

The Colonial Secretary: It is in the present Act.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: If it is, and I take the hon. member's word for it, I am not going to repeat, by giving my vote again, a farce and a blunder by agreeing to a piece of unnecessary legislation which is unfair in its consequence. It penalises the municipal tramway men at Fremantle, but lets the Government tramway men in Perth go scot-free. It puts the local authorities to the expense of issuing licenses which in all probability will exceed what the Government derive from them. With these few observations I may say I think the Bill is an excellent one, and I shall have much pleasure in assisting the Government to get it on the statute-book.

On motion by Hon. C. A. Piesse debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 5.53 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 25th September, 1913.*

	PAGE-
Papers presented	1391
Questions: Water Supplies, Malyalling Siding,	
Yillimining-Kondinin district	1391
State Hotel, Wongan Hills	1391
Railway construction, Wagin westward	1391
Fremantle Harbour, Shipping wheat	1392
Select Committee, Case of E. H. Hamel, report	
presented	1392
Bills: Fremantle Improvement, Message	1393
Supply (Temporary Advances) £223,145,	
returned	1393
Mines Regulation, Com.	1393

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

### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Mines: 1, Regulations under The Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1902—Amendment to general rule 12. 2, Regulations under The Mining Act, 1904—Amendments to Nos. 73 and 160.

### QUESTIONS (2)—WATER SUPPLIES.

#### *Malyalling Siding.*

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Works: What steps are being taken by the Water Supply Department for the provision before the coming harvest of a water supply at Malyalling Siding, on the Wickepin-Merredin Railway?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: This will receive consideration in conjunction with all other water supplies along the Wickepin-Merredin railway.

#### *Yillimining-Kondinin District.*

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is the Water Supply Department aware of the urgent necessity for the provision of permanent water supplies at each of the various approved sidings along the Yillimining-Kondinin railway, for the use of the settlers who will be carting their wheat to the said sidings in three months' time. 2, If so, what action is being taken in the matter?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1 and 2, Yes, and it will be considered in accordance with its relative importance to the other numerous and urgent works throughout the State.

### QUESTION—STATE HOTEL, WONGAN HILLS.

Mr. LAYMAN (for Hon. H. B. Le-froy) asked the Premier: 1, When do the Government intend to establish a State hotel at Wongan Hills in accordance with promises made to that effect? 2, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Premier) replied: 1 and 2, Some necessary inquiries are now being made, and the Government will announce their decision as early as possible.

### QUESTION—RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, WAGIN WESTWARD.

Mr. S. STUBBS asked the Minister for Works: In view of the fact that a Bill for the construction of the Wagin westward

line has been passed through Parliament and that a sum of £28,000 has been on the Estimates for a number of years past for the construction of this work, will he inform the House—1, What lines do the Government intend to complete before the Wagin west is undertaken? 2, At what date does he consider this work will commence?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, It is not necessary that all lines should be completed before Wagin-Bowelling is started. 2, The next line to be commenced is the Wyalcatchem-Mt. Marshall, the Wagin-Bowelling and Boltgart extension being next in order. It is impossible at this stage to fix a definite date for starting.

#### QUESTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR, SHIPPING WHEAT.

Mr. CARPENTER asked the Premier: In view of the anticipated large increase in the quantity of wheat for export during the coming season, what additional provision has been made for shipping wheat at the Fremantle harbour?

The MINISTER FOR MINES (for the Premier) replied: The Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners are making all necessary arrangements to handle the harvest. Additional handling machinery is being built, comprising two gantries and two portable conveyors, and 600 feet of new berthing space is being provided.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE. CASE OF E. H. HAMEL.

*Report presented.*

Mr. LANDER brought up the report of the select committee appointed to inquire into the removal of Edward H. Hamel from the public service of the State.

Report received.

Mr. LANDER moved—

*That the report be read.*

Motion passed; report read.

Mr. LANDER (East Perth) moved—

*That the report be printed.*

Mr. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): There was no necessity to print the report, unless the hon. member desired that it should be further discussed. If there was to be no further discussion it would be absurd to go to the expense of printing the finding of the committee, whose inquiry undoubtedly had been most exhaustive. Unless some good reason was shown for printing the report he would oppose the motion.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS (Subiaco): The committee had gone very exhaustively into the matter, and were absolutely unanimous in their finding. There was no special desire to have the report printed.

Mr. LEWIS (Canning): Since the appointment of the select committee he had received nine or ten applications from public servants for further select committees to inquire into the grievances of those individuals. Some of those grievances were of 15 or 20 years' standing. It had been urged upon him that as the member for East Perth had obtained a select committee to inquire into Mr. Hamel's case he (Mr. Lewis) ought to be able to obtain select committees for these later applicants. In some instances these applicants had been before duly constituted appeal boards, and their cases were dismissed. He would oppose the motion.

Mr. MUNSIE (Hannans): If the motion were agreed to and the report printed, the report would receive a wider distribution, and would in all probability serve to discourage further applications from civil servants for select committees. The report would not reach the public unless it were printed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion was that the report be printed. Discussion could not be allowed on the merits of the case one way or the other. The Clerk had informed him that the evidence was already in type, and that this had been done in accordance with the usual custom.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): It was unnecessary to print the report. Civil servants had sufficient courts of appeal without coming to Parliament. We had made a mistake in appointing a select committee in this case, and so had in-

curred unnecessary expense. Even if the evidence was in type the paper was still clean, and in his opinion the clean paper was worth more than the case.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington): The duly constituted appeal courts open to civil servants ought to be quite sufficient, without their grievances having to be brought to Parliament. He would oppose the printing of the report, because if it were printed it would bring along a crop of other matters which would interfere with the business of the country.

Mr. FOLEY (Mount Leonora): On the understanding that the gentleman most concerned would receive a copy of the report he (Mr. Foley) would oppose the printing of the report. The very fact that Mr. Hamel was to have a copy of the report at his disposal was sufficient guarantee that it would get publicity. It was quite unnecessary to go to the expense of printing the report. The extravagance of printing these reports of unworthy cases would militate against the good government of the State.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): When the House appointed a select committee and that select committee carried out its duties faithfully and brought in a report, in deference to the committee we ought to print that report and have it placed on the records and proceedings of Parliament. He did not remember any report of a select committee being rejected during his time, nor did he remember any report not being printed. The chairman of the committee brought in the report and it should be treated with due respect. We should be doing wrong in not printing it. Seeing that the evidence was already in type there would not be much saving. We should have the report on the records so that we could turn it up at any time and see the résumé of the extraordinary career that had been read out this afternoon. The report should be printed and allowed to become a record of the proceedings.

Mr. HARPER (Pingelly): If the report was printed it would stand as an example to other dismissed civil servants who asked for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into their cases.

The decision of the select committee was unanimous, and as five members of the House had devoted a large amount of time and had brought in a report which was a unanimous decision, it was sufficiently important that it should be printed.

Question put and passed.

#### BILL—FREMANTLE IMPROVEMENT.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending the Bill.

#### BILL—SUPPLY (TEMPORARY ADVANCES) £223,145.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### BILL—MINES REGULATION.

##### *In Committee.*

Resumed from 18th September: Mr. McDowall in the Chair, the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

Clause 35—General rules—[Hon. Frank Wilson had moved an amendment that in line 4 of Subclause 13 the word "forty" be struck out and "sixty" inserted in lieu]:

Mr. HARPER: It was to be hoped the amendment would be carried. Even 60 feet in his opinion was too limited. The subclause should be deleted as it was too far-reaching. How were we to get on with new mines owned by men of small capital if the owner had to go to the expense of providing timber and guides in the shaft? In hard ground he had known timber within 60 feet of a shot that was fired being damaged and the workings rendered unsafe. He had worked in a number of shafts where there were no guides or timber for 200 or 300 feet deep.

The Minister for Mines: Where?

Mr. HARPER: In Broken Hill. In Western Australia he had worked in mines where there was no timber in the shaft for 200 feet. When small mines were in the prospecting stage and some depth had to be sunk, and when these

mines were long distances from a railway, with no facilities for getting timber, it would be a serious matter indeed to make the owners timber the shaft. Mines in out-of-the-way places should not be subject to these conditions.

Mr. HEITMANN: If men have to go down a shaft there should be something to secure it.

Mr. HARPER: There were many places where trial shafts were sunk and it was not fair to expect these shafts to be timbered. Some time ago in Cobar, New South Wales, a shaft was sunk 300 feet and no timber used. If the owners had had to timber the shaft the prospectors would never have sunk the shaft. The conditions could be made so stringent that we might prevent the industry from being carried on. This was a far-reaching requirement, especially for mines in the prospecting stages.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: From information derived from practical mine managers there would be no extra safety by reducing the height. There would be no further safety for the men and in certain ground the risk of accident would be increased. There was a danger of shattering the timber and—

Mr. HEITMANN: By the same token you should have no timber at all.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The question was how far the timber could be safely carried down. Why did not the hon. member for Cue suggest that it should be carried right to the bottom?

Mr. HEITMANN: It is not necessary.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Because it was impracticable. Directly the shots were fired the timber and everything else would be smashed, and would have to be replaced after every firing. It was impracticable to reduce the height. It would mean that shafts could be sunk only twenty feet before the timber would have to be carried down, and then the timber would be within twenty feet of where the shots were being fired and the guides would be shattered.

Mr. HEITMANN: They timber down to within six feet in many instances.

Mr. HARPER: In certain ground.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member might show how it would be of any benefit to the industry and the men employed in it. The hon. member for Pingelly pointed out that it would be detrimental and would injure the small man. Members on the Government side posed as champions of the prospectors and yet they would put an unnecessary burden on them.

Mr. FOLEY: The reduced height would provide more safety for men working in the shaft, and no bar which did not exist at present would be placed on the industry. The hon. member for Pingelly said he had worked in shafts where there was 300 feet without timber and the only means of exit was a straight ladder. There was no such thing as safety where a man had to climb 300 feet of straight ladder.

Mr. Harper: I did not argue that from the point of view of safety.

Mr. FOLEY: And there was no such thing as safety where chain ladders were concerned. If a man had to ascend sixty feet of chain ladder he would be no safer than if there was no ladder at all. It would be almost impossible to reach a point of safety on account of the chain ladder swinging about. Usually small prospectors did not use machinery with which to raise or lower the men. The guides in the shaft were for steadying the bucket, and it was better to have the steadying guides within forty feet than sixty feet from the bottom. In most shafts there was a monkey which worked in between the skids, not to prevent damage to the timber, but to steady the bucket on which the men rode. When a shaft had been fired out, the men had to work under the mullock or ore which was being sent up in the bucket. A man when riding on a bucket had a chance to steady it, but when mullock was being sent up there was nothing to steady it, and the fact of it being steadied from a height of forty feet instead of sixty feet was important.

Mr. HARPER: When Mr. Greenard was Inspector of Mines in the Davyhurst district, timber was put in to sixty feet and it was blown out.

Mr. Foley: You know it is within ten feet sometimes.

Mr. HARPER: It all depended on the character of the ground. Forty feet should be the minimum instead of the maximum. It was impossible to timber with any degree of good workmanship unless it was done in ten or twelve feet sections, and if forty feet was made the maximum, a twelve foot section below that would bring the timber to within 28 feet of the bottom, and much of the ground in this State would not stand timber at 60 feet and much less at 28 feet from the bottom.

Mr. Heitmann: What nonsense.

Mr. Foley: You know they timber down to 28 feet.

Mr. HARPER: Yes, but it depended upon the character of the ground and of the charges used. If the centre of the timber was broken there was little to support it, and it had to be taken out before the men could go below. This was a matter which should rest with the manager and inspector.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	13
Noes	..	..	..	2
Majority against				9

#### AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Moore
Mr. Broun	Mr. Nanson
Mr. George	Mr. A. E. Piesse
Mr. Harper	Mr. A. N. Piesse
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Male	Mr. Layman
Mr. Monger	(Teller).

#### NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Foley	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Green	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Lander	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Lewis	(Teller).
Mr. McDonald	

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. FRANK WILSON moved a further amendment—

*That all the words after "shaft" in line 5 be struck out.*

These words were—"and there shall be provided and used efficient means and appliances for steadying the load by means of such guides." There was no wish on his part to infer that those interested in mining did not want to provide efficient means and appliances. They always did that for their own sakes, but it was an undoubted fact that the use of monkeys or spiders often was a source of danger. They did not always run quickly in a shaft. They sometimes stuck and were apt to fall and do serious injury to those working at the bottom of the shaft. The men themselves objected to them. They would rather be free of the monkey or the spider. If the words were struck out of the paragraph others might be inserted. For instance, the Minister might provide that these efficient means and appliances might be provided when the men demanded them. Why make it mandatory when we knew the men regarded them as objectionable? We were binding our district inspectors far too tightly, fixing things by Act of Parliament rather than leaving them to the discretionary powers of the inspectors. If we went to the full extremes we would stop the whole industry.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It was true that a good deal of discretion should be allowed to the inspectors with regard to matters of this kind, but he would repeat what he had already pointed out, that the whole of these rules which the Committee were now dealing with were subject, as was stated at the beginning of Clause 35, to what might be reasonably practicable. The point arose in connection with the arguments used by the member for Pingelly where exceptionally hard ground would shoot out timber, but there again as with all of these rules the inspector would use his judgment as to whether it would be reasonably practicable to insist on timber going down on every occasion to the bottom of the shaft. The amendment of the leader of the Opposition, whilst it was on the face of it reasonable, was very unusual, because it

would be quite an innovation for us to start legislating in a direction which would say that we would give certain things, provided that the persons concerned asked for them. We would alter the whole course and trend of our legislation if we were going to say that we would give certain things provided the persons concerned asked for them. We might say with regard to the fixing of a minimum wage, provided the employee was satisfied to work for less, we would let him do so.

Hon. Frank Wilson: So you should; there is no question about that.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Perhaps that was the view the hon. member took, but present day thought was against him. It had been recognised that employees wanted protection against themselves very often, and men took unnecessary risks.

Mr. Harper: That is absolutely right.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We required to protect them against themselves sometimes, not only in regard to mining but in connection with other callings. This was not one of those matters which should be left to the discretion of the men to ask for. It had been argued that there was danger in a provision of this kind when the monkey might hang up and cause an accident, but very few had occurred. The member for Hannans had referred to one instance.

Mr. Munsie: One I know of proved fatal.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That was the only case known. The State Mining Engineer was in favour of a provision of this kind.

Hon. Frank Wilson: And to his opinion you do not attach much weight.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It all depended upon what the question was. With regard to some of these clauses he (the Minister for Mines) attached considerable weight to the opinion of the State Mining Engineer, and on this question, that officer's opinion was that the advantages would outweigh the disadvantage.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There was no suggestion that we should ascertain the

opinion of the men, but we should lay it down that if men working at the bottom of a shaft should ask for a monkey, if they thought it would be a convenience to them, and was not increasing the risk, it might be provided. Why should we insist upon it if the men thought that its provision would be increasing the risk?

Mr. Heitmann: Most of these have been provided for years past.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: But we need not blindly follow past legislation. If we saw a defect we should point it out. He was voicing the opinions of practical men who had spent their lives in controlling the mining industry.

Mr. HARPER: The matter of monkeys or guides in a shaft was a very debatable one. There were cases where monkeys had been put in and had to be taken out because they were not working satisfactorily. In regard to monkeys it was difficult to decide whether they were a source of danger or of safety. When a cage dropped away the safety catches gripped the skids, but if a monkey, which just moved up and down on skids, broke away there was nothing to hold it. Everything depended on the conditions prevailing in a shaft and how the men used the monkeys. This matter was one which should be left to the men in charge of the work. Hon. members would see how dangerous it was for defective skids in a shaft to have a monkey skidding up and down on a rope.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. FRANK WILSON moved an amendment—

*That in Paragraph (b) of Subclause 15 the words "unless exempted in writing by the Minister as being impracticable in the circumstances of the case" be struck out, and "when required by the district inspector" be inserted in lieu.*

Little argument was required to show that this power should be left in the hands of the district inspector. It should not be necessary to go to the Minister to get exemption. The decision should be left to the expert on the ground, who could judge as to the necessity for exemption from this rule. After this amendment was dealt

with he proposed to move a further amendment, the effect of which would be that signals from the surface should not necessarily be carried right down to the bottom. One could not have the return signals carried to the bottom of the shaft where firing was taking place.

Mr. FOLEY: The desire of the leader of the Opposition that this power should be left in the hands of the inspector was really provided for in the clause as printed, with the exception that the responsibility, instead of being placed on the inspector or the Minister, or the head office in Perth, or those in charge of one little portion of the mine, would be thrown on the mine owner himself. In a big mine it was absolutely essential for the safety of the men working that every level should have means of communication to the brace and thence to the engine room.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I am not arguing against that.

Mr. FOLEY: The hon. member was arguing against return signals from the bottom of the shaft. Where men were firing and their lives were in the hands of one who did not know and had no means of guessing what they were doing, and who had to depend solely on the signals in order to safeguard the lives of men working in the bottom, no rule was too strict to place on the owner of a mine in order to ensure that the men's lives were safeguarded. The subclause provided that the Minister in writing might exempt certain shafts in certain mines. The Minister himself did not see every shaft or the means of communication over which he was giving exemption. The Government representative in the district would report to the Minister and in 99 cases out of 100 it would be the opinion of the inspector that the Minister would be backing up in writing. The mine owners wished to throw the responsibility off themselves on to the inspector, and through the inspector on to the Minister. If the people who owned the mine considered it impracticable or unnecessary to have this rule operating in their mine, all they had to do was to report through the inspector to the Minister and the Minister

might then exempt them from conforming to this rule. If the inspector refused to report they could have their case adjudicated upon by the Mines Regulation Board.

Mr. Harper: Would the Minister state what method of signalling he proposed to have from the surface to the bottom of the shaft?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: This was an important matter in regard to which exemption should only be given by the Minister in writing. There were many cases in which the inspector was not given power to give approval to various matters without consulting the head office. In the first place it was essential that in a matter so important as signalling there should be something like uniformity of action. Some inspectors might not regard it so importantly as others, and we might have one inspector permitting one thing in a particular mine and another inspector insisting upon something quite different or more stringent in another mine, and it was to secure something like uniformity of decisions that it was desired this matter should be submitted to the head office. After all, exemption by the Minister in many cases would mean exemption by the State Mining Engineer, on whose recommendation the Minister would act. The same thing applied to the granting of exemptions from engine-drivers' certificates. It might be argued that the inspectors should be allowed to grant exemptions for small winding plants, but they could not do so. The inspector reported and made a recommendation to the head office and that was dealt with by the State Mining Engineer. So also, in the case of signalling, it was essential that the head office should know exactly all the exemptions given under this subclause. For that reason the State Mining Engineer thought that it would lead to the more convenient working of the office if the exemptions were to go through the head office, so that the department would know the districts and mines where exemption had been granted, and keep a proper record. The subclause threw upon the management the obligation of getting ex-

emption. If the amendment was carried it would not be necessary for the management to get exemption, as it would then be necessary to have proper signals only when instructed by the district inspector. The subclause provided for a proper means of communicating distinct and definite signals. It would be impracticable to have the same set of signals to the bottom of the shaft as to the levels. It was not intended to have the same.

Hon. Frank Wilson: They must.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The subclause did not say that the same set of signals should apply to the bottom as to the levels. It stipulated a proper means approved by the inspector and it would be for the inspector to decide what would constitute proper signals.

Hon. Frank Wilson: If you were sinking a shaft you would have to carry the same system right down.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It would have to be a system approved by the inspector and it would be for the inspector to decide what would be practicable. Where men were working in the bottom of a shaft it was impossible to be too careful in regard to signals and in providing safeguards against the possibility of accidents. There was nothing in the subclause which was not practicable and essential to the safety of all concerned.

Mr. HARPER: This subclause provided an example of the difficulty of getting a draftsman who understood the technical points of mining. The subclause provided that definite signals must be carried down to the bottom of the shaft. What sort of signals could be carried down other than by word of mouth?

Mr. Foley: Do you think it right to have that sort?

Mr. HARPER: What other signals could be adopted? It was easy enough for the men who were below to indicate by knocking that they were about to fire, or that tools were being sent up, but the difficulty was to get signals below other than by word of mouth. How could any one signal from the surface down 2,000 or 3,000 feet?

The Minister for Mines: It is in the existing Act.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is impracticable and has never been required. That shows it is not wanted.

Mr. FOLEY: The remarks of the hon. member for Pingelly were surprising. Provision was made in the Mines Regulation Acts of every State in Australia that a means of communication should obtain between the surface and every level working in the mine——

Hon. Frank Wilson: Yes.

Mr. FOLEY: And the bottom of the shaft.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No, that is where you are wrong.

Mr. FOLEY: The hon. member would have a chance to prove that he was wrong. This subclause provided that the signals should be from the bottom of the shaft and from every entrance being worked between the surface and the bottom. If a shaft was being sunk deeper there must be a means of communication between the men working in the bottom of the shaft and those in the next level.

Hon. Frank Wilson: This provides between the bottom and the surface.

Mr. FOLEY: No; to the next level and thence to the person in charge of the hoisting.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are putting words in.

Mr. FOLEY: If sinking was being done the winch would be on the bottom level, and the means of communication would have to be from the bottom of the shaft to the engine-driver on the bottom level.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That meaning is not in the subclause.

Mr. FOLEY: That the communication must be to the surface he was prepared to admit.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Then you will agree to the amendment.

Mr. FOLEY: No. On one occasion, when word of mouth signalling was adopted, he had been in a difficult position, having been over 12 holes loaded with about six packets of fracture, and it was only due to the greatest fortune that he was present to tell the tale. That was not a fair kind of signalling for the workers.



Mr. George called attention to the state of the House; bells rung and a quorum formed.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. FOLEY: It must be admitted that the clause provided later on that in every shaft a knocker line or some other appliance approved by the inspector must be used, but that was not the point we were discussing, nor the point which the Minister wished to stress. It was desired that if any other means of appliance was used the Minister should have the right to say what other appliances might be used. If it was shown to the Minister by the chief mining engineer that certain proposed restrictions in relation to the means of communication were harsh and impracticable, the Minister would act reasonably, and would be guided by expert knowledge. It was to be hoped the subclause would stand as printed.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Subclause 20 provided that in every mine there should be constructed as soon as practicable after the opening of each level one or more passageways for men from each level to the one above it, and to surface, independent of and separate from the main shaft or other principal entrance to the mine. In the second reading debate he had referred to this matter, and pointed out that it was a new condition which would act very harshly if it were enforced. The inspector had power already to order a second passageway for the protection of the men or for ventilating purposes if he deemed it absolutely necessary, but this subclause made it obligatory "as soon as practicable after the opening of each level." That meant a second passageway might have to be constructed 20 or 30 feet from the main shaft.

Mr. Munsie: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Then say 50 feet. We must take the language of the subclause, "as soon as practicable." No doubt it was intended for the protection of the men in case of fire or explosion to give them extra means of exit from the

mine. If we were going to have this second passageway constructed close to the main shaft it would have no such effect at all. If there was an explosion which blocked the men using the main shaft it would block them from using the second passageway if it were near to the main shaft.

Mr. Foley: Whose opinion is to be taken on that?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Leave it to the expert of the Government to order the second passageway when necessary. To put it as a hard and fast rule in the Bill was not reasonable. We were asked to put in the Bill hard and fast rules that would have to be conformed to, and if they were not conformed to a prosecution would follow against the manager.

Mr. Munsie: It is a pity there was not a prosecution before that sad disaster at Mt. Lyell.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If the second passageway had been made under this rule in all probability not one man would have got out; if it was made a condition that the passageway should be some distance from the main shaft, there would be some chance of providing an exit that would avert such a catastrophe. When we found rules in the 1906 Act that had not been conformed to because they were not practicable, it was right to strike them out of this measure. This, however, was a new condition altogether. Not only was it not going to be protective to the workmen, but it would be a great hardship on the smaller properties. Wealthy mines might be able to conform to this rule.

Mr. Munsie: You do not want to strike out Section 16 of the 1906 Act relating to the present system of appointing workmen's inspectors, which has proved impracticable, because it has never been availed of.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The very fact that it had not been availed of showed that the work was going on satisfactorily. Why should we want to hamper the industry with conditions such as the one contained in this subclause, especially when it was not necessary? There was full power already to pre-

scribe work that was necessary to obviate danger in the mine. Let the inspector exercise his discretion according to the circumstances in each individual case. In some mines it would be impossible to carry this rule into effect.

Mr. Foley: That is what this clause means.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It did not mean anything but what it read in plain English. He moved an amendment—

*That Subclause 20 be struck out.*

Mr. HARPER: It was hardly possible to see any real meaning in the subclause, which stated that as soon as practicable after the shaft was down another had to be sunk. The general method was that when the shaft was being sunk a winze was simultaneously put down for ventilation purposes: every mine owner who wanted to carry on mining economically carried on that process. In some cases more than one winze was put down. It had been held by some hon. members that the Mount Lyell accident would not have occurred if what was proposed in the Bill had been adopted there but it should be remembered that there were miles of levels in the Mount Lyell mine, and some of them were a long distance from the shaft so that it might not have been possible to avert the accident by perhaps thousands of feet. As a matter of fact it happened a long way from the shaft. The general system followed in mining was to put down winzes 100 feet apart, and material from above was sent down them for filling.

Mr. Foley: Would you approve of winzes being sunk every 100 feet?

Mr. HARPER: That would depend on circumstances. In some mines it would prove economical and in others it would not.

Mr. Foley: Did you not say it was necessary to have them every 100 feet?

Mr. HARPER: Yes, if there was a regular quartz reef. The Committee had decided that no more rising was to be carried on beyond 10 feet.

Mr. Foley: On a point of order, were we discussing rising?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should be reasonable. Some lati-

tude had to be allowed in the discussion; if not the hon. member himself would have to be called to order very frequently.

Mr. HARPER: Were we going to stop a mine from working in the lower levels while the sinking of a winze was being carried on? A winze was nearly always sunk simultaneously with the main shaft. This clause would make mining difficult to carry on and therefore it should be deleted.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If we adopted the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition to leave this matter to the judgment and discretion of the inspector, we might as well leave everything connected with mining to the inspector's judgment and discretion. We might simply pass a Bill with one clause and say to the inspector, "You are not to allow anything that is likely to be dangerous or harmful to the men employed in the industry." The leader of the Opposition should recognise that we should have principles to guide the inspector.

Hon. Frank Wilson: These are not principles, they are hard and fast rules, and foolish ones at that.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Yes, with a limitation so far as it was "reasonably practicable," as was set out at the beginning of the clause. Hon. members opposite did not attach sufficient importance to the words "reasonably practicable." We might go for a whole 12 months without these rules being put into operation simply because the conditions were not "reasonably practicable." It was essential, however, that there should be power to enforce the conditions. In connection with the accident at the Mount Lyell mine all those men lost their lives because there was not a provision of this kind in the Tasmanian law. The men were shut in like rats in a trap; they had no means of escape. We desired to guard against the possibility of such an accident happening in this State. As already pointed out there was a provision in our existing regulations in regard to ventilation; it was laid down that there must be a second shaft for ventilation purposes. The paragraph under discus-

sion would not work any hardship and would not increase the cost to any extent, because as the member for Pingelly knew, in most of the mines there were two ways for entrance and egress, and where there were the two ways the management should provide ladders or other means of getting out. There were very few mines in which it would be necessary to do any work in this connection more than to make the existing passage ways possible for men to travel out of. It was not to be expected for one moment that the inspectors were going to insist, immediately a level was opened up, as had been suggested, on communication being made 15 feet away from the main shaft. The whole thing was so absurd that no one would entertain it for a moment. At the present time winzes were carried out practically simultaneously with the sinking of the shaft, and by the time a level was opened up a couple of hundred feet there was means of communication through the winze, and when they got in far enough they were met with a rise. There were cases where it would not be reasonable to enforce this provision. If a level were driven in 1,000 feet and there did not happen to be a level above it, it would be unreasonable to expect communication to be made, and as that would not be "reasonably practicable," it would not be insisted upon. The clause did not ask for anything more than the men employed in a mine had the right to expect. They should not be left to the mercy of anything unforeseen.

Mr. HARPER : There was a big difference between "reasonably practicable" and "reasonably necessary." The former meant if the work could be done.

Mr. Taylor : The meaning is "reasonably required."

Mr. HARPER : "Reasonably required" would be better.

The Minister for Mines : You must show first that it is reasonable.

Mr. HARPER : We ought to say in the clause if it was "reasonably necessary." It was not a matter whether it was required or not; it was a matter

of whether it was practicable to carry it out.

The Minister for Mines : The inspector will have to ask also whether it is reasonable.

Mr. HARPER : The question would arise whether it was necessary to carry out this work. Even the provision of a second travelling way would not necessarily avert a catastrophe at any great distance away from the shaft, because the men might be cut off from access to it. For instance, a fire or a flood might occur between the travelling way and the place where the men were working. It sometimes happened that men were cut off from the main shaft, and it might happen that they would be cut off from the second means of communication with the surface also. It would be seen, therefore, that the provision of a special ladder way would not necessarily obviate a catastrophe, although, of course, in a general way, it would improve the chances of escape. He believed in giving the men every possible chance of getting away in case of an accident, but he could not shut his eyes to the fact that the clause would not necessarily prevent an accident.

Mr. TAYLOR : The arguments used by the hon. member were fallacious to a degree. The hon. member ought to have realised that, because he had been managing mines in this State for the last 20 years. The hon. member knew well that when a main shaft, whether vertical or on the underlay, was down to a reasonable depth of, perhaps, 100 feet, driving commenced along the first level. When the driving had continued along that level until it was getting too hot to drive with any success, a start was made with the rising and with the putting down of a winze. The hon. member knew that in eight out of ten mines winzes were sunk ahead of the main shaft, with a view to following the lode down before undertaking the expense of sinking the main shaft. All that the clause demanded was that a winze should be kept open and laddered in order to provide an unobstructed means of egress. Of course, under the clause, such a passage could not be used for any other purpose than that

of an air pass and a ladder-way. The clause could not possibly work any hardship on the mine owner. If the men underground were dependent solely on the main shaft, they were at once locked in if anything went wrong with that main shaft, but with this open roadway provided, the blocking of the main shaft would not affect the men below, who would still have a direct line of communication with the surface. The provision was that this second mode of egress should be furnished in every mine as soon as practicable after the opening of each level. The hon. member knew well that nothing short of 150 or 200 feet was regarded as a level. At about that distance from the shaft a start would be made with the rising, and with the bringing down of a winze. Clearly that was what was meant by "as soon as practicable." It would not be until he had reached this distance along the level that the mine owner would be called upon to make a rise by way of providing a means of egress. Nor was such a passage only necessary as a roadway, for it was necessary to the health of the miners as an airway. No mine inspector would think of calling upon a manager to put in a rise or winze as a roadway at 15 or 20 feet from the main shaft. The prescribed passes were actually there to-day.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Then why the subclause?

Mr. TAYLOR: Because the rise was not always kept open as a road way, but was very often obstructed.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Then what are the inspectors doing?

Mr. TAYLOR: It might reasonably be asked, what had the inspectors done under the hon. member's administration?

Hon. Frank Wilson: You have had two years at it now.

Mr. TAYLOR: The point was that these egress passages should be instituted when the mine was first opened. If this were done no additional expense would be entailed by the clause. It was impossible to ventilate some of our biggest mines to-day because of the hurried manner in which they had been opened up in the

first place. The subclause should be agreed to.

Mr. HARPER: The hon. member had broken no new ground, had revealed nothing not previously known. All could agree with what the hon. member had said, if only an assurance could be given that the provision would not be put into operation except where reasonably required. It was to be remembered that this special exit from a mine could not be used for any other purpose than that of a travelling way, while the ordinary winzes in a mine were sunk for quite other purposes. The hon. member did not refer to ladder ways or any means of travelling up and down.

Mr. Taylor: I said they have ladder ways in them; that is the only cost.

Mr. HARPER: The shafts were often required for mullocking purposes, and there were partitions in big winzes because to sink a winze or shaft economically it had to be carried to wide dimensions.

Mr. Taylor: You are breaking ore all the time.

Mr. HARPER: One might be breaking country rock all the time. Then a winze had a three-fold purpose, namely, ventilation, a travelling way, and a means of mullocking. Often when rises were put up there was a partition for men to travel up and down, and this was used also to convey the mullock from the level above to fill in the stopes. The mullock must come down the winze; it could not be carried up to fill the stope. That was repeated level after level from the surface down to thousands of feet. The member for Mount Margaret had referred to the competency of the mine managers. Then why not allow them to manage the mines? Members on the Government side wanted to manage the mines by Act of Parliament, and if that were done we might as well not have those competent mine managers. A competent mine manager would work his mine and his men to the best advantage, and he would give them all the ventilation he could, because he knew that would enable them to do their work better. It was too hard to have all these details embodied in an Act

of Parliament, especially when the inspectors were given no discretion.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The member for Mount Margaret might be an expert in regard to sheep stations and wool growing, but it was a good many years since he had seen a mine underground or done any practical mining.

Mr. Taylor: I am not a bad judge of goats either. I am looking at them.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: When words were put into an Act of Parliament the inspectors were bound to take note of them, and here again the inspectors to be appointed by the trades unions would carry out the conditions of the Act to the letter. It was idle to think otherwise. A second passage way had to be made immediately a shaft was put down and a level opened out, and it had to be kept clear of obstructions, its purpose being to provide means of exit or ingress for the men.

Mr. Green: To give them a chance for their lives.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The second passage way must be put in where it would most conveniently serve its purpose, and if it was to be anywhere in close proximity to the main shaft, the probabilities were that when an accident happened the men would be cut off from both the main shaft and the second passage way. Nevertheless, as soon as the shaft was sunk and a level was commenced, the second passage way must be made.

Mr. Taylor: The Bill does not say anything of the kind.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That was the undoubted reading of the subclause.

Mr. Taylor: When does it become a level?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: As soon as the drive was begun.

Mr. Taylor: It is a drive until it is completed.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Let the hon. member tell the Committee something about the value of wool. Of course, members on the Government side were not going to give any consideration to practical suggestions from practical members of the Opposition.

Mr. Thomas: Where are the practical men of the Opposition?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: One was speaking at the present time. Members were going to jeopardise the Bill by their stubbornness in sticking to every clause, whether or not it was shown to be unreasonable or unworkable. Notwithstanding what the member for Mount Margaret had said, even from the early days of the Goldfields, this State had had some of the most eminent and up-to-date mining engineers in the world.

Mr. Taylor: There has been some terrible muddling.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There always would be. The Bill was an evidence of muddling, where Ministers came in and would not take the advice of their practical experts. Western Australia had always had the best managers that the mining world could produce.

Mr. Foley: The manager of the Ivanhoe did not know a hole in the ground when he saw it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Taking them all in all, our mining engineers were some of the best experts the world had produced, and they had been here for the last 20 years. But even if they had come only recently, why trammel them with these regulations?

The Minister for Mines: Good management does not always mean regard for the men.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was not economical management if they did not look after the men as far as they possibly could. Mining was not the only hazardous industry in the country. We had to see that reasonable precautions were taken, having due regard to all the circumstances surrounding the place where the men were working. It was impossible to make a hard and fast rule for every industry and it would simply be hampering the excellent mine managers to whom the member for Mount Margaret had given such a handsome testimonial. Now it was proposed to send special inspectors after them, so that when they committed a breach of the regulations they would be brought to book. That might be the hon. member's idea of helping an

industry which was getting poorer every year as far as results were concerned—

Mr. Green: The output was greater last year than for several years.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That might be so, but the *Statistical Register* showed that dividends and profits had been going down for the last ten years.

The Minister for Mines: This is the first year it has recovered.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was necessary to be careful how we increased the cost or hampered this industry with its decreasing ore values. No man objected to reasonable precautions to safeguard the workmen.

Mr. Munsie: Well, agree to this.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The managers here were as conscientious as those in any part of Australia, and were willing to the best of their ability to provide every reasonable safeguard that could be suggested, but to impose a hard and fast condition of this kind and argue that the words "reasonably practicable" at the beginning of the clause qualified it to some extent, was absurd. It was a question of whether this requirement was reasonable and practicable, and not merely reasonably practicable. Efforts should be concentrated to do as little as possible to put obstacles in the way of this industry. We had arrived at a stage in our history when we should encourage it. Many mines, which were just paying their way, were employing a large number of men, and such a condition might compel them to close down and necessitate the men seeking employment on other fields. No sound argument had been advanced in favour of the subclause. The statement of the member for Mount Margaret that these passage-ways were already provided showed that the subclause was unnecessary. They were provided for a dual purpose as the member for Pingelly had explained. Now, however, they were to be provided for a special purpose and that was where the hardship came in. As inspectors had the power to order these exits if necessary, there was no reason to enact a hard and fast condition.

Mr. MUNSIE: It was impossible to understand that this clause would hamper the industry and put managers to unrea-

sonable expense and trouble. The member for Mount Margaret had said that in most mines these extra passage-ways were provided so far as the sinking of the winze was concerned. A winze was also sunk in the Mount Lyell mine, where that deplorable disaster occurred, but the reason that the men lost their lives was that the pass was filled with mullock, which blocked the airway as well as the exit. The member for Pingelly said it would be necessary to sink a special winze for the express purpose of providing an additional exit for the men, and that it could not be used for any other purpose. That was absurd. If no other winze was sunk the one must be kept open, but as the mine was developed other winzes would be sunk for the benefit of the mine. One winze would have to be kept open and the subclause did not stipulate whether it should be 50 or 1,000 feet from the main shaft so long as there was one open. On the Golden Mile he had worked in the Lake View mine at the 1,800 feet level, 700 feet from the nearest airway, and at least 30 men were working 100 feet below him. For three years every man who went on to the 1,200-foot level or below it had to depend on the main shaft for getting out of the mine. Was that a fair condition to work under? When the Coal Mines Bill was before the House of Commons, and a similar provision was under consideration, the fear was expressed that the industry would be seriously affected, as it would mean putting down shafts in some instances 2,000 feet deep, but the legislators had stuck to their guns, and many mines had to cease work until the second shaft was sunk. The subclause would not result in a solitary individual losing employment; it would not increase the cost by the fraction of a farthing per ton, and it would not hamper the mines in general working. The second shaft was necessary from a health standpoint as well as for an exit. The member for Pingelly said the enforcement of this provision would entail the possibility of a fall of ground between the second exit and where the men were working. That might happen, but it was impossible to prevent accidents in mines by legislation.

The Minister for Mines: In effect, he says we should do nothing because we cannot meet every possible contingency.

Mr. MUNSIE: It was simply criminal neglect that this provision had not been put into operation years ago. There was the experience of the Mount Charlotte mine, where four men had been killed by fumes. If such a provision had been in force, their lives would probably have been saved. Such legislation was not going to have a hampering effect or cost anything, which seemed to be the main consideration with members of the Opposition. Even if it was going to cost something and put people to some little inconvenience, if it were the means of saving only one life, it would be worth while, and would pay tenfold for all the inconvenience caused to mining companies in Western Australia.

Mr. HARPER moved an amendment—

*That after the word "level" in line 2 of Subclause 20 the words "and the crosscut put in to the lode or reef" be inserted.*

By the wording as at present the level meant the opening out of the main shaft, and in many cases there was 200 or 300 feet of a crosscut to put in. That was the case now on the Golden Horseshoe mine.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The leader of the Opposition had moved to strike out the subclause. Unless the leader of the Opposition withdrew his amendment the amendment of the hon. member for Pingelly could not be taken.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If the hon. member for Pingelly wished to move an amendment he would ask leave to withdraw his own.

Amendment (Hon. Frank Wilson's) by leave withdrawn.

Mr. HARPER: As the leader of the Opposition had withdrawn his amendment it was to be hoped that the Minister for Mines would accept this one. The subclause as at present would mean that the shaft would have to be sunk as soon as practicable after the level had been opened.

Mr. Male called attention to the state of the House.

The Minister for Mines: That is clever.

Mr. Male: A Bill of this importance should receive a little attention from members.

Bells rung and a quorum formed.

Mr. HARPER: There should be no difficulty in the Committee agreeing to this amendment.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It was not his intention to accept any amendment with regard to lode or reef at all because he thought it was unnecessary. If the inspectors and others administering the measure were a set of lunatics it might be necessary to put all sorts of provisions into the clause. To talk about the management being forced to cut a passage way immediately a level was opened was too ridiculous altogether. There was no need for the amendment. Members of the Opposition were moving amendments and opposing every word, line, and clause of the Bill. They would not have the Bill at all if they had their own way. There were as capable mine managers in Western Australia as anywhere, but capable management did not necessarily mean due regard for the safety of the men, particularly if it involved additional expenditure. The leader of the Opposition had taunted him with sticking to the Bill right or wrong.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Yes, a party measure.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The leader of the Opposition had said he (the Minister for Mines) refused to listen to his expert advisers. His expert adviser was a gentleman upon whose opinion the leader of the Opposition had laid such stress and weight last week. That expert adviser had approved of this subclause. Furthermore it had not been placed in the Bill at the suggestion, as might be inferred, of labour unions; but at the suggestion and recommendation of the State Mining Engineer, the expert whose advice the leader of the Opposition had been recommending all along should be followed. What was there objectionable in it? Hon. members said they did not object to all reasonable precautions for the safety of the men. He wanted it to be placed on record that the Opposition

considered the provision for a second means of getting out of a mine as an unreasonable provision.

Hon. Frank Wilson : I never said so.

The MINISTER FOR MINES : That was what the argument amounted to.

Hon. Frank Wilson : You are wilfully mis-stating it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES : The leader of the Opposition said he had no objection to all reasonable precaution being taken for the safety of the men, and the deduction to be drawn was that this proposal was unreasonable. We must take it that the provision of the second passage way was regarded as an unreasonable request, and that notwithstanding the accident at Mount Lyell, where a number of men lost their lives recently because there was not a second exit. As had been pointed out by the hon. member for Hannans an accident of the same character might occur again at any time. If men had to risk their lives, was it an unreasonable request to make that there should be a second means of exit from the mine. There were not many who would agree with the leader of the Opposition that such a request was unreasonable. The Royal Commission which sat in New Zealand last year recommended a provision of this kind. The effect of the recommendation was as follows :—

That the provisions for two outlets from a mine to the surface as recommended by the Transvaal Commission, 1910, be adopted to the following extent : In connection with every mine there shall be at least two shafts or outlets to the surface, with which every reef or mineral bed for the time being worked in the mine shall have a communication of not less than 3 feet wide and 3 feet high, so that such shafts or outlets shall afford separate means of ingress or egress available to all persons employed in such mine; provided that it shall not be necessary for such shafts or outlets to be situated on the same mine.

Mr. Foley : On page 55 of the Royal Commission which sat in this State in 1905, the same thing appears.

The MINISTER FOR MINES : It was absolutely essential that such an important matter should not be left to the discretion of the inspectors. It should be laid down in the Bill that a second way should be provided where practicable.

Mr. FOLEY : The Minister for Mines had stated that he intended to leave much to the discretion of the inspector, but we should only leave to the inspector that which we could reasonably expect an average man would do, and the inspectors were only average men. If we left the inspector without a rule on which to work, there would be nothing for him to report on. We were only laying down a set of rules, as it were, for his guidance, and once he broke those he was responsible. The leader of the Opposition had taunted the Minister over the measure being a trades union one. It was backed up by the trades unions and openly, unlike the Bill which the friends and colleagues of the leader of the Opposition brought down in 1906. That measure was backed up by the Chamber of Mines. The files would show what wires were being sent daily and hourly by the Chamber of Mines to the Minister for Mines, and also by the Minister to the Chamber asking, "Does this suit?" and "Does that suit?" and also "I will be in Perth to tell you what to do." If that was not trade unionism he did not know the meaning of the term. They at that time wanted to combine to injure, unlike the trade unions which combined to assist. The leader of the Opposition was working at the dictates of one of the strongest unions in the State, the Chamber of Mines.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Do not get so excited.

Mr. FOLEY : The leader of the Opposition knew no more about this measure than a log of wood. All his information had been got from the trades unionism of the Chamber of Mines. We admitted that it was a party measure.



The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question before the Committee was that certain words be inserted in the paragraph of the clause.

Mr. FOLEY : To give an inspector the right to legislate as the clause provided was too much to put into the hands of one man. If the people were not to be trusted to elect men to the legislature to frame rules for the guidance of inspectors, it was about time members resigned.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Yes, it is about time.

Mr. FOLEY : And we should let the country be run by the inspectors backed up by the Chamber of Mines, a body who required no rule and who wanted to protect the employees in the mining industry in the same way that the employees in the farming industry were protected in the interests of the employers. It was a disgrace to the State to see the manner in which the employees in the farming industry were kept down.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order! The hon. member was not discussing the proposed amendment.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : Would the Deputy Chairman allow him to reply to the remarks of the hon. member ?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The member for Leonora had absolutely over-shot himself.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : The member for Leonora was in the habit of doing that. There was no necessity for all this heat on the question and he failed to see why the Minister should lose his temper and try to put a wrong construction on the remarks which he (Hon. Frank Wilson) had made in supporting the amendment. As he had already pointed out, the Minister was not going to agree to any amendment to the Bill.

Mr. Munsie : How do you know ?

Hon. FRANK WILSON : The Minister said so.

The Minister for Mines : When did I say that ?

Hon. FRANK WILSON : Before the Minister sat down.

The Minister for Mines : I said I would not accept this amendment.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : The Minister had his majority behind him and he was going to carry the Bill as it was, but all the same, he (Hon. Frank Wilson) was going to place his views on record, and he would not allow the member for Leonora in a personal attack to misrepresent him, and neither would he allow the Minister for Mines to put words into his mouth which he never uttered.

The Minister for Mines : I did nothing of the kind.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : The Minister put a meaning on words of his which he never intended them to convey. The Minister was apt to make out that members on the Opposition side of the House had no consideration for the workers.

The Minister for Mines : I did not say so.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : The Minister put that construction on the remarks of members of the Opposition. Speaking personally, he had done more for the workers in this State than all the other members on the Ministerial side of the House put together.

Mr. Munsie : You are not doing it in this clause.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : That might be the hon. member's opinion. Surely he (Hon. Frank Wilson) could utter an opinion without being eaten up by the hon. member.

Mr. Munsie : I am not excited.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : The hon. member looked savage; he showed his teeth as if he wanted to bite or to intimidate. The hon. member would like to drive him out of the Chamber, but he would remain to voice his opinion and declare again that the clause was not necessary, because the second passageways were already there.

Mr. Munsie : Why not let them be in all the mines ?

Hon. FRANK WILSON : As soon as the levels were driven and stoping was commenced we got to the second passage. The Minister wanted to make it hard and fast and to use it for one purpose.

The Minister for Mines : You say that there should not be two ways for exits.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No. The Minister was hitting below the belt: he was not fair; there was no manliness about him and no generosity; he hit unfairly every time.

The Attorney General: Oh no.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Attorney General had not been in the House all the time. The Minister for Mines had been hitting unfairly and did not understand the rules of the game. The desire seemed to be to convey to the people that the Opposition had no regard for those who were working on the mines.

The Minister for Mines: Is it not true?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There again was another sly hit. The Minister for Mines knew that that was not true, and no doubt thought he was smart by making the interjection. Hon. members on the Opposition side of the House had as much consideration for the well-being of the workers in the mining industry as members on the Ministerial side, and it was absolutely wrong for the Minister to describe the suggestion contained in the amendment as the proposal of lunatics.

The Minister for Mines: I did not say that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Minister used the term two or three times.

The Minister for Mines: I said that the district inspectors would be lunatics if they did as was suggested. I did not apply the remarks to hon. members opposite.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: An inspector would be bound to carry out the law of the land.

Mr. Munsie: With common sense.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: And if the Minister described an inspector as a lunatic because he acted under the law, he was behaving in a dastardly way towards his officers.

The Minister for Mines: What I said was that if the inspector did what was suggested by the hon. member he would be a lunatic.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Minister argued that an inspector would not carry out the Act.

The Minister for Mines: I did not. I said he would carry it out with judgment and discretion.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The inspector would carry it out with what the Minister considered judgment and discretion, but what the Opposition might consider harshness. What he had been asking all along was that inspectors should be allowed to use their judgment and discretion, and the Minister said, "No, we will put it into the Act, and then there will be no question of judgment." Then, when the Minister wanted to protect himself, he declared that the inspector would be a lunatic if he carried that out.

The Minister for Mines: I said he would be a lunatic if he did as was suggested by the member for Pingelly.

Mr. Green: The leader of the Opposition is now hitting below the belt.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Hon. members on the Ministerial side of the House did not know the first rules of the game.

Mr. Munsie: You are a fine judge.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The paragraph stated that "in every mine there shall be constructed as soon as practicable after the opening of each level, one or more passage-ways." Where was the discretionary power there?

Mr. Munsie: In the words "as soon as practicable."

The Attorney General: The discretion is as to when it is practicable.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was always practicable. The Attorney General had given the show away.

The Attorney General: Oh no.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Practical miners had stated that it was always practicable to put down this second way, but it was not necessary and not expedient.

Mr. Munsie: It would not be asked to be done and you know it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Attorney General knew that the law must be construed from the legal standpoint. The member for Pingelly (Mr. Harper), a practical mine manager, had said that as soon as a drive was put in it was practicable to put in the air passage way.

The Minister for Mines: Would you be guided by the opinion of the State Min-

ing Engineer in regard to the necessity for this rule?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It had not been his privilege to hear the opinion of that officer on the point.

The Minister for Mines: Here it is. Now I ask you to read it to the Committee.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No doubt the Committee would be interested in hearing the views of the State Mining Engineer on the subject. That opinion, as now supplied by the Minister for Mines, read as follows:—

This new rule is to prevent any such position as occurred in the recent catastrophe at Mount Lyell, where the main shaft was the only available means of egress for men and it became impassible through a fire. We already have the same rule under the regulations so far as regards ventilation air ways, but the fact is quite sufficiently important to be in the general rules of the Act itself.

That was perfectly acceptable as the explanation of the State Mining Engineer in regard to the subclause, and he was prepared to believe that the matter was sufficiently important to find a place in the Bill. But it was significant that we already had the same rule in respect to ventilating shafts, and we knew that the inspectors could cause these shafts to be equipped as they thought fit.

The Minister for Mines: No, they cannot.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It had been pointed out that the second means of exit would not have saved the lives of the men at Mount Lyell. On the question of the height of stopes the Minister had refused to accept the opinion of the State Mining Engineer, but now, because that officer declared that this matter was of sufficient importance to be inserted in the general rules, and because that opinion coincided with the views of the Minister, everybody must stand aside and defer to the departmental officer. He (Hon. Frank Wilson) had the same right as the Minister to disagree with the officer.

The Attorney General: Then why abuse the Minister for having done the same?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Minister had been abused, not for disagreeing with the officer, but for having led the Committee to believe that the State Mining Engineer had altered his views.

The Minister for Mines: I did nothing of the sort.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was to be hoped the Committee would accept the amendment, which was a perfectly reasonable one.

Mr. HARPER: It was tiresome to try to get any consideration from the Minister for Mines. The Minister could not discuss any question in a gentlemanly manner, but must distribute insults on every occasion. The Minister had been understood to refer to him (Mr. Harper) as a lunatic.

The Minister for Mines: Absolutely no.

Mr. HARPER: It was as well, because if the Minister had done so, he (Mr. Harper) would have given the Minister such a scorching as he had never had before.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order in making threats.

Mr. HARPER: Did the Deputy Chairman desire that it should be withdrawn?

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

Mr. HARPER: In accordance with the Standing Orders, it would be withdrawn. The subclause as it stood was absolutely absurd, and was most ambiguous in its meaning. The provision was an absurd one, while the amendment was essentially reasonable. The Minister had declared that he would not take any notice of his experts, but would do as he thought fit. That being so it was of no use trying to make the provision a reasonable one.

The Minister for Mines: This is the State Mining Engineer's subclause.

Mr. HARPER: Then it must have escaped the notice of the State Mining Engineer.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. FRANK WILSON moved an amendment—

*That the following words be added at the end of Subclause 22:—"or in lieu thereof such approved indicators*

*shall be provided as in the opinion of the inspector will efficiently provide for safety."*

This subclause made it imperative that the engine-driver should have a clear view of the brace from his station at the engine, and the amendment was to insert the words in the old Act that if he could not get a clear view of the brace he should have approved indicators provided which would efficiently safeguard the men. At the present time engine-drivers did not necessarily have a clear view of the brace. Indeed, it was not considered necessary, because they hauled or lowered by the indicator, and the engine-driver must keep his eye on his indicator the whole time. If we were going to provide for him to work by an indicator, which gave the position of his cage as it ascended or descended from the surface to the lowest level, and then when it came above the surface, require him to work by his eye, we would be courting disaster. It was better for him to be working by the one system, and if it was safe for him to work by the indicator when the cage was below the surface it should be safe for him to follow the same system above the surface.

Mr. Foley: How many mines are there in the State which have indicators from the brace to the engine-room.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Many of them. Another argument was that the engine-drivers on mines of any size could not see the cage when it passed the brace, it being hidden from view by the brace itself, and by trying to keep an eye on it the engine-driver might be doing something which would lead to disaster. The Act of 1895 contained the provision now proposed, but it was the Act of 1906 which provided that the engine-driver should have a clear view between his station and the brace, or that he should have in lieu an approved indicator, which would show exactly the position of the cage. He submitted that the provision in the Bill could not be worked satisfactorily on an underlay shaft. The hauling engines were behind the poppets, the skips were coming up on the underlay, and it would be impossible from the position where the engines were so placed to

gauge the exact position of the skip or cage, as the case might be, on the gantry. Taking everything into consideration, the rule was too drastic when it said that there must be a clear view between the engine-driver's station and the brace. No extra safety would be provided for the men who were working on or about the brace or in the cages. Indeed, the risk would be added to, because the engine-driver would be given a dual system by being made to work from the bottom level to the surface by indicator, and then being given the option above the surface of either watching his indicator or working by sight. Between the two systems, a man might become confused and the danger would be increased.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Being always prepared to listen to reasonable amendments, he was inclined to agree to the hon. member's proposal, more especially as it coincided with the opinion of the State Mining Engineer. It would be wise to have a provision whereby new mines starting should, if possible, keep a clear view between the driver's station and the brace, but he realised that the amendment was identical with the section which had been in the Act for the last seven years, and that many mines had built up their surface equipment in conformity with that legislation, and it would be undoubtedly a considerable hardship and expense to require them to alter it now. As a matter of fact the trucks were hauled up, and in being tipped into the ore bins were necessarily pulled towards the engine-driver; consequently managers were compelled to erect the bins between the driver's station and the brace, not for choice, but because it was the only practicable way at the present time.

Mr. FOLEY: In October, 1912, an accident occurred on the Sons of Gwalia mine by which seven men were killed. On that mine the engine-driver had not a clear view of the brace. Eight men used to descend in the cage, and their descent brought one skip out of gear to the surface, and the engine-driver, in order to indicate that he was right and waiting for the men to descend, used to shake the rope by giving his lever a slight move backwards and forwards. The men who

lost their lives made a mistake in thinking they saw the rope shake. If the amendment was agreed to and the clause carried out in its entirety it would do exactly as much good as though the engine-driver had a clear view of the brace.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Apparently it was not intended that Subclause 24 should apply to Holman hoists and similar small hoists used for sinking, which were not worked on an indicator showing the position of the cage. He moved a further amendment—

*That after the word "than," in line 1 of Subclause 21, the words "a Holman or similar hoist and" be inserted.*

It was not always necessary to have an indicator, and it should be left to the inspector to require one.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The subclause would not cause any inconvenience. It would apply to a Holman hoist, but was there any need for an indicator on such a hoist?

Hon. Frank Wilson: No.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member evidently had in mind an important kind of indicator, but it might simply be a mark on the rope, or anything approved by the inspector. It was essential to have some kind of indicator. If a Holman hoist was working in a winze down to 100 feet, there was no reason why it should not have an indicator.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I do not think you could construe a mark on a rope to be an indicator.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That point had been inquired into, and the officers of the department had informed him that some such simple indicator would be all that would be required. After all it was left to the discretion of the inspector, but the officer responsible assured him that a mark on the rope or some other simple indicator would comply with the provision.

Mr. HARPER: A mark on the rope was often used so that it could be seen when the bucket was at the bottom of the shaft. If that was the Minister's idea of

an indicator the subclause could be agreed to.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: After the Minister's explanation he felt prepared to accept the assurance regarding his intention. It would be absurd to ask that a valve indicator should be applied to a Holman hoist. At the same time it would be wise for the Minister to accept the amendment. The engine-driver would see that the rope was marked in order to guard against over-winding. Would the Minister intimate whether he would accept his amendment standing on the Notice Paper to the effect that an approved indicator should be provided when required by the inspector? That would make the subclause clearer.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The second amendment to which the hon. member referred was on all fours with one which was discussed earlier in the evening. The subclause should stand because it threw on the management the onus of having some kind of an indicator. If the suggested amendment was adopted, it would not be necessary to have any kind of an indicator except when required by the inspector.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is not on the Holman hoist, and you say it is not intended.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The inspector would lay down the form of indicator to be used on all Holman hoists in a particular district so that it would not be necessary to get approval for the indicator for every Holman hoist. If the amendment was carried the inspector would have to give a special order to the management for each Holman hoist to have an indicator. The obligation should be on the management. No difficulty was apprehended under the subclause as it stood because the management and the men would take every precaution possible by the provision of indicators to lessen the risk of accidents. To guard against possible neglect, however, it was necessary to have an indicator approved by the inspector so that no hoist could be worked without an indicator.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. FRANK WILSON moved a further amendment—

*That in lines 3 and 4 of Subclause 21 the words "with an indicator approved by the inspector" be struck out and the words "when required by the inspector, with an approved indicator" be inserted in lieu thereof.*

Mr. MUNSIE: Provision was being made for all hoists other than those operated by hand power. Would the Minister consider the advisability of preventing the use of single-cylinder Holman hoists for the raising of men? There was considerable danger in pulling men away in a winch with a single-cylinder Holman hoist. He did not think we would be placing any great hardship on the mining companies or the industry generally by compelling them, where they were using the Holman hoist for the purpose of pulling men, to have double-cylinder Holman hoists so as to prevent the possibility of centring.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Single-cylinder hoists might, as the hon. member contended, perhaps be dangerous, but he (the Minister for Mines) was not aware that there had been any accidents. On the contrary, he thought that the use of Holman hoists in our mines had been remarkably free from accidents. A strong agitation existed on the goldfields for some time that men in charge of Holman hoists should undergo some examination and hold a certificate, but that had not been found necessary except on examination by the management. He believed that as a whole, Holman hoists had done good work and had not been a source of accidents. The matter would be taken into consideration and if it was found necessary to prevent the use of single-cylinder hoists, there would no doubt be power to do it without making an amendment in this clause.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Subclause 27 provided that no iron, timber, tools, rails, sprags or other material except when repairing the shaft should be raised or lowered on the same cage or conveyance as men. It was absolutely necessary, however, that a man should travel with

tools. To have the clause worded as printed was impracticable, and he moved an amendment—

*That all the words after "work" in line 1 of Subclause 27 be struck out.*

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The words in question were very essential, as there had been complications in the past. No one could dispute the fact that it was undesirable for men to travel on the same cage as tools which were being lowered or raised. The subclause really made the men responsible. The men themselves would be responsible for a breach of this regulation, because it had been found that the men themselves, without the knowledge of the management, had sometimes entered upon cages which were loaded with tools. One magistrate had held it was not a breach of this regulation where the men had entered upon a conveyance where tools already were, and he had held it would only be a breach of the regulations if tools were put in where men were; but because the tools were there first and men entered without the knowledge of the management it was not a breach. It was essential that the men should know they would be committing a breach of this regulation if they of their own volition, and without the knowledge of the management, entered a cage where tools were being carried. Because of a case which had come to the knowledge of the department, it had been considered essential to make this provision.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Would the Minister consider the need to exempt the man in charge of the tools, who was travelling up and down all the time?

Mr. FOLEY: In a mine where there was a man in charge of the tools exclusively, that man scarcely ever rode in the cage where the tools were; but he went to a level and the platman would send the cage or skip down to him with all the tools he required for that level. If the Minister decided to accept the amendment, the interests of the men would not be sufficiently safeguarded, because many underground bosses told men to get into cages, buckets, or skips that were half-full of tools. The subclause, besides protecting the men against them-

selves, would also prevent them from having responsibility placed upon them by underground bosses.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** The subclause would hardly apply as the leader of the Opposition supposed. It had been framed to apply to men who were going on work or coming off work. The amendment hardly seemed necessary, but he would promise the leader of the Opposition to look into the matter, and if he found it would be necessary to make some such provision to exempt some particular man, he would see it was done either upon recommittal or in another place.

**HON. FRANK WILSON:** In view of what the Minister had said he asked leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

**MR. HARPER:** In a winze or temporary shaft people often had to travel with material for their own use, and it would be a great pity if there was a strict condition that they were not to carry material with them.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The leader of the Opposition had been allowed to withdraw his amendment, the Minister for Mines having promised to look into the question.

**HON. FRANK WILSON:** Subclause 31 provided that every brace, lift, platform, elevated platform and elevated tramway on which men had to work and pass should be kept securely fenced so as to prevent men falling therefrom. He did not think it was possible to fence anything in a way that would prevent men falling from it in certain circumstances, and he did not think we ought to legislate to the extent proposed. It would be sufficient to provide that these places should be securely fenced, and there was no need to add the words "so as to prevent men falling therefrom." If a man did happen to fall there was negligence at once. He moved an amendment—

*That in lines 3 and 4 the words "so as to prevent men falling therefrom" be struck out.*

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** The argument in favour of the deletion of the words was reasonable. It was realised that it would be practically impossible,

unless there was erected a great barricade of considerable height, to prevent men under some circumstances falling off a platform. The clause without the words it was proposed to strike out would meet all that was required, and the obligation would rest with the management to fence these platforms securely.

Amendment passed.

**HON. FRANK WILSON:** Subclause 38 provided that automatic or self-acting doors, tumblers or supports of a suitable kind should be affixed to the skids or guides below the poppet heads of every shaft in such a manner as to prevent the fall of the cage when detached from the rope or chain by overwinding, etcetera. It was questionable whether it was possible to provide doors to conform with this subclause. Every appliance that could be devised and worked satisfactorily was now utilised. Moreover, the appliances were watched keenly, and inspections took place every week or fortnight, and tests were also applied to see that everything was in working order, so that it was almost impossible for the cage to fall. To specify that there should be automatic or self-acting doors, tumblers, or supports, in addition to the appliances already in existence, was asking too much. As the subclause was worded it was unworkable. It was not possible to fix these appliances to the skids or guides, which were only small timbers. There would have to be something very much more substantial. But there were all the self-acting appliances at the present time.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** If they fail to act in case of over-winding, the cage may drop.

**HON. FRANK WILSON:** Then the grippers would act. These were tested every few weeks. There was nothing that could be put into the clause which would have the effect of holding the cage any better than the appliances now in use.

**MR. HARPER:** It was clear that the clause meant that these doors and tumblers should be affixed below the top of the poppet head. As it was worded in the clause, it meant below the collar of the shaft. The present appliance used

was the safety thimble and it had never given way.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If there was any doubt about the wording of the clause to effect the purpose which was intended, he would be prepared to substitute the words "pulley wheels" for "poppet heads." The interpretation might be put on the subclause that these timbers would have to be placed just below the collar of the shaft. That, however, could be overcome by the substitution of the words "pulley wheels." It would be possible to affix tumblers or doors of the kind suggested, even if they were not entirely fitted to the skids, or gates, so as to be self-opening when the cage went up, and prevent the cage from falling in the case of an accident. In the case of an overwind it was possible, and indeed probable, that they would fail to act and the cage would drop down the shaft. A similar provision had been in the Victorian Act for the last 30 years, and was favoured by very many mine managers. One of the leading managers on the Boulder had proposed to put in these doors or tumblers in the South Kalgurli some years ago, but some of the other managers had objected on the score that they also would be compelled to put them in, and they did not think they were necessary at the time. The State Mining Engineer had assured him that it was merely an oversight that the provision had not been inserted before. It would cost very little to furnish these fittings, and it would tend to greater safety. The subclause might reasonably be agreed to, with the amendment suggested by the member for Pingelly, in order to make the intention quite clear.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In view of what the Minister had said he would withdraw the amendment to strike out the subclause.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. FRANK WILSON moved a further amendment—

*That in lines 2 and 3 the words "to the skids or guides below the poppet heads" be struck out, and "above the top brace" inserted in lieu.*

Amendment passed.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Subclause 39 read as follows:—

No cage shall be used for the raising or lowering of persons unless it is so constructed as to prevent any portion of the body of any person riding therein from accidentally coming into contact with the timbering or sides of the shaft. All doors on cages shall be so fitted that they cannot be opened accidentally.

It was impossible to make doors which could not be opened accidentally. He moved an amendment—

*That in lines 5 and 6 the words "all doors on cages shall be so fitted that they cannot be opened accidentally" be struck out.*

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The intention of the clause was that the doors should be so constructed that they could not open of their own volition, that they could not be opened except by human agency. If somebody were to open the doors carelessly or negligently it would be different. It would be the duty of the management to see that the fastenings or latches were not likely to break. However, it was very difficult to lay it down hard and fast that something should not happen accidentally. Whilst he did not think the words were liable to be interpreted in a harsh fashion, at the same time, seeing that the inspector had power to order that all the appliances in or about a mine should be kept in safe order, he thought this would meet the requirements, and therefore he would accept the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. MUNSIE moved an amendment—

*That in line 3 of Subclause 56 the word "thirty" be struck out and "twenty" inserted in lieu.*

He realised the danger of rising, not only in the occupation itself, but because of the detriment to the health of the men engaged, on account of the dust. If we were going to allow rising where it was proved to be absolutely necessary, 20 feet was sufficiently far to allow the rise to go without the box system, which would enable a current of air to be di-



rected through the rise, thereby giving improved ventilation.

Mr. Foley : And they can use the timber afterwards for other things.

Mr. HARPER : The subclause should not be altered. A 30 feet box rise was very short indeed, and as for the dust mentioned by the member for Hannans, the miner got just as much dust on the first drill as in the next one. With the box system good air could be had in a rise at an even greater height than 30 feet. Every mine was not dry like the Kalgoorlie mines.

Mr. Munsie : They want the box system even where it is damp, for ventilation.

Mr. HARPER : The box rise created a current of air and the amendment was making a hard and fast rule that even where there was no dust it should be illegal to rise beyond 30 feet without the box system.

The MINISTER FOR MINES : It was reasonable that where rises were being taken to a greater height than 20 feet the box system should be adopted. The next subclause gave the inspector power to give permission to do rising beyond 20 feet where the object could not be attained by winzing or other means. Under that subclause it would be possible for rises to be carried to a considerable height.

Hon. Frank Wilson : You would not limit a box rise to 20 feet.

The MINISTER FOR MINES : Yes; in the event of an inspector giving permission to rise to a greater height than 20 feet the box system should be followed. The advantage of that system had been admitted on all hands by every body concerned, and the very fact that the principle was adopted in the existing Act for 30 feet and over showed that it had been agreed to. If the principle was good as applied to 30 feet and over, it was good as applied to 20 feet and over.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Why not say ten feet?

The MINISTER FOR MINES : A rise hardly started at 10 feet, but 20 feet

was a reasonable distance at which to require the box system to be brought into operation, and the additional expense would be infinitesimal.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : It was difficult to see the necessity for both this subclause and the one following. The amendment proposed that if a rise was more than 20 feet it must be cut on the box system. The next subclause specified that no rise should be greater than 20 feet.

The Minister for Mines : Except when permission is given by the inspector; then Subclause 56 would apply.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : Then why was Subclause 57 necessary? If provision was made in Subclause 56 for 20 feet rises, and for the adoption of the box method for any height beyond 20 feet, the whole thing was restricted.

The Minister for Mines : The box method is.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : Exactly.

The Minister for Mines : But no rise at all was better than the box method.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : The box method would not be adopted if it could be avoided; it was cheaper to sink a winze. If the 20 feet limitation was adopted in Subclause 56, the succeeding subclause would be unnecessary. He would agree to the amendment if the Minister was prepared to delete Subclause 57.

The Minister for Mines : Subclause 56 deals only with the method, but Subclause 57 limits the height to 20 feet altogether.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : If it was provided in all vertical rises that the height should not be greater than 20 feet unless the box method was adopted, the Minister would have all he desired.

The Minister for Mines : No.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : Yes, because rises would be restricted to 20 feet.

The Minister for Mines : Except by the box method.

Hon. FRANK WILSON : Subclause 56 would give the right to go above 20

feet by the box method and Subclause 57 would take away the right.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: We want the permission of the inspector.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Let the inspector stop the work if it was dangerous. This was going against the Mining Engineer's advice. Managers did not want to be running after inspectors all day long to find out whether they could put a rise here or there.

Mr. Munsie: They can go 20 feet high without getting the permission of the inspector.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Then why was Subclause 57 required? The whole of the ground was covered by Subclause 56.

Mr. Munsie: You will allow them to rise indiscriminately if they employ the box system.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The cost would limit them.

Mr. Munsie: I was compelled to put in one of 56 feet.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No manager would put in a rise on the box method 20 feet high if he could avoid it. The height of 30 feet had better remain if Subclause 57 was to be retained.

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

Ayes	..	..	20
Noes	..	..	7

Majority for .. .. 13

#### AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Bolton	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Collier	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Foley	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Green	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Lander	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Lewis	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Heitmann

(Teller).

#### NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. A. N. Plesse
Mr. Broun	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Harper	Mr. Layman
Mr. Mafe	(Teller).

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. FRANK WILSON moved a further amendment—

*That Subclause 57 be struck out.*

Amendment negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clauses 36, 37—agreed to.

Progress reported.

*House adjourned at 11.5 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 30th September, 1913.*

	PAGE
West Province Election Select Committee ..	1416
Motion: Perth-Fremantle road ..	1417
Bills: Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage ..	1418
Amendment, 2A ..	1420
Rights in Water and Irrigation, Com. ..	1420
Adjournment, Special ..	1438

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

## WEST PROVINCE ELECTION SELECT COMMITTEE.

### *Extension of Time.*

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: In the absence of the Chairman (Hon. A. G. Jenkins) who was unfortunately ill and unable to attend the House he moved—

*That the time for bringing up the report of the West Province Election select committee be extended to the 15th October.*

Question passed.