

workers should wait so long for a hearing. I understand the judges of the Federal court expressed regret that they did not have this particular power. I am sorry the Attorney General is opposing this new clause because it only gives the court discretionary power to grant a retrospective award when the court thinks such an award should be granted.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	34

Majority against .. 8

AYES

Mr. Collier
Mr. Jones
Mr. Mullany

Mr. Troy
Mr. Willcock
Mr. O'Loghlen
(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Broun
Mr. Draper
Mr. DuF
Mr. George
Mr. Harrison
Mr. Hickmott
Mr. Maloy

Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Money
Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Thomson
Mr. Willmott
Mr. Hardwick
(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

RESOLUTION—RETURNED SOLDIERS AND RAILWAY PASSES.

Council's Message.

Message received from the Council requesting concurrence in the following resolution:—"That in the opinion of this House the Government should (1) grant free transit over the State tramways to ex-members of the A.I.F. who are blinded or totally and permanently incapacitated, or eligible for full membership in the Maimed and Limbless Men's Association; (2) and in the event of the request made by the Federal Executive of the Returned Soldiers' League to the Federal Government being definitely refused, grant to ex-members of the A.I.F. free railway transit provided that they are (a) blinded or totally and permanently incapacitated; (b) inmates of or attending for treatment at military hospitals, sanatoria, convalescent homes, and hostels; (c) eligible for full membership in the Maimed and Limbless Men's Association."

BILL—PRICES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT AND CONTINUANCE.

Message received from the Council notifying that it had agreed to the amendments made by the Assembly.

House adjourned at 11.53 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 1st December, 1920.

Question: Wheat supplies for poultry farmers	1975
Leave of absence	1975
Bills: Factories and Shops, Revived	1975
Sale of Liquor Regulation Act Continuance, 3R.	1980
Licensing Act Amendment Continuance, 3R.	1980
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 1R.	1980
Innkeepers, 2R., Com., report	1980
Meekatharra-Horseshoe Railway, 2R.	1980
Railways Classification Board, 2R., Com.	1980
Motion: Electrical Energy; to inquire by Royal Commission	1980

QUESTION—WHEAT, SUPPLIES FOR POULTRY FARMERS.

Hon. J. DUFFELL asked the Honorary Minister: 1, In view of the decision of the Government to fix the price of f.a.q. wheat for local consumption at 9s. per bushel free on rails metropolitan basis, in the event of the wheat pool being continued, will such wheat be sold for poultry feed at the same price? 2, If not, why not? 3, What provision will be made to see that adequate supplies of suitable wheat are available for poultry farmers? 4, At what price will such supplies be obtainable?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: 1, No. 2, It is anticipated that there will be sufficient low grade wheat available for use as feed for poultry. This can be bought direct from growers or from the Wheat Scheme. 3, Facilities will be afforded poultry farmers to obtain inferior wheat direct from the growers at prices mutually suitable, and from the Wheat Scheme at fair dock from average value of f.a.q. pool wheat. Whether such supplies will be adequate will depend on the demand for wheat in comparison with demand for substitute feed at different prices. 4, Answered by No. 3.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. T. Moore, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to the Hon. J. W. Hickey (Central) on the ground of ill-health.

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS.

Revived.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.34]: I move—

That the Committee stage of the Factories and Shops Bill be revived at the stage at which the Chairman left the Chair.

Point of Order.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I rise to a point of order. We have a Standing Order bearing on this motion and it distinctly says

that a motion "that the Chairman do now leave the Chair" will, if carried, supersede the proceedings of a Committee; but the Committee may on motion after notice be revived for a future day. Standing Order 99 reads—

No notice of motion shall be given after the Council shall have proceeded to the business of the day, as set down on the Notice Paper, unless by leave of the Council.

It will be within the recollection of members that notice of this motion was given after a considerable amount of business had been done, and in the circumstances I would point out, though I do not wish to take any advantage of it or prevent debate in any way, that it might be as well to be quite clear as to how we are going to proceed.

The PRESIDENT: In answer to the hon. member, speaking strictly according to the letter of the Standing Orders, the contention might have something in it, but it has become the practice in this House for notices to be given during the business of the House and, therefore, I would not rule the motion out of order on the ground suggested.

Debate resumed.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: With regard to the point raised by Sir Edward Wittenoom, it would have been a matter of indifference to me personally if the point had been taken, and if the motion had been ruled out of order, because I should then have found it necessary to give notice to-morrow, and had that been denied me I should have given notice for the succeeding sitting of the House, which would have had the effect of hanging up the debate over the week-end. I have found on many occasions that the hanging up of a debate over the week-end has allowed for an expression of public opinion, and I can assure the hon. member that I would have nothing to fear from an expression of public opinion on this question. Therefore it would have suited me as well as if the point had been taken. The motion is intended to meet a very extraordinary and, I may say, absolutely unprecedented position that has arisen as a result of the motion of yesterday, when the Chairman was moved out of the Chair. I confess that I was taken, entirely by surprise, and one reason for my surprise was that it had been suggested to me by one hon. member, who I presume had some knowledge of the course that was to be adopted, that it might be desirable, in view of the large number of amendments on the Notice Paper, that the Bill should be referred to a select committee of this House for the purpose of arranging these proposed amendments in a convenient order. Consequently, I say it was a great surprise to me to find that such an attitude should have been taken up. I would ask hon. members to consider how their action is likely to appeal to the public. After all, we are the servants of the public, and therefore

are entitled to consider how the public will regard the action taken by this House. The course laid down for the consideration of public Bills is well known to hon. members. The first reading is a purely formal matter, but the second reading is provided for the acceptance or rejection of the principle of the Bill. That is the object of the second reading—the acceptance or rejection of the principle of the Bill. That this is a proper course must be obvious on the very slightest consideration, because if we reject a Bill on the second reading, we reject it after debate, and after having had an opportunity to give to the public our reasons for rejecting the measure. What did this House do in connection with this Bill? The House passed the second reading of the Bill without a division. Amongst all those who spoke there was only one member who intimated opposition to the second reading. This hon. member did say that, if he thought he could get sufficient support, he would move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months. Apart from that, however, members without supporting the Bill in its entirety and while reserving to themselves the right to move amendments in Committee, approved of the principle of the Bill, and the Bill passed its second reading without a division. How are the public likely to regard yesterday's action after that—to pass the second reading without a division, adopting the principle at the time when it was open to members to give their reasons for rejecting the principle, and then at a subsequent stage to throw out the Bill on a motion that does not permit of any debate, and when members cannot give to the public their reasons for rejecting the Bill? I put it to members that this is a most extraordinary attitude for a House of review to adopt. The public will consider it an extraordinary attitude, too. We accepted the second reading of the measure, after having had an opportunity to give reasons for and against the principle of the Bill. Some members accepted the Bill by saying they intended to support the second reading; others approved of the general principle, but desired to make certain amendments in Committee; others silently acquiesced in accepting the principle of the Bill at the stage when it was open to them to give their reasons for accepting or rejecting it.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Did you never know of a Bill being thrown out on the third reading?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes; it is competent on the third reading for members to give their reasons for throwing out a Bill, but after members had accepted the principle of this Bill and at a stage when it was not competent to give their reasons for rejecting the Bill, they threw it out. I ask members to consider how an independent public are likely to judge an action of that kind, whether they are likely to regard it as being in accord with the principles of a House of review. I have looked for the reasons which actuated hon. members in the

attitude they adopted. Of course they had no opportunity to give their reasons yesterday on a motion which, without any disrespect, might be termed a sand-bagging motion. The only reasons I have been able to find are those advanced by Sir Edward Wittenoom in the Press this morning. The hon. member said that he and other hon. members—which suggests that the matter had been discussed and considered beforehand—

Hon. R. J. Lynn: A caucus meeting!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: He and other members supporting him considered the measure unworkable and not in the best interests of the community. I submit that these would have been excellent reasons, if they could have been substantiated, for throwing out the Bill on the second reading. But in what position do members now place themselves? They place themselves in this position: they approved of the second reading of a Bill which they knew to be unworkable and contrary to the best interests of the community. They were not prepared to give their reasons why they thought it unworkable or contrary to the best interests of the community. They approved of the second reading when they could have given their reasons, and threw the Bill out at a stage when they could not give their reasons. They could not have given their reasons yesterday even if they had desired so to do.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You introduced the Bill to the House and then gave notice of 57 amendments.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I shall come to that point. The hon. member, with his usual exaggeration, says I gave notice of 57 amendments. I have not given notice of 57 amendments, but I shall deal exhaustively with the question of the amendments which I have put forward and with the utterly improper amendments that had no right to be put on the Notice Paper, added by members to create an atmosphere which might justify the unprecedented attitude they took up.

Hon. J. Duffell: You have given notice of 49 amendments.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Mr. Lovekin said if he could get members to support him, he would move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months. His attitude one can understand and respect, even though one does not agree with it. But the position is entirely different as regards those members who approved of many of the principles of the Bill, and expressed warm sympathy with some portions of the Bill and declared their intention of trying to secure an amendment of other portions of it, and who then, by this vote on which they were not allowed to give their reasons, set out to destroy the Bill. They are in an entirely different position, as are also those members who silently acquiesced in the passing of the second reading, when they had an opportunity to tell the public and their constituents why they approved of the Bill, and then

sought to throw it out in a way in which their reasons could not be questioned.

Hon. J. Duffell: Did you say something about a somersault?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I did not say anything about a somersault.

Hon. A. H. Panton: The hon. member has got that on his mind.

Hon. J. Duffell: Do not make any mistake about that.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It was also said by Sir Edward Wittenoom in the Press that it was the intention of those who voted with him to introduce another Bill aiming not only at the early closing of shops, but at other matters affecting industrial conditions. What are we to assume from that? That this Bill, which has received the careful consideration for a period of years of the department charged with its administration—a department not of partial men, but of impartial men familiar with their work; a department who have escaped public criticism on every side, who have been commended from all sides for the way in which they carry out their work—this Bill, which is the work of that department, which is a Bill whereon the officers of the Crown Law Department have spent many hours and even many days, a Bill to which a select committee of the Legislative Assembly gave several weeks, this Bill is to be cast aside, and in its place is to be substituted a Bill drafted apparently on the spur of the moment by Sir Edward Wittenoom and his supporters. Is it likely that that Bill is going to be a more perfect instrument than the one we have now before us, or that that Bill will lend itself more readily to amendments in the interests of the community generally than the one we have before us? Is it likely that a Bill of that kind would meet with a cordial reception in another place, especially after this House had, in a manner that I repeat is absolutely without precedent, turned down the Bill on which the select committee of another place had spent a great deal of time—a Bill which came to us, not as the result of close divisions in another place—and this is a point that is worth the while of hon. members to keep in mind—but with the general approval of all parties in another place? I do not say for one moment that everybody in another place got exactly what he wanted in that Bill. That was not the case, and that never will be the case as long as we have parties. However, the Bill came to us with the general approval of another place, and the circumstances of the case were not such as might justify this House in taking extraordinary action. The case would be entirely different if the Bill came to us from a bare majority in another place, and on the eve of a general election, when the House might say it was justified in throwing out the Bill so that the electors might have an opportunity of declaring what their wishes really are. But, I repeat, this Bill came to us with the

general approval of another place. Is it likely that another place would be prepared to see that Bill tossed incontinently aside and in its place some other measure, a measure aiming not only at the early closing of shops, but at many other matters affecting industrial conditions, and propounded by Sir Edward Wittenoom and his friends?

Hon. R. J. Lynn: Was not another Bill similar to this rejected on another occasion?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I will explain to the hon. member what happened and how the House took somewhat similar action and how then members pleaded with the Minister in charge of the Bill to reinstate it so as to get them out of the hole in which they found themselves.

Hon. J. Cunningham: Not forgetting your own action.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I was not in the House then.

Hon. J. Cunningham: You were in this House last session.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member is labouring under a delusion. The only other occasion on which a Factories and Shops Bill was dealt with here in the manner suggested by Mr. Lynn was in 1902.

Hon. J. Cunningham: What about the Bill last session?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have already explained that I introduced that Bill and endeavoured to get it through, and that when I found the opposition to it too strong I withdrew it. I would submit, however, that a Bill drafted in the circumstances suggested by Sir Edward Wittenoom is not likely to be satisfactory to members of this House.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is part of your own Bill.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: We will come to that point later. Of course I do not yet know what that Bill is. If my motion is rejected—which I sincerely hope it will not be—

The PRESIDENT: It would be better for hon. members to confine themselves to the action of the House in rejecting the Bill in the manner in which that has been done, and to the possible reinstatement of the measure. The merits of the Bill have already been fully discussed on the second reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I quite understand that, Mr. President; but I did not think I was offending in drawing attention to the reasons given by Sir Edward Wittenoom for the action which has been taken.

The PRESIDENT: That subject is gradually being introduced, and I wish it to be avoided.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: If the reasons given by Sir Edward Wittenoom were good reasons, then there would be little chance for this motion of mine. If they were bad reasons, then I take it this motion will be agreed to. In regard to the proposal

that another Bill should be put up, I would like to remind the House that it will be impossible to put up a Bill which would take the place of this Bill, one of the reasons being that revenue shall be provided sufficient to carry on the administration of the measure. This House could not initiate legislation of that kind. This House could not put up a Bill which would provide revenue for the carrying on of the administration of the measure. That feature of the Bill, therefore, which is one of its most important features, and a feature in practice, I believe, in every State of the Commonwealth, would have to be abandoned even if the course suggested by Sir Edward Wittenoom were agreed upon. I would ask hon. members very seriously to consider the position of this House as a House of review if the course suggested is adopted—to pass the second reading of a Bill without a division, then to throw the Bill out on a motion which cannot be debated, and then to introduce another Bill to serve some of the purpose of the Bill which has been rejected. The nearest parallel that I can find to the action taken yesterday was in connection with the Factories and Shops Bill introduced in 1902; but even there the position was widely different. That Bill, so far from being carried on the second reading without a division and apparently with the general approval of members, was hotly contested on the second reading. A motion was submitted that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, and that motion was defeated by 15 votes to 11, the second reading being carried. I do not propose to quote from the debate of 1902, but I should like to direct the attention of hon. members to a passage of Sir Edward Wittenoom's speech on that occasion. The hon. gentleman was overflowing with the milk of human kindness, and was full of sympathy for the toilers.

Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom: He always is.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: However, he was afraid that the Government were going too far. So he voted for the second reading, and then subsequently he voted for the sand-bagging motion which threw the Bill out. So that the hon. member is quite consistent in his inconsistency. What happened in 1902 was that when the second reading had been carried the Bill was taken into Committee. One of the first clauses in the Bill was the interpretation clause. When the Committee came to the interpretation of the word "factory," a motion, which was quite consistent with the attitude a number of hon. members had taken up previously and for which they had given their reasons—and this fact makes the position then entirely different from the one with which we are faced to-day—a motion was moved that the definition of "factory" should be struck out. The definition was struck out, and the Minister in charge of the Bill then moved to report progress, an entirely reasonable and proper thing to do, because a very serious alteration had been made in the Bill.

The Committee on that occasion refused to allow the Minister to report progress, and an hon. member moved "That the Chairman leave the Chair." That motion was carried by 12 votes to nine, and the report of the proceedings concludes with these words, "and the Bill lapsed." Now, the Minister on that occasion did not take the action that I have taken now, and he refused to take it for this reason, that the House, having struck out the definition of "factory," had taken the responsibility of destroying an essential feature of the Bill. The Minister said, "The Government regard this Bill as an important Bill"—as the present Government regard the present Bill—"and I am not prepared to allow this Chamber to mutilate the Government's Bill; and therefore I do not propose to reinstate it." Then those very members who had voted the Chairman out of the Chair, and thereby destroyed the Bill, were not long in discovering the difficult position in which they had placed themselves. They were not long in discovering that that was not the sort of action which was expected from a Chamber of review, and they pleaded with the Minister to reinstate the Bill.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Have you got the plea?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. If the hon. member looks up "Hansard" for 1902 he will find it all. The Minister of that day finally was prevailed upon to give notice of motion that the Bill be reinstated; but when the time came for him to move that motion, he refused to do so, and for the same reason. A private member of the Council then gave notice of motion for the reinstatement of the Bill. That private member's motion was carried, and the very members who had moved the Chairman out of the Chair, and for the time being had destroyed the Bill, reinstated the measure. They proceeded with its consideration by striking out all the references to factories and passing the Early Closing Act as we have it to-day, with one or two amendments to which I referred in moving the second reading of this Bill. That is the nearest parallel I can find to the action which has been taken on this occasion, but I must point out again how far it is from being an exact parallel to the action taken in that case. The members who took that action in 1902 gave their reasons on the second reading, and hotly contested the principles of the Bill to which they objected. On this occasion the objection was not taken on the second reading. On that occasion, the Chairman having been moved out of the Chair, the Bill was subsequently reinstated, and the House satisfied itself with knocking out those clauses to which it objected. On this occasion something of an entirely different character is contemplated. I drew attention when moving the second reading of the Bill—and I intended even before you had spoken, Mr. President, to avoid any reference to the Bill itself, but this much I think I may be entitled to say—to the fact that our factories

legislation is obsolete. I do not want to offend in any way against the principles of debate, and I do not know that I am not out of order in referring to the notice of motion which Mr. Lovekin has given this afternoon. I may say that all that I had in my mind, and all that hon. members had in their minds, suggests that unless my motion is agreed to and the Bill proceeded with, all that portion of the measure referring to factories is to be passed out.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is right.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I ask hon. members to bear in mind that our existing factories legislation was passed in 1904 and has not been amended since. Therefore the rejection of my motion, in view of the hon. member's statement, will be tantamount to a declaration by this House that the factory legislation which was good enough in 1904 is good enough to-day.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Not at all. We want to see that the country has a chance of getting factories established here.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member would seek to delete all that portion of the Bill referring to factories. For that reason I say that the rejection of my motion would be tantamount to a refusal on the part of the House to consider amending factories legislation, that is to say, to consider legislation amending a Factories Act passed in 1904 and not since amended. If hon. members like to take up that attitude, the responsibility of course is with them.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: They take the business of the House entirely out of the hands of the Government.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Quite so. The present Early Closing Act was passed in 1902. It is 18 years old; and although it has been amended since in two directions, those amendments have been comparatively small and unimportant. The legislation generally is the legislation of 1902. Now I would like to refer to the number of amendments on the Notice Paper. Amongst those amendments are no less than 27 to strike out whole clauses. With all respect I submit to you, Mr. President, than an hon. member has no right to put on the Notice Paper a notice to strike out a clause. Amendments put on the Notice Paper should be amendments which hon. members intend to move. No hon. member, I contend, has the right to put on the Notice Paper something that he knows perfectly well he cannot move.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is only fair to give the Minister notice of what one proposes.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: What would become of our Notice Paper if every member thought it incumbent upon him to put on that Notice Paper something to show how he is going to vote on every question that comes before us? The Notice Paper is intended to show what an hon. member is going to move, and it is not competent for an hon. member to move that a clause be struck out.

Hon. A. Lovekin: They were just put on to let you see what was intended.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I never asked for them, and I thank no one for having put them on. They have been put on the Notice Paper in violation of the proper principles of the Notice Paper. They had no right to be put on, and the effect of putting them on is simply to load up the Notice Paper and so appear to justify the extraordinary and unprecedented conduct that has taken place.

Hon. A. H. Panton: They did not give you notice of what they were going to do yesterday, did they?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Scarcely. In regard to the other amendments, Mr. Holmes has referred to the amendments which I proposed to move. I told the House on the second reading that amendments made in the Chamber itself are not satisfactory: that is to say, although they express the meaning of the House clearly enough, it often happens that they conflict in some way with other clauses, and so it is highly desirable that amendments made in the House should, if possible, be subjected to review. I told the House on the second reading that the action of another place in the appointment of a select committee and in the amending of the Bill set up a necessity for close scrutiny by the Crown Law Department and the department charged with the administration of the Act; not with the intention of in any way altering the decisions of the select committee of another place, except in so far as they might be altered by the deliberate vote of this House, but to correct small mistakes which might lead to misunderstanding. With a big Bill such as this, those errors are bound to creep in. Of the 40 odd amendments which I placed on the Notice Paper, only three or four affected the Bill in principle. The rest were all to correct mistakes and avoid misunderstandings which might arise.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Why did not they do that in another place?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I cannot say.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Why do not you send the Bills down properly?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not send them down at all; they are sent up to me. However, that is the position in regard to the amendments which I placed on the Notice Paper. Those amendments, with only three or four exceptions, did not alter the Bill in any way, and those exceptions were deliberately aimed at giving just consideration to those cases in regard to which petitions have been submitted to the House, particularly in regard to small shopkeepers and mixed businesses. Apart from them there was not any amendment involving an alteration of principle. Are we to assume that because three or four members place on the Notice Paper a

large number of amendments, many of a trivial character and others which should not be on the Notice Paper, the Bill cannot be dealt with this session?

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is not quite correct.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: What is the justification for the action taken? I have to look, hon. members will have to look for some justification for an action never before taken in this Chamber.

Hon. J. Duffell: It would not be easy to justify some of your actions.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I gather that some hon. members find a justification for that action in the large number of amendments on the Notice Paper. If that be the case, and if the principle were to be accepted, then whenever a Bill came before the House it would only be necessary for half a dozen members who opposed it to load up the Notice Paper with amendments, many of them of a trivial character, and declare that in view of the number of amendments it would be futile to proceed with the consideration of the Bill. I recognise that probably some hon. members who voted the Chairman out of the Chair may have done so because they were not prepared to consider the Bill at that time; if so, it is quite competent for them to vote in an opposite direction now. But I make this final appeal: that this House is a House of review. If we are to abandon our functions as a House of review and say we are going to reject and then re-initiate legislation, we can hardly expect that that legislation will receive very cordial consideration in another place.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is a part of their own.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not know how many members of this House are acquainted with the Bill which the hon. member intends to put forward. Apparently he desires that that Bill shall be taken cognisance of by hon. members in order that it may influence them in their vote on this motion, that they should turn down this motion because they are promised something else from Mr. Lovekin. I do not know how many members are aware of what it is which Mr. Lovekin promises them.

Hon. A. Lovekin: They all know it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I know nothing of it. The hon. member did tell me one or two things yesterday, one of which would put our legislation in regard to shops a long way behind what it is today. That is all I know about it, and from what I know of it I am not prepared to reject the opportunity for putting a well-considered Bill on the Notice Paper merely because some other Bill is to be presented by Mr. Lovekin.

Hon. J. Cornell: "I asked for bread and ye gave me a stone."

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: What will be the position of the House in the eyes of the public if, having accepted a Bill on the second reading, they then throw it out on a motion which cannot be discussed? What interpretation is to be placed upon an action of that kind? There is but one, and one which I am sure is not in accord with the feelings of the majority of the House.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [5.7] We have listened with a great deal of interest to the sophistical remarks which have fallen from the leader of the House, but beyond the fact that he has given a very fine display of the unusual quality of his eloquence and his fine control of the English language, I do not think his arguments have been at all convincing. He started by telling us how the Bill would affect the public. He pretends not to understand why the action taken yesterday was taken; he pretends to be ignorant of that, whilst he knows perfectly well what the reasons were that induced members to act as they did. He has told us of all the forms which the Bill is supposed to go through. They were already familiar to hon. members. It will be within the recollection of all that although the second reading was put through on the voices—and I should like to say, incidentally, that I did not vote for the second reading and that I was not in the Chamber when it was passed. Nor was I in accord with the second reading, and therefore I am not inconsistent in the action I have taken. Nor do I consider that those who passed the second reading on the voices are inconsistent either; because they have found out that the Bill, which nobody can explain, is not suited to the requirements of the country and, instead of making a further mistake, they have had sense enough to review their action and afford a further opportunity for discussion before the Bill becomes law. That is one of the reasons for their later action. The reasons are perfectly plain. In the opinion of a good many, and of myself in particular, the Bill is not one to meet the requirements of the State. In the first place, it is an ill-considered Bill. The hon. member asked just now how we could think of throwing out such a well-considered measure; and in the next breath, he told us that he had 40 amendments to make to it. The Bill came from another place, where hardly any hon. member understood it. This is the well-considered measure! When we discuss it with members of this House it is found that hardly anyone understands it, and even of those friendly towards it one or two have said it is very complicated and that one never knows where one phase begins and another comes in. The public, when they know the truth, will say that this House is a House of review and has tried to review a Bill that came from another place but found it such a mixture of impossibilities that it was impracticable to make anything of it. In consequence, rather than the Bill should go for-

ward after the second reading, the House decided to take the only alternative left and deal with it in another way; and provided also that rather than the country should go without the particular amendments required, another Bill should be introduced. The hon. member asks what sort of a Bill we are prepared to introduce, and what sort of a reception it would get in another place. I know that in another place it would be kicked out, because the Government would be jealous of this House preparing a Bill that suited the country. No Bill that went to another place from here in those circumstances would be received. At the same time, there is no reason why we should not try to suggest to the Government what is required. I want to deal with the Bill. I do not want to drag hon. members through what happened 18 years ago. I do not want to camouflage this business by telling the House what was done by Sir Edward Wittenoom many years ago, and what sort of a speech he made. I want to come to the Bill before us, and say it is a Bill which no reasonable set of business men could possibly accept.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must confine himself to a discussion of the action of the House, not of the Bill.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I am trying to give reasons why the action, which was so objectionable to the leader of the House, was resorted to. It was because the Bill contained utterly impossible provisions. There is a number of reasons, but I cannot go into them all, because you have ruled that it would not be right, and your decision is perfectly correct. One of the most important reasons is that there are in the Bill so many conditions hedging about those who own factories that industry would be stifled and nobody other than a fool would put a penny into a factory—at all events, not if he had to carry on that factory in accordance with the provisions of the Bill. Our object is to encourage factories, to encourage people to develop industry and to invest their money therein. The Bill would stifle exactly what we wish to see fostered. Amongst other things it interferes with the existing privileges of a certain class of people. I could give many reasons why the Bill should not be considered, but the main reason is that those members who the leader of the House thinks were inconsistent in voting for the second reading and afterward for the moving of the Chairman out of the Chair, have since considered the Bill more fully, have had sufficient strength of mind to recognise that they made an error in allowing the second reading to go through on the voices, and in consequence they have corrected that error in the only possible way it could be done. I agree with the hon. member that it was not the sort of method that would usually be adopted. Mr. Panton is always smiling and interjecting. I do not suppose he is in accord with what I say.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Not a bit.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Because he has only been interested in two classes since he has been here. He was, however, sent here to consider all classes of people in the country, not only two. We want Bills to suit everyone as well as the worker. We have to consider the proprietor, the man who has invested his money. We have to study all classes of the community and it is necessary, to do that, that we should give more attention than was proposed to a Bill like this. The Bill contains about 160 clauses. It was almost rushed through this House on the second reading. I was astounded when I found on reading the newspaper that it had gone through on the voices without further discussion. One or two hon. members, such as Mr. Holmes, spoke against it, but the majority of us did not realise what it meant. In these circumstances hon. members took the only course they could, which I agree was not one that anyone would adopt if they had an alternative. What I would suggest is that, if the leader of the House does not carry his motion, a new Bill be brought down by the Government embodying something which is comprehensible. This Bill is absolutely incomprehensible. To say it is a well considered Bill is an insult to the people who had anything to do with it. The Bill is a conglomeration of conditions which would never work, and in certain circumstances would be of the very greatest hardship to the community. Many of us, and all who took part in the division yesterday, are in accord with the main principles of the Bill. We have every desire to make the working people in factories, workshops and anywhere else as comfortable as possible, but we have to look at two sides of the question. If we are to develop the resources of this country we must have Bills that suit both sides and not Bills that suit only one side. The leader of the House says that the House will be taking a great responsibility if it rejects his motion. If there is any loss to the community by this Bill being thrown out, the Government must take the greatest responsibility for having sent down the Bill in the condition it is in. That is the position we want to take up. The Bill has been sent down to us, and therefore, there is no responsibility upon this House in the matter. We say that this House, which is a House of review, has reviewed the Bill carefully and found it an impossible Bill. What is the use of one member bringing in 30 amendments, another 50 amendments, and another 10, and calling them all a Bill? By the time we had got these amendments into shape and worked as hard as possible, a week or two would have elapsed. Then probably another place would not agree with a great deal of what we had done, and the consequence would be that no Bill would be passed this session. The leader of the House said he wanted the reasons for our action. There is one solid reason for it, namely, that

the Bill is a hopeless Bill. Nothing can be done with it by way of amendment. The responsibility of sending the Bill down is entirely in the hands of the Government in another place. They cannot expect us to saddle ourselves with a Bill which we do not think will be in the best interests of the country. As it was passed inadvertently on the second reading and was reconsidered, the only possible method of changing the position was by adopting the course that was taken yesterday. I shall vote against the motion.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.20]: I listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks of the leader of the House, hoping that he would be able to give us an explanation of the attitude which he adopted yesterday. I regret to say he did not enlighten me in any way. He referred to the extraordinary action taken by this House on the Bill, but I contend that the attitude taken by the House was not nearly so extraordinary as that adopted by the leader when the Order of the Day was called on yesterday afternoon. Three minutes before you, Sir, were asked to leave the Chair for the purpose of considering Order of the Day No. 1, that is the Factories and Shops Bill, in Committee, we had handed round to us an addendum to the Notice Paper containing about 49 amendments to be moved by the leader of the House. The thought occurred to me immediately that this was a Government Bill sent down to us from another place and that the member of the Government in this House, the leader of the House, was going to move 49 amendments to it, and was asking us to give immediate consideration to them. This was a most extraordinary action. The action that I would have considered suitable would have been for the leader of the House, when Order of the Day No. 1 was called, to have asked that this Order of the Day be postponed to enable members to consider these 49 amendments and tabulate them and see how far they improved, or otherwise, the Bill we had under consideration. The extraordinary action of the leader of the House on that occasion is on a par with other extraordinary actions of his on previous occasions. I have here a volume of the Minutes of Proceedings of this House for the year 1914-15, in which I find that even Mr. Colebatch—

The PRESIDENT: The Minister for Education.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Moved in a similar direction to that which he now considers a most extraordinary action, with regard to amendments being placed on the Notice Paper. He said that the action on that occasion was one without precedent. I contend that the action of the Minister for Education is also without precedent, at any rate within my knowledge as a member of this Chamber. As representative of the Government the Minister places 49 amendments on the Notice

Paper, which we had not actually seen and had no opportunity of knowing anything about, and three minutes after we had received the addendum he moved that you, Sir, do leave the Chair for the purpose of considering the Bill in Committee.

The Minister for Education: I did not move anything of the kind.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: It was the first Order of the Day. The leader of the House had 49 amendments to the Bill on the addendum and then allowed you, Sir, to leave the Chair, and expected us to know exactly what he had placed on the Notice Paper. Such an action was unprecedented and certainly warranted the step taken by members of this House.

The Minister for Education: Which you decided upon before you knew anything about it.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The leader of the House does not know what he is talking about. He has no ground for the statement he has made. I think I shall succeed in convincing the leader of the House, if he is open to conviction, that he has on more than one occasion performed most extraordinary actions. I do not desire to refer to the action he took when he was appointed leader of the Government, and will leave that out altogether. Since he has been leader of the House I say that on more than one occasion his actions have been most extraordinary in regard to measures which have been sent up from another Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The actions of the Minister are not under consideration.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: With all due respect to you, Sir, I have to reply to the statements which have been made by the leader of the House with regard to our actions of yesterday. That is what I am endeavouring to defend.

The Minister for Education: Is that the best reply you can put up?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I remember an occasion when the leader of the House committed an act in connection with his duties as a pressman which will never be forgotten in this State. Does he want anything further than that? If we were to talk about actions—

The PRESIDENT: The hon. gentleman must not persist in this line of argument.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: All right, Mr. President, I will go on with the motion before us. I have plenty to say upon that. We had under consideration, at the time that this action was taken, a Bill which was supposed to be a Bill having received the consideration of members of another place. It had also been referred to a select committee of another place and was sent on to us. We spent hours over this Bill; I say with certainty that I have never spent more time on any Bill than I have spent on this since it was received by this House.

Hon. A. H. Panton: It got on your nerves.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: It neither got on my nerves nor into my affections.

Hon. A. H. Panton interjected.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The hon. member is probably referring to a petition that is on the Table of the House. The hon. member himself directed a Minister of Wesley Church, Perth, to see me with the object of my presenting this petition before Parliament. I lay that against him as a charge. Knowing that he wants to make that an excuse that I am favouring Chinese because I have laid this petition on the Table of the House, I take his remarks for what they are worth, and that is nothing at all. The Bill is supposed to be one to heal the woes that the Labour party and every other party in the State are subject to at present. In other words it is a Bill that is going to pre-empt the dawn of the millennium. That is Mr. Panton's contention and that of those who are supporting him. It is a Bill that is going to work wonders.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I did not say that.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: There is one part of the Bill which is to provide for the abolition of the late shopping night. I am entirely in accord with that.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the hon. member not to discuss the details of the Bill, which have already been discussed on the second reading.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I am giving reasons for my action yesterday. It is upon that I must make myself understood. I have been sent to this Chamber by the people of the metropolitan-suburban area, and it is in their interests that I speak and not to please certain hon. members. Anything that will have for its object the abolition of the late shopping night will receive my attention. It was with that object in view that another Bill has been printed since to take the place of this Bill, and to afford an opportunity of placing on the statute-book a measure which will abolish the late shopping night and relieve the people who are suffering at present. If this Bill is allowed to come on with nearly 200 amendments to it on the Notice Paper, I am convinced—I believe the leader of the House in his innermost heart knows that this is so—there will be no possibility of the Bill being dealt with, and the amendments made by this Chamber accepted by another House.

The Minister for Education: I know nothing of the kind.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: There are many things you do not know, but we will tell you by degrees.

The PRESIDENT: Will the hon. member kindly address the Chair?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The leader of the House drew me off the track.

The Minister for Education: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has made an absolutely false accusation against me. I simply deny it.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: In what regard?

The Minister for Education: It was an absolutely false accusation.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: In what regard? I do not know to what the Minister refers. I have not made any accusation against him.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Minister for Education wish certain words to be withdrawn or contradicted?

The Minister for Education: No.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member may proceed.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: This Bill with nearly 200 amendments to it is brought down to us for consideration. A great many of these amendments will require a considerable amount of study. I am given to understand it is the intention of the Government to close the session on the 10th of this month. That being so, what possible hope have the Government of getting the Bill through under present circumstances? Even if we put it through, what chance is there of another place giving its concurrence to the amendments we make here, and of the Bill passing through all its stages and being placed on the statute-book? No more hope than the Minister for Education has of flying to heaven this afternoon. The leader of the House referred to the action that was taken yesterday as most extraordinary. The action that we took on that occasion was not in opposition to the abolition of the late shopping night, the definition of small shops, or the amelioration of the conditions of the people whom the measure aimed to assist. I go further than that when I draw attention to the petitions which have been coming in to this Chamber. We have at present a petition signed by 8,647 persons. Names are rolling in at the rate of 300 per day, and these are not solicited. There are no representatives of any party going round in an endeavour to secure additional names. If this Bill goes on for consideration, before long I shall have a further petition to present which will contain 10,000 names of persons who claim that the measure will be inconvenient to them.

Hon. J. Cornell: You will go down to posterity as the member for petitions.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: We are asked to give further consideration to this Bill, and if that is the honest wish of the leader of the House he has not gone about it in the best way to get us to do so. I can go on for a considerable time; I have many notes of matters which I could deal with. However, I have made it clear that the object we had in view in voting against the Bill yesterday afternoon was not to introduce a money Bill—that is the usual gag—but a measure that would have for its object, in a few clauses, the abolition of the late shopping night, the definition of a small shop, and one or two other small matters, leaving an opportunity for the further consideration of the Factories Bill during next session of Parliament. I have no alternative but to continue the attitude I adopted yesterday and vote against the Bill, with the

object of securing another Bill, as I have already indicated.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [5.33]: I have listened to the leader of the House and, although he said a great deal, he did not give an adequate reply to those members who moved the Chairman out of the Chair yesterday afternoon. Any member of the House who considers to the full his duty to, and the dignity of, this House must feel that he has ample justification for the action taken on that occasion. Considering the nature of this measure and the fact that the leader of the House was apparently unable to give members certain information which was asked for during the second reading debate—

The Minister for Education: Regarding what?

Hon. H. STEWART: Regarding certain sections of the Bill. Under the ruling of the President it would not be right to give details, but all members know, as the Minister knows, that he was not prepared to indicate what were the definite meanings of certain portions of the Bill. The measure was dealt with by a select committee in another place, and members in this House had very little time to read the report of that committee and at the same time deal with the second reading of the Bill. Only a small proportion of the people who gave evidence before the select committee were concerned with factories and conditions in the country. The Bill mainly provides for matters affecting the metropolitan area. The report of the select committee shows that when the members of that body were faced with the opposition of the people in the country and of people representing factories, they did not see fit to make provisions to meet their desires in the Bill itself. The measure passed through another place in what might be regarded as record time, for the reason, I suppose, that the select committee had dealt with it. It went through practically before the report was read by members of that House. When we remember all these things it goes a long way towards the justification of members who took the action complained of yesterday. These are only some of the arguments that could be advanced. As a member of the Legislative Council, I have a great feeling of resentment regarding the way this Chamber is dealt with session after session. I resent the way measures are brought before this Chamber. When we could go ahead with Bills they do not come before us. When Bills are introduced here and passed, they are taken to another place and thrown aside. This Chamber has not received that consideration which should be given to it. Every member of the House is entitled to resent the attitude of the leader of the House, and the manner in which he neglects to represent the rights of members of this Chamber to the Government, in order that the business coming

before the House may be brought forward more satisfactorily.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why are they holding up the Estimates now? They are finished in another place.

Hon. H. STEWART: That is another reason in support of the action taken by members yesterday. I am concerned also regarding my own attitude in this matter. Measures are frequently introduced by the Government as framed by the Parliamentary draftsman, and recommended by the leader of the House. I recollect the Drovings Bill, which came before the Chamber on one occasion and was cordially supported by Sir Edward Wittenoom during the second reading debate as being a most perfect measure, because it had the endorsement of the late Mr. Sept. Burt. Before the Committee stage, I and another member went through the Bill, with the result that a large number of amendments were placed on the Notice Paper. I do not know whether that was not sufficient reason for the Bill to be killed. It might well have been, judging by the way it was put before this Chamber. A select committee was appointed to deal with the measure, and practically all the amendments we had on the Notice Paper were carried. I have not much sympathy with the leader of the House on this occasion, and members resent the way the rights of this House have been represented to the Government. When a Bill comes down to this Chamber we should be prepared to consider it. I recall to mind what took place during the closing hours of last session, when we received the Land Act Amendment Bill from another place. A majority in this House endeavoured to get a proper interpretation embodied in that measure, and to have a wrong righted. In spite of that fact the Government did not deal with that measure in the way I believe the public wished it to have been dealt with. We were promised that the measure would come down this session, and it is not here yet.

The PRESIDENT: I think the hon. member is straying somewhat from the motion.

Hon. H. STEWART: When members consider the similarity of the action taken on that occasion in comparison with the present instance, this furnishes another vindication of the action taken by members yesterday. I believe this House is prepared to go on sitting indefinitely to deal effectively with legislation. Without any question of sympathy with the leader of the House, I think we should consider this Bill, and I intend to support the motion. Apart from the large number of amendments on the Notice Paper, it is extremely probable that all the amendments necessary are not on the Notice Paper yet. Possibly the Bill will have to be recommitted several times. We should consider the Bill in Committee, and endeavour to amend it in many directions. We have not been treated fairly, and if we are to give the Bill the attention it deserves,

we will be here for a very long time. The session will not close at the early date which the Government desire. In fact, there is no prospect, if we are to do our business as we should do it, of the House rising about the 10th of this month.

Hon. J. E. DODD (South) [5.42]: I did not intend to speak on this motion, but having heard what has been stated by one or two members I think that perhaps a word from some of those who are supporting the Government may not be out of place. I object entirely to the attitude adopted by Sir Edward Wittenoom and those supporting him, because it looks to me simply a matter of tactics. It is not a matter of the ordinary business of the House, but, to use vulgar parlance, merely showing the Government a point.

Hon. J. Duffell: The Government showed us 49 points yesterday.

Hon. J. E. DODD: As the leader of the House has already indicated, the proper course to adopt would have been to defeat the Bill on the second reading. If that had been done, none of us could have taken exception to the attitude of members who were opposed to the Bill. In moving the Chairman out of the Chair those members stifled further debate on the Bill. The Government have every right to complain regarding the way members have taken the business out of the hands of the Government. When the Labour Government were in power I recollect that there seemed to be on occasions a desire to take the business out of the hands of the leader of the House in this Chamber.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. E. DODD: On every occasion some members endeavoured to prevent that, and you, Mr. President, on several occasions vetoed with the Government possibly against your convictions because you did not desire to see the business taken out of the hands of the Government. That is one of the principal reasons why I am supporting the Government in a matter of this kind. I do not think we should take the business out of the hands of the Government, whatever our opinions may be. If we intend to defeat a measure, let us do so in the proper manner. We have every opportunity of doing so. If members do not wish to vote against the second reading of a Bill, surely sufficient latitude will be given in Committee to oppose any clause they desire. In regard to what has been proposed by Mr. Lovekin, does any hon. member think that the Government will accept a part of this Bill? So far as I am concerned, although every clause of the proposed Bill may be in accord with my principles, I will oppose the second reading of it for the reason that I do not believe in the adoption of such tactics in this Chamber. I have offered a certain amount of criticism as to the manner in which the Bill has been sent up. On the second reading I stated that I objected to the way in which the select committee secured their evidence; I objected be-

cause the select committee left out the goldfields. That, however, was not sufficient to induce me to vote against the Bill. The select committee, in my opinion, did not do their duty when they omitted a large population on the goldfields, and thus deprived that section of the community of the State from giving evidence in connection with the Bill, but no one can justify his action of yesterday on that score. Mr. Duffell has referred to the petitions which have been sent round for signature. Mr. Duffell stated that some 380 people signed the petitions every day. I have a boy 14 years of age, and he came home and said, "Dad, I have signed a petition against the Factories Bill." It appears that he was out and some small shopkeepers were inviting people to sign the petition against the Bill, and this boy of mine was allowed to affix his signature to it.

Hon. J. Duffell: Did you ask him his age?

Hon. J. E. DODD: I said he was my boy. That is the manner in which signatures are being secured to these petitions. As to the Bill bringing about any radical alteration, I draw attention to my second reading speech, and I would also refer hon. members to what is happening in other parts of the world. In connection with the League of Nations and the Labour Convention, which is not made up altogether of labourites—there are employers of labour at that convention, and no fewer than 39 countries are represented—that convention recommended principles far in advance of those embodied in the Bill which we have dealt with so summarily. Yet hon. members, in a young country like ours, say that we can capsize all industry and turn the place upside down because we are introducing legislation which gives consideration to a number of employees. I was amused at the attitude adopted by Sir Edward Wittenoom. Whenever he is in opposition to any measure that is before the House, the hon. member puts me in mind of General Stonewall Jackson. I do not know whether you, Mr. President, know of the incident, but at one time General Jackson had a negro servant, and this servant, whenever his master was going to do something great, declared "He prays like Hell." Hon. members will agree with me that whenever Sir Edward Wittenoom is going to do anything great, he flatters, like that handsome genius who is supposed to preside over those regions. Whenever the hon. member is going to put up a case, he will tell the leader of the House, or maybe hon. members, what a splendid case has been advanced, and what splendid arguments have been used, and how he has almost been persuaded that the measure should be adopted. Whenever the hon. member takes that attitude I know he is going to record his vote in the opposite way. I sincerely hope the House will not stultify itself by opposing the motion which has been moved by the leader of the House. We should not put the leader of the House in a humiliating position. I should object

very strongly if I were in his place. We should certainly not put him in the position of having the business of the Government taken out of his hands, simply by subterfuge. I hope the motion will be carried.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.53]: I have not spoken on this Bill, either on the second reading or in connection with the motion before the House. In order to keep very closely to the motion which is before us, let us see exactly what it is, and whether we should go back to the stage at which the Chairman left the Chair. I will tell hon. members and the public outside that the threats—I think we might call them threats—from the leader of the House—

The Minister for Education: I have not threatened.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Well, shall we say that the Chamber was warned—perhaps that word will commend itself to the leader of the House. I should have no hesitation in saying inside or outside the House, that the people who are interested in the Bill have only the Government to thank for the position in which the Bill is at the present time. Perhaps I could establish the position better outside than I can here at the moment. I will put it to the leader of the House and to his supporters—his curious supporters, politically speaking—what the position is in connection with the Bill. Here we are on the 1st December, and I am asked to support the leader of the House in this proposal. I supported him yesterday. There was a strong feeling against the Bill being proceeded with at this stage. We were defeated. Why not accept defeat? Now the leader of the House asks me to support the motion he has moved. I say, "Very well, I may be led on as I have been led by the great leaders of the Nationalist and the Liberal party until I find myself where I am." The leader asks me to support him to revive the Committee stage of the Bill. In Committee, as is well known, there would be every opportunity for discussion of the Bill at great length. There is determined opposition to it from, if not a majority, a large minority in this House, and as my colleague suggested just now, how can the Government possibly expect to get the Bill through? I will tell the leader of the House the conditions on which I am prepared to support him. I do not know how it will appeal to his colleagues and I am not sure whether I am permitted to make reference to the Governor's Speech. But let us take it from our own knowledge of the Bills promised and Bills introduced, and the present stage of the session. There is the Mining Act Amendment Bill. I am prepared to fight that to the last ditch. Then there is the Land Act Amendment Bill, which will deal with the pastoral leases, the Wheat Marketing Bill, the Grain Elevators Bill, and the taxation

measures, to say nothing of the Estimates. I put it to you, Mr. President, and to the Government supporters—and what a mixed lot of supporters they are, politically speaking—we are here as a House of review and I use my discretion, as I think, to the best advantage of the country. Here are five measures of prime importance: Personally, I say at once that I do not regard the Factories and Shops Bill as a measure of prime importance. It is a Bill that should receive the most careful consideration in Committee.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Then let it go into Committee.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: That is the point we are discussing. We are asked to go into Committee on this Bill, and I will support every member who brings forward amendments, but what I want to know is where the Government are going to land us during the next fortnight with the other Bills that have to come up. Take one, the Wheat Marketing Bill. This measure is going to land us in further difficulties, and it certainly wants the fullest discussion. I will tell the leader of the House that I am prepared to support him to-day, but with more hesitation than I did yesterday. The only reason for doing so is that the people who sent me here want the Factories and Shops Bill fully discussed. They are a very difficult lot of people to deal with, especially in connection with a Bill of this kind, because I find that the small shopkeeper fears that someone is going to tread on his toes. But the small shopkeeper is no different from the Chinese section of the community who are referred to in the Bill. That section will get as much consideration from me as any other, and because it is in a small minority it is all the more reason why it should have a full and fair hearing. I shall support the leader of the House once more.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Only once more.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I shall do so with hesitation, because I do not expect to satisfy either of the parties this afternoon, but I hope I shall satisfy those people who sent me here to look after their interests. When we get into Committee we shall have a full opportunity to discuss every point in the Bill, and I will repeat what I said at the commencement. If this Bill is lost or hung up, and if there is dissatisfaction outside as a result, I shall be able to explain to anyone who cares to go into the matter that the people who are to blame and who ought to be blamed and who will be blamed are the Ministers who are in charge of the public affairs of this country.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [6.1]: Very few remarks from me will enable me to justify my action yesterday in supporting the rejection of the Bill. I have listened very attentively to the eloquent address put up by the leader of the House. From start to finish he reminded us that the Council was a House of review, and I would like to ask

him what have we reviewed this session. We have been in session for four months and what have we reviewed? We reviewed the Prices Regulation Act Amendment and Continuance Bill and another place re-reviewed it and sent it back, and we are now reviewing the Factories and Shops Bill, or at least we were doing so yesterday. Need I say more as to the argument of the leader of the House that this Council is a House of review beyond referring to the fact that the whole of the legislation mentioned in the Governor's Speech and elsewhere has not reached us yet? The Estimates have been dealt with in another place and finished, or they can be finished at any time the Government so desire.

The Minister for Education: The Loan Estimates have not yet been considered.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am not referring to the Loan Estimates. The Government have a majority in another place, and they have practically finished their consideration of the Estimates, and they might at least have had the courtesy to complete them and sent the Appropriation Bill here to be reviewed. On the second reading debate I traversed the Factories and Shops Bill from A to Z insofar as I had been able to give attention to the measure, and it was my intention when the Bill reached Committee to seek to get it so amended that it would be equitable alike to the employer, the employee, and the public. Since I have been a member of this Council, there has never been a Bill brought before the House to which I have devoted so much attention as to this Factories and Shops Bill, and I candidly admit that it has got me into a fog and I claim to have ordinary intelligence, if no more. This measure constitutes two Bills in one, a Factories Bill and a Shops Bill, and we should have had separate measures. I have worked hard on this Bill, and I have come to the conclusion that it is quite impossible to amend it and make anything of it. The Minister complains that we should have rejected the Bill on the second reading. At that time a lot of us did not know that it was loaded, but when, in course of preparation for the Committee stage, we found that it was loaded, that the Minister himself had given notice of 47 amendments and that other members had amendments by the score which they desired to see embodied in the Bill, we came to the conclusion that we would be only wasting time to attempt to further consider it, and instead of throwing it out on the second reading, we took the opportunity at the next stage by moving the Chairman out of the Chair.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: How many times did you interject?

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not address other hon. members.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The hon. member is not on the Fremantle wharf now, Sir; and he cannot do as he likes here, as he could do there, due to the laxity of the Government controlling the affairs of this country. The

Minister, in order to justify his case, went back to 1902 and referred to what members did in 1902. I was not a member of this House in 1902, and I am not in any way responsible for what happened then. I may be permitted to say that there is a principle in this Bill giving the Minister power—and the Minister himself has admitted it—to wipe out whenever he desires every small shop in the community. This provision has been in existence since 1902, and it should never have been passed.

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the hon. member not to discuss the provisions of the Bill.

The Minister for Education: Not to wipe out every small shop when he desires.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The fact that this Bill seeks to re-enact that provision is one of my reasons for opposing the measure. This Bill contains a clause giving the Minister power by proclamation whenever he desires to wipe out every small shop.

The Minister for Education: Not power to wipe them out, but to refuse to re-register them.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am not permitted to discuss the point and I hope I shall not have an opportunity to do so at a later stage, because I trust that the Bill will not come back for further consideration. The Minister asked what hope there was of another place accepting a Bill that it was proposed to introduce into the Council.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: That is only camouflage.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: What hope is there of getting through all the legislation foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech, none of which with the exception of this Bill has yet reached us, and this one subject to 49 amendments indicated by the Minister and all the other amendments which have been placed on the Notice Paper, what hope is there, I ask, of getting this Bill through? This Bill was dealt with in the only practicable way—short and sharp—in order to let the Government know that they could not humbug us about as they think fit, that they cannot keep important legislation back till the last minute and then rush it through in 24 hours, meanwhile keeping us going on a Bill of this description which the Government themselves knew could never be carried. One would almost think that the Minister had been put up to move the 47 amendments in order to keep us going, and to fill in time until another place was ready to push in their legislation.

The Minister for Education: That is a very absurd suggestion.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Nevertheless, it is my opinion, and from what I have seen going on in this country—and I go about with my eyes and ears open—I honestly think it is not far out. I oppose the motion, although it has been so eloquently moved by the leader of the House.

Hon. A. H. PANTON (West) [6.7]: I have listened with a great deal of interest for some explanation from some of those members who took action yesterday to reject this Bill. So far three members have spoken, and with the exception of the fact that they have made a tremendous lot of noise, I have not heard anything in explanation of their action.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: You are accustomed to that.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: Yes, and I am getting a lot more of it here. So far as I can gather from the remarks of the three members who have spoken, the principle reason for rejecting this Bill is that they are going to introduce another Bill. This is sheer hypocrisy on the part of hon. members.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not accuse any other hon. member of hypocrisy.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I am very sorry, Sir, and I withdraw the word if withdrawal be necessary. Members know as well as I do that if they introduce a Bill, and pass it through this House, it will have no chance of getting any further. This is the reason why they are talking of introducing another Bill. It is a rather remarkable fact that the two members chiefly concerned in the rejection of this Bill are mostly concerned with the early closing of shops in the metropolitan area. It might be a coincidence that one of them represents the Metropolitan-Suburban Province and the other the Metropolitan Province where most of the shop assistants live. I can claim to have been more closely associated with the shop assistants and factory workers during the last six or eight years than any other hon. member.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Did you try to get them to stop work yesterday?

Hon. A. H. PANTON: The hon. member will get all the stop work he wants if it is necessary for him to attend and explain the attitude which he has taken up in this House. If the rejected Bill is not revived, I have no hesitation in saying that I shall attend all the stop-work meetings which are likely to be held, and there is likely to be one every Friday night. I shall go further. The last two agreements, drawn up between the shop assistants and the employers without going to the Arbitration Court, contained certain clauses which were withdrawn by the employees conditionally on the employers assisting to obtain the passage of this Bill through both Houses of Parliament.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is what they are doing now.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: We have the evidence tendered before a select committee appointed by another place, which shows that only one business man, Mr. Montgomery, of Fremantle, opposed the provisions of the Bill, and Mr. Montgomery all his life has been opposed to trade unionism.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: And Mr. Davies of Geraldton.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I am speaking of the metropolitan area. Mr. Clifton represented the views of the whole of the business people in Fremantle before the select committee.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: They repudiated his representation.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: The hon. member's colleagues will repudiate anything at any time. If they repudiate their representative I cannot help that; there is the sworn evidence which was tendered before the select committee. The reason why the clauses to which I have referred were withdrawn from the agreement was that the employees had a guarantee from the employers to assist to get the Bill passed by Parliament. The shop assistants can now come to only one logical conclusion and that is that the employers have, so to speak, got them up a tree and are now seeking to cut down the tree from under them. After getting the clauses withdrawn from the agreement, the employers are using their influence with their representatives in this House to defeat the Bill.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I rise to a point of order. I have not moved in this matter as I have done otherwise than from my own ideas, and I have had no suggestions whatsoever made to me by anyone.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I said that there was only one logical conclusion which could be drawn by the shop assistants, and that is the conclusion which I draw.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member must not repeat that statement after the assurance of the hon. gentleman that in his case it is not so.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: Very well, I shall not repeat it. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the references made from time to time in this Council, as to it being a non-party House, the bulwark of the Constitution and the essence of democracy. Now we find Mr. Holmes complaining that for four months we have had nothing to discuss. Yet on the first occasion on which the Government send along something worth discussing, according to the hon. gentleman, he is not prepared to discuss it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I gave my reason.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: It seems to me that those members who adopted the attitude of rejecting the Bill yesterday wish, while waving the flag of democracy with one hand, to choke democracy with the other. Irrespective of what happens to this motion, I shall oppose any further Bill which may be brought down because it would merely be brought down in the hope of placating the shop assistants of the metropolitan area.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	11

A tie 0

AYES.

Hon. F. A. Baglin	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. H. P. Colebatch	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. H. Stewart
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. A. H. Panton
Hon. J. E. Dodd	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. J. Mills
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. R. J. Lynn	(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. R. G. Ardagh
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. E. M. Clarke

THE PRESIDENT: In order to permit of further deliberation, I give my casting vote with the "Ayes."

Question thus passed.

Sitting suspended from 6.17 to 7.30 p.m.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Sale of Liquor Regulation Act Continuance.

2, Licensing Act Amendment Continuance. Passed.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and read a first time.

BILL—INNKEEPERS.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [7.35] in moving the second reading said: Early in this session a Bill was introduced and passed through Parliament for the purpose of limiting the liability of common carriers. In that case it was pointed out that the law in regard to common carriers had been amended in England many years ago, but had not been amended in this State. Exactly the same thing applies to the liability of innkeepers, and the purpose of this Bill is to do substantially for the innkeeper what was done for the common carrier by the Bill passed at an earlier stage of the session. Again, in this case we are simply following what has been done in the Old Country for many, many, years. As far back as 1863 a law was passed in England limiting the liability of innkeepers in the manner in which it is proposed to limit their liability under this Bill. Should this measure become law, no innkeeper will be liable to make good to

any lodger any loss of, or injury to, goods or property brought to his inn, not being a horse or any live animal, or any gear appertaining thereto, or any carriage, to a greater amount than the sum of £30, except in the following cases, where such goods or such property have been stolen, lost, or injured, by the wilful act; default, or neglect of such innkeeper or a servant in his employ, or where such goods or property have been deposited expressly for safe custody with the innkeeper. The necessity for legislation on these lines was emphasised recently, when a case was brought before the Supreme Court in which a lodger at one of the Perth hotels claimed several hundreds of pounds—I am not sure that the amount did not run into four figures—

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: It was over £400.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:—In respect of jewellery that had apparently been stolen from the lodger's room, and of the existence of which jewellery the innkeeper probably had no knowledge whatever. I am not aware of the exact grounds on which that case was decided, but I believe the innkeeper gained the verdict. Had this Bill been law, however, it would not have been competent for that lodger to obtain from the innkeeper more than £30 unless the jewellery had been specifically entrusted to the care of the innkeeper, or unless the owner of the property could demonstrate that the theft had been made possible by the wilful act, default, or neglect of the innkeeper or any person in the innkeeper's employ. At the present time that is the law in England. An innkeeper is only responsible up to the amount of £30 unless the loser of the goods can prove one of two things—neglect on the part of the innkeeper or someone in his employ, or else that the article was committed to the innkeeper's care. This Bill, if passed, will establish here the relationship between innkeeper and lodger which has existed for the past 60 years in England, and which is, I think, entirely equitable. Our present law cannot be regarded as equitable, since under it a lodger can claim any amount against an innkeeper in respect of goods stolen, and can recover it excepting in circumstances such as existed in the case tried recently, where the innkeeper was, I believe, able to prove negligence on the part of the lodger. In any event, negligence on the lodger's part is a complete answer by the innkeeper even to a claim for a lesser sum than £30. The passing of this Bill will bring our legislation into conformity with that of the Old Country, and also with that of the other States of the Commonwealth. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [7.39]: I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill, which I consider a very useful measure and one that ought to have been

brought in some time ago. In the past innkeepers and hotelkeepers have been compelled to take a great deal of risk; and, apart from that phase, there is always the possibility of collusion on the part of people who might possibly arrange a theft by which they could profit afterwards. In the circumstances I have pleasure in supporting this measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL — MEEKATHARRA-HORSESHOE RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [7.42] in moving the second reading said: This is a very important Bill, and one which I have no hesitation whatever in commending to the favourable consideration of the House. The measure asks authority for the construction by a private company of a private railway to run from Meekatharra north to Peak Hill, and thence northwards to the Horseshoe Reef, a distance of 85 miles. The route of the railway is set out on the plan which hon. members perceive hanging on the wall of the Chamber. The purpose of the railway is to enable the company, the General Chemical Supply Co., Ltd., who at present hold certain leases in that locality, to open up and develop those leases, which contain manganese deposits of great value and of very considerable dimensions. Two reports on the extent and value of the manganese deposits have been submitted. One is by Mr. G. B. S. Dunn, mining engineer, who estimates that there is or the surface 2,700,000 tons of high-grade manganese ore, valued at 127 millions sterling. The other report, by Mr. Montgomery, the State Mining Engineer, is to the effect that the deposits contain not less than 1¼ million tons of ore of good marketable quality, easily obtainable by open excavation, and that most probably there are much larger quantities of ore below the superficial course which alone has been taken into account in his figures. So that the two estimates do not necessarily conflict with each other. Mr. Dunn's estimate of 2,700,000 tons of ore is not disputed by Mr. Montgomery, who says that there is certainly 1¼ million tons on the surface and probably a very much larger quantity below. Mr. Montgomery states the present value of the 1¼ million tons, delivered in England, at 13 millions sterling. The estimated value per ton in each report is approximately the same. The State Mining Engineer's report goes on to say that the quantity in sight justifies the construction of a railway to connect the

mines with the State railway system at Meekatharra, and also justifies the construction of ore-loading bins and appliances at Geraldton. Mr. Montgomery further states—

When once a railway has been built there, there would seem to be no reason to fear that the mines could not put their ore upon the world's markets in open competition with that of India.

At the present time, as no doubt hon. members who study the metal market at all are aware, there is a manganese famine in England. Last year Great Britain was £100,000 worth of ore short. The Imperial Government are doing everything possible to increase the supply of manganese ore. This ore, as members are aware, is used extensively in the manufacture of steel, which, of course, is of the utmost importance throughout the British Empire. The development of these manganese leases will, according to the reports, be a profitable enterprise for the company, who will have to lay out a very large sum of money, and thus employment will be given to a great many workers. The railway, as is usual, will be surveyed by the Public Works Department. Such Crown lands as are required for the railway will be leased to the company for a term of 99 years, and provision is made that where it is necessary to resume private lands, those private lands will be resumed by the Government under conditions applying in such cases, and the company will have to pay the cost. The Government will have the right to purchase the railway at any time during the currency of the lease, the price to be determined by the Engineer-in-Chief, but not to exceed the cost of construction, less depreciation. While the railway is to be constructed for the service of the company developing the manganese ore deposits, it is intended that it shall be made of general service to the people of the district, and the company will be required to carry goods and passengers for that purpose. The company may make by-laws, which will be subject to the approval of the Governor. I have no doubt that whilst it would not be within the range of practical politics to construct such a railway at the present time for the general development of the district, the existence of the railway will be of immense value to the industries there, particularly to stock raisers and others in the locality. Recently the Federal Government arranged for a fortnightly mail service by motor from Meekatharra to Marble Bar, and the patronage is of such an extent that a private individual has found sufficient justification for running a passenger service on the alternate weeks. There is quite a number of industries which will be facilitated by the construction of the line—although that is purely a side issue, and the sole justification relied upon for building the line is the development of the manganese ore deposits. It is estimated that

the cost of constructing the line will be about a quarter of a million sterling, so hon. members will see that the project is of considerable magnitude. It will be noticed that under the Bill no provision is made as to the gauge of the railway. Last year the House passed a somewhat similar Bill contemplating a very much shorter line to connect the lead mines at Ajana with the State railway system.

Hon. J. Cornell: That was a tramway, not a railway.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No, it was described in the Bill as a railway. In that case no mention was made in the Bill of the gauge of the railway, but it was stated both here and in another place that the intention of the proprietors was to construct the railway on the 2ft. 6in. gauge, a foot narrower than the ordinary railway system in this State, and that they contemplated transferring their product from the narrower gauge railway to trucks on the State railway system. In the same way this Bill makes no provision as to the width of the railway, but I understand the present intention of the company is that it shall be the 3ft. 6in. gauge. There is no wish whatever to set up any false pretence or anything of that kind, because the company naturally take this view: on investigation it will have to be determined which is the cheaper method of bringing the manganese ore to the place of treatment. I say candidly that although the intention is to construct the railway on the 3ft. 6in. gauge it is not intended to tie the company down to that. They are to be given the same free option as the people at Ajana, namely, to do what is best for their industry. The industry is an enterprise of great magnitude, and a lot of capital will have to be invested, and the promoters are entitled to say, "We shall investigate the thing thoroughly, considering all the phases of the shipment of ore, and its transference from the narrower gauge to the 3ft. 6in. gauge." Whilst it is the present intention of the company to build a 3ft. 6in. railway, it is in the Bill left to the company to do the best in their own interests in order to properly develop their industry. There is one other point in regard to which the Bill differs slightly from the Ajana proposal, namely, in regard to the carrying of passengers and freight. In the case of the Ajana Bill, provision was made that the Governor should make by-laws for the regulation of traffic on the railway; in this case the owners are to make by-laws, but those by-laws must be approved by the Governor and published in the "Gazette." I merely draw attention to the difference, which is really not a material one, and I ask hon. members to bear in mind the fact that this company are taking on a very big proposition which, if it succeeds, will undoubtedly be of very great benefit to the State. I do not think they are asking anything unreasonable in the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) [7.52]: We ought to welcome any Bill which shows that there is to be some development in the country; but when we have a railway Bill like this before us and know something of what has happened before, we realise that it requires full consideration. I know nothing whatever about this railway, except what we have heard from the Minister. I know nothing whatever about the company. I do not say the Minister has not given us some information, but I should certainly like a great deal more before I am asked to vote for the Bill. We have an extraordinary way of conducting public business in this State, and then we are surprised when this or that turns up and entirely upsets our calculations and hopes and wishes. I have had no opportunity for knowing anything whatever about the company. I do not suggest it is not a company with sufficient capital and with all its affairs in perfect order, but we have no evidence that the company has any money at all. Here is the proposal; the owner is to be given two years after the passing of the Act in which to make a start with his construction. The Minister himself has told us that the company will investigate the proposal after we have passed the Bill. Not until then will the company determine whether the railway is to be of a 2ft. 6in. or a 3ft. 6in. gauge. I do not know much about railway construction, and I do not pretend to be a great authority on company matters, but I should imagine that any company which asks for a concession from us should be prepared to put down on paper what the financial position of the company is and what the company actually propose to do. Surely for their own protection they would be well advised to find out, before they ask for the concession, whether the railway is to be of 2ft. 6in. or 3ft. 6in. gauge. Unfortunately, during the last month we have had a very serious railway accident on one of these private railways. I imagine that matter is being inquired into. But here the company are to carry goods and passengers under conditions to be approved by the Governor in Council. Does that mean that we are to be in any way responsible for the conduct of affairs on that line? We know exactly how the public treat these matters. The public know perfectly well that 90 per cent. of the railways of the State are Government railways, and they will get on to this line naturally assuming that the Government are looking after their interests.

The Minister for Education: We are not responsible for accidents on the Midland line, which is the same as this.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: No, that is a private company of some magnitude. This line, 85 miles in length at £3,000 per mile, is not going to be a first class railway.

Hon. H. Stewart: It depends on the country.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: The country is as flat as a pancake.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am not speaking with any hostility to the company. I know nothing whatever about it. But if we are to be parties to this agreement, I think we are entitled to have a good deal more information than we have already. Clause 3 provides that it shall be lawful for the owner to construct, maintain and work the railway. Clause 8 provides that as soon as the railway is completed the Minister for Lands may lease the railway to the owner for 99 years. That, surely, is a wrong way of doing business. If the company get a concession for the railway what do the company want a 99 years lease for?

The Minister for Education: That is for the land on which the railway is to be constructed.

Hon. J. Nicholson: No. It means a lease of the railway, not of the land.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The Bill was not brought down until this afternoon. I am only commenting on it as it appears at first glance. The Minister is in error when he talks of leasing the land; it means the lease of the railway. It is not important, except as evidence that the Minister has not grasped the position on that particular point; and, considering the number of things he has to do, I am not surprised at it. I take it the measure has been carefully considered by the Government; but there is no evidence of that to the ordinary member. We have here a map of some value. But to tell me that the company are to have two years after the passing of the Act before they get to work—what is the object of that?

Hon. J. Duffell: They have to get the money.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Now we are beginning to get some evidence. They have still to get the money.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You do not think they have the money now, do you?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: It is not unknown in company affairs that companies have the necessary money when starting operations. I do not know whether this company has money or not. When the Bill is through it will certainly have an asset. We all know the trouble we got into through these railways, and the bad odour we have got into with people outside. We are told that this company has no money.

Hon. E. H. Harris: I believe it has £5,000.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: That will not go far in the building of a railway. One hon. member says the company has no money, and another says it has £5,000.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is a contradiction.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I do not seek to reconcile the observations of hon. members. Five thousand pounds may be sufficient for the preliminary expenses, such as having this Bill printed and passed through Parliament. I am not going to be a party to passing a measure of this kind until I know what the position of affairs is. I re-

member the trouble we got into some 30 years ago in connection with the Midland Railway Company's Bill. The company referred to in the Bill now before us can, when the Bill passes, go to different people and say, 'Here is the proposal.' I do not suggest there is anything wrong in that, but as representatives of the people we are entitled to know more about the whole matter. There is no reason why the General Chemical Company should not supply the information. It is not easy to carefully criticise a measure like this in the position in which we find ourselves. Anything that will help Meekatharra will have my support. It is not in opposition to the company that I make these observations, for I wish it every success. This proposal, however, constitutes a change in the railway construction policy of this country. I do not know whether it means the Government intend giving up the idea of building railways, and whether they find it beyond their power to run them successfully from the financial point of view. I trust the Minister will see that the fullest possible information is supplied as to the position of the company and what it is proposed to do. I will not be a party to passing the provision that two years after this Bill becomes law the company can start this railway.

The Honorary Minister: What period do you suggest?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: That is not a matter which can be decided off hand. If we pass the two years' term, the company may come to the Government and say they have not more than £20,000 or £100,000, and ask for an extension of the concession. I have no desire to see companies that come to this State dissatisfied with the treatment they receive here, as has been the case with other companies. Such companies turn round and attack Parliament and Western Australia because of the treatment which in many cases they have brought upon themselves. Let us cast our minds back to the French timber affair. The impression left upon my mind in that regard is that those people were treated very shabbily.

The Minister for Education: In what way? Their money was returned to them.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The impression left upon my mind was as I have stated. The Government said they were going to put the thing through and then dropped it for some reason.

Hon. A. H. Panton: They had not the money.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The negotiations were badly conducted. There should have been a proper bargain and proper investigation made beforehand. It is most regrettable that we did not get an Anglo-French company interested in the progress and development of this country.

Hon. A. H. Panton: We bought another mill instead.

The Honorary Minister: What is the good of a company without capital?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: This from the Honorary Minister! Perhaps I had better leave that alone. I have no desire to indulge in personal observations in the conduct of public business, I desire to see some arrangement made satisfactorily to this company and ourselves. Possibly in Committee we shall get more information than we have at present received, and such as will enable members to explain to people outside, who have every right to know, exactly what the position of affairs is.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [8.7]: By this Bill we are asked to cast a vote for or against the established policy of railway construction and maintenance in this State. It proposes to vest in the company concerned the right to construct 85 miles of railway. It also proposes that the railways should be constructed a portion of Western Australia, of which an organisation, which has my strongest appreciation, says its potentialities are unlimited. The jumping off point of the proposed national railway is Meekatharra. I will not cast a vote to set aside the existing policy of railway construction and maintenance in Western Australia. I shall probably lay myself open to the charge of being opposed to capital and to providing facilities to assist capital to come to this State. That is not so. A good deal of capital has come to this State during the last 25 years, on the understanding that the Government of the State will construct and run their own railways. This Bill proposes to alter that position. To whom does the Bill propose to give this power? What is this chemical company? Who are its directors, what is its capital and what is its object? The Minister for Education has put forward no case as to why we should alter the present policy. If people outside this Chamber knew what this meant, the same thing would happen as occurred in connection with the proposed sale of the State sawmills to a French company. Public opinion side-tracked the Government. Almost every society and organisation of repute in the State resolved that the State was to continue to conduct its own trading concerns.

Hon. H. Stewart: What is the capital of this company?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not know. The company has pegged out certain base metal leases at the head of the proposed line. What work or development will be carried out? What is there to justify us in consenting to the construction of this line? What is the necessity for hurry until the company justifies its existence? There is no analogy between this company and the other two companies which have built private railways, the Midland Railway Company and the company which constructed the Great Southern line.

Hon. J. Ewing: There were land grants in their cases.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Conditions were imposed which ensured that the companies fulfilled their obligations. One is still doing

so. What will happen in the case of this company will probably be that when this gigantic egg has been brought into existence, a favourable opportunity will be taken to put it on the market and leave it. I view this as an experimental company, and one that is resourceful and after something. The Minister has drawn an analogy between this proposed railway, and the Ajana-Geraldine line to the Surprise lead mines. There is no analogy between the two. The management of the Surprise lead mine more than justified their existence under unfavourable conditions. They did all that resourcefulness and initiative could do to make the surroundings of the mine congenial to those working on it. All this was done before they asked for a tram line. They made the request in order to provide transport facilities from the mine to the rail head, and not for the purpose of carrying passengers. That was the sole purpose and function of the Ajana tram line. There is absolutely no analogy between the proposal under the Bill and that particular line. I have visited Ajana and am aware of the different conditions which operate there. What the company in that instance desired to do was practically on the same lines as Millars and the Firewood company have been allowed to do. Under this Bill, it is a totally different project. This is to give the company a right similar to that held by the Midland Railway company and by the old Great Southern Railway company. It is a direct departure from the established principle governing the construction and control of the railways of the State by the State. When I belonged to the Labour party, it was a recognised principle with that organisation that on all occasions they should oppose the construction of railways by private companies. There should not be any departure from that principle which is endorsed not only by the people of Western Australia, but by the people of Australia as a whole. It would be injurious to the welfare of the country if we were to agree to any such proposition. I do not know whether there has been any change in the policy of the Labour party, but if not, I know I shall have the support of the members of that party in this House. In going through the Bill, I find that all the company has to do, to all intents and purposes, is to find the money and the Railway Department will practically construct the line.

Hon. H. Stewart: No, they only survey and locate the line.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes, and, if necessary, construct it. It will really be under the supervision of the Commissioner of Railways and every action of the company will be subject to the veto of the Commissioner. Once we agree to a departure from a principle of such importance as this, we will have further measures of this nature brought before us. There is no guarantee

whatsoever that if the company construct this line, in three or four years' time the conditions will not be observed and the matter will lapse. There is no provision as to the gauge of the railway. The leader of the House in introducing the Bill said that there was no similar provision regarding the Ajana tramway. I have already pointed out that there is no comparison between the two propositions and, in any case, if it was desired to construct a railway to replace the Ajana line, it could be done in two or three weeks. Has any member in this Chamber given any consideration to the havoc that has been wrought in Australia from the standpoint of defence on account of the break of gauge in the railways of Australia? If the second reading of the Bill is agreed to, I hope that members will insist that the gauge shall be in conformity with that which obtains within the State. Assuming that the Bill becomes law, and the company gets this concession, their lease will extend for 99 years, which is a very long period. We hope that the company will become prosperous and will be a boon to this country. We will assume that other resources in that locality and in the areas beyond, will be developed and that in due course the northern railway project which Mr. Miles has mentioned on several occasions will be taken up seriously. Unless we take steps regarding this gauge question, we will find that we will be confronted with the problem of the dual gauge in Western Australia just as that very problem is now facing Australia as a whole. If we permit the company to have a narrow gauge, and the company in due course allow their lease to lapse, the whole of the rolling stock will be wasted. I hope the House, therefore, will consider the necessity for providing that the gauge shall be the standard one. We should have some information as to whether the bylaws, which the company is empowered to frame, are to be subject to the veto of Parliament. They should be, and I consider that Parliament should see that they are made subject to its approval. I intend to vote against the second reading of the Bill on the ground that it is detrimental to the existing railway policy of this State. We have not sufficient evidence of the bona fides and intentions of the company nor have we sufficient evidence that they will spend the money necessary under this Bill. The question is so important and far-reaching that the House should be informed as to who are the directors of this company. We should not deal with the company. We should deal with the directors. I want to know who they are and then I will satisfy myself to what extent they are desirous of working in the interests of the State, the base metal industry or of themselves.

Hon. J. EWING (South-West) [8.25]: I have listened to the hon. member who has

just spoken and I give him hearty support regarding many of the matters which he has referred to, particularly regarding the break of gauge which is sought to be permitted under this Bill. The Minister, in introducing the Bill, stated that no gauge in connection with the railway was mentioned in the measure. It is possible that it may be a 2ft. 6in. gauge instead of a 3ft. 6in. gauge. An enormous amount of money has to be spent in Australia in connection with the break of gauge problem. It is a very serious matter and one which will cost Australia many millions of money to rectify. It is causing engineers of note grave concern. Although in this particular instance, the question at issue is a small matter in comparison with the major problem confronting Australia, it is one that deserves very grave consideration. I hope provision will be made in Committee that the gauge shall be 3ft. 6in. It may prove to be the nucleus of a railway going north, as suggested by Mr. Miles, and if we do not make some provision such as I have indicated, then we will be confronted with trouble at the very outset. Regarding other matters affected by the Bill, I do not believe in a dog in the manger attitude at all. This country requires development. It is essential that we should have capital brought into the country, and if these people are prepared to spend £250,000 in order to construct this railway so that they may be able to develop the manganese deposits, I am with them every time. I am satisfied that such a step would be in the interests of the State. The provision of £250,000 is perhaps a liberal allowance for the construction of the line, bearing in mind the increased costs which are now levied. The people concerned in the company are satisfied with the reports made by Mr. Dunne and by the State Mining Engineer, the latter being a more conservative document. The State Mining Engineer estimates that there are 1,250,000 tons, valued at 22 million pounds. Mr. Dunne estimates the deposit as aggregating 2,700,000 tons, which would be worth about 27 million pounds. These are big figures. It has to be remembered that the Government are not prepared to build a line at the present time. They have not got the money to do so. If the Government cannot spend that money to construct the line and these people are willing to do so, I say good luck to them. If we are not to encourage capital to come into this State in order to carry out work which will be beneficial to the State as well as to those introducing the capital, such a course will be most unwise. So far as the railway construction policy is concerned, it would be greatly to the benefit of the State if the Government could construct and control all railways. If that were so, there would be no question of anyone else controlling or constructing any line whatever in this State. Members must recognise that the position in Western Australia is that a

large number of agricultural railway lines have been authorised by Governments during the past few years and those railways will have precedence over this particular line. I would be no party to authorising the construction of this line before those which have been promised and authorised in the past, are constructed in the agricultural areas.

Hon. J. Cornell: If the late Lord Forrest had gone on that policy, they would never have secured a line to Kalgoorlie.

Hon. J. EWING: The lines I refer to have been authorised by Parliament. The Government have not got the money to construct the lines and it is not likely that they will get the money for some considerable time. If we are to develop these manganese deposits and the company are prepared to spend £250,000, they should be encouraged to do so. It is known that the deposits of manganese will be extremely valuable in this State. The leader of the House in introducing the measure stated that the manganese was required in the old country. Personally, I would like to see this manganese used in Western Australia. I would have no objection to manganese being exported to the old country for use in connection with the manufacture of steel, but I hope to see steel works established in the South-West in the course of a very few years. I am satisfied we must take a broad view of this matter, and that if we cannot take the necessary steps which will bring about the development of the manganese deposits, we should permit others who are prepared and willing, to do so. I am sorry that Mr. Cornell holds the view to which he gave expression, because it might have the effect of putting back the progress of the State for many years. Naturally, it would be better if the State could carry out the construction of this railway. I would ask the hon. member, however, where could the State get the money with which to construct the line? If it were possible for the State to carry out this work, I should certainly support it being built by the State. But the State cannot do the work, and therefore we should not deny the right to other people to do it for us. They will be watched carefully, and the State will be thoroughly protected. I can only express the hope that those who are connected with the development of the manganese deposits will be successful in their efforts, and I shall be only too glad, as a member of this House, to assist them. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.33]: I realise that the Bill, although small, embodies a big principle. It is necessary for us to ascertain the reasons for granting a concession of this nature. In that direction I look to the person who introduced the Bill, and I find that it was presented in another place by the Premier. That should be a guarantee that the Government are

seized with the importance of the Bill. I am not so much concerned about the General Chemical Company; I am not so much concerned as to whether they are going to raise funds for the building of this railway, but I am concerned with this fact, that the Bill will facilitate the development of a large deposit of manganese ore which has been found in a certain portion of Western Australia. I take it for granted that the Government are satisfied in regard to the bona-fides of the company concerned.

Hon. A. Sanderson: We have to be satisfied.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: That is the point. We want to know whether the company have a clean title to this deposit of manganese. I am not yet quite sure, but I take it that, as the Premier has introduced the Bill, he is satisfied with the reports he has received from his officers that the ore is there in the quantities stated. He must also be satisfied that the development of that deposit of ore will be put in hand, and that it will be turned into marketable channels in such a manner as to redound to the credit of Western Australia, not only by way of cash but also as another illustration of our possession of great mineral resources. I notice that Clause 11 places a limit on the time to be granted to the company to find the money for the construction of the line. It is only reasonable that there should be a time limit. I have on all occasions expressed myself very definitely on matters of this kind, and it has always been my desire to assist in the development of the natural resources of the State. We have granted concessions from time to time, amongst others to the Lake Clifton Company. I am told in connection with that concession that work is progressing satisfactorily, and I believe that if the concession is granted as provided in the Bill before us now, we shall assist to develop what must become a valuable asset. I hope that, when the Minister is replying, he will assure the House that the company who are applying for this concession have a clear title to the deposit of ore, and that they will be able to carry out the conditions required of them.

On motion by Hon. Sir F. H. Wittenoom, the debate adjourned.

BILL—RAILWAYS CLASSIFICATION BOARD.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [8.38] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is in some respects not unlike the Bill passed at an earlier stage of the session to establish an appeal board in connection with the civil service. It is not entirely on all fours with that Bill, because the circumstances are different in this respect, that the civil service were excluded from the provisions of the Arbitration Court, whereas the railway officers have the right to go to the court, but the

court has not the power to do what is considered desirable. There are differences also in the powers with regard to classification. This is a classification board, whereas the civil service board is for appeals against classifications. But in a general way, just as that Bill was intended to devise a satisfactory method of dealing with disputes between the service and the Government, so this Bill is intended to devise satisfactory methods of dealing with disputes and differences between the Commissioner of Railways and the officers of the railway service. The purpose of the Bill is to provide for a board for the classification of the salaried staff of the Government railways. The salaried staff of the Railway Department, in common with the wages staff, are at the present time entitled to approach the Arbitration Court for the settlement of disputes which may exist between the salaried staff and the Commissioner of Railways. The Arbitration Court has proved an unsatisfactory tribunal in the matter of dealing with classifications, and after careful consideration it has been thought desirable to provide a tribunal that will carry out this work in a way which will do justice to both parties and avoid the troubles which have existed in the past. If the Bill becomes law, and the board is established, the railway officers will no longer be entitled to approach the Arbitration Court. One of the clauses of the Bill takes away the right they have at the present time to approach the Arbitration Court. In Victoria a classification board affecting the salaried staff of the railways of that State has recently been appointed, and this Bill is founded largely on the Victorian measure. It provides for a board consisting of accredited representatives of the Commissioner and of the salaried officers with a chairman, who shall be a magistrate, or some other person mutually agreed upon by the parties. With the board will sit two assessors, one of whom will be appointed by the Commissioner and the other by the salaried officers. The assessors will be entitled to examine and cross-examine witnesses, take full part in the proceedings with the members of the board, but they will have no voice in the decision that will be arrived at. The members of the board will hold office continuously until their period expires, or until they are replaced under the provisions of the Bill. The board is intended to be a continuous body, but the assessors will vary from time to time. They will be men with technical knowledge and experience in the particular sections in connection with which the inquiry or classification is being held. There are several branches of the service—such as ways and works, the existing lines, and the traffic branch. In the Arbitration Court it has frequently been felt that three men are under a disadvantage when called upon to deal with a variety of interests. In this case the difficulty is sought to be overcome by having at the disposal of the board assessors representative of the Commissioner and the employees who will have expert

knowledge and experience of the particular class of work in regard to which the classification is proceeding. The railway officers have for some time past been asking that a board of this description should be appointed. The provisions of the Bill do not go nearly so far as the officers of the Railway Department would desire, but they do represent a reasonable compromise. The duties of the board are set out in clause 15, which really is the most important clause of the Bill. It says—

(1) The board shall have jurisdiction—
(a) to classify all salaried positions in the service of the Government Railways, except heads and sub-heads of branches. When the Bill is in Committee I propose to submit an amendment to the interpretation clause giving the definition of heads and sub-heads of branches, because this has not been sufficiently provided for. The matter was discussed between the Commissioner and the railway officers, and on general lines an agreement was arrived at as to what should constitute heads and sub-heads of branches. It is not intended that the classification of heads and sub-heads of branches should come within the jurisdiction of this board. That will be a matter within the exclusive right of the Commissioner. Clause 15 continues—

(b) to create classes, and to provide the minimum and maximum salaries of all positions in any class; (c) to prescribe the method by which officers shall be advanced from the minimum to the maximum of the salary assigned to their positions, or from class to class; (d) to hear and determine any appeal by any officer or class of officers in respect of the classification, re-classification, or salary of such officer or class of officers, or his or their office or offices. (2.) The board may determine—
(a) the maximum number of hours to be worked daily or in any period; (b) the maximum number of hours which a shift may extend; (c) the minimum interval for rest between shifts; (d) the maximum number of shifts to be worked weekly or in any period; and (e) what payment or allowance (if any) shall be made by reason of any condition of employment affecting remuneration (but not including payments of allowances in respect of accidents), such as payments of allowances to be made—(i) for overtime or emergency work; (ii) for Sunday, holiday, or night work; (iii) for travelling time; (iv) for relieving expenses; (v) for travelling or incidental expenses; (vi) for relieving in higher positions; (vii) for district allowances; (viii) for work performed under special conditions; (ix) for youths living away from home; (x) for sick pay, annual and long service leave; (xi) or any other matter submitted by mutual consent; and may make awards with respect to any of the matters referred to in this subsection.

Therefore, the powers of the board are comprehensive and practically cover any matter which might reasonably be dealt with by the

Arbitration Court, in regard to other industries. It is considered that the board will present an easier, much less costly and much more satisfactory tribunal than the Arbitration Court in existing conditions can possibly do. It will be available whenever required, which is another consideration of great importance, because the Arbitration Court, called upon as it is to deal with all industries of the State, is usually overburdened with work, and it is difficult for those who desire to approach the court to do so within a convenient time. This board will be available at all times, so that difficulties may be quickly settled. Partly because of the expert knowledge which the assessors will have and the constitution of the board generally, it should be able to arrive at conclusions more satisfactorily than might be expected from the Arbitration Court in existing circumstances. I would draw special attention to the fact that promotion is not a matter within the functions of the board. This will remain a function of the Commissioner of Railways. I do not think it is necessary at this stage to deal at any length with the separate clauses. The Bill provides for the constitution of the board, and for the tenure of office, the period being three years and the members eligible for re-appointment. It provides for the filling of extraordinary vacancies, for the creation of the board in case of failure to elect members, and for deputy members in the absence of members, and it gives the right to vote for the board to every officer of the department. The provision relating to the constitution of the board reads—

One member shall be a magistrate, or such other person as may be agreed upon between the Minister and the Railway and Tramway Officers' Industrial Union of Workers, and such member shall be the chairman of the board. One member shall be a person nominated by the Commissioner. One member shall be a person elected in the prescribed manner by the Railway and Tramway Officers' Industrial Union of Workers.

That is practically the same as the representation of the Civil Service Association and the Teachers' Union in connection with their appeal board. There is power to appoint clerks and to carry on the machinery of the board.

Hon. J. Ewing: Will not it be much more expensive than the present system?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not think it will be as expensive as the Arbitration Court. Provision is made that the cost shall be a charge on the railways.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: This is in addition to the Arbitration Court.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Quite so, but if the Arbitration Court had to deal with additional cases, its expenses would be greater. Members must admit that the Arbitration Court cannot deal with the whole of the cases. We should need two Ar-

bitration Courts to deal with all the cases necessary. The awards of the board will be final, and in this respect the provision is similar to that contained in the Public Service Appeal Board Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Ewing in the Chair; The Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short Title:

Hon. H. STEWART: It was due to inadvertence on my part that the Bill passed its second reading. The President in putting the question, was certainly too quick for me. I have not even read the Bill, and I ask the Minister to postpone the consideration of the Bill in Committee until members have had an opportunity to study the Bill. I do not think any other member has read the Bill.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Yes, I have read every word of it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am willing to report progress on the next clause.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have no wish to proceed with the Bill until members have had an opportunity to study it.

Progress reported.

MOTION—ELECTRICAL ENERGY.

To Inquire by Royal Commission.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. J. Ewing—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the feasibility of generating electrical energy at Collie, and transmitting the same from there with a view to reducing the cost of the supply of power for industrial and domestic purposes at centres where it is required.

Hon. R. J. LYNN (West) [8.54]: I commend the hon. member for having brought forward this motion, and I hope that the Government will take into consideration the questions which it raises. I am not in favour of the appointment of a Royal Commission at this stage, because I think that the Government will have sufficient data and ample time to give thorough consideration to the motion. There is no doubt in my mind, or I think in that of any hon. member, regarding the great advantage to be gained from the provision of cheap power for industrial and other purposes in the metropolitan area, but

it would take more than a Royal Commission to decide this matter, because the question of policy would have to be considered by Parliament. Some years ago, when the proposition for the installation of the East Perth power house was put forward, I was one of the severest critics of the scheme, because I considered that the Government of the day were infringing the rights of the local authorities. Because of my opposition to the scheme in those days I have watched its progress. Looking back over the intervening years, I must say that those who were responsible for the inauguration of the scheme are certainly to be commended for the foresight they showed. In those days we had in the metropolitan area several power houses generating electricity, and I could not see how a Government scheme could possibly get a sufficient number of consumers to warrant such heavy expenditure. The returns dealing with the East Perth power house show that the growth has been indeed marvellous. In the East Perth power house we have plant capable of generating 52 million units per annum, and at the present time only 18 or 19 million units per annum are being consumed. Yet the power house is producing current at a lower cost than any station in the United Kingdom. Current is being sold in various districts within a radius of 10 to 15 miles from the power station at a lower cost than in any other part of Australia, not excepting Tasmania.

Hon. J. Ewing: What is the rate?

Hon. R. J. LYNN: It is as low as .75d. to the Perth City Council.

Hon. H. STEWART: Are not the Government making a loss on that?

Hon. R. J. LYNN: No. That is one of the questions with which I intend to deal.

Hon. J. Ewing: The Government are not making a loss?

Hon. R. J. LYNN: No. If the Government did not cater for the Perth City Council the overhead charges would be considerably in excess of what they are to-day. It is necessary to have the large consumption; otherwise the overhead charges would result in a considerable loss. Last year the loss was approximately £4,000, after allowing for obsolescence and interest and sinking fund. But if there were not large consumers like the Fremantle tramways and the Perth City Council, the overhead charges would have brought about a much larger loss than that actually incurred. Had the scheme been originally located at Collie instead of being pioneered in the metropolitan area, it would have cost an extra amount of £50,000 per annum. Even now the consumption is only 18 million units per annum, whereas the East Perth power house is capable of producing 52 million units per annum. At the present time it would not be an economic proposition to establish further works anywhere in this State, irrespective of the cost

of establishment, because there would be duplication of capital expenditure unless there was a consumption of more than the maximum that the East Perth power station can now produce. Mr. Ewing referred to the great advantages which would accrue to the metropolitan area if the current could be disposed of at such a price as would, according to Mr. Edmiston's report, result in a consumption of 15 million units annually. All hon. members are aware that a previous Government made a contract to supply the Perth City Council with current at 75d. per unit. But the Perth City Council are quite unable to retail the current at anything like a reasonable rate, because of the overhead charges connected with the council's other scheme, which cost about £400,000 or £450,000. The result is that, on top of the charge of 75d. payable to the Government, and the cost of distribution, the Perth City Council must make provision for wiping out the heavy capital expenditure incurred through the purchase of works before the establishment of the East Perth power house. I am quite sure that we would not be a party to repudiating the agreement entered into by a previous Government with the Perth City Council. In order to bring about the consumption desired by Mr. Edmiston, and referred to by Mr. Ewing, of 15 million units per annum, it would be necessary to abolish or repudiate or cancel the agreement with the Perth City Council. I do not intend to say anything with respect to the administration from the Perth City Council aspect, but I must express my regret that the Perth City Council are not alive to their responsibilities as regards the extension of power in the metropolitan area. It may safely be said that Perth is the worst lit town to be found in the world.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Oh, come, come!

Hon. R. J. LYNN: I do not know one worse for its size. Let me give the House an idea of the business capacity of the people running the electric distribution in the metropolitan area. I did not know anything of the Perth City Council's business methods when I put electric light into my own house. My first bill was for 92 units, costing 7s. 6d., equal to 1¼d. per unit. My next bill was for 58 units. Now, 92 units had cost 7s. 6d., but these 58 units cost 19s. 4d. I ventured to suggest to the Perth City Council that their minimum was a most extraordinary thing. In the kindest spirit I inquired whether they could not charge me the minimum of 60 units, so that I might get those 60 units at 1¼d., equal to 6s. approximately, instead of paying 19s. 4d. for 58 units. However, in order to get the minimum of 60 units for about 6s., instead of paying about £1 for a lesser number of units, I have to run a radiator in summer so as to make up the consumption of current necessary to enable me to get electricity at the reduced cost. Can a more absurd position be imagined? If Mr. Ewing

thinks the Perth City Council have the business acumen and business capacity to develop the metropolitan consumption to an extent of 15 million units per annum, and to do it on their present basis of charging, I do not agree with him.

Hon. J. Ewing: Put someone else there to do it.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: That consumption cannot be obtained unless we repudiate the agreement made by a previous Government with the Perth City Council. Such a thing I feel sure neither the present Government nor any other Government would be prepared to do. Independently of the consumption necessary in order to justify the installation of a power house at Collic, I shall not argue that when railage amounts to 12s. per ton it is not possible to generate current at Collic more cheaply than at the East Perth power house; but I do say that it would be quite impossible at present to erect a large generating station at Collic and transmit the current to the metropolitan area except at an extremely heavy cost. There would be no advantage derivable from such a proceeding, because the present surplus at the East Perth power house is equal to about 32 million units per annum. It has been stated that for the establishment of industries in the metropolitan area we must have some station to pioneer the business. Those who have been and are in charge at the East Perth power house have worked very hard, and as regards the consumption outside the five-mile radius have done very well indeed. So far as I know, only two or three industries are likely to require large supplies of current here within the next two or three years. The development of those industries would undoubtedly assist very materially to place the Government's electric power undertaking on a good financial footing. When that situation has materialised, it will be time enough to consider the extension of the existing generating plant and probably the erection of another plant in the place where coal is cheapest. I shall not enter into the technical side of the question, not being too well versed in it; but I do know that to add to the capital cost already incurred while the present power station is capable of putting out three times the current it now puts out, would not be an economic proposal, especially in view of the fact that the charge made by the Western Australian Government is lower than the charge in any other part of Australasia. I am somewhat opposed to the engagement of experts in this connection until such time as the Government consider it necessary to embark upon a new scheme. Assuming that the motion is carried and that a Royal Commission is appointed, the Government will be engaging experts, at very heavy cost, to report years before their reports will be required. I think some time must elapse before any further increase in the consumption of electric current can be expected in the metropolitan

area. Conditions must first become more normal. Outside the one or two industries mentioned by Mr. Ewing, there are only the works to treat iron ore from Yampi Sound. When the day arrives—and I shall be very pleased indeed if it arrives early—that it is necessary to establish large works for the treatment of Yampi iron, the question will arise where that ore should be treated, and also the further question at what point a power station should be erected. Apart from the coal question, there are many considerations applying to the installation of a plant. One of them is a supply of good water. Whilst I commend Mr. Ewing for having brought this matter forward, I do not think the present time is suitable for the establishment of electric works at Collie. I have gone into the figures of the approximate cost of installing a power house there, and also of the cost of transmitting current from Collie to the metropolitan area. I realise what such a scheme would mean to the metropolitan area generally if the consumption of current were such as to warrant the expenditure. But I do urge that in view of the surplus capacity available to-day at the East Perth power station, it would not be advisable to incur that additional expenditure at present, or, indeed, until such time as a further quantity of electric power is required beyond what the East Perth power house can supply. Mr. Ewing thought it was quite possible that sufficient money would be forthcoming from, I take it, private enterprise to embark upon such a scheme. There again, that would be a question of policy for the Government or for Parliament, but not for a commission to decide, as to whether the concessions should be granted to private enterprise. I question very much whether, in the first place, we could get private enterprise to provide the capital, and even if we could, I do not think Parliament would grant the concession. I am willing to admit that if some system could be devised whereby the consumption could be increased in the metropolitan area where the convenience would be so very great, especially in summer for cooking purposes, it would be a considerable advantage and would add greatly to the success of the system.

Hon. J. Cornell: It would save a lot of energy expended in chopping the morning's wood.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: That is one of the exercises I enjoy. But under the existing system, which gives the Perth City Council a monopoly within a radius of five miles of the town hall, I do not think, unless the city council were prepared to allow the Government to pioneer this business, they will succeed in devising such a system. I do not know whether it is part of their policy to encourage the use of gas as against electricity in the metropolitan area, but I think the instance I have quoted will indicate to the House that if they are desirous of extending it in the direction of bringing about an in-

creased consumption within their area, they will have to adopt some other methods than those in existence. In the original scheme it was intended that the electrification of the railways should be part and parcel of the East Perth power installation, but because of the capital expenditure involved and, I suppose, of the scrapping of so much plant, it would not, I understand, be economical or advantageous to make the alteration at the present time. I commend the hon. member for having brought this forward, but I do not think the time is ripe for the appointment of experts to make the investigation.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: Have not they a permanent commission at Collie?

Hon. R. J. LYNN: They have had many commissions.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: They had one which sat for about three years.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: Yes. It may be necessary for this commission to also visit Canada and other places to collect the required evidence. There can be no question about the great value attaching to this if the current can be produced at a price which will encourage the establishment of industries. The trouble is that within a radius of five miles of the Perth Town Hall the city council have a monopoly. That reaches to Claremont. On the other hand, the Fremantle Tramway Board have a monopoly agreement with the Government for the supply of electricity within a radius of five miles of the Fremantle Town Hall. So, for a distance of 15 miles from the Fremantle Town Hall, through and beyond Perth, no matter how desirous those in control of the system may be of extending their business, it will be impossible for them to do so unless we repudiate the existing agreements. That being so, any industry would have to go beyond that 15-mile limit to obtain current at a reasonable rate. I have had a good deal of experience in connection with contracts entered into by the Fremantle Tramway Board. They were in a position to make agreements for the supply of electricity at a very little margin of profit over and above the Government price, as low as one penny per unit. But that does not apply to the Perth municipality, and it is impossible to establish any additional consumption within the Perth radius unless the council are prepared to accept a very small margin of profit, as against loading up the system to provide money for obsolescence in connection with the previous power station. I commend the motion to the Government. I believe they are alive to the position, and I hope that, having brought his question before the House, the hon. member will perhaps withdraw his motion.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.22 p.m.