

Legislative Council,

Friday, 14th February, 1902.

Paper presented—Question: Railway Station (Perth), Electric Lighting—Question: Royal Commissions, Powers as to Witnesses—Roads Act Amendment Bill, Assembly's Amendments—Appropriation Bill, third reading (postponed)—Wild Cattle Nuisance Act Amendment Bill, in Committee, Bill arrested—Judges' Pension Act Amendment Bill, Council's Amendment (Bill dropped)—Public Service Act Repeal Bill, first reading—Metropolitan Waterworks Amendment Bill, first reading—Municipal Institutions Act Amendment Bill, first reading—Coal Mines Regulation Bill, second reading, in Committee, progress—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: Journal of the Calvert Exploring Expedition, 1896-7.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

QUESTION—RAILWAY STATION (PERTH), ELECTRIC LIGHTING.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What is the cost to the Government for electric current for lighting the Railway Station and yards at Perth, including depreciation and superintendence; 2, If the Government is importing new machinery to replace present plant in use at Electric Lighting Works in Perth.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied:—1, 8·6 pence per unit. This charge includes supervision, depreciation, interest on capital, renewals, supplying of lamps, alterations and necessary small works not debited to capital. 2, No. The Government has imported new plant to provide duplicates, as the present plant is overloaded.

QUESTION—ROYAL COMMISSIONS, POWERS AS TO WITNESSES.

HON. F. T. CROWDER asked the Minister for Lands: If a Royal Commission appointed by Parliament can examine witnesses under oath, and compel the attendance of witnesses.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: A Royal Commission can examine witnesses under oath, but cannot compel them to attend.

ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY'S AMENDMENTS.

Schedule of ten amendments made by the Assembly now considered, in Committee.

No. 1.—Clause 12, add the following words, in line three: "In estimating the net annual value of gold-mining or mineral leases, no regard shall be had to any metals or minerals contained or supposed to be contained therein."

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the amendment made by the Assembly be agreed to.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Unless mining machinery and buildings were exempted, some companies would have to pay enormously, as the plant on some of the leases was valued at £100,000. He moved that after "any" in the Assembly's amendment, the words be inserted: "mining machinery or mining machinery buildings situate thereon or used in connection therewith, and to any."

HON. F. T. CROWDER moved that the Chairman leave the Chair.

Motion put, and a division taken with the following result:

Ayes	7
Noes	10

Majority against ... 3

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. R. G. Burges	Hon. G. Bellingham
Hon. F. T. Crowder	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. G. E. Dempster	Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. G. Randall	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. J. E. Richardson	Hon. A. Jameson
Hon. H. J. Saunders	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. R. Laurie	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
(Teller).	Hon. C. Sommers
	Hon. J. M. Speed
	Hon. J. T. Glowrey
	(Teller)

Motion thus negatived.

Amendment put and passed.

Question (as amended) put and passed.

No. 2.—Clause 13, line 6, strike out the words "30th day of June," and insert "31st day of December" in lieu:

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the amendment be agreed to.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: If this amendment were agreed to, a man who had not paid his rates on the 19th of December would not be allowed to vote for the whole of the next year. The provision did not cover a half year, but a whole year. Surely this must be a mistake.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Goldfields elections were held in December.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The idea was to change, by means of Clauses 24 and 25, the period of elections. The 30th of June was the end of the Government financial year, and therefore it had been thought well to rearrange matters in so far as the date of elections was concerned. At present, elections were held in July instead of December. There might be something against the amendment, inasmuch as the policy of the boards was to carry out the whole of their works during the winter months. The amendment would necessarily change the works policy of the boards; although, of course, the amendment was advisable from a financial aspect. The question was whether the financial arrangements or the works methods of the boards were the more important.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Had the Council power to alter the Bill, as well as the Assembly's amendments? If the measure were passed in this House, still it could not be brought into law because from beginning to end it was *ultra vires*. Under the Bill, roads boards would retire at the commencement of June, and there would be no machinery to re-elect until December. Thus no boards would be in existence from June until December.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was the hon. member speaking on the amendment before the Committee?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Yes. These remarks went to show that the amendments would not make the Bill a workable measure. Clause 31 provided that voting papers should not be counted unless they purported to vote for the full number of members, whereas Clause 32, Sub-clause 2, distinctly permitted plumping. The whole Bill was self-contradictory, and would prove absolutely unworkable.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's remarks were in the nature of a second-reading speech, and were not directed to the particular amendment.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: All the dates mentioned in the Bill were absolutely wrong. The measure could not come into force, and we had no power to amend it.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The only manner in which the Bill could be amended afterwards would be by sugges-

tion from the Governor. Only the Assembly's amendments could be dealt with now, or a message could be received from the Governor, later, making certain suggestions.

HON. C. SOMMERS: There were difficulties in the way, and he moved that progress be reported.

Motion put and passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

APPROPRIATION BILL.

THIRD READING (POSTPONEMENT).

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the Bill be read a third time.

HON. F. T. CROWDER moved, as an amendment, that the third reading be postponed until the next sitting. There were several important matters which had gone to the Assembly to which this House required replies; and if the Appropriation Bill were passed to-day, Parliament could be prorogued immediately, so that this House might not obtain answers to the matters which had gone forward. The Bill should be held until satisfaction had been received from another place.

Amendment put and passed, and the third reading postponed.

WILD CATTLE NUISANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the previous day.

Clause 2—Notice of capture to be given to the police:

HON. J. W. HACKETT: There was no particular object in pressing this measure forward. Some members felt strongly that certain persons might be allowed to add to their income by capturing wild horses and selling them to the Zoo. He moved that the Chairman leave the Chair.

Motion put and passed, and the Bill arrested.

JUDGES' PENSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT RECONSIDERED.

The legislative Council having made an amendment in the Bill, and the Assembly having disagreed to the same, the reasons for disagreeing were now considered, in Committee.

HON. G. RANDELL: The only way possible to deal with the Bill was to move, in accordance with Rule 288, that the Bill be laid aside. He moved accordingly.

HON. F. T. CROWDER moved, as an amendment, that the Council do not insist on their amendment. He did not desire to see the Bill laid aside, but rather see the measure passed without the amendment. There was some benefit to be derived from the Bill as first received from another place, but if the motion moved by Mr. Randell were carried, there would be no Bill at all, which was the desire, no doubt, of another place.

HON. G. RANDELL: It was not possible to do what the hon. member suggested. The Bill was in a peculiar position, which had never occurred before. The rule was very clear. If we sent the Bill back to the Assembly saying the Council did not insist on the amendment, that would virtually have the same effect as laying the Bill aside, because neither the Assembly nor the Council could now restore the Bill to its original condition. The manly course was to take the responsibility ourselves, seeing that a mistake had been made in not linking the Bill with the principal Act. Members would be maintaining the dignity of the House by carrying the motion he had moved. The Bill must be laid aside, for not even the Governor could restore the Bill to its original position.

HON. J. M. SPEED: Could the Committee farther amend the clause?

THE CHAIRMAN: An amendment could be made, but practically it would be inoperative—would have no effect. The proper course was to carry the motion moved by Mr. Randell.

Amendment (Mr. Crowder's) put and negatived.

Question put and passed, and the Bill laid aside.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT REPEAL BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, read a first time.

METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, read a first time.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, read a first time.

COAL MINES REGULATION BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. E. M. CLARKE, in moving the second reading, said: It is not my intention to take up much of the time of hon. members in speaking on this Bill. The measure is before them, and it has been before the country for some months past. The report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the Bill is also available. As the result of its investigations, the select committee recommended the adoption of the Bill with amendments suggested by various mine managers at Collie. These amendments, with few exceptions, have been adopted in another place. It is natural that a Bill of this kind should contain some clauses which are in favour of the men, and therefore against the mine owners and managers. The latter, of course, entertain objection to these clauses. The report of the select committee, I must specially mention, is favourable to the particular clauses. The most important part of the Bill is that dealing with accidents liable to happen in a coal mine. From returns it appears that many accidents have happened during the last few months, and it follows that unless preventive measures be taken more will occur. The object of the Bill is to minimise accidents by making rules for the safe working of mines, and providing penalties for the infringement of the rules. I shall not enter into a detailed exposition of all the clauses of the Bill, since these will come up for consideration in Committee. One provision to which I may direct particular attention is that establishing an accident fund. Nothing, I think, can more recommend a measure to the sympathies of hon. members than a provision whereby men who meet with slight accidents, such as incapacitate them from work for a short period, are compensated. Nothing could be more laudable. Another commendable feature of the Bill is that it makes ample provision for sanitation. Legislation in that direction must certainly be admitted to be perfectly safe.

Another important matter dealt with is ventilation. It must be admitted that in small mines, such as those at Collie, the managers are somewhat hampered by want of funds, and hence may result a tendency, not to scamp hygienic provisions, but still to devote to them less than their due meed of attention. We are legislating for the future as well as for the present, and our object should be to pass a law which will make the mines workable with safety. Our object should be to minimise accidents and to provide, as far as practicable, for sanitation. Of course I do not claim that the Bill is perfect in every respect. To draft an absolutely perfect piece of legislation would require superhuman skill and knowledge. I do claim, however, that the Bill is a big stride in the right direction. If, after the measure is passed, practical experience should show that it is defective, it can be amended by farther legislation. If we now devote our efforts to obtaining the framework of a workable Bill, we shall ultimately be able to attain to something like a perfect piece of legislation. I ask hon. members to pass the second reading. Of course, they will be justified in challenging every clause as it comes up in Committee, and at that stage we shall be able to see what is the value of the Bill. At present, I ask hon. members merely to accept the Bill in its main features. Some of these I shall do my best to preserve; but others, I frankly admit, I am willing to forego. I repeat, the time to remedy any defects is in Committee.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): I have to call the attention of the House to the fact that this Bill has been drawn more with a view of protecting the employee than of protecting the employer. All hon. members will agree that it is our duty to carefully consider measures, and to pass nothing that will be injurious to either worker or employer. It must be patent to everyone that the interests of both classes are practically identical; therefore the interests of the one class must be protected as much as those of the other. I trust that every clause of the Bill will be carefully considered in Committee, and that where it is evident the interests of the employer have not been conserved, hon. members will endeavour to make the Bill safe. It

has been asserted that the gentleman who introduced the measure in another place stated no regard had been paid to the interests of the employer in this measure. The gentleman expressed himself as caring not a button how the employer fared. That is an improper attitude to take in endeavouring to frame laws. The duty of Parliament is to consider equally the interests of all parties.

HON. F. T. CROWDER (East): I shall support the second reading of the Bill, in the hope that when in Committee hon. members will give every clause careful consideration. If time will not allow of due attention to the details of the Bill, it had better be laid aside. I am quite willing to devote my time to a careful scrutiny of the measure; but, seeing the importance of the subject dealt with, I consider it would have been far better if the Bill had come before us at an earlier stage of the session. We have had but little time to go into the measure since it was read here for the first time last night. Most of us, I daresay, have carefully perused it. I see some difficulties in it. For one thing, the Bill means giving the Government power to spend more money in appointing boards and inspectors. These inspectors will have secretaries and assistants, and so the cost of Government will go on increasing. One clause of the Bill which needs special consideration is Clause 72, under which mine owners are compelled to contribute to an accident fund, to the extent of one half-penny per ton on the total output of their mines. [Clause read.] Later, the Bill provides that employees shall also subscribe to the fund. I am willing to listen to any argument that can be brought to bear in favour of this provision, which, however, does not altogether commend itself to me. The Workers' Compensation Bill has passed this House, and will no doubt become law very soon. In view of that circumstance I fail to see the necessity for Clause 72. Undoubtedly all mine-owners will, under the Workers' Compensation Bill, be compelled to insure against accident to their employees. Therefore, I consider it unfair to cast on them the additional burden of paying one half-penny per ton on their total output as a contribution to an accident fund. I see no reason why the mine owners should be subjected to a double tax in that respect.

While contributing the one half-penny per ton they will still be liable to suits for damages in case of loss of life, or loss of limb. The Bill on the whole is simply a machinery Bill, dealing generally with the working of coal mines, and on a good many of its clauses I am unable to form a judgment. I have read the evidence taken by the select committee which inquired into the Bill, and I think that committee did exceedingly good work, and went to a great deal of trouble to obtain information. The outcome of its labours is the Bill as amended. The object of the amendments has been to equalise matters between the employers and employees. Personally, I am disposed to regard the measure as pressing somewhat hardly on the employers. From the report of the select committee I gather that this measure is much on the same lines as the corresponding Acts of New South Wales and Victoria. The mines in those States, however, have been in existence for many years, and legislation answering their requirements may not be applicable to our mines, which are only in their development state. I note that the double tunnelling and air shaft provision is not to apply for twelve months after work has started on a mine. Still it may be that our mines are not in a position, and may not be for two or three years, to need the requirements of the Bill. So far as I can find out in the limited time at my disposal, the only objection the employers have to the Bill is that the measure is not required at the present time. They say that in a few years when the mines are farther developed the Bill will be a very good one. That is a point for the Committee to consider; still the Bill should not be passed through the House in a hurry. There are many questions that require calm consideration at our own hands. If members are prepared to give that consideration I am prepared to give my time to make the best we can of the Bill. I would sooner give that time and see the Bill pass than allow the Bill to go over without discussion until next session.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): The gentlemen who have made themselves responsible for the drafting of the Bill, if they had heard the debate this afternoon, must have felt satisfied with their labours. The points which may be taken exception

to on behalf of the earnest supporters of the rights of the employers are very few indeed, and may be counted on the fingers of one hand. There may be some questions open to debate, but the main portion of the Bill where it is considered and examined into will impress members that a judicious and fair-minded attempt has been made to meet a case that is crying out in many directions for a remedy. The real object of introducing the Bill is that it has been discovered that the Mines Regulation Act of 1895 is not sufficient to meet the circumstances of a coal mine. All over the world coal-mining is considered an occupation which has to be made the subject of differential legislation. The dangers connected with coal-mining are of a peculiar character, and they are dealt with by special provisions solely peculiar to the industry. This Bill is an earnest and legitimate attempt to deal with this difficulty. All I can say is that the conditions under which the miners are employed at Collie distinctly call for legislative interference. The rules in force in other parts are not enforced there, and the men suffer from a degree of exhaustion and bad air, and other conditions which are not known in other parts of Australia. The Bill is also necessary to bring us into line with other parts of Australia. There is very little indeed in the Bill that is new; it is mostly a copy of Acts which have been working in other States, and on the whole have been considered to act fairly enough both to the interests of the miner and the employer. It is not necessary to labour the matter of the second reading, as I am sure the House will unanimously pass it. The Bill will be found to commend itself to members, therefore I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 3, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 4—Interpretation of terms:

HON. G. RANDALL: The word "engineer" was used in the Bill, and should be defined. He moved that at the end of the clause the following be added: "Engineer means a duly qualified engineer."

HON. J. M. SPEED: Was this amendment necessary? Some men held certifi-

cates to run engines, but were not certificated mining engineers.

HON. G. RANDELL: The word "engineer" was given a very wide meaning in this country. Every engine-driver, stoker, or fitter claimed to be an engineer. Such a man was not required on this board; therefore it was necessary to define what was meant by "engineer."

HON. J. M. SPEED: Why not say "duly certificated engineer?"

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Engineers in Western Australia were not certificated. The only papers an engineer held were those of his apprenticeship. The amendment by Mr. Randell would meet the case.

HON. J. M. SPEED: "Duly qualified mining engineer" would meet the case.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: There were men in the country who called themselves "mining engineers" because they managed a mine, but they were not engineers in the strict meaning of the term.

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

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Persons not to be employed below ground more than eight hours in any day:

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER moved that in sub-clause 2, line 4, "returns" be struck out and the words "is relieved at the face" be inserted in lieu.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: It was to be hoped the amendment would not be pressed. It was the rule in all mines in Australia that miners were paid from the time they went to the mouth of a shaft until they returned to it. It was distinctly unfair to make a miner's time commence from the time when he arrived at the face, which in some cases might be two minutes and in others 20 minutes from the time of arriving at the mouth of the shaft.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Mr. Dempster's amendment represented a fair compromise. If the time expended in descending into a mine should be taken into account, then the time for coming up should not be allowed. Under clause 7, an engine-driver had to work eight hours over and above the time occupied in lighting and withdrawing fire. What was fair in the case of engine-drivers was fair in the case of miners.

HON. E. M. CLARKE: The object of the clause was that a man should be paid from the time he presented himself at the pit's mouth until he returned to the pit's mouth. To walk down the face of the mine with a kit of tools on one's back was a hard 10 minutes' work.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: It was to be hoped that Mr. Dempster's amendment would be carried. The word "returns" in sub-clause 2 was unsuitable, allowing, as it did, of several interpretations. There were certain hours at which shifts began work and left off work, and it would be fair to fix the working time in accordance with those hours.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: The amendment was so reasonable that he wondered at the Committee's hesitation in passing it. It would be unfair to the mine owner to compel him to pay for the time a man spent in standing about while waiting to be relieved from duty.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The clause, unless amended, might lead to men loitering about, and running the risk of being blown up by a shot exploding in the mine.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: The clause should be passed as it stood. As had been remarked, a man might be relieved at a point two or three hundred yards distant from the shaft. The miner should be paid from the moment he entered the mine until the moment he left it. This was the practice in gold-mines, and there was no reason why it should not obtain in coal mines.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: What about the engine drivers?

HON. G. RANDELL: The parallel Mr. Crowder had drawn between the case of the miner and that of the engine-driver was inadmissible. In all businesses an engine-driver had to be at his place before other employees to do the acts enumerated in Clause 7; and his case was, therefore, an exception. In the building trade, for example, a man was considered to have started work when he arrived at the place where the work was done. In the same way, a miner's time ought to be counted from the moment he arrived at the pit's mouth, ready to be lowered or to travel down the shaft, until such time as he returned to the pit's mouth; because during the whole of that period he was in the service of his employer. The meaning

of the word "returns" in this sub-clause was not perfectly clear.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: The addition of the words "to the pit's mouth" would make the meaning clearer.

HON. G. RANDELL: Yes; that would be better.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The clause should be allowed to remain as it stood. A large proportion of men working underground were not employed at the face at all, and thus their cases were not provided for by the amendment. It was useless to expect coal miners to accept less favourable conditions than were granted to gold miners. The adoption of the amendment would simply mean that an amending Bill would be before the House next session.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: It would be well if Sub-clause 2 were struck out altogether. Sub-clause 1 provided that no person should be employed below ground for more than eight consecutive hours at any time, or for more than 48 hours in any week, except in cases of emergency. The Collie coal mines, of course, were still in their early stages; but in large coal mines in the other States and in England men lived underground for a week at a time, without coming to the surface at all. Assuming that the same practice were eventually adopted here, would the men have to be paid for the whole time they remained underground?

HON. H. J. SAUNDERS: Sub-clause 1 distinctly stated that a man was not to work for more than eight consecutive hours at a time. To meet that difficulty, Mr. Dempster's amendment might be put in these words, "until he returns to the surface." This change would overcome the difficulty and give effect to the evident intention of the Bill.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: Coal mining being an extremely dangerous occupation, the men engaged in it should be afforded every protection. If the amendment were carried, mine-owners were absolved from liability in respect of accidents which might occur to men after they had completed their working time at the face. The clause should be passed as it stood.

Amendment put and negatived.

HON. H. J. SAUNDERS moved that at the end of Sub-clause 2, the words "to the surface" be inserted.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: No necessity to alter the clause. Three shifts of miners were employed to work in a mine, and the manager arranged the shifts to suit the convenience of the men and the mine.

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

Clauses 7 to 11, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 12—Payment of persons employed in mines by weight:

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Had a miner to be paid for everything he got from the mine, whether stones, rubbish, or coal? This appeared to be the case according to the clause.

HON. E. M. CLARKE: If a miner filled his skip with stones, the mine manager might say he would not pay the miner for that. The clause allowed an agreement to be come to between the manager and the miner.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: If no agreement were made between the manager and the miner, the manager would have to pay the employee for all he got from the mine, whether stones, coal, rubbish, or whatever it was.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 13 to 22, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 23—Constitution of board of examiners:

HON. F. T. CROWDER: What was to be the cost to the country of the board? Was it to be a paid board? And what were the members to be paid?

HON. E. M. CLARKE: There was no desire to rush this Bill through. He moved that the clause be postponed, so that he might get the information.

Motion put and passed, and the clause postponed.

Clause 24—Certificates of competency of managers and under-managers:

HON. J. M. SPEED: As clause 23 had been postponed, and as the following clauses up to and inclusive of clause 36 were consequential, he moved that clauses 24 to 36 inclusive be postponed.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: What for?

HON. E. M. CLARKE: Not being in a position to say how the board would be paid, or whether they were to be paid at all, he would agree to the postponement so that information might be obtained.

HON. J. M. SPEED: It would be absurd to go on with the clauses until it

was known whether clause 23 would be passed.

Motion put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	13
Noes	5

Majority for ... 8

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. R. G. Burges	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. A. B. Kidson
Hon. F. T. Crowder	Hon. G. Randall
Hon. C. E. Dempster	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. J. T. Glowrey	(Teller).
Hon. A. Jameson	
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	
Hon. J. E. Richardson	
Hon. H. J. Saunders	
Hon. C. Sommers	
Hon. J. M. Speed	
Hon. G. Bellingham	
(Teller).	

Motion thus passed, and Clauses 24 to 36 postponed.

Clause 37—agreed to.

HON. E. M. CLARKE moved that progress be reported.

Motion put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	10
Noes	8

Majority for ... 2

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. G. Bellingham	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. R. G. Burges	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. F. T. Crowder	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. J. T. Glowrey	Hon. A. B. Kidson
Hon. A. Jameson	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. G. Randall	Hon. J. M. Speed
Hon. J. E. Richardson	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. H. J. Saunders	(Teller).
Hon. C. E. Dempster	
(Teller).	

Motion thus passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again

ADJOURNMENT.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the House at its rising do adjourn until the next Monday, at 4:30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned accordingly at 22 minutes past 6 o'clock until the next Monday.

Legislative Assembly.

Friday, 14th February, 1902.

Paper presented—Vaccination, Rooms Inadequate—Question: Kalgoorlie Hospital Site—Question: University Exhibition, Examination Papers—Question: State Mining Engineer, Applicants—Question: Military Contingents—Land Act Amendment Bill, third reading—Metropolitan Waterworks Amendment Bill, third reading—Municipal Institutions Act Amendment Bill, third reading—North Perth Tramways Bill (postponement)—Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill, Council's Amendments—Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Amendment Bill, Council's suggestion—Gaols Act Amendment Bill, second reading, in Committee, third reading—Midland Railway Inquiry, Joint Committee's Report—Perth Suburban Lands (Subinco) Exchange Bill, second reading, etc.—Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Amendment Bill (No. 2), in Committee; Bill arrested—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Journal of the Calvert Scientific Exploring Expedition, 1896-7.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

QUESTION—VACCINATION, ROOMS INADEQUATE.

MR. DAGLISH asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Is he aware that the accommodation in the public vaccination rooms is quite inadequate, and that much annoyance and worry are inflicted upon mothers having their children vaccinated, owing to the crowding of those who have been operated on with those awaiting operation? 2, Will he take steps to have this remedied.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: I am not aware as to the first question. I will inquire as to the second.

QUESTION—KALGOORLIE HOSPITAL SITE.

MR. J. RESIDE asked the Colonial Secretary: Whether the site of the present hospital in Kalgoorlie was ever objected to by the Kalgoorlie Municipal Council. If so, when?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: There is no record of any such objection. In June last the Kalgoorlie Municipal Council interviewed the Hon. the Premier and protested against the removal of the hospital from Kalgoorlie, and have recently forwarded a petition making the same protest.