

occasion for a return to be prepared. The Government had a fortnight in which to frame the answers. This would have taken up a little of the spare time of the officers who are running about on the estate. I am not opposing any extension of the Act to the South-West, for the time may come when it should be extended in that direction. I do, however, urge extreme caution before anything of this kind is done. To commit oneself at this stage would be ridiculous. The Government should bring about a better system of inspection under the Industries Assistance Act. When travelling about my district many complaints are brought under my notice, most of them being justifiable. People complain about the long delays of inspection. Time and again supplies have come too late to enable settlers to put in their crops. In one case a settler was compelled to seed ground from which both he and the inspector knew it was hopeless to expect a payable return. In another case a man had to put in a certain acreage to meet the requirements of the board. He had to run his drill over land which would not yield three bushels to the acre, because it was wodge country. He knew he would not get the price of his seed back, let alone any return for his labour and super. These things are very detrimental to the settler. The Act has been in operation long enough to enable the authorities to institute a proper system of inspection. A better method of getting supplies out to the settlers should be inaugurated to enable them to get their crops in at the right time. The regulations requiring a certain area to be put in should not be enforced if the land is not there to crop. I trust the Leader of the House will bring these matters before the Government. I am in accord with this Bill, and will support the second reading.

On motion by Hon. T. Moore, debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION—ESPERANCE NORTHWARDS RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Assembly's Message.

Message received from the Legislative Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the following resolution—

"That in the opinion of this House the Government should obtain the necessary authority as early as possible to extend the Esperance Northward Railway line (now in course of construction) so that it may junction with the existing lines of the State at Norseman," presents the same to the Legislative Council for its concurrence.

House adjourned at 9.42 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 31st October, 1923.

	Page
Questions: Queensland Probate Coy., Local Campaign	1245
Sandalwood Licenses, restrictions	1245
Agricultural Stock, Departmental purchases	1245
Railway Coal supplies, Government payment	1246
Group Settlements, tanks	1246
Abandoned mining leases, papers	1246
Leave of absence	1246
Assent to Bills	1246
Papers: Colliery coal, Railway supplies	1247
Bills: Stamp Act Amendment, 1A.	1246
General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment Act Continuance, 1A.	1246
Insurance Companies Act Amendment, 1A.	1246
Meredin Reserves, 1A.	1246
Registration of Engineers, 1A.	1246
British Imperial Oil Co. (Private), 1A., referred to select committee	1247
Trading Concerns Act Amendment, postponed	
Architects Act Amendment, 2A., Com.	1247
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 2A., Com.	1256

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at 7.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—QUEENSLAND PROBATE COMPANY, LOCAL CAMPAIGN.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: 1, Have the Government any information regarding the value of shares in the Queensland Probate Company, a campaign for the sale of which has lately been conducted in Narrogin and other country centres by Mr. J. A. Greig, M.L.C., director for the said company in Western Australia, and Mr. Harold Seddon, M.L.C., inspector and salesman for the said Queensland Probate Company under Mr. Greig's direction? 2, If not, will the Government institute inquiries, as the said shares are not listed in any Australian stock exchange list? 3, Have the Government any information as to the salaries, commissions, and other profits being received by the promoters of this company? 4, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to protect the residents of this State from exploitation in regard to the purchase of shares in the large number of new mushroom insurance companies of unknown and doubtful value which are being hawked round the country districts by plausible directors and their salesmen and employees?

The PREMIER replied: 1, 2, and 3, Intending investors should satisfy themselves of the bona fides of a company before becoming shareholders. No one is compelled to purchase shares. 4, The Government do not know of any individual who has invested in such concerns.

QUESTION—SANDALWOOD LICENSES, RESTRICTIONS.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Forests: 1, Is he aware that licenses to cut sandalwood are now refused to local citizens applying for same? 2, What is the reason for this action? 3, To whom are licenses to cut sandalwood now issued? 4, What qualification is now required to secure a license to cut sandalwood? 5, Under what authority are these new restrictions imposed? 6, What is the reason for their imposition?

The MINISTER FOR FORESTS replied: It is understood that the above questions refer to the registration of sandalwood getters who up to the 30th June, 1923, worked under license. Under the regulations gazetted yesterday (30th October, 1923), any person who desires to obtain employment in connection with the pulling and removal of sandalwood from Crown lands may be registered as a timber worker engaged in such occupation on payment of a fee of 2s. 6d.

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL STOCK, DEPARTMENTAL PURCHASES.

Mr. LATHAM asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is it a fact that the Agricultural Department recently purchased in the Eastern States Guernsey and Shorthorn bulls and cows? 2, If so, what was the price paid per head, and the cost per head of getting the stock to the State? 3, Is it not a fact that there are plenty of the above-named breeds, available for stud purposes, which could be purchased locally? 4, Before making any further purchase from the Eastern States, will he have inquiries made within the State for all such stock?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Yes. 2 (a) The average price per head, f.o.b., was £50; (b) this has not yet been ascertained as all the cattle have not arrived, and the forwarding agents have not yet rendered their account for the three that are to hand. 3, There were no females of the Guernsey breed available, and only one bull. The milking Shorthorns available had no official production records. 4, Yes; this is the usual practice and was observed in this case.

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, COAL SUPPLY, GOVERNMENT PAYMENT.

Hon. P. COLLIER asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Has any sum of money been paid to the Amalgamated Collieries of W.A., Limited, pursuant to a claim made by the said company in connection with the late agreement for the supply of coal to the Railway Department? 2, If so, what is the amount of such payment?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. 2, £3,250.

QUESTION—GROUP SETTLEMENTS, TANKS.

Mr. HUGHES asked the Premier: 1, How many tanks have been supplied to group settlements Nos. 27, 32, 34, and 36? 2, Were they constructed by day labour or by contract? 3, If by contract, who were the successful tenderers, what were the prices, and were tradesmen plumbers engaged in the construction? 4, Were the tanks examined by a competent officer before acceptance of delivery? 5, Have there been any complaints with respect to the quality of the tanks?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Group No. 27, 23; Group No. 32, 20; Group No. 34, 7; Group No. 36, 18. 2, Contract. 3 (a), A. S. Bosuston, C. Brown, N. Davis, F. S. Bailey, G. B. Bovell. (b) Material: average cost, £4 5s.; construction, 30s. per tank. (c) C. Brown, plumber—others carpenters. 4, Yes. 5, No.

QUESTION—MINING LEASES ABANDONED, PAPERS.

Hon. P. COLLIER (without notice) asked the Minister for Railways: Will he lay on the Table of the House all papers relating to options granted or proposed to be granted over abandoned mining leases?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: I have no objection to the papers being placed on the Table. I suggest that the hon. member gives formal notice for the tabling of the papers, and I will make them available.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Mullany, leave of absence for two weeks was granted to the member for Katanning (Mr. A. Thomson) on the ground of urgent public business.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read, notifying assent to the following Bills:—

- 1, Supply Bill No. 2 (£1,050,000.)
- 2, Electric Light and Power Agreement Amendment.

BILLS (5)—FIRST READING.

1. Stamp Act Amendment.
2. General Loan and Inscribed Stock Act Amendment Act Continuance.
3. Insurance Companies Act Amendment.
Introduced by the Premier.
4. Merredin Reserves.
Introduced by the Minister for Agriculture.
5. Registration of Engineers.
Introduced by the Minister for Works.

PAPERS—RAILWAY COAL SUPPLIES, AGREEMENTS.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier resolved—
“That all papers referring to the late agreement and to the agreement made on the 11th September between the Commissioner of Railways and the Amalgamated Collieries of W.A., Ltd., for the supply of coal for railway purposes be laid on the Table of the House.”

BILL—BRITISH IMPERIAL OIL COY., LTD. (PRIVATE).

Introduced by Hon. W. C. Angwin and read a first time.

Referred to Select Committee.

On motion by Hon. W. C. Angwin, Bill referred to a select committee consisting of Hon. P. Collier, Messrs. Gibson, McCallum, Teesdale and the mover, with power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, to adjourn from place to place and to report on the 7th November.

BILL—TRADING CONCERNS ACT AMENDMENT.

Order of the day read for the moving of the second reading.

On motion by Mr. Latham, order postponed.

BILL—ARCHITECTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 19th September.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [7.55]: A good deal of the argument used by the member for York (Mr. Latham) in moving the second reading of the Bill may appeal to most members, but the Architects Act was passed by Parliament, not with a desire to make the profession a close corporation, but to put a very necessary profession upon a standard basis. When the Bill was framed, we thought every precaution had been taken to protect the interests of those that had entered into the study of the profession prior to the conditions embodied in the Bill being promulgated, and I was assured by those to whom the measure was referred that no difficulty whatever would be experienced by any person that was engaged in the profession and had only recently gone in for study. The hon. member referred to Clause 2 of the Bill which seeks to amend Section 14 of the Act. The amendment is not necessary. The power sought thereunder is provided in Section 14 of the Act, which section is quite broad enough to carry anything that may be required. Section 14 states that a person who has attained the age of 21 years, is of good character and reputation, who had completed a course of study or prior to the commencement of the Act was articulated

or indentured for not less than three years to a practising architect as an architectural pupil, shall be registered. The amendment proposes to insert the words “or holds a certificate in writing by the practising architect to whom the applicant was articulated or indentured to the effect that the applicant has such knowledge and experience as to justify his registration.”

Mr. Latham: Read on in the principal Act.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is no necessity for the amendment because any person so articulated or indentured for that period would or should have no difficulty in obtaining the necessary documents to enable him to appear before the board and secure registration.

Mr. Latham: But he has to sit for an examination.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That does not make very much difference. If he is qualified as required by the Act the examination will show it; if he is not qualified, he has no right to be registered. In my opinion the amendment is unnecessary. To the other provision desired by the hon. member, I see no objection. Under the provisions of the Act, the time allowed for applying for admission may be considered rather brief and the hon. member seeks to extend it somewhat. No harm can be done by that.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [8.0]: The Architects Act was assented to on the 31st December, 1922. That measure received the consideration of both Houses of Parliament and the result of the deliberations was the placing on the statute book an Act that is in the best interests not only of the profession, but of the people of the State. The member for York (Mr. Latham) has no knowledge of the profession of architecture, and he is not competent to judge what the requirements of that profession are. Neither does he know anything about the qualifications that should be possessed by those who are desirous of being registered. Regarding the second portion of the Bill, the architects themselves have no objection to it, because it is recognised that there are certain applicants for registration who, through untoward circumstances, were unable to get their names placed upon the roster. I had the distinction of being a member of the first board and I know that every effort was made to offer facilities for registration to those who were entitled to it. There is one case that appeals particularly to the member for York—one of his constituents—who through unfortunate circumstances was unable to obtain registration.

Hon. P. Collier: Have you not already spoken on the Bill?

Mr. PICKERING: This is the adjourned debate.

Hon. P. Collier: But you spoke on a previous occasion.

Mr. PICKERING: No, this is the first occasion. The adjournment was obtained by

the Minister for Works after the member for York moved the second reading.

Hon. P. Collier: I merely asked the question. I thought you had spoken.

Mr. Hughes: I know of the case of a man who failed to secure registration through no fault of his own.

Mr. PICKERING: The hon. member will have an opportunity of addressing the Chamber.

Mr. Hughes: But not at such length.

Mr. PICKERING: Everyone will have a chance to speak.

Mr. Hughes: But it is impossible to get in before you. No one can beat you off the mark.

Mr. PICKERING: I rose to my feet only when it seemed that nobody else desired to speak. I do not wish to attribute ulterior motives to hon. members, but it is strange for an hon. member to insinuate that one is interested in the obstruction of the debate. There can be no objection on the part of the Institute of Architects or the Registration Board to the second portion of the Bill, because there is no desire to inflict any undue injustice upon anyone who wishes to practise the profession of an architect. Under the Bill no individual will suffer any disability because he may desire to prepare plans or specifications. The only disability, if it be one, will be that it will not be possible for a person to call himself an architect. That is what the Act really stands for. The desire of Parliament when it passed the Act was to place the profession on a better and more learned footing. It was never intended that anyone should be debarred from practising the profession if he possessed the necessary qualifications. There were several who were eligible for registration, but who did not avail themselves of the opportunity to register.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They were not given a chance.

Mr. PICKERING: They were given every chance. The greatest publicity was given to the matter when the Bill was going through Parliament, and further, the board took steps to advertise in the leading newspapers that those who were eligible for registration should make application. Further than that, the board wrote to all those of whom they had knowledge.

Mr. Latham: Only those whom they wanted to register.

Mr. PICKERING: The unseemly interjection is quite befitting the character of the member for York.

Mr. Latham: It is somewhat similar to your own.

Capt. Carter: Another split on the cross benches.

Mr. Hughes: York is poaching on Sussex preserves.

Mr. PICKERING: There is no objection on the part of the board to register any person who is entitled to registration. I have here the copy of a document signed by nine out of 12 of those who will be

brought under the provisions of the Bill. The names of those students are—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Is it fair to give them?

Mr. PICKERING: They have given their names so that they may be read to Parliament.

Mr. Latham: You are not within your rights in reading them.

Mr. PICKERING: I will read the objections and the names of the students—

The following architectural students were serving their articles to practising architects or the Public Works Department at the time the Architects Act was passed. Those persons whose signatures appear opposite their names disagree with Clause 2 of the Bill because exemption from passing an examination would lower their status compared with that of architects in other parts of the world. Before the Act was passed, they would have aspired to pass the exam. of the Institute of Architects, which subsequently would have been replaced by the exam. conducted by the board: the latter would entitle them to registration. If Clause 2 of the Bill is passed, there will be no occasion to sit for either exam.; the legal status of an architect could then be obtained without any exam., and on the bare certificates of the architects to whom they are articulated. By passing the exam. their degree of competence would have to be equal to that required in the other parts of Australia and generally throughout the world, and they would in consequence be qualified to occupy positions anywhere. The signatories are:—H. O. Allom, G. W. Churchill Wright, O. V. Chisholm, B. L. C. Clifton, W. L. Green, T. T. Lewis, M. T. Pitt Morison, T. W. Holmes, J. S. Sanders, B. M. Cavanagh, L. Walters, C. Ednie Brown.

Capt. Carter: How many of those are public servants?

Mr. PICKERING: Three. The students whose signatures I have given wish the board examination to be retained, but that the University junior certificate be not expected from those students who were serving their articles at the time the Architects' Act was passed. If we carry out the proposal submitted by the member for York it is obvious that very few architects will refuse to give qualification certificates. If they were to do so it would be a reflection on their ability. I have given the names of the nine out of the twelve who desire to pass a qualifying examination as set forth in the Bill, and it is necessary that the Act should be amended to permit of that.

Capt. Carter: What pressure was brought on those men to induce them to give their signatures?

Mr. PICKERING: None at all, so far as I know.

Mr. Latham: I am surprised at you reading such a document.

Mr. PICKERING: I had no hand whatever in obtaining those signatures.

Mr. Latham: Who supplied them?

Mr. PICKERING: The students' association. It is contended that the community should have protection in respect of this profession as well as others. Plumbers are not allowed to carry on their trade without examination, and plumbing is only one branch of architecture. Surely, if it is necessary that plumbers who have to carry out ordinary sanitary services should pass a qualifying examination before being entrusted with that work, it is highly necessary that architects should qualify before having the responsibility of supervising all the different works connected with construction. The plumbing work is in the majority of cases carried out to the specification and under the supervision of an architect. The architect should be in a position to say whether the work has been well and faithfully carried out. The amendment proposed by the member for York will afford opportunities for fraud. A man might have gone through a certain period of training as an architect, and then given up that avocation and taken to something else. Yet by reason of this suggested amendment it would be possible for such a man to be registered as an architect now. It is also possible that a principal might, if he so desired, antedate the articles of a student, and so defeat the object of the measure. It would be invidious to leave the responsibility for the efficiency of an architect to the man to whom that architect is articulated as a student. It is ridiculous to assume that an architect would not give the necessary qualifying certificate to a student after having had the training of him for a number of years. If there is one profession which needs close study to-day, it is the profession of architecture. The works which are to be seen in course of construction in Perth to-day, and the greater works being carried out in the cities of the Eastern States, are sufficient proof of that, but I might refer to the scandals which occurred in connection with war service homes, for instance. In the best interests of the people it is absolutely necessary that the men who are entrusted with the construction of our buildings should be fully qualified. No doubt the member for York is an authority on the subject of architecture, but I wish to mention that the architecture of to-day is distinct from the architecture of previous ages. To-day the practice of architecture requires an intimate knowledge of mathematics, of strains and stresses, and other factors of that nature. Not only is the construction of buildings at issue, but the very lives of our people are at issue. Quite recently we had introduced into this Chamber by the Minister for Works a Bill dealing with scaffolding. In connection with that measure great stress was laid on the danger to the lives of workmen engaged in the construction of buildings. In connection with the

difficult problems attending the construction of buildings to-day, we must bear in mind the necessity for having the man who is responsible for the structure thoroughly qualified.

The Premier: The object of this Bill is to remedy an injustice.

Mr. PICKERING: I contend there is no injustice. Any student who is desirous of obtaining an associateship in the Western Australian Institute of Architects must to-day pass an examination. All that the Act lays down is that the student should pass such an examination. If the amendment suggested by the member for York is carried, a man might get in through the back door.

The Premier: He will get through in just the same way as other people have got through.

Mr. Lambert: How many people have got in through the back door?

Mr. PICKERING: I regret very much that the two previous debates in connection with this subject have resulted in such density on the part of some members. When a trifling measure is introduced to deal with the question of scaffolding—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Bill dealing with scaffolding is more important than this Bill.

Mr. McCallum: The scaffolding Bill only deals with common workmen.

Mr. PICKERING: What I wish to urge is that scaffolding is merely a temporary measure. If there is one man in this world for whom I have respect, it is the skilled artisan. I never called artisans "common working men." It has remained for the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) to do that. I do not admire that hon. member for calling skilled artisans "common working men." I am proud to grasp the hand of any skilled artisan in this State.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are dealing with this Bill now.

Mr. McCallum: The hon. member opposed a Bill to protect the lives of the skilled artisans.

Mr. PICKERING: I did not oppose a Bill to protect the lives of working men.

Mr. McCallum: Yes, you did.

Mr. PICKERING: The hon. member's statement is not correct. Reflections have been made on the standard of architects in this State. The history of the Western Australian Institute of Architects is worthy of note. The institute has set out with the sole object of improving the standard of architecture.

Mr. Hughes: That is not true. At any rate, the object is to preserve the interests of architects as well.

Mr. PICKERING: I am not prepared to controvert the narrow-mindedness of the hon. member interjecting. That would be an impossible task. The object of the Institute of Architects has been not only to raise the level of architecture, but also to educate students. The desire of the institute has been to make the standard high. The member for York

seeks to undermine that standard. He says it is not necessary to have examinations.

Mr. Latham: Do not apply that to me. I have not said anything of the sort.

Mr. Mann: Has the institute registered men who have been away from the profession for 15 years, while refusing to register men who have served their articles?

Mr. PICKERING: The statement of the member for Perth (Mr. Mann) is not true in fact. I know of the instance to which the hon. member refers. The gentleman in question was responsible for the plans of the Calyx Porcelain Works. Those plans were intricate. Anyone who could design the kiln connected with those works was worthy of registration.

Hon. F. T. Brown: The works are tumbling down.

Mr. PICKERING: Knowing the gentleman to whom the member for Perth refers, I consider it my duty to refute the hon. member's statement. For many years past the institute has insisted upon the examination of students and justly so. The students who were articulated before the passing of the principal Act were expected to pass qualifying examinations set by the institute. The Public Works Department require that now in the case of many of their officers. If students go to the trouble of being articulated and of attending courses in order to qualify for examinations, surely it is not right for us to give an undue advantage to the one man whom the member for York has in mind. After all, only one man is concerned in the proposed amendment.

Mr. Latham: You read out the names of three men.

Mr. PICKERING: I know the one man whom the member for York has in mind. I do not think that a principle which has been endorsed by Parliament should be whittled away just for the sake of one individual who is too indifferent regarding the work in which he is engaged to pass the qualifying examination. The institute has no objection whatever to remedying any injustice which may exist as regards people who have missed registration by some accident. It would be ridiculous to-day to attempt to amend the law governing the legal profession, for example. We have just passed the first reading of a Bill for the registration of engineers.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The present position of this matter shows the danger of passing a Bill without full discussion.

Mr. PICKERING: What danger is there in seeking to make people thoroughly qualified for their work?

Mr. McCallum: Why not have a qualifying examination for carpenters?

Mr. PICKERING: I do not know to what profession the member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) belongs.

Mr. McCallum: So long as I am not an architect I don't care.

Mr. PICKERING: Anyone who qualifies for his trade or profession, no matter what it be, is worthy of the highest esteem. I am not one of those who seek to drag down; I

am one of those who seek to build up. If we want to compete with the world, it is obvious that the more highly qualified our citizens are in every profession and every trade, the more likely are we to attain success. If I may just refer to the matter of the tariff, I would say that consequent upon the high tariff which has been imposed by the Commonwealth Parliament, there is not the incentive that there should be to improve in our methods of manufacture, in the condition of our plant, and in keeping all our appliances up to date. In this way the high Customs tariff operates to prevent the advancement of our industries. That statement is incontrovertibly true. I contend that it is desirable we should elevate the profession of architecture, so that any man going to a qualified architect will be able to do so with the assurance of receiving efficient service.

Mr. Lambert: Have people that assurance to-day?

Mr. PICKERING: I do not wish to cast any reflection on the hon. member interjecting, though I might do so.

Mr. Lambert: I could retaliate.

Mr. PICKERING: In passing an Act like this, we naturally do not wish to inflict any injustice.

Mr. Latham: Nor do we wish to make it retrospective.

Mr. PICKERING: The Act is not retrospective.

Mr. Latham: It is. That is the trouble.

Mr. PICKERING: It is a pity we cannot make the hon. member retrospective. The object of the Act was not to do injustice, and the measure has not done an injustice to any of those who are coming forward. It may have inadvertently imposed injustice on certain people who were not able to get registration. The architects desire to remedy any such acts of injustice. Therefore, I ask that the Assembly will not extend the operations of the Act to the prejudice of the profession.

Mr. MONEY (Bunbury) [8.31]: The arguments used by the hon. member who has just sat down could have been equally well used when the Bill of last year was passed. Under Section 13, paragraph (h), any person who, during the next preceding 12 months had practiced as an architect in Western Australia, or been engaged as an assistant to a practising architect, was entitled on the passing of the Act to be registered. I take it that provision was made in order that existing rights should not be interfered with. But I understand there is another class, those who had entered into contracts on the determination of which they would be qualified to act as architects. That class was affected by the Act, for the Act interfered with their contracts, supplementing them and making it necessary for the trainees, at the end of their articles, to pass an examination. The principle of the Act of last year was that existing rights should not be interfered with. Yet in spite of Section 13, it has interfered with existing rights, the rights of the ar-

articled clerks. The intention of the amending Bill is to make it possible for the rights of articled clerks to be preserved, exactly the same as the rights of a person who had been practising as an architect for 12 months prior to the passing of the Act, notwithstanding that he might have had no qualification whatever.

Mr. Pickering: Why did not you put this up before I spoke? You know I cannot reply to it.

Mr. MONEY: Clause 2 of the amending Bill provides that if the architect to whom the trainee is articled grants a certificate of competency, the trainee shall be eligible for registration. If we recognise the principle of non-interference with the existing rights of an unqualified person who happens to have been practising for 12 months prior to the passage of the Act, it is also right that we should not interfere with the interests of the articled clerk if he obtains a certificate of competency from the architect to whom he is articled. I know one or two articled clerks who went to the war and who, but for their absence at the Front, would have completed their articles, and so come within Section 13, in which case their interests would not have been interfered with. I am sure the House would not desire to impose any injustice on those men.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [8.35]: The Bill is wrongly named. It should be entitled a Bill to repeal the Architects Act. Any person, whether in a technical school or any other school, if he desires to pass an examination, can be registered as an architect. The member for Bunbury (Mr. Money) sought to elucidate the provisions of the Bill. He pointed out that the principal clause provides for a small number of persons who will not have completed their articles when the Bill passes. He said he knew one or two who had gone to the war. But the Bill does not say anything of the kind.

Mr. Money: It covers it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, but it goes on indefinitely, and if it be passed a person will be able to work with an architect for six months and claim registration, provided the architect gives him a certificate of competency.

Mr. Latham: Read the clause before that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: At present if an architect fails to give proper tuition to his apprentice, and if the board prove that the apprentice is not qualified, the apprentice can claim damages from the architect to whom he was apprenticed. But under the Bill the architect has only to give him a certificate, and he can claim registration.

Mr. Money: It applies only to those articled prior to the beginning of the Act.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But whether a man be properly trained or not, provided he holds a certificate of competency from his trainer, he can claim registration. A few years ago, a gentleman tried to pass the ex-

amination for a lawyer—an easy job, surely! Three times he was turned down. Then a Bill similar to this was introduced in order that that gentleman might be admitted to the legal profession. However, the Bill did not go through. I quote that as showing that the gentleman alluded to had to comply with the Act in force at the time.

Mr. Pickering: That was the law.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is the law to-day. We all know that a member who attends to his Parliamentary duties has little or no time to spend in his office. What is to prevent the member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering), if he have an apprentice in his office, giving him a certificate of competency that will compel the board to register the apprentice?

Mr. Mann: It applies to only those who serve their articles before the passing of the Act.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No Bill was so much cut to pieces as was the Architects Bill of two years ago. By the same token, there is no more liberal Act in existence than the Architects Act. The way things are going, we shall be required presently to register every person in the community. Already we have promised for this session two Bills, one for the registration of engineers, and the other for the registration of opticians. No man should have the right to say that his apprentice is qualified. That should be for another professional man to say, after inquiring into the apprentice's work. Where is the schoolmaster who would not pass all his pupils if he were allowed? We do not permit that. Instead, we send inspectors to examine the children. It is highly dangerous to allow a man to say that his trainee is efficient. In regard to the other part of the Bill, I think the hon. member is justified in moving his amendment. When in Committee I will go further and move to leave it at the discretion of the board for all time. I have heard of persons who, being out of the State when the Architects Bill was passed, knew nothing about it on their return, and so neglected to make application for registration. Opportunity should be afforded those persons to apply for registration. The board of architects, I understand, are willing to register those persons if only they had the power to do so. The member for Sussex said that here to-night. To that portion of the Bill we can all agree, but I hope members will not agree to accept the principle of a trainer giving his trainee a certificate of competency as an architect.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [8.45]: When the parent Act was passed a few of the students were overlooked and a grave injustice was done to them. That was not the intention of Parliament. I quite understand the attitude adopted by the member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering). It is the attitude adopted by all people who under Acts of Parliament have definite privileges conferred upon them, making their calling restrictive and protecting it.

Mr. Pickering: I remember you on the Dentists Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: My attitude on that occasion was as consistent as it will be on this.

Mr. Pickering: You opposed all the amendments.

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes, when I thought the granting of concessions conflicted with the public safety. There is no analogy between the passing of a Dental Act conferring upon certain people the right to practise on the mouths of others, and allowing a man to put up a brass plate and practise his profession as an architect.

Mr. Pickering: None at all.

Mr. LAMBERT: When we passed the Architects Act we allowed all people who were practising the profession of architecture in the State—

Mr. Pickering: And dentistry.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am not going back to the Dental Act.

Mr. Pickering: It is just as true.

Mr. LAMBERT: That was passed 30 or 40 years ago, and is too ancient for me.

Mr. Pickering: You are not as young as you make yourself out to be.

Mr. LAMBERT: The Architects Act is fresh in my memory. I am fortified with many facts in this matter.

The Premier: Let us take them as read.

Mr. LAMBERT: It might be wise to adopt that suggestion. I do not think Parliament intended any injustice upon a comparatively few students when it passed the Architects Act.

Mr. Pickering: Nine out of 12 are satisfied with the injustice.

Mr. LAMBERT: Nine out of 12 of the architects registered?

Mr. Pickering: Of the students that are not registered.

Mr. LAMBERT: Those are students who will not be affected.

Mr. Pickering: Every one of them will be affected.

Mr. LAMBERT: A small number only. The member for Sussex stated there was only one, but if an injustice has been done to one, Parliament should remedy it.

Mr. Pickering: I do not think it is an injustice.

Mr. LAMBERT: I am surprised that the hon. member should oppose the amending Bill. It is sought by an independent source to remedy the unintentional injustice done by Parliament.

Mr. Pickering: Say uninterested source.

Mr. LAMBERT: It is quite a disinterested source. It is not a source that desires to see a larger ring of preference thrown round a profession that is characterised by the hon. member as so noble and grand. Parliament is sufficiently seized of the importance of architecture, and all that it spells to Western Australia, to see that it is properly safeguarded. There was a similar case in connection with the last amendment to the Dental Act, which amended the parent Act and allowed certain people to practise dentistry.

Unintentionally, or intentionally, certain people were allowed to be registered who should not have been registered, and others were not registered who should have been registered. I believe it is the intention of the Colonial Secretary to remedy the unintentional wrong done through a lack of knowledge on the part of Parliament. Parliament has a sufficient sense of the fitness of things to see that under this Bill no injustice is done. I regret the attitude of the member for Sussex in trying to make a still closer preserve of the profession of architects, and to keep out those who are anxious—

Mr. Pickering: Who are anxious to qualify by examination.

Mr. LAMBERT: Some of them are.

Mr. Pickering: Nine out of 12.

Mr. LAMBERT: Are those who were practising before the parent Act was passed clamouring to be registered as architects?

Mr. Pickering: Many have passed their examination.

Mr. Latham: How many would pass today if they sat?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Sussex must not keep on interjecting.

Mr. LAMBERT: Probably not many. That, however, has no bearing on the point. There may be some fine architects who could not pass the examination to-day. Parliament should concentrate on the question as to whether an injustice has been done to certain individuals through the passing of the parent Act which placed architecture and the profession upon a permanent and proper basis for all time. I am sure the sense of fairness that pervades the mind of every member will induce him to support the amending Bill submitted by the member for York.

Mr. LATHAM (York—in reply) [8.55]: The point raised by the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin)—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I was in error. I understand the matter now.

Mr. LATHAM: I have no desire to minimise the value of the work of architects, or to place them upon a footing with anyone else. I want to see all the professions benefited by Acts of Parliament, if that is possible, but I will not be a party to making regulations, retrospective, as the last Act was. This interfered with the rights that existed between the indentured persons and the architects themselves. If we asked the architects that became registered under the parent Act to pass an academical or technical examination, hardly 80 per cent. could do so. It is set out in the examination papers that a man shall qualify in a modern language other than English. When a man reaches the age of 30, it is difficult for him to learn a foreign language.

Mr. Pickering: Most architects qualify in that direction before.

Mr. LATHAM: These apprentices—

Mr. Pickering: There is only one.

Mr. LATHAM: If there is only one we should remedy any legislative defect in re-

gard to him. I wish to reply to the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin). The architects have a society called the Royal Institute of Architects. It is recognised as the body representative of the profession in Western Australia, and has received the recognition involved by permission to use the word "Royal." It fosters as part of its activities the education of architectural students. Under its influence students are encouraged to enter into proper articles of apprenticeship for a period of three or four years to practising architects, and the society provides a register of all such apprenticeship deeds.

Mr. Pickering: Is the hon. member reading his speech?

Mr. LATHAM: I am reading an extract. Until the Act was passed, articles of apprenticeship to a practising architect duly registered with the Society of Architects represented the best and most approved method of architectural education in this State. When students completed their terms of articles they were admitted as members of the society. The students were not called upon to undergo any examination. By virtue of being apprenticed they automatically became architects, and were permitted to be registered under the parent Act. All we ask is that these people should go through the ordinary course of study, and at the end of their term, instead of sitting for a purely academic examination, they should hold a certificate from the man to whom they are apprenticed, testifying that they are qualified to enter the profession. I do not think any architect would certify that an apprentice under him was fit to carry on as an architect if he did not think that was the case. I do not know why it should be suggested that the architects should be so dishonest as to do otherwise.

Mr. Pickering: They should not be given the opportunity.

Mr. LATHAM: I am willing to leave it in the hands of the members of the profession to give these students the certificate necessary. This is only a temporary measure and must go out of existence in three or four years time. I hope the second reading of the Bill will be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Angelo in the Chair; Mr. Latham in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 14:

Mr. PICKERING: The proposal to entrust to any man training a student the passing of that student as qualified to become an architect, is not right. That must be obvious. If such a person did not issue a certificate, it would be a reflection upon his own training. Of the dozen or so men concerned and who will be affected by the passing of the clause, nine desire that they

should be required to pass a qualifying examination.

Mr. Lambert: They say not.

Mr. Money: They can still do so.

Mr. PICKERING: That may be so. When the member for Bunbury was discussing a Bill to infringe the privileges of another profession, he did not adopt his present attitude. That hon. member would be prepared to concede where architects were concerned what he would not agree to where the legal profession was concerned. The responsibilities of an architect more directly concern the safety of the public than do those of the lawyers. When we see the public buildings and other large buildings in Perth, we know that that must be so. We also see the necessity for architects being as efficient as possible. The member for York said that many architects practising their profession to-day could not pass the necessary examinations. That may be so.

Mr. Latham: It is true.

Mr. PICKERING: And the same is true of many men in other professions. They reach a stage at which they cannot face examinations as they could in their younger days. They have shown their proficiency in their profession. It is only right that students should qualify for their profession, and it is not imposing any injustice if we ask that students shall pass a qualifying examination. In the ordinary course it is necessary for students wishing to enter the Government service to pass the examination of the Institute of Architects before they receive their certificates.

Mr. Money: Without this Bill.

Mr. Latham: That applies only to the Government.

Mr. PICKERING: If it is important so far as the Government architectural work is concerned, it is as essential, if not more so, where the outside public are concerned. I hope members will not be misled by any specious argument. It is not fair to place the onus on the architects as suggested by the clause. Such a practice would lead to the encouragement of fraud, pre-dating of articles and other actions the Committee should not tolerate.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Since I spoke on the Bill I have looked at the parent Act. I find that I was in error. The Act refers to those engaged "at or prior to the commencement of this Act." The member for Bunbury might well examine Clause 2 to ascertain whether, in view of the provisions of Section 14, it is worth the paper it is printed on. I hope hon. members will not agree to the clause. Do they think it just to place in the hands of a practising architect, the right to certify that his pupil is competent? The Arbitration Court provides inspectors and examiners who report upon and test apprentices in various trades to ascertain whether they are receiving the proper tuition to enable them to become good tradesmen. There is no such reference in the clause.

Mr. Latham. There must be some provision for examinations in their indentures.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That applies to every indenture, but it is very essential that the architect's pupils should be properly educated.

Mr. Lambert: So they are.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: They are not any more so than in other trades or professions. The law is sufficiently wide at present and the system proposed in the clause is wrong. We would not dream of agreeing to any such proposition in professions, such as the legal or medical.

Mr. Lambert: Most of these architects do not even hold the certificate suggested.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It does not matter. A commencement has to be made. The examiner should not be the man that has taught the applicant for admission.

Mr. Lambert: That is what we have in the dental profession.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The principle is wrong. In our State schools we do not allow the head teachers to examine the scholars. There has been plenty of time to enable the architect with apprentices under him to impart the necessary tuition.

Mr. LAMBERT: Previous to 1922 a student was indentured to an architect, paying 100, 200, or 300 guineas premium. After serving three years, he was automatically admitted to the Royal Society of Architects without any examination, or any certificate of competency.

Mr. Pickering: You cannot prove that.

Mr. LAMBERT: That was the general procedure.

Mr. Pickering: No, he had to pass the examination of the Institute of Architects.

Mr. LAMBERT: There was no examination; he was admitted automatically, whether qualified or not. Parliament decreed that every architect should be registered, but nine out of ten architects practising to-day have never passed an examination.

Mr. Pickering: Mere repetition does not make your statement true.

Mr. LAMBERT: A meeting of the Royal Society of Architects was held, and out of 73 registered architects, only eleven attended to record their solemn protest and opposition against the remedying of this injustice to the students.

Mr. Pickering: Where did you get your information?

Mr. LAMBERT: From Mr. Harold Boas, an architect of standing in this city.

Mr. Pickering: Was he at the meeting?

Mr. LAMBERT: That does not matter.

Capt. Carter: Can the member for Sussex say you are wrong?

Mr. Pickering: Yes.

Mr. LAMBERT: The member for Sussex should adopt a more generous attitude. Nine out of ten of the architects practising to-day were automatically registered. But now, when a disinterested member seeks to remedy a flaw in the Act, the profession plead that to admit six or eight students on the same

basis as they themselves were admitted would lower the status of the profession. It is sheer hypocrisy and humbug. They merely desire to keep out a few competitors. If it is seriously contended that the admission of a few students is going to lower the standard of the profession, that standard must be very low to-day. Before the Act was passed, those students entered into an agreement to serve their term—

Mr. Latham: And that contract should be honoured.

Mr. LAMBERT: Quite so.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Why not repeal the Act?

Mr. LAMBERT: The profession have no right to adopt an arrogant attitude towards those students. Members should not be led away by the argument that this amendment will undermine the usefulness of the parent Act. The profession is on a good foundation and while we should preserve its status, we should have some regard for those who had entered into a contract and paid their premium prior to the passing of the Act, never anticipating the legislation that now debars them from becoming architects.

Mr. PICKERING: I hope the Committee will not be misled by the exuberant verbosity of the member for Coolgardie. The argument I advanced was advanced in the best interests of the community. The member for North-East Fremantle illustrated how important it was that architects should be qualified to deal with the problems that demand their attention. Because we realise the urgent necessity of improving the status of the profession, we are anxious that the existing statute should be maintained. This is an insidious attempt on the part of the member for York to bring about the registration of one who will not take the trouble to pass an examination. If the clause is passed the status of the student will be reduced. Parliament decided on certain legislation in 1922, and that legislation was the result of mature deliberation. The Act has not worked unfairly beyond the failure to register certain individuals who were inadvertently overlooked.

Mr. MONEY: Section 13 of the Act contains exactly the same principle as is intended by the clause. Paragraph (h) of Section 13 of the Act provides that anyone who for 12 months has been practising as an architect or was engaged as an assistant to an architect, shall be automatically registered. That paragraph sets out that anyone who has been an assistant for seven years, whether he was an assistant at the time of the passing of the Act or not, is entitled to registration. That is an astonishing thing. Such a person may have had no training whatever, and yet on registration, he may put up his signboard.

Mr. McCallum: He may not even have had a job.

Mr. MONEY: Such a man is entitled automatically to be registered as an architect and he may put up a ten-storey building in Perth.

We are interfering with the right of a person whose desire is to be thoroughly trained as an architect and who may have paid a premium, although we did not worry much in reference to qualifications when we passed the Act of 1922. Under that Act an assistant, who is entitled to registration, may have been an assistant for merely menial purposes. I am reading the Act just as it is. The assistant may have had no training at all. An assistant means one who assists. Why do we differentiate between an articulated student who must serve three years, and an assistant who needs to have seven years' experience?

Mr. Pickering: He holds a position equivalent to the managing clerk in your office.

Mr. MONEY: When a surveyor has an assistant—

Mr. Pickering: He is a student of surveying.

Mr. MONEY: Not necessarily. He is under no agreement and neither is he articulated. He goes out simply as an assistant to the surveyor.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And you would not license him as a surveyor.

Mr. MONEY: Under the Act it is possible to license an assistant to an architect. Men who are entirely unqualified are entitled to practise as architects in Western Australia. However, we have adopted the principle of the right of a man to live. I do not care whether this measure involves the right of one man only, or the right of two or three: I shall do my best to give that individual or those two or three individuals the right which obtains under Section 13 of the Act.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The last speaker has really put up a strong argument against passing any legislation of this kind in future. I move an amendment—

That the following be added to the Clause:—"Before such registration the applicant shall be approved as competent to practise as an architect by the Government Chief Architect."

I am strongly opposed to allowing an architect to give a certificate of qualification to his own students. I have been told that there is one architect who has a student utterly unable to pass the examination, and that heaven and earth are being moved for the sake of that student. Under the law as it stands, an unqualified man may practise the profession of architecture, but cannot call himself an architect. If a person is registered by the Institute of Architects, it is an acknowledgment that he is qualified. The most independent man to certify to qualifications is the Government Chief Architect.

Mr. LATHAM: I see no great harm in the amendment, but a question of principle is involved. Contracts were entered into prior to the commencement of the Act, and I want the Chamber to respect those contracts. The contracts do not provide for passing an examination set by the Government Chief Architect. That official might not be as well qualified as the architect to whom the student is

articled. The Bill is intended to apply only to men who were apprenticed before the commencement of the parent Act. There cannot be more than ten or twelve of them. Nine of them can pass the examination, and therefore only three men will be affected.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But all those men want the Bill.

Mr. LATHAM: Formerly any man who had had the word "Architect" written on his door was admitted. I see no necessity whatever for the amendment, and I hope the Committee will not carry it.

Mr. LAMBERT: I can hardly think the member for North-East Fremantle is serious over this matter.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I am perfectly serious.

Mr. LAMBERT: Why should we set up the Government Chief Architect as the sole arbiter of competency? That officer is in a groove of such a nature as might render him disqualified to bear the proposed responsibility. In passing the parent Act we desired to place architecture here upon the same footing of dignity as it enjoys in other countries. The parent Act embraces everyone who could be regarded as having even the semblance of a claim. No such person was debarred from following the profession of architect, without examination and without restriction. Now it is discovered that by some inadvertence a few men have been excluded, and we seek to mend that fault. Some extraordinary distortion of reasoning causes the member for Sussex to object to that step. If it is the considered opinion of the architects of this State that an injustice should not be rectified, I can only regret it.

Mr. Pickering: These men recognised from the start that they would have to pass the certifying examination of the institute.

Mr. LAMBERT: No such thing.

Mr. Pickering: Yes, they did.

Mr. LAMBERT: That is not so.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: How do you know? Here is a man who had to do it.

Mr. Pickering: The Public Works Department insist upon the qualifying examination and the men you are referring to knew that.

Mr. LAMBERT: If Parliament were as bare-faced as some in the architectural profession, we would go so far as to prolong the life of Parliament for another 10 years.

Mr. Latham: In Britain, architects have not an Act to protect them.

Mr. LAMBERT: That is so. Yet when we find a few people have been omitted who were intended to be included under the parent Act, the architects, with their close professional preserve, object to the position being rectified. I do not believe the member for North-East Fremantle is serious in his objection.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I would not hold up the Bill for an hour if I were not serious.

Mr. LAMBERT: The hon. member knows that no good purpose will be served by the amendment, which does not indicate how the Principal Government Architect is to

arrive at his decision that the students are qualified. To pass the amendment would be to introduce a most dangerous principle in our legislation.

Hon. T. WALKER: I do not like the clause, nor yet the amendment. It is a sound principle of law that a man must not be the judge in his own cause.

Mr. Lambert: What about the Barristers' Board and the Dental Board?

Hon. T. WALKER: The Barristers' Board approve of what I am saying. The man responsible for training an individual should not be the judge of his own work. That is sound, common sense, and it is insisted upon as a principle of law. I sympathise with the attitude of the member for York, for if an injustice has been done to anyone, we should open the doors to correction.

The Premier: I think we should discharge this Bill from the Notice Paper; it is taking up too much time.

Hon. T. WALKER: I will not delay the Committee for long. We should not introduce a new principle absolutely at variance with the essence of justice itself. If the Bill were defeated and another measure introduced, which would directly rectify the injustice referred to, it would have my hearty support. The Bill is an offence in another sense, for it gives the lesser authority power over the greater authority.

Mr. Latham: He can pass the examination set by the board. Provision is made for that.

Hon. T. WALKER: Then the Bill should be put in that form. After this the board will set examinations for future apprentices.

Mr. Money: That is so.

Hon. T. WALKER: If it read, "Notwithstanding that he has not passed the preliminary examination set," it would meet the case. But here we are putting up for a few a standard that will not be imposed upon future applicants.

Mr. Latham: There are only three of them.

Hon. T. WALKER: It is introducing a principle that will be a menace to future architects. It becomes a very dangerous precedent. I shall be compelled to vote against that feature. I suggest to the hon. member that he have the clause recommended for the purpose of redrafting it in such a way as to remove the sound objections raised by the member for North-East Fremantle.

Mr. Johnston: I move—

That progress be reported.

Motion put and negatived.

The PREMIER: We never pass a measure of this kind without doing injustice to some. The Act of 1920 did injustice, although it seems it is limited to two or three people. The Committee now wants to see justice done to those men. The Act of 1920 interfered with certain apprentices articulated to architects. That should be cor-

rected. It would be wise if the member in charge of the Bill agreed to redraft the clause in a way that will remove the objections raised to it.

Progress reported.

BILL—FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from 5th September.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. R. S. Sampson—Swan) [10.24]: The Bill seeks to amend the Act of 1920. I have consulted medical officers competent to advise in this matter. It is not my intention to offer opposition to the second reading. There are certain amendments, but they can be attended to in Committee. The Bill has a twofold object, the main one being connected with the establishment of a lead factory at Fremantle. The member for South Fremantle (Mr. McCallum) when moving the second reading gave members a good deal of information in respect of lead factories. I agree with him that very careful consideration is necessary to prevent the admittedly terrible disease that so frequently follows the establishment of lead factories. It was formerly the opinion that sulphate of lead was not poisonous. To an extent that is true. But I am convinced that all forms of lead in process of manufacture are poisonous, and that the utmost care must be exercised to see that those engaged in lead factories shall not be injured. The Bill makes provision for a supply of lemonade made with sulphuric acid. Some years ago this was regarded as an antidote for lead poisoning in a factory producing carbonate of lead. It was not even then used in a sulphate of lead factory, and sulphate of lead is the class of lead produced in the newly established Fremantle factory. Later research work has convinced even those interested in the production of carbonate of lead that lemonade made with sulphuric acid is of little practical benefit. In 1900 this matter was fully discussed at a conference held in England. From that time the use of lemonade made with sulphuric acid has been dropped. I have gone carefully into this subject, and I feel that when this particular clause comes before the committee it can be deleted without injury to the Bill. In Clause 2 reference is made to arsenic or other poisonous substances. I suggest to the hon. member in charge of the Bill that if the production of arsenic or other poisonous substances is to be considered, it would be better to introduce special legislation for the purpose; because whereas for instance it was considered that lemonade made with sulphuric acid was good for one class of poison, it is a scientific fact that even if it were of advantage in one case, it might be a positive irritant in another. As an antidote to be used in the production of carbonate of lead, chemists hold that strong tea is the best liquid the workers can consume.

After all the best thing is the adoption of preventive measures. Let me enumerate some of the measures that would do much to minimise the evil effect of working in lead factories, as follows:—1, Efficient general ventilation; 2, Local exhaust ventilation from the point of view of dust protection; 3, Wetting down floors to lay dust; 4, The wearing of respirators; 5, Eating and drinking in lead-free rooms; 6, Scrupulous personal cleansing on leaving the point of manufacture, particularly before partaking of food or drink. In addition to these preventive measures a further safeguard is recommended in the shape of an antidote—flour of sulphur or calcium sulphide in very thinly-coated pills. The effect would be to convert ingested lead into the really insoluble lead sulphide which would pass through the system without being absorbed into the blood. I am informed that in the Eastern States where there are lead factories, protective legislation has not been introduced, but that is no reason why it should not be brought in here. While I realise we have all too few secondary industries and must be careful not to impose unnecessary restrictions upon them, I am in accord with the desire of the hon. member to safeguard the lives and health of those concerned. Subject to amendments, I support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. ANGELO in the Chair; Mr. McCallum in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Provisions applicable to factories where lead, arsenic, etc., are used:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in the proposed new Subsection (1), before the word "lead," the words "compounds of" be inserted.

Without those words it would mean that plumbers and others using lead would come within the scope of the provision.

Amendment put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That in the proposed new subsection (1) the words "arsenic or any other poisonous substance" be struck out.

If a factory is established to manufacture other poisons, special legislation should be introduced.

Mr. McCALLUM: The same regulations under the British Factories Act cover such works. It would be as well to have a comprehensive measure covering all dangerous trades where disease is contracted, particularly where such poisons as those mentioned are in the atmosphere where men are working.

The Colonial Secretary: Arsenic is not produced here.

Mr. McCALLUM: But there is every prospect of its being manufactured here. There are big mines at Southern Cross.

The Colonial Secretary: Then I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. Marshall: You are getting more humane every day.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Mr. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That after paragraph (b) of the proposed new Subsection (2) the following be inserted: "And if the roasting, conversion, reduction or treatment of lead or arsenical ore by any process is carried on,"

In the printing trade a levy is made to provide for the families of men who are affected by lead poisoning. I do not suggest that masks and leather gloves should be used in the printing trade, but that they should be confined to works where roasting, conversion, reduction or treatment of lead or arsenical ore by any process is carried on.

Amendment put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (c) of sub-clause 2 be struck out.

Lemonade made with sulphuric acid is not considered as an antidote for lead poisoning. Strong tea is of greater value, as the effect of the tannin is to hold the sulphate of lead soluble and allow it to pass through the system before it is dissolved in the blood.

Mr. McCALLUM: I have conferred with several physicians in connection with this provision. Their advice is that lemonade made with sulphuric acid is an effective antidote, and that it prevents the lead from being absorbed in the system, through which it passes in a solid state. Immediately sulphate of lead reaches the intestines, it becomes a carbonate. The acids in the system turn it from a sulphate into a carbonate. Lemonade made with sulphuric acid allows the lead to pass through the system in solid form. I have copied this provision from the regulations made under the British Factories Act, as a result of the Geneva conference. This was embodied in the Act as late as 1922, but the Colonial Secretary talks of the conference which met in 1900. I am also informed that tea and water are ineffective as an antidote, and that ordinary lemonade is of no use. I appeal to the Minister to allow the paragraph to go through. If, later on, some better provision can be inserted the Bill can be further amended.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The drinking of lemonade made with sulphuric acid is, I understand, not harmful. The authority I am quoting holds that in this case it would be of no use. I acknowledge that the member for South Fremantle has very recent evidence upon the subject. Whilst sulphuric acid may be harmless in respect of sulphate of lead, it may become an irritant in respect of other poisons, and may even lead to cases of spontaneous combustion. If it is found on further

inquiry that it is desirable to embody this sub-clause in the Bill, it can be re-inserted at a later date.

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

Clause 3—Repeal of paragraph (d) of Section 66:

Mr. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That the words "Paragraph (d)," line 1, be struck out, and "Paragraphs (d) and (e)" inserted in lieu.

I shall, later, move the insertion of another paragraph, which appears on the Notice Paper.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The effect of the amendment will be to extend the provision generally, instead of its being limited to lead works. The amendment means that in every factory where the number of employees exceeds six, the employer must provide a separate room in which the employees shall take their meals. That would impose on many employers a very heavy burden, involving structural alterations. The principal Act already provides that separate dining rooms must be supplied for women and boys. Where a dining-room is provided, there is great difficulty in inducing the workers to use it, compulsion being necessary as a rule. Working in lead is admittedly most dangerous, and in lead works the provision of a separate dining-room is undoubtedly necessary. But in factories where poison is not floating in the air, a special dining-room is not necessary. I hope the amendment will not be carried, as it would have a bad effect on nascent industries.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and negatived.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 143:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is no positive objection to this clause, but it is unnecessary, as the Interpretation Act of 1918 provides than an Act shall include regulations, rules, and by-laws made under it. Consequently, the desire of the hon. member is given effect to already.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Crown Solicitor advised me that the clause was most necessary.

Hon. P. Collier: He advised the Minister too, I suppose.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is necessary to make provision for enforcing the regulations as well as the measure itself. In any case, the position cannot be damaged by agreeing to the clause.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The clause would be necessary but for the fact that the Interpretation Act deals with the matter. My information was not gained from the Solicitor General, and it is only fair that I should mention the fact.

Clause put and negatived.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 11.3 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 1st November, 1923.

	PAGE
Condolence: The late Lady Wittenoom, President's acknowledgment	1258
Questions: Wyndham Meat Works	1258
Arbitration Court, congestion	1258
Jandakot Road Board, papers	1259
Bills: Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 1A.	1259
Inspection of Scaffolding, Com.	1259
Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 2A., Com., report	1265
West Australian Trustees, Executor, & Agency Co., Ltd., Act Amendment, Select Committee's report adopted	1266
Friendly Societies Act Amendment, Com.	1267

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

CONDOLENCE—THE LATE LADY WITTENOOM.

President's Acknowledgment.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The following letter has been received from the Hon. the President:—

I and my family appreciate very highly the resolution carried at the meeting of the Legislative Council on Tuesday. Will you please convey to the members our sincere appreciation not only of the sympathy expressed in the resolution, but also in their action of adjourning the House. It is indeed comforting under such a sudden and wholly unexpected bereavement. I am, Yours, sincerely, E. H. Wittenoom, President.

QUESTION—WYNDHAM MEAT WORKS.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES asked the Minister for Education: 1, Has any agreement been finalised for the disposal of the products of the Wyndham Meat Works? 2, If so, with whom? 3, Will the Minister lay the agreement or agreements on the Table?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, An arrangement has been made with Sheed, Thomson & Co., and an agreement is now being finalised. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Yes, when finalised.

QUESTION—ARBITRATION COURT, CONGESTION.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Minister for Education: 1, How many of the 105 industrial cases, i.e., 34 references of industrial disputes, 10 applications for interpretation of awards, and 61 citations for breaches of awards, that were awaiting hearing by the Arbitration Court on the 25th September last, are still unheard? 2, Will the Arbitration Court go into recess for the Christmas vacation? 3, If so, on what date and for what