

Government will take this matter into their consideration. We have an industry fairly going, and if we get good results we shall have miles and miles of vineyards in this country. I appeal to the House to consider the matter in the interests of the wine-growers, and if there are any difficulties in the way, let us get over them and see if we can give people an opportunity of selling what they grow.

On motion by MR. ILLINGWORTH, debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at five minutes to 11 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

### Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 2nd December, 1902.

	PAGE
Petitions: Hairdressers ... ..	2532
Questions: Midland Railway, Water haulage ... ..	2532
Esperance-to-Goldfields Railway Survey ... ..	2532
Papers ordered: Pastoral Leases, Eucla ... ..	2532
Bills: Police Act Amendment, third reading ... ..	2532
Public Works, third reading ... ..	2533
Roads Act Amendment, Recommittal ... ..	2533
Dividend Duties, first reading ... ..	2533
Constitution Act Amendment, first reading ... ..	2533
Rabbit Pest, first reading ... ..	2533
Tramway Bills (4), Leonora, Broome, Ashburton, Derby, first readings ... ..	2533
Electoral Bill, first reading ... ..	2533
Factories and Shops, second reading resumed, division ... ..	2533
Bread Bill, in Committee, reported ... ..	2547
Criminal Code Amendment, second reading, in Committee, reported ... ..	2553
Land Act Amendment, Committee resumed, reported ... ..	2553

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### PETITIONS—HAIRDRESSERS.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY presented two petitions; one from master hairdressers on the goldfields, the other from operative hairdressers on the goldfields, against

the provision in the Factories and Shops Bill for closing hairdressers' establishments at 6:30, and in favour of closing at 7:30, with one hour for tea.

Petitions received, read, and ordered to be considered when the House is in Committee on Factories and Shops Bill.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: 1, By-laws of the Municipality of Norseman. 2, Western Australian Government Railways—Alteration to Classification and Rate Book.

Ordered: to lie on the table.

#### QUESTION—MIDLAND RAILWAY, WATER HAULAGE.

HON. J. M. DREW asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What charge per truck is made by the Midland Railway Company for the haulage of water for the Government from Minginew to Geraldton. 2, Whether suitable water for the locomotives at Geraldton cannot be obtained closer than Minginew.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, The Midland Railway Company's charge is 24s. per tank, containing 1,200 gallons, delivered at Walkaway. 2, No.

#### QUESTION—ESPERANCE-TO-GOLD-FIELDS RAILWAY SURVEY.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What progress has been made with the survey of the Goldfields-Esperance Railway. 2, When will the survey of the whole of the line be completed.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, The survey has reached a distance of 80 miles from Coolgardie. 2, About the end of 1903.

#### PAPERS—PASTORAL LEASES, EUCLA.

On motion by HON. G. BELLINGHAM, ordered: "That all papers and correspondence in connection with applications for pastoral leases in the Eucla division for the past six months be laid on the table of the House."

#### POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

**PUBLIC WORKS BILL.**

Read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

**ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.  
RECOMMITTAL.**

On motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, Bill recommitted for amendments.

Clause 156—Application of this part (borrowing and special powers):

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that in line 1, after "apply," there be inserted "only"; that in line 3 "only" be struck out, "and" inserted in lieu. The amendment made in Committee would cause the provision to apply only after presentation of a petition; and such was not the intention.

HON. J. W. HACKETT said he remembered questioning the Minister, who seemed to think the word "only" referred to the presentation of a petition. It now appeared that the word "only" referred to both parts of the clause.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 167—Subdivisional plans to be approved by board:

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The words "on application from the board," in line 5, were rather vague. He moved that "application" be struck out, and "appeal" inserted in lieu; also that between "from" and "the" there be inserted "the decision of."

HON. G. RANDELL: This amendment would make the clause perfectly clear. His own amendment had been moved under a misapprehension, and he now concurred in the alteration proposed.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Bill reported with farther amendments, and the report adopted.

**DIVIDEND DUTIES BILL.**

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

**CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

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

**RABBIT PEST BILL.**

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

**LEONORA TRAMWAY BILL.**

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

**BROOME TRAMWAY BILL.**

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

**ASHBURTON TRAMWAY BILL.**

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

**DERBY TRAMWAY BILL.**

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

**ELECTORAL BILL.**

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

**FACTORIES AND SHOPS BILL.****SECOND READING.**

Debate resumed from the 26th November.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central): I have carefully read the Bill, and have come to the conclusion that with judicious amendments it may be made a useful addition to our statute-book. The principles of the Bill are undoubtedly safe. It aims at regulating the hours of labour and the ages of those employed in factories; contains provisions with regard to women and boys, sanitary safeguards, and precautions against accidents; and deals with the closing of shops on lines somewhat similar to those of the Early Closing Act. There may be some differences of opinion as to the methods which should be used to achieve the objects sought by this Bill; but I think most members will agree that those objects are at all events deserving of the serious consideration of Parliament. I heartily approve of the principles of the Bill; but I repeat that some amendments will be essential to make it conform to the requirements of a country where it may be said factories have as yet scarcely sprung into existence. In the first place I consider the definition of "factory" covers far too wide a ground. It seems to me ridiculous in the extreme that two persons, including the occupier, should constitute a factory. This appears to me something like legislation run mad, although I must admit

we have a precedent for it in the Eastern States. What does it mean? That a shoemaker and his assistant, or a washer-woman and her help, constitute a "factory" if this Bill is passed. Surely nothing could be more preposterous; nothing could be more seriously calculated to defeat the very object the Bill has in view. If passed without alteration, it will entail the appointment of a vast army of inspectors to secure its administration; and I am sure so many inspectors would not be appointed, therefore the measure, whatever good it may contain, can never be strictly enforced, and the community will never reap the full benefit to be derived from a well-drawn Act. If a Factories and Shops Act is to be at all workable, it must be based on lines of which common sense and reason approve; and I am sorry to say the Bill is not a measure of that description. I certainly think not less than 10 persons should be needed to constitute a factory under this Bill. It is only in large establishments that the evils the Bill proposes to attack exist to any extent calling for legislative intervention. If the Bill be made applicable to every trade and handicraft in the community, it will be killed by its own dead weight, because it never will be enforced. Clause 4 provides that an inspector may hold any other office or employment which the Governor deems not incompatible with the inspector's duties under the Act. From this I conclude that the work of inspection will devolve on the police. If my assumption be correct, it will not be long before pleasant pastures will open up in Western Australia for the criminally inclined. While the police are engaged in bringing the lash of the law to bear on the shoulders of the factory owners—that is, every person who is the occupier of a workshop, and employs one or more men—there will be a rich harvest for pickpockets, knights of the jummy, burglars, and law-breakers of every sort. If the policeman is to carry out the Act in its entirety, if he is to be the inspector, he must be a personification of all knowledge, a walking encyclopædia, a sanitary expert, an architect, a lawyer, and lots of other things as well. By Clause 9 he has to examine the factory to satisfy himself that it is suitable for the purpose for which it is used. By the

same clause he must ascertain whether the requirements of the Act, or of any Act relating to public health, are complied with. By Clause 32 he shall ascertain whether the factory is constructed in such a manner as to provide fresh air, and to carry off fumes, dust, or other impurities; and shall determine what space of cubic or of superficial feet shall be reserved for each worker. In short, he must be an embodiment of all the sciences, a knowledge of which men spend money, and time to acquire. Then look at what the keeper of a factory has to do. To register, keep records, post various notices, and admit an inspector at any hour of the day or night. Surely common sense cannot dictate that all these terrors should be held over the head of a man who employs perhaps only one hand—perhaps some poor unfortunate boot-repairer. I consider that if this Bill is to be of any use in the community, and if it is to be enforced, the definition of "factory" must be seriously restricted. I shall support the second reading, but only on the understanding that the Bill be adequately amended in Committee.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE (South)  
In listening to the second-reading speech of the Minister for Lands (Hon. A. Jameson), I certainly did not think the hon. gentleman was serious, there being so much in this Bill which is already covered by various other measures. The Minister classified the provisions of the Bill under four headings: health, safety, leisure, and morality. Now we have already measures dealing with the health of the community. During the short time I have had the Bill I have noticed several clauses in the Health Act which effectually provide for the health of the general public and that of factory workers also. The Health Act is very far-reaching in its scope, and effective if properly carried out. Then with regard to safety I think the Building Act provides for that as far as buildings are concerned, and the Mines Regulation Act has a good many sections which safeguard the workers employed in connection with mining machinery. Regarding leisure, I think members will agree with me that now we have a Conciliation and Arbitration Act, bodies of workers or unions can obtain from the Arbitration Court what leisure

they require. That Act as passed by this House renders it perfectly practicable for men to secure reasonable hours of employment. Disputes can be sifted by a proper tribunal, without parliamentary interference of any sort. Regarding the morality of the community, only a few days ago we made various amendments in the Police Act which will deal with that also, and last session we passed a most exhaustive Act known as the Criminal Code, which gives the Government ample means of safeguarding public morals. As to this Bill, I congratulate the Government on the great attention they have given to the working classes. Ministers have my sympathy there; but while on the subject I would remind them that there is another portion of the community which deserves our sympathy and support in other ways than by legislating to destroy its industries. I refer to employers of labour, particularly to the owners of small factories. I cannot help thinking that the Government have not given this measure the consideration it should receive, and I feel sure that when it comes into operation, if it ever does—and I hope it will not—many factories will have to close down. There is nothing in this Bill as I read it which will help the employer. Looking back at some of the factories which started in the Eastern States, I can call to mind a great number which had very humble beginnings. Take a blacksmith starting with a shed, a forge, and a few tools, or starting perhaps without a shed and under a tree, and not necessarily a “spreading chestnut tree” either. Such a man starts in a very small way, and by working hard and attending to his business becomes an employer of other men, and the business soon grows into a prosperous concern—sometimes into a foundry, sometimes into a fitting shop doing all sorts of machine work. If those smaller men are called on to comply with the regulations contained in this Bill—some of which are quite unnecessary—the result will be very hard upon them, and will no doubt land the whole of our industries in the hands of the capitalist and the monopolist. I want the House to think seriously that we should not do so, but should assist, if we can, the smaller man, the man who comes here with his brains, hands, and

what little capital he can put up. We want to assist and not harass him in every way, as this Bill does. There are many clauses in the Bill which will operate harshly on industries. I notice in paragraph (e) of Clause 2 that “any mine, or colliery, or any place in which machinery is used about a mine or colliery” is exempt. The clause says nothing regarding reduction works. Members from the goldfields will know that we have many reduction works on the fields, and because they are not connected with a mine, colliery, or place in which machinery is used about a mine or colliery they are not exempt from the Bill. That shows the matter has not been properly studied. I have marked my clauses, so that in Committee I can bring them before members. I notice that the Bill as drafted is all for the working man. The employer is not considered in any way. The whole matter has been rushed into this House. We have only had the Bill about three or four days, and have had no time to consider it. We have not even had time to consult our constituents about the matter. I have not had time to go to my district, and I doubt whether other members have had time to do so. I think the measure need not have come before us this session at all. It has been introduced; we can see the ideas of the Government; and now that we have the Bill before us and know their intentions, I think it will be time enough if the Bill, in a much revised form, is brought before us next year. I therefore have pleasure in moving an amendment:

That the word “now” be struck out, and “this day six months” inserted in lieu.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM (North): In approaching the consideration of this Bill, I do so with mingled feelings. In the first place, I have a great deal of sympathy with the Government, who I feel sure are, according to their lights, trying to do the best they can for the State, and to ameliorate certain conditions which they think require some attention. On the other hand, I am in some doubt myself whether they are not perhaps a little ahead of the times, and whether they are not doing work for which, as yet, there is no demand. It is almost superfluous for me to make any remarks in connection with it, because Mr. Drew put the case from my point of view so

admirably just now, in such excellent sentiments and well-chosen language, that it almost makes it like repetition for me to say anything more. However, perhaps on this occasion in taking an objection here it would be as well to show some reasons, and I therefore propose to address myself to that portion of the Bill which is connected with factories. As I have said before, it has never come to my ears from the proprietors of the factories or the employees in the factories that there is much demand for this great amount of inspection and care that is to be taken of them. I am certain there is not a member in this House who would not be the first to support a Bill of this nature if he felt there was a real demand or a real necessity for it, but as I say, in the absence of all requirements on the part of factory owners, and in the absence of complaints at the hands of the factory workers, I think we are a little bit ahead, and that we are anticipating the future too much. One objection is that this immense amount of inspection causes, as Mr. Drew has pointed out, a great deal of expense; and although I quite agree with the Minister for Lands (Hon. A. Jameson) that we have many factories in this State, at the same time they are not quite on sure ground, on such good footing that they can be put to any unnecessary expense. If there are any real matters that want attention, I think that under the Public Health Act, and many other Acts, these can be attended to; but to put upon the struggling factories extra expenses which are not required is not, I think, quite the height of wisdom, and we should be very careful before we pass into law these suggestions, and not do so until we make quite sure they are required. The first thing I agree in objecting to is the description of a factory—a factory composed of two or more persons. That is, I think, a clause which will not commend itself to this House, and therefore I need not say anything more about it. The next clause I may take exception to, although no doubt those in favour of the Bill will say it is practically of a personal nature, is that timber stations—and this is perhaps an example that in many of these large concerns there are no complaints—are included. I think that under Subclause 3 timber stations will be included. I challenge any inspector or

anyone else to go to any of the timber stations down there, and especially those belonging to the Millar's Company, which I know most of, and find fault with, anything to do with the health arrangements of those places. Every arrangement is made. The work is carried on in the open air, and the idea of putting upon these struggling companies, these poor companies, which the Government tried to crush the other day by raising the railway rates, more expense in the way of an immense army of inspectors and other things is hardly, I think, quite fair and reasonable at the present moment. Mines, in which people have to work probably where the air is not the purest, and under circumstances that are not of a most favourable nature, are excluded from the operation of the Bill, whereas timber stations, where the work is really in the open air and every arrangement for health is made, are included. I think one can hardly say that this is consistent. Another objection I have to this is that a good many of these clauses were passed in another place when the House was very thinly attended. We all know that the attendance there has not been very good; in fact, we have unfortunately seen in the reports of the newspapers that at times it has been most difficult to get a quorum. I hardly think that sufficient importance is attached to measures carried in this way; at all events, not such importance as would allow us to carry them into law without the very greatest consideration. Under these circumstances I have not made up my mind. Certainly I am not convinced that I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill so far as the factories part is concerned. I repeat once more that if I were fully convinced that the proprietors or the workers wanted this, or that there was a tremendous demand for it, I would support it, and I am quite sure that all members would do so. I can only say we appreciate the ideas of the Government; we appreciate their efforts to do what they think right; but unfortunately I think they are mistaken in the time, in anticipating it. We should allow those factories to become more matured, and to get on a surer footing and foundation before we attempt to bring in innovations which are working in very much more extensive factories in

older countries. Before we try those experiments here, we should allow them to get thoroughly on a good footing. I now pass on to the question of early-closing. The question of employees in all conditions having their hours limited to a reasonable time is one that has my strongest support. I believe that anybody who is in the position of a worker should have his hours defined, and those hours should be defined in such a way that the proprietors of these concerns, and these various enterprises should not be put on a footing which would be against their interests with other parts, not only of the States, but of the world. With regard to all these institutions, whether they be mercantile, agricultural, or horticultural, in limiting the hours we have to bear in mind the competition we have to deal with. If you have one industry or one place working at six hours a day against people working eight hours a day, naturally you cannot make any progress. The competition would not be any good. Therefore, in limiting these hours consideration must be given to that point, but so far as this Bill is concerned, I do not know that there is much to object to, and I am quite in accord with all employees working so many hours a week, and having their half-day a week. I am not in accord with that part that causes shops to be compulsorily closed. I am entirely against the freedom of the individual being interfered with. I think the world has been developed by the fact of energetic people being allowed to work as hard as they like and when they like. Therefore, under those circumstances, I am not in accord with the compulsory closing of shops. I am, however, quite in accord, as I have said before, that employees should have their hours of work limited. Under those circumstances, I shall be very glad to support those clauses of the Bill which apply to that which I have mentioned, and with regard to the other provisions, my mind is open. I shall await with great pleasure and some little anxiety the speech in reply of the Minister for Lands, and when he has done, I shall probably make up my mind which way I shall vote.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan) : I have risen from a perusal of the Bill, and rather a careful perusal I think,

for I have been over it again and again ; and the only part to which I think I can give anything like a cordial assent or adherence is that which relates to shops, and to which the hon. member who has just sat down referred. I think the Bill may be described—the factory part of it—as a Bill for the destruction of our industries. I believe it would have that effect to a very large extent. I believe it is a Bill that may be administered in a very bad or oppressive and unjust sort of way. It creates a large number of positions for inspectors. I do not know, of course, what may be the intention of the Government with regard to inspectors ; whether they mean to employ the police. If so, I think it is open to the objection Mr. Drew has taken to their employment in this way. I have been considerably astonished in reading this Bill to find that the members of our Government are apparently so utterly and entirely ignorant with regard to the industries in this State. They cannot be acquainted personally, I think, with the industries which have been started in this country recently, and are carried on under a great many disadvantages, which will be immensely enhanced by the passing of a Bill of this description. To place blacksmiths, carpenters' shops, boat-building establishments, foundries and fitting-shops and shops of that description, and timber stations, where in many of them a large part of the work is carried on in the open air, alongside of factories where boots and shoes are manufactured, or where articles of clothing and apparel are made, seems to be the very height of folly, to be perfectly ridiculous ; and yet we find it is proposed in this Bill, as was instanced by Mr. Brimage, to constitute a blacksmith's shop under a tree, where a man and his apprentice are engaged, a factory. As Mr. Drew has pointed out, the interpretation of the word "factory" is so all-embracing that one wonders what is omitted, saving only the special exemptions under Clause 5. I am not quite sure that under this Bill a lady whose daughter was about to be married and who was getting the wedding trousseau prepared with the aid of two or three friends would not find her house subject to inspection as a factory, under this Bill. It may be that in other States factory legislation works well ; I am not pre-

pared to say; some members of this House can give information on the point. But to adopt from a country where industries have been long established and have arrived at full maturity laws which answer for highly organised industries, and apply them to the totally different conditions prevailing here, seems to me altogether out of the question. At our present rate of progress, which is highly satisfactory, this Bill is at least 10 years before its time; and to attempt to carry it out or administer it in anything like the spirit which its clauses indicate would, I feel sure, result in the closing down of a large number of our factories. The circumstance that an inspector may exercise his judgment does not greatly relieve the position, because, as we happen to know, inspectors are not always to be trusted; after all, they are but human like the rest of common mankind, and they are liable to develop likes and dislikes. That an inspector should be placed in a position to compel a boat-building shed or a carpenter's or blacksmith's shop, for instance, to be lined with matchboard is altogether absurd. Such a requirement would certainly mean a serious handicap to persons engaged in these undertakings, and would throw on them an unnecessary burden nowise tending to the comfort or good of the people employed by them. As I have already pointed out, in the case of a boat-building shed, which is generally open at both ends and has air currents passing through from all points of the compass, a requirement to line with matchboard at the whim of an inspector might operate most objectionably; and although it may be urged that appeal lies to the Minister, I hold nevertheless that the passing into law of a measure involving such dangers is a proceeding strongly to be deprecated. I have consulted various persons engaged in the industries to which this Bill relates, and I find that although they are perfectly willing to bow to any Act which may be passed by the Legislature, they hold notwithstanding that in some cases the passing of this Bill would mean the ruin of businesses. I am in entire accord with the shortening of hours of labour already accomplished; but, as previous speakers have observed, machinery which meets every requirement in this respect already exists. I am in

sympathy with the desire to protect women and children employed in factories from working under conditions that are improper or for hours that are too long. I believe that every member in the House is in sympathy with that principle of the measure. These ends, however, can be attained and are attained without a Bill of this nature, which, if passed into law, would act so unjustly, so injuriously, and I may say so destructively generally to the industries being established in this country. I have some hesitation in casting my vote in favour of the Bill being read a second time this day six months, seeing that the Government have thought wise to embody in the measure certain conditions relating to shops. I see no necessity for doing that. I believe the better course would have been to bring in any amendments required in the Early Closing Act in the proper manner, instead of embodying them in a Factories Bill. For some little time longer, perhaps, the Early Closing Act now in existence will confer sufficient protection on employees in the various shops and business establishments of this country. I think, therefore, on the whole I should favour the Bill being read a second time this day six months rather than that it be referred to a select committee. I regard it as impossible to consider the measure adequately in any reasonable time, that is to say within a space enabling the House to rise between now and Christmas. For after the measure had been considered in all its bearings by a select committee, there would remain the discussion in this House of the Bill and the recommendations of the select committee. I do not think that as a House we are called on to reconstruct—I think I may call it that—a Bill of this description: I fail to see that we are in any way called on to do so. My opinion is that the better course will be to have this Bill discussed in all its phases by the country at large. No doubt it will be so discussed, because there is in some quarters a strong feeling in favour of the introduction of factory legislation. The ideas of the people I have in mind go back to Victoria, and the desire is that the Victorian Factories Act shall be introduced into this State. I consider that we shall be better able to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion on the subject in another

session of Parliament. In my opinion, the employees will not suffer in the slightest degree by reason of the delay. If next session the Government still consider it desirable to introduce factory legislation into this State, then they will have available a mass of information which is certainly not in their possession now. After the discussion which has taken place here, the Government would act wisely in obtaining the opinions of experts in all the various branches of industry carried on in our midst; and I hope this course will be taken. I certainly hold that the Bill has no possible chance of being carried and adopted into the laws of this State; therefore, although in view of those provisions of the measure which relate to shops and which possibly constitute an improvement on the present Early Closing Act, I am sorry to do so, I must certainly, having regard to all the circumstances, vote for the amendment.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): This Bill is certainly one which will keep a little longer. I regard it not only as premature, but as utterly unnecessary at the present time. Moreover, the measure interferes too much with the liberty of the subject. I fully concur in the remarks which have fallen from Mr. Randell and other members. The idea of hampering those making a living in any particular employment by restricting them to certain hours constitutes an unwarrantable interference with popular liberty. The Bill throughout savours too much of grandmotherly legislation, and of such law I do not hesitate to say we are getting far too much. The measure instead of benefiting employees will injure them by its deterrent effect on the opening of every imaginable class of industry in this State. If we restrict the employer to certain hours, if we subject him to supervision, inspection, and all that sort of thing, he will not venture into trade. That fact appears to have been totally overlooked in the preparation of this Bill. To my mind, the employer is deserving of consideration equally with the employee. The duty of the employer, of course, is to study those whom he employs and to provide in every possible way for for their comfort and health, but at the same time he must have a fair return for his expenditure: otherwise he cannot

carry on. I do not like this legislation, and I do not hesitate to say that everybody ought to raise his voice against it, except in so far as its enactment may be necessary in common justice and fairness to all parties concerned. I repeat, however, that the employers' interests ought in every case to be regarded equally with those of the employee. Taking into consideration the general dissatisfaction which has already been expressed, and bearing in mind the petitions against the measure which have been sent into this House for consideration, and also the many self-evident objections to the passing of the Bill, I certainly hold that the wisest course will be to support the amendment moved by Mr. Brimage, and have the Bill read a second time this day six months. Assuredly the measure is not necessary at the present time, and any Bill of the kind which may be demanded in the future must be framed more in accordance with the requirements of the people. Such legislation this House, I feel sure, will be only too willing to support.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT (Metropolitan): I am fully in accord with what has fallen from most members, though I have advocated shops and factories legislation. I have advocated it, but not, I must point out, on the lines of the present Bill. This measure might have been more in keeping with English and other legislation, and then it would have been very much better. Under Clause 1, two or more persons working together constitute a factory. That provision in itself is enough to condemn the Bill. I know of a case where two young fellows work until 10 and sometimes 11 o'clock at night, making meat safes and other small articles of furniture in order that they may support their family; and in their case a provision of this kind would inflict great hardship. The whole of the family I refer to is dependent on the two boys, the eldest of whom is 21, while the second is 17 or 18: they support their mother and three children. I cannot favour a Bill which would work hardship in so deserving a case. I agree with Mr. Drew that the term factory should be limited to businesses employing at least 10 people. In regard to the early-closing portion of the Bill, I am fully in accord with Sir Edward Wittenoom's view that the



hours of employees should be restricted. In nine cases out of ten, however, the men known as successful at the present day are men who have not stuck at half an hour's or an hour's extra work, but have laboured for their own benefit as well as their employers. If a man choose to amuse himself after hours at a shop or in a store, I do not see why he should be refused the privilege of following his inclinations. Moreover, the small trader employing no assistants should be allowed to keep open for any hours he pleases. He should be allowed to open when he thinks fit, and to keep open as long as he thinks fit. The same remarks apply to the business of a barber. Shopkeepers who do not retain their employees after certain hours should be shown every leniency and consideration. On these grounds I shall not support the Bill in its present form. I am prepared to accept that portion of the Bill which deals with shops, but only subject to amendments giving a free hand to the small trader.

HON. B. C. WOOD (Metropolitan-Suburban): I do not think I can support the amendment moved by Mr. Brinage, although the application of certain provisions of this Bill would operate to the detriment of various businesses. The part dealing with factories is most absurd; and I think we had better let it go into Committee, throw out such portions as we do not approve of, and devote our attention to remodelling the clauses in the second part. I am not at all in accord with Sir Edward Wittenoom when he says he is not in favour of compulsory early closing. I am absolutely in favour of the compulsory closing of shops at certain hours, and of the compulsory half-holiday for shops; for I think that when shop assistants commence their duties at a quarter to 9 o'clock and leave at 6 o'clock, such a day's work is quite long enough for anyone.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM (in explanation): I did not say I was opposed to compulsory closing. I said I objected to interference with the freedom of the individual. I think those were the words I used.

HON. B. C. WOOD: I think you used the word "compulsory." If not, I apologise. Let us pass the second read-

ing, and deal with the Bill as sensible men when it reaches the Committee stage.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): This is a Bill which I have always desired to see introduced; it was one of my hopes that before my parliamentary career closed I should have a voice in passing such a measure; and I cannot but recognise that the Government have in many ways placed the community under a debt by embodying in a number of clauses the latest legislation of the day with regard to labour. I shall not address the House at any length, because I perceive that the feeling of hon. members is emphatically against this Bill. To some extent I regret this, but I more keenly regret that there should be so much that is unanswerable, so much against which it is impossible to argue, in the speeches which have been delivered hostile to this Bill; for whatever may be the object of the Government, and however well-considered their motives, I cannot believe it would be to the advantage of the country to place this Bill in its present form on the statute-book. I am loth, however, to go to the length of an hon. member who asks for a vote hostile to the principles of the Bill as well as to its details. But for that consideration I should be prepared to vote with Mr. Brinage, on the very clear ground that at this hour of the session, when we are in our last month, with a great mass of important work before us, it would be impossible to do adequate justice to this whole question save perhaps at the cost of losing all the time remaining for the consideration of our other business. My difficulty is, I am not prepared to vote for what I consider would be a resolution condemnatory of the principles of the Bill. On the other hand, the Bill will need such extensive amendments, will have to undergo such a thorough recasting and redrafting, that I think it is perfectly hopeless for us to attempt the work at this moment; and I must say that I think this House has a right to demand that a better considered measure and a better-drawn measure should be brought in before we are asked to deal with this all-important question—important not to the rights of labour only, but to the rights of the community at large, to the rights of

employers. A few references, to show how carelessly this Bill has been drawn. It has been obviously enough copied from the corresponding Acts of other States, but without considering that even the phraseology of those Acts had a close connection with the circumstances of each country—I am now speaking of the East—and with the phraseology of other Acts dealing with similar subjects in those countries. For example, I find the word “district” continually occurring in this Bill; but there is no definition of “district,” and the word is evidently used in the technical sense in which it is employed in other parts of the continent. Clause 6 reads: “This Bill shall only have effect in such districts as the Governor may from time to time declare.” We know that “district” is with us sometimes a more or less technical phrase.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The Governor will declare a certain piece of country a district.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: How can he? Is a district to be a municipality?

HON. M. L. MOSS: It would be the district set forth in the proclamation.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: But you have not taken power to do that.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Certainly.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Then I shall certainly vote against the clause. Let us know what the word “district” means: is it to apply to a municipality or a roads board district, or to several municipalities?

HON. M. L. MOSS: Clause 6 is perfectly plain.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: If it is, it is in a shape that should not command the assent of the House. We wish to know exactly what those districts are to cover; whether they are to embrace several interests or a single interest, whether several municipalities or a single municipality, whether the Government are to carve parts of local bodies' districts in all directions and form new districts within the meaning of the Bill at the sweet and happy will of the Ministry. I entirely object to that. Let us know what those districts are to be, otherwise I shall vote against this wide power being given to the Government. A little farther we find this same confusion of districts crops up. However, I shall not dwell on the

smaller details of the measure, but will give another instance of careless drafting in Clause 22, and perhaps Mr. Moss will be ready there also with his explanation. That clause is headed “Hours of work in factories”; and yet the clause, which is supposed to deal with hours of work in factories, does not specifically allude to hours of work, but deals with the awards of the Arbitration Court. Now that is an absolutely misleading heading, and yet a heading which is sought to be embodied in the Act.

HON. M. L. MOSS: That is a very frivolous objection.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: No; because that heading would become a part of the Act, as the hon. member knows. It is quite different from a marginal note. The hon. member smiles at that instance of the unpardonable carelessness of the Government in placing before the House a Bill of the first importance drafted so carelessly. If Ministers are not careful of even their drafting, how can we attach any importance to their opinions about the principles of the Bill? I allude to the carelessness of the drafting only to introduce what I will not farther pursue at present, the extreme indifference and negligence displayed in dealing with principles. I am rather surprised and a little indignant that the Government should have invited those of us who are really more or less in favour of the principles of this measure to deal with a Bill which in every clause will need revision, and practically the attention of a draftsman. I also agree that sufficient consideration has not been shown to the struggling industries of the State. This is one more instance of that unhappy, I had almost said “frenzy” for social legislation which seems to attack the Government. With the unemployed absolutely in our midst, with their outcry rising up every week and their demands becoming stronger every day, more care and precaution should have been taken by the Government when introducing legislation which will certainly press most harshly and unduly upon persons with a little capital who are prepared to give those unemployed employment if fair conditions be provided. All the industries and the trades of this country will become, to put it shortly, inspector-haunted; and a man will consider not only whether he can

obtain a fair interest on the money he invests, but whether he will be able to bear up against the multiplied and endless annoyances to which he can be subjected by the gentleman who is called an inspector. Mr. Drew referred to the fact that the police might be appointed inspectors under the Bill. We should have to increase the police force 20 per cent. if the police were expected to carry out the regulations. In almost every clause some important duty is imposed on the inspector, who, to give satisfaction and not to half-ruin the country, would have to be a man of exceptional calibre, common sense, and experience, such as I have really very little faith in the present Government appointing. As Mr. Randell suggests, the inspector would have to be an Admirable Crichton, and a good deal more than that. Fortunately the appeal is in most cases made from the inspector to the local magistrate; but the local magistrate has his hands full; he must generally take the assertion of the inspector, or must devote his own time to ascertaining the facts. We know it has been found necessary to ask a Judge of the Supreme Court to investigate complaints in regard to arbitration questions. To show the power to be reposed in these inspectors, of whom we shall need dozens, let us look at Clause 36, which is really only a development of Clause 37. The two clauses should have been amalgamated. Clause 37 is the legislation of another country; Clause 36 clearly occurred to some person, when the Bill was going through another place, as containing a lot of principles which if he had read the next clause he would have found dealt with in the Bill; and so Clause 36 was adopted. I believe it is original in this country, and I hope it will not remain in the draft of the Bill to impress other countries with the extraordinary character of our originality. It declares that—

If in any building, yard, or place adjoining a factory there exists any nuisance or other sanitary defect which in the opinion of the inspector is likely to injuriously affect the proper sanitation of the factory or the health of the persons employed therein, he may by requisition to the owner or occupier of such building, yard, or place, require him to effectually abate such nuisance or amend such defect within a time named in the requisition.

In other words, the inspector may put

his head out of a window and see an ash-pit which he objects to, or a cow or a horse in a stall, or any matter to which he takes exception, not belonging to the factory but to the persons living around, and he has to order the owner or occupier of the place to effectually abate such nuisance within a time named in the requisition. If the nuisance be not abated, then the inspector asks the local authority to abate it; and if the local authority does not comply, he takes it into his own hands. That is a most extraordinary provision. Instead of going from the local authority to the magistrate, the inspector takes the matter into his own hands and compels the abatement of the nuisance. It is not said within what area around the factory such action may be taken by the inspector. The wording is very wide—"a building, yard, or place adjoining a factory;" so that in a large factory the inspector will practically be required to keep his eyes on all the tenements and buildings around, to see that the regulations of this Bill are properly carried out. The powers given in this clause are bad enough; in fact, the clause is unnecessary, or the matter could be dealt with under Clause 37. What I complain of most is that in almost everything the tradesman or factory owner is supposed to do, he will have this inspector practically at his shoulders. It is well known that in the days before the French Revolution, and it largely brought on the French Revolution, trade was practically ruined in France through excessive inspection and restriction. A chapter by John Stuart Mill, in his work on *Political Economy*, may be read with great advantage by my friends in relation to new, fancy legislation. Perhaps my friend Dr. Jameson is familiar with it. I adopt Sir Edward Wittenoom's sentiment that we should allow the fullest freedom to individual action within such lines as are good for the health, the safety, and the morality of the community. No doubt early closing is one of these; but to say that for carrying a few provisions with regard to early closing and sanitation and so on, a Bill of this kind is required, is to bring up a cannon to fire at a mosquito. I very much fear that this Bill is doomed. It may get into the Committee stage, but it will

take us all the time we have before us to get it into such a shape as will be, I do not say acceptable, I do not use that word at all, but beneficial to the community at large. At the same time, in order to assert my belief in the general principles of the Bill, and also I may say in the *bona fides*—I wish I could use other words, but they do not occur to me—in the excellent intentions of the Government, I shall be prepared to vote for the second reading.

HON. W. MALEY (South-East) : I did not intend to speak on this Bill, nor have I quite satisfied myself that it is my duty to vote either way. It will be remembered that when the Early Closing Bill, the present Act, was before us I took strong exception to it, and I still hold to the same opinion. I tried to limit the operation of that to 12 months. We have had it in operation about 12 months, and it does not give satisfaction at all. Public meetings have been held in the city of Perth and objections have been presented. The measure has proved, as I predicted, unsatisfactory. This Bill is more so. Still, I do not think that I lay myself open to any particular charge of being hard-hearted and cruel because I cannot support faddist measures that are introduced. What spring they come from goodness only knows, or what is the motive. I hope the motive is a good one, and I am willing to accept it as such. But while opposed to the greater portion of the Bill, I should say there is one clause—but not the subclauses—that meets with my approval, and that is Clause 87, which says, “the Acts mentioned in Schedule 5 are hereby repealed.” I think if that were the only clause in the Bill it would have my most hearty support. I do not want men to work more than eight hours a day. I am willing for the hours of labour to be limited. It is quite right that they should be limited; but I object to any interference with employment of capital in the shape of shops. I think shops could be worked with shifts the same as mines, but as there are 86 clauses I cannot agree with—at least, I take it there are 86 that would require amendment—I shall vote for the amendment that the Bill be read this day six months.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN (Central) : After the excellent speeches made by other

members, I feel somewhat timid; but in the face of the hostility that has been shown to this Bill by those members, I myself intend to vote for the second reading, and I trust the majority of the House will do the same. I notice that all the members who have spoken seem to freely admit it is necessary to have such a measure. They nearly all admit it is necessary to have a Factories and Shops Act, and something in the shape of an Early Closing Act. I, in common with other members, maintain that there are faults in this measure; but after the wisdom that has been displayed in this House, we shall be able to knock the Bill into perfect shape. With reference to the definition of “factory” we may freely admit it is somewhat vague. But I do not see why we cannot get over these difficulties, and I desire to say I will give my hearty support to the second reading. I trust the Bill will get into Committee, and that we will endeavour to put it into such a form as will make it suitable for the purposes for which it has been designed. I feel it is impossible for those gentlemen who sent the Bill down to us from another place to expect the Bill to pass through this Chamber in its present form. We all know the matter is a very contentious one. However perfect a Bill may be, it would be very difficult to put such a measure as this on our statute-book and to give satisfaction to all. It would be absolutely impossible; but it has been admitted by members here that it is necessary to have a measure. We ought to endeavour to put this Bill on the statute-book this session, and we may from time to time amend it in the way required, and in due time have a good measure. I desire to support the second reading.

HON. A. G. JENKINS (North-East) : I also intend to support the second reading, bad as I think the Bill is in its present state; and if any argument were wanted for a second Chamber, I think this measure most conclusively furnishes it. Had the Bill been allowed to go into force in its present form, we should have had such an outcry from one end of the State to the other that there would speedily have been a special session to repeal it. But I think there are some good points in it, and that probably the

combined wisdom of this House may be able to make a presentable measure, and one acceptable to the country. In my opinion it would be rather too extreme a step to throw out a measure such as this, which is admittedly of great importance to the community, and I consequently hope that the amendment of Mr. Brimage will not be passed. This House has certainly plenty of work before it, but I do not think any of it is of more importance than this measure. I intend, accordingly, to support the second reading. Personally, I have numerous amendments, dozens of them, and I dare say other members have the same, and I hope that by the time these amendments have been passed, and I feel sure that a good many of them will be—

HON. G. RANDELL: Christmas will be here then.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: We cannot help that. The burden of throwing out the Bill will not be on us, at any rate. It will be on the place that sent it to us in such a shape. I intend to support the second reading, and I hope the second reading will be carried to show at any rate that the House is earnest in its endeavours to have satisfactory legislation.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY (North-East): I did not intend to speak on the measure this afternoon, but on account of the rather unexpected amendment that has been moved I do not feel inclined to give a silent vote. I, too, feel with the hon. member who has just spoken that it is going a little too far to vote for the amendment moved by Mr. Brimage. It seems to me like voting against the principle. I, at any rate, am in favour of a Shops and Factories Bill, not altogether in the form that I find this one in. I think the argument by previous speakers that it has been passed through another place, where it is well known there has been a remarkably small attendance of late, should not debar us from doing our duty. As regards that portion of the Bill relating to factories, I do not think there can be two opinions. There is a good deal in that part which requires very radical change, and I refer more particularly to that clause which says two persons shall form a factory. Then there is also a portion I object to very much, in

the first section of Part III., which provides that this part shall only have effect in such districts as the Governor may from time to time, by notice in the *Government Gazette*, declare. If this Bill is to apply at all, why would it not apply to the whole State? People in certain parts of the State will have it perpetually hanging over their ears. They will not know when it is going to be put into force. I think it would be very unwise to allow the Bill to go through in its present shape. There are, in my opinion, defects in the Bill. Still, I think it contains many good clauses. I do not go so far as my friend Mr. Maley and say there are 86 bad clauses and one good one.

HON. W. MALEY: Eighty-six which require amendment.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: Which require amendment. I do not go quite so far as that. I go so far as to say that Clause 23, which fixes the hours of work for boys and women, is very good; also such clauses as Clause 28, restricting the employment of children in factories. I must say that I do not think there can be any hardship to anybody in Clause 32, as regards sanitation of factories. To my mind, it is much more essential that a man should work in a good clean factory, than that he should work seven hours rather than eight, and I think a man would live much longer by working long in a good healthy place than by working for a short time in an unhealthy place. I would prefer this Bill to be referred to a select committee, and thoroughly gone into, and then it would be presented to the House in something like the form which we wish to see it in. I think we must allow that the Government were very well-intentioned when they brought the measure in, and in my opinion it would be rather unfair to throw it out in a peremptory manner. I shall support the second reading.

HON. R. LAURIE (West): I also purpose to vote for the second reading. I think there is much in the Bill in respect to the sanitation of factories that requires attention, and it is a measure which will in a great degree provide for that. There is one factory in this State specially in my mind where perhaps 30 or 40 persons are employed, and the factory, the closets for the use of employees, and a stable are practically under

the same roof. I am satisfied that the local board of health would take a matter of that sort in hand. Still, proper inspection such as there should be under a factories Act would remedy the matter at once. I know that prior to the introduction of a Factories Act in the old country, factories there were a menace to health. In my early days I have seen closets arranged in such a manner that they were used by both men and women. While I think such a state of things does not exist in this State or in the Commonwealth, I am of opinion that a Factories Act providing for the proper sanitation of factories would be a good measure. With reference to the Early Closing Act, I think most members understood when that measure was passed by this House that a Factories Act would stipulate the hours employees might work; that is to say, a Factories Act would decide how long employees might work in shifts. The employer would be restricted to working his employees for only eight hours, but nevertheless would have the right to keep his shop open for any number of hours he liked. Thus the trader's liberty would not be interfered with. Of course, no proprietor of a shop would keep open longer than it was profitable for him to do so. I agree, therefore, with much that has been said. I have no wish to see our factories haunted by inspectors. The appeal to the Minister from the decision of the inspector is a difficult and tedious process for the employer, who would never know what he might be called on to do next. I speak now possibly as a man interested in a factory. As Mr. Randell has pointed out, a factory may have plenty of air passing through it and its iron roof may be as high as that of this Chamber; yet an inspector happening to come along the day after this Bill became law would have power to compel the proprietor to put in a wooden ceiling, and appeal would be useless. However, I think it would be a pity if this House were to decide straight away that the Bill shall be read a second time this day six months. If the measure in its present form does not answer the requirements of this State, still we may be able to alter it in such a manner as will make it acceptable, even if in the process we are compelled to sweep away the greater part of the clauses. I con-

sider, therefore, that I shall be only doing my duty in voting for the second reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (in reply): I have listened to this debate with a great deal of pleasure, though certainly the arguments advanced by various members have occasioned me some surprise. I understand that we are now dealing with the second reading of this Bill, and all the arguments advanced in opposition have dealt with matters that should properly be considered in Committee. After all, the principle of factory legislation is surely not new: it is of at least 100 years' standing. Similar legislation has been passed in every Australian State and in New Zealand, and also I believe in nearly every State of America. Therefore it is not extraordinary to find the Government of this State at the present day bringing in factory legislation, more especially in view of the enormous advance which the State has made within the last few years. Western Australia has now about 215,000 people, and many States of smaller population have Factories Acts. In introducing the measure I pointed out that Western Australia has a large number of factories which will be beneficially influenced by such a measure as this. I am somewhat at a loss to know what reply to make to hon. members. Almost every point raised was one of detail, and should receive attention in Committee. The Bill has been before the country, at all events, for a considerable time. Perhaps no measure has been subjected to so much discussion in another place as has this Bill, which comes to us now very considerably altered from its original form. I think we might show some courtesy to another place, and accordingly regard this Bill as one which, having received earnest attention elsewhere, is entitled to our earnest consideration. I hope the measure will receive the support of the majority of members, at all events so far as the second reading is concerned. When it goes into Committee we shall be able to alter it to any extent thought necessary. The various objections advanced by Mr. Drew to the definition of "factory" can be dealt with in Committee: we can decide whether we shall make a definition of our own or adopt one from

the Eastern States. Such a point does not affect the principle of factory legislation, the betterment of the health and the safety of the employee. I cannot imagine that there are in this House members who would for a moment oppose an end so desirable. I was much surprised to hear Mr. Randell speak of this Bill as likely to prove the destruction of our industries, Dr. Hackett has referred to John Stuart Mill, but one must go back farther than John Stuart Mill's time for examples of similar remarks in a Legislative Chamber. It is necessary to go back at least 60 years in the history of factory legislation to quote such objections as that factory legislation will prove destructive of industry. The objection is most extraordinary, but if many members hold that this measure will destroy our industries, I am driven to ask whether the destruction of our industries is not a matter of less concern than the destruction of the health and life of the people. If members take the contrary view, then by all means let them oppose the Bill. I do not for a moment believe that the majority hold that this Bill will destroy our industries. [HON. J. W. HACKETT: You know they do not.] The hon. member who has just interjected has lectured the Government on the score of neglect, indifference, carelessness, and so forth. Ministers are so well accustomed to lectures of that kind that they have ceased to regard them: for two sessions past I have been rated by the hon. member. I do not admit, however, that the Parliamentary Draftsman is at all careless: I say this State has a most able draftsman.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I referred, not to the work of the Parliamentary Draftsman, but to the drafting of another place.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The work of another place has been done thoroughly; at all events, many hours have been expended on the measure. I do not like to blame another place for the work which has been done.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I object to the whole Bill. To put it right would take a month.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then let us spend the better part of this month in setting it right.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: But I do not get £1,000 a year.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: No; and I do not think you are likely to get it.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I hope not.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not think you are likely to get £1,000 a year from the country. I need not take up the time of the Chamber farther. I simply ask hon. members to support the measure as being valuable in its general principles. The Bill contains nothing particularly new, being simply drawn from measures in force in the other States and from the great Factories Acts of the old country. I just call to mind that Sir Edward Wittenoom, in referring to the closing of shops, expressed himself as opposed to interference with the liberty of the subject. I am glad indeed to find that feeling aroused in the House. In connection with a former early closing measure, I was at some considerable pains in endeavouring to induce the House to liberalise the Bill. Now a measure is brought in for the purpose of liberalising to an appreciable degree the Early Closing Act of the day; and the hon. member, if he wishes to extend to the people greater liberty, will support the Bill. I do hope the House will see its way to carry the second reading. As for any alterations necessary in regard to details, hon. members can avail themselves of their opportunities in Committee.

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

Ayes	...	...	15
Noes	...	...	11

Majority for ... .. 4

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. G. Bellingham	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. H. Briggs	Hon. W. G. Brookman
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. C. E. Dempster
Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. J. T. Glowrey
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. T. Loton
Hon. J. W. Hackett	Hon. W. Maley
Hon. A. Jameson	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. R. Laurie	Hon. G. Randell
Hon. M. L. Moss	Hon. J. E. Richardson
Hon. B. C. O'Brien	Hon. R. G. Burgess
Hon. J. A. Thomson	(Teller).
Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom	
Hon. J. W. Wright	
Hon. B. C. Wood (Teller).	

Amendment thus negatived, and the question passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE.

HON. W. MALEY moved that the Bill be referred to a select committee.

At 6:32, the PRESIDENT left the Chair.  
At 7:35, Chair resumed.

HON. G. RANDELL: If the Bill were referred to a select committee, the time devoted to it by the committee would be wasted. Many of the alterations to be made in the measure were of so radical a nature that the action taken might perhaps induce the Government to withdraw the measure, or insure its rejection in another House. He felt that his time would be wasted. He could not see his way to take any active part in endeavouring to make the Bill a workable measure, because in his opinion the time was too limited to deal with such a very important Bill as this. He, at any rate, could not serve on a select committee.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: There would not be sufficient time for a select committee to deal with the Bill. As far as the principle of a Factories Bill was concerned, he would vote willingly for it, and he believed all the members would vote for a Factories Bill; but the measure now introduced by the Government was not the Bill they required. By no means was it a Bill workable in this country at the present time.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was to be hoped the proposal to refer the Bill to a select committee would not be passed. There were so many contentious questions with regard to it that it was not reasonable to expect a small committee of the House to be able to deal with broad general questions, so many of them. It would be very much better that the matter should be dealt with by the whole House in Committee. He feared that if the Bill were referred to a select committee we should not see it again this session.

Question negatived, and the Bill ordered to be considered in Committee of the whole House.

#### BREAD BILL.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

HON. A. G. JENKINS moved that "loaves," line 3, be struck out, and "Coburg" inserted in lieu. A "Coburg" loaf was baked in a tin reversed during

baking, and therefore came out of the oven without a hard crust, the top being spongy like a cauliflower. Coburg bread was subject to great evaporation, and therefore correctness of weight could not be assured. Only a small quantity of it was made, and consumers were satisfied with the weight given.

HON. G. RANDELL: Was the term well understood in the trade?

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Yes.

Amendment passed.

HON. G. RANDELL: While not liking the definition of household wheaten bread, he did not propose to interfere with it, in view of the circumstance that it corresponded to definitions given in other Acts. He objected particularly to the use of the word "inferior," because of the inference that wheat used in bread-making might be inferior in quality. Subclause (a) was incomprehensible, and he moved that it be struck out, and that there be inserted in lieu, "without any mixture or division, is the whole produce of the grain, the bran or hull thereof only excepted." This amendment would give the subclause a clear and definite meaning, without affecting the sense intended to be conveyed. The word "hull" was used because it appeared in Acts from which the proposed new subclause was taken. "Husk" meant the outside shell of wheat, the sheath formed around the grain of the wheat itself. Although Subclause (b) was to him meaningless, he did not intend to move its excision. How the proportionate weight of wheat to the flour from which it had been produced could affect the flour in a baker's shop or the loaf when baked, he did not understand.

Amendment passed.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE moved that Subclause (b) be struck out. Various master bakers had asked him to secure the excision of this subclause; hence this amendment. He did not understand much of the subject; indeed, as he had stated on the second reading, Parliament knew so little of bread-baking that it had really no right to pass this Bill.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Subclause (b) might stand, although it was not of the same importance as formerly. The provision originally appeared in an English Act passed in 1836. Good flour, he understood, under ordinary conditions



ought to be two-thirds of the weight of the wheat from which it was made. In old times, when flour was not so well prepared as at the present day, large quantities of husk, bran, and lighter material frequently got into the flour, thus reducing its weight below the standard. If the subclause were struck out, the use of inferior flour might be encouraged.

HON. J. M. DREW: By what means would one discover the fact that the flour used in baking was not two-thirds of the weight of the wheat from which it had been produced? By what possible process could the fact be established?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Members ought not to question the Minister for Lands on subjects of which the hon. gentleman knew nothing. As a miller, he would say nothing against the subclause, except that it represented a mere waste of words.

HON. G. RANDELL: The amendment which he had moved covered the whole ground, and Subclause (b) was mere surplusage. The definition of household wheaten bread sufficiently met the necessities of the case. He would support Mr. Brimage's amendment.

Amendment passed, and the subclause struck out.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 4—Bread to be marked:

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: A man should have freedom to brand bread if he liked; but one could not see why the Government should compel a man to brand bread. He moved that the clause be struck out.

HON. G. RANDELL: The Coastal Districts Master Bakers' Industrial Union of Employers had asked that the clause be struck out. He thought there was a considerable safeguard in branding bread. It fixed upon the baker the responsibility of the bread approximating at any rate to what it professed to be. He could not see that any injustice would accrue to the baker.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Any operation that would cause labour in the making of bread must enhance the cost, and consequently make bread dearer. It was in the bakers' interests for the best bread to be made at the lowest possible cost.

HON. E. M. CLARKE: If the wording had any meaning at all, it meant that if one happened to be travelling on the

road and wanted to buy a bit of bread from a housewife, he could not do so unless the bread had that letter stamped on it.

HON. G. RANDELL: There were only two classes of bread which had to be stamped.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Clause 5—Bread to be sold in loaves of fixed weight:

HON. A. G. JENKINS moved that the words "one pound," in line 2, be struck out. If people desired to buy small loaves, they could purchase rolls or fancy bread.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The weights specified in Section 11 of the regulations of weights and measures were one pound, two pounds, and four pounds.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Clauses 6, 7—agreed to.

Clause 8—Scales to be kept in shop:

HON. A. G. JENKINS moved that after the word "weights," in line 3, "or other sufficient balance" be inserted.

Amendment passed.

HON. G. RANDELL moved that the words "justice of the peace," in line 4, be struck out. Inspectors could perform all the work without calling in a justice of the peace or a police constable.

HON. M. L. MOSS: It would never do to strike out these words. If the member would look at the interpretation of "inspector," he would find that the inspector was appointed by the Central Board of Health, or Local Board of Health. There were a number of districts in this State where there was no board of health, and therefore no inspector under the Act; but there might be a baker, and there would be no opportunity of carrying out Clause 8 for the purpose of getting loaves weighed in the presence of a purchaser. In his opinion the words "justice of the peace" and "police constable" should be left in. If the hon. member was particularly anxious to have the words "police constable" struck out, perhaps there was no objection, but he thought "justice of the peace" should be kept in.

HON. G. RANDELL: It was scarcely probable that where a baker existed there would not be an inspector under a local board of health. He was told there was

some place in which there were only two bakers, and one of them was a justice of the peace. One could easily see that if the justice of the peace were inclined he could abuse his powers to the injury of his neighbours.

Amendment negatived.

HON. G. RANDELL moved that the words "or police constable," in line 5, be struck out.

Amendment negatived.

HON. A. G. JENKINS moved, as a suggestion, that after the word "constable," in line 5, the following be inserted: "And in case any such person who sells bread shall neglect to fix such beam and scales or other sufficient balance in manner aforesaid, or to provide and keep for use such proper beams and scales and proper weights or balance, or shall have or use any incorrect or false beam or scales or balance, or any false weight not being of the weight it purports to be according to the said standard, then and in every such case he shall, for every such offence, forfeit and pay a sum not exceeding five pounds nor less than forty shillings."

HON. M. L. MOSS did not agree with the amendment. Clause 18 provided all penalties under the measure. The imposition of penalties all through a measure was an obsolete and cumbrous method of drafting; far better have one penal clause.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Clause 18 fixed a general penalty not exceeding £20, and thus left the punishment of offences in every case to the varying discretion of magistrates. His desire was to fix certain penalties for certain offences.

Amendment negatived, and the clause as previously amended agreed to.

Clause 9—Every person selling bread to carry scales:

HON. G. RANDELL moved that in lines 1 and 2 "person who sells bread, and every person who conveys or carries it" be struck out, and that "baker or seller of bread, and every journeyman, servant, or other person employed by such baker or seller of bread who shall convey or carry it" be inserted in lieu. This amendment did not alter the intention of the clause, but merely gave that intention clearer expression.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Had the hon. member observed Clause 19?

HON. G. RANDELL: Clause 19 did not affect this amendment.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Clause 19 effected the object which the hon. member apparently had in view, inasmuch as that clause extended the responsibility to the journeyman, servant, or agent of the baker.

HON. G. RANDELL: Clause 9 as it stood enabled the seller of bread to sell it as he liked, so long as he did not carry it out of his shop or bakery.

HON. M. L. MOSS: No. The objection was that the amendment amounted to a mere repetition of matter contained in Clause 19.

HON. G. RANDELL: The amendment was necessary in order to make the meaning of this clause clear. The Parliamentary Draftsman was understood to have had nothing to do with this Bill, which had in part at all events been drafted by another place and therefore possibly contained mistakes.

Amendment negatived.

HON. A. G. JENKINS moved that the clause be struck out.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could vote against the clause.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: The provision as to the carrying of scales would certainly be more honoured in the breach than the observance. If the inspector under this Bill carried scales, why should the baker be put to the trouble of weighing every loaf sold from the cart? The clause as it stood would make the measure burdensome in the extreme.

Sir E. H. WITTENOOM supported the remarks of Mr. Jenkins. The clause would serve only to harass bakers. How could the boys or youths engaged in delivering bread be held responsible for correctness of weight? The nature of the roads constructed by the Perth City Council and the suburban municipalities rendered it certain that any scales carried on a cart would be jolted to pieces very speedily. If the recipients of bread found that it was short weight, let them transfer their custom to another baker. Weighing by the inspector at the bakery ought to be sufficient.

HON. G. RANDELL said he would support Mr. Jenkins, although in his opinion a baker's cart ought to carry

scales. Hawkers of vegetables and other commodities carried scales, and therefore bakers could do so. However, the clause was useless as printed, and he would accordingly vote for its excision.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The clause was right enough. Every facility should be afforded poor people to have bread weighed as it came out of the baker's cart. It was absurd to say that this was harassing a baker or imposing any duty upon him which he ought not to be ready to carry out. Butchers and greengrocers carried weights with them. It was of the utmost importance that Parliament should endeavour as far as possible to see that people got full weight of bread, which was used so largely by the poor throughout the country. He had been appealed to by a number of bakers with regard to this clause. They wanted bread to be weighed at the bakery, and asserted that the bread lost weight afterwards. He told bakers that if bread lost weight it was their duty to put a little more on to the loaf, so that the people paying for so many pounds of bread would get exactly what they anticipated.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: This clause was a very wise precaution. How very few people who were purchasers and users of bread could afford to have scales of their own! They might time after time buy bread supposed to be of a certain weight, and all the time it might be deficient. In most towns in Scotland he knew, people who hawked coals round the country were compelled to carry scales in their coal carts, and any person could ask to see that the coal was correct weight.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: It stood to reason that if evaporation took place the baker could not put up with the loss. He would overcome the difficulty by raising the price of bread. A great deal had been said about carrying scales. There was a difficulty even in keeping scales on the counter in order, and there would be greater difficulty still if one had to carry them in the street.

HON. G. RANDELL: There would be no hardship in compelling bakers to carry scales. Many butchers carried them, and he had seen butchers selling meat by weight in the streets. However, he would vote for striking out the clause, if the hon. gentleman did not give an undertaking to make it reasonable. The clause

said every person who sold bread should constantly carry a correct beam and scales with proper weights. How was one to carry out that? One might sell bread in a basket or in a shop.

HON. W. MALEY: The clause did not commend itself to his mind as it stood at present.

HON. E. M. CLARKE: This was throwing a lot of needless obstacles in the way. It would generally be found that these much-talked-of poor people were pretty keen, and that they watched that they got their full weight from most dealers. They could generally fossick and find a pair of scales with some person or other. If one took a loaf of bread out of the oven and weighed it every three or four hours for a week afterwards, he would find that it lost all along the line.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The objection raised by Mr. Randell could be removed by striking out the word "constantly" and inserting "in the vehicle or receptacle containing the bread." In Fremantle, Perth, and other places, numbers of bakers had been convicted for selling bread of short weight, and there had been a deficiency of as much as six or seven ounces on a two-pound loaf. There was no reason why bakers should not be compelled to carry a set of weights or beam. In England, bread was sold by the pound; but here it was sold by the loaf, which was supposed to weigh either two pounds or four pounds. Was it not reasonable that people buying two pounds of bread should expect to get two pounds' weight from the baker just as they would expect to get two pounds' weight from the butcher when buying a couple of pounds of meat?

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Clause 12 afforded all the protection necessary, since under it bread could be weighed at any time by a justice of the peace, a police constable, or an inspector.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Clause 12 afforded absolutely no protection. He had prosecuted or defended more than one baker on a charge of selling short-weight bread. The majority of bakers were honourable men, but the evil practices of the dishonest bakers must be stopped. Under the Act of William IV. power was given to justices and inspectors to weigh bread, but we knew that except immediately after raids, which were made only at long

intervals, the provision was a dead letter. A baker knowing that he was bound to carry scales and therefore liable to be met at any time with a demand to weigh either from a purchaser or a constable would hesitate to carry short-weight bread.

HON. J. M. DREW: In many country districts bread was delivered by boys on horseback, the roads being too bad for vehicular traffic. Under the clause country people might be debarred from having bread delivered to them. Accordingly he supported Mr. Jenkins.

HON. W. MALEY: Under the clause as it stood, a baker might have to carry two pairs of scales—one balance scale in his cart, and a spring balance in his basket or around his neck. Weighing at the cart ought to be sufficient.

HON. C. SOMMERS: If the clause were so amended as to exclude from its operation the country baker who did not use a vehicle, it would work well.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The amendment suggested by Mr. Sommers was rather a good one.

HON. C. SOMMERS: To leave the matter to the inspector was useless. Notwithstanding inspectors, milkmen went on selling milk-and-water morning and afternoon. The knowledge of the liability to be called on to weigh at any moment would operate as a check.

HON. B. C. WOOD: The more the clause was discussed, the more impracticable it appeared; and he would therefore support its excision.

Amendment passed, and the clause struck out.

Clause 10—No unsound flour to be sold:

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The miller as well as the baker ought to be responsible for unsound flour.

HON. G. RANDELL: The miller was liable, since the clause provided that no person should sell unsound flour.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The miller should be made explicitly responsible.

HON. G. RANDELL: The hon. member was tendering the "It wasn't me, it was my brother" excuse.

Clause passed.

Clause 11—agreed to.

Clause 12—Justices or inspector may enter premises, etc.:

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY moved that, in lines 1 and 2, "justice of the peace or police constable authorised by him" be struck out.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Clause 13—Bread weighed, six loaves to be tested:

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Six loaves which when weighed all together were of the proper weight, when weighed separately might not as to each individual loaf prove of right weight. Now, a customer had power to demand that a single loaf should be weighed.

MEMBER: No; six loaves must be weighed in every case.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes; the average weight of six loaves was taken.

Clause passed.

Clause 14—No person to hinder search:

HON. A. J. JENKINS moved that in line 1 "wilfully" be inserted between "shall" and "obstruct." An unintentional offence ought not to be punished, and wilfulness could easily be proved.

HON. J. A. THOMSON said he very much favoured the retention of the clause as it stood. It would be very difficult to prove wilful obstruction, but it would never be difficult to prove obstruction.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The onus of proving that an act was done wilfully would be very difficult on some occasions. He did not see that the provisions of the clause could be used in a very harsh way. The duties of a justice of the peace, constable, or inspector were laid down clearly in the Bill. Every baker or person in his employ ought to know the provisions of the Bill when it became law.

HON. W. MALEY: A baker might be hailed by a police constable who wished to search his cart. That baker might be slightly deaf, or the wind might be blowing the wrong way, and he might drive off.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Unless the word "wilfully" was inserted, no matter how innocent an obstruction or hindrance might be, a penalty must be inflicted.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	11
Noes	...	...	...	8

Majority for	...	...	3
--------------	-----	-----	---

## AYES.

Hon. R. G. Burges  
 Hon. E. M. Clarke  
 Hon. C. E. Dempster  
 Hon. J. W. Hackett  
 Hon. A. G. Jenkins  
 Hon. B. C. O'Brien  
 Hon. C. A. Piesse  
 Hon. G. Randall  
 Hon. C. Sommers  
 Hon. J. W. Wright  
 Hon. W. Maley (Teller).

## NOES.

Hon. J. D. Connolly  
 Hon. J. M. Drew  
 Hon. A. Jameson  
 Hon. R. Laurie  
 Hon. E. McLarty  
 Hon. M. L. Moss  
 Hon. J. E. Richardson  
 Hon. J. A. Thomson  
 (Teller).

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

Clause 15—Purchaser may require bread to be weighed:

HON. A. G. JENKINS moved that after the word "customer," in line 1, "on the premises of any seller of bread" be inserted. This was a consequential amendment, the Committee having already decided that persons who sold bread need not carry scales on a vehicle.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 16—No baking on Sunday:

HON. A. G. JENKINS moved that the word "seven," in line 2, be struck out, and "five" inserted in lieu. The amendment would be of great benefit both to the employers and employees. He believed there was no objection by the Minister in charge.

Amendment passed.

HON. A. G. JENKINS farther moved that after the word "Sunday," in line 2, "except with the permission of an inspector" be inserted. In seaport towns a batch of bread might be badly wanted for a vessel, or for some urgent reason. An inspector of course would inquire into the case, and if he was satisfied that bread should be baked, he would give permission.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 17—agreed to.

Clause 18—Offences:

HON. A. G. JENKINS suggested that the word "twenty," in line 10, be struck out and "ten" inserted in lieu.

HON. M. L. MOSS: If that alteration were effected, there would be no power of appeal; there could not be a power of appeal unless a fine was upwards of £10.

HON. A. G. JENKINS did not press the alteration, as he did not wish to prevent the power of appeal.

Clause passed.

Clauses 19, 20—agreed to.

Clause 21—Bread, etc., on premises of baker to be deemed intended for human consumption:

HON. W. MALEY: Under this clause any person carrying bread in a basket would be liable to a penalty, whether a vendor of bread or not. He thought that after the word "apparently," in line 2, "a vendor of bread" should be inserted. Perhaps there was no great harm in the provision.

Clause passed.

Clauses 22, 23—agreed to.

New Clause:

HON. A. G. JENKINS moved that the following be added to the Bill:—

All bread shall be weighed in the bakehouse or on the premises where the same is baked within eight hours of the same being baked.

This clause no doubt would give all-round satisfaction.

HON. M. L. MOSS: One would like to know who had suggested this amendment, though a shrewd suspicion was easily formed.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: The master bakers had suggested it.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Naturally. Under the old Act of William IV., bread might be weighed within 48 hours of baking, and that period the amendment would reduce to eight hours, the result of which would be that bread baked in the early hours of the morning could not be weighed at all. The new clause would reduce the measure to simply a dead letter.

MEMBER: Besides, how would one prove when bread had been baked?

HON. M. L. MOSS: Just so. This new clause would make it absolutely impossible to secure a conviction under the measure.

Question negatived.

New Clause:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that the following be added to the Bill:—

Section 11 of the Act 3 Gul. IV., No. 2, is hereby repealed.

The section referred to was contained in an Act which came into force in this State on the 19th March, 1833.

Question passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

## CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

## SECOND READING.

HON. M. L. MOSS (Minister): The small Bill of which I now move the second reading is designed to correct a few mistakes which crept into the Criminal Code in the course of its passage through Parliament, and enacted last session. Having regard to the magnitude of the Criminal Code, I think the fact that 12 months of its operation has resulted in the discovery of so few and such small mistakes as this Bill is designed to correct speaks highly for the care and attention devoted to the drafting of the measure. The Bill proposes only two actual amendments. Section 319, dealing with assault, provides that the penalty for the offence shall be £5, and that this penalty shall include costs. The experience of the magistrates administering the Act is that in many instances an amount of £5 is not sufficient to cover the cost of witnesses' expenses, where a number are subpoenaed. Thus persons guilty of serious assaults occasionally get off practically without any fine. It is thought well to increase the maximum penalty to £10, and farther to give power to award, over and above the fine, the costs of prosecution. Clause 5 provides that an aboriginal charged with an offence not punishable with death and pleading guilty may be summarily dealt with by justices and sentenced to a term of imprisonment not exceeding three years. This amendment of the law is desirable, because the expense of committing aborigines for trial is in many cases considerable, involving the necessity of conveying them long distances to a court of quarter sessions. No injustice will be done, because a case will be summarily disposed of only if the accused pleads guilty. I hope the House will agree that the power proposed may safely be intrusted to justices. At this stage I do not intend to enter into the schedule, which can be better explained in Committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 6, inclusive—agreed to.

Schedule:

Paragraph 1:

HON. M. L. MOSS: The maximum penalty for persons taking part in a riot had originally been fixed at imprisonment with hard labour for life. That penalty had been reduced in the Criminal Code to imprisonment for 14 years, but the form of proclamation still set forth the old penalty. This amendment was, therefore, really consequential.

Paragraph passed.

Paragraphs 2, 3—agreed to.

Paragraph 4:

HON. G. RANDELL: Were the sections of the principal Act correctly quoted in this paragraph?

HON. M. L. MOSS: Yes.

Paragraph passed.

Paragraphs 5 to 11, inclusive—agreed to.

New paragraph:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that the following be added to the schedule:—

In Section five hundred and fifty-two, the words "or for sentence" are inserted after the words "committed for trial."

Under Section 552, only Judges of the Supreme Court had power to allow a person committed for sentence to bail; and it was thought desirable to extend that power to justices. The amendment was particularly desirable in respect of outlying districts, so that a man who had pleaded guilty to a trivial charge, and who would possibly be dealt with as a first offender, should not be subjected to weeks or months of imprisonment pending sentence.

Amendment passed, the paragraph inserted, and the schedule as amended agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment, and the report adopted.

## LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

## IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the 26th November.

New Clause:

HON. A. G. JENKINS moved that the following be added to the Bill:—

Notwithstanding anything contained in Section 14 of the Land Act Amendment Act, 1900, the land in respect of which the residential leases described in the schedule to this Act have been granted may, subject to the provisions of the principal Act, be granted in fee simple to the lessees thereof.

Certain people at Boulder had taken up

lots on the strength of a telegram sent by the Under Secretary for Lands. Those people were under the impression that they acquired rights in 1896, and no doubt they did so; but those rights were taken away by a section in the Land Act of 1900, which was retrospective. Those persons had taken up certain residential lots which were 10 chains from the town-site and were of 33ft. frontage, and there were about 200 of these lots. What they now asked was that they should have the right of getting the fee simple of those lands. This measure was introduced into the Assembly really for the one special purpose, he thought the Minister said, of giving those people that right. In a thin House the clause was struck out, and he (Mr. Jenkins) desired to have the measure sent back to the Assembly with the wish of the Council that the clause should be reinserted. In reinserting that clause the Council would be undoing what practically had been a great injustice. He believed the reinsertion of the clause was not opposed by the Ministers.

HON. A. JAMESON: No; they did not oppose it.

Question passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

Schedule:

HON. A. G. JENKINS moved that the following be added to the Bill:—

#### THE SCHEDULE.

Residential leases of } Boulder Town Lots }	405 to 416 inclusive
Do. do. ...	418 to 429 "
Do. do. ...	431 to 438 "
Do. do. ...	441 to 444 "
Do. do. ...	446 to 459 "
Do. do. ...	462 to 471 "
Do. do. ...	473 to 490 "
Do. do. ...	492 to 499 "
Do. do. ...	501 to 510 "
Do. do. ...	513 to 516 "
Do. do. ...	518 to 526 "
Do. do. ...	527 to 546 "
Do. do. ...	549 to 552 "
Do. do. ...	554 to 561 "
Do. do. ...	563 to 582 "
Do. do. ...	587 to 606 "
Do. do. ...	608 to 615 "
Do. do. ...	617 to 628 "
Do. do. ...	628 to 633 "
Do. do. ...	635 to 654 "

Question passed, and the schedule added to the Bill.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9-38 o'clock, until the next day.

### Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 2nd December, 1902.

	PAGE
Questions to Ministers (in lieu of Motions) ...	2554
Questions: Railway-yard Labourers' Wages ...	2555
New Law Courts, Particulars ...	2555
Railway Deviation, Fremantle ...	2555
Water Supply (artesian), Cottesloe ...	2555
Leave of Absence ...	2556
Bills: Collie to Collie-Boulder Railway, in Committee, progress ...	2556
Permanent Reserves Rededication, Committee resumed, reported ...	2556
Rabbit Pest, third reading ...	2560
Electoral Bill, Recommittal, third reading ...	2560
Leonora Tramway, third reading ...	2561
Coolgardie Goldfields Water Supply (to constitute board), second reading moved ...	2561
Annual Estimates (resumed): Votes, Medical, Observatory, progress ...	2579

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at 2-30 o'clock, p.m.

#### PRAYERS.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: 1. By-laws of the municipality of Norseman.  
2. Report (copy) and evidence of "Drayton Grange" inquiry.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

#### QUESTIONS TO MINISTERS.

##### (IN LIEU OF MOTIONS.)

MR. HOPKINS by leave, asked the Premier: Whether, seeing that the Standing Orders were suspended, he would assist members as far as possible by answering questions for information which, under other circumstances, members might move for in the shape of returns.

THE PREMIER said he would be glad to do that; but he did not want to