municipality goes in for municipal undertakings which are profitable it should not be necessary to strike this rate. Members will see the absurdity of a municipality striking a rate for which they have no use. There is one other matter upon which I wish to touch, the issuing of a return showing the assets and liabilities of a municipality. To me that provision seems absolutely absurd. The majority of the liabilities of all municipalities would be their loans, which every municipality has very generously availed itself of, whereas their assets are very few. We should probably see such a state of things as that which occurred in South Australia. We might see in East Fremantle, for instance, the liabilities stated at £7,000 to £8,000, and the assets one horse and cart or a roller. That I say is most ludicrous and waste of time on the part of the officials in making up such a return. In the city of Perth the assets would be the parks and reserves which we have received from past generous Governments, and which show no return of profit to the municipality. I trust that when the Bill is in Committee it will receive very careful attention from members, and that we shall strike out many of the provisions from this very extreme measure which I say has been introduced by an extremist.

On motion by MR. LYNCH, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at a quarter past 10 o'clock, until the next afternoon.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 28th September, 1904.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 3·30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: 1, Goldfields Water Supply Administration—1st Annual Report to 30th June, 1904.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: 1, Amended Regulations for Ticket-of-Leave holders. 2, Warders and nurses employed in Fremantle Gaol and Hospital—wages paid and hours; return moved for by Mr. Needham.

QUESTION—COLLIE-CARDIFF TOWNSITE.

MR. HENSHAW asked the Premier: 1, Is it the intention of the Lands Department to declare a townsite at Cardiff? 2, If not, why not?

THE PREMIER replied: The late Government decided to establish a townsite at Collie-Cardiff in July last. Necessary steps are being taken in consequence to resume land required for the purpose.

QUESTION—MULLEWA COAL BORING.

MR. CARSON asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to test the country near Mullewa for coal? 2, If so, when?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Yes. 2, On the completion of of the boring operations now being subsidised by the Government near Mingenew.

QUESTION—SUNDAY THEATRICAL PERFORMANCES.

MR. NANSON (for MR. Hopkins) asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, On whose authority was the "Sign of the

Cross" accepted as a sacred drama? 2, What evidence was adduced in support of such classification?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, On the authority of the Bishop of Norwich, Canon Farrar, and the late Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone. 2, When the representatives of Mr. J. C. Williamson applied for permission to stage the "Sign of the Cross" in Kalgoorlie on Sunday, they produced in support of their application extracts from sermons delivered by Canon Farrar and the Bishop of Norwich, which demonstrated beyond doubt the character of the drama. The Bishop of Norwich was so impressed with the ennobling and elevating character of the play that he dispensed his congregation from their Lenten observances so far as would enable them to witness its representation; while Canon Farrar concluded an eloquent appeal to "all those desirous of seeing the stage used as a vehicle for the promulgation of truly moral and Christian sentiment, to avail themselves of the opportunity of witnessing 'The Sign of the Cross,' which, judged from a religious aspect, has never before been seen in the memory of living man." *The Christian World* wrote of the drama that "it was felt and confessed that by a work of art and from the stage the true universality of the Christian worship was expressed with unimagined power." Another extract submitted to me was from the *Australasian Schoolmaster*, and read: "Teachers could give no better intellectual treat and moral tonic to the pupils in senior classes than by taking them to see the contrast between the religious freedom we are privileged to enjoy now and the persecution Christians endured under that inhuman monster Nero in pagan Rome." In addition to the above, the play has been commended by clergy in Australia. I hope the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) may see his way to concur with the views of those hon. gentlemen.

QUESTION—NORTHAM RESIDENT MAGISTRATE'S QUARTERS.

MR. WATTS asked the Treasurer: Do the Government intend providing on the Estimates for the resident magistrate's quarters at Northam, the vote for which has twice lapsed?

THE TREASURER replied: Provision has been made on the draft Estimates for the current year.

QUESTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR, DREDGE EMPLOYEES.

MR. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for Works: 1, Will the men at present engaged on the dredge in Fremantle Harbour be reinstated in the event of the dredge being recommissioned? 2, In the event of any men being required in the Fremantle Harbour Works, will the men who are at present working at the dredge and about to be dismissed have preference employment in the harbour works, pending the resumption of dredging operations?

THE PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Old employees will receive precedence; but as those employed on the dredges are not the only men retrenched, they cannot be selected for special treatment.

INSPECTION OF MACHINERY BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the previous sitting; HON. M. H. JACOBY in the Chair, the MINISTER FOR MINES in charge of the Bill.

Clause 53 — Drivers in charge of engines:

MR. A. E. THOMAS moved as an amendment:

That the words, "in which the holder thereof shall be designated an engineer," in line 11, be struck out.

Yesterday the great majority of the Committee held that a man who had for the last five years been manufacturing or repairing engines was entitled to gain by examination an extra first-class certificate. That was as far as we need go. Why provide by certificate that the successful candidate might call himself an engineer? Let him call himself what he liked, but without official recognition.

MR. A. J. WATTS supported the amendment. It was ridiculous to call a person an engineer because he had spent a certain time in a workshop, starting perhaps as a boy, assisting generally, and then carting sand or otherwise working as a labourer. Presumably such work would be included in "assisting in the repair of engines." The Minister considered the amendment would prevent

men from achieving the highest grade in their profession; but the designations "first-class engineer," or "extra first-class engineer," should be sufficient. To distribute titles broadcast without a satisfactory reason was objectionable.

THE MINISTER: The member who had just spoken said he (the Minister) wished to call men "engineers" because it would assist them in their profession. But he had never given that reason. He had stated over and over again that the proposal was made because he believed the men referred to were much more competent engineers than the majority of those who called themselves engineers. The term "engineer" was used by many people. Indeed it would be difficult to point out a man who was not an engineer of some sort. He could not understand why members raised this objection. The member for Northam (Mr. Watts) said that a person might be in a workshop as a boy, or in the capacity of a labourer. If that were so, it would be a fatal objection; but the clause provided that a man must be five years in a workshop where the class of work alluded to was going on. He had promised that on recommittal the matter should be fixed up so that the objection raised should not be fatal. The objection was only fanciful. A man who had all those qualifications mentioned was entitled to the position of engineer.

MR. H. GREGORY: It was absolutely absurd to say that a man had only to be employed in one of these workshops for a certain period to become entitled to this certificate. One had not only to spend a certain time in the workshop and to obtain a first-class certificate as an engine-driver, but also to pass a special examination which would be arranged by the board; and doubtless the certificate would be a high-class one. When this proposal was first drafted it was intended as a special inducement to the engine-drivers. At present no authority in Western Australia could issue an engineer's certificate. Every person who spent a little time on machinery called himself an engineer. Under this measure there would be power to issue certificates. The certificates would be appreciated not only by those able to obtain them, but also those who desired to employ the holders of them.

MR. E. E. HEITMANN said he saw no objection to the term "engineer." Any man could call himself an engineer, but it was decidedly unfair to exclude a certain portion of workmen from obtaining this certificate. Apparently, the Minister did not understand engine-driving or engineering work, otherwise he would not prevent fitters who had perhaps been years at the trade from obtaining this certificate. He hoped the Minister would see his way clear to give the title "engineer" to men who really deserved it. Those were the men who had been years fitting and working in the fitting shops. In his opinion the majority of engine-drivers could never obtain it.

MR. W. NELSON: The "Century" dictionary gave as the definition of "engineer," "a person who makes or who uses an engine." According to that definition an engine-driver was an engineer.

MR. E. P. HENSHAW: If there were a board constituted to examine mechanical engineers he would welcome it, but he objected to the clause as it stood, giving a preference to a person not a mechanical engineer, and enabling him to obtain a certificate such as this. It did not follow that because a man worked five years in a carpenter's shop he would be a carpenter. When we designated a man a carpenter or engineer, we wanted him to have some credential. An engineer, he understood, must have a full knowledge of drafting and computing strains, and also of mechanical construction.

THE MINISTER: Who gave those certificates?

MR. HENSHAW: This clause was headed "Examination and certificates of engine-drivers." As the proposal was limited to engine-drivers, he felt it his duty to support the amendment.

MR. N. J. MOORE supported the amendment. The only persons eligible for the examination were engine-drivers. A fitter generally served his time in a workshop, and was qualified as an engineer, but an engine-driver was not so qualified. There was as much difference between an engineer and an engine-driver as there was between a coach-builder and a coach-driver.

THE MINISTER: Before a certificate was granted a man was required to pass an examination which was limited to those who knew all about engineering.

MR. THOMAS: Engine-driving.

THE MINISTER: It was provided by the clause that to get a certificate as an engineer, a man must at least serve five years in a workshop; and the assumption was that the man during that period learned sufficient to become a mechanical engineer; but a mechanical engineer was not competent unless he understood how to drive an engine as well as to make one. The clause would give an engine-driver who had not been apprenticed in his early days an opportunity of qualifying for a certificate to serve as an engineer.

MR. HEITMANN: A man indentured in a shop in Perth might never see a winding engine; why should such a man be excluded by the clause?

THE MINISTER: Such a man was excluded because the Bill only provided for engine-drivers getting this class of certificate. There were engine-drivers in the State who had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with engineering, but they were not called engineers. If the board declared that such men came up to all requirements then they should receive a certificate which would entitle them to be called "engineers."

MR. THOMAS: If the Minister's suggestions were carried out we should be acting unfairly to a large body of men who were more qualified to be called engineers than those whom the Minister wished to favour. There were men engaged on small mines who had special qualifications: inasmuch as the mine was not large enough to employ an engineer as well as an engine-driver, therefore the owner of such mines employed an engine-driver who could do any necessary repairs. Such a man would not be eligible to take a first-class certificate which would entitle him to be called an engineer. Because an engine-driver was favourably situated to work in a workshop where engines were manufactured or repaired, he should not have an advantage over a man situated on an outside mine, and who probably was doing better work. The first-class certificate should be extended to fitters and equally good men. If the Committee gave engine-drivers a certificate it would amount to telling employers that such men were superior to those who had not had an opportunity of working in a workshop, but who had been repairing the engines which they were employed to drive.

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

Ayes	...	...	13
Noes	...	...	22
Majority against		...	9

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Burges
Mr. Brown	Mr. Carson
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Cowcher
Mr. Horan	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Layman	Mr. Diamond
Mr. N. J. Moore	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Needham	Mr. Gill
Mr. Scaddan	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Harper
Mr. Watts	Mr. Hastie
Mr. F. F. Wilson	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Frank Wilson	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Henshaw (*Teller*).	Mr. Holman
	Mr. Hopkins
	Mr. Keyser
	Mr. Lynch
	Mr. McLarty
	Mr. Nelson
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Troy
	Mr. Gordon (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. P. J. LYNCH moved as an amendment:

That in line 18 the words "steam engine other than a locomotive" be struck out, and the words "machinery worked by steam, gas, oil, air, water, or electricity" be inserted in lieu.

Men engaged on such machines as those in the amendment should not be excluded from the provisions of the Bill. There was a section in the Mines Regulation Amendment Act containing a similar provision to the amendment; but if the provision in the Mines Regulation Act were repealed, it would thus allow the machines mentioned in the amendment to be controlled by anyone the owners chose to employ. There would be many machines on the goldfields not under certificated control. The Minister should give assurance that in the consolidating Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill the old conditions would be continued. Otherwise we should have men working under one employer on different machines subject to two different Acts. The amendment sought to maintain the present conditions on the goldfields. No outcry was raised against these conditions except on minor details, and it was certainly not the province of

the Legislature to disturb these conditions.

THE MINISTER: The hon. member was not serious in asking that the amendment be inserted in a Bill which was confined to steam-engines alone. The amendment provided that a man was to be examined as to his competency to deal with gas or electricity, but the hon. member could be assured that nothing of what he suspected was likely to occur. At present no one on the goldfields could drive a hoisting machine without holding an engine-driver's certificate, no matter what motive power was employed; and it was necessary that this provision should continue, as it would continue. In the Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill now being prepared, provision would be made to protect the class of machinery indicated; but it was unwise to increase the scope of the Inspection of Machinery Bill in the direction indicated by the hon. member. We would have to declare also that all certificated engine-drivers must be examined for certificates to drive engines driven by electricity, oil, or gas

MR. HEITMANN: Holders of engine-driver's certificates were now examined on their knowledge of electricity.

THE MINISTER: That was news. The examiners must only touch upon the fringe of electricity. It would be hard to call on these men to pass an examination such as was indicated.

MR. LYNCH: No purpose was to be served by withdrawing the amendment, because the Bill clearly defined that it applied to all machinery worked by steam, oil, gas, or electricity, and as such machinery was to be subject to inspection, those controlling it should also be subject to an examination. In certain contingencies men in charge of air machines and electric hoists on the fields might be entirely left out of the scope of the Bill.

MR. H. GREGORY: Was it not possible to get the amendment desired in the Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill now before the House? The amendment would ruin the Inspection of Machinery Bill.

MR. LYNCH: One could not doubt the Minister's promise; but the Minister should go farther and promise that the sections in the present Mines Regulation Act would not be repealed until the consolidating Amending Bill was passed, so that there would be no intervening period during which drivers of these machines would escape attention. Electricity was becoming rather popular as a motive power on the goldfields; and it was unwise to let unskilled men touch electric machines, as it sometimes led to catastrophe. Recently a foreman bricklayer on the Mount Lyell mine in Tasmania rushed in to stop an electric machine, and happening to touch the wrong spot was killed instantly. To bring that machine to a standstill it was necessary that a man with an elementary knowledge of electricity should do it. It was fair to presume that the Mount Lyell company took all reasonable precautions to prevent such a catastrophe, and that smaller companies would not adopt greater precautions.

THE MINISTER: This Bill gave power to inspectors to see that all protection was given to such machinery.

MR. LYNCH: All the teachings of science had been utilised to prevent a catastrophe taking place in the Mount Lyell mine. An uninitiated man should not have control of such machinery. The man in charge should have at least an elementary knowledge of his engine.

MR. GREGORY hoped the amendment would be withdrawn. The Opposition would assist the Government to insert in the Mines Regulation Bill clauses which would give due protection to underground workers, and ensure that none but certificated drivers should have charge of hoisting machinery where human life was involved. With the amendment the Act could not be administered; for all machinery driven by steam, gas, water, oil, or electricity must then be in charge of a certificated driver.

MR. SCADDAN: No. See Clause 66.

MR. GREGORY: The Bill should apply entirely to steam; provision for winding machinery and underground air winches being made in the Mines Regulation Bill. Passenger lifts in towns ought to be classed as "machinery," and inspected at least once a year; but none would ask that an electric lift or a printing plant driven by an electric motor should be in charge of a certificated driver. If we insisted on enforcing even the existing Mines Regulation Act, every

electric motor on a mine must be in charge of a certificated driver.

MR. LYNCH: That was not insisted on.

MR. GREGORY: No; but a new Government might insist on it. To insist on having a certificated driver for a small oil-engine would close up many little factories.

MR. LYNCH: What about an oil-engine driving a battery?

MR. GREGORY: All would depend on the size of the plant. What did an ordinary engine-driver know of an oil-engine?

MR. J. SCADDAN: The last speaker was in error as to the effect of the amendment. This clause did not specify the engines for which the drivers must be certificated, but prescribed those to whom certificates should be given, and the classes of machinery they were entitled to drive. Clause 66 provided that none but steam-engines must be in charge of certificated drivers. However, the amendment would not have the effect of compelling drivers of oil and gas engines etc. to be certificated. The clause before the Committee stated that any person in charge of a steam-engine must hold a driver's certificate, and then specified the class of certificate and what engines the holders were entitled to drive.

MR. GREGORY withdrew his criticism of the amendment, and apologised to the mover. He (Mr. Gregory), desiring to get away from the old order of things, had presumed that the hon. member intended to amend Clause 66 also.

MR. LYNCH: Clause 66 was to be amended similarly. The amendment now before us was intended to obviate argument in courts of law. If passed, the amendment would make it clear that the holder of a steam-engine driver's certificate was not thereby entitled to drive an electric hoist. While specifying what class of engine a certain certificate entitled its holder to drive, let us specify also such engines as he was not entitled to drive, thus clearly showing that the steam certificate did not empower the holder to drive, say, an air-winch.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The mover of the amendment overlooked the fact that if he insisted on adding these words, candidates for first-class or extra first-certificates must pass an examination in the driving of electric, gas, and oil-engines, etc. If so, the board must prescribe a very stringent examination. How many applicants for certificates could pass in such subjects as air, water, electricity, and gas? Very few in this country. Then the control of steam engines other than locomotive would be restricted to the select few who had a special knowledge of electric, gas, oil, and water engines. In the interests of candidates for examination, the amendment should be withdrawn.

THE MINISTER: The clause provided that a first-class or an extra first-class certificate entitled the holder to drive and have charge of any steam engine other than a locomotive. The member for Mt. Leonora proposed that a man with a certificate for machinery worked by steam should be entitled to drive machinery worked by gas, oil, water, and electricity, yet he pointed out that this engine-driver would not necessarily be examined upon electricity or gas.

MR. LYNCH: Engine-drivers were examined already by some of the examining boards, if not all.

THE MINISTER: Many were not examined. Some examining boards had recently been putting questions touching on the fringe of electricity, and also with regard to oil. Hundreds of people who drove engines in this State had never passed any examination at all, and if this amendment were passed it would be necessary to see that all engine-drivers went up for a fresh certificate. That was not required, and he hoped the hon. member would withdraw his amendment.

MR. HEITMANN said he could not agree that the present holders of certificates would have to go up for extra examination. In the early days old classes of machinery were used in this State, but he thought we now had some of the best machinery in the world. A man who had gone through such an examination as now existed knew considerably more about machinery of any description, no matter what the motive power might be, than the man who had not passed an examination. A man after passing the examinations which existed at present could, in a very short time, take charge of any machine. Supposing a manager thought fit to drive a battery or a large mill by air or electricity, there was nothing in this measure which would

force him to have certificated drivers. To prevent him from doing that, some provision should be inserted. It was just as well to have it in this measure as to wait and put it in the Mines Regulation Amendment Bill.

Amendment negatived.

MR. LYNCH: There was a farther amendment of which he had given notice, of exactly the same nature as the last, but he presumed that would meet with the same fate as the one already dealt with. There was, however, yet another amendment, for the abolition of the third-class certificate. The object was not only to simplify as much as possible the work of the examining board, but also to rid candidates of the necessity of going up so often for examinations which would serve no purpose. We had no less than five grades of certificates under the measure. A first, second, and extra first would, in his opinion, serve all purposes. He therefore moved that the whole of the paragraph relating to third-class certificates be struck out.

THE MINISTER: Although the provision was new in Western Australia it was not new in Australia. It had been the law in Victoria in relation to mines and the Factory Act for a large number of years. If this amendment were passed, we must either bring down the examination which now obtained for second-class engine-drivers to that which obtained for third-class engine-drivers, or else prevent 150 or probably 200 people from following a useful avocation. The object of having a third-class certificate was to see that a man understood machinery in a general way so as to run it safely. Third-class certificates were granted in Victoria, and no harm had been done.

MR. HEITMANN: They were no good in Victoria.

MR. SCADDAN: In Victoria they were separate under the Mines Act.

THE MINISTER: If these certificates were no good, they would do no harm.

MR. GREGORY: The measure said that no steam engine should be used in future without being in charge of a person who had a certificate. For the purpose of enabling small plants to be worked there should be certificates of service, which would not do injury to those who had second-class certificates, possibly also to those who had valuable machinery, and might assume that a man had knowledge sufficient to enable him to take charge of it, whereas the examining board would be satisfied he was not competent for the purpose.

MR. FRANK WILSON: Far too many classes were specified, and apparently the extra first-class certificate for engine-drivers was purely a West Australian invention. With four classes, two at least were too many. We did not require more than two grades of engine-drivers, and we should be wise if we exempted the small class of steam engine which the member for Menzies had referred to. There might be a small factory owned by a person who had a five or six horse-power engine running intermittently. Should we penalise him by making him employ a third-class certificated engineer? There could be no objection to making a large employer of steam power, who had big interests, employ a certificated engine-driver in the interests of safety to life, and he did not think such employer would object to that. An employer always saw that he got a man who was competent to take charge of the machinery running in his industry; therefore we need not be so stringent. Should we make the cabinet maker, or the small butcher who used an engine for driving a sausage machine, employ certificated engineers? It was to be hoped that the clause would be struck out, and that second-class engine-drivers would be allowed to drive engines above the size mentioned in the clause, that was with cylinders 12 inches in diameter. Any engine with a cylinder under 12 inches in diameter should be left out of the clause, leaving the employer to see that no damage was done, as the employer was brought to account for injury done to a workman.

MR. HEITMANN: Would a third-class certificated engine-driver be able to take charge of a winding engine?

THE MINISTER: No.

MR. HEITMANN: The clause enabled him to do so.

THE MINISTER: No.

MR. HEITMANN: There was no necessity for a third-class certificate; there was such a certificate in Victoria, but it is not made use of. The small machines came under the Factories Act in Victoria.

There should be an examination for a second-class certificate. A man who could handle a 12-inch cylinder engine could also handle a 24-inch cylinder engine.

MR. C. C. KEYSER: If the provision were eliminated from the Bill, the Minister had stated that 200 or 300 men would be thrown out of employment. Was that so? And what clause of the Bill was the Minister referring to?

The MINISTER: If the provision for a third-class certificate was struck out, then all engine-drivers would have to obtain either a first-class certificate or a second-class certificate, and a second-class certificate entitled a man to drive any engine except a winding engine. If we lowered the grade, the men who were now driving small engines could go on the goldfields and drive any stationary engine. There was a danger if no provision existed for a third-class certificate, for men would be compelled to get second-class certificates, which entitled them to drive any engine except a winding engine. A good case had been made out for having four classes of certificates.

MR. HEITMANN: What sort of examination would a third-class man have to pass? No matter how large or small an engine was it was worked on the same principle. A man must be examined on the same principles to obtain a second-class certificate as for a third-class certificate. The man who could pass a third-class examination would have exactly the same examination to pass for a second-class certificate.

MR. SCADDAN: Was it usual for a Bill which was handed down from one Minister to his successor to be considered inviolable when before Committee? Or how did the Minister justify his vote on this provision last session when he voted against it?

THE MINISTER: If two opinions had been given by himself, one last year and one this year, then he asked members to accept his more matured opinion.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. FRANK WILSON moved as an amendment:

That all the words between "engine" in line 2 and "not" in line 6 of paragraph 5, be struck out.

Why should a man who had passed examination as engine-driver be confined to driving an engine with a 12-inch cylinder? It was absurd to say that a man driving a horizontal engine having a 12-inch cylinder could not drive an engine with a 16-inch or 18-inch cylinder. The length of stroke was not stated, so the question of power did not come in. If a man applying for a third-class certificate was not capable of driving a larger than 12-inch cylinder engine, he was certainly incapable of driving a small one, and ought not to have a certificate at all. That was the reason why he objected to four grades of certificates. A man who controlled a winding engine which hauled men to and from the surface ought to have some extra experience over and above the man in charge of ordinary stationary engines, because the driver of a winding engine had the lives of the men in the cage under his control. We were making the measure far too complicated in having so many classes of certificates.

MR. THOMAS supported the amendment for the reason that he did not believe in a large number of certificates being granted. *Hansard* had been quoted against the Minister ——

THE MINISTER: Already that question had been settled, and we could not go back to the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was in order in moving the amendment.

MR. THOMAS: *Hansard* had been quoted to show that last session when this matter was under discussion the present Minister strongly objected, and adopted similar arguments to those now used against the clause. The present Minister evidently did not like his past action brought home to him, as it showed that, without rhyme or reason, he had altered his opinion since becoming a Minister. More care should be exercised by men in charge of winding engines, therefore such men should be thoroughly qualified and be extra competent. Where an ordinary engine was used and where there could be no danger to life or limb there was no necessity that, for the protection of a particular association, we should insist that members of that association should be in charge of engines for which certificated men were not required.

THE MINISTER: The amendment seemed like double-banking. A discussion had already taken place on third-

class engine-drivers and we had decided to have them. Now, by a side-wind, the member for Sussex endeavoured to have the subject re-discussed; and the member for Dundas was practically saying the same things over again. The Committee should not make itself ridiculous by taking the proposal seriously. With regard to last session's vote on this subject he (the Minister) had not spoken on the amendment, but he was informed that the member for Dundas voted for the retention of the third-class certificate. The Committee should not countenance any more fooling, but should pass the subclause as printed.

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

Ayes	...	...	3
Noes	...	...	30
Majority against	...		27

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Bolton
Mr. Frank Wilson	Mr. Brown
Mr. Thomas (*Teller*).	Mr. Burges
	Mr. Carson
	Mr. Cowcher
	Mr. Daglish
	Mr. Diamond
	Mr. Gill
	Mr. Gregory
	Mr. Hastie
	Mr. Hayward
	Mr. Heitmann
	Mr. Henshaw
	Mr. Hicks
	Mr. Holman
	Mr. Isdell
	Mr. Keyser
	Mr. Layman
	Mr. Lynch
	Mr. McLarty
	Mr. N. J. Moore
	Mr. Nanson
	Mr. Needham
	Mr. Nelson
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Scaddan
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Troy
	Mr. Watts
	Mr. Gordon (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. A. E. THOMAS moved as an amendment:

That all the words after "pump," in line 1 of paragraph (*b*) in Subclause 2, be struck out.

This amendment differed from the amendment of which he had given notice; but since the clause was not made to apply to air-compressers, there was no longer any necessity to include them in the amendment. However, all pumps should be exempt. There was no more danger attachable to driving a pump of 10,000 gallons capacity than one of 2,000 gallons capacity.

MR. HEITMANN: Were air-compressers exempt from the Bill?

THE MINISTER: Air-compressers did not come under this clause, but would be considered on the schedule. Last year there was a difference of opinion as to whether all pumps should come under the Bill or not. Eventually the matter was compromised, and it was decided that 6,000 gallon pumps should be exempt. It was known that larger engines, as a general rule, were more complicated.

MR. HEITMANN: Certainly not.

THE MINISTER: It was well known.

MR. THOMAS: Certainly not.

THE MINISTER: There was more to learn in connection with larger pumps. Many pumps throughout the State could be put under the hands of uncertificated persons; but the hon. member wished that large pumps, such as those on the Coolgardie Water Scheme, should be under the control of uncertificated men. That was not desired. If the hon. member thought the limit too high, he might have suggested 2,000 gallons, and the matter might have been compromised; but the compromise set out in the Bill was fair enough, and would allow small people to be exempt.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The Minister talked of a fair compromise supported by strong reasons. Where had he gained his experience? The reasons he gave were not strong; but other members advanced strong reasons against this and other clauses. All admitted that the primary object of the Bill was to protect life. Property could be protected by the owner; yet the Minister said the Bill was to protect property. Would the owner of valuable machinery place it in charge of incompetent men? If the owner could not look after his machinery, let it be smashed up. Take a pair of Worthington pumps with a capacity of 20,000 gallons an hour, what attention did they need? Merely that the engineer should walk round once in four or five hours. If they stopped, what harm resulted? Life was not endangered. Yet the owner must pay a third-class engineer to smoke his pipe and watch those pumps working, thus demoralising the man and inflicting hardship on the employer. True, some

men wanted jobs with the highest pay and no work attached. Pumps might well be excluded from the clause, for few pumps in this country needed special attendants. The Collie coal-mine pumps needed none, being looked after by the engineer. In case of a general smash the owner suffered; and the presence of a third-class engine-driver to watch the pump would not prevent a smash. In respect of small engines the third-class certificate would prove a serious hardship; and in many distant centres the Bill would be honoured by its non-observance; just as there were now in the North-West boilers which no inspector ever saw, the Boilers Act being too cumbersome and costly to be administered in such places. Was it reasonable that a man using a four or a six horse-power engine for electric lighting in his private house must employ a certificated driver? Such provisions would be the laughing-stock of the community.

MR. THOMAS: A pump with a capacity of 10,000 gallons an hour must have a certificated driver, though a 6,000-gallon pump was exempt. Where would the Minister put the meter?

THE MINISTER: In a convenient place.

MR. THOMAS: Take an instance of the hardship which the clause would entail. On the Westralia Mt. Morgans mine was a large and specially-designed steam pump for use in case of fire. Steam was always connected; the mere turning-on of the water started the pump; and the more water used the quicker the pump worked. It was self-acting; yet by the clause a man must be constantly in the engine-house. [THE MINISTER: No.] The pump could discharge more than 6,000 gallons per hour, and therefore would not be exempt. That was farcical. The Bill of last session was thrown out in another place because of many similar absurdities. Agricultural members recognised last session that these restrictions would harass the farmer. Now the farmer was exempt; but if the restrictions were good for the rest of the community, agriculturists should not be denied them, and farming representatives should on recommittal strike out all exemptions of farmers. Pass the amendment, and exempt any steam pump.

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

Ayes	...	...	14
Noes	...	...	17
Majority against	...		3

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Burges	Mr. Bolton
Mr. Carson	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Hicks	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Keyser	Mr. Henshaw
Mr. Layman	Mr. Holman
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Horan
Mr. N. J. Moore	Mr. Isdell
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Lynch
Mr. Rason	Mr. Needham
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Nelson
Mr. Frank Wilson	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gordon (*Teller*).	Mr. Troy
	Mr. Watts
	Mr. F. F. Wilson
	Mr. Gill (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived, and the clause passed

Clause 54—agreed to.

Clause 55—Drivers of marine engines:

MR. FRANK WILSON: Why was a marine engine-driver to be deemed the holder of a second-class certificate only? Was the Minister going to differentiate between the first engineer and the second engineer in regard to these marine engine-drivers' certificates? Was he going to limit the power of the steamship the engine-driver was to be in charge of? Why should the chief engineer of a steamship not have a certificate equal at any rate to a first-class certificate as provided under Clause 53, if not to the extra first-class certificate? The chief engineers to the steamship companies ought to pass just as stringent, if not a more stringent, examination than the extra first-class certificated driver.

THE MINISTER: A marine engine-driver, he understood, passed a far more stringent examination than a first-class engine-driver, but the first-class engine-driver was entitled to work any winding engine, and a marine engine-driver was not necessarily capable of performing that work. Engine-drivers' certificates would only be issued to marine engine-drivers for local ships running in rivers and in harbours. Those people at present were under the Boat Licensing Act of 1878, and it was proposed to follow out that principle to some extent, and have an examination equivalent to that passed by second-class engine-drivers.

Clause passed.

Clause 56—Examinations:

MR. A. J. WATTS moved as an amendment that the following words be added:

Such board to sit, if required, and examine applicants for certificates at least once a month.

The board of examiners should sit at regular stated intervals to examine candidates for certificates. Great inconvenience would be experienced by many who might require to have a certificate, if they could not get it on short notice. According to the Minister, provision would be made that a provisional certificate might be granted, but he (Mr. Watts) held that anyone occupying or appointed to an important position who found it necessary to get a permanent certificate to retain that position, should be able to be examined within a short time. A case had come under his notice in which a gentleman was appointed to a position in the Government service, and although he held a marine engineer's certificate, it was necessary to hold an engine-driver's certificate. The request to be examined was refused until it was too late for him to obtain the position. It was stated that the people responsible had a prejudice against this person, and therefore refused to hold the examination. There were perhaps in the scattered portions of this State many who had to travel a distance in order to get, with the least possible delay, a certificate necessary to hold some appointment. The Minister seemed to look askance at every amendment proposed in relation to the Bill. [THE MINISTER: Except good ones.] The hon. gentleman stated that although he might previously have objected to pass certain provisions now included, his more mature opinion was in favour of them. Apparently there was nothing like the hot-house influence of the Cabinet to mature a man's opinions. It made one wonder whether we had not done a bad action by turning out the gentleman who had a previously matured opinion, and who brought in these measures which were satisfactory then. Possibly the country would suffer if the opinions of Ministers were to keep on maturing.

MR. HEITMANN: If the member for Northam had studied the Bill a little more, he would not have thought it advisable to move this amendment. He (Mr. Heitmann) believed the Bill contained provisions for the granting of a service ticket in the case of a man not being able to take up a certain position through not having a certificate. If that man had had previous experience there would be no necessity, under this Bill, for him to go before a board of examiners, for he could demand a certificate from either member of the board. Moreover, the Bill stated that previously to going before the board for examination, a man must have had 12 months' experience. Surely during those 12 months that man would have time to know exactly when he would be able to go up for his certificate. [MEMBER: The man might not be in this State.] If he was not in this State, but had had 12 months' experience in the other States before this Bill came into force, he could get a service ticket.

THE MINISTER: If this amendment were passed, it would have a very centralising tendency. It would scarcely do for us to say that the central board should meet, even in Perth, once a month, so long as this measure was in operation. It was proposed that the board should meet every three months, and the board need not necessarily always sit in Perth, but would move about. If we prevented the board from leaving Perth under any circumstances, and provided that they were to meet in Perth once a month, that would hamper their operations. The Government would see that people in different parts of the State should have an opportunity of being examined locally, and not have all the trouble, expense, and inconvenience of coming to Perth.

MR. WATTS: A service certificate did not necessarily apply in all cases where an applicant might require a certificate. Clause 60 provided that applicants for service certificates should furnish evidence, to the satisfaction of the board, that they had been in charge of and efficiently managed and driven on a mine for a period of not less than twelve months prior to October, 1895, winding, pumping, and crushing engines with boilers and appendages. Although the Minister had stated that the board would travel to various portions of the State, still it would be inconvenient for a person

who required to be examined, say on the Murchison, to find that the members of the board were at Kalgoorlie or in some other portion of the State. At stated intervals the board should sit in a central place, say Perth, where persons requiring certificates might attend and be examined.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed as printed.

Clauses 57, 58, 59—agreed to.

Clause 60—Certificate of service may be granted:

MR. THOMAS moved as an amendment:

That in line 2 of paragraph (*a*) of subclause 2, after "shall," the words "be a holder of a econd-class certificate and shall" be added.

If the amendment were carried, there would have to be a similar amendment in subclause (*b*). A person ought to be the holder of a second-class certificate before being entitled to receive a first-class certificate. That was the object of the amendment.

THE MINISTER: According to the member for Dundas, if one of the best engine-drivers in England came to Western Australia he should be denied a certificate. Perhaps the hon. member wished to confine certificates to those already certificated in Victoria, New Zealand, and Western Australia, for men coming from England would not be able to get a certificate at all. If a man came from England and showed that he was efficient, he should get a certificate if, in the opinion of the board, he was competent.

MR. HEITMANN: There was no use for the amendment. There were no certificates granted in Western Australia prior to 1895.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. FRANK WILSON: Subclause (*b*) provided "An applicant for a second-class certificate should furnish evidence, to the satisfaction of the board, that he had been in charge of and driven an engine the cylinder of which exceeded twelve inches in diameter, or if the engine had more than one cylinder, the combined area of the cylinders of which does not exceed that of a single cylinder, the diameter of which was equal to twelve inches." The words "does not" should be struck out.

THE MINISTER: The subclause would be looked into, and if necessary amended.

MR. SCADDAN moved as an amendment:

That the following words be added to paragraph (*a*) of Subclause (1): "Provided, however, that if a certificate was obtained it shall only hold good for twelve months."

The object was to compel persons who procured certificates of service to come up for examination in twelve months, which time would give them an opportunity of making themselves competent to compete on equal terms with those who had already gone through the examination.

THE MINISTER: If the amendment were carried, a large number of men working engines now would be prohibited from following their calling. The hon. member was quite willing to entrust the control of an engine to those persons for twelve months; that being so why should not those who had the certificates be entrusted with the engines continuously? If all those who got service certificates had to come up for examination, the rule would have to apply all round, and every man in the State having a service certificate should come up for examination. If the amendment were carried the Government would require a large vote, as examinations would have to be held all over the goldfields. If a man was competent to work an engine for twelve months, there was no reason why we should, at the end of that period, ask him if he could pass a technical examination.

MR. HEITMANN agreed to a certain extent with the remarks of the Minister; but the Minister should apply the same principle to some later clauses in the Bill. It seemed ridiculous to grant a man an interim certificate for twelve months, and at the end of that time force him to go for examination; because we practically said that the man was competent for twelve months, and not competent afterwards. Since 1895 we had been granting service certificates to all those with prior experience; but now we would make provision to give certificates to men who failed to pass examinations during the last few years.

THE MINISTER: A man failing in examination could not get the service certificate.

MR. HEITMANN: Then only the man without the pluck to go for an examination would get his certificate.

Many things pointed to the fact that it was absolutely necessary for the State to negotiate with the Eastern States for the issue of a federal certificate, so that drivers travelling from one State to another could gain employment without having to pass farther examinations. At present a man with twenty years' experience in the Eastern States on coming to this State, was granted an interim certificate for six months, at the end of which time he was compelled to submit himself for examination and, as happened often, probably failed. We considered the man competent for six months and then refused to grant him a certificate. On the goldfields drivers had been forced to pass examinations, and they were now placed on the same footing as men who had not gone for examinations.

MR. FRANK WILSON: By passing the amendment hardship would be inflicted on those already granted certificates of service. Legislation of this kind often deprived competent men of their callings, because, though competent to carry on their work, they could not pass a technical examination. The same thing took place in England when the Board of Trade first initiated examinations for marine engineers, as a large number of men who had been following the calling all their lives lacked the education to pass the examinations. Why should we legislate to take away the living of those men who had been carrying on their callings on certificates of service since 1895? We should legislate for those who followed, and provide that they should have a superior education; and that was as much as we should be asked to do.

MR. SCADDAN: The case mentioned by the member for Sussex was not parallel to the matter under review. The circumstances differed. In Western Australia engine-drivers on the goldfields were compelled to pass an examination before getting certificates. Now the whole of the State was to be brought within the scope of this Bill, and men driving small engines on the coast would get service certificates and be able to go on the goldfields to compete with men who had to pass examinations. We should compel the men getting certificates of service to bring themselves into line with those holding certificates under the Mines Regulations Act.

MR. GREGORY: The Act of 1895 applied to those coming after that date, and did not refer to drivers following their callings in the past. In the same way this Bill should apply to the future. The regulations under which these certificates of service were granted under the 1895 Act were very rigid, and the board was careful in granting them. Even for a second-class certificate of service the board needed to be assured of the respectability of the applicant, of his period of service in connection with machinery, of his age and eyesight, and of any disease that might affect the applicant in regard to his calling. The Act stated that the board might grant a certificate when everything was right according to the regulations. If this amendment were passed, men who had followed their calling for 20 years and who were competent to take charge of machinery would need to pass an examination at the end of twelve months. This would not be fair, unless the clause applied to every certificate granted in the past; and even then it would act harshly. The hon. member should be satisfied that only competent men received certificates.

MR. LYNCH: The amendment was not too drastic, and would give an opportunity to men on the coast to prove their competency within twelve months, so that they could be put on the same level as drivers on the goldfields. The amendment practically proposed to dovetail the conditions of the past with the conditions of the future, so as not to make a buck-joint. If it be admitted that men on the coast were competent in every respect, why should the Bill be introduced to determine their competency? The amendment outlined a fair compromise, and would prevent unfair competition with engine-drivers who had passed their examinations on the goldfields.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. THOMAS: It was apparently an anomaly that a man could obtain a third-class certificate only after having been in charge of an engine for twelve months. Would the Minister remedy this in the regulations?

THE MINISTER: Yes.

Clause put and passed.

At 6·30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.
At 7·30, Chair resumed.

Clauses 61, 62—agreed to.

Clause 63—Certificates from beyond State recognised:

MR. SCADDAN: As the whole intent of the Bill seemed to be to raise the standard of examination for engine-drivers, we should, before recognising interstate certificates, ascertain that they were equal to our own in value. The holder of a Victorian or a New South Wales winding engine-driver's certificate should satisfy our board by passing an examination. The chairman of the board of examiners, in his report to the Mines Department recently laid on the table, stated that before reciprocity could be satisfactorily established several alterations would be necessary, as every State—with the exception of South Australia, where certificates were not required—had its own standard; that certificates should be uniformly graded, and examinations for each class of certificate conducted on a uniform basis with a well-defined standard; and that the examining boards for the various States should be similarly constituted. If the standard here were lower than that of other States, the matter would not be so important; but until the suggested arrangement was arrived at, the clause should remain in abeyance. He moved:

That the clause be struck out.

THE MINISTER: Reciprocity existed in New Zealand, Victoria, and Tasmania, provided the boards were satisfied that the applicant held a certificate of equal status to their own. The hon. member had not adopted the proper course to achieve his object. The people of this State were federalists, and wished as far as might be to assimilate the laws of the various States. Before moving his amendment the hon. member should have tabled a motion to abolish federation. The legal practitioners here had in the past complained of lack of reciprocity with Victoria; but our Supreme Court recently decided to admit Victorian barristers. It was but fair to give engine-drivers also the right to exercise their profession in all States. The clause was specially framed to meet the circumstances indicated in the report of the chairman of the examining board; and if the clause were omitted a special Act of Parliament would be needed before the board could accept interstate certificates. Better leave the matter to the board.

MR. BOLTON opposed the clause. Interstate reciprocity was not general. There was no reciprocity as to locomotive engine-drivers' certificates. Then why have reciprocity as to other certificates? If a first-class engine-driver left any of the other States and came here, he had to start as a fireman, work his way up to the position of driver, and must pass the necessary examination before taking charge of an engine. Was it at all likely that a board of examiners in this State would question certificates of equal status granted in the other States? If this clause passed, such certificates would be admitted by the board of examiners without question. Examinations on the other side were by no means as stringent and severe as those in this State.

MR. M. F. TROY: Examinations were held very frequently, and we should not be inflicting any great hardship on people who came from the other side if we made them pass the same examination as those in Western Australia.

THE MINISTER: The member for Ivanhoe advised that we should lower our standard of examination here.

MR. SCADDAN: Nothing of the kind had been suggested by him.

THE MINISTER: In some respects the examination in Victoria might be lower than the examination here, but in others perhaps it was higher. Presumably the board of examiners had to arrange these things on an equal basis. One was glad to hear that more was expected from our engine-drivers than from engine-drivers in the East; but at the same time we should not be justified in being the only State in the Commonwealth which refused to give reciprocity. He was convinced there were decent engine-drivers who came from Victoria.

MR. SCADDAN: The report issued by the chairman of the board of examiners was sufficient to justify this amendment.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: When was it printed?

MR. SCADDAN: On the 25th March, 1904. Some arrangements should be made with the other States to bring the

examinations there up to the examinations here.

THE MINISTER: That was being done now.

MR. SCADDAN: Sufficient latitude was allowed in Clause 61. A person coming from the other States had a right to apply to any member of the board for an interim certificate of an equal standard to that which he had in the other States; and could then take charge and work exactly as if he had a certificate under the present Bill, until such time as he appeared before the examiners and passed, if able, the examination of competency. As to Victoria recognising certificates granted in Western Australia, if that was done it had only been during the last few months. He doubted whether it was being done now. Only the other day a young fellow who went from Western Australia to Victoria made application to the board of examiners, but was told they did not recognise his certificate, even for reference. Our standard was not too high. Let their standard be brought up to ours, or else let us have some arrangement so that when any person went from one State to another he could take on the same work and be of exactly the same standard.

MR. BOLTON: The examination which would entitle a person to an extra first-class certificate and to designate himself an engineer, should be somewhat high. It would be no hardship to make persons from the other States undergo the same examination as men here had to pass. The Minister said arrangements were now being made for the examinations to be somewhat equal in the States. If so, the certificates in existence now could be brought to this State and equal status claimed, and there would be a danger of flooding Western Australia with certain men who had certificates granted on an examination not equal to that in this State.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Taylor): Clause 63 said that the board "may" admit men from the Eastern States. It did not say the board "shall" admit them. The member for Ivanhoe had based his argument principally on the report of the chairman of the board. If the chairman of the board thought it necessary in his report to point out the need of a severe examination for those engine-drivers from the Eastern States, the matter could well be left in his hands. If the chairman was earnest in the report read, the hon. member would see the necessity of leaving that portion of the clause "may admit."

MR. SCADDAN: The present chairman might not always be in the position.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was to be hoped that any other gentleman who took the position would be just as cautious. He (the Colonial Secretary) was totally against making close corporations anywhere. Engine-drivers in this State would be perfectly safe in allowing the clause to pass, because those who had power to grant certificates would see the necessity perhaps of putting those men from the Eastern States through the examination necessary to meet the requirements of this measure.

MR. HEITMANN would not, as an engine-driver, try to make the engine-drivers of this State a close corporation; but if we were to put candidates in Western Australia through a certain examination, the other States ought also to be up to that standard. Having a little experience in this matter, he knew that scores who came from the other side holding first-class certificates were unable to pass the second-class examination in this State. It was time that the Government should communicate with the Eastern States to obtain a standard examination throughout the whole Commonwealth. As long as it was intended to put the candidates in this State through a severe examination, why should we allow those coming from the other States to be on the same footing as ourselves without passing such examination?

THE MINISTER: For some time past the Government had been in communication with the Governments of the other States, with the object of trying to make the law uniform, and as soon as arrangements were come to something would be done. With that object the clause had been framed.

MR. BOLTON: Negotiations might be pending and near completion, but those holding certificates from the other States should be admitted here.

MR. NEEDHAM: Was it right or wrong to debar a man in any portion of the Commonwealth working as an engine-

driver? If there was no reciprocity why should this State not set a good example? If a man had to pay a fee to obtain a certificate on the other side of the continent, and came here in search of employment, he should be allowed to work. It was a hardship to compel men to pass another examination on arrival in this State. It was not a question of the system, but of equity. If men had the ability to work on the other side, they surely had the ability to work here. There had not been a great many accidents in the other States owing to negligence and incompetency, and the arguments puts forward were not such as to prevent men coming from the other States being allowed to work here.

MR. TROY: Those coming from the goldfields knew there was a big element of responsibility on an engine-driver, especially those handling winding engines. To secure safety we should have the best possible men and those who had been subjected to a stiff examination. In Tasmania and Queensland the examinations were not as stiff as in this State. He would like to see the standard kept as high as possible, as it would mean securing the best possible men.

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

Ayes	...	...	6
Noes	...	...	23
Majority against		...	17

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Angwin
Mr. Lynch	Mr. Burges
Mr. Scaddan	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Troy	Mr. Carson
Mr. Watts	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Bolton (*Teller*).	Mr. Diamond
	Mr. Foulkes
	Mr. Gordon
	Mr. Hastie
	Mr. Hayward
	Mr. Hicks
	Mr. Holman
	Mr. Hopkins
	Mr. Isdell
	Mr. Keyser
	Mr. Layman
	Mr. McLarty
	Mr. Needham
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Frank Wilson
	Mr. Gill (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived, and the clause passed.

Clause 64—Boiler attendant's certificate:

MR. C. H. LAYMAN (Nelson): This clause appeared to be unnecessary, and read with Clause 69 it would inflict hardship on owners, as in many cases owners would have to employ certificated men to do such work as firing boilers. He moved:

That the clause be struck out.

THE MINISTER: Clause 64 was not connected in any way with Clause 69. Clause 64 provided that persons looking after boilers could get a certificate of efficiency after passing an examination. There was nothing strange about this provision as it was included in the Steam Boilers Act of Queensland and the Machinery Act of Tasmania, and in Victoria it was contained in the Shops and Factories Act. The New Zealand Machinery Act provided that every boiler should be under the control of a certificated engine-driver. It was not thought very strange to have this provision there, and it was proposed in this State to follow the milder rule of the Eastern States of Australia, making the granting of certificates permissive. It was impossible for owners to have one man attending to a large number of boilers. No doubt the member for Nelson thought that every boiler would require a fireman, but that was not the case. In most instances in this State, engine-drivers looked after the machinery and did the firing themselves. There was no chance whatever of a boiler attendant being required to have a certificate, but there were cases in which it was impossible for an engine-driver to attend to the boilers and the engines as well. It was to the interest of the owners to appoint a man to look after the boiler.

MR. FRANK WILSON: Where were we to stop in granting certificates? We would be having examinations for greasers, carters, and windmill attendants. Once we started granting certificates under this clause it would not be possible to refuse the application of any man to come up for examination. We must of necessity grant other certificates unless the man first receiving a certificate was to have a monopoly. Therefore there was nothing permissive about the clause. It seemed that the Government were most concerned in collecting the fees provided for in the clause. Members must notice that we created a new division of labour in connection with these certificates for boiler attendants, and

were going to bring the agriculturists into play. Agriculturists were excluded so far as engines were concerned; but if the chief inspector thought fit, he could instruct the attendant in charge of a farmer's boiler to have a certificate.

THE MINISTER: Any person could apply for a certificate, and no one thought of any monopoly being granted until the hon. member suggested it, nor did it occur to anyone that the clause would apply to farmers until the hon. member suggested it. It was a pleasing change that the hon. member had apparently given up the idea that this legislation would drive away capital. The clause would only apply to boilers of eight horse-power; and few farmers had boilers over that power.

MR. FRANK WILSON: Numbers did. The Minister did not understand the Bill. It would apply to any sized boiler.

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

Ayes	...	...	10
Noes	...	...	19
Majority against	...		9

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Burges	Mr. Angwin
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Bolton
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Carson
Mr. Hicks	Mr. English
Mr. Isdell	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Layman	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. McCarty	Mr. Gill
Mr. Watts	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Frank Wilson	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Gordon (*Teller*).	Mr. Hopkins
	Mr. Horan
	Mr. Lynch
	Mr. Needham
	Mr. Nelson
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Scaddan
	Mr. F. F. Wilson
	Mr. Troy (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived, and the clause passed.

Clause 65—agreed to.

Clause 66—Acting without certificate:

MR. SCADDAN: Would the Minister give an assurance that the sections of the Mines Regulation Act covered by this Bill would not be repealed until the consolidating Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill was passed? Otherwise a considerable number of engines, such as air-winches, would be driven by non-certificated drivers.

THE MINISTER: It would be provided that anything in the shape of a winding engine on the goldfields must be under the control of a certificated driver. On the spur of the moment he (the Minister) could not say that people with certificates should have a sole monopoly of driving any electric plant, whether used for hauling or not, and machinery on which engine-drivers were not examined, as he was doubtful on the point. The draft of the Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill, now being prepared, provided that men must have certificates to drive anything in the shape of a winding engine, or any machinery where there would be a possibility of danger. It did not arrange to give a monopoly to steam engine-drivers of every oil and electric engine.

MR. SCADDAN: What about air winches?

THE MINISTER: They came under the category of winders.

MR. SCADDAN: This Bill would be in operation before the Mines Regulation Act.

THE MINISTER: It was hoped not. It would be provided that drivers of all winding engines should have certificates.

MR. SCADDAN: That was satisfactory.

MR. FRANK WILSON: Under a previous clause the Minister thought it reasonable that the chief inspector should issue an authority before proceedings were taken. The same argument applied to the proceedings specified in Subclause 2. Would the Minister consider the matter on recommittal?

THE MINISTER: Perhaps it would not be wise to leave all these matters to be decided in Perth, but consideration would be given to the point raised.

MR. LYNCH: According to the Minister, this clause was, as to engine-drivers, a serious alteration of the Mines Regulation Act. Why should we pass legislation which neither employees nor machinery-owners asked for, leaving engines and machinery worked by electricity, air, or oil entirely at the discretion of the owner, who could place in charge whom he pleased; so that with the exception of machines for winding purposes the Bill would have no application? The possibility of accidents with electric motors had already been demonstrated. Let us seize this opportunity of preventing such accidents. The amendment should be pressed to a division.

THE MINISTER: We had already decided that every steam engine, except-

ing those specifically exempted, must have a certificated driver, certificates being issued for this purpose; but there was no decision to issue certificates of competency to drivers of gas, oil, or electric motors. The preceding speaker would give a monopoly of such work to the steam engine-drivers. Why? Most of them were competent to drive these motors, but many were incompetent. To give steam-engine men a monopoly would involve special examinations for gas, oil, and electric motor driving. None asked for that. The last speaker was not fair in stating that the employers had not asked for the exemption of these motors. True, no request came from rich companies; but poor employers who used small oil engines had asked for it. Yet the hon. member held that such engines should have certificated drivers. To this the Government could not agree. Certificates should be compulsory when the safety of the driver or of his fellow workmen was in question; but a certificate for an oil-engine driver was absurd. On the north lead at Kanowna there used to be from six to ten oil engines; and of a number of steam-engine drivers there only one was competent to drive an oil engine. We should not tax the most deserving class in the community by compelling the employment of certificated men for this purpose. These engines were rarely used save on small claims, and by people who had little money to spare.

[MR. BATH took the Chair.]

MR. HEITMANN: The Minister could hardly get members to believe that he was pleading for the poor prospector. Did he know of any prospecting party using electric motors? The Minister approved of the Victorian Act; yet that Act provided that any man in charge of machinery driven by steam, oil, or electricity must be certificated.

MR. SCADDAN: None wished to apply the clause throughout the State, but on the goldfields merely. The proper time to provide for this would be on considering the Mines Regulation Bill; therefore he would not press the amendment, the only object of which was to make the clause apply to engines on which men were continuously engaged. After the Minister's assurance, the amendment would be withdrawn.

Amendment withdrawn, and the clause passed.

Clauses 67 to 71—agreed to.

Clause 72—Notice of removal of boiler:

MR. FRANK WILSON: This was another extraordinary production which would prove a hardship to users of machinery, and particularly to *bona fide* settlers. If one wished to send a fly wheel or a driving belt from one part of the district to another, the inspector must be notified. This was not a question of selling, but merely of transferring machinery. Surely this was carrying legislation too far. He moved:

That the clause be struck out.

THE MINISTER: If this clause were struck out, we should require to appoint about two or three times the number of inspectors we should have if the clause remained. The member for Sussex tried to persuade the Committee that if a belt were removed notice would have to be given, but no one would believe in such a fantastic interpretation. Those who would administer the measure were not so foolish as the hon. member made them out to be. "Machinery" would be interpreted to mean not one part moved from one district to another, but say a whole machine, except a machine exempted under the Bill.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The interpretation clause said "machinery" means and includes every shaft, whether upright, oblique, or horizontal, and every drum, wheel, strap, band, or pulley. Was he not right in saying machinery included a driving belt, a fly wheel, or a driving wheel?

THE MINISTER: It did not.

MR. FRANK WILSON: If an inspector did not exercise his powers under the measure he was not fit for the position. He (Mr. Wilson) did not say the clause meant that notice was to be given if a person sent a part of a machine from one portion of a district to another; but under the second schedule the machinery subject to the measure included chaffcutting machinery, and if a farmer removed a chaffcutter from one end of his estate to another he must notify the removal to the inspector.

THE MINISTER: No.

MR. FRANK WILSON: That was what the measure provided.

MR. T. F. QUINLAN: There was no necessity for notice to be given of removal from one part of a district to another. If this sort of thing were going to continue, he did not know where it would end. It was making a farce of legislation. In fact the time of this Parliament and every other Parliament in Australia was wasted upon tin-pot legislation of this sort.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not reflect on any question before the Committee.

MR. QUINLAN said he was perfectly entitled to express an opinion on any clause in a Bill, and was in order in doing so.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member might criticise, but must not reflect on on any question before the Committee.

MR. QUINLAN repeated that he was in order. He would appeal to the Speaker, if the Chairman wished it.

THE MINISTER: The member for Sussex made it a speciality to raise the fear of some section of the community. These clauses were necessarily wide. The member for Sussex told us we should define exactly what had to be done, and that we should see that the inspector carried it out to the letter. Not so, however. We must give some discretionary power. The inspectors would never give such fantastic interpretation to their powers as the hon. member did.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The Chief Inspector had to do with inspectors.

THE MINISTER: It was absurd to say that if a person shifted a chaffcutter from one part of his farm to another he would have to notify the inspector.

MR. FRANK WILSON: What was the good of the clause?

THE MINISTER: It would be impossible to trace things unless the removal of important machinery from one part of the country to another was notified. A similar clause appeared in every machinery or boiler Act that he knew of; and why should it not appear in this measure?

MR. QUINLAN: The Minister said it was discretionary. What was the meaning of the word "shall"—did it leave any discretion?

THE MINISTER: It would not over certain machinery.

MR. QUINLAN: The magistrate or justice would have no alternative but to inflict a penalty.

THE MINISTER: It had not been stated by him that the exercise of the power was discretionary.

MR. QUINLAN: The Minister as distinctly as possible said it was discretionary. It would be most unfair to penalise people for moving machinery from one part of a district to another; across the road, for instance. Probably the Minister had not considered this matter sufficiently.

THE MINISTER: What he said was that it would be discretionary to a large extent as to what was considered "machinery." That was the only thing there was discretion about. He saw no difficulty whatever in administering this clause. There was a similar clause in the Steam Boilers Act which had been in force for the last half-dozen years, and there had been no complaint about it.

MR. C. H. RASON: Taking a literal interpretation of the definition of "machinery," it included a chaffcutter. The Minister had said no inspector of machinery would ever compel the owner of a chaffcutter to give notice of its removal to another part of the same district, and that the inspector would have sufficient good sense not to enforce the Bill in certain respects. There were, however, other people to be considered besides the inspectors of machinery. If this Bill became law, any owner of machinery would obtain a copy of the measure for his own protection to see what he had to do. The owner of a chaffcutter would think it incumbent upon him, if he removed a chaffcutter from one portion of his estate to another, to give notice to the inspector. It was true that the inspector might not compel the owner to give notice, but the owner would feel obliged to do so, as if he did not give notice he would render himself liable to a penalty of £10. The definition of machinery included a chaffcutter. The clause should be altered so as to allow a man to remove a chaffcutter from one portion of his estate to another. The Minister had pointed out that there would be no hardship as the inspector would have sufficient good sense

not to insist on the Bill being enforced; but the owner would feel himself compelled to abide by the law.

THE MINISTER: Would the words "as prescribed" meet the case?

MR. RASON: It would be a way out of the difficulty.

THE MINISTER: In order to allay the fears of members, the words as "prescribed" could be inserted; but he promised to see that the matter was fixed up properly on recommittal.

MR. FRANK WILSON: It would be better to strike the clause out, for the simple reason that he had heard no argument in favour of it from the Minister. What was the intention of the clause? Was it to harass owners of machinery? In order not to detain the Committee he would accept the Minister's suggestion and withdraw his amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

THE MINISTER moved as an amendment:

That in line 1, after "machinery," the words "as prescribed" be inserted.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 73 to 78—agreed to.

Clause 79—Application of part of penalty to person injured:

MR. FRANK WILSON: This clause should be struck out. We were piling up compensation upon compensation. If a person suffered bodily injury or was killed through neglect on the part of an owner of machinery there were statutory powers to claim compensation. There were the Workers' Compensation Act, the Employers' Liability Act, and the common law. Why insert a clause in the Bill by which a magistrate might give to a person injured half the fine? The bulk of the fines were only £10 to £20, although in one or two instances the fine was £50 or £100? If the magistrate awarded to anyone injured half of the fine of £10 to £20 that would not be compensation. Was it proposed that we should take away from the person injured the right to sue under the other statutes of the State? He moved:

That the clause be struck out.

THE MINISTER: The Committee might discuss the question. This was a matter of first importance because of the manner in which fines were usually imposed. If a man received half a fine of £10, when a certain proportion of the expenses had been deducted the man would really not get more than £1 or £2 at most. This provision was contained in the New Zealand Act and he thought in England, but it became law before the Workers' Compensation Act and the Employers' Liability Act were passed. The circumstances here were somewhat different. Under the Workers' Compensation Act no damages were given until the man had been laid up for a fortnight, so that if the injured person received £1 or £2 out of the fine he might not get more than what was right; therefore the clause might be allowed to stand. The Workers' Compensation and Employers' Liability Acts only gave damages to an employee, whereas several other persons might be damaged besides employees. People might be at the place on business or passing at the time, and if the clause were struck out these persons would get nothing unless they could bring a successful action at common law, which was a very difficult thing.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Clauses 80, 81, 82, 83—agreed to.

New clause—Appeal:

MR. FRANK WILSON moved:

That the following be inserted as Clause 82: "The owner of a boiler or machinery shall have the right to appeal to the Minister against the decision of the local inspector with respect to any boiler or machinery coming within the provisions of the Act."

He understood there was no objection on the part of the Minister to the proposal.

THE MINISTER: This was a very wise clause. Although every possible care would be taken to appoint none but reliable inspectors, they might go wrong, and people should have the right of appeal to the Minister; so the clause was a good suggestion.

Question passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

New clause—Inspectors:

MR. HENSHAW moved that the following be added as a clause;

All persons acting as inspectors under this Act shall be duly qualified engineers.

The Bill would depend upon its administration. By appointing duly qualified engineers as inspectors we would have

persons with a general knowledge of machinery, boilers, and engines, and persons possessing considerable knowledge of designing, construction, and maintenance of engines and machinery. It was necessary that the inspector should have these qualifications. Though it might be pointed out that it was hardly likely inspectors would be appointed unless they possessed this general knowledge, it was as well to have this clause added, seeing that the advantages of an Act depended upon its administration.

THE MINISTER: It was a pity the hon. member did not bring up this question on Clause 7. The new clause could not be accepted, because another member would propose that every member of the board must be a duly qualified boiler-maker, while another member would propose that every member of the board must be a duly qualified engine-driver. The hon. member could not imagine the Minister appointing an inspector without a general knowledge. No two members would give the same definition of an engineer. Fitters and turners called themselves engineers.

MR. FRANK WILSON: According to the Bill, an extra first-class engine-driver was an engineer.

THE MINISTER: It would be unwise to define what all the inspectors should be. The ideal inspector was one knowing all about engines, machines, and boilers; and men with such knowledge would be appointed. If the hon. member pressed his idea he could do so on the recommittal of Clause 7.

MR. FRANK WILSON: It was not desirable to hamper the Minister in his selection of inspectors. The proper persons to administer the Act would not be certificated engine-drivers but genuine engineers—men brought up to the construction and designing of machinery and boilers. An engineer was a man who served his time to the trade and had a knowledge of designing and construction. Such men should be employed as inspectors.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND: Men like Mr. Hume, the Chief Mechanical Engineer on the railways.

MR. FRANK WILSON: Capable men could be obtained as inspectors, though they might not have actually been employed on the construction of boilers. It was the universal rule that boilers were designed by engineers who might not take any part in construction, but who knew the formula and calculations and all the theory of construction, while perhaps possessing a fair amount of experience in the way of inspection, seeing that the designer of a boiler must be constantly inspecting the progress of construction. It was the same with the designing of engines and other machinery. It would be unwise to specify in the Bill what class of man alone should be employed. We must leave that to the discretion of the Minister and his responsible officers. If suitable people were not appointed, it was the duty of hon. members to bring the matter before the Government and, failing to get satifaction in that way, to bring the matter before the House and deal with the Minister at fault.

MR. NEEDHAM: While recognising the necessity for something being inserted in the Bill regarding the qualification of inspectors, he could not agree with the proposed clause, because it would probably put someone out of employment and prevent another class of men from competing for positions of inspectors. While holding no brief for one class or the other (engineers or boiler-makes), he thought the boiler-maker should have a chance of becoming an inspector.

MR. HENSHAW: The boiler-maker could qualify.

MR NEEDHAM: If the clause were passed, the boiler-maker would be unable to compete. It was acknowledged that an engineer might have the best theoretical knowledge; but it would not be fair to confine the position of inspector to one class of tradesmen only. We ought to encourage the boiler-maker to study and pass the qualifying examinations. With all due respect to the discretion and common sense of those administering the Act, Clause 6, which stated that any person might be employed by the Government, was vague. It should be provided that inspectors must be competent and qualified men. A boiler-maker in many instances knew more about a boiler than an engineer, because he was brought into daily contact with the vital portions of a boiler in work and out of work, though he might not compete with an engineer in other branches. An inspector

should be a duly qualified man, but other tradesmen than engineers should not be barred. The engineer referred to in the proposed clause was a man who had served his time to the trade of engineering. He (Mr. Needham) would oppose the use of the word "engineer," and he was anxious to see an amendment that would give a chance to all tradesmen to compete for positions of inspectors.

THE MINISTER: The member for Collie (Mr. Henshaw) should withdraw the proposal, and on recommital of the Bill, a proposal would be submitted to ensure that only duly qualified persons would be employed.

Proposed clause withdrawn.

First Schedule—agreed to.

Second Schedule—Section 14:

Mr. LYNCH moved as an amendment:

That the words "air compressing, pumping, electric generating plants, refrigerators," be inserted after "weight-raising," in the last line.

Large quantities of such machinery might not come under the Act unless specifically included now. The Committee already admitted that certificated persons should be in charge of air compressors. As to pumping, apart from the Goldfields Water Scheme large plants were sometimes used on low-lying country to supply big mines. On the coast were many electric generating plants; and if these were not included the owners would have a great advantage over owners of other machinery. So with refrigerators. If these were largely employed on the coast it was but fair that the owners should not be specially exempted. He appealed for support to the coastal and farming members, who so far had been specially favoured. The goldfields members had done more than any other section of the House to impose restrictions on the gold-mining industry; therefore he hoped his amendment would not be opposed.

MR. GREGORY opposed the amendment, in view of Clause 14, which empowered the Governor-in-Council to include or to exclude any type of machinery. When the Bill passed and inspectors were appointed, they would advise as to what machinery should be brought within its scope; and such machinery could be added to the schedule. If any were now added the Minister would hardly care in future to exempt it. Many additions to the schedule would doubtless be made.

THE MINISTER hoped the amendment would be withdrawn. If every appliance to be classed as "machinery" were now defined, the Minister would hardly care to add anything. Air compressors need not be specified. Clause 14 empowered the Governor to include all machinery. If the amendment were withdrawn the schedule would be carefully considered against recommittal, to ascertain whether any alteration was necessary.

MR. LYNCH: The member for Dundas sought to include air compressors and was defeated; and these were not within the scope of the measure. The fact that pumping machinery was not specified warranted our including it. The question must arise in courts of law whether such types of machinery were subject to the Act; and the fact of their not being scheduled would afford a reasonable presumption that they were not within its scope. There was ample warrant for putting owners of electric generating plants on a level with owners of struggling coastal industries. As to Clause 14, that was provided for the inclusion of types of machinery not thought of while the Bill was under discussion; and there was no reason why the machinery covered by the amendment should be excluded.

THE MINISTER: It was unfair for the hon. member to spring on us such amendments at the last moment when we had been discussing the Bill for a fortnight.

MR. LYNCH: Only half the amendment was new.

THE MINISTER: An air compressor was part of an engine, and should not be scheduled. Pass the schedule on the understanding that it be recommitted; and then we could discuss the amendment after due notice. The mover was in error as to Clause 14, which was not to provide for "afterthoughts," but to permit of certain classes of machinery being from time to time included or excluded as might be necessary.

MR. LYNCH withdrew the amendment, on the understanding that the Minister needed time to digest it.

Amendment withdrawn, and the schedule passed.

Schedules third to sixth—agreed to.

Seventh Schedule:

MR. GREGORY: When these fees were before the Committee last session, it was understood that a slight reduction would be made in the charges where two or more boilers were together, but we were now still sticking to the 30s. Last year the Committee agreed that the charge for the first boiler should be £3, and that the charge for every additional boiler should be reduced from 30s. to 25s. Would not the Minister make the scale of fees agreed upon by the last Parliament apply at the present time? Lower down appeared the words "for every boiler erected or any sailing vessel." Should not the word be "on" instead of "or"?

THE MINISTER: Last year we made a slight reduction which was not carried out in this measure, but he found that our scale of fees was absolutely the lowest in Australasia, though in one or two items they might be higher by 5s. or so. We should try to make the department as nearly self-supporting as possible. About three years ago, the member for Sussex and himself did their best to enact the Workers' Compensation Bill, and at that time he (the Minister) again and again asked the Committee to agree with him regarding reduction of fees, because he believed the effect would be that insurance companies would appoint inspectors who would see that everything was done by the cheapest possible method. That was the effect in England. That law had been in operation here, but the insurance companies instead of appointing inspectors had simply increased the rates. If this Bill were carried out fairly, accidents would be prevented to a large extent, and in consequence rates for insurance would greatly decrease, because our inspectors' orders would be thoroughly carried out. As to the other point raised by the member for Menzies, the word "on" should be substituted for "or." As various sailing ships came to this State, and there had been some boiler explosions, we declared it only right that such boilers should be examined, and fees were charged which would generally pay. It was proposed that the fee should be £3. If it were less, and we sent an inspector to examine those boilers, the State would certainly lose.

MR. T. HAYWARD: The engines on sailing vessels were about two or three horse-power; they were merely donkey boilers. They were vertical. The fee charged seemed very high.

MR. GREGORY: On the recommittal of the Bill he would ask that the fees agreed to last year should be inserted.

Schedule put and passed.

Eighth Schedule—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

THE MINISTER, in moving that consideration of the report be made an order for the next Tuesday, asked that members intending to move amendments should hand them in before that date.

Question passed.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from the 20th September; Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Minister) in charge of the Bill.

MR. P. J. LYNCH (Mount Leonora): Speaking on the second reading, I have to say that the present Government deserve some credit for giving the measure such a prominent place in their programme for this short session, because it is plain to those who have had experience in municipal matters that an amendment of the present Act is sadly needed; and the prominent place given the measure by the present Government deserves much commendation as compared with the action of the previous Government, who had equal opportunities. Although the measure does not follow closely all the amendments laid down by the Municipal Conference, after very careful consideration and anxious scrutiny, yet I think it will be agreed that it is not absolutely necessary to take the advice *in toto* of that body. I do not wish to be understood to say that the Municipal Conference has not its use; in fact, it has served a very useful purpose in watching the trend of municipal legislation and making valuable suggestions for the working of the law. Yet, when we consider the small proportion of the population affected by municipal government, it is but right that the sovereign authority, as expressed in the Legislature, should add something original to the advice already tendered by the Conference. The member for Perth (Mr. H. Brown) has spoken

of the Bill as having shortcomings, that is to say we do not take *in toto* the recommendations of the Municipal Conference; but I noticed that even the municipality of Perth found it necessary at times to ignore the Municipal Conference, unless it was found that by taking part in that Conference something solid could be gained. We find that the Perth municipality held aloof from the Conference and its discussions until it was necessary to seek an indorsement for the maintenance of the subsidy, when it was found advantageous to fall into line with the municipal councils throughout the State. It is more than a coincidence that the Perth municipality fell into line, and immediately afterwards asked for the indorsement by that Conference of an application for a 15s. subsidy on the rates collected by the municipal council of Perth. If it is the opinion of the municipality of Perth, as expressed by its out-going mayor, that respect should be shown to the findings and suggestions of the Municipal Conference, it is necessary for the Perth Municipal Council to explain its past bearing towards the Municipal Conference. As to the honorary Minister being a lone Ishmael in the Conference as sought to be made out by the member for Perth, after all when it is weighed up, that may be the very best recommendation the hon. member for East Fremantle can possess, because when one finds a number of men influenced against him in these progressive times, I think it is rather a sign of his progressiveness than otherwise; so that the accusation that the Minister who introduced this Bill stood alone in the Municipal Conferences should not annoy him in the least. With regard to the first provision of any importance, the question of the qualification for mayor and councillors, it is gratifying to find some restrictions are to be removed. The £10 stipulation is not provided for in the Bill before the House. As to the mayor having a 12-month qualification as a councillor or as mayor that hardly suits the conditions to be found in a young State such as we are living in. I believe in a place like this, where young municipalities are constantly springing up and where conditions are different from those in old and settled countries, that it should not be necessary to expect a man to have a 12-month qualification as mayor or councillor in any part of the State. If a man comes from an adjoining State, having qualified there in municipal or local government, his experience should not be ignored on landing in this State. We should have the same spirit in evidence which was talked about in the Bill which was just passed; there should be a federal spirit in evidence, and we should recognise the services and experience that any suitable candidate may have possessed in the Eastern States before coming here.

MR. HOPKINS: Reciprocity.

MR. LYNCH: Yes; something like that which was wanted in the Machinery Bill, but we were not fortunate in having it recognised to so great an extent in that measure as I would like to see it recognised in this measure.

MR. HOPKINS: What has the Conference to do with this Bill?

HON. W. C. ANGWIN: Suggestions.

MR. HOPKINS: Then it is not your Bill at all?

MR. LYNCH: The proposal to make all candidates go to the poll I think is very necessary, and prevents any scheming in connection with nominations. It is within my knowledge that in recent events at a nomination on the fields two or three candidates put their heads together and ran one man against the more progressive candidate, whose policy was far in advance of those who polled in opposition to him.

MR. HOPKINS: Like the Labour party.

MR. LYNCH: In this case the tactics were on the other side, and were worked against the Labour party. Such a system, whether an offspring of the Labour party or not, should be kept down as far as possible. As to proxy voting, this is rather a sweeping innovation, and one that I cannot agree to as far as the proposal goes. It is proposed to sweep away with a stroke of the pen all the machinery clauses that enable a man going away temporarily from a municipality to exercise his vote. While it is necessary that some amendments should be found in the present Bill, yet I am in favour of a modified amendment enabling a ratepayer, on the eve of quitting a municipality, going before a magistrate and declaring his intention so that he should not be denied the natural

and just privilege of recording his franchise in connection with the local body with which he is concerned. In doing this there would be no departure from the law relating to Federal and State affairs. I do not see why there should be any alteration in the procedure when applied to municipalities. I would not go so far as to allow people living at a distance being left to the mercy of those who would try and get a monopoly of the votes. It is necessary that a man should be in the neighbourhood to insure the casting of the vote in distinct obedience to his wishes. In going so far and no farther, I think the Government are taking a step in the right direction as opposed to sweeping away absent voting altogether. The word "proxy" voting is used for want of a better term. The proposal of the Government to change the system of rating property within the limits of a municipality is one that the member for Perth should feel no alarm about. I do not know that there are any grounds for the hon. member's complaint that the Labour party should stick to the system that has so long been clamoured for and so long advocated.

MR. H. BROWN: I say it is one of the planks of your platform.

MR. LYNCH: It is one of the planks of the platform, and should be adopted in its entirety. It may be left to the option of the Perth Municipality to live up to their former professions, in common with all municipalities throughout the State, and adopt the method provided in the Bill.

MR. H. BROWN: We want the unimproved value solely.

MR. LYNCH: You don't want the annual value?

MR. H. BROWN: No.

MR. LYNCH: So much has been said as to the necessity for the unimproved value system that it is not worth while taking up the time of the House farther than to say it is a step long desired, just in principle and application, and it should readily meet with the approval of the House. No ratepayer who through his own exertions improves his own lot should be penalised for improving that lot at the expense of his own energy. The Bill in providing for a statement of assets and liabilities is a distinct step in the right direction, as it enables any incoming councillor clearly, and at a glance, to see all the advantages or disadvantages, or disabilities or otherwise, he may have to face in coming into office, and not be obliged to accept the glowing picture often painted by outgoing councillors—as well as outgoing Governments, I may add. The provision is a step in the right direction, and I hope it will find a place in the Bill when it finally passes from this Chamber. I would like to see a provision in the Bill making it incumbent, in a rather stringent fashion, on the owners of estates in cutting their property into blocks to preserve some semblance of symmetry in laying out the streets in a suburb. Any one passing around the suburbs of Perth is struck by the serious drawbacks in the municipal law. There are imperfectly-made suburbs around the city, and one would have thought that there should be finger posts in some places so that a man may find out the street he is looking for. I would like to see the Bill stringent in this regard, so that owners who have large estates would be obliged to provide for a chain-wide road. In the suburbs one notices no rights-of-way provided for in some large estates which are cut up. This shows that the Act in the past has been sadly lacking in administration. I know of several blocks on which there are no rights-of-way provided, and one can imagine when these places are burdened with a congested population in the near or distant future what a menace it will be to the public health for the want of rights-of-way. I am glad to learn the Act is to be amended in this direction, and I hope in the future it will be so rigidly administered that none of these perfect conundrums which abound around Perth will exist. There ought to be plenty of land to make the suburbs model suburbs as far as measurement and symmetry are concerned. I find there is hardly time to discuss all the points on the second reading, and it is not necessary to touch minutely on every subject; but there are a few matters which may worthily find a place in the measure, and one of these is that it should not be allowable for any councillor to take upon himself, through ill-temper or any other reason best known to himself, to retire from a council without good cause. I would go so far as to penalise a councillor

retiring from his duties and service unless good and sufficient reason were given, such as leaving the district or ill-health. These persons should not be allowed to saddle the ratepayers with an amount of £10 or £20 expenses in order to satisfy a desire to indulge in a burst of ill-temper or for some other reason.

LABOUR MEMBER: In the English Act there is a penalty of £5.

MR. LYNCH: I would welcome a similar provision in this Bill, so that no councillor should be allowed to retire, thus increasing the burdens of the ratepayers by indulging in a temporary burst of temper or some other silly motive. There is the matter of selling or letting tramway concessions. There is on record an instance of a concession being granted, and it will be necessary that provisions should be embodied in the Bill empowering the ratepayers to veto by a poll any resolution that contemplates the selling of a concession.

MR. HOPKINS: The sale or gift of a concession.

MR. LYNCH: It means the same thing, but "gift" perhaps is the better word. We have a case on record in which a council, without consulting the ratepayers, gave away or sold a concession which worked to the serious detriment of the State railway. I would like to see councillors deprived of this power, and statutory authority given to ratepayers, on the initiative of a certain number, to have a poll taken to veto such a sale or a resolution to sell. We have a sorry example in which a council and a roads board, acting on their own initiative, did a serious and lasting injury to a State railway.

MEMBER: It was passed by the Assembly.

MR. LYNCH: It was passed by this House as constituted at that time; but I have more faith in this Parliament than to think it would agree to such a measure as passed that Parliament. We are living in a process of change, and we do not know but that this Parliament may change, and that in a temporary aberration there may be a combination of circumstances by which it might actually indorse the action of those local governing bodies that have been so foolish (I will not use a stronger term) in parting with these valuable privileges, and at the same time in doing lasting damage to the State railway service. I should like to see municipal bodies endowed with larger powers—I presume it would only apply to Perth and Fremantle and those rich municipalities about the coast—to run technical schools, so that the youth of tradesmen who would industriously apply themselves should be given a chance of learning trades. We find in Birmingham that there are technical schools run solely by the progressive municipality of that town, and we find the same thing in Manchester: Manchester we find building the ship canal connecting it with Liverpool. There is a small matter that affects the inland areas of this State where amusement is not to be found in very liberal quantity. We should empower councils to subsidise bands of music to play, especially on Sundays and other holidays.

MR. H. BROWN: We do it in Perth.

MR. LYNCH: You may do it illegally.

MR. H. BROWN: We do it out of the three per cents.

MR. LYNCH: But we are not so opulent on the fields as those in the city of Perth. We are face to face on the fields with the difficulty that it is necessary to find healthy amusement for the people in the shape of bands. We got the advice of a council's solicitor that we could not subsidise bands; so I hope the present Government will take the full advice of the Municipal Conference on this point and include bands as one of the helpful means of recreation we so badly need on the goldfields and other desolate areas thereabouts. That is all I have to say, except to briefly refer to "one ratepayer one vote." Although it has occasioned surprise on the part of the member for Perth that we should go so far and no farther, yet the hon. member should recollect that it is a distinct advance on the present Act. Under the Act now in operation it is possible for men having property in four wards of a city to having something like eight votes, whereas this Bill reduces it to four. [MR. H. BROWN: Five.] In that respect I think we are creating a very contradictory position, and I cannot hold with the Government on the point. I think it should be necessary to lay it down as a fundamental principle that one

vote should have only one value. We can imagine a municipality not subdivided into wards increasing the value of votes by agreeing that the area should be divided into wards. It is a condition to which the democratic members of this House should not agree. It should not be possible for any council on the verge of subdividing the municipality to increase the value of votes merely on their own proposition. I believe that one ratepayer one vote should suffice for all purposes. It is only in keeping with the trend of progress, not only in Australia but in other parts of the world where we find marked progress. The London County Council has adopted it. The City of Sydney Act, passed five or six years ago, adopted it in a form which certainly does not resemble the form in which it appears in this Bill. In Sydney every lodger with a slight qualification is entitled to vote for municipal elections, and the *personnel* of the City of Sydney Council has not been altered in such a way as to reflect any discredit on the exercise of the franchise in that form.

MR. H. BROWN: It has not been a credit.

MR. LYNCH: There the council elected under Dr. Graham grappled with the plague in that city in a manner that would perhaps compare with any city. Dr. Graham was elected on the manhood, the lodger vote as it is called; but unfortunately the Government here are not going so far. However, it satisfies them so far as they are going. To go farther might jeopardise the measure in another place; and I am anxious to secure some of these reforms, or many of them, so that I do not wish to jeopardise the Bill by insisting on matters that would risk its passage in another place. Though I regard the Bill as far from perfect in details, I think it is a marked improvement on the measure we are working under at present; and while it may not be perfect in every detail, by making it so we would certainly jeopardise its passage; and I am quite satisfied at present to give it my support.

On motion by MR. HOPKINS, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 22 minutes past 10 o'clock, until the next afternoon.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 29th September, 1904.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 3·30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Interim Report on the working of the Government Railways.

By the MINISTER FOR MINES: Exemptions granted under "The Mining Act, 1904," to 30th June, 1904.

QUESTION—ELECTORAL ROLLS, FREMANTLE.

MR. NEEDHAM asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Are the summonses issued by the Electoral Department to persons to attend revision court at Fremantle on October 3rd, 1904, to show cause why their names should not be removed from the electoral rolls of East Fremantle, North Fremantle, South Fremantle, and Fremantle Electoral District, based on information obtained by officers appointed by the department to make a house-to-house canvass recently, and from them only? 2, If not, what other persons are objecting to persons' names being retained on roll, and what is the number of objections? 3, Do the objections made by those outside the department agree with the results of the canvass made by the officers of the department? 4, If not, what is the number of persons that the officers of the department state are residents that other objectors state are nonresidents? 5, How can persons that are summoned to attend the revision court, and still have their qualification, retain their names on the electoral roll without attending the court, which means loss of time and expense?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, The majority are, but not all.