expression of opinion which has been given utterance to. I feel convinced that the regulations would never have been enforced, and that probably in the *Education Circular* submitted to teachers each month some mention will be made of the fact that the regulations are suspended pending a complete scheme which the Government intends to submit to this House and the country. I hope that when next it makes an excursion into the realms of education it will be with a determination to take a step forward instead of a step backward. Having obtained an expression of opinion and I think unanimous opinion from the House on this question, I beg, with permission of the House, to withdraw the motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 8·46 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 25th September, 1906.

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

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Report of the Comptroller General of Prisons for 1905.

POLICE OFFENCES BILL INQUIRY, EXTENSION.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. N. Keenan) moved that the time for bringing up the report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the Police Offences Bill be extended for four weeks.

MR. JOHNSON, before agreeing to the extension, asked for assurance that the report would be forthcoming at the end of this term. How many sittings of the committee had been held, and what number of witnesses were examined since the previous extension of the time was granted?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The committee had one meeting every week except last week, when he was absent. There was a meeting fixed for this week. No witnesses had been examined so far, because the committee had not completed the Bill itself. When the Bill was completed, they would be prepared to examine witnesses if necessary.

Question passed.

BILL—STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT.

One amendment made by the Legislative Council was now considered in Committee, and agreed to; a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the previous Thursday; MR. ILLINGWORTH in the Chair, the PREMIER in charge of the Bill.

Clause 16—Amendment of Section 3:

THE PREMIER: The section in the principal Act provided that if any lease, license, or occupation certificate under the Act was lodged, a duplicate might be issued on payment of 5s. In some cases it entailed great expense to make out a duplicate parchment. The Government asked that power might be given to the Minister to provide for the charge by regulation instead of a fixed charge. In some cases it was not worth more than 1s. to give a certificate; in another case it might be worth a pound.

MR. TAYLOR: What would be the maximum?

THE PREMIER: In no ordinary case could it exceed £1, and that charge would be made where a duplicate certificate was issued. Possibly where a plan would have to be prepared in relation to an irregular-shaped block there would be a considerable amount of drafting entailed in the preparation of a new certificate, and in a case like that a fee would be charged in proportion to the amount of time taken by the draftsmen in preparing the certificate, and also the price of the parchment. In some cases there might be a most trivial amendment, and practically it might not be just to make any charge; in which cases the Minister should have power to make a fixed charge.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 17, 18, 19—agreed to.

Clause 20—Power to Minister to transfer holdings of a deceased person where no adminstration:

MR. BUTCHER: What section did this clause amend?

THE PREMIER: The section relating to relatives of deceased settlers taking possession of land. The clause provided for the transmission of the title without probate. In some cases the estate was of so small a value that the cost of the taking out probate would exceed the value of the estate. The clause would enable the relatives of deceased settlers to take out letters of administration. It was practically a copy of the section of the Queensland Act.

Clause passed.

Clauses 21, 22—agreed to.

Clause 23—Amendment of Section 35:

THE PREMIER: This clause would enable youths of 16 to take up land. The age was now limited to 18. The clause would enable sons of farmers to take up land immediately on leaving school, so that they would have an opportunity of settling on their own blocks when they arrived at man's estate. Apparently a similar provision had worked successfully in New South Wales and Queensland.

MR. TAYLOR: Had the existing provision worked any hardship.

THE PREMIER: It was urged by farmers that it would be advantageous to the younger generation if the boys had the opportunity, on turning 16, to acquire land within a radius of the family homestead, in order that later on they might take up these blocks. In Victoria it was necessary for the sons of farmers to take up blocks a considerable distance from their families' homes. It was better that our own youths should have the land.

MR. TAYLOR: Rather than Mr. James's Italians.

Clause passed.

MAXIMUM AREA, TO REDUCE.

Clause 24—Restriction as to area:

MR. STONE: This clause made it impossible for one person to hold more than 2,000 acres. It would affect banking and other securities to a great extent.

THE PREMIER: This was a most important clause. At present one adult person could hold 1,000 acres under Clause 55 with residence, 1,000 acres under Clause 56 without residence, 1,000 acres direct purchase under Clause 57, with 160 acres of a homestead block and 3,000 acres of second-class land or 5,000 acres of third-class land, a total of 4,000 acres of grazing lease. Thus the one settler could hold 7,160 acres, in addition to which 10,000 acres could be taken up on poison lease; and if acting jointly with others there would practically be no limit to which one individual could acquire land. It was considered advisable to stop the accumulation of large estates, and this amending clause would limit the area one person could hold to 2,000 acres of cultivable land, or 5,000 acres of grazing land, in the proportion of two to five. For instance, the settler could hold 1,000 acres of cultivable land and 2,500 acres of grazing land. At present New South Wales was spending large sums of money in repurchasing estates which in the early days were alienated without restriction. From a gentleman well acquainted with New South Wales he had received the following letter:—

Under the administration of the Land Act of 1861 in New South Wales, a number of practices were resorted to to enable pastoral lessees to alienate Crown lands which were not contemplated by the Act. These were dummy selections, improvement purchases,

auction sales, volunteer land orders, etc., under which so early as 1881 more than four-fifths of the alienated lands had been acquired by less than 5,000 persons, who thus secured large landed monopolies, and in doing so hemmed in and surrounded the great bulk of the small settlers. In that year, after 20 years' operation of the Act, 33 million of acres were alienated, of which 35,755 persons held five millions of acres; 4,237 persons held 20 millions of acres; and 96 persons held eight millions. In my recent visit to New South Wales I examined into the figures with which 20 years ago I was thoroughly conversant, and find that, although the areas alienated have very largely increased, the great bulk of the increase has gone to augment the already large estates acquired by the 4,333 persons who already held more than 28 millions of acres, while the number of small holders has only increased by about 7,000 persons. The large landed proprietors are now letting out their lands to the small holders on clearing and cultivation leases—the terms of one estate of 80,000 acres, through which I passed, are that the lessee gets a lease of three to five years and has to clear and cultivate the land, giving half the crop as rental.

This matter of restricting the area should be well considered. He (the Premier) was not wedded exactly to any particular area as a limit, for it was recognised that an area which might be sufficient in one portion of the State would not be sufficient in another portion. Rather than adhere to the existing terms of first and second-class land, the term "cultivable land" was adopted in the Bill. Recently a considerable area of second-class land had been alienated for grazing purposes, but that process would be stopped. It was questionable whether it might not be wise to provide that in addition to the cultivable land a person might hold grazing land; but 2,000 acres was quite sufficient of cultivable land for one person to hold. In heavily timbered country it would be quite sufficient for one person; but about Kellerberrin it might be reasonable for a person cropping 2,000 acres to acquire an extra area for grazing purposes within reasonable distance of his cultivable land. What was known as third-class land was described in the Bill as "grazing land." The section dealing with poison leases was also amended to provide that in future poison land must be taken up as grazing land at 3s. 6d. per acre.

MR. GULL: Sandplain was classed as grazing land. If a man held 5,000 acres of sandplain as well as 2,000 acres of cultivable land, and the sandplain proved cultivable, how would it affect the position? If he found he could grow crops on grazing land, there was nothing to prevent his doing so.

MR. STONE: Would the clause affect securities? If a farmer wanted an advance on his holdings, would the bank be at liberty to make it?

THE PREMIER: The title would be equally as good as under the present Act; practically the same.

MR. BUTCHER: Whilst agreeing with the Premier in desiring to prevent in the future the building up of large estates in our principal agricultural districts, he asked the hon. gentleman to be particularly cautious not to err in the other direction. Throughout our agricultural areas there was really only a very small proportion of the country, speaking broadly, that was capable of being brought under cultivation. There was an enormous amount of waste land in every instance which had to be included in the areas which were applied for, and which would be applied for under the measure. If the Premier was not careful he would so reduce the area that it would be almost impossible for a man with a family to make a living out of it.

MR. FOULKES: The clause said that no person should be competent to acquire, under Part V., more than 2,000 acres. He took it that the clause was intended to mean that no person should acquire direct from the Crown; but according to the way the clause was framed, it was open to the interpretation that no person should be able to purchase from any private individual if by so doing he would have more than 2,000 acres. If the words "from the Crown" were inserted after "acquire," that would remove all doubt.

THE PREMIER: The clause contained the words "either as lessee or transferee."

MR. FOULKES: The words "or transferee" might be left out. The hon. gentleman himself realised it was advisable to consider whether opportunity should not be given to a man to take up some grazing land in addition to the 2,000 acres. During the last two or three years none of these grazing leases had been granted, and the result was that people went through the country and picked out the eyes of the land. It

was not a good bargain for the Minister any more than for a private individual to let the eyes of property be picked out, and to have the tag ends of pieces not taken up. He was speaking particularly of the South-Western district. There the good land was situated in the valleys, and the poor land on the hills. The Government should try to get rid of the poor land as well as the good land.

MR. BUTCHER: Survey before selection would overcome that.

MR. FOULKES: It was not a question of survey before selection. It was most necessary that full facilities and every encouragement should be given to people to take up grazing leases. He was hoping that the Minister would come forward with some proposal to the effect that if a man took up a thousand acres of agricultural land, he should as a matter of right be entitled to take up say a certain quantity of grazing land.

THE PREMIER: One person was entitled to take up 2,500 acres. Subclause 2 contained the words "or the equivalent area of grazing land."

MR. FOULKES was glad to see that a person could take up a certain amount; but the Minister knew it was difficult to draw a hard-and-fast line in regard to the quantity of land a man should be entitled to take up, the conditions being so different. As to agricultural land, a great deal of cultivable land was really very poor. In many districts the returns were only nine bushels per acre. Perhaps it would have been better if the Government had framed certain regulations that should apply to the various parts of the State instead of having a cast-iron rule for all. For the purposes of discussion he moved an amendment:

That after the word "acquire," in line one, "from the Crown" be added.

MR. GULL: If the word "acquire" meant that a man should not be able to purchase a neighbouring freehold when the conditions had been fulfilled, he objected to the proposal. The limit stated in the clause was 2,000 acres. We had to realise that the system of cultivation extended into the third year, which was the most advantageous; so much in fallow, so much under grass, and so much under crop. There would be from 600 to 700 acres under crop. Were the Government going to restrict the land to 600 or 700 acres under crop? If a farmer advanced money to his neighbour, and the mortgage fell in, what was the mortgagee to do with the land? To restrict the area to 2,000 acres might sometimes be justifiable to encourage settlement; but much land, after being cropped for a number of years, was fit for grazing only. To limit a man to 6,000 or 7,000 acres under crop was unreasonable.

THE PREMIER: By Subclause 2 a married man could take up 1,000 acres and its equivalent in grazing land; so that he could acquire 3,000 acres of cultivable land, or 2,000 acres of cultivable land and 2,500 acres of grazing land. The mortgagee referred to by the preceding speaker could, after foreclosure, auction the land and recover his money. There might be a difficulty when a settler received land as a legacy. We might provide that he must, within two or three years, reduce his holding to the maximum area allowed.

MR. FOULKES: The legatee might wish to hold the land till his eldest son came of age.

THE PREMIER: There was nothing to prevent his holding it upon trust. To make a law to suit all the exceptional cases cited would be difficult; and the hardships foretold were not likely to be experienced. By Clause 25, when land was granted in the joint names of two persons, each person would, for the purposes of Clause 24, be deemed to be the holder of an area equal to half the holding; in the case of three such persons, each would be deemed to hold one-third; and so on with any larger number. Members might express opinions as to whether, in addition to the 2,000 acres of cultivable land to be allowed to one person, an additional area of grazing land should be permitted. The Government realised that lands in this State varied considerably in quality; and in the Eastern District, at places like Kellerberrin, it might be advisable to allow a man to hold a small area of grazing land as well as the cultivable land mentioned in the clause.

MR. STONE: Would financial institutions which advanced money on the security of farm land be properly protected? If this clause passed here it would not pass in another place. If the point were not properly explained, he

would move that the clause be struck out.

MR. TAYLOR: This vigorous discussion was refreshing, and the paucity of amendments from the Government side surprising, considering that the Premier, every time he rose, asked his supporters to alter the Bill to suit them. What a difference between the Premier's generosity to agricultural members and the attitude of the Minister for Mines when dealing with the Mining Bill, towards mining members who had a practical knowledge of that subject.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not discuss the main question, but must confine himself to the amendment.

MR. TAYLOR opposed the amendment, and regretted the disorganised condition of the party supposed to represent agriculturists and pastoralists. Several of those members had expressed sorrow at the absence of the boss-cocky and farming man, the member for Katanning (Hon. F. H. Piesse). The Committee should not pass legislation to encourage the mortgagee. Here and in the Eastern States hundreds of struggling farmers had, in spite of liberal land laws, been squeezed off the land by money-lenders, who thus secured agricultural and pastoral areas which they never did anything to develop.

MR. BUTCHER: Give one instance.

MR. TAYLOR: In all parts of Australia were instances galore. In the early days he had seen the goldfields dotted with cockies jammed out of their selections, moving off with swags on their backs. In his pocket was a letter from a man who complained that an hon. member had squeezed him out of his property. The money-lender was not so virtuous as to refrain from squeezing the debtor. We should do all in our power to discourage the person who pressed on the selector by lending money. We wanted to discourage the lending of money. Had not the State initiated the Agricultural Bank to protect settlers from persons whom members desired to assist? He supported the clause practically as it stood.

MR. BUTCHER: Some alteration should be made in the clause. No industry could be developed without money. If the clause was allowed to pass in its present state it would prohibit anyone with money from lending it on agricultural or pastoral areas, and it would put a stop to business in land, which was not a desirable state of affairs to bring about. It was a mistake in a country like Western Australia, where we had huge areas of unused and unoccupied agricultural land, and when we were advertising to induce people to come here to settle, to prevent people holding areas on which a person could make a decent living. In some districts it was impossible to make a living out of the areas stipulated. Under certain conditions 3,500 acres were no use to any man. If a man were allowed to pick out the eyes of the country, then 3,500 acres would be sufficient. Farming in Western Australia was different from farming in any other part of the Commonwealth. It was impossible for a man to make a living out of farming unless he carried stock. If a man wished to farm in a successful way in Western Australia, with the high freights on the railways and the condition of the markets and the prices of produce, 3,000 acres were little use to him. The Committee should approve of the amendment.

MR. BATH: The proposal to insert the words "from the Crown" would limit the total area to be held by a landholder in Western Australia, therefore the total area held, whether acquired from the Crown, by mortgagees, or as freeholders, should be discussed. The member for Gascoyne had spoken about Western Australian land in a way that made one wonder what was the quality of land in Western Australia. We had discussed at various times the question of expending considerable sums in bringing immigrants to Western Australia, and we had heard members representing farming constituencies speaking in the most glowing terms of the land we had in Western Australia, and the splendid opportunities that awaited those who arrived here with a certain amount of capital; but when it came to the question of discussing a Land Bill and limiting the area which a person should hold, we had a different picture drawn. He would like to know which side of the picture was correct; whether we had this splendid land, or whether it was, as members had stated, absolutely impossible except on enormous areas for

people to obtain a living on Western Australian land? The Minister had taken a very wise step in attempting to limit the area that might be held. There was room for argument as to what that area should be—the total area of grazing land and cultivable land. Members had quoted New South Wales, but the latest returns of the Government Statistician of New South Wales showed that half the land in that State was held by 722 persons; the total number of moderately sized holdings was stationary, while the number of large sized holdings was increasing. The Agricultural Bank was an excellent institution, because in lending money to the farmer on the land it had done so at a reduced rate of interest; but if it were possible for the farmer to do without the assistance of the Agricultural Bank it would be better for him. Did the member for Gascoyne say that there was no farmer in Western Australia who did not owe money either to the Agricultural Bank or to private persons? If the member said that, then he (Mr. Bath) did not agree with him, for there were farmers who did not owe money to the Agricultural Bank or to anyone else and who were getting on very well. In Western Australia, even although we recognised that at times assistance was necessary, the more a farmer was able to dispense with such assistance the better it would be for him. We should support such an institution as the Agricultural Bank in order that one might get assistance at a reasonable rate. In New South Wales many people had been squeezed out owing to the heavy interest they had to pay. The member for Claremont proposed to limit the operation of this clause to lands acquired from the Crown. When once a person had secured a freehold, so far as our present law was concerned no one could prevent him from holding anything over the maximum amount specified; but the insertion in this clause of the words proposed by the member for Claremont was unnecessary and would tend to destroy the object sought to be gained.

MR. GULL: Western Australian land, more particularly in the South-West, was in its original state practically worthless for farming purposes, and it only became valuable as farming land after it had been worked and treated with phosphate manures. The reason men had been making money in farming in Western Australia was that they had had good markets, that the country had not been producing a sufficiency for requirements, and they had been getting good prices. Every year, however, the production was increasing and the price was going down, and it must go down. When once we reached the normal level it would be more necessary than ever that provision should be made for men to have stock on their farms. The natural country was very poor. On an average its carrying capacity would be supposed be one sheep to ten acres. That did not apply to the South-West, but where land had not been brought into cultivation. If we restricted a man to an area of 2,000 acres, that man would have no chance of making a living off it.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. Jas. Mitchell): The amendment should be rejected, for if it were adopted it would lend itself to dummying of the worst order. A man might acquire 2,000 acres from the Crown and immediately transfer it to some person already holding land, and then go on indefinitely. The clause as it stood was a good one. An area of 2,000 acres was quite sufficient for a man to start on, and when he acquired the freehold it would be open to him to make farther selection. The trouble had not been to sell land. We had been able to sell land very readily in the past, but we had experienced considerable difficulty in getting it improved. He supposed we had sold every acre of land within easy reach of a railway, and also a great deal that was a considerable distance from a railway. Land had been sold in large areas, and that was against the best interests of the country. As a farmer he said that 2,000 acres were quite sufficient. He welcomed the remarks of the Premier that he would consider the advisableness of granting an area of grazing land in addition to the 2,000 acres. If the Premier would accept an amendment which would enable him to do that, the position would be very satisfactory. The member for Swan had made some wild statements about the acreage necessary to support sheep. One should not expect to find a Garden of Eden when he got into the wilderness, but he could

certainly get land and make it into a very nice garden. Land here was equal to that in any other State, and certainly with our splendid climate it was not necessary to have a greater acreage in our wet districts than the 2,000 acres mentioned in the clause.

MR. BUTCHER: Did the Honorary Minister practise what he preached, and was he satisfied when he had 2,000 acres? Was he satisfied with the area he at present held? Would this clause have the effect of preventing any person from purchasing or transferring anything over 2,000 acres of freehold?

THE PREMIER: This measure would not interfere with the transfer of freehold in any case, but it would prevent persons from taking up land for speculative purposes and immediately selling it to the first man who came along, and then repeating the operation. A considerable amount of land had been taken up under those conditions. There was a stipulation regarding conditional purchase lands that £50 should be spent in improvements on a 500-acre block before any transfer was allowed at the present time. The object of that rule was to prevent the transfer of land to any great extent. A tremendous lot of blocks had been taken up, and disposed of at very enhanced values two months afterwards. Under this Bill improvements were a good deal more severe than under the existing Act, consequently it would not be to any man's interest to take up more land than he could possibly work, because by the system of progressive improvements he would in ten years have had to spend on actual improvements an amount equal to the total of the purchase money. As to the area a man could make a living on, he had an opportunity quite recently to make enquiries as to what could be done. In the Eastern Districts there were any number of men making a very good living from 500 to 1,000 acres. In the South-Western portion a man could make a good living on a smaller area. In regard to the cutting up of land for selection after survey, whilst in the Eastern Districts blocks varied from 500 acres to 1,000 acres, in the South-Western District round Bridgetown and other places the area varied from 200 acres to 500 or 600 acres. In the Eastern Districts the land could be cleared for £1 an acre, whereas in Bridgetown and other places clearing cost from £10 to £25 an acre. There was no hardship in restricting a man to the area he could actually work. The object of the Bill was to get the best we possibly could out of the land, and as far as possible to restrict the building up of large estates.

MR. BARNETT supported the clause as it stood. If any mistake was made it was in making the area too large. The object of our legislation at present was to settle people on the land, and the only way to do so was to limit the size of holdings. It would not be the slightest use borrowing money to build agricultural railways if the holdings along the railways were even up to the limit imposed by the clause. Some members spoke of the poor quality of the land in the State, but many of them were large owners of land. One would like to hear what they would say if one offered to purchase their land at the nominal price of 10s. per acre. The surveying of land along agricultural railways before settlement, and the cutting up of the land into suitable areas according to the quality of the soil, would be the best system to adopt, the one by which the best interests of the State would be served.

MR. FOULKES: It was necessary to place a reasonable limit on the area of land a man could hold, because we should not allow the large estates to increase in number; but the man who held up to 5,000 acres and complied with the conditions of improvement should be encouraged. Attention should be paid to enforcing the conditions. In the past the fault was the slackness of the Lands Department in allowing people to hold lands without complying with the conditions, the greatest culprits in that respect being the small holders, persons holding from 1,000 acres to 1,500 acres, though these people were not to be blamed, because to some extent it was owing to want of capital; and now suddenly the Lands Department swung round, but instead of seeing that the conditions were to be carried out, they brought in the present drastic proposal. In New Zealand, where they had very stringent land laws, the latest proposal was that no individual should hold more than £50,000 worth of land.

MR. BATH: But there were other restrictions in the laws.

MR. FOULKES: It was recognised that the Premier's supporters in this matter were the Opposition. One effect of the clause if passed would be that persons holding land could not purchase conditional purchase land put up for auction. Only persons without land would be allowed to buy conditional purchase land sold by auction; thus the man who complied with the labour conditions on a conditional purchase block would be deprived of the opportunity of selling his land.

THE PREMIER: The land would be freehold by that time.

MR. FOULKES: Yes; in twenty years.

THE PREMIER: Not necessarily.

MR. FOULKES: It was not every man who could pay for the land before the twenty years expired. The State allowed no discount for payment before the expiration of twenty years. The Honorary Minister believed that 2,000 acres of cultivable land was sufficient. No doubt it was at Northam, but it was not sufficient in other districts. Many of the agricultural members were not present in the Chamber. The Premier should accept the amendment, and afterwards the clause might be recommitted.

MR. HOLMAN; Why was the hon. member stonewalling?

MR. BOLTON: For the member for Katanning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. FOULKES: When the agricultural members arrived in the Chamber steps would be taken to have the clause recommitted if the amendment were now rejected.

THE PREMIER: The member for Katanning would reduce the area.

MR. FOULKES: The member for Katanning was not referred to, though that hon. member no doubt loomed largely in the sight of the Premier. This clause required farther consideration.

MR. WALKER: Members on the Opposition side of the House were fighting for those farmers who had to make the best use of a small piece of land, as against large owners holding 2,000 up to 6,000 acres of land, and working it in a more economical way by using up-to-date machinery, thus practically preventing small men from competing against them in the sale of produce. The great evil of farming in America was caused by enormously large areas being worked by men who could afford to use the most expensive machinery, and thus make it all the harder for small farmers to get a living out of what they could sell off their small holdings. The member for Claremont had been arguing that it would be a hardship to prevent men having 2,000 acres of land in this State from being allowed to take up more land. It was a tendency of large estates to grow still larger, the owners buying up small holdings near them because the smaller men could not get a living in competition with the larger men. The same evil was seen in Ireland as in the United States; the owners of large estates working them in such a way as to make the condition of the small farmers worse than it need be. A better example had been set in New Zealand under the policy of the late Mr. Seddon, adopted from his predecessor Mr. Ballance; and the result was that a family could get a good living and enjoy considerable comfort from the produce of a 40-acre farm. It was the duty of members to prevent agricultural land in this country from being monopolised in a few large estates. No man could properly cultivate to advantage more than 2,000 acres of land in this State, for if he did more than that he would be making it impossible for small farmers to obtain a living by competing against his system of working the larger area with expensive machinery. The agitation was growing daily against any farther alienation of land; and though we could not stop it at present, we should try to check it and thereby minimise the evil. Seeing that the object of this clause was to minimise the amount of land which one person could lawfully hold in this State, he would vote for it.

THE PREMIER: As to the inspectors of conditional purchase leases in this State neglecting their duty and allowing land to be held without the improvement conditions being duly complied with, the member for Claremont was wrong in his contention; for the fault lay mainly in the fact that for eight years after taking up a conditional purchase area, the holder need not do more than merely fence the land. His intention as Minister for

Lands was to require that all future lithographs issued by the department for the use of persons intending to take up land should have inserted on each holding the date when it was taken up, so that a person going about the country with lithographs of conditional purchase areas held would be able to see for himself by the date on each area whether the improvement conditions were being carried out. As far as New Zealand was concerned, the limit to which persons could acquire land from the Crown was 640 acres. The provision in the clause now under discussion limited the amount to 2,000; but even with this limit, a married man with a family and having one son say over 16 years of age could acquire in his own name 2,000 acres of cultivable land, another 1,000 acres could be taken up in the name of his wife, and the son over 16 years could take up 2,000 more, making 5,000 acres that could be held practically by one family. The clause as it stood should be passed in the best interests of the State.

MR. H. BROWN: In the case of a mortgagee who lent money on conditional purchase areas and might in this way hold 2,000 acres of such land, would he as a mortgagee be precluded from taking up more land under the clause? The same would apply to a bank holding conditional purchase land held as security for money advanced.

THE PREMIER: As soon as the transfer of a conditional purchase area was approved, the mortgagee holding it would become the actual owner.

MR. H. BROWN: Banks held securities of this kind, and the question was whether a bank or a mortgagee could hold more than 2,000 acres of land under the clause. There were many cases known to him in which conditional purchase land was held without the improvement conditions being complied with. As to the tendency for small estates to be bought up, he knew that in the York district, for instance, holders of large estates had in many instances bought up small farms in the same locality, and the reason was that the holder of a small farm of say 400 acres found it was not sufficient to keep him occupied all the year round after he had once cleared it for cultivation, and so he would be induced to sell to some larger owner for ready money, in order that he might go out farther back and take up fresh land so as to occupy his whole time in clearing and improving it.

At 6·32, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.
At 7·30, Chair resumed.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	9
Noes	...	...	...	22
Majority against			...	13

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Butcher.	Mr. Bath
Mr. Davies	Mr. Bolton
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Brebber
Mr. Gull	Mr. Carson
Mr. Male	Mr. Collier
Mr. Monger	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Smith	Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Stone	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Brown (*Teller*).	Mr. Heitmann
	Mr. Hudson
	Mr. Keenan
	Mr. Mitchell
	Mr. N. J. Moore
	Mr. Price
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Troy
	Mr. Underwood
	Mr. Veryard
	Mr. Walker
	Mr. A. J. Wilson
	Mr. F. Wilson
	Mr. Layman (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

On formal motion by the PREMIER, the word "agricultural," wherever it appeared in the clause, was struck out, and "cultivable" inserted in lieu.

MR. H. BROWN: On inquiry during the tea adjournment he had learnt that banks and other mortgagees held thousands upon thousands of acres of conditional purchase lands in their own names as transferees. If by a windfall a man received as a legacy a large area of conditional purchase land, it was idiotic to force him to sell it; and in view of the land tax few people would care to buy it, even if that were allowed by this clause. Thus financial institutions would absolutely refuse to lend on conditional purchase holdings, and the larger holders could not borrow from the Agricultural Bank. The clause would prevent the improvement of conditional purchase lands. Would any Oppositionist refuse a legacy of 5,000 or 6,000 acres of conditional purchase land? The clause would prevent them from accepting the gift.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. J. Mitchell): To protect the mortgagee

was necessary, and he was protected. The last speaker stated that banks took security by way of transfer; but for some years they had taken mortgages, and were sufficiently protected by Section 140 of the principal Act.

MR. H. BROWN: Some thousands of acres were still held in the names of banks as transferees.

THE MINISTER: Under the existing Act it was impossible for any person to hold many thousands of acres. The area was limited, as in this Bill.

MR. FOULKES: Was Section 140 still in force?

THE MINISTER: Yes; and it afforded sufficient protection. There was no reason to fear that any financial institution would suffer through the clause.

MR. GULL: Would the banks lend money under the clause?

THE MINISTER: Just as freely as they ever did.

THE PREMIER: The member for Perth (Mr. Brown) should look up Section 140 of the parent Act. The only amendment of that section was in Clause 60 of the Bill, which would add the words "or private sale" after "auction," in Subsection 2. In clauses 76 onward full provision was made for conveyancing. No transfers were approved at the present time; but mortgages could be approved under the Bill as under the existing Act. The only difference was that this clause reduced the maximum holding from 7,000 to 2,000 acres.

MR. H. BROWN: What about a legatee?

THE PREMIER: A clause would be drafted to enable the legatee to hold land for a certain time, within which he must dispose of it, so as not to exceed his maximum area.

MR. TAYLOR: Earlier in the evening he stated that certain mortgagees squeezed small farmers, and Government members denied the statement. Now the member for Perth (Mr. Brown) had just proved his case by showing that banks as mortgagees held "thousands upon thousands of acres." The Bill sought to minimise that evil.

MR. FOULKES: This was a convenient stage to introduce an amendment giving power to a person holding agricultural land to take up grazing land. He moved that in line four, of paragraph one, the words "and grazing land not exceeding 2,000 acres in area" be inserted. If we did not give a man the right to take up grazing land he might pick out the eyes of the country.

THE PREMIER: If 2,000 acres of cultivable land and 2,000 acres of grazing land were stipulated, then there was to be an equivalent in grazing land?

MR. FOULKES: An amendment would be moved later on to alter that, but if this was not a convenient stage to introduce the amendment he would postpone it, but he hoped the Minister would see the necessity of making provision enabling a man to take up grazing land as well as agricultural land.

THE PREMIER: Such an amendment would be considered.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

MR. TROY: This clause was inserted because the land in some localities might be richer than in others.

THE PREMIER: Land in proximity to a railway station might be richer than land in other localities, and it would be advisable to cut that land up into smaller holdings.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 25—agreed to.

Clause 26—Amendment of Section 38:

THE PREMIER moved—

That in line 4, "Central Division," the words, "thence east of the 120th meridian of east longitude" be struck out.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 27—agreed to.

Clause 28—Amendment of Section 55:

THE PREMIER moved that after "aforesaid" in Subclause 5 the following be inserted:—

Provided also that if the purchase money exceeds £1 an acre, the purchase shall for the purposes of this subsection be deemed to be £1 an acre if the Minister in his discretion so directs.

Where property was in close proximity to a railway station it was possible that a man might have to pay £10 an acre for land, and it would be impossible to spend more than £1 per acre in improvements on the block, which was double the amount specified under existing conditions.

Amendment passed; the clauses as amended agreed to.

Clauses 29 to 37—agreed to.

GRAZING LEASES.

Clause 38—Repeal of Section 68; Governor may declare certain lands open for selection as grazing leases.

MR. BATH moved: That all the words after "open" in line 10 be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—

The term of lease shall be 21 years, with right of renewal or the valuation of improvements as hereinafter provided.

In a State such as Western Australia where development in land settlement was going on, it was preferable, so far as grazing land was concerned, not to tie the hands of the State to grant the fee simple as provided by the clause, but to adopt something after the same principle as was adopted in Queensland in what were known as scrub leases, or in New Zealand in what were known as small grazing runs, giving persons a lease of 21 years and the right of renewal, or the right of securing compensation for improvements, to be settled by some equitable system of arbitration. Under the New Zealand grazing runs provision a lease was given for 21 years, subject to certain conditions as to residence and improvements, but the holder had the right on these grazing runs to carry on agricultural work. The result was they had an excellent system of tenure, but the hands of the Government were not tied, seeing that if settlement developed, and by the development of agricultural science these lands became valuable for closer settlement, the Government would be able to pay for the improvements fixed by arbitration, and to secure the land and allot small areas according to the new demand as it arose. There were big areas of land in this State which could be leased in even larger areas than provided for in this measure. It would be advisable so far as concerned our eastern land contiguous to the rabbit-proof fence to lease it for stock purposes, at the same time not denying the right to lessees to carry on agricultural work. To the eastward there was a limit beyond which it would be unwise for the Government to induce people to go purely for agricultural purposes. In relation to small grazing runs in New Zealand it was provided that a portion of the land could be used for agricultural purposes. If such a provision were made here in relation to the same class of land, with perhaps a higher maximum, there would, he thought, be no difficulty in indicating a line in the eastern land so that in the one case there should be one form of tenure as provided in this Bill, and in the other the form of tenure to which he referred. With that object, and with a view of having the power to lease instead of granting conditional purchase, he would move another amendment.

THE PREMIER: In view of the proposal by the hon. member it would be well to report progress, to give the hon. member an opportunity of having his amendment on the paper, and at the same time to consider what would be a suitable line to draw in order to adopt his suggestion in regard to the different tenures. Most of us were aware that beyond Nangeenan practically it was not advisable for anyone to go for agricultural land, on account of the small rainfall, there being only about nine inches. If the amendment were put on the Notice Paper, and progress reported, we could discuss the thing at a greater length and we should know exactly the hon. member's ideas on the subject.

Progress reported and leave given to sit again.

BILL—MINES REGULATION.

IN COMMITTEE:

Resumed from the 13th September; MR. ILLINGWORTH in the Chair, the MINISTER FOR MINES in charge of the Bill.

Clause 33—General Rules.

New subclause—Height of stope:

MR. SCADDAN: The following had been moved by him as a new subclause to limit the height of stopes:—

A stope shall not be worked to a greater height from the filling than twelve feet, or such lesser height that the inspector may order.

He understood that the Minister was not prepared to accept the amendment,

holding that it was not practicable. But those who considered it impracticable were those who had not been working stopes; whereas men who had been working stopes all their lives contended that the amendment was necessary. The Chamber of Mines and the mining managers on the Belt in particular, in their desire to avoid any unnecessary friction, made themselves very obnoxious in the past week by taking an extended trip to Perth and doing a fair amount of "lobbying"—he would not say with those on the Treasury bench, but those on the Ministerial side of the House—for the purpose of knocking out this amendment and others. On a previous occasion he read to the Committee a report of an inspector of mines in Kalgoorlie stating that he had issued certain instructions to managers with a view of having the height of stopes down to within reach, to make them safe; but the Minister then asserted that this was not correct. He (Mr. Scaddan) had now a copy of it. In his report dated November 1904, the inspector stated in relation to the Lake View Consols that he gave orders in November 1903 to limit the height of stopes to 10 feet, and that in March 1904 the stopes were still over 10 feet, and still dangerous. In the Great Boulder, in July 1903 he gave orders to limit the height of stopes to 14 feet, but in November 1903 they were over 14 feet. In November 1904 he again visited the mine and found stopes worked to a height anywhere between 20 and 30 feet, in spite of the order given some eighteen months previously.

MR. GULL: Did he prosecute?

MR. SCADDAN: No; because he contended that at that time he had no power to prosecute. In the Golden Horseshoe, in 1904 stays were ordered, and the orders were ignored. He (Mr. Scaddan) learned too that at the time there came a change in the management, and as to some stopes that had been worked by the previous management the working was ordered to be stopped until made safe. Those stopes were considered absolutely unsafe. In the Associated, in February 1904 stays were ordered; in March, attention was drawn to the stope, also in July and November, and it was found that the orders had been disobeyed. In Hannan's Star, in 1903 orders were given to lower the height of stopes. On the Boulder Main Reef Mine, in 1902 orders were given to stop work in the main stopes; but in December 1903 the inspector reported that the stopes were highly dangerous and unsafe. Men were still working in them. In August 1904 attention was again drawn to the dangerous height of stopes. In the Ivanhoe mine, in 1904 special orders were given to limit the height of the various stopes to 14 feet; but these orders were absolutely ignored. In the Oroya Brown Hill mine, orders were ignored on several occasions. On the Perseverance mine, in December 1903 orders were given to reduce the height of stopes to 14 feet, but in February 1904 the limit was still exceeded, also in May 1904. In view of these facts it was useless for the Minister to urge that it was desirable to leave the matter in the hands of the inspectors. To inspect one mine in Kalgoorlie and visit every part where men were working would take an inspector a week; so it was essential to make this provision a hard and fast rule, to be posted on the mines. One could not understand why the managers were so anxious that this amendment should be dropped. Their only argument could be the reduction of costs, to produce good balance sheets for their directors in London; but our first consideration should be the lives and welfare of the miners working in the mines. Members had been buttonholed by a recent deputation from the Chamber of Mines in regard to this Bill. He (Mr. Scaddan) in bringing these amendments forward had consulted no body of men. They were placed on the Notice Paper from his practical knowledge, and because he knew something of the dangers of working in mines. He preferred to see the whole Bill dropped rather than have this amendment rejected, because the carrying of stopes to dangerous heights was the cause of a great many accidents in mines.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: There was no justification for the remarks of the hon. member with regard to the

mission of the mine managers to interview members. These mine managers had so much responsibility thrown upon them by the Bill that they were entitled to place their views before members in regard to any amendments which they considered impracticable.

MR. SCADDAN: Then why did they not do it in the daylight?

THE MINISTER: Probably if they had consulted the hon. member it would have been no use. He (the Minister) was pleased to see them and to obtain their advice on many matters. He would rather go to them for advice than to many who prated so much about their mining knowledge. One could not point to any member on the Opposition side, except perhaps the member for Ivanhoe, who had been in any responsible position. The member for Murchison had had experience underground, and others might have had experience underground, but managers were responsible persons; the slightest mistake on their part might lead to a prosecution for manslaughter.

MR. TAYLOR: And a fine of £10.

MR. SCADDAN: But the managers only interviewed a small section of members. Why did they not see their representatives?

THE MINISTER: The hon. member was not worried with interjections.

MR. SCADDAN: The reporters were not there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order!

THE MINISTER: The hon. member had referred to a report by an inspector of mines produced in the previous Parliament by a former Minister; but the hon. member in the previous Parliament had not said so much about it; while he (the Minister) had thought at the time that the inspector was exceedingly weak not to see that the managers carried out instructions, or to prosecute if they did not do so. Taunts were made on account of a prosecution for manslaughter having failed. The facts were that the department had prosecuted on one point, and the manager had been fined £10; and then when the more serious charge was brought on, the court properly held that the man could not be convicted twice for the same offence. That was a blunder on the part of the Mines Department which was then controlled by a Labour Minister. Clause 37 of this Bill would give an inspector every power to stop work in any part of a mine he considered dangerous or unsafe. The clause was perfectly clear, though it might be improved by the addition of the word "forthwith" as suggested on the Notice Paper.

MR. SCADDAN: What about Subclause 3 of that clause?

THE MINISTER: It provided that the inspector could withdraw a man from the dangerous part of the mine until the matter was determined by arbitration. If the wording was not sufficiently clear we could make it clearer. The accidents that occurred in mines were, to a great extent, not in mines where the stopes were high. He could prove it. He had a long list of the accidents that had occurred in mines during the last 18 months.

MR. SCADDAN: The list was drawn up for the Minister's own purpose, not for the Opposition's purpose. The Oppositon could draw up a list for their purpose.

THE MINISTER: The hon. member should not believe that the officers of the department, when asked to prepare a return, would have a false return made.

THE CHAIRMAN: The member for Ivanhoe should withdraw. It was a reflection on the Minister.

MR. SCADDAN: It was not to his knowledge that the list was prepared by the departmental officers. He had thought it came from the Chamber of Mines, seeing that it had been supplying so much copy. As the list was prepared by the departmental officers, there was no reason for his making the statement, and he withdrew.

THE MINISTER: A long list of accidents of various kinds occurring in the year 1904 showed that most of them occurred in mines where the stopes were low, and comparatively only a few accidents occurred in mines where the stopes were high. This was evident again in the return of accidents occurring in 1905; most of the accidents occurring in places where the stopes were not high. The amendment proposed for a maximum

height of stopes would not apply to the varying conditions under which mining was carried on. Where the ground was dangerous or treacherous, it would manifestly be necessary to work with a low stope. A maximum height of 12 feet might be suitable for the big mines, but would not be suitable for many of the smaller mines. For example, if the height of a stope were 11 feet, and it was found necessary to remove some dangerous ground, the height of that stope might be increased to over 12 feet in places; and so the management would be committing a breach of the Act in removing the dangerous ground, although necessary to do that for safe working. As an instance of stopes in a large mine, take the Kalgurli mine, in regard to which the return of accidents occurring showed that only one accident occurred there through a fall of roof. The stopes in that mine were very wide, one being 100 feet high; so if we fixed a maximum height of stopes for all mines, that would not be a practical way of providing for safe working. The Mines Department recognised that high stopes were dangerous, that it was essential the managers of mines should not be allowed too much latitude in regard to stopes; but there were circumstances in which high stopes could be worked without anything like the same risk as in cases where stopes were low. The mining inspectors had in fact been trying for some time to arrive at a certain limit to which various mines could safely go in working stopes; but it was found that while in one mine the man might be able to work safely with a height of 15 feet, in another mine inspectors would have to refuse to allow men to work even at a height of six feet. A hard and fast rule could not be applied. Under Clause 37 of the Bill, power was given to inspectors to prevent any dangerous part of a mine from being worked; and if when that clause was being dealt with it was found that the power was not sufficient or the intention was not clear, the intention could be made more clear. Inspectors must have power to close down any part of a mine that was dangerous. No one could be more sympathetic in trying to provide for the safety of men working in mines than the State Mining Engineer, who had been framing elaborate regulations dealing with the ventilation and sanitation of mines, the testing of ropes, and the providing of proper signalling apparatus. The State Mining Engineer stated as his opinion, "It is not reasonably practical to provide a maximum height of stopes." The amendment now before the Committee should not be pressed.

MR. BATH: Although the Minister assurred members that the safeguards in the Bill would be a sufficient deterrent against any dangerous practice in the working of mines, yet the fact remained that judging by results from the existing provisions they had not deterred mining managers from working under dangerous conditions. The return of accidents for 1905 showed a total of 270 serious accidents, of which 61 were due to falls of ground. There were 34 fatal accidents, and of these no less than 12 were dne so the same cause. Therefore the present provisions of safeguards were powerless to deter managers from working the mines in a manner dangerous to life or dangerous to the safety of workers.

THE MINISTER: All those accidents did not occur in stopes. Only two fatal accidents occurred in stopes last year, according to the return furnished by the department.

MR. BATH: There would be many falls of ground in places other than stopes. Among the cases of serious accidents mentioned by the Minister, seven of them were in high stopes and four in low stopes; showing that the majority of serious accidents occurred in high stopes, according to the Minister's figures. The fact of a mine having its filling within a reasonably safe distance of the back of the stope meant that men could work with greater effect, because they need not erect stages. The former Minister for Mines, when introducing the Bill referred to by the member for Ivanhoe, said that for the last few years all the inspectors had been instructed to stop the dangerous practice referred to; that in some cases the instructions had not been carried out, because the inspectors had been unable under the Act to enforce the instructions, the Crown

law authorities being of opinion that the power did not exist; hence the introduction of a short amending measure. Yet the present Minister said the other evening that this amendment was unnecessary, and might, by involving expense, limit the work done in some mines. Unfortunately, the most powerful argument for the amendment was that almost at the time we were last discussing this clause a man was killed in the Oroya South mine, Kalgoorlie, and another man seriously injured. The deceased had thought the ground unsafe, but, having been induced to go back to work, he was killed by a fall of ground. The number of such accidents showed that the existing safeguards were insufficient. The Minister said, give more power to the inspectors; but the best safeguard was to prevent the working of stopes to unsafe heights. With the height of the stope specified in the Act the inspectors had a much better chance to enforce the law.

MR. EDDY opposed the amendment. The statement of the member for Ivanhoe that 75 per cent. of accidents occurred where the stopes were more than 12 feet high was incorrect. Most accidents occurred in stopes from 4 feet to 5 feet 6 inches. In the East Coolgardie Goldfield, according to the departmental report for 1905, three out of 13 fatal accidents were due to falls of ground. Whether these were in stopes did not appear. There were fewer fatal accidents in 1905 than in 1904, though the number of accidents had increased, the chief increase being probably due to the more general recognition of the fact that all serious accidents must be reported. The State Mining Engineer reported that the exigencies of work did not permit of strict insistence on a rule that no stopes should be higher than 10 feet above the filling, and that such a rule would undoubtedly hamper the mine in keeping up supplies of ore to the mill, and would largely increase the working cost; that to require by regulation that filling must be used in all mines involved the proposition that workings could not be maintained in safety by any other method—a contention which was quite untenable; that the practice that was safe in one place might not be permissible in an adjoining one. Seeing that most accidents occurred in stopes of low height, and knowing that stopes were worked up to a height of 100 feet, the hard-and-fast rule proposed in the amendment was not practicable. The statement of the mover that the management took an extra risk when getting towards the end of a stope of high-grade ore was merely suppositional. The amendment would obstruct progress, and be a blow to mining development.

MR. TAYLOR: Anyone hearing the last speaker could judge of his knowledge of mining. He said that the greater number of accidents occurred where stopes were low, and that some stopes could safely be left open for 100ft., presumably with no filling and little timber. According to that argument, the more ground left open, the safer the workers. A company which did not use mullock in a high stope would not buy timber.

MR. GULL: That would not apply to big mines.

MR. TAYLOR: The interjector exposed his ignorance. Repeated complaints were made against big mines for using cyanide tailings for mullocking up, thus endangering the health of the men, as appeared by the report of the Royal Commission on the Ventilation of Mines. Any manager who would work a mine with a stope 100ft. high should be taken up for attempted murder. What safety was there in timbering up? Timber was scarce on many mining camps. [MR. HOLMAN: And dearer than men.] The number of accidents amply justified the statement that timber was dearer than men. There was a marked difference between the attitude of the Minister to-night and his attitude on the last occasion when the clause was under discussion. On the last occasion, the Minister desired to place the responsibility on the management, but presumably the Minister had in the meantime been advised upon the point by the Chamber of Mines, and now desired the responsibility to be placed on the inspectors. Probably the Minister had received a severe chastisement from the Chamber

of Mines for adopting his previous attitude. In view of the lobbying that had been indulged in, it was fair to say so. What would the present Ministry say if they were in Opposition, had members of the Labour Party, being in power, brought secretaries of labour organisations into the dining room of the House during a debate on a subject in which workmen were interested? The present Ministers had secretaries of the Chamber of Mines and the Chamber of Commerce dining in this House during the debate on this Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: What had this to do with the clause?

MR. TAYLOR: The Bill, in a large measure, was moulded by that class of individual.

THE MINISTER: That was absolutely untrue.

MR. HOLMAN: Was the Minister allowed to make that statement? On other occasions members saying that a statement was absolutely untrue had been called to order. The Minister should withdraw.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the Minister referred to the remark of the hon. member, the statement should be withdrawn.

THE MINISTER withdrew.

MR. TAYLOR: Ministers invited secretaries of the Chamber of Mines to dine with them.

THE CHAIRMAN: How did this affect the clause?

MR. TAYLOR: It was from that source that these regulations were in the Bill. We would not have had the Bill if it were not for these meetings. It was talked of all over Perth that half of this legislation emanated from the Palace Hotel; in fact, he (Mr. Taylor) thought of going to board at that hotel in order to get in the "know" and so as to be able to enlighten his fellow-members two or three months beforehand as to what legislation would be brought down. It was idle saying that the first consideration of the employer was the health and safety of the employee. What had been the cause of all the big fights in the Legistive halls of the English speaking countries but the interests of those employed? We had in the early days most humane employers standing up in the House of Commons and even in the House of Lords in the interests of the employees. Lord Shaftsbury year after year fought to stop the employment of children in mines; but employers were no better to-day than they were in days past. Competition brought about this state of affairs. Any humane manager must do as his neighbours did; must make his dividends as high as he possibly could in the interests of holding his position as manager; and must cut down working expenses which, in many cases, meant the neglecting of the safety of those working underground in the mine.

THE MINISTER: Would the hon. member tell the House why he was so silent in 1904 when the same clause was before the House?

MR. TAYLOR: When the Mines Regulation Bill was under discussion in 1904, there was no necessity for him (Mr. Taylor) to speak upon the subject. It was a better measure than this. This measure was taken from it, but the best part of the previous measure, that in the interests of the workers, was left out. The Minister knew that his (Mr. Taylor's) advocacy was not required when the previous measure was being discussed, because the Bill was in the hands of a Minister adequately capable of piloting it through Committee; but now that the Labour party was so small, it became necessary for him, as a goldfields representative, to raise his voice and try to point out to members not possessing a knowledge of mining affairs how this clause would affect the safety of men working in mines. All members were agreed that this should not be treated as a party question.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: One gave the member for Ivanhoe credit for being influenced solely by a desire to promote the safety of miners; but the question was whether the amendment would tend to that desirable result. One could not live on the goldfields for a few years without knowing that there was the greatest possible variance in the legitimate height to which stopes could be carried in different mines. If the ground was good standing ground, the stope could be carried to a height which in other cases would be absolutely dangerous at

a very much lower height. Where the vein was narrow and the ground hard, the stope could be carried probably 30 or 40 feet high, without the same risk as where the stope was 7ft. or 8ft high in bad ground.

MR. SCADDAN: What was the advantage of carrying it that height?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL was not arguing as to the advantage of carrying it that height, but he wished to show that a general rule would be practically inoperative and of no avail in a number of instances. What the Minister said was this. The true position to take up was to give control to those placed in authority to fix for each particular mine the height to which stopes should be carried. If a mine had bad ground, let the height be fixed at less than 12 feet; if on the other hand the ground was beyond question good standing ground, there was no risk in carrying the stope higher than 12 feet.

MR. SCADDAN: There was always a risk.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Of course there was a risk in a stope six feet or seven feet high. The member had referred to an accident which occurred only lately, and what was the height of the stope in that case? only six feet. No matter what the height, there was a risk, and the greater the height the risk would be greater in the same ground. The advice given by the Minister was absolutely sound, when he said the proper procedure was to give ample powers to those placed in authority to dictate to those who had the management of mines what was to be the ligitimate height for carrying stopes in a particular mine. If that were adopted we eliminated the danger in allowing too excessive a height in a dangerous mine, and avoided interfering unduly where the ground was safe. It had been said the Minister had changed his ground in asking that the responsibility be placed in the hands of the inspectors of mines. The Minister had not taken up that position; he had asked that power be given to inspectors of mines, and that the responsibility should rest with the manager. To adopt the methods suggested by the member for Ivanhoe, so far from leading to the largest measure of safety, would by the mere fact of making a statutory limit, make a dangerous element in a mine. We should suggest no height, but leave it open, and say it should be decided by the man on the spot. The inspectors of mines were men carefully selected for these duties, and he was prepared to trust to an expression of opinion on their part rather than to an expression of opinion on the part of members.

MR. UNDERWOOD: There were members in the House who had had experience as managers. He had never had the responsibility of being a manager, but he had certainly had a couple of very narrow escapes from being killed; and he felt sure that a man who took risks and had narrow escapes was equally as well able to see where the danger was, as the man who took all the responsibility and remained on the top. It was essential for the safety of miners that a limit should be placed on the height of stopes. He would not say that 12 feet should be fixed as the height; it might be a foot or two more; but he urged on the Minister the desirability of fixing a height. It was said the inspector could examine the stopes, and if he found danger could stop work; but an inspector could not detect danger in a high stope, because there was a deal of ground he could not get near to inspect. The danger was not only of the reef or the lode falling, but there was danger of particles of the wall giving way. The chief danger in the high stopes was the flakes falling off the wall. The longer a stope was open the greater the danger. A stope might be safe this week but next week might become winded and come away. The most dangerous ground was the apparently safe ground. But where ground was known to be dangerous inspectors could see that it was properly mullocked up. There was no great cost in keeping a stope mullocked up. It was impossible for an inspector to fairly examine stopes 50 feet high, much less 100 feet high. If an inspector got up 12 or 15 feet and thoroughly examined a stope he was doing very well indeed.

MR. HOLMAN: The Minister had stated that he was willing to take advice

tendered by members, but it seemed that the only advice he was willing to take was that offered by the Chamber of Mines; not one suggestion of importance put forward by the workers had been accepted by the Minister. It would be foolish for anyone to say that stopes in all mines were similar. This measure was brought forward, not to encourage in a direct way the mining industry but to protect the lives of those engaged in the industry, and he did not see why the Minister should be so unreasonable as to refuse to accept suggestions made by members on the Opposition side. Some provision should be made to limit the height to which stopes should be worked. If we made provision in this Bill we should be able to take action against the mining companies, and compel them to see that their stopes were kept safe. At Broken Hill there was no stope of a greater height than six or seven feet, because as soon as they reached that height timber was put in. A somewhat similar system should be adopted in the big mines on the Belt. The Minister had said that no member on that (Opposition) side of the House had had any practical experience as regarded mining. It was, however, a great pity that some members on the Government side had not had the same experience as had some on the Opposition side. Several members on the Opposition side had been brought up in mining from boyhood. He himself managed mines in Western Australia over ten years ago, and could show his credentials. He had worked in the Great Fingall Mine 11 or 12 years ago, and he put in the first hundred feet of timber in the main shaft. His work had stood the test of time. Where there was any doubt as to the safety of the mine the manager should be compelled to keep his stopes timbered up. We heard of an accident last week at Kalgoorlie where a man lost his life owing to the fact that he was compelled to work in a stope not safe. The Minister appeared quite willing to admit every recommendation made by the Chamber of Mines, but not one suggestion made by workers in mines had been adopted and brought forward by the hon. gentleman. How was it possible for an inspector on the Murchison who had to travel 2,000 miles in a buggy and a thousand miles by train to satisfactorily carry out the necessary work?

MR. GULL: The men in charge of the mines were as competent to give a sound and good opinion as were members on the Opposition side of the House. He regretted that there should be always this one upbraiding from the Opposition side that the Minister was being guided solely by the views of the Chamber of Mines.

MR. HOLMAN: That was beyond all doubt.

MR. GULL: Such was not his opinion.

MR. HOLMAN: The Minister had not accepted one suggestion of the workers.

MR. GULL: That was a mistaken idea. The last time the Bill was before the Committee amendment after amendment by the member for Ivanhoe was accepted by the Minister, and agreed to by both sides.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Opposition members wanted the Government to be guided entirely by the unions.

MR. GULL: From experience he knew that the ground in one mine was very different from that in another, and he had come to the conclusion that the placing of the fullest power in the hands of inspectors would meet the case. He admitted that inspectors had a great many more mines to look after than they could possibly attend to properly, and if necessary farther inspectors should be appointed, but we should leave to the inspectors the power to say whether the stopes were dangerous or not. He could not see why members on the Opposition side of the House should almost throw out the suggestion that mine managers liked to see accidents now and again. That was the suggestion thrown out, that they were going to do all sorts of things, that they were going to force men to go into a dangerous stope. [MEMBER: They had done so.] He did not think they had. Where accidents had happened they had been purely unforeseen, and it should be borne in mind that mining was a dangerous occupation.

MR. HEITMANN: Accidents should be provided against.

MR. GULL: He regretted the amount of ground left open. It depended a good

deal upon the size of the lode. In many cases they had not the filling.

MR. JOHNSON: The main reason he had for desiring to see the height of stopes limited was that he did not think it possible to expect inspectors of mines to visit all the stopes and decide when a stope became dangerous. A stope might be perfectly safe to-day and unsafe to-morrow, and the inspector could not visit the mine every day; yet the minister asked us to leave it to the inspector to say whether the stope was safe. The Minister maintained that according to the departmental report the majority of accidents occurred in stopes less than 12 feet high. That the report proved this was denied; but if it did, then the amendment was clearly necessary; for if accidents occurred when the men could reach the top of the stope, surely accidents were more likely when the stope was 12 feet high and the top out of reach. The Minister argued that because men were not killed in stopes 12 feet high we should not limit the height. According to the evidence of the shift boss, the unfortunate accident that occurred almost at the time when this clause was last under considera tion happened in a stope from 10 to 12 feet high. The deceased had expressed his dissatisfaction with the surroundings, and a few minutes afterwards he was killed.

MR. EDDY: That might have happened in a four feet stope.

MR. JOHNSON: But there the man could have examined and tested the ground. Men knew that if they refused to work in a dangerous place they would be sent up the shaft. It was idle to say that a miner who drew attention to unsafe ground was thanked by the manager and moved to a place of safety. Speak of this Bill to miners on the Hannan's Belt, and they would urge, first, that the height of stopes be limited, and second, that the contract system be put down. These were the two main causes of fatal accidents and partial disablements.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Again to-night it was said that the State Mining Engineer had a private interview with the Chamber of Mines in January last as to the height of stopes. Members forgot to state that the officer interviewed the Miners' Association also, the object being to have a proper understanding as to this clause. To say that the Bill was the outcome of suggestions by the Chamber of Mines was unfair. Last year he (the Minister) met the Chamber of Mines in conference, and the Miner's Association also. This year he again interviewed both sides, to hear their suggestions regarding the Bill which had then been drafted and was now before us. The Chamber of Mines asked for more amendments than the member for Ivanhoe (Mr. Scaddan) required. He (the Minister) had tried to stick closely to the Bill as drafted. The consistency of certain members opposite was admirable. Two years ago the Labour Government brought in and passed a similar Bill; and the then Minister for Mines said that instructions were not carried out because inspectors were unable to enforce them, though aware of the dangerous height of stopes The member for Ivanhoe was in the House at the time, and no argument for special legislation as to the height of stopes appeared in his speech.

MR. SCADDAN: That was not a consolidating measure like this Bill.

THE MINISTER: It was brought in to deal with this question. On that occasion also the member for Murchison (Mr. Holman) was significantly silent; and the member for Mount Margaret simply supported an amendment by him (Minister) providing fortnightly instead of monthly pays. The hon. member was then muzzled with a portfolio.

MR. HOLMAN: The Minister was now muzzled by the Chamber of Mines.

THE MINISTER: The statement was incorrect. He was fighting for the Bill he had brought in, and was not giving way to any amendments from either side if he and the departmental authorities thought them impracticable. The Government were more anxions than the member for Mount Margaret for the well-being of the men. To conserve this the Government had done something, and the hon. member nothing. The hon. member tried to mislead the House by saying that he (Minister) had shifted his position, and wished to-night to put

the responsibility on the inspector instead of on the manager. Nothing of the sort. The desire was to make the inspector responsible for inspecting; to make him do his duty. Two years ago, speaking on a similar Bill, he (Minister) held that the inspector had the necessary power; and under the existing Act, Rule 8, the inspector had the power, and prosecution should have followed disobedience to the inspector's instructions when he thought that certain stopes were too high and the mine dangerous. The rule provided that every drive and excavation of any kind, whether on the surface or underground, should be securely protected and made safe for persons employed therein. Clause 37 seemed clear enough; but if any member could suggest a means of making it clearer, he was prepared to adopt the suggestion. Two years ago he had stated that the inspector had the necessary power, but that we should provide that if the inspector considered any part of the mine dangerous he could close down that part of the mine; also that if the manager thought the inspector acted harshly, the inspector could be reported, and an inquiry would be held. We could give strong powers to the inspector, because it would be well known that if the inspector were unduly harassing the managers, and asking for impossible things, an inquiry could be made. From all the advice he (the Minister) could get on this amendment, he was assured it would be impracticable. In some cases an inspector might refuse to allow a stope to be more than 6 feet high, but in other mines conditions would vary. He was given to understand that drill holes were now bored to a depth of up to 9 feet, and that when an 8-feet face was being taken out it was necessary to have room for the machine drills. It must be remembered that when the Labour Government brought down a Mines Regulation Bill the Minister at that time presumed that it would suffice to give absolute power to the inspector. When that Bill was being discussed, considerable debate took place on the question of the height of stopes, and it was specially pointed out that provision was made that the inspector had power to close down a portion of the mine, while the manager could call for an arbitration, by which it could be ascertained whether the manager or the inspector was wrong. That power was provided in this Bill now before the Committee, and it was sufficient power. We should not put impracticable things in the Bill.

MR. COLLIER: Government members were just as anxious as Opposition members to preserve life, but Opposition members did not infer, as the member for Swan suggested, that mine managers were pleased at the frequency of accidents. Mine managers took all reasonable precautions to prevent accidents, but where stopes were carried to great heights it was impossible to ascertain whether they were safe or not. In a stope 18ft. or 20ft. high neither the inspector nor the manager could tell whether the roof was safe, as had been pointed out; and it was only when the roof was allowed to stand for some time that it became unsafe, because of the effect of the air upon it. If we limited the height of the stopes to 12ft., a man could pass along and tap the roof with a hammer, to see if it was "drummy." A roof only sounded drummy after it had been standing two or three weeks, but one could tell by tapping it whether it was likely to fall or not. Great quantities of fracteur were used in mining operations nowadays. Holes were bored up towards the roof, and it took a greater quantity of explosives to take the face out than if the holes were bored downwards. As greater quantities of fracteur were used in this way, it was natural that the explosions shattered the roof of the stope considerably, and the effect of the shattering was apparent after the roof had been standing for a few weeks. The Secretary of the Miners' Association last December sent word to the inspector of mines that complaints had been made with regard to the safety of a stope in the Oroya-Brown Hill mine, but the inspector was too busy to examine it. Three days afterwards a great body of stone fell from the roof and a man was killed. It was all very well to talk of responsibility, but what responsibility did any man take who was not endangering his life?

Managers would take all ordinary precautions, but the system of competition on mines to reduce working costs was such that a manager would not take any step that would unduly increase the cost of working his mine. The Minister talked of a case of baulky ground being encountered, and necessitating increasing the height of a stope beyond any limit fixed; but all laws would press harshly on some individual, and we must assume, as the Attorney General had suggested a few nights since, that the men administering the Act would use a reasonable amount of common sense.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Suppose an accident occurred, would not the manager be liable for manslaughter?

MR. COLLIER: As the Attorney General had pointed out, those administering the law would exercise a reasonable amount of common sense, and if a man were not killed the manager would be probably fined only a nominal sum. The Minister relied on Clause 37. That clause would meet the case if the Opposition had been successful in carrying the amendment for check inspectors, or if it were possible for an inspector to frequently visit a mine, but on the Eastern Goldfields an inspector might not visit a mine once in two or three months. The State Mining Engineer recommended one inspection every three months as sufficient. We all knew what might happen in large mines in the course of two or three months; a stope might be practically safe when the inspector visited the mine, but it might be unsafe the next week. If an inspector could frequently visit a mine then Clause 37 would meet the case.

MR. TROY: This measure was brought forward to better ensure the safety and protection of miners, and the fact that two years ago the measure brought forward did not go as far as we were attempting to go to-day was no argument why the amendment should not be accepted. The Minister held that the responsibility of seeing whether a stope was safe or not, and whether it was too high or not, should rest with the inspector; but an inspector was not always competent to judge. Inspectors had not been selected because of their great knowledge of mining matters: the majority of them were selected at a time when it was easy to secure such positions, and the knowledge which they possessed had been gained since they had become inspectors. There were some inspectors in the State in whom the miners had no confidence. There was one inspector on the North-Eastern Goldfields in whom the miners had every confidence—he was previously on the Murchison; but that feeling did not obtain in regard to every inspector. What was the use of placing the responsibility on inspectors when we could provide in the Bill that stopes should be a certain height? Then the responsibility would rest on no one. We could lay down a hard and fast rule providing against mistakes being made; the inspector would then know his duty, so would the manager. A great many accidents had occurred through the height of stopes, and although mining was an avocation which was very risky, there was no reason why we should not legislate to minimise that risk. He did not say that a manager liked to see men killed, but managers were compelled to compete with other mine managers and keep down the cost of production. It was in consequence of this that a manager compelled his employees to work in dangerous places, and if an employee did not work in these places then it was soon made known to him that he must go elsewhere. On one occasion at Cue, in a mine known as the Brilliant, a miner was blown up. There was a regulation providing that if a shot missed miners should not go down until a certain time had elapsed. The manager, in the case referred to, did not tell the man not to go down until a certain time elapsed, but by his action he implied that time should not be wasted, and in order to keep in with the manager and to hold his position the miner went down to the place sooner than he should have done, and was blown to pieces. At the inquiry the manager said that he did not tell the man to go down before the regulation time had elapsed, but he implied it, and the man saw that if he did not go down he would not be giving satisfaction. We were endeavouring to provide that responsibility should not rest on the manager or the inspector. We were not legislating alone for the

Coolgardie belt. An inspector on the Murchison, and at North Coolgardie, and Norseman did not visit a mine more than once in three or probably six months. Those portions of the State would be utterly neglected if the amendment were not adopted. If the amendment were adopted, in every portion of the State which could not be visited by an inspector the manager would know to what height the stopes could be worked, and he would not work them any higher. Members on the Government side of the House had been invited to dinner at the Palace Hotel by mining managers, and were filled with plenty of champagne and good things. Mr. Hamilton presided and made a speech, and that speech met with the commendations of all members present. This was a gross scandal, for had the heads of any unions come to Perth and entertained members on this (Opposition) side of the House and stated their wishes with regard to a certain matter, the members would not only have received the condemnation of the House but would have been very little thought of in the country.

MR. HEITMANN: In reading a few days ago the objections of the Chamber of Mines to certain amendments on the Notice Paper, he was rather surprised that they adduced not one argument against the amendment now before the Committee; and here to-night although the Minister had spoken twice he had not informed the Committee how the amendment would act against the interests of the mine-owners. In the most economically worked mines we found the stopes not higher than 12 feet or very rarely 12 feet. He was not bound to 12 feet, and would even go as high as 14, but in his opinion that would be sufficiently high for the economical working of any mine in Western Australia. As to leaving full discretionary powers to inspectors his experience had been that it had been impossible for an inspector to do his duty and attend to the mines as they should be attended to, especially seeing that, as had been pointed out, an inspector on the Murchison could not inspect many of the mines more than once in every two or three months. The adoption of this amendment would not increase the cost of mining in any way. In fact where a miner could get at his work handy, and where he could see what he was doing and could examine the backs without staging, the cost of stoping would be much less than was that of the stopes where one had to use ladders or stages of other descriptions. Again we saw empty benches on the Government side, though their proper occupants had promised to treat this as a non-party measure. Surely the fact that miners had for years asked that the height of stopes be limited should have some weight, even with members who had never been down a mine.

MR. SCADDAN would reply to some statements and misstatements made by members and by the Minister. The Minister's reading of a departmental report on this clause was misleading, and the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Eddy) stated in consequence that the majority of accidents occurred in stopes carried to a height of four feet. The return showed that the height of the stope was "four feet above man's head." That would be a 10ft. stope. In another place the return stated that the stage was 5ft. 6in. from roof. The height of the stope was not mentioned. It might have been 35ft. The return was absolutely useless. Few stopes in the Kalgoorlie field were carried to four feet only. The return in most cases did not show the height of stope; hence it did not show how many accidents happened in stopes carried beyond 12ft. The return seemed to have been prepared by a boy clerk ignorant of mining. It showed 17 accidents in stopes during 1905 in the Kalgoorlie district, and for eight months of 1906 17 accidents, with four months yet to go, showing that accidents were increasing. To this must be added the two accidents last week. In 1905 only 12 accidents in stopes happened throughout the rest of the State, showing an undue percentage on the Kalgoorlie field, where sufficient regard was not paid to the welfare of the men. In New Zealand, under an effective Act, the death rate per thousand in 1905 was 1·35 of men employed, and in Western Australia it was 2·02. In 1905 the number of serious accidents per thousand was in New Zealand 1·27 and in this State 16·03. As our mines were so rich, surely the men should be protected.

Apart from shafts, stopes were probably the most dangerous places in a mine. Men would not complain to an inspector that a stope was too high; and no sane man would expect them to do so. The management could easily trace the information.

THE MINISTER: Not if it came through the secretary of the association.

MR. SCADDAN: Undoubtedly. If a miner reported to the secretary that a certain stope was unsafe, the secretary would inform the inspector, who would probably go immediately to the mine to inspect the stope; and the mine authorities would conclude that the men working in the stope must have given him the information.

THE MINISTER: Would the men be dismissed for that?

MR. BATH: Recently at Davyhurst he saw a case in point.

MR. SCADDAN: A letter received by him from Kalgoorlie last week showed that a man employed on one of the big mines received orders to put up a rise from the 250ft. level to the 200ft. level; but as he was to work alone, he did not think it good enough and complained to the underground manager, and the underground manager replied, "All right, there are plenty of men who will do it." That young man was six weeks out of work, and on applying again at the mine for work was told that it was no use his looking for work there, as he would not get a job on the mine again. This showed that if a miner often complained that a place was dangerous, he would get his time. The Minister remarked that Opposition members had not been so prone to discuss the Bill brought down by the Labour Government. The Minister would remember that he (Mr. Scaddan) on that occasion remarked that inspectors were not doing their duty, and of the Opposition, took him to task that the present Minister, then a member for saying so, and said that inspectors should be dismissed if they were not carrying out their duty. However, the Minister afterwards concurred with the inspectors when they pointed out the reason for not paying surprise visits. The Attorney General, on his own confession, had not any practical knowledge of mining, and the hon. member had not even read the amendment before opposing it. The amendment did not make it a hard and fast rule that stopes should be 12ft. in height. A lesser height was provided for if necessary. The Miners' Association had asked that the height should be fixed at 10 feet. Also in regard to the taunt of the Minister for Mines, when the consolidating Bill was brought down by the Labour Minister for Mines he (Mr. Scaddan) on the second reading made reference to the necessity for providing for the height of stopes, for boxes in rises, for testing ropes, for ventilation, the introduction of special rules, and for the provision of pent houses; he was just as anxious, sitting behind the Labour Minister, to make the Bill effective as he was to make this Bill effective. The member for Swan asserted that the Minister had accepted amendment after amendment from him (Mr. Scaddan); but the amendments the Minister accepted were not of vital importance and were really in many cases only verbal, inserting a word here and there. The Minister had not agreed to the amendment with regard to check inspectors, nor with regard to the provision for notice when again commencing operations in abandoned mines. The Minister accepted a modification of the clause dealing with the engine-drivers, which he stated was his desire, but the clause was not drafted as he intended it to be. Dealing with the proposal for persons firing out a lode, the Minister opposed the amendment and it was not accepted. As to the compulsory testing of cages, the Minister did not accept the proposal brought forward. The essential points that had been proposed by him (Mr. Scaddan) the Minister had opposed. Now, dealing with the height of stopes, which was the most vital point in the Bill, the Minister was opposing that. One would just as well see the Bill withdrawn as that it should go through without limiting the height of stopes. The Minister depended on Clause 37, which compelled an inspector to see that the workings in any part of a mine were not dangerous. That did not meet the case, for a stope could be carried to any height until such time as the inspector arrived and told the men to cease working. Then he could bring the limit of the stope to 10 feet, but after that the management could continue to

carry the stope to its original height until the inspector visited the mine again. The journal of the Chamber of Mines stated that the mine managers had been negotiating with the Mines Department for months in connection with the height of stopes, but that they had not been able to come to any agreement. It was useless to permit the question to be passed aside on the assumption that some agreement was to be come to. If we stated in the Bill that the maximum height of stopes was to be 12 feet, should any accident occur or the inspector arrive on a mine and find the stope had been carried to a greater height than 12 feet, he could take proceedings against the manager. An inspector only visited the big mines twice in the year. As to the Minister stating that in using rock drills more than two feet were required, it was very rarely that men stoped directly over their heads. If they went higher than nine feet they had to rig a staging. He (Mr. Scaddan) had seen ground which to all appearances was safe, and sounded safe, but the next moment a fall had occurred through a soapy heading. No reason had been advanced against limiting the height to a maximum of 12 feet, and he asked the Minister to give a 12-months trial to the proposal and see how it worked out in practice.

MR. BARNETT: Having listened to the arguments on both sides he had decided to support the amendment.

MR. TAYLOR: Having heard the statement by the member for Ivanhoe with reference to mines being visited only twice a year on the Golden Mile, that must show members that some limit in the height of stopes should be fixed. Of course the visits of inspectors were frequent, but an inspector could not thoroughly inspect a mine more than twice a year. It was surprising to hear the Minister say that in the Kalgurli mine there was a stope over 100 feet high. The scrip of that mine was higher on the market than that of any other mine in Western Australia. There must be some object in carrying the stope to the height it was carried. No argument had been advanced sufficiently strong to support the Minister's contention. The limitation of 12 feet might perhaps work a hardship in some parts of the State; but a limit should be placed on the height of stopes.

MR. HOLMAN: The Minister and also the Press had stated that members on the Opposition side praised the measure when it was introduced. He (Mr. Holman) to-night denied that. As regarded himself, the member for Ivanhoe, and other members, the measure was not praised at all. The only thing said was that they were glad the measure was brought down so early, and when it was in Committee they would do everything possible to turn it out a decent Bill. The Bill introduced two years ago was brought forward for a special purpose, and experience had shown that it was not sufficient.

Amendment (Mr. Scaddan's) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	14
Noes	...	...	19
Majority against		...	5

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Barnett	Mr. Brebber
Mr. Bath	Mr. Brown
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Carson
Mr. Collier	Mr. Davies
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Eddy
Mr. Holman	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Scaddan	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Smith	Mr. Gull
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Underwood	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Walker	Mr. Layman
Mr. Ware	Mr. McLarty
Mr. Troy (*Teller*).	Mr. Male
	Mr. Mitchell
	Mr. Price
	Mr. Stone
	Mr. Veryard
	Mr. Hardwick (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

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