system of State hotels they will curse this country, and they will receive the curses of the people of the country in time to come. My advice to Ministers is to take very philosophically the rejection of this Bill by this House, for it must be rejected; and if any necessary amendment to Section 87 of the present law occurs to Ministers, let them submit it in the general Bill that they are going to bring down. I move an amendment to the motion moved by the Colonial Secretary—

That the word "now" be struck out and "this day six months" added to the motion.

I do this in order to emphasise the wisdom and absolute necessity of refusing the Government the powers they are seeking in this Bill.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban): I second the amendment.

The Colonial Secretary: Is Mr. Sanderson in order in seconding the amendment, having already spoken?

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member may second the amendment.

On motion by Hon. R. G. Ardagh, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.38 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 15th October, 1912.

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

QUESTION — RAILWAY MAINTENANCE, PORT HEDLAND-MARBLE BAR.

Mr. MONGER asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What are the total working and maintenance expenses of the Port Hedland-Marble Bar Railway since taking over from the contractors? 2, What are the total receipts during the same period.

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Railways) replied: 1, From the 1st July to the 31st August, £2,672 6s. 4d., of which amount £1,595 6s. 4d. is properly chargeable to capital account, in accordance with Cabinet ruling of 25th November, 1907. 2, £1,858.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier: 1, Papers with reference to the retirement of Mr. D. B. Ord, formerly chief clerk in the Colonial Secretary's Department. 2, Papers in connection with the dedication of Katanning town lots under Workers' Homes Act.—(Ordered on motion by Mr. A. E. Piesse). 3, Return *re* Government motor cars.—(Ordered on motion by Mr. Allen).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. MALE, leave of absence for three weeks granted to Mr. Wisdom on the ground of ill-health.

BILL—RIGHTS IN WATER AND IRRIGATION.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL — FREMANTLE RESERVES SURRENDER.

Council's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Legislative Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Holman in the Chair, Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Bill provided that the whole of the lands mentioned should be transferred to the Government. The Council had made an amendment in Clause 2 by adding the words "or any portions thereof." The amendment would make no difference to the Bill. Why the words should have been added, he did not know. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. CARPENTER: While agreeing with the Honorary Minister that the amendment would do no harm, he could not understand why it should have been moved. Here was a contract between two bodies, both of whom had agreed to do a certain thing, and the amendment said, in effect, that one party would now be able to do something contrary to what it had agreed to do. Although the amendment would not injure the Bill, yet it might possibly give rise to some controversy in future negotiations. Still, perhaps, it was not worth fighting about. It was merely one more evidence of the disadvantages of the bi-cameral system.

Mr. MALE: Could not the Honorary Minister give any information as to why the amendment should have been made in another place?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There is no reason, except that it will do no harm.

Mr. MALE: Was that the only reason? He had an idea that the amendment had been moved by a member who had some particular knowledge of Fremantle, and because of this it might be that there was some particular reason for the amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: So far as he could gather, there was no reason at all for the amendment. He had never had any request for such an amendment. The Bill had been prepared at the request of the Fremantle Municipal Council, by whom no mention had been made of the amendment.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—TRAFFIC.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 10th October; Mr. Holman in the Chair, the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 24—Regulations:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for Beverley (Mr. Broun) had given notice of an amendment to deal with vehicles having wheels that did not track in conformity with those of similar vehicles used in the district. He could not adopt the suggestion. The width between the wheels of wool vehicles was greater than that of vehicles in agricultural districts, and the same applied on the goldfields. He proposed that the Minister should have power to make regulations to overcome the difficulty. He moved an amendment—

That the following paragraph be inserted after paragraph (g) of Subclause 1:—"prescribe by what distance or length of axle tree any wheel of a vehicle shall be separated from the opposite wheel."

That would give the Minister the right to declare certain widths in certain districts.

Mr. BROUN: The amendment would overcome the difficulty. In the past there had been no provisions to even enable road boards to pass by-laws to deal with the matter. Wagons which did not track did a considerable amount of damage to the roads.

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

Clause 25—agreed to.

Clause 26—Effect of regulations and by-laws:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved an amendment—

That the following new subclause be inserted to stand as Subclause 4: "No

camel while in use by a prospector for prospecting purposes shall be required to be registered."

The Bill provided that camels used for carrying merchandise should be registered and a fee was prescribed, but it was proposed to exempt the camels used by prospectors off the beaten track.

Mr. Nanson : Would it not be better to register them without charging a fee?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : The difficulty was to get them registered as they were out in the back blocks for such long periods.

Mr. MALE : Camels would have to be brought into the townships to load up before going out. If a license was issued without charge there would be no difficulty, but a difficulty might arise if a prospector entered a township and was asked for a license.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : It was true that a prospector must go into the centres at different times, but he was in the bush for long spells. Some parties were out six and twelve months at a stretch. They were out of touch with the law and action for non-registration might be taken when the non-registration was simply due to ignorance. A prospector might well be exempted because he did not use the beaten tracks. Other camels not only used the tracks but were objectionable to ordinary traffic.

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

Clauses 27 to 30—agreed to.

Clause 31—Maximum weight of vehicles :

Mr. BROUN moved an amendment—

That the word "nine" in line 4 be struck out and the word "seven" inserted in lieu.

Heavy loads carried on narrow tyres were destructive to the roads. It might be argued that to compel a contractor to carry less weight would make it more expensive to the farmers to have their produce carted to the railways, but farmers would sooner pay more per mile for carting than see their roads destroyed. Nine cwt. per inch of a tyre was too much for any road. In most country districts suitable metal for road making was not obtainable, and chaff carting especially cut the roads into holes and entailed heavy maintenance. The amendment would mean that a contractor carting up to 8 tons would require to have a 6 inch tyre. That would inflict no hardship on farmers because they had not the number of good horses to carry big loads, whereas contractors with eight or nine horses carried eight or nine tons on a wagon having narrow tyres. Most of the contractors last year were carting 7½ ton loads.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : The clause was taken from the South Australian Act, where the maximum was 9 cwt. per inch. The Engineer-in-Chief had submitted a report compiled some years ago on the width of tyres regulations throughout the world, which worked out at 8 cwt. per inch. Representations had been made to him since the Bill had been before the House and in the metropolitan area a number of people were of opinion that 5cwt. per inch was sufficient. The amendment seemed to be a fair average which would not unduly penalise owners of vehicles and he would accept it.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE : The Committee should be seized of the importance of fixing a weight which, after all, was problematical. South Australia had adopted 9 cwt. per inch and in 1867 there was a varying weight for two wheeled vehicles in South Australia. At first the law provided that the load should be 8cwt. per inch for a two wheeled vehicle, and for vehicles with more than two wheels 9cwt. per inch was fixed. Two years later the South Australian Act was amended providing that the weight per inch for all vehicles should be 9cwt. Seven cwt. would not be an acceptable provision in the Bill. We were providing regulations which might have a serious effect on the traffic of the State, particularly in the agricultural districts where produce had to be carted long distances. There was a difference of opinion in the conference on this matter. We should be slow to make the provision 7cwt. per inch. He agreed with the member for Beverley (Mr. Broun) that great damage was done to the roads, but we should be guided by the experience of the other States.

As the provision was a new one a compromise might be come to, making the weight 8cwt. per inch. Although this clause was taken from the South Australian Act, which had worked well and which provided 9cwt. per inch, in Victoria the Act provided for half the weight per half inch, which might be desirable to get at the more accurate load per inch.

Mr UNDERWOOD: A 7-inch tyre was fairly wide, but 7cwt. per inch would only work out at 9 tons 16 hundredweight for the 7 inches, and a 6 inch tyre would work out at 8 tons. If a person had a 10 ton boiler to cart, such a wagon would not carry it, and no one could build a wagon especially to carry one boiler or one piece of machinery.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: There was a proviso in the South Australian Act covering what the member for Pilbara (Mr. Underwood) referred to. It provided that nothing in the section should prevent the carrying of a heavy piece of machinery that could not be easily taken apart.

The Minister for Works: I will agree to that proviso.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: The Committee should be careful before agreeing to the amendment. What would happen in the North-West where settlers carried big loads of wool long distances, some loads 10 or 12 tons? The wagons were specially constructed for this work, but he did not know of any wagons with more than a 6-inch tyre. Seven cwt. per inch with a 6-inch tyre would not carry more than about eight tons. Seven cwt. per inch would be all right for the country districts down South where there were continuous winter rains and heavy traffic, but in the North where there were no roads except bush tracks heavy loads should be allowed.

Mr. GILL: At the Royal Agricultural Show last week he noticed a wagon built for Carnarvon and marked "15-ton wagon." He did not know what such a wagon was used for, but provision would have to be made for such a vehicle. He did not think the tyres of that vehicle were more than 6 inches or 7 inches at the outside. He inquired if the wagon was built to be used and was told that it was the usual class of wagon in the North-West.

Mr. MALE: One was reluctant to support the amendment. This was one of the difficulties in having universal regulations throughout the State. Under the old Act the roads boards were able to make regulations for themselves, and the width of tyre was not regulated entirely by the weight, but by the size of the axle.

The Minister for Works: That was not put into operation.

Mr. MALE: This provision would be difficult to put into operation except in districts adjacent to a railway, for in the country there would not be weighbridges to test the weight of the load or the weight of the wagon. Some of the wool wagons where the roads were good and firm were loaded up with a great weight.

The Minister for Works: And after the wagon had gone over the road it was no longer firm.

Mr. MALE: Not always so. These heavy loads were only carted during the wool season. If it were possible to differentiate in different parts of the State no doubt 7cwt. in the farming districts would be all right, but the Bill had to apply to the whole State. He would support the clause as it stood.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It was possible to have 10 tons in a wagon, although he did not go much on the big loads in the North-West. In the Pilbara country big loads could not be carried because of the rivers that had to be crossed, and the same thing applied to the Ashburton. But a 7-inch tyre was very wide, and 10 tons could be carried in a wagon with such tyres. The 7-inch tyre with 9cwt. to the inch would carry from 10 to 12 tons, and 10 ton loads would not be an impossibility in a big dray. In the Eastern States where a great deal of wheat carting was done 10 tons was only a circumstance. In the western districts of Victoria 10 tons was only a small load on a wagon, and the farmers there found it profitable to put big loads on. In his opinion, the proposal in the Bill should be retained.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The difficulty in regard to the clause was realised by him, and the 9cwt. per inch was put in by the officers of the department. He discussed the matter with them, and it was also discussed at the roads boards conference, where there was a big difference of opinion. The Engineer-in-Chief made an exhaustive inquiry, and worked out a scale which came out at 8cwt. Mr. Haynes, the well-known engineer of Fremantle, who was also a well-known authority on local government and road-making generally, strongly advocated that we should go no further than 5cwt., and he put in a strong argument in favour of 5cwt. He (the Minister) thought that by making it 7cwt. they would be doing something which would be fair to all concerned. It had to be realised that the Bill was drafted for the purpose of giving the local bodies some control over the roads, and it was all very well to speak of the individual that did contract carting and heaped up a tremendous load on his wagon, and then got out to another district, leaving the road in a deplorable condition to be traversed by the people settled there. He was not prepared to make special provision for the contractor. If we made it for the settlers to meet the general conditions, we were doing all that could be done. Whilst he was not wedded to the 7cwt. per inch, he though that 9cwt. was too great, and if, in the opinion of Committee, it was thought that 8cwt. would be desirable, he would be glad to fall into line with that proposal.

Amendment (that "nine" be struck out) put and passed.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: It should not be forgotten that the roads boards conference decided that 9cwt. per inch of tyre should be the weight fixed. He was not going to say that 7cwt. was too little, or that 9cwt. was too much, because we had not had much experience. In Victoria the weight fixed was 11cwt. per inch. He was of the opinion that, owing to the varying conditions of our roads, and the materials used on the roads throughout the State, it would be better to have some provision whereby the weight could be fixed according to the quality of the roads. A weight of 7cwt. per inch might be fixed for a gravel road, and 9cwt. for a macadamised road. He moved an amendment—

That the word "eight" be inserted in lieu of "seven."

Mr. GEORGE: This question about the weight was a very dangerous one. The axle was the main factor in the carrying of the weight, and if we allowed 8cwt. for each inch of width, we would be taking a step which would lead us into trouble.

Mr. Underwood: What about the road?

Mr. GEORGE: A dray might be working in Perth or Fremantle on good roads, and then go to a district where roads were not so well made. He did not see how we could frame regulations to cover a matter of that sort. In his opinion it was dangerous to make it so much per inch of tyre.

Mr. S. STUBBS: The amendment had been moved with a laudable object, and it was to protect the roads from being excessively cut up, and also to prevent the enormous upkeep of these roads where narrow tyres were used. If the amendment was carried, it would mean a serious matter for the settlers in a new district.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment which was before the Committee was that moved by Mr. Piesse to insert "eight" in lieu of "seven."

Mr. S. STUBBS: In his opinion, eight would meet the case with a great many roads boards in the State. Up to now, he had not heard of any of the heavy traffic doing much damage. The member for Beverley might agree to the amendment, because it would meet the case.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: It was true that heavy weights were injurious to the roads in the eastern districts, but the Bill applied to the whole State, and stations on the Murchison which had to cart their wool enormous distances loaded 60 and 70 bales on a wagon. To cut the load down to 7cwt. to a wheel would not allow them to cart the load which they carted at present. Those roads in the north were as firm as any macadamised road, there were very few bridges and culverts, and they would easily bear loads

of 1,000 tons. Although he was satisfied that 9cwt. would not do any injustice, he was prepared to accept 8cwt. because that weight would be more generally acceptable.

Mr. FOLEY: In many parts of the State ten tons was only an ordinary load for general carriers to put on their wagons. In many instances the weight of the load was gauged entirely by the haulage power of the carrier, and if a small farmer had not the haulage power for a big load he would not put one on. The Minister said that he wished to protect the pioneer and the genuine man. Most of the teamsters in the back country could be called genuine men, because they not only paid their wheel tax, but the majority of them paid rates to the various roads boards through whose districts they carted. Personally he was of opinion that 9cwt. was not excessive, because it would allow the man who had the haulage power for that weight to load accordingly. The strength of the axle was apart from the question, because if a man fitted to a wagon an axle which was not fit to carry a big load that was his own funeral. The interests of both the roads boards and the persons who used the roads must be safeguarded.

Amendment (to insert "eight") put and passed.

On motion by Mr. B. J. STUBBS clause further amended by inserting the following proviso:—"Provided that nothing in this clause shall be deemed to apply to the conveyance of any heavy piece of machinery which cannot be taken apart without great expense or loss."

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 32—Load may be measured:

Mr. A. E. PIESSE moved an amendment—

That in line 13 before "weighbridge" the words "weighing machine or" be inserted.

In many districts there was no weighbridge, but an inspector having measured a load and decided that it was excessive. the load could be taken off and weighed at a machine.

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

Clause 33—Name of owner and weight of vehicle to be displayed:

Mr. GEORGE: How would this clause apply to existing vehicles? Many of them might be hundreds of miles away from a weighbridge.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This portion of the Bill would only come into operation by proclamation, and it was not his intention to rush the proclamation until ample notice had been given. It would be unfair to enforce the width of tyres provisions of the measure without giving to people ample opportunity to make their vehicles conform to the requirements of the Act.

Mr. GEORGE: So far as new vehicles were concerned there could be no objection to the Act being brought into force at once, but the position was different with regard to vehicles now in use. Until the local authorities had erected weighing machines there would be no possibility of weighing the carts now in use. Farmers had no opportunity of having their vehicles weighed; there was probably no weighing machine between Perth and Bunbury. In many instances it would prove almost impossible to get the vehicles weighed except at great expense. How could people manage? They could only form approximate guesses as to the weights, and if those weights were questioned the owners were liable to a daily penalty of £2. The object of the clause was all right, but the difficulties surrounding it were almost insuperable.

Mr. S. STUBBS: There should be some provision protecting roads boards and municipalities in the direction the Minister desired. There were many places in the Great Southern District where wagons could be weighed.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: If the clause were put into force at once it would cause a certain amount of inconvenience to those a long way back, but it would be in the interest of the owner or user of the vehicle to have the weight displayed as soon as possible, because it would save him a certain amount of inconvenience. Owners of vehicles were usually once a year somewhere close to a weighbridge. There might be some difficulty in regard

to the South-West, but the local authorities would have to make some provision for weighbridges. In the Eastern States weighbridges were provided and people did not depend entirely upon railway weighbridges. A cart weighbridge could be obtained at a fairly reasonable cost.

Mr. GEORGE: There should be an addendum to the clause providing that the penalty would not be inflicted if there was no weighbridge within ten or fifteen miles of the residence of the owner of the vehicle. It would cost a farmer residing between Perth and Bunbury £5 to have his cart weighed and tared, because there was no weighbridge on the road between Bunbury and Perth. There were no weighbridges on the roads leading out from Bunbury to Bridgetown and Collie. There were possibly railway weighbridges, but they might be a considerable distance away from many owners of vehicles.

Mr. NANSON: The difficulties would be considerable in the district back from Geraldton. Possibly there was a weighbridge at Walkaway, but the effect of the clause would be to compel the people in most parts of the Greenough electorate to take their vehicles to Geraldton to be weighed, which might mean, in some cases, covering a hundred miles. It would be unreasonable to have a provision of this kind in operation unless there were facilities for weighing wagons. There was no weighbridge at Northampton, notwithstanding that the Railway Department had been frequently requested to have one put there.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Hon. members were magnifying the difficulties. It would be unfair to enforce this provision immediately, but this part of the Bill would only be brought into operation by proclamation after the Minister made inquiries and saw that everybody had a fair opportunity of complying with the provisions contained in this portion of the Bill. It would be a responsibility on the part of the Minister to make inquiries. This part of the Bill would not be put into operation until it could be put into operation without doing injustice to anyone. It would not be put into operation unless facilities were provided or until the Minister was satisfied everyone had the opportunity of complying with the provisions.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: It was to be hoped the Minister would not put this part of the Bill into force until every facility was given to people to obtain the weight of their wagons. Permission to erect weighbridges was given to local authorities by the Bill, but it was somewhat superfluous, because local authorities already had the power. It was doubtful whether the Midland Railway Company would allow farmers to weigh their wagons. The Minister was in sympathy with the people who owned carts and wagons and one could feel that he would look after their interests in the matter.

Mr. NANSON: Could particular districts be exempted?

The Minister for Works: I do not think so.

Mr. NANSON: If the Minister was going to wait until in every part of the State weighing could be conducted without undue inconvenience, he would wait for half a century. Was the metropolitan district to be kept waiting until all the outlying districts were ready? Surely an amendment could be provided, if necessary on recommittal, by which the operation of this portion of the Bill could be suspended in certain districts.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 34 to 37—agreed to.

Clause 38—Licensing of drivers:

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: Presumably the clause intended that every owner who drove his own motor car would be obliged to obtain a license. What sort of examination would such owner have to undergo? Surely it was not necessary that the owner of the car should have a license.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The clause would apply generally. Personally he held that it should so apply. A motor car was essentially a vehicle which should be under the control of a capable person. Considerable damage could be done by an incapable driver of a motor car. Moreover, motor cars were capable of travelling such huge distances within a limited time that they were not con-

fined to any one district. For instance, it was the custom for the pastoralists of the Ashburton and Gascoyne districts to motor in their own cars to Perth, where for a considerable period of the year they used their cars, before returning to their stations. Therefore, the provision should apply generally if it was to be at all useful.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 39 to 41—agreed to.

Clause 42—Notice of regulations:

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: Subclause 2 gave power to the local authorities to erect signposts denoting dangerous corners, cross roads, and precipitous places. Unless the provision were made compulsory the clause would be a dead letter. He moved an amendment—

That in line 2 the word "may" be struck out and "shall" inserted in lieu.

Mr. NANSON: The amendment required some consideration. In a huge State like Western Australia there were of necessity thousands of miles of roads but little frequented. If we were to make the clause mandatory the local authorities would be required to put up signposts on roads carrying but very little traffic. It would be as well to continue the existing conditions, under which the local authorities put up such signposts where they were deemed necessary.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: It was true that difficulties would be likely to arise. With the permission of the Committee he would withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 43—Traction Engines:

Mr. NANSON: Paragraph (f) provided that a traction engine should be preceded by a licensed attendant, whose duty it would be to give notice of the coming of the engine. Surely it did not require any degree of ability to walk a hundred yards in front of a traction engine and give notice that the engine was coming behind. Why, then, should the attendant be licensed? Some years ago, in England he had noticed that similar functions were discharged by dogs. Without suggesting that a dog should be employed in this instance, he could not see any necessity why the attendant should be licensed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The provision had escaped his notice. Possibly it was going a little too far. An amendment to delete it would be accepted.

Mr. NANSON moved an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (f) "a licensed" be struck out and "an" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 44—Notice:

Mr. S. STUBBS: Was it really necessary to give a municipality notice that a traction engine was about to pass through?

The Minister for Works: Absolutely necessary.

Mr. S. STUBBS: The driver of a motor car was not required to give notice; why, then, should notice be required in the case of a traction engine? The provision was ridiculous, and would serve merely to put an undue hardship upon drivers of traction engines.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The Bill was for the State, and not alone for the country districts. In some towns it would be absolutely necessary that notice should be given, in order that the authorities might direct as to which road the traction engine should take through the town.

Mr. BROUN: The provision was a little drastic, especially when it was remembered that traction engines were used chiefly in country districts. It might happen to be particularly inconvenient to give the notice required.

Mr. LANDER: It was only right and proper that such notice should be given. Some drivers of traction engines were not at all as careful as they should be when passing horses. The provision would serve to put a check upon some of these drivers.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The clause seemed drastic. The Honorary Minister, who had had some experience, suggested that it should apply only to

the municipal townsite and not to the district. He would accept any reasonable amendment.

Mr. S. STUBBS: If he lived just outside a district and used a traction engine instead of horses, would it be necessary to give the authorities notice every time he entered the district?

The Minister for Works: Yes; otherwise you would disorganise other traffic.

Mr. S. STUBBS: What about a petrol traction engine?

The Minister for Works: This applies to steam traction engines.

Mr. S. STUBBS: The suggestion of the Honorary Minister was a good one.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The definition clause stated that a traction engine meant any vehicle, not being a motor, propelled by mechanical power. He moved an amendment—

That the words in lines 1 and 2, "part of a municipal district or" be struck out.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 45—Liability for damage:

Mr. BROUN moved an amendment—

That after "engine" in line 1 the words "or motor wagon" be inserted.

Motor wagons were almost as weighty as traction engines and did as much damage to roads and bridges. Last year a motor wagon had smashed thirty planks in passing over a bridge.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This part of the Bill dealt purely with traction engines. The division dealing with motor vehicles had been passed. He agreed that a motor wagon with a trailer would cause as much damage as a traction engine. He would have an amendment drafted and inserted in the right place.

Mr. BROUN: On the Minister's undertaking, he asked leave to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 46—agreed to.

Clause 47—License:

Mr. MALE: Would the omission of "attendant" be consequential on a previous amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: It was quite possible there might be an attendant other than the one previously dealt with.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved an amendment—

That the words in line 1, "or act as attendant to" be struck out.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 48, 49—agreed to.

Clause 50—Power of road authority to cover expenses of heavy or extraordinary traffic:

Mr. MALE: The Minister should give an explanation of this clause. If a person paid the fees and conformed to the Act, why should he be subjected to extra expense?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The clause was intended to meet difficulties which were constantly arising in different parts of the State. It was not fair that drays employed in carting stone from the quarries at Cottesloe Beach to the Cottesloe Beach station should pay only the ordinary license. They slaughtered the roads. Where special use was made of the roads, the local authority should be able to make special arrangements. Pipes had been carted along the Canning-road for laying the pipe line on the south side of the river, and a lot of material had been carted to the wireless station, thus causing considerable damage to the roads, and the Government had had to provide money to put them in repair. The clause was not mandatory, and did not require the person to pay the full amount of the expenses, but the local authority could compromise with anyone who used the roads for unduly heavy traffic.

Mr. TURVEY: If it was within the province of the Minister to impose a special tax on such persons as wood and stone carters, there would be no objection; but one road board might exercise the privilege and a neighbouring board might take little notice of it, with the result that we found wood and stone carters in one of the roads board districts paying 7s. 6d. or 10s. per wheel per month, and in another roads board district adjoining only the ordinary tax of 5s. was imposed. To his knowledge one roads board, not very remote from the metropolitan dis-

trict, recently carried a resolution to impose a special tax of 7s. 6d. per wheel per month; that was an iniquitous impost.

Mr. S. Stubbs: It is pretty hot.

Mr. TURVEY: Yet the neighbouring roads board, where similar work was carried on, still had its tax of 5s. per wheel per month. When this was pointed out to the particular roads board, one of the members, who was in fact the acting chairman, said if he had his way he would drive all stone and wood carters out of his district. That might be all right from his point of view, but men had to earn their living by wood carting or stone carting and this power should not be given to the local authority. He would be agreeable to the Minister having power to fix a special impost. We might find a roads board, where the majority of the members were perhaps not in sympathy with the labouring classes in the district, and in the locality he had instanced, under the present system of roads board elections it so happened that the members of the board, or a majority of them, were elected not by the residential ratepayers but by those who had their homes in the City, who had small blocks of land which they were holding in idleness, week-enders, and some of them not even that. If it came to a vote of the residential ratepayers those members who were ready to impose the impost of 7s. 6d. on the working classes would soon be sent about their business. At the last election in that particular district the residential ratepayers did not record their votes in favour of the members who were at present sitting on the board. It was therefore possible under the present system to have a roads board which was entirely out of step and not at all in sympathy with the people who were resident in the district. Hon. members should take the opportunity of removing from the local authorities the power to impose any special impost. Whilst it was realised that wood and stone carters did cut up roads, it was not fair to give power to a local authority to impose a tax in the manner which had been indicated. Even before the Bill was introduced one roads board actually carried a resolution increasing the tax by something like 1,000 per cent., and if they were given the power it was hard to tell to what extent they would exercise it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): If the hon. member read the clause he would find there was no power to levy a special tax. If a road was being badly dealt with by a person using it and an inspector reported the matter the case could be fought out in open court. Then there was a proviso that the parties could enter into an agreement. The roads board would have no authority to levy a special tax.

Mr. S. STUBBS: If the local authority desired to proceed against persons using a road they would have a difficulty in proving in the first place that the road was properly constructed and that the actual damage was caused by the heavy traffic.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): They would get no damages then.

Mr. S. STUBBS: The point raised by the member for Swan (Mr. Turvey) demanded something more than what was in the clause. Members of a roads board who imposed such a tax as the hon. member had referred to were not fit for their positions.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for Swan was justified in bringing forward the matter he had referred to but that was an exceptional case. He (the Minister) had some personal knowledge of the action of the body to which the hon. member referred, and that action was distinctly out of step with local opinion. Their object was to drive the wood and stone carters out of the district, a most ridiculous proposition, and they were doing it by increasing the wheel tax to an enormous extent. They would not have the power to do that under the clause in the Bill. They would have to prove that the damage was done to the roads, and in this particular instance there were no roads.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 51—Roads may be closed:

Mr. ALLEN: Would the Minister explain why he sought to take to himself this power? It was a power which the local bodies had enjoyed for a long time.

Mr. LANDER: It was to be hoped that the Minister would adhere to this clause. Not long ago on the Pinjarra road there was a dangerous hole which no one took notice of, and it was in cases like that where the Minister should have the power, if he considered a road unsafe, to cause it to be closed. Unless we gave the Minister power to deal with the local authorities some of them got apathetic; they got what was called "the tired feeling." The Minister should certainly have the power to put the boot into these local authorities.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The clause simply gave the Minister power to close roads in exceptional cases. It was essential, in the public interests, that he should have this power. It was unwise to give a local authority power to close any particular road; it might be all right so far as their own district was concerned but they might be doing a grave injustice to the outside public, and consequently the Minister should have the right to say whether the closing of the road in any particular restricted area controlled by one body would not be perpetrating an injustice to those outside.

Mr. ALLEN: The clause would take away from the local authorities the power they had the right to enjoy. The local bodies were most conversant with facts such as these and they were the better judges. The effect of the clause would be to bring the Minister into conflict with these bodies.

Mr. LANDER: Another instance which he might quote was that of the case of a hole which was permitted to remain by the city council in Stirling-street.

Mr. Allen: There is a hole in every street.

Mr. LANDER: Because the city council were covered by insurance they permitted that hole to remain until a horse attached to a vegetable hawker's cart put his foot into it, and then they considered it time to fill it in. We should be able to say to them that they should keep their roads in order.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The North Fremantle municipality on one occasion, in order to force the hands of the Government, had closed the main Fremantle road because they said it was unfit for traffic.

Mr. Allen: They were good judges.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They might have been, but that action was unfair to the general public. The people from Perth and Claremont were content to use the road, but the North Fremantle municipality thought they could do without it and by closing it would force the Government to have it repaired. It was essential that provision should be made to prevent a recurrence of such a case, and that could only be done by giving the Minister power to intervene in the public interest.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 52—agreed to.

Clause 53—Application of Act to Crown and local authorities:

Mr. S. STUBBS moved an amendment

That after "authority" in line 4 the following words be added, "or any minister of religion."

A great many ministers of religion did a considerable amount of travelling throughout the State, and no one would say that the work they did was of an easy character. It would be a graceful act on the part of the Committee to allow them exemption.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Whilst having every respect for the good work being done by ministers of religion, he saw no necessity to exempt them from the payment of these fees. If we started exemptions there was no knowing where they would end. If we exempted ministers of religion, we must remember that there were a number of religious bodies operating what were trading concerns, and in those cases they should certainly pay the ordinary fees. There were a number of ministers who, whilst they utilised their vehicles for the common good, also used them for their own special purposes; amongst them were ministers who owned farms, and who did work outside their religious calling.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: The difficulties laboured under by ministers in the back country were well known, and the amendment should certainly be carried. To

meet the cases mentioned by the Minister for Works of ministers of religion owning farms and using their vehicles in conjunction therewith, the exemption might be limited to the carriage used by the minister in his religious work.

Mr. Heitmann: Would you apply it to motor cars?

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: Yes.

Mr. Broun: How many ministers have motor cars?

Mr. Heitmann: I know of one.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: There were very few ministers who were interested in farms and used their vehicles in connection with them. Under the local government laws ministers of religion were exempt from the payment of rates.

Mr. ALLEN: The amount of fees that would be collected from ministers of religion would not be great, and the State would not suffer very much by the exemption. Those ministers who were employed in the outback country received very small remuneration, and a concession such as that proposed would be much appreciated.

Mr. BROUN: It was desirable that ministers of religion should be exempt from these fees in connection with the vehicles they used in travelling their districts. Those men had big districts to attend to, they were poorly paid as a rule, and could ill-afford to pay these fees. There were one or two parsons who owned farms, but such cases could be overcome by limiting the exemption to vehicles used for religious purposes.

Mr. HEITMANN: If it was right to exempt ministers of religion from one tax, we should go further and exempt them from paying taxes on their foodstuffs. There were many people doing work just as worthy as that done by ministers of religion. Clergymen very often earned very good fees, and used their vehicles to enable them to derive that income. It might be true that some ministers of religion were poorly paid, but there were thousands of others in the community who had to struggle for a living, and who were just as much entitled to exemption. Amongst them were the wood carters.

Mr. S. STUBBS: Under the Carts and Carriages' Licensing Act all ministers of religion were exempt from the payment of fees. He was holding no brief for any particular denomination or any particular clergyman, but it must be within the knowledge of members that ministers of religion travelled great distances each year in the course of their duties.

Mr. Heitmann: I know of nurses in country districts who are doing just as good work.

Mr. S. STUBBS: Probably the nurses were better paid.

Mr. Heitmann: It would do a lot of the ministers good to get work. There is one man getting £700 a year. Would you exempt him?

Mr. S. STUBBS: If a minister owned a farm and used his vehicles to travel to that farm he should pay the tax, but 95 per cent. of the ministers in the State had as much as they could do to make ends meet.

Mr. Heitmann: Then let them get work.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): It was to be hoped the amendment would not be carried. Ministers of religion wished to be full citizens of the State and take their responsibility the same as other citizens. The fees were very small indeed, and he did not think there was any denomination so poor as to wish to escape them. It was true that ministers of religion were exempt from municipal and roads board rates, but that exemption was not justified. If a minister of religion lived in a private house and paid rent he was not exempt from municipal rating. Ministers would not ask to be exempted from a small fee like this.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: They have been exempt for some years.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): But that did not entitle them to be exempt any longer. They would not ask for it.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: You do not know their difficulties.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Some get not more than £75 a year.

Mr. Heitmann: More shame to those that keep them at that.

Hon. H. B. LEFROY: It had been the custom for many years that ministers of religion should not be required to pay this tax. Probably they would not feel it, their parishioners would probably pay it for them, but there seemed to be no just cause for taking away the privilege they had enjoyed since 1876. It was a gracious act that might be continued to ministers of religion. The omission of the words from the clause showed that the Government had premeditated the abolition of the privilege, and it seemed an ungenerous action.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Bill took away many privileges previously enjoyed. The measure referred to by the member for Wagin (Mr. S. Stubbs) was seldom enforced. Some boards enforced it, others claimed to enforce it but never collected the fees, and generally speaking there was a happy-go-lucky administration of it.

Mr. Moore: I never heard of that.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Bill was introduced to have uniform legislation and uniform license fees throughout the State, and one feature of it was the abolition of exemptions. It was regrettable that hon. members had raised this point. Ministers of religion would not thank them for doing so.

Mr. S. Stubbs: I have been requested by them to bring it forward.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Ministers of religion used the roads like ordinary individuals; and though they received very slight remuneration for their services, still there were others receiving less money who would be required to pay the tax. Ministers of religion wished to be put on the same footing as their fellow citizens, and to pay for their use of the roads as others did. Certainly the Bill was taking away a privilege, but it was introduced to take away privileges and to apply generally. The amendment brought into the debate questions that should not be brought into the discussion of this Bill. There were no exemptions in the Bill. If this exemption were granted there was no reason why other exemptions should not be made. There were others besides ministers doing equally good work in the cause of humanity, and once we started exempting there would be no limit. The only safe method was to have no exemptions, and to make the Bill apply generally.

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

Ayes	..	..	11
Noes	..	..	22
Majority against		..	11

Ayes.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Moore
Mr. Broun	Mr. A. E. Piesse
Mr. George	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Male	Mr. Layman
Mr. Monger	(*Teller*).

Noes.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Bath	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Foley	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Swan
Mr. Green	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Lander	(*Teller*).
Mr. Lewis	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 54, 55—agreed to.

Clause 56—License to be produced on demand:

Mr. LANDER: Did this clause mean that the driver of a vehicle was always bound to have his license with him?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Where the local authority had the assistance of the police the police officer could not enforce the provisions of the measure and see that they were being complied with unless he could demand the production of the license.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 57—agreed to.

Clause 58—Lost license:

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: What was the prescribed fee likely to be? Who was to impose it?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Minister would fix the fee by regulation.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 59, 60—agreed to.

Clause 61—Application of penalties:

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: Provision was made that the fines or penalties should be paid to the local authority within whose district the offence was proved to have been committed. Under this provision the busier centres of population would reap all the fines, because within their districts would the greater number of offences be committed, notwithstanding that the vehicles belonged to outlying districts. Thus a municipality in the agricultural districts would get all the fees, while the outlying roads board would get none.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There was a good deal of truth in what the hon. member had pointed out. No tears would be shed if the clause were deleted altogether. Undoubtedly, if passed as printed the clause would have the effect the hon. member had pointed out. However, it was but a small matter after all, and the hon. member might be content to let the clause stand as printed.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 62—agreed to.

New clause:

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: It was his intention to move the addition of a new clause to stand as Clause 8 as follows:—"No vehicle license is required for the use on any road of any agricultural machine." This would give effect to the definition of agricultural machine which he had moved at an earlier stage. It was to be hoped that the Minister would accept the new clause.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There was no objection to the proposed new clause, except that to be in its proper place it should go in as a proviso to Clause 7. With the concurrence of the hon. member he would recommit the Bill for the purpose of placing the proposed amendment in its right position.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: In the circumstances, he would refrain from moving the proposed new clause.

New clause—Penalty for reckless driving and obstructing road:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 51:—"No person shall, on any road,—(a) drive any vehicle recklessly or negligently or at a speed or in a manner which is dangerous to the public, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, including the nature, condition, and use of the road, and the amount of traffic which actually is at the time, or which might reasonably be expected to be, on the road; or (b) in any manner wilfully prevent any person from passing him or any vehicle or animal under his care, or by negligence or misbehaviour prevent, hinder, or interrupt the free passage of any person, vehicle, or animal, or fail to keep any vehicle or animal under his care on the left or near side of the road, for the purpose of allowing such passage. Penalty: Ten pounds."

It would be remembered that, as far as motor vehicles were concerned, a similar provision was inserted. The proposed new clause was to apply generally to all vehicles. Paragraph (b) was to compel vehicles to keep to the right side, and to give right of way to vehicles following behind and making more speed.

New clause put and passed.

New clause—Penalty for unauthorised use of vehicles:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 52:—"No person shall, without the consent of the owner or person in charge of a vehicle, drive, occupy, or otherwise assume control of or use such vehicle. Penalty: Twenty pounds."

This had been taken from the Victorian Act. Its object was to obviate the excursions known as "joy rides." It was found that very often vehicles were taken out without the consent of the owner, and in many instances accidents had occurred and vehicles had been damaged. The clause was necessary to make it clear to those temporarily in charge of the vehicles that they could only use them with the consent of the owner.

New clause put and passed.

First and Second Schedules—agreed to.

Third Schedule—License fees:

Mr. MALE: There was very great objection to the proposal to license bicycles, seeing that they were largely used by school children and by workers going to and from their employment. If these bicycles were to be licensed, the proposed charge of 2s. 6d. per wheel was altogether too much. He moved an amendment—

That under "Vehicle licenses" in line 1, "2s." be struck out.

This would leave the licensing fee at sixpence per wheel.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The proposed amendment was too drastic. He would be agreeable to a fee of 1s. 3d. per wheel, or 2s. 6d. per bicycle. But to make it sixpence per wheel would not pay the costs incurred. There was not the general objection to the licensing of bicycles that the hon. member would have the Committee believe. Moreover, the registration of a bicycle would give the owner a better chance of identifying it in the event of its being lost or stolen. It had to be borne in mind, too, that on the goldfields the local authorities maintained special bicycle tracks. Those local authorities derived considerable revenue from the licensing of bicycles, and largely spent it on the maintaining of the tracks referred to. Moreover it was to be remembered that the Bill had been submitted to the conference of local authorities who, after an exhaustive debate on the question, had adopted this very tax.

Mr. MALE: In accordance with the intimation from the Minister that a fee of 2s. 6d. for the whole machine would be accepted, he would withdraw his amendment with a view to adopting the suggestion of the Minister.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. MALE moved an amendment—

That "2s. 6d." be struck out and "1s. 3d." inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: Would the Minister explain how he intended to arrive at the horse power of motor cars. There was a good deal of variation in calculating the horse power. British makers rated in one way and American makers in another, the latter being very much higher. Unless there was a standard, there would probably be some difficulty.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: A standard would be necessary. He could not say what it would be, but there was power under the measure to decide on a standard and that would be made general throughout the State.

Schedule as amended put and passed.

Fourth schedule—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 10th October.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): The Attorney General is always at his best when he is pleading the cause of humanity, and I must say that when introducing this measure he made a great effort in that direction. He appealed to the sentiment of members of the House and gave the history of legislation which has obtained in the United Kingdom for many years past. Stirring appeals of this sort are calculated to work upon one's imagination, and perhaps if one gave way to his feelings entirely, he would be prepared to follow him and pass anything at all that he submits in the shape of legislation, indeed, perhaps more than is contained in a measure of this description. I venture to think that we have to take a calmer view of this proposed legislation than the Attorney General would have us do by his introduction of the measure. We have to consider it not only from the standpoint of the unfortunate individual who has suffered from injury or perhaps from disease contracted in the course of his employment, but also from the standpoint of the general public because, after all is said and done, it is upon the shoul-

ders of the general public that legislation of this description falls, that is as far as the cost is concerned. In this measure we seek to protect all and sundry who may receive injury through following their employment and it goes to my mind somewhat far when we protect a man who through his own wilful misconduct and neglect suffers injury and enable him to recover when perhaps he may have engaged in his work in or around machinery when he was not in a right condition to be working. I mean by this that men have been known to go to their work when they were intoxicated, and it seems to be stretching our legislation considerably, no matter how we may wish to protect the bona fide worker from injury, when we introduce clauses which will enable a man to go to his work in an unfit condition, suffer injury thereby and yet recover from his employer in consequence. Surely serious misconduct of this description if resulting in permanent injury, or no matter whether permanent injury or death itself, ought not to be levelled upon the shoulders of the employer, and by him of course transferred to the general public.

Mr. Heitmann: What would you call serious and wilful misconduct?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I refer to a man going to work in an intoxicated condition and thereby suffering serious injury.

Mr. Heitmann: An employer has something to say in that regard.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Not under this Bill.

Mr. Heitmann: The employer could stop such a person.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The employer cannot be watching every man going to his work. It seems to me we are endeavouring by this legislation—and I do not say it is new although it goes further than we have gone before—to relieve the individual of all responsibility, and I wish to point out that in my humble opinion our commercial fabric is founded to a large extent upon individual responsibility. If we take away that responsibility from the individual then we endanger the whole fabric, and we ought to consider very carefully before we legislate to the extent that a man, no matter what his acts may be, can come down on his employer and receive compensation for injuries caused by his own wilful misconduct. We have in considering legislation not to consider so much our feelings but to see that justice and equity are meted out to all, remembering all the time that when we put a burden upon any of our industrial enterprises by way of liability such as we propose to do under this legislation, it must of course be passed on to those dealing with those enterprises, and they are the public generally. It very often happens that people aim at getting something and think they are going to get a decided benefit whereas sometimes they find that they have a burden to carry themselves in consequence. The Bill, it seems to me in reading it through, is very complete so far as the protection for the worker is concerned, and in that respect I presume it will receive the approbation of a majority of the members in this Chamber. It repeals —and this I think is a very good point in its favour—our previous legislation and allows us to start afresh in the direction in which it is proposed to legislate. The Attorney General, in introducing the measure, roused us almost to a pitch of enthusiasm by his appeal on humanitarian grounds, and he pointed out that the legislation was based almost entirely upon the Workers' Compensation Act of the Imperial Parliament passed, I think he said on several occasions, in the year 1879.

Mr. Dwyer: Oh no, 1906.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Attorney General said 1879.

Mr. Heitmann: That was the first.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There were several errors in the remarks made by the Attorney General in the introduction of the measure, because the Act he referred to was not passed in 1879. There was no such Act in that year; it was passed in 1897. This is the Act upon which this measure is pretty largely based.

Mr. Dwyer: There was a subsequent Act to that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I was referring to the Attorney General's speech.

The Minister for Works: His figures were correct; he only put them round the wrong way.

Mr. Heitmann: You are not trying to make capital out of a mistake?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We are entitled to look to the Attorney General to be accurate. I can point to other errors. This is only a beginning. I wish to draw attention to this so that members may not be misled and may not waste time trying to find an Imperial Act of 1879 because there is none. The Attorney General in his eloquent periods went on to draw attention to the fact that the British conscience awoke to the injustice of a certain rule, a rule which was comprised in the maxim of a personal action dying with the individual. He again claimed that the Act of 1879 had abolished this rule. This is not so, because in turning up the legislation and the authorities on the subject, I find that the Act which did away with the rule that personal action died with the person was passed in England so far back as 1846 and it was adopted in Western Australia in 1849. This is a rule which prior to 1846 prohibited a person's dependents from prosecuting a charge for compensation for injuries received if the individual who had been injured died in the meantime. Of course so far as libel and slander and actions for malicious prosecutions are concerned, the rule still holds good, but so far as actions for personal damage are concerned, injuries received in the course of employment, notwithstanding that the person who has been injured has departed this life, those who are left behind can prosecute the case and recover damages. The Attorney General was very insistent that Western Australia had been behind the times all along, had lagged behind and had done nothing to protect the workers and he took great credit that to-day we were introducing this measure which would bring us up to the mark because hitherto our legislation had not been even as good as the legislation which existed in the old country. Here again I think he was misleading because I believe Western Australia has been fairly up to date in her legislation.

Mr. Dwyer: Not in this particular; we are miles behind.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I draw hon. members' attention to this fact that the English Fatal Injuries Act of 1846 was adopted in Western Australia in 1849.

Mr. Dwyer: Talk about recent times.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If the hon. member will have patience I will come right down to it; he is so impatient he wants to deliver speeches himself while others are talking. He will have his opportunity when I have finished. I want to draw hon. members' attention to the fact that English legislation from time to time has been adopted in Western Australia. The English Fatal Injuries Act, as I stated, was adopted in this State in 1849, long before the member for Perth saw the light of day. The English Employers' Liability Act of 1880 was adopted in Western Australia in 1894 and the English Workmen's Compensation Act of 1897 was adopted in Western Australia in 1902.

Mr. Heitmann: In its entirety?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes. With regard to the present measure, which I was inclined to think was almost an exact copy of the Imperial legislation from the introduction of the Attorney General, I find that much has been left out of it, and much has been added to it, and therefore it behoves hon. members to scrutinise it carefully, to read the clauses for themselves, and if they wish to ascertain what the legislation is in the old land, to turn up the Imperial Act and compare it with this Bill. For instance, in regard to the workers lent or let out on hire, the employer is responsible under the English Act but in this proposed legislation, he is to be, or he may be or must be indemnified by the other person; that is that the person who hires a worker from an individual is responsible for any damage which may occur to that worker during the course of employment. If I engage a fitter to overhaul my machinery and he happens to receive an injury I, under this Bill, have to indemnify the man's immediate employer for that in-

jury. The same applies to a joiner or a plumber who may be called in to repair a house or the roof of a house, or the shipwright who may be sent along by a firm of ship repairers to carry out repairs to a vessel. If the man suffers an injury during the course of his employment then the immediate employer can call upon his customer to indemnify him.

Mr. Heitmann: Under what Act is that?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Under the proposed measure. These words which I have referred to in the proposed legislation are not found in the Imperial Act.

Mr. Munsie: Quite right, too.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: And I hope they will be struck out of our measure. This is a point that ought to be noted. The individual who lets a contract has recourse against a contractor for any damage that happens to the employee who may have been lent to do certain work. Here, therefore, we have two conflicting positions.

Mr. Heitmann: You have not read the Bill.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do not think the hon. member has read it; I will at any rate await his explanation. Then another matter which is not in accordance with Imperial legislation is the definition of a ship. It is proposed here to bring all vessels which may be engaged in the West Australian trade under this measure, and the definition of ship under the Bill means any craft or boat whatever. Under the Imperial Act the definition is as set forth in the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894 and there is a very wide difference. For instance, so far as I read this definition of ship, covering as it does any craft, or boat, it will cover even a rowing boat which may be engaged for pleasure. Any hon. member who wishes to go for a row on the Swan, or go fishing, and hires a man to row him, will render himself liable if that man, through his own incompetence, capsizes the boat and loses his life. Hon. members will agree that that goes rather too far. When I point out such a provision is not included in the Imperial Act, on which this legislation is supposed to be based, it will be agreed that such a clause should not be permitted to remain, or should be amended so as to be brought into line with the Imperial legislation. Then there is another clause to which the Attorney General referred, and that was that the worker could get compensation from the time of his injury or accident. Although I do not object to that yet I think it would be wise to allow some little time to elapse, say a week, before a claim could be made. The English Act which we are supposed to be following only grants compensation when a man has been disabled for a period of at least a week and compensation commences to accrue from the termination of that week. This paragraph has been left out of our measure altogether and it must be obvious, if we leave it open for a man when he goes home to say that he has ricked his leg or injured his foot, to send word to his employer next day that such is the case and he lodges a claim. Thus we are opening the door to malingering of the worst type.

Mr. Heitmann: If you allowed a week the same thing would happen.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No. We can prove by medical examination whether the man has been injured or whether he is malingering. Hon. members know there are people who will take advantage of a clause of this description. I have known men injured, or at least stated to have been injured, to draw more pay than their wages for a considerable period.

Mr. A. A. Wilson: Do you know their names?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Imperial Act restricts the liability to work done in the course of the principal's business, but again these words have been left out of our Bill, so that anyone who engages a tradesman to do any work is responsible, not only for the accident that may occur to that worker, but anything that may occur to him on foot, or on a bicycle, or a tramcar during his journey from his employer's premises to the job on which he is to work.

Mr. Dwyer: Only in the course of his employment.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If a man is called upon to go to the hon. member's house and he is travelling on a tram to get there and he meets with an injury, he can claim compensation.

Mr. Heitmann: Not at all.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Under this Bill he can claim compensation and I am giving not only my own opinion but that of a competent authority. It all goes to show how necessary it is for hon. members to scrutinise this measure in order that they may not fall into the error of passing it as it is printed. If a man is called in to do some repairs and he meets with an accident the man who has engaged him is liable from the time the worker leaves his employer's shop.

Mr. Dwyer: The English Act uses the same phraseology as is in the Bill.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That is a mistake which the hon. member makes. The words are left out of our Bill and the proviso which appears in the English Act has also been left out of our legislation and that embodies another principle, and a very strong principle so far as Western Australia is concerned. The proviso of this portion of the Imperial legislation sets forth that the contractor for agricultural work, for instance, by mechanical power, such as thrashing by machinery, ploughing, etcetera, shall alone be liable for any accident that may befall a man. Under this Bill, however, a farmer will be responsible in addition to the contractor, and, as hon. members know, in 99 cases out of 100, the farmer will have to pay. It seems to me, we ought to carefully scrutinise these clauses and endeavour to see that they shall not bear too harshly on those who are certainly not in the position to watch the operations of the men or to protect the men during the course of their work. It goes without saying that a farmer cannot control a man employed by a contractor who is doing ploughing by mechanical power. A farmer cannot interfere with a contractor who is taking the job on of cutting chaff. He cannot interfere with the thrashing operations when a man is under contract to do thrashing at so much per bushel.

Mr. Munsie: Can it not be stipulated that the employees be insured?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: What is the good of stipulating it? How are we going to find out whether these men are insured or not? Are we going to compel them to produce their insurance policy?

Mr. Munsie: I would.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If a threshing machine came along would a farmer be in a position to refuse to take advantage of the machine if its driver did not hold an insurance policy?

Mr. Munsie: If this Bill goes through each man will have his policy in his pocket.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I want to emphasise the point that there will be a considerable burden placed on the agricultural population of this State by the clauses I have referred to. I am mentioning these because the Attorney General in introducing the measure eulogised it as being almost a copy of the Imperial legislation, and yet these points which I have had time to look up are not included in that legislation. We have gone very much further in that respect than the Imperial legislation, and I ask hon. members whether we should not see that these safeguards which already find a place in the Imperial legislation, which we are supposed to be following, are included in this Bill.

Mr. Heitmann: Do you see any reason why a man working for a farmer should not be compensated for an accident?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have not said so.

Mr. Heitmann: You have indicated it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I did not indicate it at all. In Subsection 4 of Section 4 of the Imperial Act there is a provision that the principal is only liable for injury done on his premises, but that has been carefully and studiously left out of this Bill, and under this measure an injury which may befall a worker who is going to the principal's premises to follow his occupation must be compensated for. If the principle was good in the Imperial legislation, I fail to see why it is not good enough for Western Australia. But whether it be good or bad,

it showed neglect on the part of the Attorney General that he did not point out where this proposed legislation differed from the legislation he was eulogising. To give just one more illustration, there are left out of the health clauses many words which are contained in the Imperial Act. For instance, the words which in the Imperial Act compel a worker to give sufficient information to enable the employer to take proceedings against the previous employer are left out of this Bill altogether. A man may be working for a person for a few days and develop a disease, and so long as he gives the name of his previous employer he may claim compensation, although it may be apparent that he has not contracted his disease in his present employment. The words in the Imperial Act that safeguard the employer of to-day are left out.

Mr. Foley: What are the words?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: These are the words in the Imperial Act—

> The workman or his dependants if so required shall furnish that employer with such information as to the names and addresses of all the other employers who employed him in the employment during the said twelve months as he or they may possess, and, if such information is not furnished——

Mr. Munsie: Those are in the Bill.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes, but the following words are left out—

> or is not sufficient to enable that employer to take proceedings under the next following proviso—

Mr. Munsie: Certainly.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member did not know that before.

Mr. Munsie: That is your opinion.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Ah, I see, the Bill has been threshed out in caucus, and therefore it is to be passed as printed. I am wasting my valuable effort in endeavouring to convert members on the Ministerial side to do justice to this measure. They have already threshed the matter out and we have no hope of amending the Bill in this Chamber.

Mr. Foley: You have your remedy in another place, and you use it, too.

Mr. Green: Yes, you have your Old Guards.

Mr. Heitmann: The worker is compelled to give such information as he may possess as to the names and addresses of previous employers.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No, the Bill doe not compel the worker to give sufficient information to enable his present employer to take action under the succeeding proviso. If this provision was not necessary it would not be in the Imperial Act, because there are wiser and more experienced men in the old country drafting these Acts of Parliament than we have here, and they would not insert those words unless they were necessary.

Mr. Heitmann: We have differed from the Imperial Parliament before.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: But I have been pointing out that the general introduction of the measure by the Attorney General would lead us to believe that this Bill was framed on the Imperial legislation.

Mr. Dwyer: With improvements.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No, not with improvements. The Attorney General said that it was almost identical with Imperial legislation, whereas on looking into the matter I find that it differs materially. I think I have said sufficient to show at any rate that Western Australia is not so far behind other portions of the British Empire with regard to legislation of this description, and I think we may take credit to ourselves that we have all along passed legislation for the protection of the workers generally. In my opinion we shall be going too far if we try to relieve the individual worker of all responsibility, and I certainly hope that when the Bill gets into Committee members will not agree to that clause which enables the dependants of a man to sue for full compensation when his accident has been caused through his own wilful conduct and neglect.

Mr. Foley: That is specifically dealt with, but not in the manner you speak of.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is not dealt with, and I think the provisions in this respect are unfair, and that in Com-

mittee we should alter the clause so that if a man by his own wilful misconduct meets his death no one should be held responsible.

Mr. Heitmann: There cannot be wilful misconduct on the part of a man to cause his own death.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I object also to the principle embodied here that if regulations are rejected by either House the two Houses may be called together, a vote taken, and if the majority of members vote in favour of them they are to be passed. We have to get the sanction of both Chambers for the passing of the measure, and the least we can do is to adopt what has been the course heretofore, namely, reject regulations if either House passes a resolution to that effect, and leave it for fresh legislation to be brought forward if the Government so desire. Then I want to say that in my opinion the whole question of legislation —and I think the Government Whip agrees with me, more or less—would be better dealt with under the insurance proposals which the Attorney General forecasted when introducing this measure. Compensation for accidents or disease caused by the employment or calling of the injured person is essentially a matter for joint insurance. Let the worker feel some responsibility with regard to his employment, and the safeguarding of his occupation, let him feel that he also has to contribute something towards the insurance fund which will compensate him, and we will get a much better feeling between employer and employee, and much greater freedom from accidents such as we experience at the present time.

Mr. Heitmann: Surely you do not say that because a worker does not pay towards an insurance fund, he has no responsibility.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do wish the hon. member to believe that the worker will not be so careful under clauses such as we have in this proposed legislation as he would be if he was covered by a joint insurance fund, such as has been established in many countries of Europe and elsewhere. That is my firm conviction, and I would far sooner see matters of this description dealt with by legislation for joint assurance, because I feel certain that we would have a better result and fewer accidents under such a system than by having these Bills brought in from time to time always increasing the responsibility of the employer and the burden on the industry and never asking the workers themselves to contribute one iota towards it. All burdens placed on commercial or industrial matters recoil on those who use the products of those industries, and sooner or later it has its effect on the cost of living. As we put burdens on industries so the prices of commodities increase, and the demand for increased wages of course naturally follows. Then, where are we to end? Of course it goes on until it breaks down with its own weight. The sooner we realise that workers and employers must join hands together to establish proper protection for the individual in insurance funds or legislation, I think the better it will be for the people generally and for the commercial and industrial pursuits of our State.

Mr. MUNSIE (Hannans): I congratulate the Government and particularly the Attorney General on the introduction of this Bill. There are several provisions in it that are an advance on the old measure. I first of all congratulate the Government on having widened the scope of the Bill and on bringing all workers in the State under its provisions. There are many industries now employing large numbers of workers who have no redress under the present Act. I congratulate the Government on increasing the amount to which the worker is entitled under this new Bill. I congratulate the Government on wiping out the serious and wilful misconduct provisions of the old Act. The leader of the Opposition would lead us to believe that a man working for his living will deliberately attempt to commit suicide to get the benefits under the Workers' Compensation Act, but I do not think that any employee of any firm or business is likely to do anything of the kind. It should be perfectly understood that the employee has to be permanently injured or the injury must result in death

before the serious and wilful misconduct provisions are deleted, so that if the employer, in the case of any employee meeting with an accident that does not result in death or permanent disablement, can prove that the employee is guilty of serious and wilful misconduct the provisions of the old Act will still apply. Another feature of the Bill on which I congratulate the Government is the wiping out of the 14 days in which the worker is not entitled to get compensation. The leader of the Opposition only quoted portion of the Imperial Act dealing with this. Our existing law provides that the injury has to result in the incapacity of the worker for more than 14 days before he is entitled to any compensation. The English Act provides that the accident must incapacitate the worker for more than seven days before he is entitled to compensation. But the leader of the Opposition failed to quote the English Act where it continues and provides that if the injury results in the worker being incapacitated for more than 14 days compensation dates from the date of the injury. There is a great deal of difference between that and what the leader of the Opposition actually quoted. The leader of the Opposition also endeavoured to prove that the wiping out of this 14 days would lead to malingering. The hon. member is prepared to follow the Imperial Act. I am firmly of opinion that the provisions of the Imperial Act are more likely to provide for malingering than wiping out the 14 days altogether, because it is only natural and human to suppose that if a man meets with an accident capable of incapacitating him for twelve days, when he knows that by staying off work for one or two days more he is entitled to an extra week's compensation, he will endeavour to get that extra week's pay. From my experience of dealing with workers in regard to accident pay, I can say there is very little malingering. I admit that the unions do have some men malingering in certain directions. The trouble is to ascertain whether it is an accident or not. The men that do malinger, if there is any malingering, are men who are off in some instances with bad backs. Medical men eventually send in certificates saying that they are suffering from lumbago or some other such disease, and these men have been receiving accident pay. On these lines I admit that some workers do malinger, if it can be called malingering. There is another feature of this Bill on which I desire to congratulate the Government. I am surprised it has escaped the notice of the leader of the Opposition. I refer to the provision allowing a person who has met with an accident, and who is unable to earn as much as he was earning at the time of the accident, to resume work on a lesser paid job or on a lighter job and at the same time receive in compensation the difference between the amount he is receiving and the amount he was receiving at the time he met with the accident. In my opinion this will wipe out the whole of the doubt, if any does exist in the mind of the leader of the Opposition as to any need for malingering. Another feature of the Bill I am pleased to see is in connection with having a lump sum assessed. The old Act provides that after six months the employer can compel the worker to have a lump sum assessed. There was no opportunity given to the worker to apply for a lump sum. I am pleased, however, to see that the Bill provides that after three months either the employer or the employee has the right to apply to have a lump sum assessed. From my experience on the goldfields, the provision in the present Act has worked a considerable number of hardships. I do not blame the actual employer. I blame the insurance companies. In many instances men, after being off for some considerable time, have applied to have lump sums assessed, but the insurance companies have made some practically ridiculous offers in full payment, holding over the unfortunate man who has been injured the threat that if he does not accept what they offer they will continue paying half wages.

Mr. Heitmann: I must say from my experience of the insurance companies in that regard they have been very fair.

Mr. MUNSIE: That has not been my experience. The worker has had no

alternative in nine cases out of ten but to accept what the insurance companies have offered, or continue on half wages. I am pleased the Government have seen fit in this measure to give the worker the same right as the employer in this direction. Another important feature of the Bill is the inclusion of industrial diseases. The leader of the Opposition, until he came to this particular part of the Imperial Act, was prepared to follow that measure exclusively. He criticised the Government, or the Attorney General, for omitting different provisions of the English Act, but when we come to this feature of the Bill that includes industrial diseases, we find the hon. member is not prepared to stick to the English Act where is provides for payment of compensation for industrial diseases. There are six distinct diseases provided for in the schedule to the Imperial Act, but the leader of the Opposition of course conveniently forgot that phase of the question in the interest of getting contributory insurance. From my experience, while I have the opportunity of casting a vote in this Chamber, never on any occasion will a vote of mine be given towards compelling any workers in any industry to pay contributary insurance. If this Bill becomes law I realise the responsibility of the people I am representing—I represent a mining constituency—and I honestly believe that so far as industrial diseases are concerned the principal parties affected will be those following the occupation of miners. I believe the responsibility will eventually come on the shoulders of the State to bear some of the burden, and rightly so. Not long ago we had a Royal Commission sitting in regard to this matter, and the principal objection raised by the employers, particularly the mining companies, to the inclusion of miners' phthisis under the Worker's Compensation Act was that it was going to increase the premiums they would have to pay to such a large extent that the industry could not bear the burden.

Mr. Male: That it would be impossible to insure.

Mr. MUNSIE: The hon. gentleman says it is impossible to insure. If he had read carefully through the evidence of experts given before that commission I cannot see how he could make that statement.

Mr. Male: There is the New Zealand experience.

Mr. MUNSIE: The New Zealand experience has nothing at all to do with this particular phase of the question, inasmuch as no provision was made in New Zealand. I believe the matter was practically sprung upon the employees, no provision being made for them, and they refused to undergo a medical examination. But the very essence of the Bill provides for medical examination, and I am firmly of opinion that the workers on the goldfields will readily submit to such examination, if the Bill goes through. Expert evidence given before that commission proves conclusively that it is not impossible for the insurance companies to take the risk of industrial diseases. I would like to read one or two paragraphs from the evidence given by Mr. Basil L. Murray, manager in Western Australia for the Victoria Insurance Company. In connection with this matter, Mr. Murray was asked the question—

> Assuming that every miner submitted to a periodical examination, you have no doubt that the companies would quote?

His reply was as follows:—

> Yes, I do not think that they would quote more than the slightest fraction above any rate that excluded it. If you have a periodical medical examination and you detect the disease, from a humane standpoint you are not going to send the man suffering from it back to earn his living at mining. Directly it is detected he has to go. If you have periodical medical examinations, claims under a policy of that kind would be infinitesimal. I doubt whether the premiums would be increased more than a fraction.

Further on he was asked by the same representative on the commission a question with regard to the State taking on insurance. The question was—

> And the State need not employ canvassers?

To this he replied—

> The State would have practically no expense. If I were the manager of the one company in the State which had no competition, I think I could get all premiums down 30 per cent.

Upon this the chairman of the committee interposed with the reflection that a monopoly does not always result in the cheapening of rates, to which the witness responded—

> No, but it ought to. That the State should one day come in and interfere with the business of private companies is one of the things we are ever dreading, so to speak.

We quite realise that they do not want the introduction of a measure likely to lead to the State taking on insurance. Later on Mr. Murray was asked the very question—

> Presumably the State would only interfere in the case of a man so thrftless as to neglect to make provision for himself?

His reply was—

> It is an excellent idea so long as it is carried out on reasonable lines. In Perth at the present time there are over 300 persons permanently employed in insurance business. We sometimes hear complaints of low wages paid in banks, and other institutions, but you never hear of that charge being brought against insurance companies. Throughout Australia the insurance staffs are well paid and well contented.

When you get gentlemen giving evidence before a commission, gentlemen who, I take it, are in a position to know exactly how things should stand, their evidence should carry some weight. We have that gentleman stating that if the Bill provided for periodical medical examination the increased cost to the insurance companies would be infinitesimal. Further on we have the same witness stating that if he were the manager of the one insurance company in the State, without competition, he could reduce the cost by 30 per cent. Now the principal reasons that actuated the commission, or several of them, was the evidence submitted by the employers in the mining industry. I can quite realise that it came as a surprise to get a manager of an insurance company making admissions such as I have read, and this, too, coming on the top of the evidence of the general manager of Messrs. Bewick, Moreing & Co. That gentleman submitted a schedule in which he contended that the inclusion of fibrosis was going to increase the premiums by 50 per cent.; and he went further and said that if the fourteen days provision were wiped out and the compensation were to date from the date of the accident, it would increase the premiums another 50 per cent. Three or four managers of insurance companies gave evidence, and the whole of their evidence goes to prove that such would not be the case. All their fears were in respect to the undertaking of insurance for industrial diseases of this kind without medical examination. So far as the diseases are concerned, I welcome the introduction of such a clause. I do not believe there will be half a dozen serious objections to a medical examination on the whole of the gold fields. I believe the men working in the gold mining industry realise that if by undergoing a medical examination they should be compelled to leave that employment, they have the ability to get something else to do, and their desire is to get out of the mines. Personally I think they should be compelled to submit to the medical examination for their own benefit, and for the benefit of their fellow men. Another feature in the Bill, upon which I desire to congratulate the Government, is the introduction of the system adopted in New Zealand of framing a schedule showing what a sufferer is entitled to receive for certain injuries. In the past we have had a considerable amount of trouble, so far as this is concerned, and I trust the House will adopt the schedule, if not in its entirety of detail, at least in its principle. I know of an instance in which a man, who was unfortunate enough to lose an eye in following his occupation of a miner, had only received some eight weeks of compensation money when he went to the doctor, who told him that if it were possible for him to obtain some light employment, in

all probability he was fit to carry out that employment; whereupon the injured worker interviewed the management, who said they were prepared to give him a light job. He then interviewed the insurance company, and they offered him the magnificent sum of 30s. for the loss of an eye! And they refused to budge from that figure. In view of that and similar instances, I trust hon. members will see the wisdom of laying down in the schedule what an individual is entitled to when he meets with certain accidents. There is another provision which, to my mind, will do away with the possibility, or at least the probability, of malingering. The Bill provides that any person receiving compensation can make an application to the employer to be allowed the opportunity of attempting to resume work. Under the existing Act the mere fact of a man resuming work debars him from any future benefits in respect to his accident and, as a consequence, the insurance companies have had to pay considerably more money in insurance than, perhaps, there was any real necessity for them to do. Because, naturally, every worker receiving compensation required to be thoroughly convinced that the accident would not come against him again, and that he was thoroughly cured, before he would attempt to resume work. Under the present Bill, however, we allow a man an opportunity of resuming work, and if he finds he is not yet fit for work the mere fact that he attempted to resume work will not debar him from further enjoyment of the benefits provided by the Bill. I contend that this provision will, to a great extent, do away with malingering. There are several other slight amendments in connection with the measure which, I take it, will be fully dealt with in Committee. I honestly believe, as a result of the appeal made by the Attorney General, that there will be little or no opposition to a measure of this description, unless indeed that opposition is in the direction of increasing the amounts due to those entitled to them under the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

House adjourned at 9.59 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 16th October, 1912.

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Papers relating to the retirement of Mr. D. B. Ord, formerly Chief Clerk in the Colonial Secretary's Department. 2, Report of the select committee of the Legislative Assembly on the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill, 1910.

HIGH SCHOOL ACT AMENDMENT BILL SELECT COMMITTEE.

Extension of Time.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban) moved—

That the time for bringing up the report of the select committee be extended for a fortnight.

If any explanation was required by members in regard to the request, it would be sufficient to state that, owing to the change in the constitution of the committee, members had not been able to meet for a week, and the examination of witnesses had not been completed.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan) seconded the motion.

Question passed.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day; Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 7—Resolutions and rules to be passed before application made for registration:

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The Honorary Minister's attention might be drawn to an ambiguity in the third line, which