remarks I place my little Bill, my first political offspring, in the hands of the House, and I commend it to their kind consideration, and trust members will bottle-feed it on the very best medical preparations, and give it honest and fair consideration, so that we may evolve something that will achieve the objects I have in view, and something that will be a credit to the House as well.

On motion by Mr. Gardiner, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 3rd October, 1912.

	Page
Papers presented	2214
Papers, Collie Coal	2214
Motion: Aborigines Reserves	2214
Bills: Fremantle Reserves Surrender, 3R.	2220
Landlord and Tenant, 3R.	2220
Industrial Arbitration, 2R.	2220
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, 2R., Com.	2234

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Return of overtime paid to Foreman Box (ordered on motion by Hon. C. McKenzie). 2, Correspondence between the Fremantle Harbour Trust and the Railway Department *re* shunting delays (ordered on motion by Hon. R. J. Lynn). 3, Papers relating to railway tests of Collie coal (ordered on motion by Hon. R. J. Lynn). 4, Regulations under the Criminal Code.

PAPERS—COLLIE COAL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): A file was asked for by Mr. Lynn on the 19th September, relating to inquiries by the Mines Department respecting ignition of Collie coal, and at the time I saw no objection to placing it on the Table. On a perusal of it, however, it seems to me that it would be highly undesirable that certain remarks which appear in the file should be given publicity. The remarks to which I allude have no direct bearing at all on the report of Mr. Mann, but they would be decidedly injurious to the business of certain persons in Western Australia, and perhaps of advantage to others. I hope Mr. Lynn will not press for the presentation of these papers but I will be prepared to allow Mr. Lynn, or any other hon. member to peruse them in my office or in this Chamber, so long as they are not laid on the Table. If hon. members peruse the file for themselves they will see that I am perfectly justified in adopting this attitude.

MOTION—ABORIGINES RESERVES.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (North-East): I move—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable, for the preservation of the native race, to continue and extend the policy laid down in C.S.O. file 1709/11, viz., by reserving large areas of virgin country for the sole and exclusive use of the aborigines.

In submitting this motion in regard to permanent reserves for aborigines, I wish to preface my remarks by saying that I am not doing so in any hostile spirit to the Aborigines Department or to this Government, or, indeed, to any former Government in regard to the treatment of the aborigines of Western Australia. I believe the aborigines have been exceptionally well treated, and notwithstanding anything that might have been said to the contrary, they have been much better treated in Western Australia than in any other Australian State. Therefore, I wish to make it clear before going further that the motion is not being moved with the object of offering criticism, because, let me again repeat, the Governments have treated the natives in the State exceptionally well. I am speaking more particularly since Responsible Government. Before that time they may have been

treated as well or perhaps better, but I am not in a position to speak about that period. When Responsible Government was granted to Western Australia a provision was included in the Constitution Act, I presume at the request of the Imperial Government, that there should be at least £10,000 per annum provided for the welfare of the natives of the colony. That was a condition of the granting of our Constitution by the Imperial Government. But it has not stopped at that. There has never been so small a sum, certainly not within my knowledge, spent for the benefit of the native race. For instance, if hon. members will turn to the report of the Aborigines Department for the year ended 30th June, 1911, it will be found that there was no less a sum than £46,000 spent on those people in that twelve months. True, £21,000 of this amount was spent for the purpose of acquiring and equipping the native station near Hall's Creek known as Moola Boola. Even deducting that £21,000, which it will be admitted was rather unusual expenditure in that year, we still have a yearly expenditure of £25,000 for the welfare of the natives. We have in the past established lock hospitals at Bernier and Dorre Islands for the unfortunate portion of this race who have become contaminated with contagious diseases. Speaking from memory, these hospitals have cost £7,000 or £8,000 to erect and equip. I had the honour of establishing these hospitals, and I find that in the year ended 30th June, 1911, their cost for upkeep amounted to £8,475 16s. 3d. That sum includes £2,130 for the collection of these natives and returning them to their native habitats. Apart from transport, it costs over £6,000 per annum to maintain these hospitals. In addition to that, we have provided the native station to which I have already referred. By the way, the name Moola Boola in tribal language means "meat plenty." That name was selected to signify that it would be no longer necessary for the natives to kill bullocks on adjoining stations as they can now go to Moola Boola where there would be "meat plenty" for them. This name it was thought would convey the right intention of the station to the natives. Before that the natives were sent to gaol in large numbers for cattle stealing, and after studying the question I, as Minister controlling the department, arrived at the conclusion that it was a gross waste of money and that no good purpose was being served by putting the natives in gaol. By altering the administration of the Aborigines Act, and also altering the administration of the police department, those numbers were reduced considerably. In addition, the object of establishing this station was that the natives might know they had a home to go to, and that they could go to it just as they pleased, do any work that might be necessary, and get as much beef as they felt disposed to eat. It was also intended to establish a herd of horses there so that there might be bred enough remounts for the police. That, together with the sale of surplus fat stock, it was thought, would return enough to pay interest on the money which had been expended, and the natives would then be fed for nothing and we would accomplish the purposes of preventing the natives from stealing cattle, establishing a home for them, and reducing by many thousands a year the cost of feeding the indigent natives by the police and the squatters. There were a number of fat bullocks there when the station was bought, and the removal of these caused a little trouble amongst the natives, because they got rather particular so far as their beef was concerned, especially when they had carte-blanche to spear whatever cattle they wanted. Naturally, they speared them in great numbers, but when the choice beasts were taken from them, the natives who had been educated to a standard of good living demurred at being offered the cows of the herd, so that when the fat bullocks were sent away there was some trouble. The present Government brought down a shipment of fat bullocks from the station less than twelve months afterwards and, remembering the tastes of these natives in regard to a choice meat diet, I was interested to see the quality of the beasts in that shipment. However, the public accepted them, and I suppose the Government are quite satis-

fied, but from my previous knowledge of the opinion expressed by the blacks I refrained from buying any of that beef. In addition to establishing stations, lock hospitals and other institutions for the support of the natives, I see from the report of 1911-12 that £9,685 was spent on feeding old and indigent natives in the different depôts established. To verify what I have said in regard to the gaols I would draw attention to a return in this report, which shows that in 1910 no fewer than 218 natives were discharged from the gaols, while at the date on which the report was written there were only 47 natives in the gaols in the northern portion of the State. That is very gratifying, because it proves that the system which I instituted is the right one, seeing that it reduces the number in our gaols to such an extent, and that we now hear less of cattle spearing than we did in the days when the gaols contained between 400 and 500 aborigines. There is another aspect also. I have already said that the several Governments have treated the aborigines well, notwithstanding anything suggested to the contrary. There seems to have been a feeling that the natives of Western Australia have been badly treated. That is not the case at all so far as the Government are concerned. There seems also to be a common belief that the squatters of Western Australia have treated the aborigines in a very harsh manner. With a view to looking into the aborigines question I travelled right up as far as Derby on one occasion, and I came to the conclusion that on the whole the squatters treated these natives in a very kindly fashion.

Hon. J. Cornell: My experience has been that they do not treat them too generously.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: There are bound to be exceptions.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: The natives have been a very great burden to them.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: That is so. On page 5 of this report the Chief Protector of Aborigines states—

> During my recent visit to the North, on one station I saw over 100 native men, women, and children that were regularly fed throughout the year. The property was a well improved one, being fenced throughout, and, except at shearing time, it was very obvious that there was not sufficient work to absorb that quantity of native labour, and yet all were fed, including the infirm and indigent, at the station's expense. This is only one of many similar instances that I could mention, where natives are continued in employment and their wives and children fed because they and their forefathers were born on the country where the employers' stock are depasturing. Settlers have in a most liberal manner responded to my request to feed at their own expense the infirm and indigent relatives of their employees.

That bears out all previous reports, whether from the travelling protectors, of which there are two in the North, or of the Chief Protector, who travels to the North generally once a year. Moreover, the Governments of the past have very liberally subsidised the aborigines missions, of which there are eight in the State. I see also by this report that they were paid last year a subsidy of £2,500. I cannot speak too highly of the self-sacrificing work of these missions in the interests of the aborigines, and I say most decidedly their work should be encouraged and extended; that is to say, it should be encouraged and extended so far as the semi-civilised aborigines are concerned. By these I mean all those aborigines in the settled portions of the State, including that portion of Kimberley which is settled by squatters. But, as I will show later on, I do not think these missions are likely to do any good so far as the future preservation of the race is concerned. I remember that some five years ago the Benedictine community, which has established and maintained a highly successful mission at New Norcia, approached me with a view of obtaining a grant for the establishment of a further mission on the Drysdale River, situated in the extreme North-West of the State. I refused to recommend this to Cabinet. Later on I was waited upon by the Presbyterian community with a similar re-

quest. They desired to establish a mission at Walcott Inlet, between Derby and Broome. This also I refused, and the only assistance either of these missions was given took the form of a grant of Crown land, which was to be held so long as the mission was carried on, but no longer. The Benedictine fathers established their mission on the Drysdale River under great hardships, and at some risk of their lives, and the Presbyterian mission also began in a small way.

The Colonial Secretary: They returned, because they could not get any blackfellows.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: They certainly set out with the greatest enthusiasm.

The Colonial Secretary: They have selected another site.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: They were certainly very enthusiastic. They brought over from Queensland a young man who had been very successful in mission work, and placed him in charge, but I was very doubtful if they would have the necessary capital. Fortunately, the Benedictine community had several thousand pounds which they had secured in Europe, and so were able to make a substantial start. I have come to the conclusion that the uncivilised native will not live under white man's conditions. Take, as an instance, the New Norcia mission, which has been established about 70 years. That mission is conducted in the best possible manner, and no exception has ever been taken to the way in which it is conducted. The late Bishop Salvado and his assistants gave up their lives to it, and their successors are still at it. They have built substantial, comfortable houses for the natives, boys and girls, and I venture to say that very few children in Perth, certainly not the majority of Perth children, enjoy such comfortable homes. They build small houses for the married men. They never allow a native girl to go out from the school until they marry her to a native, when they establish them on a piece of land. But, notwithstanding all this, what is the result? There are scarcely a dozen full-blooded natives in that district. It proves that the natives will not live under white man's conditions. So soon as they are placed under those conditions so soon will they fall into bad health and, therefore, it is useless to attempt to preserve the race along those lines. I am not speaking now as to education and enlightenment, but simply in respect to the preservation of the race, and in that regard I believe that as a whole the missions have been a failure, although, as I have said, they have done a great deal for the educational enlightenment of the natives. The average native cannot comprehend either learning or religion. The New Norcia community can show some splendid examples of natives excellently trained as mechanics. It proves, of course, how intelligent some of the natives are, but these are the exceptions, and they represent a very small minority? I do not wish to be misunderstood. These missions should be allowed to continue, and should be encouraged in every way in all the settled portions of the State; because these men have been brought in from their native country, which has been transformed by being stocked up, and therefore they must now be fed under white man's conditions. Under the method adopted the children are brought into the mission and educated, and that system should be encouraged in every way by the Government. I have said this much in order to explain the position to which I am leading up. After having studied the question for some five years I have come to the conclusion first, that we are in duty bound to do something for the preservation of the native race. I have felt that all the work done was not tending to the permanent preservation of the native race, and I have come to the conclusion that the only way is to set apart an unselected portion of the State and hold it as a native reserve. There is an area of about four million acres with the Cambridge Gulf for its eastern boundary, and with a line from the southern corner of the gulf, extending over to the Drysdale River, as the southern boundary, I am anxious that this area should be set apart as a class "A" reserve so that it might be reserved for ever for the native race, because I

believe if the natives are allowed to continue in their own way and live their own life, they will live just as long as any other race on the face of the earth. The native game and native roots are not only their food, but also their medicine. These things are essential to their native state, and to my mind we might just as well take a bird or a horse, and endeavour to rear it under white man's conditions, as to take the aborigines, place them under those conditions, and expect that we are thereby going to prolong the race. Notwithstanding all that we have done, it is our duty to see that the race does not become extinct, as it has done in the Eastern States, and I say with all due respect to the missions, that religion and learning for the natives are so much waste time inasmuch as the great majority cannot comprehend them.

Hon. W. Patrick: They are not extinct in Queensland.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: No. I am referring to the portions of Australia where they come more in contact with the white race. I believe that in Tasmania and Victoria they are practically extinct, but in Queensland there are probably just as many natives as there are in this State. With the object that I have indicated to the House, some time before I left office I brought this matter before the Government and asked that a reserve should be set apart for this purpose. Perhaps it will be the shortest way to explain the matter to members if I read the minute I then submitted to Cabinet. It was as follows:—

> For the past 12 months or more I have been giving very careful consideration to the question of setting apart a large native reserve in the totally unsettled portion of the Kimberley district. This, I am convinced, is the only way by which native races can be preserved. The missions and education, so far as the aborigines are concerned, are all very well, and I have no wish to detract from their good work. The missions certainly tend to elevate the natives, but the fact remains that they have not the desired effect. This is my experience after administering the affairs of the department for five years, and I do not think I could give a better instance than New Norcia Mission, which has been in existence for 65 years and without question has been conducted on the very best lines. Although the natives have been educated and elevated during their lives, there are very few full-blooded natives there to-day. This, to my mind, proves that the aborigines, therefore, cannot thrive under white men's conditions. I have come to the conclusion that the only way to preserve the native race is to reserve for them a piece of unsettled country where native herbs, roots, game and fish are available. These form food as well as medicine for them. In this territory they would not come in contact with white men and they would be able to live their lives in their own native way, and their preservation can in this way be assured. It is clearly our duty to do what is possible to preserve the native races, and believing that this can only be achieved by this means I make the following recommendation: After having made considerable inquiry, and upon reports received from Mr. Surveyor Brockman and Mr. Arthur Haly (the manager of the native cattle station), both of whom have been over the country and know its capabilities well, I consider that the portion hatched blue and marked A on the plan hereunder is suitable.

I then went on to describe the boundaries, and later continued—

> There is a further tract of country having its southern boundary extending from a point on the coast opposite the Anderson Islands on the west to the King Edward river on the east, and for its eastern boundary the King Edward river north to the north-west corner of P.L. 893/98, and thence north-east to survey mark 8221, and from thence north adjoining the west boundary of the Drysdale River Mission grant to Napier Broome Bay.

I concluded by making the following recommendation—

(a.) That reserve 3960 be cancelled.

(b.) That the area of land set out in paragraph 4 hatched blue and marked A on plan hereunder, subject to the amendments of the eastern boundary to adjoin the reserve for naval defence, be reserved for native use only, as a class "A" reserve, so that the sanction of Parliament must be obtained before it can be interfered with.

The Colonial Secretary: What date is that?

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: September, 1911. But it had not been dealt with by Cabinet when the Government went out of office. I asked for these papers in order that I might refresh my mind, and I am pleased to see that the matter was taken up by the present Government, and that a few months after we left office the portion of land that I refer to, comprising 4,000,000 acres, was proclaimed a class "A" reserve for the use of the aborigines. I am very pleased indeed to see that the present Government saw eye to eye with the late Government and that this principle was the right one. After I had seen the papers I thought that I would continue with the motion in order that the House might know the policy which the former Government proposed and the present Government had adopted, so that members, if they approve of it, may give it their endorsement, and thus offer an incentive to the Government to continue this policy. Now is the time to act. It may not be known to all hon. members that only a portion of the Kimberley country is selected; certainly very little is stocked, but if meat works are established there and a market afforded for the stock, no doubt the whole of the country will be applied for. Therefore I say that now, before any more country is taken up, is the time to establish these natives reserves. The importance of establishing them at once lies in the fact that once they are stocked they are useless for this purpose, because the stock will eat off the native herbage, alter the whole character of the country, and make it quite different from what the natives were originally accustomed to. Unless these reserves are put aside before the country is stocked it will be too late. In addition to that portion which I have mentioned there was a further reserve suggested, as members will see on reference to the file. To revert again to the reserve of 4,000,000 acres between Cambridge Gulf on the east and the Drysdale River on the west, there was a reserve of 100,000 acres inside that area which had been granted to the Church of England in 1897 as a mission station. So far as I remember, that area was never made use of in any way, and my recommendation to Cabinet was that this reserve should be cancelled, and if necessary the church could be given another reserve somewhere else and the old one included in the native reserve. I ask the Colonial Secretary to take a note of that, because I think the object we all have in view will not be attained if he allows that 100,000 acres to remain inside the native reserve. It would no doubt suit the church to exchange that area for another one, because the present one is most inaccessible and the church could be given another nearer to a port. If this is done the whole of that area, totalling 4,100,000 acres, could be made a class "A" reserve for natives. On the other side of the Kimberleys a stretch of coastal country, beginning from Vansittart Bay in the north-west and following the coast down as far as Prince Frederick Harbour, should be reserved for the same purpose. That tract of country contains about a couple of million acres and no harm could be done to anybody by reserving it, because it is extremely rough country and unsuitable for selection. Yet, it would be very good for the natives inasmuch as native game and fish abound. I think, however, that the line shown on the plan in this file should be taken a little farther north so as to exclude Prince Frederick Harbour, as this is said to be an excellent harbour, which may be worth opening up in time to give access to the country in the interior. I have briefly given my reasons for moving this motion. Let me say again that I am very pleased the Government have constituted the area I first referred to a class "A" reserve, and it will continue as such until Parliament otherwise orders,

because no Government can, without the consent of Parliament, use it otherwise than as a reserve for the use and benefit of the natives. I also wish to impress on the Colonial Secretary that this system, which the Houses will endorse if it carries my motion, should be extended, and other reserves set aside for this purpose. I have much pleasure in moving the motion standing in my name.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) : I second the motion.

On motion by the Colonial Secretary, debate adjourned.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Fremantle Reserves Surrender (returned to the Legislative Assembly with an amendment).

2, Landlord and Tenant (transmitted to the Legislative Assembly).

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE (North-East) : In addressing myself to the Bill before the House, a measure which might have such vital effect on the industries of the State of Western Australia, may I say that from my point of view the Bill has been very ably debated by members who have spoken, and that without reiterating a lot of the arguments which have been used, it would be almost impossible to make a speech, even if it were a short one, on the Bill. I do not intend to speak at any very great length. I would just like to make my opinion on the question of arbitration and conciliation clear to the House and point out one or two clauses of the Bill to which I take exception. I wish to say that I will support the Bill in its second reading, in the hope that when it is in Committee it will be amended somewhat to suit the conditions of our industrial life. With members of this House and indeed, I suppose of every adult in Western Australia, I desire to see industrial peace. I think it is our duty as legislators to try to help to build up prosperous industries in this great State of ours. We also want to see surrounding those industries a contented people, a people who will be able to live in comfort from the proceeds which they receive for their labour in the various industries. The industries of Western Australia are somewhat limited. The principal industries at the present time are, undoubtedly, mining and agriculture. I want to say that I think this measure should be so cast that it will do justice to all sections of the community. It must do justice to the employee, as well as to the employer. The employer cannot do without the employee, and the employee cannot do without the capitalist or the employer. Sir Edward Wittenoom yesterday, in an eloquent speech, stated that he supposed he was the representative of a very large amount of capital in this State. Now I think there can be no question of the fact that when Sir Edward speaks in this Chamber, he makes no bones of the fact that he is a representative of capital. He usually makes that very clear indeed, and we may even go so far as to give Sir Edward Wittenoom the title of leader of the capitalistic party. Just as the leader of this House desires to get the best Bill he can for his party when he introduces a measure such as the one before us, so it is the desire of the representatives of capital to get the best Bill they can for themselves also. Those of us who are not labourites, and are not representatives of capital, have a duty I think to see that a happy medium is struck. I do not think that the Bill as presented to this House will be accepted in its entirety; on the other hand, I do not think that Sir Edward Wittenoom or any other member who represents capital will be able to carry all the amendments he may desire in Committee. Mr. Patrick yesterday very ably pleaded the cause of the agriculturist. Agriculture in Western Australia is undoubtedly one of our greatest industries. Next week we will have ocular demonstration of the fact in the magnificent exhibits which will be shown at the Claremont agricultural show grounds, and I hope we shall also see further evidence of this in a well dressed happy, thriving crowd of people from

the agricultural districts. Mr. Patrick pleaded the cause of the agriculturist, not only of the man who owns the land, but the man who works the land and assists the owner of it. The case was very well put indeed. May I be excused if I attempt in a small way to plead for the mining industry. When I say the mining industry I mean the industry as a whole. I do not mean the owners of the gold mines on the eastern belt, but the whole of the mining industry of Western Australia which is also a great industry and equal to if not greater at the present moment, than the agricultural industry. I want to see justice done to the mine owner, and I want to see justice done to the worker on the mines. Nearly the whole of my life has been spent in the midst of mining communities, first of all in Victoria and for almost twenty years past on the eastern goldfields of Western Australia, and I have no hesitation in saying that on the eastern goldfields of Western Australia we have as fine and intelligent a body of men and women as are to be found in any part of the British dominions, and in fact in any part of the world. There are from 50,000 to 60,000 people living on the Golden Mile or within a short distance of it, and they are not people who come to-day and go to-morrow. They have made their homes there, and will be engaged in this industry for some considerable time. It is now something like 20 years since the eastern goldfields were first discovered, and during that 20 years we have had comparatively speaking, industrial peace. I would say that the present Arbitration Act has had a great deal of influence in bringing about that industrial peace which we have experienced but I say that credit is due to the people themselves, the workers living on the eastern goldfields, for the moderate views they have taken and for complying with the awards of the court in almost every instance. I would also say the same of those leaders of the Labour party on the eastern goldfields who hold moderate views, and I speak more particularly of the Honorary Minister (Hon. J. E. Dodd) because there is no doubt he has been a great influence in bringing about this industrial peace on the goldfields. The Act as it stands at present, however, does not seem to have given universal satisfaction. We hear all sorts of reasons as to why it has not given that satisfaction. I am not going into further reasons. We hear about technicalities which prevent the workers from getting to the court. We hear that the workers do not obey the awards when the court has made them, and various other reasons. At the last general elections the question of arbitration was prominently before the electors. The Government who were ousted from office had made their policy the repealing of the Arbitration Act and the bringing in of a Bill to provide for wages boards. Both of these policies were expounded from almost every political platform in Western Australia, and the result was that the electors, in a most emphatic way, decided that the then reigning Government should go out and a Labour Government should be given a chance to come in. This was one of the strong points of the Labour people at the time. It was on their platform that they were in favour of compulsory arbitration and conciliation. While personally I favour the appointment of wages boards in preference to the present Arbitration Act, I am quite prepared to bow to the decision so emphatically given by the electors of the State, and I desire now to do the best I can to assist in making satisfactory alterations to the Arbitration and Conciliation Bill before us and to put it on our statute-book. During the short session we had last year the Government brought in an amending Bill. That Bill did not become an Act for reasons that every member of this House knows very well. We say that we, in this Chamber, did our best to make the Bill a workable measure, but the Government of the day thought differently, and would not accept our amendments, and consequently the Bill went by the board. The principal stumbling blocks in the way of amending the measure last session are to be found in the present measure which has been brought down

to be passed by us on this occasion. The principal stumbling block last year was that respecting the constitution of the court; the second was preference to unionists, and the third was the classification and grading of employees in an industry. Personally I gave my opinions during last session as to how I thought the Arbitration Court should be constituted. I have not altered those opinions to any extent. I do not intend to labour the question again, I merely wish to say I am still of opinion that the President of the Arbitration Court must be a judge of the Supreme Court. I am not prepared to accept the suggestion of Mr. Kingsmill that the judges of the Supreme Court should be asked to nominate an outside person to take this position. I believe that a judge of the Supreme Court is the one and only man who will be able to give satisfaction both to the workers and the employers. As far as the other two permanent members of the court are concerned—it is proposed to make them permament members of the court—I would prefer to see them left out, and on each occasion when the court sits two assessors—men with a knowledge of the particular industry on which the court is to adjudicate—should be there to give the court the benefit of their experience in that particular industry. In regard to preference to unionists I want to say I believe in unionism. I think unionism has done a great deal of good, and will continue to do a great deal of good in the world. It has been the means probably of uplifting the masses, and I hope it will go on uplifting and educating the masses in the future. My objection, and it is an objection oft repeated, is to the funds of the union being used for political purposes. We have been told that unless this measure is passed in its entirety it will not be accepted by the Government.

Hon. J. F. Cullen : That is not authoritative.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE : If Mr. Cornell, who made that statement, is correct it would be quite useless for us to spend any further time or trouble over the measure. If the Government will not accept reasonable amendments why waste the time of the House in framing and having those amendments carried? But I think that Mr. Cornell in his irresponsible and impetuous way has probably gone a great deal further than he was authorised to do and that this is not the case, and I am rather inclined to think that Mr. Dodd will take a reasonable view of the case. I remember many years ago being associated with a deputation that waited on the Premier of the day to ask for a grant. We discussed the matter beforehand and thought that we might get £500 and that we might be lucky if we got £200 or £300, but it was suggested, to make sure of getting a good amount, we should ask for £1,000. When we waited on the Premier and made our request and modestly asked for £1,000, much to our surprise in his reply, without any demur, he said certainly we should have the £1,000 because we deserved it and it was for a good cause. There was no one more surprised than ourselves. I venture to think that if we pass this measure in its entirety no one will be more surprised than Mr. Dodd. In this measure, which he has spent long months over no doubt, he has put everything he wants in the shape of clauses, and I am quite sure no one would be more surprised than Mr. Dodd if we gave him everything. But I take it Mr. Dodd is a reasonable man and that he is going to accept reasonable amendments, and that with our assistance, when the Bill emerges from this Chamber, it will be made a reasonable one and one acceptable to the Government. I trust that when the Bill gets into Committee a spirit of compromise will prevail. It has also been stated that if amendments are made which are not acceptable to the Government, a measure will be brought down for the repeal of the present Act. If that occurs, I shall not support it. I believe that if this measure does not get through and if the present Act were repealed we should have industrial trouble at once. I believe strikes would eventuate almost immediately. I look at this now through goldfields spectacles. A general strike on the

goldfields at the present time would simply be appalling. There are 10,000 children going through the schools on the Eastern Goldfields. A strike would affect the women and children far more on the goldfields than it would on the coast. In the first place they would all have to be taken away from the goldfields. They could not remain there owing to the high cost of living and the difficulty of getting provisions there. Their homes would become valueless. Many of the mines that would have to close down would never reopen, and avenues of employment would be closed to a good many people who are on the fields at the present time. The Government would be very heavy losers, inasmuch as they have a tremendous amount of capital sunk in the water scheme for the fields as well as in railways, and this capital would be lying idle for an indefinite period. Therefore, in my opinion, the repeal of the present Act if something else is not placed on the statute-book would be in the nature of a great calamity not only to the goldfields but to the rest of the State, though the goldfields people would feel it more particularly than the people on the coast. There has been a great feeling of unrest in the Commonwealth and right through the world in labour circles during the last year or two, and I think it has been caused, although it has been contradicted in the Arbitration Court, by the increased cost of the necessaries of life. Certainly the standard of living has been considerably raised, and though one cannot be blamed for wishing to bring about a better standard there is no doubt the principal reason is the increased cost of the necessaries of life. I think I have mentioned this in the Chamber before. In looking through the statistics to find out how it is that commodities have all gone up in price one has only to refer to the Customs and the Excise Department of the Commonwealth to find out one reason at all events, and a very big factor for the increased cost of living. Only yesterday there were figures published showing the collections through the Customs of the Commonwealth for the first three months of this year, and they showed something over four million pounds sterling collected in three months, or at the rate of something over sixteen millions pounds per annum from a total population, men women and children, of four and a half millions. If we go further into the statistics we find that Western Australia pays an undue proportion of the amount collected through the Customs. We pay at the rate of £3 12s. per head of the population of the State, as against very much lower amounts paid in the other States. We pay 20s. more per head than South Australia, 30s. more per head than Tasmania, 35s. 3d. more per head than Victoria, and 16s. 7d. more per head than New South Wales and Queensland. Sixteen million pounds being taken from the pockets of the workers, principally, of Australia, has been one of the great factors in the increased cost of living, and Western Australia is in a worse position than the other States, because we pay considerably more per head of the population than the other States. It seems to me almost criminal that the dominant party in the Federal Parliament should go on collecting this enormous amount which is going to increase, because we find month by month that the amount collected has been on the increase and it means that industries that might flourish under normal conditions will be killed. I speak more of the gold mining industry. There is no chance in the world of raising the price of gold. An ounce of gold will not bring any more because it is going to cost more to produce it, so that the closing down of mines must be the ultimate result if the cost of living goes on increasing, and if we have to increase the wages of the men, as undoubtedly we shall have to do, in some cases, because there are men on the goldfields who are being paid 10s. a day which I say, without fear of hesitation, is not a comfortable living wage on the goldfields. These men will have to get their wages raised and if the mining industry will not stand it the mining industry will sooner or later have to go by the board. The salvation

of the industry, we are told by prominent men, is in the low-grade ores, and I am told these low-grade ores will not stand extra cost or increased wages, and I am also told they will have to get the cost of the water supply reduced. If the mining industry is to prosper some reduction will have to be made in the cost of living. The purchasing power of the sovereign will have to be considerably increased.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Can prices be reduced?

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: We have sixteen million pounds collected through the Customs from four and a-half million people. Surely it is patent to everyone that if these Customs duties were reduced it must bring down the price of commodities. It is very often the necessities of life that are most heavily taxed, articles such as tinned fish, tinned milk, and boots and shoes.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Drinks.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: I am not talking about drinks; they can be done without. The dividends paid by mining companies in Western Australia are decreasing. The number of mines on the dividend-paying list is decreasing each year, and the managers of these mines say that they have reached that stage when they cannot afford to have their costs increased. Owing to deep sinking, and for other reasons, costs of mines have increased of late, and if wages have to be increased also the mine managers say, in many instances, it will be the last straw, and the mines will have to close down. While compulsory arbitration will not be a panacea for all the evils connected with the various industries, I contend that it is a very useful thing to have on the statute-book, and, as long as I am in Parliament, I intend to support having it retained there. From time to time I am quite prepared to give my assistance to having it amended, if it is found necessary to do so, and I am going to support the second reading of the measure—I have no doubt it will go through without much difficulty—while in Committee I am going to be one of those who take a moderate view of the situation and I shall do my best to evolve a workable measure out of the Bill before us.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister—in reply): I shall not attempt to reply to all the statements that have been made while this debate has been in progress, but there are a few remarks I intend to deal with. The Committee stage will give an opportunity to discuss the measure in detail. From what we have heard, almost every clause in the Bill will be keenly debated; in fact I believe that sufficient amendments have already been given notice of and will be given notice of to almost make a new Bill. Most of the speeches have been admirable in tone, and I feel somewhat grateful to members for the way in which they have discussed the Bill; at the same time there are one or two speeches that I cannot bring within this category and to which I intend to refer directly. First I wish to give one or two authorities in regard to the technicalities we have mentioned. It has been freely said that the technicalities arising out of this measure are not such as we say they are, and that the Act is not so limited in its operations as the Labour party say it is. I want to show, on the authority of those who know, what some of these technicalities are, or at least what they think of them. I have some notes on the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act by Mr. Davies, who has been clerk of the Court of Arbitration since the Act has been in existence, and if anyone is qualified to speak on the working of the Act it is Mr. Davies. He says—

> When the original regulations laying down the practice to be followed in connection with proceedings before the Court of Arbitration were framed in 1892 no one foresaw the results which have accrued in consequence of the numerous decisions of the Supreme Court of New South Wales and of the Federal High Court upon the construction of the Industrial Arbitration Act of 1891 of that State; and even after perusing the decisions referred to, there were some of the opinion that the variations existing

in the language used in the interpretation clauses of the respective New South Wales and Western Australian Acts render the judgments referred to inapplicable to this State.

And then he goes on to say—

> The point as to whether the dissimilarities are of sufficient importance to justify this conclusion has never been definitely raised, but the negative view has been expressed by eminent legal authorities, and in fact the Full Court appears to be of that opinion . . . . In the case of in *re* Coultas (a) an application for a writ of prohibition, the members composing the Full Court unanimously adopted the views of the Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia in the case in *re* Clancy (b) where he discussed the meaning of the words "work done or to be done" appearing in the definition of "industrial matters," and considerably limited the area over which it was previously considered the Court of Arbitration had jurisdiction.

That is the opinion of one who I say has had a more intimate connection with the Arbitration Court than any other man in Western Australia. He says that the Act is very much more hampered in its present jurisdiction than it was intended to be. I may also just refer to some remarks made by Justice Higgins, who has been mentioned repeatedly in this debate. It was in connection with the Federated Engine-driver's union of Australasia, and he stated—

> If and so far as there is, or is to be, delay and expense, it is principally due, not to arbitration, but to difficulties in getting to arbitration—to the technical restrictions by which the court is surrounded.

Hon. M. L. Moss: These observations are more applicable to inter-State disputes.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): It is the High Court which is imposing these restrictions. It is the High Court decisions that are doing this. There are other remarks which hon. members have read from time to time of the whole of the judges who have occupied the position of president of the court. All of them have drawn attention to the extraordinary difficulty surrounding the taking of cases to the Arbitration Court, and also in giving awards. In bringing in this Bill we are simply trying to sweep away difficulties and make the court as free of access as possible to all those who wish to settle industrial disputes. It might be interesting to remind hon. members that this Act has been in existence for ten years, and it has never been amended. I pointed out last session when we had the amending Bill before us, that there were dozens of other Acts of Parliament that had been amended during that time, and yet here was a measure dealing with the most difficult problem possible which had never been amended, an experiment almost, as Mr. Sanderson said, and yet we are not going to try and amend that experiment so as to make the Act more workable. I would also say that the legislation we have in connection with other matters is infinitely more costly that the Arbitration Act. For instance, take the Licensing Act. Will any hon. member contend that this Act does all that it was intended it should do? Will anyone say that that Act is carried out in anything like its entirety, and that the cost of the breaches is not higher than the cost of the breaches of the Arbitration Act? And so there are quite a number of cases in the same category to which I could draw attention. I want to say a few words in reply to Mr. Moss and also to Mr. Sanderson. I am going to enter a protest against the calumnies, the innuendoes, and the absolutely incorrect statements that Mr. Moss has given utterance to here. It has been a matter of regret to me that hon. members one after the other, I do not say all, but a large number of them, have stated it to be their intention to follow Mr. Moss, and yet I have not heard anyone protest against the language used by that hon. member. Surely the privileges of this House are quite sufficient for Mr. Moss without sheltering himself behind anonymity when making an attack on an individual

outside. One would think that the privileges of Parliament were sufficient without seeking a further privilege in making an attack upon various individuals.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Whom have I attacked?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): The ignorance displayed by the hon. member upon some matters is beyond my comprehension. There is no one here who has greater respect for his legal knowledge and the thorough manner in which the hon. member goes into various matters that come before the House, than I have, but when he attempts to mislead the House—whether he is doing it knowingly or not as he has done in connection with this Bill I cannot say—it is time someone entered a protest. I want to give a few of the terms that Mr. Moss has used in his speech when dealing with this Bill. These are some of the choice and classical expresssions, as Mr. Sanderson would call them, that Mr. Moss used. He spoke of "wolves in sheep's clothing," and "agitators," and said that he would "crush politics out of unions" and "stamp out politics," "scandalous and monstrous abuse of power," "tyranny of unions," "dictators" and that "the provisions of the Act were a disgrace to another place." These are some of the choice terms which the hon. gentleman found it necessary to use in discussing this Bill. Mr. Moss, I think, would make a fairly good trades unionist.

Hon. M. L. Moss: We have heard you say that before.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): On the previous occasion when discussing the amending Bill I said that Mr. Moss would make one of the best trade union secretaries I knew of, and it appears to me that he makes too much of this. He puts me in mind of one of the men whom we used to select to discuss the conditions and the rates of wages at various conferences at Kalgoorlie. We usually selected five men, and I remember one particular man whom the rest of the members of the union used to think was somewhat dangerous to send in to the conference, and they said that he would do more harm than good because he would make a noise and cause us to go down. I always used to fight hard to get him selected because I realised we had to make a noise and show fight sometimes in order to get what we wanted. Mr. Moss puts me in mind of that same individual. He has to make a noise and show some sort of fight to get members to follow him.

Hon. M. L. Moss: I have evidently hurt your feelings. Some of the thrusts have gone home.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): No, I am sure they have not. There is nothing Mr. Moss has said in connection with this Bill that will hurt my feelings in any shape or form. I think I can show the utter inaccuracy of almost every statement Mr. Moss has made in connection with unions. I might here give Mr. Justice Higgins' opinion of union leaders in order to show what that gentleman, holding the position he does, thinks of the union leaders of Australia. He says—

> As for the court embittering the relation of employers and employees there has been before me indubitable proof to the contrary. Many groups of employees have been held back from striking by their leaders, because the leaders have been able to induce them to wait for the remedy from the court.

That is a very different opinion from the one expressed by the hon. member. If he would only give credit where it is due one would not mind very much, but when he includes in such definitions as those to which he has given utterance the whole of the unions and unionists, I say he is going far beyond what he should do. I intend to deal for a few minutes with some of the misleading statements made by the hon. gentleman in connection with the balance sheets of some of the unions. I want to say how utterly Mr. Moss is at sea in connection with this matter. He has referred to the return issued by the Registrar of Friendly Societies for 1911, covering the period for 1910, and he assumes from that return that most of the money that is being raised is spent in politics. In this return the Registrar provides four columns, one for death claims, one for relief, one for management, and the other for expenditure. They are the four columns in which the whole of the expenditure of the union is shown under

the return issued by the Registrar of Friendly Societies. The items of management and other expenditure are held by Mr. Moss to be almost entirely devoted to politics. Let me quote a few of the unions. First of all, the Lumpers' Union, to which the hon. member directed most of his time, and I will give a few figures without wearying the House. The income including contributions, levies, entrance fees, interest, repayments of loans, and fines, was £2,114 8s. 3d.

Hon. M. L. Moss: That is not correct; it was £2,259.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I am giving the returns from the balance sheet, and if Mr. Moss will go to the Registrar with me I will be pleased to point out how the returns are compiled. It is not income I am principally referring to, but I am giving this to show what passed. The accident pay was £383, the funerals and fencing of graves amounted to £129 3s. 4d., that is the death claims and other benefits to which he referred. The other matters I am going to mention are all referred to in the return as management and other expenditure. These are those other matters. Loans to members £197 10s. These loans come back on the other side of the ledger in the shape of interest and repayments. Donations £155 1s. These donations, I am told, are almost wholly donations to hospitals, the Home of Peace, and various other charitable institutions in Fremantle. The secretary of the union, Mr. Frank Rowe, is away at present, and so I could not get a detailed list of these donations, but I am informed that they all go to the hospital and the various charitable organisations. Yet, mark you, that all goes down in "other expenditure" as part of the political fund to which the hon. member has drawn attention. Salaries £393 5s. That, certainly, is chargeable to management. Comforts for the sick £16 17s. 1d.; elections £15 10s. That is the whole amount spent in connection with elections, with the exception, let me say in order to be fair, that there is an amount of £132 17s. 6d. paid to three societies with which the Lumpers' Union is affiliated, namely, the Waterside Workers Federation, the Trades Hall of Fremantle, and the Australian Labour Federation. Some of that amount, certainly, goes to politics, but only a very small amount. The audit £20, papers £37 8s. and profit £408 8s. Those are the principal items of expenditure; the others are smaller items and would take me too long to deal with.

Hon. M. L. Moss: If all this is as you say, you can have no objection to including in these rules a restriction of the contribution to politics.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I do not think we are prepared to let Mr. Moss, or any other gentleman, say what we are going to do with the money. Members of unions can spend the money in any way they think fit. Then there is the Amalgamated Timber Workers' Union. I have here the figures for their latest half year, ending June, 1912:—Accident pay, £409 10s.; donations, £352 9s. These donations are to strikes, most of them in other parts of the Commonwealth. Salaries and delegate, £360; branches, £240; death dues, £145; credit balance, £682 5s. d. In the previous half year £333 was paid for the Sharman benefit, a benefit got up on behalf of a widow, or a victim of an accident in the timber districts; yet this all goes down in "other expenditure," in respect to which the assumption has been made that it goes to politics. The other expenses are the usual management expenses. I have here the figures relating to the Gwalia Miners' Union. There they have an actual income of £643 10s. The death dues amount to £241, salary £117, capitation £104. Of that capitation amount £100 came back in the shape of direct death dues. They pay £104 capitation to their central body, and when a fatal accident occurs the central body pays £50; so they got back £100 for two fatal accidents which occurred. Donations £39, political £13 10s., papers £11 5s. The remainder are ordinary incidental expenses. There is another one, the Metropolitan and South-West Engine-drivers' Union. The figures are:—Contributions £475 10s., capitation dues £171, Australian Labour Federation dues £9 15s. 10d. These go to keep up the

central body, and certainly a part of the amount goes towards politics. Salaries £117, deaths £14. arbitration £54 1s., printing £22 13s. The total amount spent by that union which can be debited to politics at all was £9 15s. 10d., and that goes to keep up the central body, the Australian Labour Federation. It helps to pay the salary of that gentleman to whom this House has referred many times, Mr. McCallum, and also helps to keep up the Trades Hall, and various other matters connected with it.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Then it is part of the salary that was given him for writing that patriotic letter to the London newspapers.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Mr. McCallum may be equally as patriotic to the State as is the hon. gentleman when he brings forth arguments in the way he has in order to damn a Bill of this kind. I doubt whether Mr. McCallum will do more harm to the State than will Mr. Moss if the House allows Mr. Moss to have his own sweet will. Another union I propose to refer to is the Miners' Union of Kalgoorlie and Boulder. I know of no other union in Australasia of which so much can be said as this particular union. In taking this attitude I may be somewhat egotistical, because I have been the secretary of the union for a number of years. The receipts of this body for the six months ending June, 1912, amounted to £4,676; I am omitting shillings and pence. The accident pay £1,418, death dues £1,040. That is to say, the accident pay was almost one-third of the receipts, and the death dues were just about a quarter. The wages amounted to £279, medical dues—which go down as "other expenditure"—£220, the Australian Labour Federation dues £101, donations £220, distress fund £46, Children's Hospital, Perth, £20. There is nothing parochial about that union, for they not only contribute to the Children's Hospital in Perth, but to the Home of Peace, the Industrial School for the Blind, and several other charitable institutions.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Those institutions are not parochial, either.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I do not say they are, but I do say they are used much more by people on the coast than by the people on the goldfields.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Because there are more people on the coast.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): But apart from that, on a percentage basis. I certainly think a great deal of credit is due to a society located 400 miles away which is prepared to give donations to institutions down here. But I am not quoting it for that reason; I am merely showing that the item of £20 donated to the Children's Hospital has been included by Mr. Moss among the contributions to the political fund, for it goes down in this report among "other expenditure."

Hon. D. G. Gawler: The returns are not very clear.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): No. When first we came into office I saw the registrar of friendly societies and asked him to endeavour to prepare a return in a different form. However, the capitation dues of the union for the half year were £861; some of this comes back. Let me say that in this particular union no member is compelled to contribute, by levy at least, to politics if he does not desire to do so. We have a rule stating that if a man has conscientious reasons for abstaining from taking part in politics he need not pay any levies. One of the most prominent men of the Miners' Union of Kalgoorlie and Boulder ran in opposition to Labour candidates and won a seat in the Boulder municipality. In his capacity of steward he collected hundreds of pounds on behalf of the miners' union. He used to collect the fees on the mine in which he was a worker and pay them into the union, and I do not know of anything having been said against that gentleman for the action he took in opposing Labour candidates. This shows conclusively that there is not that bigotry in connection with Labour which some hon. members would have us believe.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Is that the man Mr. Gibson was charged with voting for?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): No.

Hon. M. L. Moss: It cannot be the case Mr. Colebatch alluded to either.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): There are certainly in all institutions some things to which we can object, and no doubt things take place in connection with unions which none of us can tolerate or condone; but when you make a general statement and try to include the whole of the unions I say you are going too far. I have given the lists of some of the unions to which Mr. Moss referred. I would like Mr. Moss to provide similar lists of some of the unions of employers. I would like to know the expenditure of some of the unions connected with the Employers' Federation. We hear nothing about them, and it would be interesting indeed to members of the House, and to members of the unions to know how much money is being expended. We do not spend £72 per week, as is being spent at the present time by the Liberal forces in the State, in seeking political organisation. I am not protesting against this expenditure by the Liberal forces; they can expend £172 a week if they like, for it does not concern me; what I say is, the various workers' unions do not spend this amount.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: But there is no connection between the employers and them.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister should have free speech; he is being continually interrupted.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I can hardly follow the interjections, because the various mines affiliated with the Chamber of Mines compose an industrial union of employers, and if you are trying to prevent workers' unions from spending money in politics, to be thorough you should prevent the Chamber of Mines and kindred institutions from doing the same. Some reference has been made to the endeavour to create large unions, and Mr. Moss was good enough to say that even though the employers were against him on the matter of large unions, he would still oppose the clause relating to unions being grouped together. I am sure the hon. member cannot have given these clauses the thought he should have done, or else he is seeking by some other means to kill unionism, that is by splitting it up into so many small sectional bodies that it would be impossible for them to get on. I interjected that the trouble at the present time at Kalgoorlie was due to this very reason. The employers I believe right throughout the State prefer to deal with the whole of the employees in an industry rather than deal with so many sectional bodies connected with that industry. I think Mr. Lynn will bear me out in this matter in connection with the tramways. I see there was a tramways award or agreement providing for a settlement of a dispute between the motor men, conductors, etcetera, and then the engine-drivers came along and it was necessary to go through the whole trouble and bother again to get a settlement with the engine-drivers. That is the trouble to-day at Kalgoorlie. There are eight or nine unions concerned with the mining industry and the Chamber of Mines are dealing with three or four, and unless they can get a settlement with the whole lot, they will not consent to any agreement. To me they seem to be taking a perfectly just stand from their point of view. I think it is a stand that any employer would take that unless he could come to an agreement with the whole of the employees he would not consent to an agreement with one section of them. The provision for related industries is just and one to which I cannot see that any real objection can be taken. There was fairly warm criticism with reference to the clause dealing with the restriction of lawyers, barristers, etcetera, from the court, and Mr. Sanderson was good enough to state that such objection was historic and a stage joke, and other things of that sort. It is not a stage joke to those who have to pay. The shearers award was given some time ago in the Federal Court, and the cost of that case to the employers was over £30,000 and to the shearers' union something over £5,000 or £6,000. I do not know how long that case took to decide, but the tramways case has taken over

twelve months and is not yet finished, and other cases in the Federal Court to which lawyers have been admitted took several months to arrive at a settlement. Something like £20,000 has been spent in the tramways case, or, as a matter of fact, I think it is nearer £30,000, with the object of trying to bring about a settlement, and no settlement has yet been arrived at.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Lawyers must live.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Yet we are told that the objection to legal expenses is a stage joke. Members can understand the objection of unions to the appearance of solicitors when they consider these figures. Mr. Sanderson or Mr. Moss referred again to the conditions prevailing in Great Britain and America. I referred to that matter on the Address-in-reply, and I do not wish to go over the ground again, but I use the same words that my disgust is reciprocated when it is said we should endeavour to so mould our laws that we should get the same prominence as Great Britain and America have got. The conditions of employment there are of such a nature that any man who would advocate a return to them here seems to have no humanitarian feelings about him. I am sorry Mr. Sanderson is not in the House, because I have a book, the author of which he quoted, that is Mr. Reeves of New Zealand, who, Mr. Sanderson told us, was one of the highest authorities in the world on sociological matters and on matters of arbitration, and Mr. Sanderson said that he was in the New Zealand Press gallery when Mr. Reeves introduced the first Arbitration Bill. I was anxious to know, and asked Mr. Sanderson to tell us what Mr. Reeves's opinion of arbitration is at the present time. Mr. Sanderson said he could not tell me. I have been trying to get something up to date, but the latest I have been able to get is a book published in 1902, in which Mr. Reeves gives us something upon industrial conciliation and arbitration. Mr. Sanderson said his concern was for the women and the weakest of the community, his concern was for the down-trodden section which arbitration did not touch. I want to read a short quotation from Mr. Reeves in this connection, the man whom Mr. Sanderson recommended and who, he says, is the best authority on this matter. Mr. Reeves says—

> These write of it as though its sole function must be to deal with militant, highly-organised bodies of combatants. Far from being confined to these much of its best and most humane work may be done in improving the conditions of sweated workers, too poor and too weak to give battle in the ordinary fashion of industrial warfare. It is the best hope of the woman-worker, for whom trades unionism and voluntary conciliation have done so little.

There is the opinion of Mr. Reeves, and the hon. gentleman, with those humanitarian motives regarding which he is always giving utterance, says arbitration would not accomplish this, while Mr. Reeves, after ten years' experience, says it does the very thing which Mr. Sanderson says it does not do. Further, Mr. Reeves says—

> Yet neither public sympathy, newspaper advocacy, nor even the readiness of the employers' association to act could bring a few stubborn masters concerned to accept arbitration. So for years the grievances remained for the most part without remedy. The women could not strike. Only when a compulsory Arbitration Act had been passed and could be appealed to did they get redress.

I think Mr. Sanderson is condemned by the very man whom he quoted. A statement was made by Mr. Piesse which I cannot allow to pass without some comment, that is, the statement that more work and higher wages should be the aim of the working classes. He quoted some Judge in New South Wales as saying this, and said that was the whole crux of the situation and he endorsed it in its entirety. As far as the methods of Western Australia are concerned, I can quote the highest authorities, the Chamber of Mines and the Employers' Federation, to show that the efficiency of the miner, especially on the eastern goldfields, is the greatest in the world. These authorities say that the

work done by the miners in Western Australia is greater than that done anywhere else in the world. I am not giving members a trades union quotation or a quotation from the leader of the Labour party. That statement is made by prominent members of the Chamber of Mines, and I am sure they are willing to endorse it again, and the same statement has been made by writers in the mining journals. I want to say that the price of this efficiency is sometimes something to appal one. There is no question about that. Only a fortnight ago in the space of seven days there were four fatal accidents in Kalgoorlie, and I can assure members one sometimes gets horror-stricken at the frequency of fatal accidents, especially among men whom he had been meeting every day. One might see a man one day and the next day he was crushed or blown to pieces. In addition to the four fatal accidents in seven days, another man I knew well succumbed to miners' disease, that is five deaths in seven days. That is the price of this industry. I do not blame the employer for this, but we have to get away from this system some time or other. We cannot do it all of a sudden, but the time will come when we shall limit the horrors of this efficiency to which Mr. Piesse has drawn attention. Although most of us believe that the more efficient work we can do the better, and the more efficient work done by all the better, still we can go too far in the speeding-up process and do more harm than good. Mr. Colebatch made some reference to the lock-out case tried a day or two ago in the police court. I desire to congratulate that member on the speech he made. I listened to it with a great deal of interest, and I am sure the speeches of Mr. Colebatch and Mr. Gawler are speeches which give us something to answer and speeches worthy to go into the records in this House. I want to say with regard to that lock-out case, that it may be inferred that the Government were acting unfairly; at least members may think that the Government were prosecuting in that particular case. That is not so. We were asked to prosecute but refused to do so, realising that if a prosecution was not forced in connection with strikes we could not force a prosecution in the case of a lock-out, and consequently the Government did not prosecute. It was a private posecution instituted by the union concerned.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Especially as there was no lock-out.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): That does not affect the question at all. The point I am trying to show is that the Government were asked to prosecute and they refused to do so.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: I was under the impression that the Government were prosecuting.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I make this statement because every union of employers and employees can prosecute under the Arbitration Act at the present time. Reference was also made by Mr. Colebatch to the rules of evidence, and I was anxious to find out exactly how the matter stood. This is largely a legal matter. I cannot say that I know too much about the rules of evidence myself, but I went to some pains to get an opinion from one who is qualified to express an opinion on this particular matter. Unfortunately, however, I have laid it aside somewhere, and therefore cannot give it to hon. members, but one of the points where the rules of evidence do not apply is that the records of a Royal Commission cannot be put in in an ordinary court of law, but they would be admissible in the Arbitration Court. There are many other points on which, no doubt, Mr. Moss could enlighten us whereby the rules of evidence will not apply in the Arbitration Court. The statement made about the law by Mr. Colebatch and by Mr. Sanderson I cannot quite understand. Mr. Sanderson said common sense is law, and Mr. Colebatch says that law must be common sense. If that is so, it follows that every Act that is passed by a majority in Parliament is common sense: there is no other construction to be placed on that. If all law is common sense, all the laws we pass are common sense. After all, most of us are inclined to agree with

Dickens that law is not common sense in any way. A matter referred to by Mr. Gawler on which I desire to say a few words was the incident that took place at Kalgoorlie with regard to the alleged expulsion of a member of the A.L.F., and the hon. member inferred from that that the unions were tyrannical in forcing every member to believe as they believed politically. I might explain that the A.L.F., to which various unions contribute, is a body not composed of unionists only; there are non-unionists connected with it, and they are banded together for political as well as industrial objects, and the whole of the unions contribute certain dues to that central body in order to further and to protect their interests. The gentleman to whom Mr. Gawler referred had given his word according to the rules that he would support whoever was the Labour candidate, and when a man was selected to contest the position of mayor he had four votes and he gave two of them to the selected Labour candidate and two to the other man. The matter was brought before the A.L.F., with the result which has been quoted.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Is that not suppression of freedom of conscience?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): If that gentleman referred to did not wish to be bound, why did he bind himself? Mr. Gawler, I am sure, is too just to say, if he knew the whole facts of the case, that the A.L.F. did wrong, in trying to expel that man from their ranks. The man bound himself to do certain things, and he agreed to abide by the rules and regulations, and then we find perhaps for some reason which I am not acquainted with that he did not do so.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: He is charged as with an offence.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Although the gentleman referred to is a friend of mine, I think the A.L.F. were lenient with him on that occasion. Had I been there, I can assure Mr. Gawler my vote would have gone against him. There has been considerable criticism around the word "industry," and about that I might say a few words. It has been said that we should have a union or unions of all these sectional bodies. Mr. Moss said "Why not have unions of all the sections working in connection with one particular union?" There is nothing more certain that if this were followed out you would kill all unions because you could not carry on in a sectional manner. The expense would be so great, and the number of small industries would employ so few men that it would be impossible to carry on. I cannot see any objection to the whole of the employees in a place like Brennan's or various other big warehouses being combined in one union. I cannot see where the objection comes in, and if hon. members can show it to me, in Committee, I shall be glad to try to meet them.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: You have just as much variety of occupation in mill employees, and they are all in one union.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I have not much more to say in reply to the critics except a word or two with reference to what have been termed "scabs." An independent association of workers of Australasia has been formed, and we might possibly have a branch of that society established here, as has been done in Melbourne. Mr. Gawler in speaking drew attention to the treatment which had been meted out to some blacklegs or free labourers, in London, some time ago by unionists staring at them, and the hon. member quoted from the *Daily News* a paragraph which he said was handed to that newspaper by that individual Mr. McCallum. In this paragraph it was stated that the workers were advised to stare at the free labourers who were going to work. I would say to the hon. member that these stares might be better than stones.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: They can become equally cruel.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): But they would be better than some of the other methods, better than bullets perhaps, and if we are not going to make an earnest attempt to bring about a workable Arbitration Act I very much fear that some of the scenes which have taken place in other parts of the world,

in connection with strikes, may be repeated here.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Does the hon. member defend making faces?

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I do not defend it, but I want to say what is likely to take place. It would be idle for me to introduce a Bill of this kind and try and carry it through unless I endeavoured to show to hon. members what might happen in the absence of such a measure. There was a paper read before the Sociological Society of London, of which Mr. A. J. Balfour, M.P., is president, and one of the statements made was in reference to the coming conflict in America, and I ask hon. members to pay attention to this, because these are only signs of the times, and similar things may possibly take place in Western Australia, although we are only a small community. Take Kalgoorlie and Boulder. Almost the whole of the population there are a working population, and I for one do not want to see scenes enacted in those places that are taking place elsewhere. Mr. Zimmern, who read the paper, in referring to the coming conflict in America, sums up the position shortly in this way—

> Thousands of young workmen, mere ignorant peasant boys, from the raw material of some of the most highly protected and privileged American industries, while the most influentially protected of them all swallows up their still more ignorant sisters, at the rate of over a thousand a month, into the neighbouring large town. Here they are assimilated indeed into the New World, assimilated into American economic life, into its crude violence and naked brutality, without a taste of freedom or a hint of citizenship. Emerging, if they do emerge, as adults, and flung upon a world of which they know nothing except that it has robbed them of their birthright as human beings, they are the natural rank and file of a labour revolt which, alike in its grievances and its methods, will soon put all our European squabbles into the shade.

I have drawn attention to the coal strike in England, which was the greatest and most colossal strike which has taken place in the history of the world, and here we have it predicted what is likely to take place in America and I say it is quite possible that something similar may take place in this State. I want to say that hon. members may think that the Labour party are frightened of strikes, from their point of view. We are not. It is not that altogether. If we have strikes we are going to be affected very badly; I know that from experience. Mr. Colebatch quoted John Ruskin's *Crown of Wild Olives*, and I might be permitted also to make a quotation from the same writer's *Essay on War*. I may say that I do not think there is any writer in the English language that one might admire more than John Ruskin, and I have read his *Crown of Wild Olives* many times. This is what he said in reference to war—

> I found in brief that all great nations learned their truth of word, and strength of thought, in War; that they were nourished in War and wasted in peace; trained by War, and betrayed by peace; in a word they were born in War, and expired in peace.

I can say that possibly that same thing may take place in connection with the unions. We have learned all we know of organisation, combination, and sacrifice for the common good from strikes, and therefore strikes are not all bad so far as the effect on the workers is concerned. I would ask hon. members to bear that in mind. I am not advocating arbitration altogether because I am frightened of what is going to happen to the worker, but because I know the harm strikes will do, not only to the workers but to the employers and the whole of the community. That is why I am anxious to see some workable arbitration measure placed on the statute-book. Norman Angel, in his book *The Great Illusion*, has drawn attention to the fact that the winner in the conflict between nations is very often the loser; and so it is in strikes. I think that most often the employer will win, but I am satisfied

that in winning he is going to lose more than he is likely to gain. I hope that when the Bill is in Committee members will not follow the lead of Mr. Moss, that even those who have stated that they intended to follow that gentleman will not do so entirely. There may be some amendments moved by the hon. member which may be acceptable to the House, but I sincerely trust that members will give the Bill their thoughtful consideration and not be led away by any hon. gentleman. If they are so led away, I am satisfied that there will be no possibility of the Bill being accepted. When a man rises and talks about stamping politics out of unions he is doing the very thing which is going to force the whole of the unionists up in arms against the Legislature, and, if I were anxious to do something to damn this House in the eyes of the workers, I would urge all members to use the same language as was used by Mr. Moss. I hope, however, members will give the measure their independent consideration, and look at every clause upon its own merits, and not be led away by what the hon. member has stated.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East) : I shall not detain the House long on this Bill. I moved the adjournment of the debate in the absence of the legal members of the House, and to them of course I shall leave the principal work; but I want to point out to the Minister in charge of the Bill that in the first place he is doing more than needs be done, and in the second place unless he alters the main clause in the Bill he is not going to do in the best way what he meant to do. Section 13 of the Amending Act provides ample safeguards against any accidental omissions, but it certainly does not provide against culpable negligence on the part of solicitors giving notice of a bill of sale. As the Minister explained, the point which this Bill is to rectify came about in this way : a solicitor in giving notice of a bill of sale said nothing in that notice about the bill being intended to cover property afterwards acquired, or property that might afterwards be deposited on the premises concerned in the bill of sale; and because he neglected his plain duty, a duty that is necessary for the safeguarding of numbers of people who may be dealing with the person giving the bill of sale, this Bill is brought in to validate all bills of sale in which similar neglect may have taken place. It goes further and says that in all future bills of sale it will not matter if the same neglect of duty is perpetrated. That is going further than is wise. The argument is that, after all, it does not matter much to the giver of the bill of sale, because it is the bill he is concerned about, and not the notice. But the notice is for the protection of other people who may be dealing with the person giving the bill of sale, and so long as we pass this measure in its present form it is saying that in all future time it will not be necessary for the notice of a bill of sale to cover the scope of that bill of sale. I submit to the Minister that is an unnecessary and dangerous thing to do. I recognise that the Legislature must step in and provide a remedy for these neglects of solicitors in the past, because it is better to provide a remedy and even to take the undesirable course of validating culpable errors than to take the other course of allowing a number of innocent people to suffer because of these errors. Now, I submit there is no need to say that similar blunders may be perpetrated with impunity in future. The section in the amending Act amply covers accidental omissions. I want to point out, on the other hand, that the main clause of this Bill does not accomplish what the framer of the Bill desires. What he desires to say is that if the notice has covered the property actually on the premises at the time intended to be covered it will not matter if it has not

given notice of property that may be afterwards acquired or may come on the premises afterwards; but what the clause says by its ambiguity is "if such notice contains a description of the property comprised in the Bill of sale and at the date of the notice on the premises stated in the notice as the place where the said property is situated," etc. What is the property contained in the bill of sale? If it is intended in the notice of the bill of sale to cover afterwards acquired property, as most bills of sale are intended to cover, then that is comprised in the bill of sale. The first part of the clause says "if such notice contains a description of the property comprised in the bill of sale——

The Colonial Secretary: It reads on from that.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Then the former part of the sentence demands that every thing comprised in the bill of sale, and nearly all bills of sale comprise afterwards acquired property, although they only give notice of it—of course, they cannot possibly give an inventory of it the same as if the property was actually there——

Hon. W. Patrick: Does not the clause provide that?

Hon. J. F. CULEN: No. The Minister will have to alter it to read that "if such notice contains a description of such property comprised in the bill of sale as is on the premises at the time," and if that is done the intention of the framer of the Bill will be made clear. At the present time it is entirely ambiguous, and the first part of the sentence makes it essential that everything comprised in the bill of sale must be given notice of. I submit that afterwards acquired property is included in the bill of sale. There are some bills of sale, over furniture, for instance, which are not intended to go beyond the property actually on the premises at the time.

The Colonial Secretary: What is intended to be comprised is the property already on the premises.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: That is the intention of the framer, but the clause also reads that the property must be there, and after-acquired property cannot be there. This mistake involves only an amendment in drafting, of course, and that can be dealt with when the clause is in Committee. There is no need to give an unlimited license for such blunders in future and say that in future, as well as in the past, it will not be necessary to give notice that the bill of sale is intended to cover after-acquired property, because it would affect all who do business with the giver of the bill of sale afterwards. To what do business people look for security? They look to the notice of the bill of sale.

Hon. M. L. Moss: No, indeed they do not.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Then what is the notice for? The notice is intended to put all business people on their guard. In many cases business people may do business with givers of bills of sale, not knowing that after-acquired property will be covered. I am speaking particularly in regard to the future. Suppose a careless solicitor gives notice that the property now on the premises is covered, and some innocent business man sells property to the giver of the bill of sale not knowing that the property he is selling will become liable under that bill of sale though the notice has excluded it. The notice is a protection to the business people, and why should it be provided by Act of Parliament that, although it was always contemplated the notice should cover the scope of the bill of sale, a solicitor may hide it and leave it to business people to be victimised afterwards? The House would not be doing their duty if this is not safeguarded.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West): It was not until 1906 that it was at all necessary to give notice of intention to register a bill of sale by which a mortgage is given just as a mortgage is given over any other property without giving notice to the world at large that it is intended to do so. In 1906 we passed an amendment Bill saying that in future no person should be entitled to mortgage any chattel, property, stock in trade, or book debts without notice of intention to do so was given some days previously to the registration being entitled to go through.

The object of the notice was clear—Parliament did not worry as to what was in the document—it was to give the mercantile community notice that a man was going to mortgage his chattel property so that if that person was indebted to a merchant the latter could put in a caveat to prevent the registration. Mr. Cullen has talked about neglect of solicitors, but it is quite obvious to any one who chooses to use his wits for a moment to thoroughly understand that when a person is mortgaging his stock in trade in a grocer's shop the stock in trade he has to-day is *non est* in a week or a month, and is replaced by future-acquired property, so that in reality, though there is future-acquired property, it is a mere replacement of what is sold in the ordinary course of business. Bills of sale are most important mercantile documents. It is not the legal profession that is so much concerned about this Bill, it is the mercantile community; in fact the Associated Banks have communicated with me at the request of the Attorney General to get a small amendment inserted in the Bill. They are much concerned as to the position that has arisen. If hon. members will turn to the Act of 1906 and look at the Second Schedule they will find a considerable omission which I think affects more than 90 per cent. of the bills of sale registered under this Act which compels the giving notice of intention to register bills of sale. In the prescribed form of notice of intention to register a bill of sale there is a very serious defect. The form is divided into four main columns. The second column is headed, "property comprised in bill of sale," and this column has two sub-headings, one devoted to the "description of the property" and the other headed "where situated." But there is no reference to "future-acquired property." Had there been a column after the column devoted to "property comprised in the bill of sale," and of similar importance, for "future-acquired property," as is devoted to the sub-column headed "future advances" under the third main column headed "consideration," everyone would have complied with it. In the form printed in obedience to the schedule with "description of property" and "where situated" only they merely complied with the requirement to describe the property existing at the time the document was executed. When we talk of "property where situated" it can have no application to "future-acquired property," because that does not exist. The form in the schedule therefore was defective. It did not give sufficient indication to the general public utilising the form as to what should be included in the notice of intention to register a bill of sale. But there is nobody prejudiced in the slightest degree by the fact that the bill of sale registered, which contained "future-acquired property," had this omission in the notice of intention to register, though ninety per cent. of the notices are on these printed forms. When they describe the property covered if a person mortgages all his stock in trade now in or upon or about such and such premises at such and such a place, and also all future-acquired property that may be on these or any other premises that the grantor occupies, through following the printed form and thus omitting any reference to future or after-acquired property, the notices of intention to register in ninety per cent. of bills of sale that have been registered contain no reference to after-acquired property; but no one has been prejudiced, because the notice of intention to register appears in the trade circular and at once is a notice to every business man who knows perfectly well that it means that Bill Robinson, or any other man, has given a bill of sale over his property, and that it includes present and future-acquired property. We do not brand each piece of furniture that is contained in the bill of sale, and if all these documents were not made extensive enough to cover after-acquired property the person who lent his money on that class of security would be in an unenviable position if a man with a fraudulent disposition said, "You dare not touch this property, it is after-acquired." With clean dealing, future as well as present property is covered. Mr. Cullen says that we should not legislate for bills of sale that are defective in the future. I say we

should. As long as the notice of intention to register serves the purpose of telling the mercantile community who trust a particular individual that this individual intends to mortgage his property, everyone knows that it includes present and future-acquired property. Sometimes notice of intention to register is given one or two days after the bill of sale is executed, but in the case of a bill of sale executed in the North-West it is sometimes given a month afterwards. It is necessary that the security should cover the goods from the date of the security, that is, the date of the bill of sale. The Associated Banks, at the request of the Attorney General, have asked me to move the necessary amendment in order to enable these securities to cover the property from the date of the security itself, and not only from the date of the notice of the bill of sale. The Bill before us is very necessay. It is to cover up a defect that has arisen on a technical point that was taken before Justice McMillan, which his Honour was bound to decide in the way he did. Mr. Cullen says Section 13 of the Act of 1906 is good enough to achieve this purpose when negligence is not committed. This section reads—

> No notice of intention to file a bill of sale shall be deemed insufficient or invalid by reason only, that in such notice there is an omission or incorrect or insufficient description or misdescription in respect of the particulars required to be contained in such notice, if the court, judge, magistrate, or justices before whom the validity of the bill of sale comes into question shall be satisfied that such omissison or incorrect or insufficient description or misdescription was accidental or due to inadvertence, and was not of such a nature as to be liable to mislead or deceive any person to his prejudice or disadvantage.

These words are obviously insufficient to cover up the defect that arises on all these bills of sale, because no one can say that it was accidental or due to inadvertence. All these words have to have their strict meaning put on them. Although this form in Schedule 2 is deficient, naturally the judge turns round and says, "You should not have followed a deficient form. True, the legislators have misled you to a certain extent, but you should have put in all that was included by the document." If you leave out future-acquired property, technically speaking it is deficient; but looking at it from the ordinary, common sense, business point of view we know these documents are regarded, especially by the mercantile community, in the light that if a man has given a bill of sale over his stock in trade it covers everything today and what may be there in substitution for it to-morrow. I support the Bill. I think it ought to go through with the little alteration that I have indicated.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER (Metropolitan-Suburban): I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. I cannot see any reason why business men who have been put into a certain position by a recent decision should be allowed to suffer. The decision was on a purely technical point. Many firms have always been in the habit of putting all after-acquired property in the notice, others may not have done so, but it is absolutely ridiculous and impossible to imagine a person reading a notice that a man is giving a bill of sale over his stock in trade, to mean that he is only giving it over the stock existing at that moment, because in a week that stock may have absolutely altered. No doubt many thought it was unnecessary to mention the fact that after-acquired property was included, and it can hardly be said that business men have been misled by the fact that it was not set out. The amendment notified by Mr. Moss is very necessary, because, although the notice is very often given and signed immediately a bill of sale is executed, still it may happen in a country place where a bill of sale is executed a long time may elapse between the date of the bill of sale being signed and notice being given in Perth, and many things may occur between the date of the bill of sale and the giving of notice. The Act now makes it apply only to the date on which notice is given, and that might lead to an unfortunate position. To my mind the security should date from the day on which the bill is given. I have

much pleasure in supporting the measure. I thoroughly agree with what my friend has said as to this having arisen through the misleading form in the schedule to the Act.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Validation of notices under Act No. 13 of 1906:

Hon. M. L. MOSS moved an amendment—

That in line 6 the word "notice" be struck out and "Bill of sale" inserted in lieu.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The object of the amendment was not quite clear. In 1906 when the Bills of Sale Act Amendment was brought forward, there was strenuous opposition to it by the Associated Banks, and a calamity was predicted if the Bill passed. It was defeated at one stage, but he (Mr. Connolly) had it reinstated, and as a compromise he agreed that the Act should only remain in force for three years. The object of the then amendment was that notice had to be given before a bill of sale was registered. The amendment now proposed in no way nullified the notice.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: A bill of sale as drawn stated that the "notice contains a description of the property comprised in the bill of sale and at the date of the notice on the premises." Where a bill of sale was executed any distance from Perth, say at Port Hedland, the document would go up to Port Hedland for signature and a month after that probably, notice of intention to register would be given, because notice of intention to register could not be given until the document existed, and it did not exist until it was signed. If the Bill was only to provide that it should affect the property at the date of notice, the Bill was not a security over all the property on the premises when the bill was executed, but if it was only to affect the property on the date of the notice then the security would be in an awful mess. This would not apply to people taking securities in Perth and Fremantle, but it would affect securities at a distance from Perth. If the Bill was only to operate from the date of notice there would be no security when the notice was given.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: The object of the amendment was to describe existing tangible property, therefore the notice was really the bill of sale in itself. The notice therefore should describe the property on the premises at the time the bill of sale was signed, and not the time when the notice was signed. It would be impossible to describe property on the premises at the time notice was given if that property was situated some distance from Perth.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

House adjourned at 5.54 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 3rd October, 1912.

	PAGE
Questions: Sitting day, additional	2238
Powellisation of timbers	2239
Railway employees' wages, arbitration board cost	2239
Bills: Electoral Act Amendment, 1R.	2239
Licensing (Local Option) Amendment, 1R. ...	2239
Fremantle Reserves Surrender, returned ...	2239
Landlord and Tenant, 1R.	2239
Rights in Water and Irrigation, com. ...	2239

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4·30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—SITTING DAY, ADDITIONAL.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN asked the Premier (without notice): In view of the quantity of business on the Notice Paper and the great number of private members' Bills,