

purpose and sent them to anyone who cared to pay a guinea for one. There are several in Perth, and it is difficult for the general public to know who is really qualified. In addition to the Federal Institute and the Commonwealth Institute there is a corporation of accountants, which really consists of members of the Commonwealth Institute. A Royal charter was obtained and all members of the Commonwealth Institute are eligible to be members of the corporation, but they have to retain their double membership. The moment they go out of public practice, they lose their qualification as members of the corporation. There are a number of bogus institutes which have issued certificates to people who have not qualified, and those people practice in Perth. Not a great deal of harm will be done by allowing a man who has been a municipal auditor for a number of years and who has become proficient to carry on. So long as we can be assured that not any number of persons who get together and call themselves an institute can become a recognised institute, it will be all right. I hope the time will arrive when there will be in the Act some definition of an accountant, such a one as is going to be recognised. The eligibles should be limited to those who have certificates of competency obtained by examination. Reputable institutes of architects issue certificates only after examination.

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

Clauses 59 to 67—agreed to.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 9.56 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 5th October, 1937.*

	PAGE
Bills: Fair Rents, 2s. ....	1057
Mining Act Amendment (No. 2), 1s. ....	1064
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 1s. ....	1064
Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Act Amendment, 1s. ....	1064
Adjournment, Royal Show ....	1064

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

### BILL—FAIR RENTS.

#### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 29th September.

**HON. A. THOMSON** (South-East) [4.35]: One may recognise the sincerity of the Government in introducing this Bill, and if it would improve housing conditions I would give the measure serious consideration. My practical knowledge of the cost of building however causes me to fear that the measure would merely result in curtailment of the erection of houses. In the metropolitan area conditions are arising which ultimately must prove highly unsatisfactory to the average householder. Those who are compelled to live in flats have not the same privacy and home life as are enjoyed in a house separate and distinct from others. At the present juncture anything tending to hamper the construction of houses in the metropolitan area either for rent or for sale cannot have my support. If the Bill passes, conditions will become worse instead of improving. It is said that on the goldfields the housing situation is unsatisfactory. I am inclined to agree with the statement that many of the houses on the goldfields are unsuitable and inadequate. But whose fault is that? I would commend to some of the supporters of the Bill a series of excellent articles which have appeared in the "West Australian" dealing with delinquencies of youth. Certainly the homes provided on the goldfields are not what one would like them to be. There are plenty of men on the fields earning a decent wage, but not prepared to take upon themselves the responsibility of providing homes of their own. That remark is applicable to most goldfields because of the degree of uncertainty as to their permanency. On the

other hand if one takes into consideration the enormous amounts of money companies are spending in the opening up of mines, one feels that there is considerable promise of permanency. Thus one is forced to ask himself why there should be on the goldfields this need for special consideration in the matter of housing accommodation. Those who feel doubts about the matter should read in to-day's "West Australian" an article giving practical reasons for the failure to establish better homes in that portion of the State.

Hon. J. Cornell: That applies to goldfields almost without exception.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I admit that. I was fortunate enough to visit the new township at Big Bell in connection with the recent opening celebration. Walking about the streets one realised that there was a large town coming. Still, the type of house being erected should be more comfortable, and should provide better facilities, especially for the women folk. However the type at Big Bell seems to be the accepted type of house for goldfields areas. The Bill, I repeat, would not improve matters. The clause dealing with determination of fair rents provides—

In determining the fair rent the court shall first ascertain the capital value of the dwelling-house as at the time of the receipt of the application. Such capital value shall be the capital sum which the fee simple of the property comprising the dwelling-house and the land occupied therewith might be expected to realise if offered for sale upon such reasonable terms and conditions as a bona-fide seller would require.

Mr. Cornell speaking on the Bill quoted a case where some goldfields houses had been purchased for as low as £40 apiece and now were bringing high rents. But one has to bear in mind that when those houses were to be bought at £40 the outlook on the goldfields was serious from an investment point of view. Fortunately for the people who took the risk of purchasing at £40, nobody else wanted the houses at that price. But what will be the position as regards those houses from the aspect of a fair rents court?

Hon. J. Cornell: Many of them were bought solely for breaking-up.

Hon. A. THOMSON: That is so. On the other hand a house next door to the £40 purchase might have been erected at a cost of £300 or £400. If the Bill is to be interpreted strictly, the new house should neces-

sarily carry a higher rent than the older house. If I buy a house for £40 and then sell it for £350, that being its improved market value, the purchaser is entitled, presumably, to a rental based on the larger amount, whilst I was only entitled to a rental on the basis contained in the Bill. It may be urged that that is stretching the argument, but the measure contains many administrative difficulties which would hamper investors. Recently Mr. Williams, speaking on the question of workers' compensation, said that for £600 it would be possible for a person on the goldfields to erect two cottages and let them for about £3 per week. Certainly owners should receive larger rentals than the Bill provides, or they would be likely to look for some other form of investment. Another provision which strikes me as slightly inequitable is that any person who lets a dwelling-house at a rent exceeding the fair rent determined by the court will be guilty of an offence. In effect, the clause says that a person who builds a house with a view to obtaining a living from it, will be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine if he lets it for £1 per week when the court has decided that he shall receive only 15s. per week for it. On the other hand there is nothing to prevent the man who is living in that house and receiving £1 per day by an award of the Arbitration Court from accepting 25s. a day if someone else offers it to him, and rightly so. If that principle is sound on one side it is equally sound on the other. If I honestly thought the Bill would improve the position of housing I would vote for it, but I am firmly convinced that if we pass a measure of this kind, instead of improving the housing position we shall make it very much worse. The suggestion thrown out by Mr. Cornell is one to which the Government might give serious consideration. I do not think anyone is desirous of seeing families living in hovels or three or four families living in one house, and I hope that that state of affairs is not too widely prevalent. I should like every man to be able to live in a nice comfortable house and to pay a reasonable rent which would go towards securing for him the ownership of his own home. The Government say that the Bill does not affect shops, but there is any amount of rack-renting in that direction as well. I intend to vote against the second reading of the Bill because I think that its adoption will make the position worse instead of better.

**HON. G. B. WOOD** (East) [4.52]: This is the first Bill introduced this session in which I see no good at all. I intend to vote against the second reading mainly on the ground of principle. I fail to see why the man who owns a house should not ask for any rent he thinks he ought to get. I am not against price-fixing generally. If, for instance, a producer cannot get a living wage I cannot see why his price should not be fixed to enable him to get it. If a man is paying too much for an article, and that applies to rent, too, I fail to see why the price should not be adjusted to the wage the man is receiving. On the other hand I cannot understand why the landlord should have to carry this burden.

**Hon. C. B. Williams**: I hope the hon. member will back the Government when the Agricultural Bank Bills come up.

**Hon. G. B. WOOD**: A man should be entitled to ask what rent he likes. That is not to say that he will get the rent he desires. If a house is empty for a long time he will have to reduce the rent in order to get a tenant. I can give an instance from my own town. A man had a house which cost £1,300. He was a Scotsman and went back to Scotland. For two years he asked 30s. a week rent. Eventually he was so disgusted at his inability to secure that amount that he sold the house for £600. I mention that to show that these things work out their own destiny. I know also that a rack-renting landlord may wish to exploit the shortage of houses. I think that is done. The Workers' Homes Board should come to the rescue and build a few more houses. If house-building is so good an investment I should think that people would use their money in the erection of houses. I have read carefully a number of speeches on this matter delivered in another place, and everything seems to boil down to the fact that the Bill is really desirable only on the goldfields. The Chief Secretary in his opening speech put up an argument which was applicable only to the goldfields. The rest of the speech dealt with the Bill in detail. Last year Mr. Heenan in discussing this matter said, "I regret that the jurisdiction of the Bill has not been confined to the goldfields, because from what I have heard and read I have come to the conclusion that there is no great need for it either in the city or in the agricultural areas." With those sentiments I heartily agree. We have heard that on the goldfields a five-roomed house of asbestos and wood has

brought £2 a week rent, and three-roomed houses, with rooms measuring 12 x 10, have brought 25s. a week. If that is true I feel sure that people will put up many such houses, and so in due course the rents will come down. Some years ago a lot of goldfield houses were trucked away because they were not worth anything. It was impossible to let them, but nobody seemed to worry about the people then. The Railway Department did not reduce the freights to benefit the people. I mention that because the same position might occur again. I hope it will not, but it might.

**Hon. T. Moore**: The railways carted them at a cheap rate.

**Hon. G. B. WOOD**: I tried to buy a house myself from one of the timber areas—from Jarrahdale, as a matter of fact—but found that the freight would cost as much as the house. Why control the rents of houses? Why not control the tariff at hotels? Why pick on rents? I do not know why we should not go to the Adelphi Hotel or the Palace Hotel and tell them that they may only charge 15s. a week. I do not see why one section of the people who have invested their money in houses should be penalised. No provision has been made in the Bill for houses which have been empty for long periods. The whole thing is unfair, and the Bill will defeat the purpose for which it was intended. Investors will put their money into other enterprises where they can get a reasonable rate of interest at no risk. I intend to vote against the second reading, and if it is passed I intend to move an amendment that the Bill shall apply only to the goldfields.

**HON. C. F. BAXTER** (East) [4.55]: This is one of the many Bills we have had before us from time to time which tend towards the way of compulsion. The less legislation of a compulsory nature which a country has the better it is for that country. The freer the people are the better. If I could see any redeeming feature in the Bill; if I considered that it was likely to relieve those persons who may be paying excessive rent, I would support it, but a thorough consideration will show that the effect of its application will be to increase rents and not reduce them. In the first place the valuation of a building has to be arrived at. How, and by whom? I take it that we will have another Government department set up to value these houses, when an application is

made on behalf of the tenant. That will involve heavy expenditure, and we shall continue to overload the State with more Government departments and civil servants. We shall soon have 50 per cent. of the people being employed by the State only. That is getting on the road to socialism.

Hon. G. W. Miles: We have that now.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Not quite. Having arrived at the valuation of a house certain allowances are made. The allowance to be made for maintenance has to be assessed, but how can the cost of repairs and maintenance of a house be arrived at?

Hon. A. Thomson: It depends upon the house.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There may be a house for which a tenant pays 25s. a week rent, and at the end of 12 months the landlord may have to expend over £100 in repairs. I know of one place which brought £2 a week. The tenant occupied it for 16 months, and it cost £174 to repair the damage which he and his family did to that building. It is impossible to arrive at a reasonable basis upon which to assess the cost of repairs and maintenance. There is no allowance made for the period when these buildings may be empty. I know of one person who has a group of 12 buildings. On the average one of those is empty for six out of 12 months and £40 has been written off for arrears on three in the last 12 months. All too frequently people live in one house and then go to another owing a week's rent which cannot be collected. For what is the use of attempting to prosecute for one week's rent? Again there is the question of agents' fees. Some people say that agents are unnecessary, but they are not. Agents' fees are about five per cent. That is not allowed for in the Bill, but that has all to come from the fair rent. I look upon the agent—although I have had no house to let—as a very necessary person. Anybody owning a building available for letting would be foolish to take upon himself the collecting of the rent of that building. Although there may be a percentage of tenants from whom it would be easy to collect rent, there are those from whom collection is most difficult. One has to be a man of iron, hardened to the last degree, to ignore some of the complaints put up by people to whom concessions should not be extended at all, because often those who put up the best case for lenient treatment are those who do

not deserve or need concessions. It is sound to allow five per cent. for agents' fees. It might be said that there is a shortage of homes, but I know one agent who has on his books 60 buildings erected for speculative purposes which cannot be sold.

Hon. A. Thomson: A lot of them could not be let either.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: They have not been up to date. There are hundreds of houses which have been erected for sale but have not been sold notwithstanding that the deposit asked is a nominal one and the homes could be purchased at a reasonable rental. Those that are let are returning four per cent. on the cost of the building. The Bill lays it down that not less than 1½ per cent. beyond the interest charged by the Commonwealth Bank may be charged for rent. Therefore it is easy to see that in a large proportion of cases in the metropolitan area there will, on that basis, be an increase all round. What would happen would be that the landlords would form a close preserve in that direction.

Hon. G. W. Miles interjected.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: There is much justification for doing something to relieve the position that has prevailed on the goldfields for several years. Undoubtedly rents there are excessive, but there is something to be said for that condition of affairs. One member stated that a number of homes on the goldfields had been bought for very small sums and were now returning enormous rents. The man who purchased a home on the goldfields for a small amount was very plucky to invest in house property there at the time.

Hon. J. Cornell: I know one man who paid £15 and has been getting £50 for the last four years.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am not justifying the charging of high rents; I believe that something should be done to protect the unfortunate people who cannot get a roof over their heads. At the same time we have to remember that the workers' homes scheme has been extended to the goldfields.

Hon. C. B. Williams: To a very limited extent.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If the Workers' Homes Board have restricted the number, there is nothing in my argument, but if there has been no restriction, why do not goldfields people apply for workers' homes? Possibly they feel that, although

the goldfields are prosperous at present, they will not continue so over the period necessary to repay the capital invested in a home.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Workers' Homes Board are showing good sense by not putting up too many homes on the goldfields.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The goldfields have declined at times, but let us hope that they will continue to be prosperous for a long period. Something, however, might occur to affect their prosperity, and it would not be sound business for any private person to engage in the speculative building of homes there.

Hon. C. B. Williams: The brewery people built a place costing £10,000.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: And probably the hon. member and his friends will help materially to pay for it without having any ownership in it.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It shows their faith in Kalgoorlie.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If I thought that the Bill would relieve tenants on the goldfields from paying excessive rent, I would view it more sympathetically.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why not let private enterprise erect such buildings?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: What encouragement is there for private enterprise to do so? I am not advocating the erection of homes by the Government.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I am only repeating your argument.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Would any private person build homes speculatively while a Bill of this nature is hanging over his head, to say nothing of the Distress for Rent Abolition Bill of last session?

Hon. G. W. Miles: You just put up an argument for the erection of workers' homes.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I put up no such argument. What encouragement is there at present for any person to erect a house for letting when there is no protection? An occupier can refuse to pay his rent, and the owner has to get an order for his eviction. If the occupier does not move, he might be sent to gaol for a fortnight and then return to the house. The landlord has no protection in that he cannot distrain for rent. On top of that we are to have legislation of this kind.

Hon. G. Fraser: Owners of houses were never so well off in their lives. You speak to agents who are handling the business.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If a person owes money for rent, the landlord cannot distrain, and how is he going to get the rent?

Hon. E. M. Hernan: The same as the butcher or the baker.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is all very well for the hon. member to talk like that.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Or the lawyer.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: He seems to get first cut. Members should take a serious view of the Bill and reject it, because it will injure the very people that we are told it is designed to protect. It is not a fair rents Bill.

Hon. G. Fraser interjected.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If some people were broader minded they would realise the effect of this measure. Possibly as the hon. member grows older he will acquire more experience and will be able to judge the situation better. As I consider the Bill would not be in the interests of the people it is intended to benefit, I shall vote against the second reading.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [5.7]: After having listened to the introductory speech of the Chief Secretary and the speeches of various members, I have come to the conclusion that this Bill will have the very opposite effect from that desired by the Government.

Hon. H. Seddon: What is that?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: To get more homes for the workers. Therefore I must vote against the second reading. I was interested in the figures supplied by Mr. Holmes, especially as he assured us that they came from an authentic source. Dealing with the metropolitan area, we learnt that homes are being erected more rapidly than the increase of population demands. That shows there is no necessity for the Bill in the metropolitan area, and if the Bill be passed the rate of building will be diminished and the worker in the metropolitan area will experience more difficulty to get a home.

Hon. G. Fraser: Do not you know that 90 per cent. of the homes being built in the metropolitan area are for purchasers and not for renting purposes?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: The law of supply and demand would operate and rectify the position, even if at present there were insufficient houses in the metropolitan area. Therefore I consider there is no demand for legislation of this kind for the metropolitan

area. Now let us consider the goldfields. Last year or the year before Mr. Cornell introduced a Bill to authorise the extension of the workers' homes scheme to the goldfields. On that occasion members seemed to be unanimously of opinion that repayment over a period of ten years was a fair thing for the goldfields. Any money advanced for the building of a home on the goldfields should be repaid in ten years to make it a safe proposition. Suppose we extended the period to 20 years, even if the goldfield—last for 20 years—

Hon. C. B. Williams: They have lasted for 43 or 44 years already.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: During that time a lot of homes erected on the goldfields have disappeared. Goldfields, unfortunately, have their ups and downs. Who is going to build houses as a speculation on the goldfields that will return only  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.? The Bill will have a most detrimental effect; in fact, the opposite effect from that mentioned by the Chief Secretary. For this reason, I am impelled to vote against the Bill, not only for the metropolitan area but also for the goldfields. There are other ways in which the Government could help the worker to obtain a home. I should like to see every worker in possession of a home of his own. The home life of the community would be very much more satisfactory than it is to-day if every worker possessed a home of his own, but I do not think this Bill will help in that direction. We have been informed that the New Zealand Government have a scheme for building 5,000 homes, but I understand they intend to charge from £1 to £1 13s. 6d. rent, less 2s. 6d. rebate if the rent is paid promptly. The homes to be provided for £1 a week are three-roomed flats. We do not want the Government of Western Australia to embark upon a scheme of that kind.

Hon. C. B. Williams: What is the cost of those homes?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I do not know.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Then do not mislead the House by making a bald statement.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Workers' homes in the metropolitan area may be obtained for a weekly payment of 19s. or 19s. 6d. I am in favour of a scheme of that kind, and am prepared to help the Government to extend it. I regret that Mr. Miles does not believe in extending the workers' homes scheme to the goldfields. Neither would I favour its

extension to the goldfields as a whole, but there are certain goldfields to which it could be safely extended on the basis of a home costing not more than £400 with the principal repayable over a period of ten years. That would be somewhat on the lines of Mr. Cornell's Bill, which I supported. If the Government adopt that scheme of providing homes for workers on the goldfields, so long as the period of repayment is ten years and the capital cost is limited to £400, I will help them to achieve that object.

**HON. C. B. WILLIAMS** (South) [5.13]:

I have not much to say on this question. Although I do not consider the Bill very satisfactory, I hope it will be passed by this House. The most satisfactory scheme would be to build workers' homes. When we suggest that remedy, however, the Government say they have no money. I say that Ministers have not over-much brains when they talk in that way. They have the timber and the bricks and men out of work and, in fact, everything required to provide homes. Surely Ministers, on the salaries they receive, should be able to muster enough brains amongst them to draw up a scheme that would be satisfactory. It is ridiculous for representatives of farming areas to talk about the goldfields. Some of the farmers have homes that have cost the State over £2,000, and the farmers have been granted long periods in which to repay their advances. In addition to the £2,000, we can add the money represented by the labour put into the property and the money that the farmers themselves have supplied. That shows what the State has done for the farmers. Now their properties have been reduced in value in some cases to £350, and they are allowed five years in which to begin the payment of the principal. This shows what a good landlord the State is.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Where has that happened?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The hon. member took an interest in parts of the State other than that which he represents he would discover for himself. See what has been done in the South-West for the group settlers. They were not asked to pay for their homes. Their homes were supplied for them together with hundreds of acres of land and cattle. Nothing was asked by way of rent or even interest, for a time, and for half what was

spent down there quite a number of suitable homes could have been built on the goldfields. They were fortunate indeed in the South-West because not only did they get homes but they got cows supplied.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Where were the hundreds of acres you are speaking about?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: The hon. member should know because it was he who took me down there and showed me those places. For the moment I cannot tell him where they are situated, but he should know that I am not exaggerating the position. I appreciated his kindness while he was showing me round the district. Of course I feel very sorry for those people now, but there is the position.

Hon. H. Tuckey: They are not earning over £4 a week.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: No, but they have homes over their heads, and they have cows and fresh milk, butter, and vegetables too if they have the energy to grow them, because there is plenty of water down there. In that respect the country is totally different from the goldfields, where hard Ministers insist on our paying 6s. per 1,000 gallons for water. What a difference between settlers in the South-West and the people who are on the goldfields. I do not say that the settlers in the South-West are well off, but they are well off at the expense of the State. If they are unable to earn enough to pay rent to the State, they have no right to be there. Either the land on which they are settled is no good, or the settlers themselves are no good. Some of the country, I admit, may be bad, but I suppose also the methods of some of the settlers are bad. If those people were on the goldfields they would be obliged to pay £70 or £80 for just a shelter over their heads. I draw the Country Party's attention to the position of the people on the goldfields and ask the members of that party to give support to the Bill. It looks as if it were to them just a pious measure, put up by Labour supporters knowing that the Upper House will not stand it. Really, the proper course to follow is for the Government to build suitable homes for the people on the goldfields. If we can do that for the settlers in the South-West, why should we not do it also for goldfields residents? Hon. members seem to think that the life of a goldfield is short, that it cannot go beyond seven or eight years. But have our goldfields not already lasted over 44 years, and are they not still

thriving? We know that for a time the goldfields were butchered and murdered, not because the value of the ore was not there, but because the mines were being robbed by the men in power and also because the machinery that was being used was out of date. Those were the reasons why mining went down. To-day the mechanical efficiency is a thousand times better than it was 10 years ago, and the mines are still going down on ore. Money can be found for a new power house and other works, but it seems impossible to be able to raise anything to establish the comfort of those who have to work on the mines. The basic wage on the goldfields is £4 7s., and the poor chap who receives that is forced to pay 30s. a week rent for the shanty he lives in. He is lucky, too, if he can get a house. So many now seem to be going back to the old English custom of several families living in one tenement. Australian ideas are very different from the English ideas, where families congregate under one roof. We do not want that kind of thing to increase out here. It is bad enough to know that people on the goldfields have to live in hovels for which they pay 25s. or 30s. a week rent, but it is ten times worse for two or three families to have to reside under the one roof. Members talk about the law of supply and demand. The demand is there all right but where is the supply? I urge members to pass the Bill. For myself I do not altogether like it because I consider the Government should erect homes for the workers on the goldfields. I have put it to the Chamber of Mines that homes should be built for the workers there and have urged it would be a means of assisting to reduce the costs of the industry. Homes should be built and a nominal rent charged, and the effect would be to bring down wages. A man earns £4 17s. a week and probably has to pay up to £2 a week to some landlord. That is wrong. The Arbitration Court, unfortunately, will not take into consideration the rent factor on the goldfields. The Government should build workers' homes on the goldfields, and many of them. I object to members saying that the life of the goldfields is short. The statement is ridiculous and stupid. They have not moved about as I have done, otherwise they would have found out for themselves. Some of the dumps are again being re-treated at a big profit.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Have not homes for miners been built by the Big Bell Company

and is not a rental of only 1s. a week being charged?

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Of course some people like to camp together; I do not know whether the hon. member would like to camp with someone in his room. You do not want George Miles and Charlie Williams in a camp together.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Not so much snobbery!

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: Working men like to be free and independent, and when together to be on friendly terms.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member had better confine his remarks to the Bill.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I was merely replying to an interjection. Members should not run down the goldfields, which have lasted already for 44 years and which still have a bright future. I contend it is a good proposition for the Government to build workers' homes on the goldfields, but in the meantime I intend to give my support to the Bill.

On motion by Hon. E. M. Heenan debate adjourned.

### BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

Mining Act Amendment (No. 2).

Legal Practitioners Act Amendment.

Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Act Amendment.

Received from the Assembly.

### ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL SHOW.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.30]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 12th October.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 5th October, 1937.*

	PAGE
Question: Railways, coal prices .....	1064
Bills: Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Act Amendment, 3B. ....	1064
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, Com. ....	1064
Road Transport Subsidy, 2B. ....	1099
Annual Estimates, Com. of Supply, Votes and Items discussed .....	1067
Minister for Justice .....	1067
Chief Secretary .....	1091
Adjournment: Royal Show .....	1101

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

### QUESTION—RAILWAYS, COAL PRICES.

Mr. WILSON asked the Minister for Railways: As the price of Newcastle coal has increased from 33s. 10d. in 1906 to 36s. 10d. in 1937, is it the intention of the Railway Department to grant a pro rata increase to the suppliers of Collie coal to the railways, so that the miners at Collie coalfields may receive an increase comparable with that received by the Newcastle coal miners, owing to the increase in price paid to the Newcastle coal suppliers for coal supplied to the W.A.G.R.?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: No. The price of Collie coal is governed by the Davidson award.

### BILL — FREMANTLE MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS AND ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACT AMENDMENT.

*Third Reading.*

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

### BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

*In Committee.*

Resumed from the 30th September: Mr. Sleeman in the Chair. The Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Progress was reported before consideration had been given to the proposed new clauses.

New clause:

Mr. DONEV: I move—

That a new clause, to stand as Clause 6, be inserted as follows:—"Section 38 of the prin-