would accept it, but he did not feel inclined to accept the amendment without a special case being stated. He was assured that the danger was not so great on boilers under 100lbs. pressure. Great danger did not exist unless there was a heavy pressure on a boiler.

MR. FRANK WILSON: This was an important matter, and time should be given to consider the question. He moved that progress be reported.

Motion passed, and progress reported.

LEAVE TO SIT AGAIN.

THE MINISTER: The Committee would allow him, in moving that leave be given to sit again on Tuesday next, to say a few words in explanation. The member for York (Mr. Burges) had mentioned that last year, when this measure was before the House, a great deal of contentious matter was brought to a close by some members who considered how the Bill would affect certain districts visiting the Chief Inspector of Boilers and Machinery. He (the Minister) would now strongly advise any members considering the particulars of this Bill to be good enough to call upon Mr. Matthews, the machinery expert of this State, who would be glad to discuss with members any matters connected with the Bill, between now and Tuesday next.

Leave given to sit again on the next Tuesday.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9·48 o'clock, until the next Tuesday afternoon.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 27th September, 1904.

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

PRAYERS.

Several Notices given.

PETITION: KALGOORLIE TRAMWAYS RACECOURSE EXTENSION BILL (PRIVATE).

MR. W. NELSON presented a petition for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise the Kalgoorlie Electric Tramways Ltd. to construct and manage a line of tramways on the Kalgoorlie Racecourse.

Petition received and read.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member has not brought up the petition at the right moment; but I have allowed him to proceed thus far. The proper time for presenting a petition is before Notices are called for. The proceedings this afternoon are getting slightly irregular, and I hope this will not occur again. The hon. member has a notice of motion regarding the Bill. When that is called on, he can then move his motion that the Bill be introduced.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Agricultural Bank, annual report, 1904.

By the MINISTER FOR WORKS: Port Hedland to Nullagine Railway Survey, report and plans. 2, Return showing Railways under construction on 30th June, 1903, moved for by Dr. Ellis.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners' half-yearly Report.

QUESTION—MINE INSPECTORS' INSTRUCTIONS TO MANAGERS.

MR. GREGORY asked the Minister for Mines: In how many instances during

the past three years has it been reported to the Mines Department by any of the inspectors of mines that their instructions to mining managers, requesting alterations for the safety of the miners employed, have been refused compliance?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES replied: No formal reports have been made during the last three years by any inspectors of mines that mining managers have refused to comply with instructions given by the inspector with the object of rendering their mines safe; but in several cases, when inquiries have been made into accidents, it has come out that the instructions of inspectors have either been ignored or very partially carried out. Inspectors have, in many cases, loudly complained that the Act provides no penalties for neglect of instructions given by them for ensuring the safety of the mine.

LOCAL COURTS BILL SELECT COMMITTEE.

CHANGE OF MEMBER.

On motion by the Minister for Mines, the member for East Perth (Mr. Walter James) was discharged from serving on the select committee upon the Local Courts Bill, and the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) was appointed in his stead.

PRIVATE BILL, FIRST READING.

KALGOORLIE TRAMWAYS RACECOURSE EXTENSION BILL (private), introduced by Mr. Wallace Nelson, and read a first time.

Bill referred to a select committee, comprising Mr. Carson, Mr. Diamond, Mr. Scaddan, Mr. Thomas, also Mr. Wallace Nelson as mover; to report this day week.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

INSPECTION OF MACHINERY BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the previous day; MR. BATH in the Chair, the MINISTER FOR MINES in charge of the Bill.

Clause 22—Boilers to be fitted with certain fittings:

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The amendment moved by Mr. Scaddan had received careful consideration, and members agreed that there should be some kind of protectors of glass water-guages on engines. He favoured all boilers having protectors, but if the amendment were enforced it would press heavily on those who used small boilers. As this was a new idea so far as this State was concerned, he felt justified in compromising the matter by providing that all boilers that had been granted certificates authorising a working pressure of over 100 pounds per square inch should have protectors. If the member for Ivanhoe withdrew his amendment, he (the Minister) would propose an amendment on the lines indicated; or it would be better that the member for Ivanhoe should withdraw his amendment and substitute the one which had been mentioned. It was just as necessary for the safety of small boilers as for large ones, that protectors should be used. There had been very few cases of gauge-glasses bursting excepting on large boilers which were subject to great pressure.

MR. FRANK WILSON: It was not so much a matter of size of boilers as pressure. He was not satisfied that there was any law in force in the old country that forced builders or users of boilers to place guards before water-gauge glasses. The reason protectors were used in some instances in the old country was that the pressure had been increased. He believed accidents had occurred and gauge glasses had often burst, therefore it was found that steps had to be taken to protect those attending high-pressure boilers, but the guards had been introduced voluntarily. It was found in this country where boilers were used at a considerably higher pressure than 80lbs. to the square inch that the users of the boilers adopted some guard for the protection of their employees, because owners were subject to heavy penalties if employees were injured. He had taken the trouble to make inquiries as to the cost of guards, and he found that guards were imported from England with a circular glass front at between 25s. and 40s. each. A certain kind of guard was made at the locomotive shops at a cost

of 5s. each, and these were suitable for locomotives, but he did not think these guards could be installed for double the amount mentioned. If it were found necessary to insert a provision of this kind in the Bill, although he did not think it was necessary, it should certainly be limited to boilers working at over 100lbs. pressure, because it was not necessary for boilers working at a lower pressure to have guards. Although he had known instances in which glasses had burst, it was not found that attendants received serious injury thereby; therefore the Committee should limit the use of guards to boilers working at a pressure of over 100 pounds to the square inch.

MR. H. E. BOLTON: It would be advisable for the Minister to provide for guards being fixed to boilers having a working pressure of 80lbs. to the square inch. The majority of the boilers used on the railways worked at 140lbs. pressure, which was not excessive, and the gauge-glasses were protected with plate-glass protectors; but as these were expensive it would not be fair to ask farmers to put them on their boilers. However, efficient guards could be made for 3s. They differed from protectors. Protectors usually consisted of glass tubes slotted at opposite sides, with the glass going inside and fixed top and bottom with washers, but they were not as efficient as the plate-glass protectors used on locomotives. Those protectors referred to as costing about 3s. were thin steel guards with clasps. He (Mr. Bolton) had seen many serious accidents occur through the breaking of gauge-glasses. The Minister should amend the clause to have the minimum pressure fixed at 80lbs. per square inch.

MR. J. SCADDAN: By fixing the minimum at 100lbs. per square inch, the whole object of the amendment would be obviated. On Cornish and Lancashire boilers, which were worked at from 80 to 100lbs. pressure per square inch, the gauge-glasses were very liable to burst; and as they were just about the height of the attendant's face, it was from these boilers that the greatest danger arose. The Minister should make 80lbs. the minimum.

THE MINISTER: There was no strong objection to a reduction to 80lbs.; but no doubt there would be objection raised that it would be a tax on a deserving class of people. To some extent that might be the case, but he (the Minister) had discovered since the previous discussion on this clause that what might be considered good protectors could be obtained for less than 30s., previously stated as the cost of the standard protector. Protectors of the class mentioned by the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Bolton) could be obtained for 7s. 6d., and with a large demand for them all over the State they should cost a less sum, in which case people could not complain of a heavy tax being imposed. Serious accidents had resulted from the breaking of these glasses. Two members bore marks upon them caused by the breaking of gauge-glasses, and they congratulated themselves on preserving their eyesight. He (the Minister) had heard of other serious cases. At the most a sum of 15s. would be involved, so that the Committee would not be asking too much by insisting that owners should protect the lives of their employees as well as themselves. There was no law on the subject in England; but insurance companies compelled a great number of precautions to be taken, and guards had, during the last few years, been very extensively used in England. Those acquainted with boilers and machinery in this State had assured him that most people now put guards on their gauge-glasses. The hon. member should ask leave to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

On motions by THE MINISTER, Subclause (a) amended by adding the words "with approved protectors" after "complete," in line 4; and by adding the words "which has been granted an authorised working pressure of over 80lbs. per square inch" after the word "power," in line 5.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 23—agreed to.

Clause 24—Setting of boilers:

MR. FRANK WILSON: Was the inspector bound to give the size of flues on application?

THE MINISTER: The inspector would give all the information required. It would be part of the inspector's duty to indicate what size of flue was required.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The inspector on being asked what size he required the flues to be built might say it was not his business, just as the health inspectors in Perth would not give any information to owners of condemned buildings as to what alterations should be carried out. The inspector should be compelled to give a sketch of the flues and the size of the doors required. By adding words to that effect a lot of trouble would be obviated.

THE MINISTER: Inspectors would not be so stupid as to refuse to give information. No serious complaint had been made against inspectors, and no complaint had been made that information required by people putting up boilers had not been given. The hon. member should not press the question, but should trust to the administrators of the Act.

MR. H. GREGORY: The clause was evidently new. Possibly on recommittal it might be made to read, "of sufficient size as provided by regulation." The Chief Inspector could state in the regulation the maximum and minimum sizes of flues and doors. This would suit both department and public.

THE MINISTER: There was no objection to that; but it seemed impossible to frame regulations elastic enough to meet all cases. However, if the suggestion would suit the member for Sussex, inquiries would be made as to whether it could be adopted.

MR. FRANK WILSON: Probably the suggestion would answer the purpose.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 25—Standards and appliances to be provided:

MR. A. E. THOMAS: Each inspector was to be provided with appliances for testing gauges. Had the Government a mercury tower? Inspectors had called on him and tested his expensive gauges of the latest design by comparison with a wretched instrument which one would be ashamed to see on any boiler.

THE MINISTER: For some time the Fremantle workshops had been using mercury gauges. The clause was almost identical with the New Zealand Inspection of Machinery Act 1902. When this Bill became law the inspectors would be provided with all proper appliances.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 26 to 30—agreed to.

Clause 31—Aid to be given by owner for purpose of inspection:

MR. THOMAS moved as an amendment:

That the words "the removal of which may be necessary for purposes of inspection" be inserted after "set," in line 6.

THE MINISTER: The amendment was not seriously objectionable; but the hon. member indicated that he intended moving a number of amendments. In a technical Bill these should not be sprung without notice on the House.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The Bill itself was sprung on the House.

THE MINISTER: The Bill was introduced and discussed last Tuesday; and he then specially appealed to members to table their amendments to give time for considering them. Last Thursday he made the same appeal, which had been disregarded by the member for Dundas. As the amendment was in accord with the spirit of the clause, let it be accepted, and if necessary alter its wording on recommittal; but if the effect of the hon. member's additional amendments seemed doubtful, the Government would ask the Committee to pass the clauses as printed, so that proposed amendments might appear on the Notice Paper when the Bill was recommitted.

MR. J. SCADDAN: Was not the amendment a needless repetition? The first part of the clause read "for the purpose of inspection." Why repeat these words near the end? The brickwork, etcetera, could not be compulsorily removed, except for the purpose of inspection.

MR. THOMAS: True the words appeared earlier in the clause; but the latter part read "and when required by the Chief Inspector, all brickwork and other material in which a boiler is set shall be taken down." It was essential that the taking down should be limited to material which must necessarily be removed to permit of inspection. He objected to the Minister's remarks as to amendments sprung on the Committee. Members received the printed Bill last week, and could not send copies to the country till Wednesday last; hence it was difficult enough for interested persons in outlying districts to send suggested amendments to the House in time to be

moved to-day. Repeatedly he had objected to Bills being rushed through. Last week we were asked to suspend the Standing Orders to put through a Bill at one sitting a few minutes after copies of it had been handed to members. This measure might be identical with the Bill of last session; but the majority of members were new to the House. People in outlying centres should have ample time to study the Bill with a view to suggesting amendments; and the Committee stage should be postponed. He resented the Minister's remarks, and thought himself justified in moving what amendments he chose.

THE MINISTER objected strongly to an assumption that he had tried to burk discussion.

MR. THOMAS: That had not been stated by him.

THE MINISTER: The hon. member's remarks were that sufficient time had not been given to people in outlying places. Over and over again he (the Minister) had asked that, as a matter of fairness to the Committee, all amendments should be put upon the Notice Paper, and had said that if time were not available to deal with all such amendments in putting the Bill through in the first instance, opportunity would be given on recommittal.

MR. THOMAS: There were no objections on his part to that.

THE MINISTER protested against the hon. member's introducing technical amendments without a moment's notice. He (the Minister) had been liberal enough in putting back the Bill for a week, and he was not certain there would be any more amendments if he put back the Bill for a month. Practically nothing farther would have been done. The people even in country districts had plenty of opportunities. If the hon. member received amendments from the goldfields or anywhere up to last night, he could have transmitted them to the Clerk of the House this morning, and a slip would have been printed so that members could consider them.

MR. THOMAS: The amendments were received by him only a few minutes before he came to the House.

THE MINISTER: Then the hon. member had not had time to consider them.

MR. THOMAS: Yes; they were identically the amendments which were moved before.

MR. FRANK WILSON: Apparently the Minister had been too hasty altogether.

THE MINISTER: Was the hon. member in order?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not out of order.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The Minister expected the Committee to digest a Bill of 80 odd clauses in half-a-dozen hours. That was not fair to the members of the Committee, which included a number of new members who knew nothing about last year's Bill. One did not even know that it was exactly the same; in fact he doubted very much whether it was so. Certainly members were entitled to some time.

MR. THOMAS: The Minister did not say the Bill was the same.

MR. FRANK WILSON: No.

THE MINISTER: The Bill was improved.

MR. FRANK WILSON: Members wanted to find out where the difference came in. If the Minister had adopted the ordinary Parliamentary usage of passing the second reading and then making the Committee stage a week later, or a fortnight later, giving members time to go through it, that would have been much better, and would have saved a lot of time in the long run. With regard to the amendment, he did not know that we could bring in a lot of new clauses and amendments to existing clauses on recommittal if they were not mentioned in recommitting; therefore members were justified in moving amendments now, threshing them out as far as they could, which would give sufficient notice at any rate, and then they could be put forward on recommittal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Members were quite in order in introducing amendments to a Bill on the recommittal stage. Recommittal was for that very purpose.

MR. GREGORY: The Committee might not recommit the whole Bill, but only certain clauses of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: What he was referring to was recommittal of the Bill, and not of individual clauses.

Amendment put and passed.

Farther amendment, that the word "defective" be inserted after "all" in line 22, put and passed.

MR. GREGORY: The last paragraph of the clause said: "The inspector may, in addition to any other test, test any boiler by hydraulic pressure, if he considers it necessary to do so." Last year it was pointed out that by continuous hydraulic pressure there was a possibility of danger to the boiler itself. It might be necessary at various times to apply this hydraulic test, and he was not going to endeavour to prevent this from passing in the Bill, but he wanted information in regard to these tests to be sent to the Chief Inspector, so that an inspector should not apply hydraulic tests without intimating the reasons of a test being made, and the result of the test being sent to the Chief Inspector. He moved as an amendment that the following words be added: "and shall send a record of the same and the reasons for and result of such test to the Chief Inspector." That would not interfere with the Bill. It was only a matter of departmental work.

THE MINISTER: Inspectors might do what was suggested.

MR. GREGORY: But they were not compelled to do so.

MR. THOMAS: In some cases hydraulic pressure had a bad effect on a boiler, but the amendment would certainly be an improvement to the Bill. It did not, however, go far enough. Information should be sent to the Chief Inspector before the hydraulic pressure was put on.

THE MINISTER: The Committee could not, he thought, agree with the suggestion by the member for Dundas. If the suggestion were adopted an inspector who went to a distant place could not apply this very necessary test until he sent a letter down to Perth, and he would have to wait until receiving information back, which, in many cases, would be over a month.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The inspector could send a wire.

THE MINISTER: One could not send a wire in all cases and could not give sufficient information by wire to enable the Chief Inspector to say whether the hydraulic pressure test should be applied. It would be far better to adopt the amendment of the member for Menzies. If there was any means by which the idea of the member for Dundas could be carried out in Perth itself, one could understand it, but obviously it could not be applied to the whole district.

Amendment put and passed.

Clauses 32 to 35—agreed to.

Clause 36—Fees for inspection, Seventh Schedule:

MR. THOMAS: Something should be done by the Minister whereby either the Government would insure these boilers or take some responsibility for the work done by their inspectors. People were charged stiff fees for the inspection of boilers, but if a boiler were worked strictly in accordance with the certificate granted by the inspector and the working pressure were even below that granted by the inspector, and the boiler blew up five minutes afterwards, the Government accepted no responsibility. [MR. GREGORY: That could be dealt with on Clause 74.] The owner of the damaged boiler had to stand all the risk and loss and all damage in case anyone was injured by the neglect of the inspector in not properly attending to his work. One did not mind where the discussion came up; he would postpone his remarks until we reached Clause 74, because probably we should have reported progress before then and that would give the Minister an opportunity of bringing forward his ideas as to whether something could not be done to remedy this anomalous state of affairs.

Clause passed.

Clauses 37 to 43—agreed to.

Clause 44—Working without a certificate:

MR. FRANK WILSON: The penalty mentioned in this clause seemed rather excessive, £100. Other penalties in the Bill were fixed at £20. One might unintentionally use machinery without a certificate. The penalty should be reduced.

MR. GREGORY: It might be possible to alter the clause as far as machinery was concerned, but the Inspection of Boilers Act had been in force some years, and people knew what their liabilities were. There was a greater element of danger in dealing with boilers than with machinery. The penalty might be reduced so far as machines were concerned.

THE MINISTER: The matter would be looked into, but the clause provided a penalty not exceeding £100, and no one for a moment would think that the maximum penalty would be imposed except in a flagrant case, or where a person had been summoned two or three times.

MR. FRANK WILSON: Proceedings should only be taken when authorised by the chief inspector. An ordinary inspector should not be allowed to take proceedings until the matter had been referred to his chief. That was the custom, and why not embody it in the Bill: it would remove any chance of a case being brought forward by an inspector from some ill-feeling.

THE MINISTER: There was something in what the hon. member had pointed out, and if he proposed an amendment the Committee could consider it. The difficulty might be overcome by an inspector holding the written consent of the chief inspector, for if an inspector went out back he alone would be conversant with the trouble, and it would take a long time to advise the chief inspector and obtain his authority. If the clause were allowed to remain, on recommittal he would consider the question as to a case being referred to the chief inspector before any prosecution ensued.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 45—Notice of sale, etc., of boilers or machinery:

MR. FRANK WILSON: This clause might be made very irksome. The definition of a machine included every shaft, wheel, pulley, or anything of that description. A machinery merchant could not sell a driving belt without first informing the inspector that he intended doing so. Subclause 2 was also objectionable, for no one could let out on hire a pump without first informing the inspector. A farmer could not let on hire to his neighbour a chaffcutting machine without first giving seven days' notice to the inspector. At the Collie one company often lent to another pumps and gear of every description, yet a company would be bound to notify an inspector that the articles had been lent. This would cause friction and harass owners of machinery.

MR. GREGORY: The clause was very necessary as far as boilers were concerned.

THE MINISTER: The clause at a first glance might appear to harass owners of machinery unduly, but members would find it very difficult to amend the clause.

MR. FRANK WILSON: Was the clause necessary?

THE MINISTER: The clause was very necessary. The Committee had already passed a clause that an inspector should keep a note of the condition of machinery and boilers, and the officer would be unable to do so unless he kept a note as to where the particular machinery was to be found. Without such a clause as this inspectors could not trace machinery. A great deal must be left to administration. Many of the articles mentioned by the member for Sussex would not come under the clause, which was taken word for word from the New Zealand Act; a similar provision also existed in the Inspection of Boilers Act in this State.

MR. GREGORY: There must be such a provision as far as boilers were concerned.

THE MINISTER: As far as machinery was concerned there was not likely to be any trouble. The clause should be allowed to pass, and members should trust to the regulations and a common-sense administration of the law.

MR. FRANK WILSON: If a large machinery company sold a pump it would be absurd to give notice to the inspector of the sale. Was it not sufficient that the owner of the machinery should advise an inspector or the chief inspector that the machine had been purchased? Whoever thought that an inspector could keep a record of the machinery on certain works, or trace machinery from place to place. Was it not sufficient for an inspector to know that certain machinery was worked on certain premises? He could see trouble for the department and the individual. The clause would not be observed, nor would it be enforced.

THE MINISTER: If the interpretation given to the clause by the member for Sussex was a true one it would be more honoured in the breach than in the observance; but if a person bought a

pulley, a wheel or some belting, he would not have to give notice to the inspector.

MR. FRANK WILSON: What about a chaffcutter?

THE MINISTER: There were chaffcutters that would come under the clause, and chaffcutters that would not. It was impossible to define the machinery that would come under the clause. This provision had been the law in the State for some time under the Boilers Act, and it had been the law in New Zealand since 1892 for machinery.

MR. H. E. BOLTON: When an inspector paid a visit to a machinery shed a certificate was given for a specified time, and that certificate was sent on to the chief inspector. If at any time the machinery for which the certificate was given was sold or lent or given away, how could the inspector trace that machinery without a record of the removal being sent to him?

MR. GREGORY: What would be defined as a machine?

MR. BOLTON: Machinery should be defined as that driven by power. If it was necessary to have a boiler traced, it was necessary to keep the clause in the Bill.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The clause could be confined to boilers only.

MR. BOLTON: No; the clause should be maintained as printed, because an inspector would know to what part of the State certificated machinery had been moved.

MR. T. HAYWARD: The owner of a travelling chaffcutter would, by the wording of the clause, have to give notice every second day as to where his machine would be working.

THE MINISTER: No.

MR. GREGORY: The object of the Bill was to prevent machinery in use being a menace to life. Machinery was of no danger if it was not being used. Machinery, according to the interpretation clause, included every shaft and every drum, wheel, strap, band or pulley by which the motion of the first moving power was communicated to any machinery, and also every machine, gearing, contrivance or appliance worked by steam or water power, or by electricity, etc. Therefore the member for Sussex (Mr. Frank Wilson) was quite fair in arguing that, if the administration of the Act was made very hard and fast, it would be impossible to carry out the provisions of the clause. It was, however, simply a matter of administration. The Minister, no doubt, would not enforce the clause so far as it related to machinery generally, but the word "machinery" could well be omitted. There was a dangerous element in regard to boilers, and the officers of the department should be able to put their hands on any certificated boiler at any time; but it should be the duty of the inspector to find out where machinery existed and inspect it, and the department should not look to having the information supplied. This clause was in the Bill last year which he (Mr. Gregory) tried to pass through the House; but in view of the interpretation of "machinery" and the possibilities of how the Act might be carried out, he now thought the word "machinery" might be omitted.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member should move an amendment to strike out the word "machinery."

MR. GREGORY: No. The member for Sussex could do so. One could believe that the Act would be properly administered.

MR. P. J. LYNCH: Power was given to the inspector by Clause 19 to inspect any machinery. Should we omit the word "machinery" it might happen that the owner of a piece of machinery pronounced to be defective would get rid of it, and that the machine might be put to work in a distant part of the State. There was danger in this direction in regard to winding engines, and the clause should apply to them if to nothing else. The member for Sussex (Mr. Frank Wilson) implied that inspectors were not gifted with common sense. Certainly, to make the clause apply to a grindstone would be absurd, but defective machinery on the goldfields should come under the clause, and an inspector should be able to trace any winding engine that might be got rid of by reason of being defective.

MR. FRANK WILSON: It was not insinuated that inspectors were devoid of common sense; but some members seemed to be devoid of common sense in passing such legislation. It was sufficient that, by Clause 15, every person buying machinery should inform the inspector. Why should the seller also advise the

inspector? Machinery was not necessarily dangerous if defective. At any rate the buyer of second-hand machinery would ascertain whether it was dangerous to life; and as the buyer was required to give notice to the inspector, the burden should not be put on the seller also. The seller in Perth by the Bill would need to advise the Perth inspector, and the buyer in Peak Hill must also advise the Peak Hill inspector, so that two inspectors would be running after the same piece of machinery. Duties should not be imposed on persons which they could not carry out. The inspector must carry out the Act, and would not be allowed to use common sense: so the House must use common sense and pass a clause that could be administered. The great cry recently was that we could not get a Government to administer the laws. We had so many laws on the statute-book that they could not be administered. He (Mr. Frank Wilson) would not be a party to passing laws that could not be administered. Why should the inspectors overrule the will of Parliament. By the clause we said, "the seller shall report to the inspector any sale." Were we going to give power to the inspector to say things "shall not" be reported to him?

THE MINISTER: No member suggested that Acts were not to be administered.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The member for Mount Leonora (Mr. Lynch) did so.

THE MINISTER: It was one of the little tricks of the member for Sussex.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw.

THE MINISTER: Very well; it was one of the "customs" of the member for Sussex to point out over and over again that another member said so and so, while the hon. member who was blamed was the one most surprised at the interpretation put on his words by the member for Sussex.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The Minister claimed that he (Mr. Wilson) charged an hon. member with saying something an hon. member had not said knowingly. The Minister should withdraw.

THE CHAIRMAN: The expression was not out of order. Often an expression was improper that was not exactly out of order.

THE MINISTER: The interpretation other members put on certain remarks was different from that put on them by the member for Sussex. This was an explanation the member for Sussex could accept. The hon. member was going on with a lot of vain imaginings that never would come to pass, and if the hon. member had a modicum of the common sense he preached so much, he would agree with him (the Minister). It was provided that certificates should be given for machinery; but the hon. member practically wanted to make certificates of no use. The inspector should know where any machinery for which he had given a certificate was to be found.

MR. THOMAS: The man who bought machinery was required to give notice.

THE MINISTER: If a machine already certificated was sold in Perth for the North Murchison it was the duty of the local inspector at North Murchison to examine it before a second man made use of it; but the man who obtained the certificate for the efficiency of the machinery should notify the inspector that he sold it, which would in all probability save the local inspector at North Murchison a great amount of work.

MR. THOMAS: Machinery might be damaged in transit.

THE MINISTER: The clause was inserted for public convenience. None believed that any but erected machinery would come under it. Great danger must arise if a winding-engine condemned in one part of the country could be transferred to and used in another part; hence to prevent this and to facilitate legal proceedings the clause was essential. To the suggestion of the member for Menzies (Mr. Gregory) there was no objection, though it was practically identical in meaning with the clause as printed, which would never be applied to any but prescribed machinery.

MR. GREGORY: Better make the clause explicit. The schedule included machinery used in a foundry; but much of this was not at all dangerous. Belting was an exception. It was unreasonable that a foundry owner who sold a machine must notify the inspector. The same might be said of a vendor of a rock-breaker. In case of a winding-plant which was sold and despatched to a far distant purchaser, put the onus on the

vendor. The department must be able to trace such machinery. The regulation would have to be carefully framed. He moved:

That the word "machinery," in line 2, be struck out, and the words "such machinery as may be prescribed" be inserted in lieu.

MR. THOMAS supported the amendment as a decided improvement, though the unnecessary word "machinery" should be struck out. The regulations were practically the Act; and frequently the intentions of Parliament were not given effect to. The clause gave a discretion to the inspector; and thus we were passing legislation which we intended to give someone the right to evade.

MR. E. NEEDHAM opposed the amendment. To strike out "machinery" would defeat our object—to protect life. The member for Sussex (Mr. F. Wilson) tried to make out that every strap and pulley would be treated as machinery. Such appliances would not be "machinery" unless in action. The hon. member's criticism was purely destructive. Pass the clause as printed, or we should leave a big loophole for evasions of the Act.

MR. THOMAS: If the clause passed as printed, a vendor of machinery in Perth must notify the inspector here, presumably with full particulars; and the notice must be filed by a clerk. If the machinery were sent to the Murchison, the Perth office must forward a description, and the purchaser must give a similar notice to the local inspector, and so on; several clerks being needed in each inspector's office. Had the Minister figured out the cost?

THE MINISTER: No; for he did not accept the hon. member's fantastic interpretation. Certain prescribed machinery would when sold be reported to the inspector. As to boilers, that was now the law, and it was the law in New Zealand; and last year we passed, he believed, the same clause without objection. The amendment seemed unobjectionable; but all such amendments should be carefully considered before recommittal, in case formal alterations were needed.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. GREGORY: Consequential amendments would be made in Subclause 2?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 46 to 49—agreed to.

Clause 50—Inspector to be notified of accident:

MR. FRANK WILSON: After "inspector," in line 7, the words "or to the chief inspector" should be inserted.

MR. GREGORY: It was no use notifying the Perth office of a goldfields accident.

MR. FRANK WILSON: By the clause the local inspector must be notified at his office or usual place of residence; but he might be absent for a week in some distant part of his district. If a notice was sent to the Chief Inspector he would then instruct the nearest inspector, presumably, to make inquiries.

THE MINISTER: If this Bill were only to apply to Perth and the immediate neighbourhood, he would agree with what the hon. member said, but its operation would extend over a territory almost one-third of Australia. It would cause undue delay to send any notice at all to the Chief Inspector in out-back places. The matter of getting at the inspector had been already considered. In another clause it was provided that the inspector should have an office. The present Inspector of Boilers had a well-known office, and he was notified of everything that took place which he required to know about. If the Inspector of Boilers were away, other arrangements would be made by which, in case of accident, inspection would take place immediately.

MR. GREGORY: There was a clerk in the office of the Inspector of Mines and Boilers.

THE MINISTER: There was a clerk to the Inspector of Boilers who could take steps, or, as in other places, the mining registrar or some other person would act. This was a matter that could be left to those administering the measure.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 51—agreed to.

Clause 52—Inquiry into cause of accident:

MR. WATTS intimated an amendment relating to Clause 6 to be moved on recommittal.

Clause passed.

Clause 53.—Drivers in charge of engines:

MR. E. E. HEITMANN: What examination would candidates have to pass

to obtain a certificate enabling them to be designated engineers?

THE MINISTER: The examination could not be exactly defined now, but the clause was specific. The candidate must, in the first place, have a first-class engine-driver's certificate, and doubtless the board which considered the question would see he was an efficient first-class engine-driver. In addition he must be able to fit and repair engines, and must have actually worked on the making or repairing of engines for a period of five years. Many engine-drivers took interest in all things of a mechanical nature, and spent a large amount of time in repairing machinery. Some of them had not had an opportunity of being apprenticed to engineering, but, on the goldfields especially, they had more varied opportunities of becoming acquainted with engineering things on a large scale than they would have in any of the ordinary engineering shops. In addition to driving engines, they could fit and repair them, and they were among the most useful people to be found in many parts of the goldfields. He hoped the clause would be passed as it stood, and that we would allow men who showed particular mechanical ability in the respect to which he had referred to come to the surface, that we would mark them in some particular way so that those in out-back places who wanted the services of a really first-class man would be able to select him on account of his certificate.

MR. HEITMANN moved as an amendment:

That all the words after "respectively," in line 10 to the end of paragraph, be struck out.

There was a vast difference between "engine-driver" and "engineer." A mine manager would not employ an engine-driver with an extra first-class certificate to erect machinery. An engineer, as a rule, must serve his time at the shop. The owner of one of those extra first-class certificates would not in any part of the world be admitted to an engineers' society.

MR. THOMAS: The amendment should be agreed to. He quoted from speeches of the present Minister for Works, present Chairman of Committees, and present Minister for Labour, made when a Bill was under discussion last session, to show that in every part of the world an engineer was looked on as one who had gone through training in a proper manner. It would be unfair, as the Minister for Railways and Labour stated last year, if a man who had only an opportunity of repairing his own engine were debarred from applying for this certificate, while a man who had never repaired engines, though employed in a repairing shop, was to be entitled, by passing a theoretical examination, to call himself an engineer. One would rather give an extra first-class certificate to an engine-driver who had shown his capacity in looking after an engine and repairing it if anything went wrong with it. We had lots of men in small mines who had a good deal of opportunity for effecting repairs and who were evidently better fitted to be termed engineers than the men referred to.

THE MINISTER: Those men were provided for in this clause.

MR. THOMAS: They were not.

THE MINISTER: The proposal was absurd in the extreme, and he must oppose it.

MR. GREGORY: It was to be hoped the Committee would pass the clause as it stood. He could understand a certain section of engine-drivers doing all they could to prevent other engine-drivers getting the extra certificate; but the idea of the clause was to cause a spirit of emulation amongst the engine-drivers to get them to try and learn all they could about machinery; and if there were better men, a higher certificate should be granted to them by the department. The clause provided that those who obtained this certificate must have practical experience in the workshop as fitters and repairers of machinery. These men would have to pass a special examination. If we passed the clause, engine-drivers would try and get this extra class of certificate.

MR. HEITMANN: How could they?

MR. GREGORY: By getting into a workshop and learning fitting.

MR. HEITMANN: Reading a good big book.

MR. GREGORY: We wanted men to try and obtain a knowledge of repairing and fitting and making themselves conversant with steam engines.

MR. SCADDAN: This was bringing down the standard of engineers.

MR. GREGORY: There was a large variety of electrical machinery used now, and it might be that the Government would provide that the applicant for this extra certificate should have a knowledge of electrical machinery.

MR. THOMAS: Last session those who voted on an amendment moved by Mr. Bath to allow an extra certificate to be given to an engineer with a knowledge of electrical engineering were Mr. Hastie, Mr. Holman, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Jacoby and Mr. Johnson. These members opposed the proposal of the then Minister for Mines for giving an extra first-class certificate to a man who had served five years in a workshop. He had no objection to giving a man some recognition for being an electrical engineer, but he had a decided objection to the proposal in the Bill.

MR. NEEDHAM: What was the definition of an engineer? He did not object to a man trying to get to the highest possible grade in his employment, but why not stop at the extra first-class certificate? If a man received the title of engineer, would he enter into competition with men who had spent a great deal of time in learning the profession of an engineer?

THE MINISTER: It was impossible to promise that those who obtained the extra first-class certificate would not enter into competition with those who had learnt the engineering trade, but if a man was working at repairing engines and making them, he was more competent than the ordinary certificated engineer, for there were a lot of duffers amongst certificated engineers. The ordinary engineer was not acquainted with all kinds of machines. There were mining engineers and underground engineers.

MR. THOMAS: The hon. member was an underground engineer.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw that remark.

MR. THOMAS: Certainly; but the Minister had included underground engineers as one of the professions.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member (the Minister) did not apply the remark to any member of the House, therefore he was not out of order.

THE MINISTER: This proposal had been the law in New Zealand for many years, and why should a man be deprived of being called an engineer if he could do the work which was specified?

MR. THOMAS: Why did the hon. member vote against the proposal last year?

THE MINISTER: The proposal he voted in favour of last year was that a man who had a knowledge of electrical engineering should get an extra certificate. What real objection was there to the clause?

MR. HEITMANN: What benefit would it give to any individual in the State?

THE MINISTER: The member for Cue was opposed to a person who had not served his time as an apprentice to the engineering trade receiving the title of engineer, but no reason was given. Did the hon. member want engineers to remain on the same footing always?

MR. HEITMANN: Certainly not, but the Minister was jumping two steps.

THE MINISTER: The desire was to allow men who were competent engineers to receive the title of engineer. Men should have an opportunity of getting some recognition of their ability. There were dozens of engine-drivers in the State who had an opportunity of working in shops, and if these men were competent as engineers, they should be allowed to obtain a certificate as such. No one suggested that it was proposed to bring down the qualifications of an engineer, and it was not proposed to give an engineer an engine-driver's certificate. It was provided in the clause that the holder of a first-class engine-driver's certificate who, for at least five years, had been actually employed in a workshop in the manufacture or repair of engines, or where work of a similar character was performed, should be entitled, after an examination, to receive a certificate, to be called an "extra first-class certificate," and the holder thereof should be designated an "engineer." Such a man should be allowed to call himself an engineer. Even without the clause such a man would call himself an engineer, and there was no power in the State to prevent his doing so.

MR. THOMAS: But the man would not have a Government certificate to that effect.

THE MINISTER: The man would be as competent as any engineer. The

majority of the Committee would not deprive competent engine-drivers from getting recognition for their qualifications.

MR. FRANK WILSON: We should not be asked to confer upon a man a title he could well take to himself. This part of the Bill was headed "Examination and Certificates of Engine-drivers," Why should we then go outside it? The Bill provided for first-class, second-class, third-class, and extra first-class engine-drivers. There was no need for so many classes. There were far too many. Though an engine-driver's certificate be granted it should not be an engineer's certificate. An engineer was not a man who drove an engine or was accustomed to using a hammer and chisel, but was a man who had served his time to the trade and gone through all the different departments in the shops, and a man who had some knowledge of marking out work and understood drawings, and who was to some extent a constructor—a man who understood the construction of machinery. This title of "engineer" provided in the clause was unnecessary. We were introducing too many classes. All that was necessary was to have first-class and second-class certificates. The Board of Trade in the old country issued a chief engineer's certificate and a second engineer's certificate only. The third engineer got no certificate. The second engineer could not get his certificate unless he served four years in the shops and one as third engineer at sea; and the second engineer could not obtain a chief engineer's certificate unless he had served the same period in the shops, one year as third engineer, and another year as second engineer. The chief engineer, if he were able to pass a stringent examination, might obtain an extra certificate. This was all for the large maritime pursuits embracing engines of incredible size, up to 20,000 horse power; but in Western Australia we were going to provide four classes of engine-drivers to drive the engines of the State. We were going to draw a line between the man working with hammer and chisel and the man, perhaps far more capable, who drove an engine, thus creating great complications and jealousy, and lowering the standard of the engineer altogether. If we were to have an engineer's examination for marine work, it should be a stringent examination on the lines of the Board of Trade. Why should we specify, in a third-class certificate, that the cylinder of the engine must not exceed 12 inches in diameter?

MR. GREGORY: It was easily understood by one knowing the circumstances.

MR. FRANK WILSON: It appeared that the Bill had not been thoroughly thought out, or if it had been thought out, it was thought out by someone who knew nothing about machinery.

THE MINISTER: Why did not the hon. member give the Committee some information?

MR. FRANK WILSON: Information was being given, but the Minister would not believe it. The Minister claimed every time that he (Mr. Wilson) was twisting or misrepresenting, because he (Mr. Wilson) was speaking above the Minister. He supported the amendment and hoped the Minister would take into serious consideration the striking out of the third-class certificate altogether, for then he (Mr. Wilson) would have pleasure in tabling a few amendments in a direction indicated.

MR. GREGORY: As the Minister who introduced the Bill last session, he could give the member for Sussex the reasons which actuated him in making provision for third-class certificates.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee was now dealing with an amendment to the clause prior to that part dealing with third-class certificates. The hon. member would have another opportunity of explaining.

MR. THOMAS: It was no reason to bring forward that these certificates would do no harm. They would do harm, though not in Western Australia, because people would know the circumstances under which they were granted, and would laugh at them, but other countries would not grant a certificate to a man calling himself a qualified engineer on the training required in this State.

MR. BOLTON: All loco. drivers were certificated engineers in America.

MR. THOMAS: The clause did not provide that a man should be employed in the manufacture or repairs of engines. All a man need to do was to go into a workshop and look around or be employed with pick and shovel, and he

would then be entitled to go up for examination.

MR. SCADDAN: Or the man might be employed attending to a thread-screwing machine.

MR. THOMAS: A man might never do a single day's work in connection with the manufacture or repairs of machinery, and yet would be entitled to go up for examination.

HON. W. C. ANGWIN: Could such man pass an examination?

MR. THOMAS: If the theoretical examination were on the same level as other examinations in this State, it could be passed by a man with very little knowledge. A man holding an engineer's certificate and proceeding to another part of the world would be armed with a certificate of the West Australian Government that he was a competent man, and that he had had five years' experience; and people would believe that the man had passed a stiff examination, so that they would be deluded as to his competency. It was a farce to ask the Committee to grant these engineer certificates. There were quite enough certificates already.

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

MR. M. F. TROY opposed the amendment, and took exception to the term "engineer," for which a substitute should be found. Some of those who on the fields called themselves engineers had no right to the title, the majority of them being fitters. The first-class certificate would be an incentive to greater efficiency. The member for Sussex (Mr. F. Wilson) said the English Act contained no such provision; but possibly we could improve on the English law, and this clause afforded an opportunity.

MR. THOMAS: *Hansard* showed that in a debate last year on a similar clause the present Minister for Works (Hon. W. D. Johnson) moved the insertion of the words "has been employed as an apprentice for at least five years"; and the then Minister for Mines (Mr. Gregory) said the amendment should not be pressed, as that was hardly the best place for the words proposed, though he would not oppose the amendment; that his object in drafting the clause was to make it easier to gain a certificate; and that if the clause passed, the Government would bring in an amendment containing the words "has been employed as an apprentice." The amendment was then withdrawn, and the present Minister for Labour (Hon. J. B. Holman) moved another amendment to render eligible a man who had repaired the engine on which he was engaged. He (Mr. Thomas) then said that after the Minister promised to provide that none but a properly indentured man should get a certificate, there was no need for Mr. Holman's amendment or for that of which he (Mr. Thomas) had given notice. The member for Menzies (Mr. Gregory), and all the Labour members, had expressed satisfaction with the exhaustive debate of last year; and it was to be hoped the present Committee would not give way.

MR. FRANK WILSON: From the member for Dundas he understood that the British Board of Trade provided that an applicant for an engineer's certificate must produce his indentures, or a certificate from his employers that he had served at least four years in a workshop.

The MINISTER: The clause was designed to encourage engine-drivers who had opportunities of fitting and repairing engines to gain certificates of competency. With this certain members agreed, but curiously enough objected to such persons being called engineers, and seemed to think this a new idea. For years the term had been used in New Zealand; it was used in most of the American States, and in many other countries; and no one suggested an alternative term.

MR. BOLTON: Call the men what they really were—engine-drivers.

THE MINISTER: No; for they would be competent engineers, with five years' experience of repairing, fitting, and manufacturing engines; and an engine fitter always called himself an engineer. Surely the board of experts would be better able than hon. members to decide on candidates' qualifications.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND: Apparently supporters of the amendment wished to prevent a man from qualifying for an advance in status. Whether a man had served his time or not, if after taking out an engine-driver's certificate he was employed in shops a certain time and studied to qualify himself to undergo an

examination by men fitted to examine him, he should have opportunity of advancing himself.

MR. P. J. LYNCH: One would like the Chairman's ruling whether the amendments on the Notice Paper took precedence over casual amendments such as had been moved by the member for Cue.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the amendment moved by the member for Cue (Mr. Heitmann) were passed, it would be evidence of the opinion of the Committee or a majority of the Committeee that these certificates should not be granted. Therefore it would then be futile for the hon. member for Mt. Leonora to move an amendment to restrict the period to three years. In the event of the amendment by the member for Cue being defeated, the hon. member would have the right to move his amendment in the direction he desired. As to the farther amendments on the Notice Paper, the hon. member could deal with them when they came up.

MR. A. J. WILSON: Whilst not posing as an engineeer, he claimed to have some little experience of matters concerning trades unionists, and apparently a vital principle affecting the organisation of the trades union movement was involved in this particular clause. It was hardly fair that a man who had worked for a given period as specified in this clause in connection with certain machinery should, simply from his association with that class of work, be entitled to be classed as something which in all probability he might not be—an engineer. There should be some distinction for a higher grade certificate being held by a man who in addition to being a first-class engine-driver was also an engineer, a man who had served an apprenticeship. A man might have been a thousand and one things in an engineer's shop and still not be an engineer, and we should protect those people who had served their indentures.

HON. W. C. ANGWIN: It seemed strange that a man who had a first-class engine-driver's certificate and had spent five years in a workshop repairing or manufacturing engines should be debarred from having this extra first-class certificate as proposed, unless earlier in life he had served an apprenticeship to this calling. Not long ago it was asked whether it was possible in the case of certain callings or professions to enable people who had not served an apprenticeship to enter those callings or professions. Members should give every man an equal and fair show, and this measure provided for that. A number objected to the word "engineer." The usual term applied to a man of this description was "fitter." Before one could stand for examination to obtain this extra first-class certificate he must for some years previously have taken active part and have studied the question very closely in relation to the manufacture and repair of machinery.

MR. THOMAS: A man was not bound to have done that, but could get the certificate after being engaged a specified time in the workshop where that work was done.

HON. W. C. ANGWIN: Unless a person had been employed either in manufacture or repairs he could not have the certificate. This measure would not only be beneficial to the men employed on the goldfields but also to the men in other towns of Western Australia.

MR. H. E. BOLTON: The more discussion he heard, the more determined he was to support the amendment. The proposal in the clause did not give men equal opportunity. An apprentice to a mechanical trade started at 16 or 17 years of age and put in five years at it, and then if he went up for examination and obtained a first-class certificate, he would get the extra first-class certificate, whereas under the previous clauses of this Bill a youth of 18 could take charge of machinery and put in five years working at that machinery, but in 25 years from then he could not obtain this extra first-class certificate, because he started as an engine-driver instead of being connected with machinery in a workshop. In five years the Minister for Justice could no more be a lawyer than he was to-day, nor was it possible for one connected with a shop in which machinery was working or being repaired to become an engineer in five years merely through such connection. Under the Bill, however, if one worked in a shop at whatever they liked to put him to for five years, he would be entitled to an extra first-class certificate. [Mr. GREGORY: No.] It was so. He did not deny that it was an advantage to have a fitter or what was termed an engineer as an engine-driver. Probably such man was better for a great

many things than an ordinary engine-driver, but surely that should not give him the right to an extra first-class ticket, and to be designated an engineer. Fitters were tried as locomotive drivers in England and proved to be failures. The Board of Trade would not allow them to go on with it, because they were not successful. He would have liked an amendment to cut out the words after "certificate."

MR. W. NELSON: Apparently there was a mere difference about a word, and he would suggest that instead of using the word "engineer," which seemed so very obnoxious to some of the engineers present——

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not use that expression with regard to members of the Committee.

MR. NELSON withdrew the remark. The use of the words "mechanical engine-driver" might meet the case. The difficulty might be surmounted by selecting some designation which, without confounding such a man as that referred to with an engineer, would make reference to special mechanical skill.

MR. P. J. LYNCH was surprised that so many members objected to so desirable a provision. It was to the credit of the late Government that a similar clause was included in the Machinery Bill brought forward last session. The arguments had been used that an engine-driver who had served three years in the manufacture and making of engines did not hold a qualification as an engineer, but such was the qualification in New South Wales and Victoria. Members should not throw obstacles in the way of young men getting on; we should recognise skill wherever it was found. The representatives of the Engineers' Association were silent on this matter, and that silence should be taken as an indication that the clause did not lower the status of the calling. On some of the mines there were a number of men who had never served indentures, but who were to all intents and purposes engineers, dealing with the erection of machinery and the supervision of all repairs. A man who had served three years in the manufacture of engines had, to all intents and purposes, been indentured, and he was as competent as the man in New South Wales or Victoria. The British Board of Trade only required a service of four years. It was his intention to move a farther amendment that the term of five years be reduced to three, bringing the clause into line with the law of New South Wales and Victoria. It would be impossible for some men to serve five years continuously. Members should not stand in the way of young men making progress.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The member for Forrest had stated that young men who at an early age were apprenticed to a trade should have the monopoly of that trade, and it was not in keeping with trade unionism that anyone else should have anything to do with the business engaged in. He was sorry that any member took up that position, for it was intended at an early date to bring in a measure to liberalise the legal profession, and not give those who had been apprenticed early in life a monopoly of that profession. He was doubtful now if it was worth while bringing in such a measure, as those who wished to avail themselves of it were the greatest opponents to the proposal before the Committee. He agreed with the member for Leonora that in other parts of the world persons who passed such an examination as that provided for became engineers.

MR. HEITMANN: In what part of the world?

THE MINISTER: In New South Wales, in Victoria, in New Zealand, and he believed in some parts of America.

MR. THOMAS: In New South Wales a person had to be apprenticed for five years.

MR. HEITMANN did not intend to prevent a man rising in his trade; but amongst engine-drivers a first-class certificate was all that was needed. A man could go no higher, for he could take charge of a winding engine with such a certificate. If a man wished to become an engineer, he then entered a different branch of trade. How would the fitter who had been working for years get on? A fitter was competent to drive an engine, but was not allowed to do so as he did not hold a first-class certificate. Let men rise, by all means, but let them rise as fitters or engineers: the two trades were far apart. He wished to refer to a statement made in the House by the late Minister for Mines, for it appeared that

whenever a Labour member moved an amendment or spoke to an amendment he was said to be prompted by some low-down trades union. That had become, with the late Minister for Mines, a regular parrot cry. On the second reading of the Bill the hon. member could not let the opportunity pass without blurting it out.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the clause.

MR. HEITMANN: There were just as honourable men in trade unions as in the associations which the late Minister for Mines represented.

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

Ayes	...	...	12
Noes	...	...	20
Majority against	...		8

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Angwin
Mr. Horan	Mr. Burges
Mr. Isdell	Mr. Carson
Mr. Layman	Mr. Cowcher
Mr. Needham	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Scaddan	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Watts	Mr. Gregory
Mr. A. J. Wilson	Mr. Hastie
Mr. F. F. Wilson	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Frank Wilson	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Bolton *(Teller)*.	Mr. Holman
	Mr. Johnson
	Mr. Lynch
	Mr. McLarty
	Mr. Nelson
	Mr Quinlan
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Troy
	Mr. Gill *(Teller)*.

Amendment thus negatived.

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

That the word "five" in line 7 be struck out, and "three" inserted in lieu.

Men who would particularly avail themselves of this provision would be employed in the mining industry, and employment in that industry could not be depended upon to run continuously. A man might be thrown out of work on one mine, and he should be allowed to qualify with a smaller period, such as three years, as was provided for in New South Wales.

THE MINISTER could sympathise with the proposal of the hon. member, but a period of five years was arranged for in order to meet a strong objection that would be advanced against these certificates unless an ordinary apprenticeship period was served. New Zealand legislation established the precedent of five years. Men holding these certificates should be men of whom there could be no doubt. It was true that five years would be a long period on the goldfields, but it need not be a continuous five years.

MR. LYNCH: The word "workshop" was used, and the presumption was that it must be the same workshop.

MR. GREGORY: The same workshop was not meant.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

THE MINISTER: The member for Mt. Leonora, before moving any farther amendment, should perceive that the wording provided that the man must be actually employed in a workshop. If it said, "any workshop," the man might have to start afresh should the workshop in which he started be burnt down or removed.

MR. GREGORY: Continuous service in a particular workshop was not required, and an amendment altering the wording to "any workshop" would not make the meaning clearer.

MR. HEITMANN: This clause would prevent many people from obtaining the great honour conferred by these certificates. We should not prevent fitters from gaining the honour. They learnt their trade and spent years in the shops.

THE MINISTER: A fitter who could show he was an engine-driver and could pass the examination could become an engineer.

MR. HEITMANN: The engine-driver must have twelve months on an engine, but the fitter, though more competent than the man on the engine, might never drive an engine.

THE MINISTER: A fitter could not obtain a certificate because he would not be competent to drive an engine; but if the fitter did show he was capable of being entrusted with an engine and had all the other qualifications, he could get an extra first-class certificate.

THE CHAIRMAN: The proposition of the member for Mt. Leonora should be discussed first.

MR. LYNCH moved as an amendment:

That the words "or workshops" be added after "workshop," in line 8.

THE MINISTER: The amendment was not necessary. If the hon. member would

withdraw the amendment, the Crown Solicitor would be consulted as to whether or not the words "a workshop" covered the object desired by the hon. member.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

MR. THOMAS moved an amendment:

That the words "or where work of a similar character is performed," in line 9, be struck out.

The Committee had decided that the extra first-class certificate should be granted to none but men who had five years' experience in a workshop; and the evident intention was that the candidates must have been employed in actually manufacturing or repairing engines, and not merely as labourers. The amendment would make this clear by providing that they must be employed in either repairing or manufacturing engines. "Work of a similar character" would include pick and shovel work if done in a workshop where engines were being repaired or manufactured.

THE MINISTER: It was time to stop this way of doing things. The hon. member admitted he had the same clause before him last year; and yet he moved this amendment without notice. The Committee should pass the clause as printed. Surely none would support the hon. member's fantastic interpretation, that the words "similar work" meant work of a different character. Members should not countenance such explorations of the realms of fancy.

MR. THOMAS: Several members agreed with his interpretation, that if a man were employed either in manufacturing or repairing an engine, or employed in the workshop where that class of work or similar work was being done, no matter whether he was or was not employed in manufacturing or repairing, he was entitled to enter for examination.

MR. F. F. WILSON (North Perth): The need for the words "work of a similar character" was not obvious. Surely "similar character" meant the manufacturing or repairing of engines.

MR. GREGORY: The clause was thus worded to include persons employed in large workshops on the mines, instead of confining the candidates to persons employed in foundries where engines were manufactured or repaired. A mine workshop might be called a "semi-foundry," and by the clause a man employed there for five years could enter for the extra examination. To strike out the words indicated would make no difference.

MR. FRANK WILSON: The interpretations of the last speaker and the Minister seemed incorrect. It was impossible to maintain that a man's having been employed in a workshop in which similar work was carried on necessarily meant that he must have been employed at making or repairing engines. "Work of a similar character" should be struck out. He (Mr. Wilson) objected to the Minister's threatening the Committee by saying, "We must stop this way of doing things." If the Minister had given members time to study the Bill, he might have had all these amendments on the Notice Paper; but he threw the Bill on the table and asked us to pass it, and now members saw for the first time these absurdities. On the showing of the member for Menzies the words objected to were unnecessary. What good could they do there? They might do much harm.

MR. NEEDHAM: Where was the consistency of the member for Dundas? Any man working in a shop where engines were being made or repaired ought to be allowed to enter for examination.

MR. THOMAS: The Committee had decided against that.

MR. NEEDHAM: No; against the inclusion of the words "an engineer." Passing the amendment would prevent men employed in those workshops from competing, and would bar their progress, though they might have been employed in all kinds of occupations connected with the actual manufacture of engines and their parts.

MR. SCADDAN: The words objected to were necessary, but were in the wrong place. "In the manufacture and repair of engines" should be inserted between "employed" and "in a workshop." This would be clear; but as the clause stood, even a labourer could compete for a certificate.

MR. THOMAS: The Minister had stated that the only reason why the amendment should be defeated was that it was moved without having been placed on the Notice Paper. The hon. gentleman knew however that this point had come up during the last two or three

hours. He (Mr. Thomas) was not going to be told by the Minister, nor anybody else occupying a position on the Ministerial bench, what amendments he should move. His privileges as a member of the Committee were laid down in the Standing Orders, which guided the Chairman and also the Speaker. Whilst in the House he would not allow the Minister to attempt to usurp the privileges of the man placed at the head of affairs, either in Committee or in full House, by telling us what we should do during the progress of a Bill through Committee. It was the Minister's own fault that amendments were being moved at the last minute, because the hon. gentleman did not give sufficient time to enable members to study the Bill so that amendments could be placed on the Notice Paper. He protested against dictation by the Minister, and would not submit to it.

THE MINISTER: The hon. member had had 14 months since the matter was before Parliament. Now the hon. member said he only thought of the matter when some other person brought it up an hour or two ago.

MR. THOMAS: Nothing of the sort was said by him.

THE MINISTER: The hon. member might like to have the Bill adjourned until next year, so that he might have farther opportunity of thinking over the matter.

MR. THOMAS: Members had only one week.

THE MINISTER: Fourteen months. Only a few hours ago the hon. member found out this tremendous danger. The member for Ivanhoe said the clause might be better worded. The intention of the Government was, as the member for Menzies indicated, to give people working in the engine-shops on the goldfields and similar places an opportunity of qualifying. The Government would seriously consider the wording of the clause, and if they could improve it on the lines the hon. member indicated, they would do so.

MR. THOMAS: Why did not the Minister say that before?

Amendment put and negatived.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from the 20th September; Hon. W. C. Angwin in charge of the Bill.

MR. N. J. MOORE (Bunbury): In my capacity as president of the Municipal Association I should like to take this opportunity of thanking the Government for so promptly introducing this amending Bill dealing with the Municipal Institutions Act of 1900. I have no doubt this promptitude is owing to the fact that we have in the Ministry two gentlemen who have ever taken a deep interest in municipal matters, and also an interest in the Municipal Association to which I have the honour to belong. I am pleased that some adjournment was made in connection with this debate in order to allow some of the municipalities an opportunity of considering the various clauses of the Bill. Prior to our going into Committee the member for East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) stated that the bulk of the amendments of the present Act had been adopted from the Bill finally passed at the Bunbury Conference of last month; and as these conferences include representatives from every municipality in the State I feel sure the result of their deliberations will receive every consideration from this House. I would like to say just here that an impression appears to prevail in some quarters that these conferences are only picnics; but I can assure members they are nothing of the sort. I feel sure that those members who attended the recent conference will bear me out when I say these clauses received greater consideration than similar measures receive when they are before this House. It was stated by the introducer of the Bill that it was the outcome of the various Municipal Conferences, but I cannot altogether agree with him, as many clauses have been included in this Bill which radically alter our municipal law, and which did not come before the association. I will deal with those later on. At the recent conference it was agreed that the majority should rule in important questions; but at the same time it was certainly understood that members did not pledge themselves to support the Bill in Parliament altogether. In regard to

the amendments in connection with Sections 52 and 55, they certainly are not those which were passed by the conference. The first amendment of any importance deals with the repeal of Section 40 of the principal Act. The amending Bill requires that any candidate for the office of mayor shall have had at least 12 months' municipal experience either as mayor or councillor, within this State. This clause was carried by the conference after very earnest consideration and discussion. The majority of the delegates considered this a very necessary qualification, more especially in the smaller municipalities, where, unless the mayor is a practical man, he really becomes a figure-head. In larger municipalities perhaps it is not so necessary, owing to the fact that the mayor has competent officers to advise him in regard to the various duties, and that a great deal of the work of the municipal council is done in committee. I intend to support the Bill, although I understand there is a probability that an attempt will be made to strike out this clause when in Committee. During the discussion on this clause many of the members expressed a desire for provision to be made that the mayor should be elected from among the councillors. This has been adopted in various States, but I do not think it would be suitable in this State, more especially in the smaller towns. I think it would have a tendency to create cliques in the council. The average number of members in a council in this State is nine, and the chances are that the man elected as mayor would be chosen by five members including himself, whilst his opponent would probably have four votes; and therefore I do not think it would be advisable.

MR. SCADDAN: They take it in turns, in the other States.

MR. HOPKINS: Irrespective of capacity?

MR. N. J. MOORE: It would be against the best working of these bodies, whereas if the mayor were elected by the whole of the ratepayers of the municipality he would be in a more independent position, and consequently not under obligation to any section of the councillors. The mayoral chair should in my opinion be the blue-ribbon of municipal life. To me it seems hard for a man who has served as councillor faithfully and well, and has worked vigorously in the interests of the ratepayers, to be put on one side for a man who has had no municipal experience, but who has a certain social position and the means to secure his election to that office. We have had one example of what has occurred under such circumstances as those I have spoken of at a place not very distant from Perth. I do not think any member would contend that the Speaker should be elected from new members here, and I think the same reasons which would influence a vote in that direction would be apparent in this case. The mayor is supposed not only to have a fair knowledge of debate, but in the smaller municipalities especially he is expected to lead the council, and be an authority not only on municipal law but on all questions of municipal work. Clause 13 of the Bill is a reasonable one. The only alteration it makes in the principal Act is that instead of the two auditors being elected annually, only one shall retire each year.

THE SPEAKER: I wish to take this opportunity of making a remark with regard to second-reading speeches. In second-reading speeches we are supposed to debate only the principles contained in the Bill. Members can refer to principles contained in the clauses or to the provisions in the Bill. In order to prevent second-reading debates from degenerating practically into Committee discussion, I should like members to refrain entirely from referring to particular clauses in a measure. As it is probable there may be some long discussion upon this Municipalities Bill, I have taken this opportunity to make these remarks regarding the position I intend to take in connection with second-reading debates. I hope the hon. member will refrain from referring to particular clauses by their number, though of course he may refer to the provisions contained in the clauses.

MR. N. J. MOORE: Provision is made in this Bill for one elector one vote. I cannot indicate the clause, but if hon. members look they will see what it is. This provision appears to be the result of a confusion of ideas as to the relative objects of parliamentary government and municipal government. Parliamentary government is established for the benefit

of the whole people, whereas municipal government is established to control the expenditure of special funds for special purposes. The Bill appears to give the man who contributes say 5s. to the municipal revenue a greater say in the expenditure than it gives to the man who contributes say £100 annually. The system of one man one vote opens the door to the possibility of a number of irresponsible electors, who may be mere birds of passage, saddling a municipality with liabilities of a very questionable value. Undue excitement at the time of an election may perhaps ultimately cause burdens to fall on those having a solid interest in a municipality's welfare. I say also the scheme will introduce into the municipal council room an atmosphere of politics and party which cannot be too strongly deprecated. Another provision that has been inserted in the Bill deals with voters who have paid their rates up to the 30th October, that is the end of the financial year. I think that might be altered in Committee. It is an awkward time of the year, for at that time the clerical staff would be pretty well occupied in preparing the audit, and they would not be able to give sufficient time to preparing the rolls that are necessary. The next important alteration in the Bill deals with the repeal of certain sections of the Act as to voting in absence. This was carried at the Municipal Conference, but personally I think there is an objection to the clause, and that objection might be removed by a slight alteration enabling persons who are *bona fide* residents of municipalities to record their votes within a certain time before the elections. Take members of the Assembly who have interests in municipalities. Most of the elections are held on Wednesdays, and it seems hard that members should either have to neglect their legislative duties or be disfranchised. That provision might be altered in Committee. The various clauses dealing with the width of streets I think are very necessary. There is one provision that enables a street half a chain wide being extended at that width if necessary. Under the present Act if it is necessary to extend a street which is half a chain wide, it must be extended at a width of one chain or the plan of the subdivision will not be passed by the municipal council. Provisions are also contained in the Bill to define corner posts. That is very necessary. Trouble and inconvenience are often caused owing to the removal of corner posts. With reference to the clause that provides for doing away with police court fines, I do not know why the provision in the Act has been struck out. It has been contained in the Municipal Act since the first law was passed in this State. I can hardly understand the position of the Premier in regard to this. I could imagine him as mayor of Subiaco being strongly opposed to this clause and in favour of its being struck out, while like the Pooh-Bah in the "Mikado," as Treasurer of the State he would warmly support it. In Committee I hope the Treasurer will think of some compromise being effected. The municipal councils might divide the fine with the Government. I think that a reasonable compromise.

THE PREMIER: The Government have to pay the police force.

MR. MOORE: The municipalities find light, and the Government buildings do not pay rates at all. There is a very important clause dealing with unimproved values. For rating purposes the unimproved value is no doubt the proper system in closely settled communities, but it is not wise to make the system compulsory with all municipalities: the new clause makes the system optional. It is provided that if any council adopts the system of rating on the capital unimproved value it must be adhered to for at least three years. I think it is advisable to make the system optional in order that councils may have an opportunity of comparing the revenue which they would receive under the unimproved system with the revenue they receive at present on the annual improved value. I understand a comparison was made by the city of Perth and it was found that 2d. in the £ on the unimproved capital value produced more than 1s. 6d. in the £ on the annual improved value. I think making the provision optional will enable the various municipalites to go into the question as to how their revenue under the unimproved value will compare with the present system on the annual improved value. With regard to the clause dealing with the valuation of tramways

and the valuation of gas mains and electric lines, this is a matter which I should like to have some information upon in Committee. It seems hardly fair that a company with a cable capable of supplying ten thousand lights should only have to pay as much as the owner of a cable which would only supply current for a few lamps. That is a little detail which we may give consideration to in Committee. The mode of making a valuation is practically identical with the system existing at present; no doubt we shall have a very interesting debate on the second portion of the clause dealing with this matter. There is another clause in which there is a very necessary alteration enabling ratepayers to pay the first moiety of rates, instead of, as under the present Act, which differs from the schedule, paying the whole of the rates. The clause also gives the seme power to the Revision Court as a court of law possesses in reference to the administration of the oath. There is a clause dealing with appeals from decisions of the Local Court, and I think it might be as well to leave this provision over until we have received the report of the select committee on the Local Courts Bill as to what it is proposed shall be the jurisdiction of the Local Courts. If the jurisdiction of a Local Court is extended, I do not think it will be necessary to have appeals beyond that court. The schedule amends the principal Act considerably, and one section is amended by inserting after "necessary" the words, "having regard to the profits on any of the undertakings." This seemingly slight alteration is, to my mind, one that requires a deal of consideration. Although many schemes may seem profitable at their inception, I certainly think it would not be wise to amend the clause in the direction indicated. I may be allowed to quote from a very able article, in a leading newspaper, dealing with municipal profits. The article says:—

> This question too of profits, present or prospective, on remunerative works has led to endless discussion, and doubts have arisen in many quarters whether they do not too often exist rather on paper than in actual fact. There are, for instance, suggestions that in regard to many speculative enterprises undertaken by local authorities sufficient allowance is not made for depreciation, reserve, sinking fund, or other items, while too high a value is put on available assets; and it is alleged that, if municipal accounts of trading enterprises were always made up on commercial lines, they would often show very different results from those represented. At Sheffield, for instance, it was reported that a nett profit of £32,000 had been made on the working of the tramways for the year ended March; but this amount was simply the difference between income and expenditure without providing anything for contingencies. No allowance whatever had been made for depreciation, although in a debate on the subject in the city council one member had argued that the amount of depreciation which ought to be allowed for was £35,000 per annum, while another member suggested that by unsound book-keeping one might make a business show a magnificent profit, while all the time it ought to be in the hands of the official receiver.

The New Zealand Act, to which we look to a large extent for guidance in this legislation, provides for interest and sinking fund whether the undertaking be profitable or otherwise. I hope the proposal will receive every consideration. There is good reason why the Act is amended.

MEMBER: The present Bill provides for sinking fund.

MR. MOORE: I understood by the explanation of the Minister that if an undertaking is estimated to be profitable there is no need to provide interest and sinking fund.

MR. H. BROWN: The Act compels a municipality to strike a rate here.

MR. MOORE: If the profits are realised the amount may be diverted to the purchase of debentures. There is another provision in the principal Act also reducing the rate. If the estimated profits fall short of expectations and the deficiency needs to be made up, it can be obtained from the general instead of the loan rate. Any tampering with the provisions of Section 379 of the principal Act will practically amount to a breach of faith with the council's creditors, and cannot fail to depreciate the debentures and increase the interest on future loans. I do not see any reason for striking out the proviso in the section dealing with candidates withdrawing after nomination: unnecessary expense and trouble would result from it. As I stated before in regard to voting in absence, I think this provision might well be simplified to benefit residents who happen to be away from the polling-place on the day of election.

There are several other provisions which I hope to have the opportunity of debating in Committee. One clause provides that, in addition to the statement of receipts and expenditure, there shall also be a statement showing assets and liabilities. This is a wise provision; but I think it should be stated in the Bill what should constitute an asset--whether Government reserves granted to municipalities are assets. I hope a clause will be inserted in Committee defining what assets shall be in the balance-sheet. I have endeavoured to place before the House in as short a manner as possible the reasons I have for supporting several clauses in the Bill. Unfortunately, I was under the impression that I might have gone more into detail with the various clauses. In many cases, the Bill is a departure from former practice, especially in regard to the election of mayor and auditors, and in regard to the rating of land values, as well as the proposed alteration which did not emanate from the Municipal Association, as regards limiting the voting of ratepayers. There are many good features in the Bill; and I can assure members that in dealing with the propositions that came before the association at the annual conferences, a large amount of good was done. Members of Parliament, although representing their particular councils, did not pledge themselves to support every clause in this amending Bill. I am certain that the introduction of this Bill will do good; and if the whole of the clauses are not carried out, those that are passed by the House will, I feel, be such as will be of benefit, not to one individual municipality, but to the whole of the municipalities of Western Australia.

[A pause ensued.]

MR. T. F. QUINLAN (Toodyay): There is evidently not much desire to speak on the subject before the House; but I wish to offer a word or two. In the first place I must express my surprise at the proposed innovation in regard to voting for mayor. I agree in every respect with the Bill so far as the provision that the mayor must have been a councillor for a period is concerned. It is essential that some such provision should be made, although in Perth we have had excellent mayors who have not had prior experience in the council. This is a good proposal, because we shall have persons with experience offering their services. Certainly, by the present system we have some offering who are not at all desirable, and this warrants the Government in moving in this direction. I shall heartily support them in the proposition; but I cannot entirely agree with the proposal to to have one vote for the election of mayor as well as the election of a councillor. I consider councillors are in a different position altogether from members of Parliament. Councils represent the domestic life of the people, and particularly property, and I think that votes should be in accord with the property held by ratepayers. I am not entirely bound to four votes for mayor, but I think there should be a distinction between the small property holder and the large property holder. In Committee I intend to move in the direction of having one vote for ratepayers owning property up to £50, and two votes for a ratepayer owning property worth more than £50. I must take exception to the provision of allowing one vote only for the election of mayor.

HON. W. C. ANGWIN: Property owners are more protected in this Bill than in the previous Bills on the subject.

MR. QUINLAN: Yes; so far as loans are concerned. I am glad of that. Those resonsible for the amount of the loan raised should be those with the most voice in raising it; and I congratulate the Government in that respect so far as this measure is concerned. The principal item in the Bill is the proposed change in the method of valuations. I have always been an advocate of rating on the capital value of land, irrespective of improvements. I advocated it in the old Chamber, and I have advocated it in the Perth City Council for years, because I think it is harsh on those enterprising enough to erect structures to immediately tax them for their enterprise, as has been the case here, while the other man sits by idly waiting for his neighbour to increase the value of his holding. I think this is a wise provision. It will mean, in other words, a system of rating on what is known as the frontage system. That cannot be made perfect; and I see no better means of meeting the case than the proposed capital valuation system.

Perhaps the question of revenue will necessarily have to be considered, as to what the amount of the rating should be to raise sufficient revenue; but I feel certain it would be the fairest system to have. For my part I shall be glad to support this proposed change in the rating system. I think Subclause (*f*) of Clause 24 should be made definite, instead of having the words "and not exceeding £10 per centum." It is 7½ per cent. at present, and I think that should be ample. It should be made definite that it shall be 7½ per cent. I think 10 per cent. too high. In Committee we should see the wisdom of amending this proposal.

THE PREMIER: The Municipal Association recommended 15 per cent.

MR. QUINLAN: I am rather surprised to hear that. I have been informed that this is not a measure emanating from the Municipal Association, but is purely a Government measure. I think 7½ per cent. should be ample, and I have had sufficient experience in municipal life to warrant me in saying so. We should fix it at 7½ per cent. I believe every provision should be given to councils to protect life and property. In this Bill I notice it is proposed to extend power with regard to nuisances. I am in accord with that. At present chimney-stacks are a nuisance, and under the present Act municipalities have not sufficient power to prevent persons doing injury to their neighbours in this direction. I am in accord with the council having farther powers in this regard. The Bill is good, and only needs careful consideration from members who, I feel sure, will do justice to the various municipalities throughout the State.

MR. W. NELSON (Hannans): I have pleasure in offering some observations on the Bill before the House. First of all I should like to say that I join issue entirely with many of the observations which, unfortunately, fell from the lips of the member for Bunbury (Mr. N. J. Moore). I regret to find that, with the conservatism characteristic of that unfortunate locality, he offers strenuous objection to the more liberal elements of this Bill. For example, I find that, at all events, he supports the provision that a mayor ought to be a member of a municipal council for at least one year prior to his election. I hold that this provision is unwise and unfair, because it limits the choice of the electors. I am of the opinion that, if there should be a council containing about half-a-dozen stupid fellows, and if there should be an exceedingly able man outside who has never been in the council, it is utterly unfair and unwise to compel electors to select one of the stupid men in preference to the man outside. I think that nothing should be done in a matter of that kind to limit the choice of the electors. I shall take as an instance the municipality of Kalgoorlie. For the last three years the mayoral chair has been occupied by a gentleman who, despite the fact that he is guilty of differing from myself on political questions, is, I believe, universally recognised as a man of great capacity, and one who has done the work appertaining to his position with great success, and with the acceptance of the great majority of the people. In fact, I go farther and say that during the period there has not been a man in that council who could have carried on the duties of the office as successfully as he has done. Yet, with this suggestion adopted the man, in spite of his undoubted capacity, could not have occupied the position and done the work he has done during the last three years. I hold farther that it is an exceedingly unwise provision to compel electors to select, it may be, a relatively imperfect and relatively objectionable man if there happens to be a better man open to the choice of the electors. Again, I regret that in connection with this Bill the form of taxation has not been made compulsory. The Bill, I believe, makes it optional whether a tax for local rating shall be derived from property in general or from unimproved land values. I am of opinion that we should do here what has been done in Queensland, and make it compulsory for the municipality to raise its revenue entirely from a tax on unimproved land values. That system has been in operation in Queensland for nearly 15 years, during which time I have never heard of any person with a reputation to lose who has even suggested departing from the system. The system is a good one anywhere; but it is particularly good in a young and growing community like this. I think it a misfortune that those values

which are created not by the persons who speculate in them but by the industry, the ability, the enterprise of the people of this country—that those enormous land values created by the community, values which should be utilised for the well-being of the community, should be permitted to go into the pockets of private persons, to be devoted to their private ends. And I think it may be possible in Committee—and I trust it will be—to amend in the manner I have indicated the clauses having reference to taxation. I am of opinion that if we can settle in a Bill like this the question of taxation, it will then be much easier to settle the question of the franchise. So long as taxation is derived from property in general, there may be some kind of justification for the system of property voting. But on the other hand, if we make local taxation rest entirely on unimproved land values, then we lay down a principle which absolutely justifies our placing the franchise on a one-adult-one-vote basis. And I will try to tell the House why. I know that some people who do not understand this question are under the impression that a tax on unimproved land values is paid by the landlord, and is a tax which, while directly paid by the landlord, may, if the landlord thinks fit, be transferred to his tenant. Many people are under the impression that if we impose a tax on unimproved land values, the landlord can get out of the difficulty by making the tenant pay the tax. But no man with the slightest knowledge of the merest elements of political economy can ever entertain that absurdity. Rent, or, if you like, the unimproved value of land, is determined, like most other things, by supply and demand. The unimproved value of the land in Perth to-day, for example, is entirely determined by the area of that land and the number of people who desire it. If Perth should, say in the next quarter of a century, become as large a town as Melbourne, then the unimproved land values of Perth would be as great as the unimproved land values of Melbourne are to-day. In other words, it is population which imparts to that land its value; and just in proportion as the demand for that land grows as a result of the increase of population, so will those values advance. Hence it is utterly impossible for the landlord to alter that fact. Seeing that land values are determined by the proportion between the supply of and the demand for land, and seeing that any tax the State may impose on the landlord does not alter the proportion existing between that supply and demand, then it inevitably follows that the landlord cannot by any possibility shift the tax from his own shoulders to the shoulders of anybody else. I think that fact is tolerably clear and will be admitted; and it follows that it is not the landlord at all who ultimately pays the tax; that the tax, although it may come direct from the pocket of the landlord, comes ultimately from the people themselves. In other words, the community as a community—every person who labours—pays the tax. Even the land values of Perth are not created by the people who live in Perth. The fact that Kalgoorlie exists has made Perth what it is to-day; in fact, it may be said that if one desires to know thoroughly and to realise adequately the enormous effect which the discovery of gold has had in this wonderful State, one must visit, not the mines of Kalgoorlie, but the streets of Perth. Every man who labours in this community contributes to that result, whether he works in an office or in a mine; even if he is connected with agriculture—because I admit that even the agriculturist contributes in his humble way his share to the wealth of this State. Yes; and I go farther. I recognise, and believe that the other goldfields members are wise enough to recognise, that great as is the mining industry, it is ultimately only a pioneer industry; an industry that paves the way for others. And we mining members believe just as sincerely as agricultural members that the day is bound to come when our great gold mines will be exhausted, and when the prosperity of this State will possibly depend on those agricultural resources which will remain when the mines have passed away. However, I shall not be present to take any interest in the proceedings. I hope I have made it clear that land values are created by the people; therefore a tax on unimproved land values is really a tax on the whole of the people, is really taking from the whole of the people what they produce, to be used for the promotion of

the well-being of the whole of the people. If that is so, then if we introduce in this Bill the principle of taxing on unimproved land values; if we make it compulsory to derive municipal revenue from that source only; we not only lay down an admirable system of taxation, a system which will have for its ultimate effect the throwing into use of land not now being used, and therefore encouraging the industrial activities of the whole State; we shall not only have a better system of taxation, but shall have laid down a principle which will enable us consistently, fairly, and honestly to say, "Now that we have a tax which all the people are paying, we should have a franchise which will enable all the people to elect the councillors who will govern in municipalities." I therefore submit it will be wise for the Minister in charge of the Bill to accept in Committee amendments with that object. I am glad to find, for example, that the member for Perth (Mr. H. Brown) is pledged to the principle of unimproved land values; and though I am under the impression that he has still a lingering faith in plural voting, believing that a special tax on property justifies property owners in having special privileges, I feel sure that when he sees, as he is bound to see with the marvellous intellectual capacity with which nature has endowed him, that a tax on unimproved land values is not a tax on property, but on the industry of the whole community, he will finally abandon the fallacious and exploded principle of plural voting, and will like myself and others advocate even for municipalities the principle of one adult one vote. I observe that the member for Bunbury (Mr. N. J. Moore), who has wisely vanished, declared in the course of to-night's discussion that the principle of one man one vote was unwise and unfair for municipalities, because wicked one-man-one-vote persons would vote for an enormous expenditure, would saddle the poor unhappy municipality with enormous debt, and, having perpetrated that wickedness, would immediately go somewhere else and in all probability repeat the atrocity there. I venture to say that if this be a good argument against one man one vote in the municipality, it is an equally valid argument for the abolition of the identical franchise which enabled the hon. member to enter this House. If it is wrong to give the municipal voter one vote only, because he may use it to incur expenditure and may then run away to avoid bearing it, the same argument applies with the same force to the State in general, seeing that it would be the easiest thing in the world for the same wicked persons to use their franchise in the State to induce even the Premier, with all his wise and just caution in matters financial, to enter on a lavish expenditure. I admit that would be difficult; but those very unfortunate persons might succeed. Then, seeing that is so, the member for Bunbury ought to be consistent, and say that the same consideration which justifies him in denying a one-man-one-vote franchise in municipalities justifies him in denying the same franchise for the State, and therefore in going back to the good old days when a few aristocrats—I hope some of those persons are reared in Bunbury—enjoyed exclusively the right and title to rule the affairs of this country. I do not know whether I need say much more on this subject. I should say, however, I believe the Bill with such modifications as I have suggested will be a very admirable measure. I have read with great pleasure the proceedings of the Municipal Conference which meets every year, and I must confess it is a desirable feature in civil life that we should have so many persons even connected with comparatively small communities taking an intelligent interest in the great question of local government. I am of opinion that we are very apt, even we Labour members are very apt, to under-estimate the value of local government work, and I am glad to find the Government have deemed it prudent to introduce the measure, which, in spite of some of its defects, will, I am sure, be a great improvement on any measures of this nature we have had in the past. I am glad to find the Bill makes provision for municipalities taking part in work such as the establishment of art galleries, libraries, public parks, and that kind of thing. I believe that by enhancing the powers of the municipality we not only enable them to do greater work for the people, but tend to induce men of a higher intellectual quality to take an interest in local government work, and that I think in itself is something to be

admired. While I cannot agree entirely with the Bill, and shall deem it my duty in Committee to suggest amendments, I believe it is an honest attempt, and if it is vigilantly watched in Committee, we may in time turn out a measure worthy of the great subject with which it deals.

MR. H. BROWN (Perth): I will not detain the House very long, for I only intend to speak briefly on the general principles of the Bill. We speak of the Bill as being brought in by the present Government, but I say with all due deference to them, that this is a Bill brought in by a very much disappointed mayor at conferences which have been held in recent years. I am referring to the Hon. Minister, the member for East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin). Other members who have attended these conferences with myself have on several occasions seen that gentleman in the unenviable position of not getting a seconder to those very rabid proposals which are before the House. I know that on that side of the House there are several very moderate gentlemen indeed, but the Hon. Minister, who is one of the extremes of the extremists, thinks that the present is a good occasion for him to bring in those measures on which he was so ignominiously defeated at those municipal conferences. The trend of this Bill, with a few exceptions, is really to stir up strife and introduce politics into municipal life. It is really an attempt to bring the strength of the Political Labour Party into the arena of municipal life. We are fully aware that this Bill was well known to the outside members of the Political Labour Party some weeks ago by the announcement made in the papers that a member of that party was to be run for every ward in the City Council. If the Government could inform their party, it would have been equally true if they had informed also the members of the Opposition.

THE PREMIER: But this is untrue, you know.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw that.

THE PREMIER: I do not wish to accuse the hon. member of telling an untruth. I would not think of such a thing, but I say that the statement he made was untrue. No doubt he got it from some source, and he can tell the House what source it was.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw that word, and not accuse the member for Perth of making an untrue statement.

THE PREMIER: I withdraw at once. At the same time, the hon. member evidently heard a rumour which is untrue.

MR. H. BROWN: With all due deference to the Premier, it seems as if members of the outside political labour parties knew the trend of legislation when they stated that they intended to run a candidate for every ward in the Perth Council. At all events they may have had some inkling of the legislation that was to be introduced this session to give them a chance of success—[MEMBER: Not at all]—In my humble opinion a municipal vote is a property vote pure and simple, and as such should be recognised. I have here a book showing the trouble that has been caused in England by the introduction of the Political Labour Party into municipal politics. We have here an instance at Battersea under the dominion of the unions, where the rates in twelve years went up from 5s. 8d. in the £ to 8s.:—

> The most strenuous efforts have been made by the party now in power to avoid the discredit of a further increase in the rates, but in some quarters it is affirmed that next year they will be obliged to put on another 1s. 6d. in the pound, at least, if the borough is to pay its way. . . . Even the *Employés'* Sick and Accident Fund, established by the Corporation, has been a loss to the borough of over £3,000 a year, that being the amount paid to the men out of the public purse over and above the sum which they themselves contribute. This fact would suggest that, in spite of the small amount of work they do, the municipal *employés* at Battersea must suffer a good deal from sickness.

The book goes on to say:—

> The selection of Labour candidates for local governing bodies at Poplar is made by the trade unions, which send round word as to the persons to be voted for.

It says here that the candidate—

> meets the said constituency at the dock gates on Sunday morning, or at street corners during the week, and he says:—"You elect me and I will help to find you work. We are going to spend the money on giving you employment, and we don't care how the rates go up."

MEMBER: Is that a National League pamphlet?

MR. H. BROWN: If the hon. member requires information, I can tell him that this is quoted from articles which appeared in one of the highest papers in the world, a reprint from the London *Times*; so it is very authentic. It goes on to say:—

Inasmuch as the labour members were trade unionists, returned by trade unions, it was an understood thing that every man taken on must produce a trade union ticket.

I say at the present time in the Perth Council we do not want any such tactics introduced. Whether a man be a unionist or a non-unionist he gets thoroughly well treated. No members are recognised as Labour members in the City Council, and there is no friction at all. I hope the day is far distant when such a thing as I refer to will predominate. The domination of the trades union party was exemplified in Poplar. The book says:—

As for the amount of work done, if any foreman dared to find fault with a municipal *employé*, he ran the risk both of being summoned before the officials of his union and of being rebuked, and even discharged, by the members of the committee under which he worked.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: What portion of the Bill deals with trades unions?

MR. H. BROWN: This last quotation I will make refers to a thing which actually happened in connection with the West Ham board of works, Battersea (London), where, as I showed before, the rates went up from 5s. 8d. to 8s. in the £. The trades union ran the Council there.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: What is the average rate in England?

MR. H. BROWN: Up to 8s. and 9s. in the £. At Battersea it went up from 5s. 8d. to 8s.

MEMBER: So that is below the average.

MR. H. BROWN: This is an instance of the way it went up:

On one occasion two men were elected, and soon after they took their seats something happened which is almost incredible, though it is absolutely true. These two men were offered by their fellow Labour members positions as road-sweepers at 27s. a week, and they accepted the posts. Either they were out of work or they saw no chance of getting anything else as good as this. In any case they became scavengers for the very body of which they were members. Objections were naturally made, and the men were told that the thing was illegal and that they would have to give up either their membership or their situations. They made their choice in favour of the jobs they had got, and were perfectly content to resign their membership.

Although this Bill is an attempt made under the Government, it displays the hand of the honorary Minister in reference to several of these clauses. We were told in the opening speech that this was a Bill brought in at the request of the Conference of Municipalities. In several cases it is the work of the municipalities, but several other clauses have been introduced which that disappointed gentleman (Hon. W. C. Angwin) could not get inserted at the hands of the conference. The conferences which have been working at this Bill for years knew what was required, and I am sure the member for Bunbury (Mr. N. J. Moore) will, in Committee, be able to tell members the clauses which have been introduced by the member for East Fremantle. With reference to voting for mayor, the member for East Fremantle should have the backbone to bring in his own principle which he advanced on the platform of the Labour party—one man one vote. On this question he is absolutely trimming; so are the members of the Ministry. What do we find? It is simply a subterfuge in one part.

THE SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member is in order in using that expression.

MR. H. BROWN: I will withdraw it. The proposal is that in regard to the election of mayor there shall be one man one vote. But is it the same for councillor? If we should have manhood suffrage—which I do not object to at all, for Parliament—why do not the Ministry propose that the same principle shall apply to the election of a councillor as to the election of a mayor?

HON. W. C. ANGWIN: It does.

MR. H. BROWN: I say it does not. Under this Bill it is possible for a person, in the city of Perth at all events, to own property in five wards, and the collective value of that property need not exceed £500, yet that one ratepayer would get five votes. It is also possible for a ratepayer who has £10,000 worth of land in the centre of the city—and I know there are some who hold property worth as much as £100,000—to have only one vote, as against five by another owner of property worth £500.

HON. W. C. ANGWIN: What does he get now?

MR. H. BROWN: At the present time he would get five.

HON. W. C. ANGWIN: He would get ten.

MR. BROWN: If a man had property worth £100 in each ward, he would only have one vote in each ward. The Bill does not alter that qualification at all, but simply brings it down to one vote. The Bill would give to a ratepayer owning a huge lot of property in the central ward less qualification to return members of the council than is possessed by another man who owns only £500 worth distributed over several wards.

HON. W. C. ANGWIN: The Bill gives him one vote instead of two.

MR. H. BROWN: The Bill gives him five. This shows how little the Bill has been studied by some members. I say that in this Bill a ratepayer can have five votes by holding £500 worth of property, whereas a person holding £100,000 worth of property in one ward may get only one vote. With reference to the election of mayor by the people, I would go farther than the Bill contemplates and allow the councillors to elect their mayor. The shareholders of a company, which is on a similar basis to a municipality, elect their directors, but the directors would never think of allowing the shareholders to elect the chairman from amongst themselves. The directors elect the best man amongst themselves to preside over their deliberations, and I think the councillors themselves are quite capable of making a selection. The system will prove far more workable than that of allowing the ratepayers to select a man who may not be in touch with the council or with municipal work.

MEMBER: It is done in the Eastern States.

MR. H. BROWN: Yes, it is done in Melbourne; the system has been in vogue there for years. While on the principle of voting, I may say that in Queensland, where the unimproved land value system is in existence, three votes are given for mayor. This principle has worked for 20 or 30 years with the roads boards, and we do not hear of the Government interfering with the Roads Act. For years past members of roads boards have elected their chairman from amongst their number. That system has worked well in the past, and if it is good enough for the roads boards it ought to be good enough for the Perth City Council. It is in accordance with the principles and platform of the Government that before anyone can become mayor he shall serve an apprenticeship. Councillors going into the Perth City Council should have an opportunity of rising to the position of mayor to preside over a body of which he has been a member. Councillors are blessed with a certain amount of intelligence; they are elected by the people, and they are able to select the best man amongst themselves to preside over their gatherings. We are told there is a *quid pro quo* for taking away the votes, by giving the property owners a vote for loans. I am not a property owner myself, therefore I cannot be accused of speaking for myself, but I say capital requires to be protected as well as labour, and the municipal vote is regarded as a property vote. We are told the Bill will give a vote to owners in regard to loans. That shows the absurdity of making up a roll in the way the Bill proposes. There is a provision by which the municipal authorities have to find out to a great extent who the owners are, and they have to go through the whole of the books to find what ratepayers hold land on a five-years lease, for these persons are to be inserted on the rolls as the owner of the property. I say it is absolutely impossible to make up a roll to vote for loans. The Minister did not tell the House, as he might have done, how seldom a loan is raised: for instance, in Perth the councillors are elected on manhood suffrage, and they have the control of the expenditure of practically £40,000 every year, but a loan probably only comes up once in four or five years, and then the amount may not exceed £20,000 or £30,000. With reference to withdrawal after nomination, I cannot see anything at all in its favour. We had experience of that in the city of Perth a few years ago. An attempt was made to foist a man on the ratepayers, but it turned out afterwards to be a joke. The bellman of the city was nominated for the position of mayor, and if there had not been a provision to allow that man to withdraw it would have been a travesty on the city. It would be better perhaps to make the fee higher, so that if persons withdraw after nomination

they can do so by paying the higher fee. I am in favour of proxy voting, for this would affect very few persons indeed in municipalities. With reference to gas and electric mains, I challenge the Government or the member for East Fremantle to say how it would affect any municipality. I have gone into the matter carefully, and when in Committee I shall suggest some little alterations on the principle of percentage on the gross receipts or valuation. I may say that during the past year or two the Perth Gas Company have met the ratepayers most fairly. Within the last 18 months the Perth Gas Company, in response to a request from the City Council, have placed in the streets of Perth over 11 miles of mains; but what do we find in the Bill? The company would be handicapped by being rated at £2 a mile up to £8 a mile on their pipes. Is it possible to expect any company to come to the assistance of the ratepayers if they are penalised for doing so? With reference to police court fines, I may ask the Premier whether in this matter he is studying the interests of the Government or whether he is studying the district of Subiaco, of which he has the honour to be mayor. It seems to me that this is a subterfuge on the part of the Government to get every penny they can.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw the word "subterfuge."

MR. H. BROWN: I withdraw it. I say this matter should be more open, so that ratepayers would know what is being done. Those members who have been returned for the city of Perth should be told that by supporting this clause of the Bill they will be reducing the revenue of the city of Perth by over £600 or £700 a year, and the revenue of other municipalities will be reduced in proportion. In the past a mistake occurred by which municipalities received the whole of the police court fines.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Was it a mistake?

MR. H. BROWN: Yes; because in previous years municipalities only received one-half of the fines, and they are willing to receive one-half now.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Why did you claim more last year?

MR. H. BROWN: We did not, but in this Bill the whole of the police court fines are taken away.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Last year you claimed the whole.

MR. H. BROWN: We were willing to take what Parliament was willing to give. By the assistance of the Minister for Mines we received half the fines last year, but we do not expect to be penalised for all time by a withdrawal of the police court fines. As the member for Bunbury has pointed out, we help to swell the Treasury by supplying the offences which are created against life and property in municipalities. There is a precedent in the past and we should receive half the amount of the fines. With reference to rating, this is another plank in the programme of the Government, and I am sorry to see the Government have not brought in the principle of rating land on the unimproved value and swept away the other system of rating altogether. I am with the Government on the principle of rating on unimproved values, but let the Government be true to their principles and bring forward a proposal in the Bill and stand or fall by it. In this Bill I should like to see the principle of taxation on unimproved land values brought into force, and the onus should be placed on the owners to supply a proper valuation of their property. I should like to see the amount of the rate reduced so that municipalities should not strike a rate as high as 4d. in the £. I think the outside at which municipalities should be allowed to rate should be 3d. We find that the Perth municipality can go on very well with a rate of 2d. in the £, which would give us the same result as a rate of 1s. 6d. under the present system.

MR. J. M. HOPKINS: Have you worked it out?

MR. H. BROWN: Yes.

MR. HOPKINS: You only require to equalise revenue.

MR. BROWN: We do not want an option given in the Bill: we want the Government to stick to their guns and enact what Ministers stated on the public platform, that they are in favour of an unimproved value tax. As to borrowing for municipal undertakings it is compulsory to strike a rate for any money borrowed under a municipal Bill; but I say that if a

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

On motion by MR. LYNCH, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 28th September, 1904.

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

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

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

QUESTION—COLLIE-CARDIFF TOWNSITE.

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

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

QUESTION—MULLEWA COAL BORING.

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

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

QUESTION—SUNDAY THEATRICAL PERFORMANCES.

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