sand times more frequently than by the landowner.

HON. M. L. MOSS: This was the existing law. For whose benefit was the road made?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: For the benefit of the public. Owners would gladly make private roads to the highway. As the road was used by the public, the owner should have compensation.

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

Ayes	...	...	8
Noes	...	...	9
Majority against	...		1

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. R. G. Burges	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. C. E. Dempster	Hon. S. J. Haynes
Hon. E. McLarty	Hon. A. Jameson
Hon. C. A. Piesse	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. J. E. Richardson	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. J. W. Wright	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. A. G. Jenkins (*Teller*).	Hon. J. A. Thomson
	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 107—Board may close a road permanently:

HON. R. G. BURGES: Was this provision in the original Act?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was Section 73 of the Act of 1888.

Clause passed.

Clauses 108, 109, 110—agreed to.

Clause 111—Board may require land on which there is an excavation to be fenced:

HON. R. G. BURGES: The Government might sell a block of land on which there were gravel pits, and the next day the board might require the pits to be fenced. If the owner refused to fence the land, the board could do the work, and make the owner pay. This was an extraordinary provision, and he moved that the clause be struck out.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: As far as his recollection served him, this clause was recommended by one of the conferences. If excavations were left unfenced, they would be a source of danger, and surely the owner of the land should see that these excavations were not a danger to the public. Was the board to be required to fence these holes? The board did not make them. Somebody must fill up the excavations, or fence them. It could not be expected that the board should go round a man's propert and fence all the dangerous places. A man purchased property knowing th incumbrances attaching to it.

HON. R. G. BURGES: The board should fence the excavations as they ha power under the Bill to spend money.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: There were man excavations which had been made b roads boards in the past. Unless som provision were made for the protection o the settlers, he would support the strikin out of the clause. He knew of a doze dangerous places made by roads boards

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: Surely th owner of land was not expected to fil up excavations which had been mad by roads boards in the past. He sup ported the striking out of the clause.

On motion by HON. M. L. MOSS, pro gress reported and leave given to si again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 20 minutes t 10 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 11th November, 1902.

PAGE
Question: Railway Workshops, Midland Junction 209
Bills: Friendly Societies Act Amendment, Select Committee 209
Companies Act Amendment, first reading ... 209
Indecent Publications: Council's Amendments 209
Factories and Shops, Committee resumed, reported 209

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER took th Chair at 2·30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—RAILWAY WORKSHOPS, MIDLAND JUNCTION.

MR. PIGOTT (for Mr. Harper) asked the Minister for Works: What progres has been made with the construction o

the Railway Workshops at Midland Junction, and when it is anticipated that that they will be sufficiently advanced to cope with the repair of locomotives?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: The progress made to date with the Midland Junction Workshops is as follows:—1, Main blocks Nos. 1, 2, and 3 (comprising carriage wagon shops, sawmill, hydraulic machinery, boiler, machine, erecting coppersmiths' and tinsmiths' shops)—foundations partly completed; all material for walls and columns now on ground. 2, Foundry and testing room —walls partly completed. 3, Pattern shop and tarpaulin store—completed with exception of roof. 4, Iron and plate racks, and timber store and offices practically completed. 5, Power house — Being designed in England, plans not yet received. 6, Indents for all structural material and machinery required are in the hands of the Agent General, and items under these indents are steadily arriving. To enable the workshops to cope with the repairs of locomotives, the following buildings and machinery require to be completed:—Machine and erecting shops, smithy, power house, machine tools and electric generating plant; and every effort is being and will be made to complete these works as speedily as possible.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SELECT COMMITTEE—EXTENSION.

MR. YELVERTON moved that the time for bringing up the report be extended for one week.

MR. HOPKINS opposed the motion. An unusual length of time had already been allowed to this committee, one member of which would not be satisfied unless permitted to take evidence until Parliament was prorogued.

MR. JOHNSON: When the last extension of time was granted, he had notified other members of the committee that he would oppose any farther extension. He now protested against more delay.

DR. O'CONNOR: One member of this committee (Dr. Hicks) was unfortunately unable to be present in the morning, and now the House sat at 2·30 it was most difficult for Dr. Hicks to attend. Once or twice he had come and the witness was not present. The member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) had recently been often absent.

Question passed, and extension granted.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the PREMIER, and read a first time.

INDECENT PUBLICATIONS BILL.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

Schedule of three amendments made by the Legislative Council now considered in Committee.

Amendment 1—Clause 3, strike out "two justices of the peace," and insert "any resident or police magistrate":

THE PREMIER: The measure provided that information of an offence against this Bill might be heard and determined summarily by two justices of the peace in petty sessions. The Legislative Council suggested that the tribunal should not be two justices, but a resident or a police magistrate. He asked the Committee to agree to the amendment, which did not really interfere with the substance of the Bill, the object of moving it being, he believed, to have some guarantee that these offences should be tried by a more responsible tribunal than would be created if we allowed any two justices of the peace to act.

Amendment passed.

No. 2—Clause 5, line 1, after the word "relates," insert "to any work of recognised literary merit, or"; also in line 6, after the word "treatise," insert "or a work of recognised literary merit":

THE PREMIER: Clause 5 provided that nothing in this measure related to the delivery or exhibiting in the window of any shop, or posting or causing to be posted for transmission by post for any lawful purpose, any *bona fide* medical work or treatise. The Council suggested that after the word "treatise," "or work of recognised literary merit" be inserted. He saw no objection to the amendment, and he moved that it be agreed to.

Amendment passed.

No. 3—Clause 6, Subclause (*b*), strike out "Commissioner of Police, or the":

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: This amendment related to a new clause which was inserted when the Bill was passing through the Assembly. Members would

doubtless remember that we inserted a clause that no charge should be laid unless with the consent of the Commissioner of Police or the Attorney General. The Council proposed to strike out the words "Commissioner of Police or the," and leave in "Attorney General." He did not see much benefit either one way or the other. If the discretion were vested in the Commissioner of Police it would be just as likely to be exercised with due caution as it would be if exercised by any Attorney General; but the Commissioner of Police and the Attorney General were both in Perth, and he did not see much objection to adopting the amendment. He moved that it be agreed to.

Amendment passed.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message transmitted to the Legislative Council.

[Three Orders of the Day postponed, after explanatory remarks.]

FACTORIES AND SHOPS BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the 6th November; the PREMIER in charge.

Clause 50—Closing time for Small Shops:

MR. HASTIE: There was an amendment on the Notice Paper in the name of the member for Cockburn Sound (Mr. McDonald), asking that the time for opening small shops should be eight o'clock in the morning instead of seven. He moved that this change be made. It had been practically the rule all over the country to open shops at eight o'clock and not at seven, and so far as he had heard no part of any district had asked that the opening might be seven instead of eight. The Committee had already given special privileges to small shops, granting permission for them to be kept open till eight instead of compelling them to be closed at six the same as other shops.

THE PREMIER: Clause 50 was for the purpose of meeting the requirements of small shops. The small shopkeepers had made very strong representations to him in favour of their being allowed to open at seven. They submitted that there was a certain amount of trade between seven and eight of a nature which small shops supplied. If it was found in the morning that a household had not the necessary provisions, but that some little item was short, there should, they said, be some means available whereby the order could be filled. They did not say that persons were chronically running short of odds and ends; but it happened frequently that shopkeepers were called on before eight in the morning to supply articles for the morning meal. As it was recognised that special concessions should be given to small shopkeepers he did not see there could be any objection to allowing them to open at 7 o'clock in the morning rather than at eight. Between seven and eight there might be a class of casual trade that the small shopkeepers were able to cater for, and which by the main object of the clause it was recognised they should deal with. The same argument that justified the extension of hours in the evening justified the opening of the small shops at seven in the morning.

MR. HASTIE: The amendment had been given notice of by the member for Cockburn Sound as representing the feeling to a large extent of shopkeepers who would not benefit by the proposal. It was unfair to give a privilege to a particular class which had not been asked for by the large shopkeepers and only by a small section of the small shopkeepers. At the time the agitation was carried on for the early closing of shops there were only one or two individuals who argued that small shops should be allowed to open at seven in the morning.

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

Ayes	...	...	13
Noes	...	...	13
A tie	...	...	0

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Holman	Mr. James
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Pigott
Mr. Oats	Mr. Purkiss
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. Rason
Mr. Reid	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Stone	Mr. Throssell
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Yelverton
Mr. Wallace (*Teller*).	Mr. Higham (*Teller*).

THE CHAIRMAN: To give an opportunity for farther consideration on recommittal, he would cast his vote with the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. PURKISS moved that, in line 2 of Subclause 4, after "whereof" the words "not being a person of the Chinese or other Asiatic race" be inserted.

THE PREMIER: The question as to the disabilities of persons of the Chinese or Asiatic races might be dealt with in a separate clause. Already the Committee had decided to deal with Chinese and Asiatics in connection with factories in a new clause. The amendment would not attain the desired object. In dealing with the Chinese and other Asiatics members would have to consider if some distinction should not be made between Chinese who were British subjects and those who were not. If the Committee interfered with the rights of those who were British subjects, the Bill might have to be reserved.

MR. PURKISS: After what the Premier had said, he was willing to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

MR. DAGLISH moved that after "whereof," in Subclause 4, the words "is a British subject or a naturalised British subject and" be inserted. He wished to reach the Italians who were taking away the trade from the Britisher in particular lines. Trade should be confined to people of the British race, or those foreigners who chose to become Britishers by taking out naturalisation papers, and had lived a certain number of years in this State.

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

Ayes	...	...	13
Noes	...	...	14
Majority against		...	1

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Holman	Mr. James
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Johnson	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Oats	Mr. Pigott
Mr. Reid	Mr. Purkiss
Mr. Stone	Mr. Rason
Mr. Wallace	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Higham (*Teller*).	Mr. Throssell
	Mr. Yelverton (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. PURKISS moved that the words "between the hours of 7 and 8 o'clock in the morning of every week day, and during the extra hours in the evening of every day during which he may keep open under the clauses of this Act relating to small shops," be inserted after "therein" in line 2 of Subclause 4. Small shopkeepers were debarred from employing even an errand boy. This might be reasonable during the hours when none but small shops were to be open; but the employment of assistants should be permitted to all shops when all might be open, namely, from 8 till 6, else the small shops would be penalised.

MR. DIAMOND opposed the amendment. Small shops could open for an extra hour each morning, and for two in the evening. These were great concessions, which should be struck out before the Bill passed. Small shops had no use for errand boys; and if permitted to employ them, the boys would soon develop into "assistants."

MR. HASTIE: By allowing small shopkeepers to keep open two extra hours at night, a distinction had been made in favour of those shopkeepers who did not employ assistants, and the absence of assistants had been urged in justification of the concession. But its advocates, the small shopkeepers now desired to have the same privilege of employing assistants as the large; and if this were granted the distinction between the two classes of shop would be broken down, and the existence of the Act endangered. The clause should be passed unaltered.

MR. TAYLOR opposed the amendment. The Committee were not legislating for the people as a whole, but for special people. Rather than do this, exempt all small shopkeepers, and let the Bill apply to large traders only. Once grant the small shopkeeper errand-boys and assistants, and the regulations would be constantly broken. The privileges already conceded were sufficient.

Amendment negatived.

THE PREMIER: By the subclause, no assistant should be employed, save the husband or the wife of the shopkeeper. To prevent parent and child, grandfather and grandchild, or brother and sister from keeping a "small" shop would be harsh, and such relations should be allowed to work together, care being taken to prevent abuses. We might insert the words "child, grandchild, or sister," and might conclude with a proviso that not more than one such assistant

should be employed in any shop to be exempted. He did not finally commit himself to the wording of this amendment. To limit the case to husband and wife was to narrow the clause unduly. So long as we protected ourselves by insisting that the exemption should not cover a whole family, we were safe. He therefore moved that after "wife," line 3, the words "child, grandchild, or sister" be inserted.

MR. JOHNSON opposed the amendment. Evidently the Premier had come to the conclusion that early closing was a failure, and desired to enforce it on the smallest possible section of shops. Under this amendment practically all suburban shops would be small shops. Perhaps hon. members generally now recognised the inadvisability of retaining Clause 50.

MR. DIAMOND: The amendment should not pass. The Premier had mentioned the case of a father and daughter combining to keep a shop. Now the father, who might be employed in the Government service during the day, would turn himself into a shopkeeper in the evening, the daughter meanwhile attending a shorthand and typewriting class.

THE PREMIER: The observations of the hon. member (Mr. Diamond) disclosed no valid objection to the amendment. This was not a one-man-one-billet measure, or a one-man-one-shop measure. Why should not a husband earn his living in outside employment while the wife kept a shop? One was not bound to accept the principle that a man must work only eight hours, whether he wished to work longer or not. In the absence of the amendment, the clause might work gross injustice. He would allow no one to challenge his support of the principle of early closing, which principle he had advocated in this country before a great many members had heard of it. Clause 50, while a departure from the general principle of the Bill, represented a compromise intended to meet an existing evil. Did hon. members desire that we should by Clause 50, as it was drafted, aim at placing an unfair burden on those who frequently needed the benefit of the clause far more than husband and wife needed it? Care must, of course, be taken to limit the age of the child or grandchild. He repeated that he did not commit himself to the exact wording of the amendment, but merely desired to test the feeling of the Committee as to whether we should not extend the benefit of the clause to people who in many cases were more worthy of that benefit than were the husband and wife.

MR. JOHNSON: If the object of the Premier in introducing Clause 50 had been to assist the struggling widow and the crippled man, the provision would have received all-round support; but the clause provided for the exemption of husband and wife, and to that he (Mr. Johnson) objected. He would support the clause if the Premier would insert "widow and child" in lieu of "husband and wife."

MR. BATH: It was remarkable how frequently in discussions on measures of this kind the poor widow, the crippled man, and the struggling shopkeeper were introduced. A husband and wife assisted by a child or grandchild could carry on a fairly large business.

THE PREMIER: But the amendment did not cover such a case.

MR. BATH: Another special concession was to be given to shopkeepers who did not employ assistants. Such shopkeepers had already been granted an unfair advantage in the shape of permission to keep open longer than other shops. The real object was to defeat the early-closing movement; therefore he opposed the amendment.

MR. TAYLOR: The Premier's amendment ought not to pass. If the hon. gentleman had carried his argument to its logical conclusion, he would have discovered the possibility of the poor unfortunate widow, the hungry child, and the crippled grandfather being anxious to obtain employment, but being prevented by the operation of this clause from getting it.

THE PREMIER: What shopkeeper would employ a crippled grandfather?

MR. TAYLOR: A shopkeeper might employ a starving child who kept a crippled grandfather. This country today held numbers of men starving although anxious to work. The poor man, it seemed, was always being considered by the Committee; but there was no real consideration for the poor man about the whole proceeding. We

should be more practical and less sentimental.

MR. NANSON: The object of the early-closing clauses of the Bill was to prevent shop assistants from being worked unduly long hours; but the members of the Labour party were endeavouring to extend the scope of the measure so as to prevent anyone from working more than eight hours, even though in his own employment. The Premier was perfectly right in his contention that if a man employing himself wished to work long hours he should be permitted to do so. Had Australia been brought to its present fortunes by eight hours' work a day? Successful men had made a practice of working every hour of their time. Members of trades unions who worked merely for wages were perfectly justified, looking at this matter from their own point of view, in endeavouring to prevent the wages-man from being sweated by hours that were too long or rates of pay that were too low; but it was an unwarranted interference with the liberty of the subject to prevent a man from working on his own behalf, in his own business, more than a certain number of hours per day. A great deal had been said in regard to the evil of allowing husband and wife to be joined in this clause as working together in a small shop; but we were legislating in this instance to give persons the fullest opportunity of making their living in an honest way. There were many cases in which husbands in indifferent or delicate health were incapable of doing a hard day's manual work, and if these people were not given the fullest liberty, so long as they did not hurt other persons, of earning their livelihood, where were they to go? What possibility had they of keeping body and soul together, unless they became dependent on Government charity? And he doubted whether even Labour members would allege that everyone incapable of hard manual labour should be compelled to subsist for the rest of their lives upon Government relief. He was not aware that large shopkeepers, either in Perth or other towns, feared very much the competition of these shopkeepers in the suburbs to whom this clause principally applied. As to the argument used by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Diamond), "one man one billet," he supposed there was hardly a man in this House who was not a one man two billets man. The member for South Fremantle had a billet as a member of Parliament, and perhaps he did something else in order to earn a living. Even the labour members did something else to earn a living. The member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Johnson) was a member of Parliament, and he also had a billet in building a house for the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish), also as a representative of trade unions before the Arbitration Court. The Early Closing Act, in the form it was first passed, had straitened the means of many very considerably, and it had raised so strong a feeling against early closing in Perth that the very existence of the early-closing movement was threatened by that hostile feeling. By this clause in the Bill the Premier had provided a safety-valve to that hostility.

Amendment passed.

THE PREMIER said he would redraft the clause. He moved that after Subclause 4 the words "provided that no more than one such assistant shall be employed therein" be inserted.

Amendment passed.

MR. JOHNSON moved an amendment of which the member for Cockburn Sound (Mr. McDonald) had given notice, that the following words be added to Subclause 4: "Provided that such husband or wife is not a wage earner."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: This question had been dealt with in the debate on the last amendment. He thought the Premier fully pointed out that in his opinion and that of other members of the Government, individual industry should not have any tax placed upon it. He opposed the amendment.

MR. DAGLISH: As one who differed largely from other members of the Labour party on the question of this clause, he was surprised there should be any objection to the proposed addition to it, because the addition simply meant that if a man chose to have two occupations, one being that of shopkeeper, he should have no advantage over a man limited entirely to that one occupation as a means of livelihood.

MR. BATH: The proposed addition to the clause was absolutely necessary. As

the clause stood at present an assistant in a shop which closed at six might live in the suburbs, and he might in the evening compete with his employer.

MEMBER: He would not do that long.

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

Ayes	...	...	9
Noes	...	...	19
Majority against	...		10

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Holman	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Oats	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Reid	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Higham
Mr. Wallace (*Teller*).	Mr. Hutchinson
	Mr. James
	Mr. Kingsmill
	Mr. Nanson
	Mr. O'Connor
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Purkiss
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Stone
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Jacoby (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 51—Closing time for certain exempted shops:

Mr. JOHNSON moved that the word "ten," in line 2, be struck out, and "nine" inserted in lieu. His intention was to shorten the hours of assistants working in shops mentioned in part 1 of Schedule Two.

THE PREMIER: With two exceptions there was no reason why the shops in part 1 of Schedule Two should not close at nine o'clock; but included in part 1 were also fruit shops and tobacconist shops. The question was whether members thought those two classes of shops should be closed at nine o'clock, more particularly fruit shops. His sympathies ran in favour of closing them at nine, or earlier if it could be done, but he did not see any harm in their being kept open. He thought the Colonial Treasurer considered that fruit shops, at all events, should be open until some time after nine. Fruit was an article the sale of which should be encouraged in every way, and by allowing fruit shops to be open somewhat later than other shops we should be doing good by promoting the sale of fruit. The Bill as printed was a distinct advance on the existing state of affairs.

MR. BATH: Both the Premier and the leader of the Opposition had expressed almost a yearning desire to limit the hours of shop assistants; and that being so, would the Premier insert a clause limiting the hours of assistants employed in shops? Assistants in stationers' and tobacconists' shops were employed from 8 o'clock in the morning till 9 o'clock at night, also till 10 or 11 on Saturday, such hours being exceptionally long, and these assistants required protection. If their hours were limited to 50 in the week exclusive of meals, there would be no desire on the part of Labour members to limit the time of closing.

THE PREMIER: Nine o'clock would be late enough for these shops.

MR. DAGLISH: The closing hour of 6 o'clock might well be applied to some of the shops in this schedule, and the schedule might be better arranged. In regard to tobacconist and fruit shops, it was reasonable to allow extended hours, but the hours for assistants in these shops should be limited, because an industry was no good if it simply killed people in allowing them to earn a hard living through extended hours of labour. Fruit sellers, tobacconists, and confectioners might be allowed longer hours than others. As to tobacconists, how would this restriction affect public-houses, seeing that these places sold tobacco, cigars and cigarettes as long as public-houses remained open? Another clause provided that in the case of a shop carrying on several classes of business, the whole establishment must be closed if one of those lines of business had to close earlier than others. Therefore, would that operate in the same way in regard to public-houses doing more than one class of trade, by selling tobacco in some form up to closing time? Hotels could sell till 11 o'clock, or with a billiard permit till 12, thus competing unfairly against tobacconists. Would the Premier make some provision to close public-houses at 10 o'clock, if not in regard to general business, yet in regard to the sale of tobacco in any form?

THE PREMIER: If that were done it would be necessary to insert a clause that no persons should sell cigars or tobacco unless they were tobacconists. Under the law at present, any person could sell tobacco, no license being required. The sale of tobacco was carried on to some extent in connection with several

businesses, including eating-houses, druggists, and others, and these must be open until a late hour because of the nature of the business. The same applied to boarding-houses or coffee-palaces. Surely members would not say that no tobacco, or cigars, or cigarettes, should be sold in these places after a certain hour of closing.

MR. DAGLISH: Then they could also carry on a casual trade?

THE PREMIER: Yes; they could carry on a casual trade, but the risk of competition was not serious in these cases. As to limiting the hours of employment for assistants in these establishments, it would hardly be fair to close fruit and tobacconist shops at 9 o'clock—there would be some inconvenience. Personally, he thought persons should shop early; but as these shops were allowed to be open until all hours at present, the Bill would restrict them by having to close at 10 o'clock.

THE TREASURER (Hon. J. Gardiner): The only shops that should have the time extended were fruit and vegetable shops, as they sold perishable articles; and any law which tended to increase the price of fruit by causing it to perish through the early closing of shops should be avoided as far as possible. The average man could always get his tobacco or cigars in some way. Newsagents had suggested that they were willing to limit the hours of their assistants to 48 in the week.

MR. HASTIE: If the amendment for closing at 9 o'clock were accepted, it should be understood that the schedule would have to be rearranged.

MR. NANSON suggested to the Premier, as a simple and easy method of checking the terrible evil of late shopping, that he should reimpose the curfew law which was passed in England about the year 1006. It would have this beneficial effect, that every one would have to be home and probably in bed by 10 o'clock; so that there would be no inducement to keep open shops of any kind to a late hour, because there would be no one to shop. While going in for legislation of this kind, we should be thorough. One great advantage of this plan would be that all restrictions as to late shopping would be removed from the Bill, and several objections to this clause would thereby be met. It was somewhat inconsistent that in a House supposed to be enthusiastic in trying to check drunkenness, strict provisions should be made for preventing a person from buying a mutton chop after 9 o'clock, while allowing him to buy whisky up till 12 o'clock. To prevent a man from buying a glass of milk in a shop, while allowing him to obtain whisky and milk in an hotel, was somewhat inconsistent. Strangely enough, members who so strongly favoured early closing had not sought to apply this Bill to public-houses, which after all were merely shops. It was not suggested that the moral fibre was weakened by buying apples after 10 at night, and it was admitted that the purchase of whisky at night was apt to demoralise. The well-being of customers should be considered just as much as that of the shopkeeper or shop assistant. He hoped something would be done to make the measure consistent by preventing the sale of pernicious as well as harmless articles.

THE PREMIER: The amendment in proposing to strike out the whole clause went too far. It would be better to indicate which shops should be left under the 10 o'clock rule. He suggested that fruit shops, vegetable shops, confectionery shops, milk shops, and tobacconists' shops might be allowed to remain open until 10 o'clock.

MR. JOHNSON: Apparently his amendment involved a difficulty, and he was willing to withdraw it provided the Premier would assist to frame a provision limiting the hours of assistants in the shops mentioned.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause passed.

Clause 52—Hairdressers' assistants:

MR. PURKISS moved that the clause be struck out. A hairdresser's business did not comprise the sale of goods, though a tobacconist's business was generally carried on in conjunction with it. Under this Bill the tobacconist could keep open until 10 o'clock at night, but the hairdresser had to close at seven. There was no sense in extending the time during which a hairdresser might keep open from six to seven, since that was the tea or dinner hour. Many shop assistants were engaged at their work from eight in the morning until six at night, and therefore could not avail themselves of hairdressers' shops. He intended to move a

farther amendment, transposing the business of a hairdresser from part 2 to part 1 of Schedule Two, and so enabling hairdressers to keep open until nine or 10 at night. This farther amendment would be safeguarded by yet another providing that hairdressers' assistants should not be engaged for more than 59 hours in any week, exclusive of mealtimes. These amendments were to the interest of the employer and the public, while not endangering the wellbeing of the employee.

MR. JOHNSON opposed the amendment. He recognised the difficulty which existed, and therefore he had decided, after conference with members of the Hairdressers' Union, to move an amendment providing that saloons might remain open until half-past seven. This matter demanded consideration from the point of view of the goldfields, where many men worked at a distance of three or four miles from hairdressers' shops. The assistants were willing to work until half-past seven in the evening provided they were allowed an hour for tea, say from five to six.

MR. WALLACE: The member for Perth (Mr. Purkiss) had no hope of carrying his amendment. The people in whose behalf the hon. member pleaded would still be late if hairdressers' shops remained open till nine or ten o'clock instead of half-past six or seven. The object of such a measure was to shorten the hours of labour; but now we found that one class was to work excessive hours to accommodate another class. It was impossible to legislate for universal hours in all branches of work; but let us be consistent as far as possible as far as shops were concerned. [Mr. PURKISS: Why not shut up tobacconists?] If he had his way, he would shut them all up at six o'clock, and he would close hotels considerably earlier than eleven. Some people on the goldfields were a great distance from a hairdresser's shop, but such employees only worked their regular eight hours. Ordinary workers knocked off at four or five o'clock, and if they had not time to get a shave between five o'clock and half-past six or seven, it would be because they were paltry and had no sympathy with their fellow creatures.

MR. BATH: In very few hairdressers' shops were more than one or two hands employed; and if hairdressers who had assistants were compelled to close at six, and if hairdressers who did not have assistants were allowed to keep open until a later hour, injustice would be caused to employers who had one or two assistants.

MR. PURKISS: Most of the assistants in large drapery shops and in all large warehouses were customers of the hairdressers, and they could not leave till six o'clock. Many of them lived in boarding-houses, where dinner or tea was at six, and many lived at little suburban places. He had been asked to peruse the books of two large hairdressers here, who were willing to show their books to anyone; and it would be seen they were making nothing out of the late hours. Hairdressers' assistants in this State were getting upwards of £3 a week, whereas in Melbourne they were receiving only 30s. a week; and these hairdressers assured him that if they had to close at seven o'clock wages would come down. [MR. TAYLOR: That was absurd.] He himself did not think that such would be the case.

Mr. HOPKINS: Seven o'clock seemed quite late enough for hairdressers' establishments to be open. As to tobacconists and others who had privileges, two wrongs did not make a right. If closing the shops at seven would reduce salaries, surely closing them at half-past six would have brought about a reduction.

MR. TAYLOR: Instead of increasing the hours for hairdressers, he would rather reduce them. Last month a letter was received in which hairdressers expressed a desire that "seven" should be struck out and "6·30" inserted. The member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Johnson) had had a conference with the association of hairdressers, and desired the time to be fixed at 7·30 with the object of giving the hairdressers an hour for tea, from five to six.

MR. JOHNSON said he had met the officers, but not the union.

MR. TAYLOR: In conversation, the officers asked him (Mr. Taylor) to move for closing at half-past six. They pointed out that if they had to go home, they would have to go to the suburbs, and it would take them a long time to get out there and come back. In their opinion the idea of having a tea hour from five to six would be absurd. He would rather see the time fixed at 6·30.

The hours of hairdressers were much longer than those of any other employees in the State. [MEMBER: What about butchers?] He did not think they worked more. [MR. BATH: Sixty or seventy.] They had longer time off.

Amendment negatived.

MR. WALLACE moved that all the words after "than," in line 2, be struck out, with the view of inserting other words of which he had given notice.

Amendment passed.

MR. WALLACE then moved that the following words be inserted (times altered by permission):—

(1.) Half-past six o'clock in the evening of any day except Wednesday or Saturday, and of the week days next preceding Christmas Day, New Year's Day, and Good Friday;

(2.) Ten o'clock in the evening of Saturday, and of the week days next preceding Christmas Day, New Year's Day, and Good Friday; and

(3.) One o'clock in the afternoon of every Wednesday, except in any week in which there is a public or bank holiday falling on a day other than Wednesday, and allowed to the assistants as a holiday or half-holiday, in which case the closing time on the Wednesday shall be half-past six o'clock in the evening.

It must be patent that as one or two assistants were employed in the majority of shops, the full working strength would be required at the busiest time, from half-past four to six or half-past six. If compelled to close at half-past six, arrangements could be made whereby assistants would remain on to 6·30 without interval for tea; but if the shop hours were extended beyond half-past six, it would mean that one of the saloon hands would go off at six for half an hour, the second going off at 6·30 and returning at seven. The result would be that one of the two assistants would have to do half an hour's work less than the other, or *vice versa*. The Bill also provided that employees should not be required to work longer than five hours between meals. [MEMBER: This was not a factory.] The same conditions would apply to this kind of work as far as meals were concerned. Those engaged in the trade desired the closing hours to be as he had moved in the amendment—6·30 on ordinary evenings, and 1 o'clock on Wednesday. Of course any customers who were in before the closing hour would have to be served before the assistants left off, and this meant that the assistants would be kept practically half an hour beyond the stated time.

THE PREMIER said he did not object to the closing hour being fixed at half-past 6; but to close at 1 o'clock on Wednesday would be too early, as many persons engaged in shops and offices would want to be shaved between 1 and 2 o'clock, and that would be a busy time for hairdressers.

MR. WALLACE: Hairdressers in Perth, and their assistants, asked for these hours to be fixed.

THE PREMIER: It was difficult to ascertain what they actually did want. It was not reasonable to argue that persons who wanted to enjoy the half-holiday on Wednesday could be shaved on the previous day. The hon. member (Mr. Wallace) should stick to 1·30 as the closing time for Wednesday, that being more reasonable than 1 o'clock.

MR. HOPKINS: One o'clock on Wednesday was late enough, and he believed it was approved by those engaged in the trade at Boulder. As to the argument about shop assistants requiring to be shaved after 1 o'clock on Wednesday, most persons of that class could not afford the luxury of employing a tonsorial artist, and had to shave themselves. Casual customers, professional and city men, were the persons who supported hairdressers.

MR. JOHNSON hoped the Committee would accept his proposal to close at 7·30 in the evening, as this would best suit the requirements of hairdressers and assistants on the goldfields. By agreeing to 7·30, the requirements of those on the coast and those on the goldfields would be equally met.

MR. HOPKINS repeated that those of his constituents who were engaged in this business preferred 6·30 as the closing time. The proposal to close at 7·30 would produce some absurd results.

MR. WALLACE: The most popular hairdresser in Perth had, during the last twelve months, voluntarily closed his establishment at 6·30, except Saturday, and at about 1·30 on Wednesday. This instance showed that employers doing a large business did not consider it a serious loss to close at the times stated in his amendment.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 53, 54—agreed to.

Clause 55—Employment of assistants in shops not mentioned in Schedule One:

MR. McDONALD moved that in line 8, "twelve" be struck out and "twenty-four" inserted in lieu; also that in the same line, "half" be struck out. Stock-takings as a rule were annual, and large establishments considered the 12 days allowed in one half-year too short a time to take stock.

MR. PURKISS said he had an amendment in the same direction on the Notice Paper. The firms referred to did not desire that the time during which employees might be retained after closing hours for stocktaking purposes should be extended, but merely that the time might be selected in the most convenient manner.

MR. DAGLISH: One would like some provision made to prevent the extra labour being done on Wednesdays.

THE PREMIER: The words "not being days on which the shop closes at one or ten o'clock" met that point.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 56—Half-holidays in exempted shops:

MR. WALLACE: The Committee having carried the amendment moved by him in Clause 52, he now moved that the last paragraph of this clause, referring to hairdressers' assistants, be struck out.

Amendment passed, and the paragraph struck out.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 57—agreed to.

Clause 58—Hours of employment for women and children:

Mr. JOHNSON moved that "fifty-two," line 3, be struck out and "forty-six" inserted in lieu. He had intended to move that "forty-seven" be inserted in lieu, but in view of the amendment providing that shops should close at nine instead of ten on Saturday nights the lesser number was desirable.

THE PREMIER: How did the hon. member work out the 46 hours?

MR. JOHNSON: The starting time for women and boys, generally speaking, was nine o'clock in the morning, and they worked till six o'clock in the evening, except on Wednesdays, when they stopped work at one o'clock, and on Saturdays when they worked till nine o'clock.

THE PREMIER: At present, women and boys worked nine hours on four days of the week, five hours on the Wednesday, and 11 hours on the Saturday, or a total of 52 hours per week. The hon. member wished to have the number reduced by six hours, to 46. Would not this limitation tend somewhat to affect the position of female employees?

MR. STONE: Yes; they would not be employed.

THE PREMIER: Of course nine hours a day was a long time, and 11 hours was longer still; but if we provided that women should not be employed until nine o'clock in the morning, thus leaving all details to be done by male hands up to that hour, it was to be feared that we should be handicapping women unfairly.

MR. JOHNSON: We had done so already in the case of factories.

THE PREMIER: But the hours of labour were not similar in shops and factories. The main question to be considered was whether the limitation proposed would not operate as a bar to the employment of female assistants.

MR. STONE: The clause should stand as printed. Boys and girls employed in shops did less important work than that of men, who received higher pay; and the less important work was often a necessary preliminary to the more important.

MR. JOHNSON: Under the amendment, women and boys could start work at nine o'clock in the morning and continue till six at night. This, subject to the allowance of an hour in the middle of the day, represented eight hours' work, which was quite sufficient. If it was necessary that a boy should start work earlier in the morning, he could stop earlier in the evening. The Committee should carry the amendment limiting the hours to 46.

MR. HIGHAM: It was to be hoped the Committee would not interfere with the clause. He did not think 52 hours unnecessarily hard on women and boys in any shop. A great deal of work had to be done before stores were ready for business. In the New Zealand measure the limitations were from $9\frac{1}{2}$ to $11\frac{1}{2}$ hours. The clause as it stood was absolutely

essential in the interests of the storekeepers.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Clauses 59 to 63, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 64—Management of elevators:

MR. HIGHAM moved that after the word "woman," in line 1, "under the age of 21" be inserted. In large offices the elevator was managed by a husband and wife who acted as caretakers. The husband might be away, and the wife would look after the lift. It had been proved that a woman of mature age was equally capable with a man of managing a lift. If we did not make this provision, many married couples would lose a good deal of the advantage they now had in offering to fill these positions.

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

Ayes	...	...	15
Noes	...	...	10
Majority for	...	...	5

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Atkins	Mr. Bath
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Holman
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. James
Mr. Kingsmill	Mr. Johnson
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Reid
Mr. McWilliams	Mr. Throssell
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Wallace
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. Taylor (*Teller*).
Mr. Piesse	
Mr. Pigott	
Mr. Rason	
Mr. Stone	
Mr. Higham (*Teller*).	

Amendment thus passed.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 65—Iron buildings to be lined:

MR. ATKINS moved that the clause be struck out. He did not see any necessity for it, and it would be a great hardship in the case of a number of small factories.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: If the clause were allowed to stand it would, as the member for the Murray (Mr. Atkins) had pointed out, cause a great deal of hardship to owners of small factories. Provision should be made perhaps by which the height should be mentioned. There were many buildings which doubtless were unfit for occupation as factories owing to their being so low and the area so small as to be injurious to health. Under Subclause 2 an inspector would have a right to direct that a building should be painted with white paint or whitewash or other cooling substance.

MR. NANSON: Subclauses 2, 3, and 4 of Clause 32 made ample provision for dealing with this matter. If this clause were carried in its present form it would be unworkable in a large number of factories. In some cases it would be absolutely unsafe to line the factories with matchboard.

MR. HIGHAM: Members would see that he had given notice of an amendment to strike out the clause with a view of inserting the following in lieu:—"The inspector may require any building used as a factory or shop, which is constructed or iron, zinc, or tin, to be lined with wood or other material to his satisfaction." If the inspector acted in an arbitrary way the occupier would have a right of appeal, as provided in Clause 2. In many cases a place would be far better unlined than lined. Such places cooled much quicker. An iron building that was lined retained the heat in hot weather for an indefinite period, but if unlined, as soon as the temperature decreased iron buildings rapidly became cooler, much more so than a stone building. [MR. PIESSE: And they became rapidly hot.] Yes; certainly. But where in one part of the day the weather was generally cool, an unlined building was preferable to a lined one.

MR. HOPKINS: The clause might say "any person shall," and add "either six or twelve months after the passing of this Act" be employed, etc. Sufficient time was not otherwise allowed for the necessary alterations to buildings.

MR. NANSON: What should be done in the case of a foundry—for instance, Metters' foundry?

MR. HOPKINS: A foundry was an exceptional case. Reasonable time should be given in the clause to effect such improvements as were necessary for making buildings suitable, and by doing so the owner or occupier could arrange to make the improvements within six months.

MR. HIGHAM: Under the clause, buildings would have to be lined whether lining was necessary or not. It was desirable to give sufficient notice for effecting alterations.

MR. HAYWARD: Subclause 2 was important, because such buildings were

not fit to work in unless treated in the way proposed. To coat buildings outside for reducing the heat was more important than lining them inside.

MR. JOHNSON: The amendment was desirable in the place of Subclause 1. Subclause 2, requiring buildings to be coated outside, should be retained.

THE PREMIER: It had been his intention to make the clause read so that the obligation to line should be subject to the discretion of the inspector. Subclause 1 in its present form went too far in insisting that in every case a building used as a factory or shop should be lined. There were many cases in which lining would not be an improvement for the particular purpose; and it would be placing an unfair burden on the owner or occupier to require lining in all cases. On the other hand, there might be factories consisting only of a shell of galvanised iron, and in such case no amount of regulation under Clause 32 (already passed) could overcome the enormous changes of temperature that would take place in that kind of building. The intention of Clause 32, Subclause 3, was to deal rather with internal matters.

MR. NANSON: The provisions of Clause 32, if carried out, would keep down the temperature, and there were other devices, such as using fans for reducing the temperature.

THE PREMIER: Buildings to be used for the purpose stated should be lined when required, according to the discretion of the inspector; and if the inspector acted in an unreasonable manner, there would be grave complaints against him. In the case of a large and lofty room, lining might not be necessary. The Committee would do well to adopt the amendment of the member for Fremantle.

MR. NANSON: Provisions of this kind should be general, so as to cover every circumstance that might arise. The provisions of Clause 32 seemed to him to cover all that the present clause (65) aimed at; and the temperature might be reduced by requiring a certain number of windows in proportion to the space, or by the use of fans, or by lining in some cases.

MR. JOHNSON: What about extreme cold?

MR. NANSON: Nothing was provided in the Bill against extreme cold. Clause 32 might be amended on recommittal by providing for extreme cold as well as extreme heat. As to requiring buildings to be coated outside for coolness, if this was necessary in the case of factories, why not insist on it in the case of dwelling-houses? His own experience of outside coating was that after the coating wore off there was no appreciable difference in the temperature of the building. Clause 65 went farther than was necessary, or it did not go far enough.

MR. JOHNSON: Clause 62, which had been referred to, dealt principally with brick and stone buildings, in regard to sufficient ventilation; but the present clause dealt with wood and iron structures, which were more affected by extremes of temperature; therefore the two clauses were not identical, and both were necessary.

MR. ATKINS: The inspector ought to be allowed discretion as to requiring that a building should be lined; but he should not be told in the clause that he must do this or he must not do that. Leave it to his discretion.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Clause 32, Subclause 3, already sufficiently provided for the objects of this clause, which was therefore redundant and unnecessary, and should be struck out.

MR. HASTIE: What harm could this clause do if its object was already provided for?

MR. NANSON: We did not want two clauses to do the work of one.

MR. HASTIE: Then the only evil which could result from the retention of the clause would be a slight increase in the cost of printing the Act. It was but reasonable that the inspector should have power to issue instructions. True, most Australian factories were in a fairly good sanitary condition; but it was only right that manufacturers starting in business here should understand that their premises must be thoroughly healthy and safe. The clause was not mandatory on the inspector.

MR. THOMAS: The view advanced by the hon. member (Mr. Hastie) was incorrect: the inspector had no option. In many instances the clause would work great hardship, and it ought, therefore, to be struck out.

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

Ayes	...	...	14
Noes	...	...	18
Majority against	...		4

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Atkins	Mr. Bath
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Ewing
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. McWilliams	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Hastie
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Holman
Mr. Pigott	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Purkiss	Mr. James
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Throssell	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Stone (*Teller*).	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Reid
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Higham (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

THE PREMIER moved that Subclause 1 be struck out, with a view to the insertion of a subclause which the member for Fremantle (Mr. Higham) had placed on the Notice Paper.

Question passed, and the subclause struck out.

MR. HIGHAM moved that the following be inserted in lieu:—

> The inspector may require any building used as a factory or shop which is constructed of iron, zinc, or tin to be lined with wood or other material to his satisfaction.

MR. PIGOTT: What would be the effect of this new subclause? Supposing an inspector unnecessarily ordered a man to line his factory?

THE PREMIER: The man could appeal.

MR. PIGOTT: But what would the man do in the meantime?

THE PREMIER: Nothing; the requisition would not be carried out in the meantime.

Amendment passed, and the words inserted.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 66—agreed to.

Clause 67—Lavatories to be provided in factories:

MR. NANSON: In the case of a factory employing one man and one woman, would the owner have to provide one closet and lavatory for the man and another for the woman? That seemed rather absurd.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member had put an extreme case. One could not imagine such a position.

MR. NANSON: The position was quite possible under the definition of factory.

MR. THOMAS: One could conceive of hundreds of similar cases.

THE PREMIER: The position might arise in connection with a shop, but even there it would be very rare. Moreover, shops were generally connected with dwelling-houses, so that the closet and lavatory accommodation of the dwelling-house would be available for the use of the shop assistants.

MR. NANSON: Tailors' shops would frequently employ a man to cut out garments and a woman to sew those garments together with a machine. The clause allowed no discretion whatever.

THE PREMIER: Did not the hon. member think there ought to be separate accommodation?

MR. NANSON: Not in cases where there were only one man and one woman, any more than in a dwelling-house. If factories were built in the same way as a properly constructed dwelling-house, there would be no inconvenience. If the Premier wished to retain the clause, he should redraft it in some way to meet the objection.

MR. DIAMOND: The hon. member spoke of a tailoring shop with one cutter and one woman working on a garment. He (Mr. Diamond) would think it would take from six to 10 or 12 women to make up the work cut by one cutter.

MR. NANSON: Both might be engaged in making up.

MR. DIAMOND: It would be extraordinary where one man and one woman would be the only employees in a factory. Would the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) give an instance?

MR. THOMAS: The Bill stated that if there was only one employee the place would be a factory.

THE PREMIER: That was a legal definition. What was wanted was a practical instance.

MR. THOMAS: An amendment had been passed, and rightly so, to make this Bill apply to other places where there was one clerk employed, whether a typewriter or a male clerk. Hundreds of instances, therefore, could be cited.

MR. NANSON suggested that after "shop," in line 1, "where more than six persons are employed" be inserted.

THE PREMIER: Supposing the words "if required by the inspector" were inserted after the word "shall," in line 1?

MR. NANSON: That would do. He would move that.

Amendment (as suggested) passed.

Clauses 68 to 71, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 72—Provisions as to requisitions by inspector to occupiers:

MR. HIGHAM: Members would remember that in dealing with a previous clause relating to the power of appeal against a decision or requisition of an inspector, he said he proposed to make the clause read so that requisitions of an inspector which were unreasonable or arbitrary should be subject to appeal. He now desired to move that the words "necessitating the expenditure of money," in line 14, be struck out, so that it would mean that any requisition of an inspector would be subject to appeal.

THE PREMIER: The amendment went too far. He could understand wanting to have some safeguard against the powers of an inspector being harshly used, but it would not do to have inspectors hindered at every turn. He thought that if we gave a right of appeal regarding the expenditure of money, that would be sufficient. We provided in Clause 10 that there should be an appeal to the Minister where one refused to register. That clause was struck out; but he understood when the Committee were discussing the matter that appeal should be not to the Minister but to the Local Court. He proposed to reinsert that subclause on recommittal. It was not desirable to give a right of appeal in relation to every requisition made by an inspector, for if we did an inspector could not take any step without there being a possibility of an appeal to the Court. An inspector would be bound hand and foot at every turn.

MR. HIGHAM: The fact that the occupier would have a right of appeal would not, he thought, lead to so much interference with the duties of inspectors as the Premier believed. The occupier of a factory on making an appeal would have to pay a fair amount of expenses. If the reference to the Court was a frivolous one, the Court would make him pay.

THE PREMIER: They could only make him pay costs.

MR. HIGHAM: Those costs and his own costs would mount up.

MR. NANSON: There should be a power of appeal, but not to the Local Court, for he did not think the Local Court knew much about these things.

THE PREMIER said he proposed to give power of appeal.

MR. HASTIE: The only reason for passing this amendment was to enact that an inspector of factories should do nothing whatever under any circumstances unless a magistrate of a Local Court approved. [MR. HIGHAM: That did not follow.] That was practically what was wanted. He had never heard that the power of an inspector had been abused anywhere else. He hoped the clause would be kept as it stood.

MR. PIGOTT: As far as he could see, if we gave the owner of a factory no chance of appeal against requisitions of inspectors under this measure, the case would be practically hopeless.

THE PREMIER: The occupier did get an appeal in a case involving the expenditure of money.

MR. PIGOTT: Why not in other cases? Supposing there were an inspector who wanted to be obstructive?

MR. HIGHAM: Many requisitions which an inspector might make would not necessitate the expenditure of money, but they might prevent the occupier from making money. An occupier would not appeal against any frivolous decision of an inspector to which he objected, because he would have to pay the costs. The member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) just now said that he (Mr. Higham) quoted no instance where inspectors had acted arbitrarily. As far as factory inspectors were concerned we had never had the opportunity. Many of the requisitions of inspectors of the Central Board of Health in Perth and Fremantle were arbitrary. He had seen requisitions from the Central Board of Health covering 10 pages of foolscap, demanding all sorts of unreasonable things, some of which if carried out would not have the effect desired by the board.

Amendment put, and a division taken.

MR. THOMAS claimed the vote of the member for Kanowna, on the ground that the hon. member called out "Aye," and

and was now voting on the side of the Noes.

MR. HASTIE denied that he had called out "Aye," and said he was not responsible for what the hon. member understood him to have said.

Division resulted as follows:—

Ayes	...	...	...	13
Noes	...	...	...	15
Majority against			...	2

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Atkins	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Hastie
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Holman
Mr. Nanson	Mr Hutchinson
Mr. Pigott	Mr. James
Mr. Stone	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Purkiss
Mr. Throssell	Mr. Rason
Mr. Yelverton	Mr. Reid
Mr. Higham (*Teller*).	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Diamond (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. NANSON, referring farther to the clause, said the Chamber of Manufactures had suggested that the appeal should be to a Board of Conciliation rather than to the magistrate of the Local Court, as a Board of Conciliation would be more likely to have the necessary knowledge for dealing with matters of this kind.

THE PREMIER: To refer appeals to a Board of Conciliation would be a more expensive procedure than the other. The Board for the South-Western District, for instance, had five members, one of them residing at Collie; and to summon these members for hearing an appeal would involve more expense than appealing to the Local Court. The great point which the factory owner wanted was to have an appeal beyond the inspector; and that in itself would check the inspector, so that there would probably be no necessity for appeal.

MR. HIGHAM: It was desirable to strike out the second paragraph of Subclause 4. More satisfaction would be given by appealing to the Local Court than to the Minister, because the Minister would have to rely on his officers, chiefly on his inspector, for knowledge necessary to the case. As an amendment, he moved that the second paragraph be struck out.

Amendment passed, and the paragraph struck out.

MR. HIGHAM also moved that in Subclause 5 the word "seven," in reference to seven days, be struck out, and "fourteen" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 73 to 79, inclusive—agreed to.

At 6·33, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.
At 7·30, Chair resumed.

New Clause:

MR. HASTIE moved that the following new clause be added to the Bill:—

(1.) Subject to the provisions of this Act, a male worker shall not be employed in or about a factory: (*a*) For more than forty-eight hours, excluding meal times, in any one week; nor (*b*) For more than eight hours and three-quarters, excluding meal times, in any one day; nor (*c*) For more than five hours continuously without an interval of at least three-quarters of an hour for a meal.

(2.) The foregoing limits of working hours shall not be deemed to apply to any male worker employed in getting up steam for machinery in a factory, or in making preparations for the work of the factory, or to the trades referred to in Schedule Two.

(3.) Where, in any award of the Arbitration Court, established under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1902, provision is made for limiting the working hours in any trade, this section shall, in respect to such trade and so long as such award continues in force, be read and construed subject to the award.

The object of this clause, which was similar to the corresponding provision in the New Zealand measure, was to enact an eight-hours day in factories. Early last session the House had unanimously adopted a motion proposed by the member for Wellington (Mr. Teesdale Smith), desiring the Government to introduce a Bill to legalise an eight-hours day in connection with the sawmilling industry; and, later, a motion proposed by the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) demanding the introduction of the eight-hours day into the railway service was carried by a large majority. The eight-hours day, which now ruled in all our factories, had indeed become the standard of work throughout Australia. No doubt the objection would be raised that the Arbitration Court had power to fix hours of work. That objection would have some force if there could be brought before the Arbitration Court all the workers who would come under this Bill, and if the cases of all those workers could be decided at an early date. Farther, the Arbitra-

tion Court had the power to delimit boundaries within which its rulings should operate; and thus certain districts in which the court had fixed an eight-hours day might be severely handicapped as against other districts to which the court's decision did not apply. A measure such as this must pay regard not only to the interests of the workers, but also to the interests of those who established manufactures. Such people must not be subjected to unfair competition. It was frequently stated that this State afforded the best market to be found in the whole of Australia, and if that were so, manufacturers would not be unduly hampered by a limitation of working hours to eight per day or 48 per week, exclusive of meal time. Provision was made empowering inspectors under this legislation to authorise the working of longer hours at such times and seasons as made it absolutely necessary. In the debate on the motion of the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) many members had referred to the unfairness and needlessness of demanding more than eight hours' work per day. We had all been declaring in this House over and over again that those who were employed in the Government service should, as nearly as possible, be in exactly the same position as those outside. Surely it was not an unfair thing to enact that inasmuch as we considered that eight hours should obtain on the railways, eight hours should obtain in every other industry in the State.

MR. NANSON: The Government would, he hoped, have something to say on this clause.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The clause appeared to him to be altogether too wide in its operation, especially paragraph (*a*). The member who had proposed it had given us two instances in which the eight-hours principle had been affirmed—the timber industry and the railways. As to the timber industry, the hon. member would no doubt admit that the work at sawmills was hard, continuous, manual labour. With regard to the other case, the eight-hours principle had been applied to the railway system of Western Australia in the same manner as in South Australia, with whose legislation, as regarded its forward state, he did not think any member would find fault. That was, where the work was continuous and laborious the eight-hours system was to obtain. It was proposed by this new clause to apply the system to all workers in all factories. That was far too wide in its application. Whilst we had Courts of Conciliation and Arbitration, these were proper tribunals before which workers should bring their cases, if they felt aggrieved. It was absolutely impossible to definitely and accurately specify in cases of this sort where persons should work not more than 48 hours, and where they might be allowed to do so.

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

Ayes	...	...	12
Noes	...	...	17
Majority against		...	5

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Ewing	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Holman	Mr. Higham
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. James
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Purkiss	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Reid	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Wallace (*Teller*).	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Stone
	Mr. Thomas
	Mr. Yelverton (*Teller*).

Question thus negatived.

New Clause:

DR. O'CONNOR moved that the following be added as Clause 30:—

Persons of opposite sexes under the age of 17 years shall not be permitted to work in the same room or compartment of a factory, without written permission from the inspector.

MR. THOMAS: "Over" would be better than "under."

MR. WALLACE: Would the hon. member explain the clause?

DR. O'CONNOR: The reason for moving the amendment was that it was well known that in factories the greatest danger of immorality was caused by boys and girls mixing together. That was his only reason for moving it. He would like to see them kept separate so that they could not work in one room, although they might work in one factory.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Doubtless the hon. member was prompted by a desire to protect those who worked in these places, but he had not given sufficient reason for this clause. The clause certainly would act very harshly on those

who employed both males and females in factories, and he did not think it should be adopted unless the hon. member could give a better reason than he had done. After all, it was an experiment, which he was sure would not work satisfactorily when put into practice. The clause assailed the very principle which had been adopted in the schools of the country with the object perhaps of allowing the sexes to mix. This new clause was not likely to improve the morals of those engaged, which depended on the training they received elsewhere. It was a difficult thing to legislate in this direction. We were going very far with regard to experimental legislation in relation to this factory Bill.

THE PREMIER: No experiment at all.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: It was, in his opinion. It would be found that the Bill would not work in the way expected by those who framed it. It would in a measure act against itself.

MR. WALLACE: The hon. member (Dr. O'Connor) would allow these people to work together if an inspector would permit them to do so, but he (Mr. Wallace) wanted to know what greater protection there would be by having the permit of an inspector. Surely an employer was desirous of conducting his factory in a proper way. One did not want the clause to be passed and become a farce. The clause implied that a factory owner was not capable of conducting his factory in a decent manner. While not opposed to the separation of the sexes in the work of a factory, this was not the way to do it.

MR. NANSON: This question could safely be left to the factory owners, for if they found that work was hindered by boys and girls being employed in the same room, those owners would take care to separate them; if, on the other hand, factory owners found that work was not so hindered, they would not perceive any danger in mixing the sexes. Any danger there might be was not so much in the factory as after these young persons left the factory. There was the same danger when the sexes were mixed in going to church, or in a dance, or in a social gathering. He had heard a dignitary of the church declare that the danger was not in the gathering, but was when persons of different sexes went away from that gathering. In like manner the danger so far as it existed would take place after these young persons left the factory. The Bill was practically making a little god of the inspector, by giving him powers that were not given to any other person in the community.

MR. BATH: While the mover had evidently a good intention, this clause would not attain the desired object. Those who had studied factory legislation elsewhere would know that the great improvement which had taken place in the morals of factory workers was brought about by the better sanitary conditions and by the shorter hours of labour. Restrictive legislation would not accomplish this object. The experience of factory inspectors in other States of Australia had shown that factory owners did not concern themselves much about the welfare or morals of those whom they employed, but were hardened or indifferent so long as a profit was made from the work; and this was especially so where the owner of a factory did not directly control the workers.

Question put and negatived.

New Clause (work outside a factory):

MR. HASTIE moved that the following be added as a new clause:—

> Without in any way limiting the operation of the two last preceding sections, the following provisions shall apply in the case of every factory:—(1.) If any person employed in a factory does any work for the factory elsewhere than in the factory, the occupier commits an offence. (2.) The person who, being employed in the factory, does such work elsewhere than in the factory also commits an offence, and is liable to a penalty not exceeding five pounds for each such offence. Provided that nothing in this section shall be deemed to apply to any work which cannot, by reason of its particular nature, be performed on the premises.

The object of this clause was to prevent sweating. Various provisions in this Bill relating to sweating had been debated on previous occasions. Provisions with that object were in operation in Victoria and New Zealand; but experience showed there was something wanting in those enactments, as they did not effectually prevent sweating. As to the large powers given to inspectors, it would be well for members of this House to look abroad, and they would find that the legislation proposed here was not going farther in regard to sweating than

legislation adopted elsewhere. It had been found most difficult to put down sweating. Experience in New Zealand showed there was only one way by which sweating could be prevented, and that was by means of a board fixing wages. Here no such board was constituted; we allowed appeals in regard to wages to the Arbitration Court; yet probably it would be found that sweating would continue if we did not make special provisions to prevent it, in addition to those already in the Bill.

MR. NANSON: Did sweating exist in Western Australia?

MR. HASTIE said he could not state specific instances; but surely it could not be said that we should be free from the evil in this State any more than had been found elsewhere. In submitting this new clause, he might be met by the objection that in trying to prevent industrious people doing work outside a factory, he was trying to prevent them from doing more work than they would if obliged to do it in a factory. In this country we had, generally speaking, but a limited amount of work; and the question would be, who were the persons to do it? The longer individuals were allowed to work and the more work they did, there would be (generally speaking) less work for other people to do. Our conditions were such that we had nothing to fear from competition; and at present our manufacturers could carry on business without sweating their employees, while paying a fair wage and making a fair profit. We should not allow things to get worse.

THE PREMIER: Having considered a similar provision in the New Zealand Act, he confessed that he did not see the necessity for it in this State. The Bill provided, in Clause 23, for the limitation of hours of labour in relation to women and boys. By Clause 24 "all work done by any person employed in a factory for the occupier elsewhere (whether the work is or is not connected with the business of the factory) shall be deemed to be done whilst employed in the factory, and the time shall be counted accordingly." The object was to prevent any evasion of the time limit fixed by Clause 23. Clause 25 expressly condemned the doing of work outside a factory, and it dealt with those cases where the occupier of a factory let or gave out work of any description, and it limited the overtime that might be worked in the factory or outside the factory. Clause 27 limited the hours of labour for women and boys. The Bill thus provided for the prevention of sweating in relation to work done outside a factory. It did not propose any hours of labour in relation to men; and even if it had so provided, he failed to see how this new clause would be necessary. Even if a factory-hand wanted to work overtime, he could not do so except in the factory. We had not agreed, however, to abolish overtime: it was to be doubted whether a majority of members favoured the abolition of overtime. The effect of this new clause would be practically to compel all work to be done in the factory, and entirely to abolish home work. It was true that home work was responsible for a great deal of sweating; but that was mainly in connection with the working up of textile materials, and the special provisions of Clause 45 dealt with textile industries. The new clause would not prevent a person from employing another outside a factory. This proposed restriction existed in New Zealand, and he had turned the matter over several times in his mind, but had always come to the conclusion that the provision was not needed. No evils existed here rendering it necessary or advisable to adopt the restriction. On the other hand he did see that injustice might result from the adoption of the clause. Why should not a person employed in a factory enjoy the same freedom as any other employee in dealing with his employer? By this new clause we should be throwing on the factory employee an undue handicap, merely because he happened to be a factory employee. The proviso to the new clause recognised that certain classes of work, by reason of their special nature, could not be done on factory premises; and, therefore, members must own that when work was of such a nature that it could not be performed on the premises, the factory owner was entitled to have it done off the premises. If Subclauses 1 and 2 of the new clause were aimed at the sweating evil, where was the necessity for the proviso, seeing that sweating was as injurious in work that could be done in a factory as it was in work that could not be done in a factory? Possibly the object of the clause was to provide that any

work which could be done in a factory should be done there. But even if abuses did exist, was it advisable to provide that no factory-hand should do work for a factory owner except in a factory? Failing to see any good reason for the adoption of the clause, he hoped that the Committee would not agree to it.

MR. DAGLISH: It was to be hoped that the clause would be carried, because both in cities of the old country and in the larger cities of the East the sweating evil had arisen solely from the practice of giving out work from factories.

THE PREMIER: The new clause would not strike at that evil; because, even if the clause were passed, a factory owner could still say to a person, "Do this work outside my factory: run your own factory." Clause 45, however, stopped such evasions.

MR. JOHNSON: Clause 45 did not prevent work from being taken home.

THE PREMIER: If people took work home, the home became a factory if there was more than a certain number of them.

MR. DAGLISH: The object of the clause was to stop work being done outside factories. If the clause did not achieve its end, the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) would no doubt be willing to amend it suitably. Perhaps there was some slip in the drafting?

THE PREMIER: No; the new clause was drafted similarly to the corresponding provision in the New Zealand Act, where he had observed it but had failed to recognise its utility.

MR. DAGLISH: The trouble experienced in Melbourne, for example, was that a number of women were found willing to do factory work outside a factory solely for pocket money, so reducing the price paid to those who had to earn their living by similar work.

THE PREMIER: What class of work did the hon. member refer to?

MR. DAGLISH: Textile work.

THE PREMIER: That difficulty was met by Clause 45.

MR. DAGLISH: The object of the new clause was to prevent work being taken out of the factory at all.

THE PREMIER: Clause 45 contemplated work being taken outside a factory. The new clause was the same in substance as that in the New Zealand Act. New Zealand had the new clause we were now discussing, which must therefore have an object different from that of Clause 45.

MR. DAGLISH: The Premier argued, then, that it was better to allow work to be done outside a factory subject to certain restrictions, whilst the argument of the member for Kanowna was that it was better to provide that all work should be done inside factories.

THE PREMIER: The new clause would prevent factory hands from doing any overtime at all.

MR. DAGLISH: Overtime could surely be done in a factory just as easily as outside it. The only point the Premier was aiming at now was the limitation of the women's work to 48 hours per week.

THE PREMIER: Oh, no.

MR. DAGLISH: In that case one did not see how overtime was prevented. The whole principle of doing work outside a factory was bad, inasmuch as it introduced a new and unfair element of competition.

MR. NANSON: It was not a new form of competition, but the most ancient.

MR. DAGLISH: It was the unfairest form of competition, at all events. Naturally, a person working for pocket money was able to accept far less remuneration than one working for a living. He had known cases, though not in this State, of women being forced to supplement their honest earnings by the wages of sin; and he would do anything to prevent the possibility of such things occurring in Western Australia. The experience of the Eastern States in this respect had been terrible; and it was our duty to prevent, if possible, the sweating evil from arising at all. Without such a provision as this, sweating would certainly enter Western Australia in days of depression.

MR. HASTIE: Unfortunately, this clause would not attain the object the hon. member (Mr. Daglish) had in view: to stop the indiscriminate taking of factory work by people who could earn their living otherwise than by factory work. The provision referred to "any person employed in a factory," and its object was to prevent such person from working too long hours. We had already provided that women and boys should not work for more than 48 hours per week, and this new clause was necessary for the attainment of that end.

THE PREMIER: No. Clause 24 provided for that.

MR. HASTIE: In the absence of this new clause, we could not limit the factory work of women and boys to 48 hours.

THE PREMIER: Plainly, Clause 24 dealt with that point.

MR. HASTIE: Clause 24 dealt with work in factories, but it did not prevent women and boys from taking work home.

THE PREMIER: Yes; it did. The time employed in home work was counted in the 48 hours per week.

MR. HASTIE: If we could be quite sure that we had sufficient inspectors to secure the strict observance of the clause, all would be well; but surely neither the Premier nor anyone else expected that women and boys who took work home would make returns. One hoped that Clause 24 would achieve its object, but it would certainly not prevent people from working a great deal more than 48 hours per week. We must consider whether we could not prevent the sweating evil from taking root in this country.

MR. NANSON: It was admitted by the Labour party that sweating did not exist in this country. [LABOUR MEMBERS: No.] At all events, Labour members could give no specific instances of sweating. To resume the argument of the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie), sweating did not exist here; or, if it did exist, the hon. member could not show where it existed. In order to prevent sweating from coming into existence, the Committee were asked to pass a clause which would make it impossible for anyone to do work for a factory outside the factory. The Labour party were admirably consistent. On an earlier portion of the Bill we had heard some pious opinions from them in respect to women working in factories at all. One hon. member had said that women should do no work anywhere, but should lead a life of leisured ease, and that the very last place where women should work was a factory, that it was a sin and scandal to our civilisation for women to be allowed to work in a factory; but now we had the leader of the Labour party declaring it a sin and a scandal to allow women to work anywhere but in a factory. If a person had only £2 a week, and without hurting anyone could increase his income to £2 10s., were we to understand that by doing so he would be doing something wrong or very terrible? If those members who preached one thing and practised another were sincere on this point, they would find it very difficult to reconcile their conduct. Seeing that this measure went very much farther than English legislation, although in England they had to deal with vast concerns, some of which were larger than the whole of our factories put together, he hoped that we should at least give a *trial* to the Bill in its present form.

MR. JOHNSON: Instances where sweating existed could be given by him to the leader of the Opposition. He was not going to mention them in the House, but he would give them to the hon. member outside, and the hon. member could make inquiries. As the Premier had pointed out, it was in relation to home work that sweating took place. As long as persons were working in a factory there was *little or no* sweating. On the goldfields it was found there was sweating in the tailoring trade, and the organisations decided they would not allow their workers to take work out. He knew of no instance there where sweating now existed.

MR. THOMAS: Oh, yes; in relation to the friendly societies and the doctors.

MR. JOHNSON: Sweating existed on the coast, and although there were organisations those organisations were not strong enough to put it down. Unless the amendment were inserted this clause would be a dead letter, although the Committee had passed Clauses 45 and 46.

MR. BATH: The member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) asserted that sweating did not exist in Western Australia; but if that hon. member had taken the trouble to read the evidence placed before the Conciliation Board in Kalgoorlie recently he would have seen some glaring instances of sweating on the goldfields, where they were supposed to take a little more interest in the welfare of the individual than on the coast. The gentleman who appeared on behalf of the master butchers brought forward a witness who gave evidence that his men would come to work at half-past four in the morning, and were kept at their employers' disposal until about half-past six

in the evening for seven days a week. He said they actually worked 11 hours a day; that meant 77 hours a week; but those men were at the disposal of the employers for about 98 hours. [THE PREMIER: What were their wages?] £2 and £2 10s. Not only so, but evidence was brought forward by men employed by butchers, and in the majority of those instances those men were employed from five o'clock in the morning till six o'clock at night and till 10 o'clock on Saturday night. On occasions they were brought in on Wednesday evening to unload the beef from the carts, and on Sunday night the same. Evidence was also given of some specific instances in which men were brought in at half-past three, and worked till half-past seven, also till half-past 10 on Saturday night. [MEMBER: What wages were they getting?] The wages in some instances were £3 10s. One man was supposed to supply customers, and if they did not pay him the money for the beef the amount he was supposed to receive was deducted from his wages, and he received sevenpence for four weeks' work. It had been brought before the Goldfields Trades and Labour Council that men were employed in a mattress factory twelve hours a day at £2 a week. [MR. MORAN: That was not a factory.] The member for the Murchison had waxed eloquent about the evils of refusing people permission to do as they pleased with their labour. He could not have studied the whole trend of the factory system in the old country, or he would not have spoken in the manner he had done. Ere the advent of the factory system in the old country in the great majority of instances the husband earned enough for the wife and family, but through a desire to increase wages the wife and children were brought in, until they squeezed the men out and brought down wages. The percentage of men employed had remained stationary or had not very much increased within the past fifty years, whereas the number of women and children had very considerably increased. He knew of a case where a girl was engaged to be married to a young man who was clerk in an establishment. She did not know where he was employed. She advertised for a position as a lady clerk, and obtained the very position he was engaged in, the result being that he was sacked and she was put on at a lower wage. That was an actual fact. [MR. MORAN: Marie Corelli.] There were quite sufficient cases to back up the argument of the member for Kanowna.

MR. MORAN: Everybody sympathised with the desire of the members for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) and Hannans (Mr. Bath) to abolish sweating, but he failed to see anything *apropos* to this clause in the instances given by the member for Hannans.

MR. BATH: The object was to show that sweating existed.

THE PREMIER: This clause did not apply to any of those cases.

MR. MORAN: It was not likely that a butcher's assistant would take a sheep home and serve out meat, and it would be hard to take home a mattress bed under one's arm. [MR. BATH: That work could be done at home.] The tragic occurrence between that unhappy couple who bumped against each other in this extraordinary fashion had nothing to do with the clause.

MR. BATH: It was characteristic of the objection to women.

MR. MORAN: Which showed the animus there was against women on the part of some members of this Committee. The illustration of long hours was not a correct definition of sweating. The new clause would be too arbitrary, and seemed to him unnecessary by attempting to prevent persons doing work at home, and compelling them to do it in a factory or not do it at all. There was no occasion to outstrip all the Eastern States in our first leap in factory legislation, by adopting this extravagant proposal; for if this Bill, after some trial, was found to need amending, Parliament met annually and could amend the law. By attempting to go too far or too fast, this House would be practically inviting another House to reject the Bill.

MR. JOHNSON: Did the hon. member admit that outdoor work was sweating?

MR. DIAMOND: The whole question hinged on the clothing trade. It seemed extraordinary that the experience of England and Australia showed that there was more sweating in connection with the clothing trade than with all other trades combined. A cabinetmaker could not take his work home; a person employed

in a confectionery factory could not take work home; and so it was with many other employments which did not admit of work being done outside the factory. Some 15 years ago a Miss Barnett was commissioned, he believed by the *Times* newspaper, to inquire into the sweating evil which was at that time rampant in the East-end of London. In the articles written during that investigation, instances were given which showed that one large export house gave an order for 10,000 knickerbocker suits to be made, of one quality, one grade, various patterns, and at a stated price. The man who took the contract had a large factory, but he could not do the whole of the work quickly enough in the factory, so he let out the work in ten separate contracts, each contractor undertaking to make 1,000 suits. Then it appeared that each of these subcontractors let out the work again to ten other contractors, these smaller contractors undertaking to make 100 suits each. These contractors let out the work to still smaller contractors, until the work reached persons who undertook to make ten suits each as their contract; and finally the price for doing that work got down so low that the people who were making the goods were getting 4s. 6d. a knickerbocker suit, and had to pay for thread. This instance, like others which might be mentioned, showed that sweating took place mainly in connection with the clothing trade, and that the work was done, not in regular factories, but in the homes of people who were so poor that many of them lived and worked in wretched dens in the East-end of London; so wretched and so crowded that ten or twelve Polish Jews with their wives and children were in one room—living, eating, working, and sleeping, all in the one room. The sweating evil had been found also in Sydney, in Melbourne, and to some extent in Adelaide. Within two years there was a terrible exposure in Sydney in connection with the slop tailoring trade, and the wretched pay given to those who did the work. Some firms in Sydney, whose members held their heads high, were found to be guilty of this practice. Nine-tenths of the sweating in England was done in the slop clothing trade. Sweating did not take place in connection with clothing made to measure, but in what was known as the slop trade. The new clause now proposed would prevent a possible mischief in this State, and could not do any harm.

MR. MORAN: One would like to hear the hon. member say candidly whether he had not over-stated the case. If a person got 10s. a dozen for making knickerbockers, it did not matter whether he did that work in a factory or in his own home. Was not the principal point that of the price and the quantity done?

MR. REID: It was a question of sanitary conditions.

MR. MORAN: The member for Mt. Burges had reduced the question down to one of sanitary conditions; and that being so, it meant that while it was good enough for a person to eat and sleep in his own home, it was not good enough for him to make a pair of knickerbockers in his own home, because of the sanitary conditions. Was there not something besides the place in which the work was done? Was it not now, and had it not been from the earliest time, the question of an undue amount of work done for too little pay?

MR. DAGLISH: How was the hon. member going to get at it?

MR. MORAN: There were two culprits, the manufacturer being one and the worker the other, and neither of them would tell us the conditions under which the work was done.

MR. NANSON: Labour members had not yet produced any instances of sweating.

MR. HASTIE: What was the hon. member's definition of sweating?

MR. NANSON: As generallly understood in Australia, and as understood by the commission which was inquiring into sweating in England, he believed that a Sweating Commission would not call it "sweating" if a man were employed as assistant to a dairyman or a butcher at a wage of £3 or £4 a week, as in the case stated in reference to the goldfields. It would be found that these men were not employed continuously, but were probably waiting about and ready to do the work when required, but not working continuously; and that accounted probably for the long hours. We were asked to believe that unless this new clause were passed the sweating evil would be created here and reduction in wages would follow. One would almost imagine that wages

were getting lower and lower in the old country, but the fact was that in very few British industries had wages not risen; moreover, the purchasing power of those wages had also risen.

MR. DAGLISH: And the number of the unemployed had risen enormously.

MR. NANSON: That statement, which at all events was highly inaccurate, had nothing to do with the question. Under this new clause, the widow woman of whom we had heard so much would be prevented, if she had children, from working in her home. Here we had another illustration of the trend of Labour party politics to make employment scarcer rather than more plentiful. Any unemployed difficulty we might eventually experience here would be due in large measure to our tendency to hedge industry with all sorts of restrictions and so to prevent the investment of capital. Were the sweating evil rampant in Western Australia, it might be our duty to impose restrictive legislation of the severe type advocated by the member for Kanowna; but the only instance of sweating adduced would not be touched in the slightest degree by the new clause, which nevertheless was so far-reaching and so severe as to make it a penal offence for a woman to work a sewing machine for wages in her home. In view of the high standard of prosperity in this State, this legislation was not necessary.

MR. THOMAS: The member for South Fremantle (Mr. Diamond) made an invariable practice of commencing a lengthy speech with a statement that the question had been too much laboured. To-night the hon. member had taken up more time than all the rest of the Committee together. A careful perusal of Clauses 24 and 25 still left one desirous for information as to the necessity for this new clause. The Premier and other Ministers had assured the House that there was no possibility of sweating being carried on if this Bill were passed.

MR. HASTIE: The Premier had not said that.

THE PREMIER: There was certainly no probability of sweating being carried on under the Bill.

MR. THOMAS: Although not a Labour member, he claimed, notwithstanding the assertion of the Labour members that they alone in this Parliament cared for their fellow men, that he was equally ready with any other member to pass legislation which would have the effect of preventing sweating. According to his present light, however, the proposed new clause constituted a mere redundancy.

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

Ayes	...	...	10
Noes	...	...	22
Majority against	...		12

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Holman	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Reid	Mr. Higham
Mr Taylor	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Wallace	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Hopkins (*Teller*).	Mr. James
	Mr Kingsmill
	Mr. Nanson
	Mr. O'Connor
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Purkiss
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Stone
	Mr. Thomas
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Moran (*Teller*).

Question thus negatived.

New Clause:

MR. HASTIE moved that the following be added to the Bill:—

All records or notices kept or exhibited under this Act shall be legibly written or printed in the English language.

In Victoria, records and notices had been printed or written in Italian, Chinese, and other foreign languages, unintelligible to the inspector without the aid of an interpreter.

Question passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

New Clause (milk delivery):

MR. HIGHAM moved that the following be added as Clause 59 (notice having been given by Mr. McDonald):—

No milkman shall deliver or cause to be delivered any milk on Sundays later than 11 a.m., and on Wednesdays later than 1 p.m.

The introduction of this new clause was the result of a petition signed by nine out of every ten milkmen in Perth and Fremantle. They desired that it should be included in the Bill.

MR. NANSON: At present milk was, he believed, delivered twice a day. He was told that in hot weather, unless a preservative were used, and preservatives were not very healthy, milk would not

keep the whole day; so there must be two deliveries, or we must go back to the tinned milk. If anything happened to the cows which delayed delivery of the milk, the man would have the whole supply on his hands.

MR. DAGLISH: We might begin by applying this clause so far as it related to Sundays. The object was to give to those people who were working from early in the morning, half a day a week.

MR. NANSON: Why not carry out the hon. member's own principle of limiting the hours?

MR. DAGLISH said he did not know how it could be done in regard to this particular industry. It must be remembered that this was not an interference with any industry, but an attempt to meet the wishes of the people engaged in that industry; not only the employees but the employers.

MR. NANSON: What about the consumer?

MR. DAGLISH: The consumer would, he thought, be willing to meet the vendor in this way. We should find no more difficulty in observing this in Western Australia than the people in Victoria had found. In Victoria this had been in operation for six years. He was speaking not so much in advocacy of the provision regarding Wednesday as that relating to Sunday. He would urge the Committee to give the matter a trial as regarded Sunday, at all events, and take twelve or one as a starting point instead of eleven.

MR. BUTCHER: It was going too far when we attempted to legislate for the delivery of milk in this way. How would it be possible for dairymen to keep their cows in good order? When cows were milked at certain hours it was necessary to milk them at about those particular times every day. What were consumers who were in the habit of getting milk twice a day going to do? Cows must be milked on Sunday morning, and it was necessary to milk again for the evening delivery. Why not get at it by restricting the hours of labour, and then it would be necessary to employ an extra man in the afternoon. Customers should not be deprived of their milk.

MR. DIAMOND: If the reference to Wednesday were left out, he would be prepared to support the new clause. This outcry about the consumer was absolute nonsense. Any reasonable housekeeper took the precaution to boil the milk that was delivered in the morning. Only the most foolish and careless people allowed the milk delivered in the morning to go into use without being boiled. The milk, even in the hottest weather, was boiled after delivery in the morning, and the most ordinary precautions were taken to keep it cool, it would remain good till the evening meal.

MR. STONE: This clause was going too far. It appeared to be a matter of shopkeepers trying to run their own show. We had a storekeeper bringing in the provision, and he was backed up by one of the biggest wholesale milk merchants in this State. Some milk would not keep in the summer time all day, whether it was boiled or not. The Government insisted on milk being delivered twice a day. It was not fit for use unless it was.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: What about the cow? The member for South Fremantle (Mr. Diamond) recommended the boiling of milk. Would he boil the cow?

THE CHAIRMAN: The question was that of delivering and not that of milking.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Cows had to be milked twice a day, and it would be the refinement of cruelty not to milk them on Sunday. This clause dealt with the delivery of the milk, but presumably the cows had to be milked before the milk was delivered. If there were only one delivery on Sunday morning, the cows would have to be milked on Sunday afternoons, and what was to happen to that milk?

MR. DAGLISH: Members seemed to be imagining difficulties which had not been found to exist. This proposal was not aimed at the milking of cows on Sunday, but purely at the delivery of milk. As to persons who needed milk if a man required a double supply, provision could be made for him to go to the dairy and get it. This petition was signed by nearly all the big dairymen in Perth and Fremantle, and surely that spoke for itself. The request of these people for a half-holiday a week was a reasonable one. The mere fact that this provision had been in operation for six years in Victoria was evidence that it would not cause here any of that incon-

venience which members who had no experience of it seemed to fear.

MR. ATKINS: Would it not be possible to get cows that would give a double quantity of milk on Sunday morning?

MR. THOMAS: As to boiling the milk in the morning before using it, that might be necessary in Fremantle, where the health conditions seemed to require it; on the goldfields, however, that precaution was not necessary, but milk could not be kept a whole day in a hot climate, and it was necessary to get a second supply of milk when obtainable, especially for hotels and houses where there was sickness. As to any extra hardship on those who had to deliver milk twice on Sunday, let the Labour members introduce a clause limiting the hours of labour, and deal with the question in that way.

Question negatived.

New Clause (Asiatic labour):

MR. QUINLAN moved that the following be added as a new clause:—

No factory or shop shall be registered under this Act which is owned by a Chinese or other Asiatic, or where any Asiatic is employed.

THE PREMIER suggested that this subject should be postponed, as he intended to deal with it on recommittal.

MR. DAGLISH: Better have discussion now, as another clause about to be moved would be affected by the opinion of the Committee on this clause.

THE PREMIER: If we were to restrict the Chinese from employment in factories and shops, that restriction should be sufficient, and we should not go farther and embody the suggestion in the amendment to be moved later, relating to the branding of furniture made by Asiatics. More restrictions should be imposed, but not to the extent proposed in that amendment. He wanted to consider the question, and bring up a clause on recommittal; but the subject could be discussed now.

MR. QUINLAN: The proposal he had submitted would be a wise one to adopt with regard to Asiatics. We knew that Chinese in this State when they made a little money cleared out, and did not become permanent residents. It was time to impose some restriction; and it was remarkable that the very persons who were most opposed to aliens being permitted in this country were themselves, or through their wives, the main supporters of this class of traders, as any one might see by going about on Saturday night and seeing the business done in shops kept by aliens. This Bill afforded an opportunity of dealing with the question from both sides, and terminating what be called a pest to those who were engaged in legitimate trading.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

New Clause (Asiatic labour in furniture trade):

MR. WALLACE moved as a new clause:—

Every cabinet maker and dealer in furniture who sells, or offers for sale, goods manufactured wholly or partly by Asiatic labour, and whether imported or manufactured in Western Australia, shall (1.) Stamp such goods in the prescribed manner with the words "Asiatic labour;" and (2.) Keep securely fixed outside his shop, and facing the main thoroughfare, a notice on which shall be legibly painted the words "The goods sold in this shop are made [or partly made as the case may be] by Asiatic labour."

The object was not to deal directly with Chinese or Asiatics, but with our own people, for the purpose of protecting honest traders as much as protecting the conscientious buyer, because we knew that in Perth and elsewhere in the State there were those who sold furniture alleged to be made by European labour, but which was really obtained from some Chinese workshop, as might be seen when furniture was being removed from such workshop to a shop or warehouse for sale. In order that buyers should not be deceived by unscrupulous traders, he wished to add this provision, which was similar to one in the Victorian Factories Act, for the compulsory branding of furniture made by Chinese or other Asiatics. The Victorian Act provided that furniture should be branded with a triangle bearing the words "Chinese labour" within the triangle, and regulations should be made providing that the brand should be burned into the furniture, so as not to be removable. The next provision was one that no honest trader could oppose, though it might be regarded as a new departure. Traders who sold furniture legitimately manufactured by European labour should be protected against those who resorted to alien labour for competing against them.

MR. THOMAS called attention to the state of the House.

MR. HASTIE: The object was merely to waste time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did the hon. member insist on calling attention to the state of the House?

MR. THOMAS: Yes. Important Bills ought not to be rushed through a thin House.

Bells rung and quorum formed.

MR. WALLACE (continuing): The desire was to protect the honest trader against the unscrupulous trader; therefore he commended the clause to the consideration of the Committee.

Question put, and passed on the voices.

THE PREMIER called for a division.

MR. THOMAS: On a point of order, had the Chairman heard more than one voice?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes; the voice of the Minister for Works and that of the Premier.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	15
Noes	...	...	12
Majority for	...	...	3

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Ewing	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Hayward	Mr. James
Mr. Holman	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Pigott
Mr. Moran	Mr. Rason
Mr. Reid	Mr. Yelverton
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Stone (*Teller*).
Mr. Thomas	
Mr. Wallace	
Mr. Higham (*Teller*).	

Question thus passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

New Clause (delivery of bread):

MR. DAGLISH moved that the following be added to the Bill:—

It shall be unlawful for any person to deliver bread or cause bread to be delivered, from a cart, or in the street, or at any house or premises on the third Wednesday in any month, unless the day before or the day following such Wednesday be a public holiday.

A similar provision existed in the Eastern States; and for some time the custom had existed in Perth—he believed it now existed in Fremantle—for bakers' carters to be given a monthly holiday. The trouble, however, was that one or two bakers had broken away from the great body, that thus the element of unfair competition was introduced and an end made of the monthly holiday. This clause met with the approval not only of the carters, but of the Master Bakers' Association.

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

Ayes	...	...	10
Noes	...	...	20
Majority against	...		10

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Holman	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Higham
Mr. Moran	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Reid	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Taylor	Mr. James
Mr. Wallace (*Teller*).	Mr. Kingsmill
	Mr. Monger
	Mr. Nanson
	Mr. O'Connor
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Stone
	Mr. Thomas
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Gardiner (*Teller*).

Question thus negatived.

New Clause (carters):

MR. DAGLISH moved that the following be added to the Bill:—

No carter employed by the occupier of a factory, or by a shopkeeper, or by the keeper of a dairy shall be required to work in the aggregate more than sixty hours in any one week, exclusive of such time as may be allowed for meals; and the hours of work for the purposes of this section shall include the time, if any, during which such carter is engaged in the stable and in harnessing and unharnessing his horse or horses.

As far as he was able to judge, this clause applied all round. If it did not, he would be happy to agree to any improvement to make it more inclusive. He did not think there was any necessity for him to say anything in justification of it. Either the Committee were anxious to limit the hours of this class of workers to some extent or they were not.

MR. NANSON: It did not go far enough.

MR. DAGLISH: It would, he believed, cover the case of most carters who were not working a smaller number of hours. It had been objected that it might increase the hours in some districts, but he might say, on the other hand, that in Perth and the suburbs it seemed in a large number of cases to have been adopted as satisfactory by the employers, and it had been commended as satisfactory from the em-

ployees' point of view in a large number of cases. There were many men whose condition it would ameliorate, whilst at the same time, if the clause erred at all, it was on the score of moderation.

MR. NANSON: What about cabmen?

MR. DAGLISH: Most cabmen were owners of their horses and vehicles, but he was quite willing to agree to any amendment to make the clause more inclusive.

Question passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

New Clause (waitresses, etc.):

MR. DAGLISH moved that the following be added to the Bill:

No person shall employ a waitress or a boy under the age of sixteen years in a restaurant, coffee palace, hotel, public-house, eating-house, or fish and oyster shop for a longer period than forty-eight hours in any one week, exclusive of such time as may be allowed for meals.

This related to a class of business where early closing did not apply, the object being to fix the hours for females and boys under 16 years at precisely the same as those in the Factory Bill in relation to employees in factories.

Question passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

New Clause (waiters, barmen):

MR. DAGLISH moved that the following be added to the Bill:

No person shall employ a waiter or barman in a restaurant, coffee palace, hotel, public-house, eating-house, or fish and oyster shop for a longer period than 56 hours in any one week, exclusive of such time as may be allowed for meals.

This fixed the hours at eight per day for seven days a week, or practically $9\frac{1}{4}$ for six days a week. The only objection he had heard to it was that it would unduly affect barmen employed in hotels. Hotels were open from six in the morning till 12 at night, or a period of about 18 hours, and if this were carried it would mean that if a barman were required all day two shifts would be necessary to do the week's work. He did not regard the licensed victuallers as deserving of consideration, because they absolutely had protection from competition by law, and as the profits on the sale of liquor were large they could well afford to treat their employees liberally. A statement was made, he believed, in a semi-official fashion, that licensed victuallers had opposed this and had threatened that if the hours were shortened the wages would be reduced, but one of the most prominent members of that body, who was, he thought, president of the association, assured him the statement that they had decided to reduce wages if the clause were adopted was incorrect, and that they had certainly not made any such threat. This gentleman spoke in opposition to the clause.

MR. THOMAS: Why not make it 48 hours?

MR. DAGLISH: The number had been fixed by him at 56 because he thought there would be a greater opportunity of getting the clause adopted. But if the hon. member amended it by substituting 48, he would not be disposed to vote against him, and if it were possible to go one better he was quite willing to do so. At the same time the proposal of 56 hours seemed a reasonable one.

THE PREMIER: Men could look after themselves. As to carters, he agreed with the new clause relating to them, because the maximum of 60 hours was so large that he did not think any circumstances would justify an extension of that time. [MR. DAGLISH: This was only four hours short of sixty.] Fifty-six hours were not sixty, and he should think this body of men would look after themselves. Had they not an association to look after the matter? [MR. DAGLISH: No.] If the number were altered to 60, he would accept the clause.

MR. NANSON: No one, he supposed, would accuse him of wishing to interfere with employers, but he thought 56 hours a week, in the surroundings in which these people had to work, a sufficient limit. There was a very great difference between 48 hours a week limit and 56 hours a week limit.

THE PREMIER: In dealing with shop assistants the limit of 52 hours was given only to women and boys.

MR. NANSON: But the closing time was limited.

MR. THOMAS: We had had the Labour party telling us many times to-night that they were in favour of women receiving the same pay as men for equal work. The new clauses proposed by the member for Subiaco were another proof showing conclusively that the whole aim and object of the Bill was to prevent the employment of women.

He protested against the last new clause, that no person should be employed as a waitress more than 48 hours. He presumed that the waiter and waitress were going to do the same work and the Labour party were advocating that they should receive the same pay. The member for Subiaco proposed that a waiter should be allowed to be employed for 56 hours in a week against 48 hours for a waitress. If the wishes of those members were to be carried out, that the same pay should be given, who would be employed, a waitress at 48 hours per week or a waiter at 56 hours a week? He intended to oppose the clause.

MR. HASTIE: It would be absurd to try and limit the hours of those who worked in restaurants and hotels to 48. This proposal fixed the number at 56, and that seemed to be a more reasonable thing. The question of more pay or equal pay did not come in here. We had no power to fix the pay either for waiters or waitresses. He did not think the clause would have the effect of causing waitresses to be discharged and waiters taking their places.

Question passed.

New Clause (domestic servants):

MR. QUINLAN moved that the following be added as a new clause:—

No domestic servant shall be employed for a longer period than 56 hours in any one week, exclusive of such times as may be allowed for meals.

Having gone so far with the Bill it would be well to include domestic servants.

THE PREMIER: A clause dealing with domestic servants could hardly come under a Bill relating to factories and shops. It had struck him in connection with certain other new clauses which had been passed, that they were somewhat outside the scope of the Bill. If on examination they were found to be outside the scope of the Bill, those clauses would have to come out.

MR. MORAN: Having already remarked on certain clauses being outside the scope of the Bill, he hoped this subject would be considered by the Premier. Bits of a big principle had been tacked on to the measure; yet it was necessary that whatever was included in the Bill should be within the scope of the title and of the leave given for introducing the Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: If this new clause were passed, the title of the Bill would have to be altered.

Question (new clause) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	9
Noes	...	...	21
Majority against		...	12

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Bath
Mr. Moran	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Pigott	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Quinlan	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Stone	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Diamond (*Teller*).	Mr. Hayward
	Mr. Holman
	Mr. Hutchinson
	Mr. James
	Mr. Johnson
	Mr. Kingsmill
	Mr. O'Connor
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Reid
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Higham (*Teller*).

New clause thus negatived.

Schedule 1—Fees on registration of factory;

MR. HIGHAM moved that the schedule be struck out. There was no reason why a Bill brought in ostensibly for the benefit of the general community, and especially of the workers, should impose penalties on employers.

THE PREMIER: Whether the fees in the schedule were too high was a point for consideration; but he hoped members would support the Government in regard to the necessity for charging some fees. We heard of the necessity for economy in the Government service. Here was a case of increasing the amount of work done by Government servants, and there should be some payment in return for the work. This would not be an annual fee, but chargeable only on registration. No one could say the fees were not extremely low, and no owner of a factory who was called on to pay these fees could feel them as an appreciable burden.

MR. MORAN: Having spoken against these fees on a previous occasion he must oppose them again. The country had plenty of revenue, and it would be hard to impose on struggling industries this extra burden. This legislation was not for the benefit of manufacturers, but directly for the benefit of employees.

MEMBER: The legislation was for the benefit of employers.

MR. MORAN: No; it was directly for the benefit of the employees. The operation of the measure extended throughout the State, and meant a poll tax on the most desirable men in the community—those who established industries. The Premier might let the fees lapse for a twelvemonth, and see whether the expense involved amounted to anything more than a pot of ink; or, better still, manufacturers might be allowed to register free of cost in all cases.

MR. THOMAS: On this occasion it was necessary for him to repeat certain observations he had made one morning early. Comparing this year's Estimates with those of previous years——

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee was not that of the Estimates, and the hon. member was not in order in referring to the Estimates.

MR. THOMAS: Revenue would be derived under this Bill, and to gain that revenue civil servants must be employed. The fees to be imposed ranged from 5s. to 50s. The calculations of the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) had conclusively shown that under the Bill a revenue of £40,000 would accrue to the Government. Seeing that Ministers had failed to keep their promise to cut down the number of civil servants, he was unwilling to intrust them with this extra revenue, which they might regard as an excuse for appointing still more civil servants.

THE TREASURER: That came well from one who proposed to increase the salaries of members of Parliament.

MR. THOMAS: One must not be led astray by irrelevant interjections.

MR. DAGLISH: The State was to be congratulated on the size which its industries had suddenly attained. The member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) estimated that 50,000 or 60,000 persons would be called on to pay factory registration fees, thus disposing straight away of 120,000 of our population. Most of the remaining 90,000 were probably employed in larger factories. This calculation accounted even for infants. The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) spoke of a revenue of tens of thousands of pounds being obtained under this measure. Those hon. members could hardly expect the Committee to regard their arguments with any degree of seriousness. The small expense imposed would never be felt. In some States the charge for registration of factories was annual, whilst here only one payment was required. There was not much reason for imposing fees, except that the principle of charging for the work of registration had been followed throughout the departments of this State. Such events as marriages, births, and deaths all equally involved the payment of registration fees. If we should not make any of the thousand and one charges for registration which were now paid, surely the employer of labour was not the only individual who should have a happy exemption.

MR. MORAN: The logic of the hon. member was governed by numbers: there would be no injustice done if it did not affect a large number. [MR. DAGLISH: That was not what he said.] If it had been done to 20,000 people, the hon. member would have voted for the proposal to strike this schedule out. [MR. DAGLISH: That was never said by him.] That was what he (Mr. Moran) had always said of the Labour party, that they always went for big numbers.

MR. DAGLISH said he charged the hon. member with deliberately misrepresenting him; farther with putting into his mouth words that he never uttered, and never thought; also with saying he would do things that he never attempted to do, and would not think of doing.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member's idea of justice was governed by numbers. He (Mr. Moran) repeated what Napoleon once said, that the Lord was on the side of the big battalions.

MR. DAGLISH denied that numbers influenced him one way or the other.

MR. MORAN: If the number affected had been 20,000, the vote of the hon. member would have been given for the proposal to strike this provision out. [MR. DAGLISH: No.] The hon. member doubted whether it was 10,000; he thought it was about 6,000. [MR. DAGLISH: Six thousand had not been specified by him.] If for the good of the State or for the employees some little burden was placed on the employer, it was hardly fair to ask the employer to pay for it. His (Mr. Moran's) case was none the less

strong because it was an injustice done to 6,000 people, than it would be if the injustice were done to 60,000. It should not be forgotten that this measure was being extended to the whole State. A thousand would not include the number registered in Perth, if the thing was carried out in its entirety. He was perfectly satisfied the hon. member, in his calmer moments, would not accuse him of misrepresenting him. It was not a fair thing to impose a poll tax of 5s. on the small man who had the misfortune, or luck, to have a little shop by which he was eking out an existence, and employed one man. It was not fair to make him pay 5s. for the privilege of paying someone else a week's wages. If someone proposed that there should be an extra 5s. on the food duties, what a noise would be made! and farther, supposing someone came down and proposed a direct poll tax of 5s. per head, or a tax on factory employees, the tune would be of a different character. We should see an agitation then, and members on the Labour benches would be very eager to see which should be first to denounce any Government that proposed such a thing. It would only be a poll tax, in that case, but the numbers would be bigger.

Amendment negatived, and the schedule passed.

Schedule 2:

MR. BATH moved that the words "butchers' shops," and "bakers' shops" in part 1, be struck out. He wanted those shops to close at six o'clock. They did so on the goldfields.

MR. TAYLOR: Butchers' shops in Perth closed at six.

MR. MORAN: Was there a desire to strike these out simply as regarded the question of closing hour?

MR. BATH said he was quite willing to recognise that these shops should be open at an earlier hour.

MR. STONE: Butchers' shops had to be open very early in the morning, sometimes at one o'clock on Saturday morning, to get out the Saturday's orders. Butchers' shops should be allowed to open in the morning at the owner's discretion.

MR. HOPKINS: From his own knowledge, some butchers started killing from dark, and they were bringing carcases in from the time they commenced until daylight next morning, according to how they had to distribute their supplies. It was impossible to lay down any hour when a butcher had to bring in the carcases.

Amendment negatived, and the schedule passed.

Schedule 2—Part I. (exemption as to time of closing):

MR. WALLACE: How did the Government propose to distinguish between milk shops and dairies? Could we control the opening hours of dairies? Would it not be better to leave them out of the schedule?

MR. JOHNSON moved that progress be reported.

Motion negatived.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No places distinctly called milk palaces or milk shops were known in this State. Clause 51 of the Bill provided a closing time for these places, and he did not think there would be any hardship if they were required to close at 10 o'clock.

THE PREMIER: From a previous discussion he understood that several members thought that some of the shops mentioned in Schedule 2 should close at 9 o'clock. This rule would apply to butchers, bakers, newspaper and stationery shops, florists and undertakers. Butchers and bakers might be brought under the ordinary closing hour, and they could be allowed to open earlier. The fact of having to open so early in their case would practically compel them to close early; besides, they supplied articles of food. His intention was to divide the schedule into three parts, the first part to comprise shops that must close at 9 o'clock, the second part 10 o'clock, the third part those shops which were allowed to keep open. As to dairies, a dairy was not a shop, and ought not to be in the schedule.

Schedule passed as printed.

Part 2—agreed to.

Schedules 3, 4, 5—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: By-laws of the Municipality of Albany.

By the MINISTER FOR MINES: New regulations under Mineral Lands Act.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at three minutes past 11 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 12th November, 1902.

PAGE

Questions: Agricultural Shows, Money Grants ... 2125
Education, Beverley and Pingelly 2125
Bills: Municipal Institutions Act Amendment, all stages 2125
Bread Bill, first reading 2126
Roads and Streets Closure, third time 2126
Mines Development, second reading, in Committee, progress 2126
Stamp Act Amendment, second reading, in Committee, progress 2134
Land Act Amendment, second reading... ... 2140
Droving Bill, in Committee 2146

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

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL SHOWS, MONEY GRANTS.

HON. G. RANDELL asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What amount of money has been granted by the Government in aid of agricultural shows during the past two years. 2, What amount it is proposed to expend for the same purpose during the present year (1st July, 1902, to 30th June, 1903).

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, 1900-1901, £935; 1901-1902, £1,040. 2, An amount of £2,000 has been provided on the Estimates for 1902-1903 for "Agricultural and Horticultural Societies."

QUESTION—EDUCATION, BEVERLEY AND PINGELLY.

HON. R. G. BURGES asked the Minister for Lands: If the Government has made any arrangement to provide education for those children residing between Beverley and Pingelly who are prevented by the late train arrangements from attending school.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: The Education Department had arranged that the teacher at Pingelly should give an extra hour a day to make up for time lost by children coming by train. The new time-table makes them lose the whole morning. They, therefore, only receive instruction for about 3¼ hours a day. Applications for schools at Brookton and Mt. Kokeby have been received. There are 19 children of school age at the former place, and an item is placed on the Estimates to build a school. There are 18 children at Mt. Kokeby. There has been some difficulty in getting a school site, and no building is available. At Dale, near Mt. Kokeby, about 10 children need a school, and, if the settlers can provide a room, a teacher could, no doubt, be sent.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

ALL STAGES.

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

Standing Orders suspended to allow Bill to be taken through remaining stages.

HON. M. L. MOSS (Minister), in moving the second reading, said: By Section 87 of the principal Act a returning officer was to be appointed by the municipal council for the purpose of conducting elections, such officer to be either the mayor or one of the councillors. At that point the section stopped short, without making provision for the appointment of the officer in the event of the council neglecting or failing to make the appointment. There had been difficulties in holding municipal elections where such an error had been made by municipalities, or where for some other reason a returning officer had not been provided. The Bill proposed that when from any cause a returning officer was not appointed, the Governor might nominate a returning officer. Some municipalities wished to take advantage of the Bill in view of the election to be held during this month.

Question put and passed.