not do so; they had power to strike a levy at any time. The Honorary Minister spoke about one board which had imposed a rate of only ¼d. yet that board could have imposed a rate of ⅜d. or 1d. if it had so desired. Should a board strike a rate of even as much as 2d. in the £, it would not mean that the job would be done. I know one board that has operated with a rate of ⅛d., and has done its work thoroughly.

Members will realise that the board does not itself destroy the vermin, but employs an inspector to make others do so. I am glad to see that the Government does not seek to depart from that practice, because nothing in the Bill would prevent a board from operating along those lines. The amount of the vermin rate should be left to the discretion of the board for determination. If some boards are forced to impose a minimum rate of ⅜d. in the £, they will accumulate considerable funds and will continue doing so. The only way some of them will be able to spend the money will be by employing inspectors or buying poison and giving it away, or wasting it in some other direction. It should be remembered that if poison is made available to farmers at too cheap a rate, they will not realise its value and will not use it at all. There is a definite responsibility on landowners themselves to destroy the rabbits on their properties, and they are the best judges of how to do it. In their own interests, they will keep the expenditure down.

I believe the Honorary Minister said that the central authority would employ inspectors to help boards that could not afford to engage inspectors. I do not think there is any board that could not afford to put on an inspector. In fact, it would be a poor old board that would be in that position. In the past, inspectors from the central authority, which has been the Department

of Agriculture, have done excellent work. I freely admit that; but they have not been expected to take the place of any local board's inspector. As a matter of fact, inspectors from the central authority have stirred things up, particularly where boards have been neglectful of their task. I am a member of a board that has been stirred up by the inspector from the central authority. Members will appreciate that at times boards are apt to get a bit slack in regard to such matters. In those circumstances, when an inspector arrives from Perth, he can do quite a lot of good. I will not believe it right or proper that the responsibility for appointing an inspector should be shouldered by an inspector of the central authority. I do not think that is at all desirable.

There is only one other point I wish to refer to, and that concerns the proposal to remove the exemption at present allowed to the farmer who has rabbit-netted his property. To my mind, the man who does that work properly should be entitled to full exemption from payment of the vermin rate. I realise that some farmers have not taken this precaution. Sometimes huge expenditure is involved. In addition to the first cost, there is the upkeep, which runs into quite a lot of money. The man who undertakes such an obligation and completely rabbit-nets his property should be granted exemption. The fences are inspected periodically, and if a farmer allows his fence to get out of repair, his exemption ceases. I do not think the proposal embodied in the Bill is proper. The measure is essentially one for consideration in Committee and, subject to the amendment I have indicated, I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. H. Seddon in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 59:

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (b) of proposed new Subsection (2) be struck out.

I have said all I intend to say on the matter of the imposition of the minimum vermin rate, and shall not elaborate the point. The deletion of the paragraph will remove that provision from the Bill.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I hope the amendment will not be accepted. The Royal Commission traversed much of the country areas, and the department has considered the suggestions embodied in the commission's report. In the light of experience, the Bill has been submitted. Mr. Wood has not indicated that the imposition of the minimum rate of ¾d. in the £ will impose any hardship. If imposed, this will mean assistance to the pastoral industry in the provision of funds effectively to prosecute the campaign against vermin.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I consider the imposition of the minimum rate will impose a hardship, and the provision is quite unnecessary. I am prepared to admit that in some instances it will be necessary, but, as I have indicated before, the imposition of such a rate might result in some boards accumulating large funds and the money might be wasted. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Some local authorities fail in their duty, as I have already said. Many boards that do not impose a vermin rate seek assistance to destroy vermin because they have not the money to do so.

Hon. G. B. Wood: There is nothing to stop them from imposing a rate and doing their duty.

The HONORARY MINISTER: But they do not do it. That is the point.

Hon. L. CRAIG: While not opposing the amendment, I point out that in the case of a pastoral lease the maximum rate is 1s. and the minimum ½d. In the case of some pastoral leases the rent is only 5s. per 1,000 acres per annum, but some of these leases comprise 500,000 acres which include rugged country. The vermin rate is to be ½d. per 100 acres minimum. Such areas carry a sheep to about 40 acres or less. The minimum vermin rate would be more than 10 per cent. of the total annual lease rent. I admit that this would not apply to many stations, but it would seriously affect the few stations that are situated in rugged country.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I point out to Mr. Craig that that does not affect my amendment. A board can impose a rate of ⅜d. in the £ under the present Act. My objection is that the Bill makes it mandatory to impose the rate when there is in many cases no necessity to impose it at all.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: The Honorary Minister has said that some boards have not levied a vermin rate when they should have done so. It might meet the wishes of Mr. Wood if a proviso were added that the Minister could authorise a lower amount to be rated where the board is not in need of so much money. The honest board which does levy rates might not require a rate as high as ⅜d. in the £.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am not in accord with Mr. Parker's suggestion. He talks about the honest board.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I mean the genuine board.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: All boards are more or less honest; in any event, board members are subject to election. It should be left to a board to impose what rate is required, as is now provided in the Act. What the Royal Commission had in mind when it made this recommendation was the "passing of the buck" from the owner to the local authority. The Government has accepted part of the commission's recommendation.

The HONORARY MINISTER: We cannot ignore the recommendation of the Royal Commission.

Hon. G. B. Wood: You have ignored many of them.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Government and the Royal Commission are in agreement with respect to this recommendation. Some boards, according to my information, do not strike a rate sufficiently high, and then afterwards ask for assistance to combat vermin. This provision will not affect a board which understands its responsibilities, but only those boards which are careless of the interests of farmers so far as vermin is concerned.

Hon. G. FRASER: Might I suggest to Mr. Wood that he give the provision in the Bill a trial for 12 months? I am rather afraid that if the rate is fixed at too low an amount, quite a number of boards will, for various reasons, strike the lowest rate they are permitted to and the amount may not be sufficient to cover the work in their district.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am afraid Mr. Fraser does not know very much about what happens in regard to the striking of rates by road boards. The fact of compelling a board to strike a rate of ⅜d. in the £ would not necessarily ensure that the board would do its job.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I feel inclined to support the amendment. I often wonder, as I go around country districts, what the vermin boards actually do for the rates they levy. We occasionally get a visit from an inspector; but the eradication of vermin, particularly in the district in which I am interested, is done by the farmer. I would not like to see the rate struck too low. The board should do sufficient work to assist the farmer, at least in many districts that I know a little about.

The HONORARY MINISTER: My information is that several boards have asked for permission not to rate and have subsequently made representations for a subsidy to fight vermin. This remark would apply to comparatively few boards. The provision in the Bill has the support of the Royal Commission and of the officers of the Agricultural Department, and therefore I hope the Committee will not agree to the amendment.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Mr. Simpson has pointed out to me, and rightly, that in effect the amendment would, if carried, start a war. Many boards have in their districts freehold as well as pastoral land. Mr. Wood suggests that the pastoral areas should be subject to a compulsory minimum rate, but that the freehold land should not be rated at all. If that suggestion would not cause a fight in a road board, I do not know what would.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Why?

Hon. L. CRAIG: The hon. member proposes a compulsory levy on pastoral areas and exemption of freehold land.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Farming land.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes. I am in sympathy with Mr. Wood, because some boards have no vermin at all in their areas.

Hon. G. B. Wood: But they would be compelled to strike a rate.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Yes. Personally, I am concerned. I have no rabbits on my property, as they do not infest the district.

The Honorary Minister: But you have other vermin.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I would be paying for somebody else in the hills.

The Honorary Minister: You are troubled by dogs and foxes.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Foxes do not do much harm. This provision is mainly directed against rabbits. One hardly ever sees a rabbit in the low irrigated area at Harvey, yet the people would be paying a high vermin rate per acre for the benefit of somebody else. There is something in what Mr. Wood contends. However, the rate would not amount to very much and I think we had better leave the Bill as it stands.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Mr. Craig will get out of it somehow. I have no objection to striking out the whole of the clause. I consulted with the representatives of the pastoralists and they were not concerned. I am against the principle of imposing a minimum rate, because some boards may accumulate money which they would not need for the destruction of vermin. What will the boards do with the money they accumulate? I venture to say that in 10 or 20 years' time they would have a huge fund and would not know what to do with it. There is no Act of Parliament to say what shall be done with the money. I have no objection to exempting pastoral holdings.

Hon. L. Craig: Move in that direction, and I will vote for the amendment.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Can I do that, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: That would mean going back. We are dealing with the hon. member's amendment.

The HONORARY MINISTER: With the permission of the Committee, I will report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

BILL—CHARITABLE COLLECTIONS.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [6.2] in moving the second reading said: By this Bill authority is sought to regulate and control the collection of money and goods for charitable purposes, and to repeal the War Funds Regulation Act, 1939, under which provision is made for the control of the activities of patriotic organisations arising out of the recent war. Members are well aware that in 1939 the Government took the earliest opportunity of submitting to Parliament legislation for the purpose of supervising the raising and collection of money for patriotic purposes. The legislative authority then given, however, related to activities in connection with the recent war only. Appeals for purposes not related to the recent war, or for charitable or social welfare purposes, are not covered by the Act. Thus we find ourselves in the anomalous position of having supervision over some appeals and none over others.

Since the end of the war this anomaly has become more apparent, and the proposal is to rectify the position by this measure. The Bill may be described as amending legislation extending the control of war fund appeals to all public appeals be they for patriotic, charitable or social welfare purposes, a procedure which is considered necessary in the public interest. The control and supervision of patriotic activities have been very effective, and members are aware of the magnificent response by the public to the extent of over £2,500,000 for comforts and benefits to the Services. That aspect of this State's war effort was covered in reports which have been tabled in Parliament. The people of this State can indeed feel proud of their achievement in this regard. It can be said, I think, that the manner in which the public have responded to patriotic appeals was consistent with the support they gave on all occasions to every other aspect of the nation's war effort.

Before dealing with the provisions of the Bill I propose to give a brief resume of war fund activity and of the supervision exercised thereover under existing legislation. I have already stated that over £2,500,000 has been raised by the various war funds. According to the figures as at the 30th June, 1946, £454,000 remains unexpended, in addition to which goods and materials valued at £76,000 were then held. The Red Cross Society held the greater proportion of this, the figures being £280,000 cash balance, and

£64,000 goods and materials. That organisation will need all of this to carry on its activities on behalf of service personnel, and ex-service personnel at the various hospitals, and to assist in the many activities which its objectives cover. The society comprises one of the major War Funds, of which there are eleven in this State. The others are the Australian Comforts Fund, Salvation Army Wartime Fund, R.A.A.F. Comforts Fund, Y.M.C.A. War Service Appeal, Naval Welfare and Comforts Fund, Citizens' Reception Council, Merchant Seamen's Comforts Fund, British Sailors' Society Welfare Fund, W.A. Patriotic Fund for Soldiers' Dependants, W.A. Sportsmen's Organising Council for Patriotic Funds.

Members will recollect that a few sittings ago we dealt with the remaining assets of three of these war funds. Where necessary a similar procedure will be followed in respect of the others. Responsibility for supervision of war fund activity is vested by the Act in the War Funds Council, consisting of Mr. J. Totterdell, the Rt. Hon. Lord Mayor of Perth, who became a member this year on the retirement on account of ill-health of Dr. Meagher; Hon. F. E. Gibson, M.L.C., Mr. A. Clydesdale and Mr. J. W. Vivian, and I, as Chief Secretary, am honoured to be the chairman. Up to date, 380 funds have been registered by the War Funds Council. The certificates of about 70 per cent. of these funds have been cancelled. Many others have been wound up or are winding up their affairs, and will submit final accounts before cancellation is effected, a procedure which must be followed in all cases.

In this regard it is interesting to note that the accounts of every registered war fund are the subject of quarterly audit for submission to the War Funds Council; statements are closely checked, and supervision is reasonably strict. Reports which have been tabled in Parliament disclose that the 11 major war funds have handled approximately 80 per cent. of the total moneys collected by all registered war funds, which means that the other 369 organisations in all parts of the State were mainly engaged in raising moneys for the major war fund organisations.

In each instance the accounts of these 11 major war funds are kept and audited by firms practising as accountants in the city. This, of course, is recognised as a tangible contribution to the war effort and one that has done much towards maintaining public confidence and goodwill in our war-caused organisations. It is noteworthy, too, that the business affairs of these particular funds and others are in the hands of citizens holding high executive positions in the business and commercial life of the community. Those citizens have performed and are still performing a patriotic duty of which they can indeed be proud. Theirs was a job well done, this being very evident when it is borne in mind that there have been relatively few cases needing action against individuals or committees for any improper practices.

There is another aspect which I must mention, and that relates to the part played by that army of women who during the war assisted, and even now are assisting in many ways, war-caused organisations. As chairman of the War Funds Council, I have a full knowledge of the various patriotic activities in our midst, and no-one appreciates more than I do the wonderful work of our women war workers. Throughout the State these women have exploited all avenues to obtain moneys for war purposes. They have collected clothing and organised themselves into knitting groups so that comforts could be available for the Services and overseas relief. They have assisted the various war funds in carrying out their functions, namely, as Red Cross, E.S.C., V.A.D., W.A.N.S. and Australian Comforts Fund workers, and as hostel, canteen and recreational centre workers. In doing all this they have cheerfully complied with the controlling laws and regulations in a manner that sets an example of good citizenship second to none in the Commonwealth.

Turning now to the Bill, at the outset I would like to say that its principles are identical with those in the War Funds Regulation Act. The proposal is to repeal that Act, and in so doing to put in its place a measure incorporating minor amendments which experience and circumstances have deemed necessary, and to add provisions which will extend statutory control of patriotic appeals to all charitable appeals. It is proposed to call the measure the Charitable Collections Act and that it shall come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation. The Bill does not interfere in

any way with the provisions of the Street Collections Regulation Act, a clause being inserted to that effect.

There is an interpretation clause, the main definition being "charitable purpose." This definition is similar to the one which appears in the War Funds Regulation Act and other Acts of the same type in the various States of the Commonwealth. It is not restricted to appeals for patriotic or war purposes. It is sufficiently wide to cover all appeals of a public character. There is a clause in the Bill which prohibits the collection of money or goods or the obtaining of money by the sale of discs, badges, etc., or the conducting of any entertainments for which an admission charge is made, if the moneys so collected or derived are applied to a charitable purpose, unless a license is obtained. Under the Bill existing war funds are transferred from the War Funds Regulation Act to the Charitable Collections Act, thereby making the issue of a license to these war funds an automatic procedure.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Before tea I was remarking that under this Bill existing war funds are to be transferred from the War Funds Regulation Act to the Charitable Collections Act, thereby making the issuing of licenses to these particular war funds an automatic procedure. The Bill makes provision for the setting up of an advisory committee, which is to consist of five members appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister. In this connection it is pointed out that the existing members of the War Funds Council are prepared to act on the committee. The measure also sets out the procedure which must be followed with regard to applications for licenses. These are to be referred to the advisory committee for consideration and report to the Minister.

There is also a provision in the Bill which gives power to the Governor to order the transfer of moneys, goods and securities, which are held by any particular organisation, to other destinations. A similar provision exists in the War Funds Regulation Act. The slight difference is that under that Act assets can be applied only to purposes connected with the recent war. Under the new Bill assets may be applied to any charitable purpose. A proclamation by the Governor authorising the transfer of any assets cannot be issued unless it is supported by a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament. That is in accordance with the War Funds Regulation Act, and the distribution of assets under that measure. There are other provisions in the Bill, mainly dealing with the accounts of charitable organisations and providing for the necessary authority for the Auditor General to investigate where necessary.

That explains the main proposals, the provisions of which will not in any way prejudice the authority already enjoyed by existing war fund organisations such as the Red Cross Society, Soldiers' Dependants' Appeal and many others. The certificates of registration that they already have will be acceptable as licenses under the Bill, and provision has been made for that purpose. All that the Bill seeks to do is to rectify the anomaly that I have explained, and to make amendments to the provisions of existing legislation, which practical experience has shown to be necessary.

In my opinion it is essential that we should have controlling legislation of that kind covering appeals to the public for charitable purposes. At present a large number of appeals are being made to the public, involving considerable sums of money. I could not say what the exact total is, but it must amount to something like £200,000, and we have no legislation that gives the Government or anybody else authority, in the first place, to issue a license to make the appeal or, secondly, to exercise any supervision in order to ensure that the money, when raised, reaches the quarters for which it was intended. I am not suggesting that there is any reason to doubt the bona fides of any of the appeals that are now before the public or that have been mooted, but members will realise that where large sums of money are involved and many methods are used in raising money, it is desirable that we should have some authority whereby we can keep a check on the activities connected with the appeals and ensure that the money, when raised, does reach its intended destination.

I will conclude by saying that my experience with the War Funds Council has been a happy one. For a long time there was a tremendous amount of work involved, more

than most people would imagine, and the amount of money raised—some £2,500,000—was raised under conditions that allowed the organisation that exists in my office to check and keep an eye on the activities of the various organisations and funds. In remarkably few cases could one be suspicious that moneys raised for patriotic purposes did not go to the proper place. All the other States have legislation of this kind, under which it is necessary, before an appeal can be launched, for authority to be obtained, and that is all that is being provided for in this Bill. We are repealing the War Funds Regulation Act and are including its provisions in the Charitable Collections Act, providing for the supervision of the activities in the same way as we did during the war years. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter, debate adjourned.

BILL—STATE HOUSING.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [7.37]: Every year we place on the statute book a number of Acts of Parliament, and one therefore should not be surprised if, when looking back over the various Acts that have been placed there, one finds a certain number of cases where more than one measure has been brought forward covering the same ground. We have on the statute book today two Acts that cover much of the ground to be dealt with by this Bill, and consequently one is inclined to wonder whether a certain amount of duplication of function will not thereby be created. I refer to the fact that in this Bill provision is made for the surveying and setting out of building estates, and the provision of sites and buildings for various purposes on those estates, while on our statute book there is an Act placed there for the purpose of planning towns, and for the subdivision of estates.

One is inclined to think that in order to avoid some of the duplication that might arise it would have been a wise move to have included, in the constitution of the Housing Commission, the officer who has been in charge of the duties to which I have referred. Under the Town Planning and Development Act of 1928, the functions of the board and the work of the commissioner are, among other matters, to advise on and inquire into town planning schemes, to arrange for streets, parks, open spaces and public buildings. Besides the commissioner, who is the Town Planning Commissioner, that board is comprised of an architect, an engineer and a business man.

The Workers' Homes Board, as at present constituted, consists of the Under Treasurer, Mr. A. J. Reid, the Principal Architect, Mr. A. E.. Clare, the Assistant General Manager of the Wyndham Meat Works, Mr. H. J. Harler, together with Mr. Brine who represents the master builders, and a representative of the unions engaged in the work associated with the building of houses. I see no reason why the place of one of those gentlemen should not have been taken by the Town Planning Commissioner, because, after all, the work that would devolve on Mr. Reid, as Under Treasurer, and on Mr. Harler, might well be carried out by one officer. I therefore ask the Chief Secretary to indicate, in his reply, why a man whose functions are so wrapped up with the activities of the Housing Commission—I refer to the Town Planning Commissioner—should not be included on the commission. The commission will have to administer many Acts, and one wonders whether it would not be wise to revise the Bill. The Acts that are administered, and which will be handed over to the Housing Commission, are the Workers' Homes Act, the Commonwealth-State Housing Scheme, the War Service Homes Act, the McNess Housing Trust Act and the Building Operations and Building Materials Control Act. That obviously gives the commission a tremendous amount of power.

While one realises the urgent necessity for expediting the construction of houses, not only in the metropolitan area but in the country districts, one wonders whether in the carrying out of its functions one of the spheres of building has not suffered, owing to the fact that the policy adopted by the Workers' Homes Board—which I take it would be carried on by the Housing Commission—affects priorities. It is interesting to see that the activities of the Workers' Homes Board have been concentrated, in recent months, on the Commonwealth-State Housing Scheme, to the exclusion of all else.

Before I leave the question of the inclusion of the Town Planning Commissioner, I should like to give an illustration of the necessity for having that officer on the commission. I have in mind a certain municipality that had a considerable number of reserves within its boundaries, which reserves had been created for the purpose of providing recreation and open spaces for the ratepayers. With the pressure of the demand for houses, and associated with the activities of the Workers' Homes Board in that municipality, at least two of those reserves were taken and used as sites for workers' homes, causing a great diminution in the space that should have been kept for recreation purposes. I should be inclined to think that, had the Town Planning Commissioner been a member of the Workers' Homes Board, he would have advised the board of the need for conserving those areas and endeavouring to obtain other sites for the homes.

I referred just now to the question of priority. It is interesting to note what is stated in the report of the Workers' Homes Board on that question, to read the report in conjunction with the answers given to certain questions asked from time to time, and also to compare it with certain published figures. In the report of the board, there is a paragraph as follows:—

During the years 1944 and 1945, the board curtailed its building programme because of the shortage of manpower and to permit of the utilisation by the Defence Services of all available building materials and resources. During those years only five building applications were approved under the Workers' Homes Act, which included only two under Part IV. of that Act—at Northam and Waroona—for applicants who were considered to be suffering severe hardship. Three houses were erected at Donnybrook where the need was found to be great following the erection of a dehydration factory and the importation of a number of workers into that district.

Under the conditions of war, it was necessary to curtail the activities of the board. A little further on, the report states—

The board has curtailed its programme of building under the provisions of the Workers' Homes Act to enable full attention to be given to the erection of group houses under the Commonwealth-State Rental Housing Scheme. This project was put forward and discussed at several Premiers' Conferences and crystallised in an agreement which is now being finalised and will be submitted to Federal and State Parliaments for ratification.

So we have there the policy that was adopted by the board, in which it is shown that the activities of the board regarding the building of workers' homes were, in the first place, limited by the requirements under the conditions of war and, in the second place, subordinated to the Commonwealth-State Rental Housing Scheme. Here I should like to point out this important fact, namely, that the houses being built under that scheme are built entirely for rental purposes and, as the figures that have been given to us from time to time indicate, those houses are being built, or have been built, almost entirely to the exclusion of other activities of the board. The result is that we have a very large number of houses built under that scheme, while persons who have required houses and who were prepared to have them built under the Workers' Homes Scheme with the idea eventually of owning them have been placed a very bad second in the priority of building. Referring to the Workers' Homes Board report, I should like to quote certain figures showing the applications for building made under the Workers' Homes Act. The figures are—

1943	.. ..	835 applications.
1944	.. ..	930 applications.
1945	.. ..	988 applications.

Permits issued during those years for workers' homes and also for industry were—

1943	.. .. ..	196
1944	.. .. ..	438
1945	.. .. ..	1,483

As I previously said, only five homes were built under the Workers' Homes Act, so that obviously the rest of the buildings, if those figures are correct, come under the heading of homes required for industry during the war. Under the Commonwealth-State Housing Scheme, the figures are—

1944	.. ..	75 houses built.
1945	.. ..	400 houses built.

I notice a reference in the report, page 5, to the houses that were completed up to 1945. This indicates that there were 38 in the metropolitan area and 34 in the country. Those homes were built under the Commonwealth-State scheme. There are other figures dealing with houses uncompleted, indicating that there were 93 in the metropolitan area and 30 in the country.

I should now like to refer to figures published in a newspaper on the 25th October, because, in the report, which deals with the issue of building permits, there are set out the headings under which those permits were granted. For private dwellings, there were 132 permits granted for brick and 59 for wood; shops and warehouses, seven for brick and one for wood; factories, four for brick; for other commercial use, one brick and two wood; and for outbuildings, 16 brick and 86 wood. The greater proportion of those were in the metropolitan area. I have quoted those figures to show the considerable disparity between the building of homes for letting and the building of homes for purchase. As I have shown, the workers' homes come a very bad second as compared with the homes built for renting.

When we consider the way in which the allocation of the permits was made, we again find a very grave disparity, because the metropolitan area received a much larger number of permits and had a much larger number of houses built than had the country. As regards the Goldfields, practically no permits were granted until the first three months of the present financial year. So the whole question of the granting of permits is one which is due for revision and one which we might investigate while considering this legislation. As to the building of homes for private persons, these come a very bad last because there is no provision for them; nor can I find any figure to indicate that any permit has been granted for persons desirous of building homes for themselves. While it may be contended that the demand for homes has been allocated on the basis of hardship, the fact remains that the allocation has been almost entirely for the Commonwealth homes and others are almost non-existent.

Under this Bill, we are asked to create a housing commission for the purpose of controlling the building of homes and allocating these priorities, but I should like to stress the fact that the commission will also be administering the Building Operations and Building Materials Control Act, and when we find that the allocation of buildings is on such a basis as I have pointed out, we must wonder whether the same policy is not being pursued regarding the granting of permits for obtaining materials for building operations. Before we pass this measure, we should take care to ensure that some further recognition is given to the needs of the man who wishes to build a home of his own, so that he will not be left entirely out in the cold, as he appears to have been up to the present.

I think we should also ensure that, in handing over these powers to the housing commission, we do not perpetuate the control over building materials beyond the time laid down in the Act. That Act is supposed to expire in a comparatively short time, and I am wondering whether, in handing over the power to the commission, there may not be some provision that might possibly extend the operation of the control over materials also. There is one clause to which I wish to refer, namely, Clause 14, which contains an expression that I have not seen in any of our legislation for a considerable time. It reads—

> For the purposes of this Act, the commission shall have and may exercise all the powers, privileges, rights and remedies of the Crown.

I should like some explanation as to the meaning of that. The rights, powers and privileges of the Crown are fairly extensive, and it would be quite possible that, by incorporating this provision in the measure, we might be giving powers that we have no intention of granting because they will be powers that far exceed those included in other legislation. On this point I should like the legal members of the House to give us a little advice when they speak on the Bill.

There are two more clauses to which I shall refer, namely, Clauses 21 and 69. Clause 21 deals with the special powers to be given to the commission, amongst them, the power to acquire land. It is interesting to note that the Workers' Homes Board report contains a reference to this point. It says—

> During the past two years the board continued to assist the Department of War Organisation of Industry by undertaking detailed administrative work connected with the issue of permits under the National Security (Building Operations) Regulations and prepared the applications for financial decision by the Deputy Director. This work proved onerous and difficult but the staff undertook the responsibility well knowing the need for rationing. The public, generally, accepted the decisions of the Deputy Director with good grace realising the material and manpower shortages and feeling that he had an overall picture of the general position.

There was something in the report dealing with the acquisition of land. It indicated that when attempts were made to acquire land there was considerable reluctance to sell and, as members know, towards the end of last year much comment was indulged in regarding the action of the board in acquiring blocks of land under the powers which it then had. Consequently it is interesting to know that those powers have been included in the Bill. While an amendment has been indicated by the Chief Secretary to give the owner of any land the right of appeal under certain conditions, and while that provision has been included in Clause 69, it appears to me that the right of appeal is very circumscribed, and I would like to see it considerably extended so as to be of use to the owner of any such land.

Therefore, I trust some amendment will be made to comply with the rights of an individual to retain his land if he so desires for the purpose of establishing his own home. The Bill contains certain definitions and I notice that in estimating the capital value of land certain factors are to be taken into consideration, but no allowance is to be made for the portion set aside for parks, recreation areas and other public purposes. Now, the proximity of a park or recreation area to a block of land has a material effect on its value and one wonders why that exclusion should exist in the Act. Another definition to which I would like to refer, is the one dealing with the estimation of rent. When one calculates rent it is usual to allow not only rates and taxes, but insurance, and I should have thought that in a fair and reasonable estimation of rent that factor would have been included together with any amounts payable by the tenant for repairs and renovations.

I have already referred to the constitution of the commission and indicated that, in my opinion, there should be provision for the Town Planning Commissioner to be included. I understand that suggestions have been made that the commission would be improved if it included a woman so that her advice could be taken on the planning of houses and housing. I have often said that the person most concerned in the planning of a home is the woman who is to live in it, and in planning a home to be efficient and convenient I would say that the advice of a woman should be taken because she could indicate defects that the ordinary man would not notice. I make that suggestion to the Minister for his consideration. I referred to the fact that the commission will handle building material, but there are one or two other clauses to which I would like to draw attention.

Clause 21 provides that the commission shall have power to acquire compulsorily any land in accordance with the procedure prescribed by the Public Works Act. Under that Act there is power to take land but it must be for a definite public work. Obviously the intention of the Government is that the housing commission shall be placed in the same position as the Public Works Department with regard to this part. It is possible for a person to make application to the Workers' Homes Board for the acquisition of a piece of land for the purpose of building a home for him. Owing to the fact that the housing commission is to have the right compulsorily to acquire land, the situation could arise where I might have a block and intend using it for the purpose of building a house for myself, and another man might take a fancy to it and ask the board compulsorily to acquire it from me with a view to building a house on it for him. That is not fair; no-one could condone an action of that description, and yet such action has already taken place! I do not think that power should be extended in this measure without some safeguard.

It is interesting to notice that the housing commission will have the right to set aside land for the purpose of gardens, parks, recreation grounds, and the erection of schools and religious buildings. That right has been exercised previously either by the Lands Department or by the Town Planning Board so that that appears to be granting powers to this commission which will overlap some already existing. I fail to see how the erection of schools and religious buildings could come within the scope of the housing commission. Another power granted under Clause 21 is that the housing commission may delegate a local authority to carry out any of the powers, duties and functions of the commission. The local authority can be given the power to do what I have said the commission might

do, that is, take land from one man and hand it to another.

Then again there is a subclause dealing with the powers of the commission and it indicates that any building or structure of whatsoever kind which, in the opinion of the Minister, on the recommendation of the commission, is necessary for the purposes of this Act, shall be deemed to be a "public work" within the meaning of the Public Works Act, 1902-1933. That again is a power which could be used extensively for the purposes of the commission, and used outside the ordinary purposes of housing and the providing of homes. Clause 29 is the one which provides that one man can ask the commission to take a block of land belonging to another man. It states—

> Any worker may by application in the prescribed form, request the Commissioner:—
>
> (a) To purchase or acquire an allotment of land specified in the application;
>
> (b) to dedicate or set apart such land to the purposes of this Act;
>
> (c) to erect a worker's dwelling thereon; or
>
> (d) to grant a lease to the applicant under this Part of the Act.

Clause 69, under the heading of "Community facilities," gives power to acquire land. It provides, in Subclause (1) that—

> The Commissioner may with the consent of the Minister:—
>
> (a) Purchase or compulsorily acquire land or set aside any land of the Commission for the purpose of providing: gardens, parks, open spaces, places of recreation and sites for shops, religious buildings, infant health and pre-school child centres, etc.

There again is an indication of the overlapping to which I have referred. There is provision that a person whose land is sought to be compulsorily acquired, may appeal to the Minister on the grounds that the land—

> (i) is being used by the appellant as his principal place of residence; or
>
> (ii) is intended by the appellant as his principal place of residence and that he owns no other land suitable for such purposes; or
>
> (iii) is intended by the appellant to be used as the principal place of residence of his child or of a near relative mainly dependent on him . . . .

The Minister has discretion either to allow or refuse the appeal. The clause also gives a person whose land is sought to be compulsorily acquired the right to appeal to a Supreme Court judge, but there is the restriction that, where the commissioner has prepared plans for the subdivision of land within an area such owner shall have no appeal against the acquisition. These matters require a lot of consideration and I trust that, when going through the Bill, we will take the precaution of providing the necessary safeguards to prevent persons being deprived of what is, after all, one of the strongest rights that they have—that of retaining the land on which they have or are proposing to erect their homes. I intend to support the Bill, but I hope that suitable amendments will be made to it.

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

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [8.12] in moving the second reading said: This Bill was introduced by the member for Albany in another place, and at his request I am submitting it to members here for their approval. Throughout the State there are various areas of what might be termed no man's land that are not subject to the control of the traffic or the municipal authorities. The Bill has been brought down to cover such places. The hon. member in another place mentioned the approach to the Albany railway station. I might say that what he instanced there applies to the approach to the Geraldton station. If that approach gets out of repair the municipal authorities do not have to attend to it; it is the concern solely of the Commissioner of Railways.

There is a taxi rank at the Geraldton station and there is one in front of the railway station at Albany. The taxis operating there do not come under the supervision of the traffic inspector or the police, but under the Minister for Railways. The objections to divided control need not be elaborated upon. Such control only causes confusion and is not in the best interests of "safety first" about which we heard so much recently. I do not know that I need to deal further with the provisions of the Bill, which is a short one. The reasons for its introduction are very evident, and I hope the House will agree to it. I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. H. Seddon in the Chair; Hon. E. H. H. Hall in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 21:

Hon. L. CRAIG: I do not know much about this Bill. It would seem to apply to private property. Should a traffic inspector or police officer have any right in connection with a road on private property?

Hon. G. Fraser: It means a road open to public traffic.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: But it says in addition, "or used by the public."

Hon. L. CRAIG: Was no objection taken to this in another place?

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: No.

Hon. L. CRAIG: I do not wish to raise any strenuous objection, but I question whether an inspector should have the right to go on to private property and exercise authority with regard to traffic on a private road.

Hon. G. BENNETTS: What happens at Kalgoorlie provides an illustration. In front of the railway station there is an open space with the bitumen roads from the town leading in to it. Before an individual can ply for hire as a taxi driver or carrier he has to secure a license from the Railway Department, but the traffic inspector has the right to control the traffic there.

Hon. H. TUCKEY: I agree with Mr. Craig. While it might be quite all right for a police officer or a traffic inspector to have some control over an open space that is Government property, such as there is in front of a railway station, I do not agree that it is equally right that the same authority should be vested in a police officer or traffic inspector in respect of a road that goes through private property.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am a little in the dark about this matter. Can Mr. E. H. H. Hall give an instance of a road on private property over which control is to be exercised by a police officer or traffic inspector in the manner suggested in the Bill? I want to know how it can apply to a road on private property.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I cannot readily answer the question, but if roads on private property are used by the public some supervision over the traffic is necessary.

Hon. L. CRAIG: While I might agree to this provision with regard to roads open to public traffic, the clause also refers to roads "used by the public." I have a road leading from my front gate to the House and it is used by the public. I think the clause goes too far. I move an amendment—

> That in line 5 of the proposed new Subsection (4a) the words "or used by the public" be struck out.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I think that is a perfectly reasonable request, and I agree to the amendment.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Perhaps Mr. Hall can tell us what the words "every such member of the Police Force and every such inspector" really mean? If he compares the proposal in Clause 2 with Section 21 of the Traffic Act, he will see that it is not clear. I certainly do not know what "every such member" means. What do the words mean?

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: In order to satisfy the legal mind of Mr. Parker, may I ask leave to report progress?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I understand the Bill received the blessing of the Traffic Branch of the Police Department. It refers to open places such as those in front of railway stations and probably to roads in front of municipal or road board reserves. At present a police constable or police officer has no legal power to control the traffic there, and the Bill seeks to provide that power.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: But what could he do?

The Chief Secretary: Control the traffic.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, that is the position. The member for Albany instanced the position at the Albany railway station.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Surely the Commissioner of Railways controls that reserve.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, but not the traffic.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The Bill would meet with my approval if the amendment were agreed to. As it is the Bill might mean that if a farmer had a road running from

his gate to his homestead, he might be prosecuted for driving at an excessive speed.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: But under what authority would that be done?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The Bill proposes to allow such members of the Police Force and traffic inspectors as are referred to in the Act to carry out these duties. As the Bill stands, what I suggest could happen.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Mr. Heenan suggests that the proposed new subsection would give a constable power to prosecute a man for speeding on his own private road, but it only does what the Act already gives the officer power to do. He already has the power to prosecute for speeding on a private road. That is what I wish to point out.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is all we want.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: The present Bill apparently does not apply to private roads.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: It only gives him power to perform such duties as are vested in or imposed upon him by the Act.

The Chief Secretary: The last few words are the important ones.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER: Nevertheless, it only gives him power to do what the Act already authorises him to do.

Hon. G. Fraser: It gives him the same power in a different place.

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

Clause 3, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

BILL—LAND ALIENATION RESTRICTION ACT CONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [8.34] in moving the second reading said: This small Bill proposes to continue for a further 12 months the provisions of the Land Alienation Restriction Act, which expires on the 31st December, 1946. The object of the Act is to protect ex-Servicemen and their dependants who wish to settle on the land. It provides that no Crown land, or land held by the Rural and Industries Bank, other than town or suburban lots, may be sold to persons other than members of the Forces or their dependants, except with the written consent of the Minister or his representative. This consent may be given only if it is considered that the land is not suitable for settlement by members of the Forces or their dependants, or if it is required to clarge a present holding which is inadequate to carry on farming operations, or if exceptional circumstances be proved. Furthermore, no such land may be sold for speculative purposes.

A "Member of the Forces" is defined as a person who is, or has been, a member of the Naval, Military or Air Forces of His Majesty the King during any period in which His Majesty is, or has been, engaged in war, and therefore includes persons who have served during any war. "Dependant" means a person who is wholly or partly dependent for his support upon the pay of, or upon a pension payable in consequence of the incapacity or death of, a person who is or has been a member of the Forces. The Act has proved of great assistance to ex-Servicemen, and as there is some difficulty in obtaining sufficient wheat and sheep lands for soldier settlement at reasonable prices the Government considers that it would be advisable to continue the Act for a further twelve months. If this is done it will continue the well-deserved protection given to the ex-Serviceman and will be of great value in the establishment of the War Service Land Settlement Scheme. It is absolutely necessary to continue this legislation and, anticipating that there will be no objection to it in this Chamber, I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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

MOTION—MIDLAND RAILWAY DISTRICTS.

As to Rail Passes for Inspection by Members.

Debate resumed from the 29th October on the following motion by Hon. E. H. H. Hall:—

That this House is of the opinion that it is desirable that all members of Parliament should be well informed in respect to the development and resources of the various parts of the State; and that, to provide an opportunity for such information in connection with the districts served by the Midland Railway,

is of opinion that passes should be available to every member of Parliament to visit the districts served by that railway; and that the Premier's Office be asked to make arrangements accordingly.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [8.37]: This motion deals with the question of members of Parliament being granted the right to travel over the Midland Railway Company's line irrespective of the constituencies that they may represent. I referred the matter to the Premier and would like to say, first, that he will give it consideration. Members, of course, understand the present position and are aware that he has not had much opportunity to deal with a matter like this.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: It does not seem to be of any value at the moment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is so. I thought members would like to know the history of the privileges of members with respect to the Midland Railway Company. It appears that on the 3rd November, 1911, Railways By-law No. 61 was gazetted so as to have operation from the 1st January, 1911. The by-law reads—

> Each member of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly shall be entitled to a free pass (gold) available over the Government railways and the Midland railway of Western Australia.

Therefore, in 1911 a member's pass did permit him to travel over both the Government railways and the Midland railway. The method of recouping the Midland Railway Company for the travel of members over its line was by payment of a fixed sum of £530 per annum. On the 18th April, 1916, the General Manager of the Midland Railway Company wrote to the Secretary for Railways asking that the annual payment for this service should be increased by at least £300. At that time the question of the payment had already been under consideration and it was thought that the amount of £530 for the services performed was excessive, especially in view of the opening of the Wongan Hills-Mullewa railway during the previous year and the consequent use of the new line by members for the Murchison district. On the 14th June, 1916, Cabinet decided that the lump sum payment would be discontinued and that in future ticket orders would be issued on application to members of Parliament who were desirous of travelling by the Midland line. A circular to this effect was sent to all sitting members by the Secretary for Railways. It read as follows:—

> To Hon. Members of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly. It is hereby notified that the gold pass held by a member of Parliament entitling him to free travelling over the railways of the State will not in future be available over the Midland Railway Company's line. If a member is desirous of travelling over the Midland Railway's line, it will be necessary for him to obtain a ticket order from this office—

that is, the Railway Department—

> which can be exchanged at the railway booking office for a ticket.

That decision altered the conditions relating to the travelling of members of Parliament over the Midland railway, as the gold pass was no longer available over that line. In April, 1930, Railway By-law 61 was amended to read as follows:—

> Any member of Parliament representing a constituency served by the Midland Railway Company, but not further than Tenindewa, will be provided with travelling facilities for himself when required.

Here was another change. Members representing constituencies on the Midland line were given the privilege of which Mr. Wood spoke the other night. It appears that the privilege ceases at the boundary of the constituency represented by that hon. member. One can understand the inconvenience that might be caused to a member travelling under those conditions. The moment he gets beyond the boundary of his constituency, he is travelling without a ticket and it might be suggested that he was running the risk of being prosecuted for travelling without a ticket, notwithstanding the fact that he had sufficient money to pay for it, if requested.

That by-law is, I understand, still in force and members of both Houses representing those constituencies can travel under those conditions. The State Government has to pay the Midland Railway Company for the tickets which are issued from time to time. A statement of the payments made to the Midland Railway Company for travel by members of Parliament on the Midland railway between 1921 and 1946 shows that the cost was reduced from £920 in 1921-22 to £105 in 1945-46. The statement also shows that after the bylaw was

amended in 1939, the cost was reduced from £510 for the year 1929-30 to £293 for the year 1930-31.

Hon. G. B. Wood: That is because Mr. E. H .H. Hall lives in Perth.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: As a matter of fact, it got to as low as £70 5s. 8d. in 1942-43. I think that during the discussion on this motion, reference was made to the reciprocal arrangement existing between the States in regard to rail travel, and the Commonwealth line was mentioned. It could be inferred from the remarks made that there is a reciprocal arrangement between the Commonwealth line and the State railways, but apparently that is not so. When members travel on the Commonwealth line between here and the Eastern States, or vice versa, that privilege has to be paid for by the State. It does not amount to a very large sum. For 1944-45, £329 was paid to the Commonwealth. In 1945-46, the figure was £465. I have given that information so that members will know where we stand in regard to the matter. In view of the fact that the question has been raised by Mr. E. H. H. Hall, the Treasurer will give early consideration to the request, irrespective of whether the motion is carried or not.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central—in reply) [8.47]: I am grateful to the Chief Secretary for the information he has given the House from the Premier and Treasurer, and I hope, as I said when I moved the motion, that it will appeal to the Premier that the present position is unsatisfactory and that the decision made some time ago should not be kept in force. I think members will be obliged for the information given them. It shows that the company was a little too avaricious—I do not like the word "greedy." However, that was some years ago, and the railway is now under new management. I am hopeful that the Treasurer will see his way clear to make free travel available to all members of Parliament to enable them to visit this very fine area along the Midland Railway Company's line.

The PRESIDENT: The motion having served its purpose, and an assurance having been given by the Leader of the House that the Treasurer will favourably consider the matter, whether the motion is carried or not, I think it would be a nice gesture if the hon. member asked leave of the House to withdraw the motion.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I thank you, Sir, for your reminder, and, in accordance with the hint given, I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

House adjourned at 8.49 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 6th November, 1946.

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

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Minister for Lands and read a first time.

BILL—COMPREHENSIVE AGRICULTURAL AREAS AND GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY.

Report of Committee adopted.

RESOLUTION—WAR FUNDS REGULATION ACT.

To Approve of Proclamations for Transfer of Assets.

Message from the Council requesting concurrence in the following resolution now considered:—

That under the provisions of Section 5, subsection (4) of the War Funds Regulation Act, 1939, this House approve of the issue of pro-