

salary was made. Mr. Ranford communicated with the department and drew attention to the circumstance that his position had been filled. He was then appointed a land agent at Katanning, at the place he had formerly been, and it was arranged that the position should carry with it the salary Mr. Ranford was then receiving as chief land agent, namely £740. Mr. Ranford had now returned to duty, and at present was doing work in the head office.

MR. N. J. MOORE: How much of the £740 was salary and how much allowances?

THE PREMIER: The salary was £590 and £150 allowances.

Item—Land Guides (Land Agencies), £3,000:

MR. N. J. MOORE: Were the land guides permanent officials or casually employed? He had already referred to the unsatisfactory way in which land guides had carried out their duties in some cases. These guides were paid by the department, and very often showed settlers the same area of land. When the land was surveyed the settlers became disappointed. He hoped that in any new scheme capable land guides would be appointed, and that the department would insist that no deception be practised on intending settlers.

THE PREMIER: The land guides were formerly paid out of the Contingency vote. The amount set down was considerably less than was paid last year. It was proposed that these persons should be permanent officials of the department, as it was recognised that by this there would be better control over them than was exercised when they only received fees.

[2.16 o'clock a.m.]

On motion by the **PREMIER**, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 16 minutes past 2 o'clock a.m., until Friday afternoon.

Legislative Council,

Friday, 16th December, 1904.

	Page
Motion: Pipes Manufacture by Day Labour, to disapprove	1938
Bills: Third readings, 1 Factories Act Amendment, 2 Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 3 Bills of Sale, 4 Aborigines Protection	1942
Municipal Institutions Act Amendment, in Committee resumed, reported	1942
Inspection of Machinery, Assembly's Message	1945
Distress for Rent Restriction, in Committee, reported	1945
First readings: 1 Early Closing Act Amendment, 2 Roads Act Amendment, 3 City of Perth Tramways Act Amendment	1946
Private Bill: Kalbarrie and Boulder Racing Clubs, in Committee, progress	1943

The **PRESIDENT** took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the **MINISTER FOR LANDS**: Geological table Bulletins, issued by the Department.

MOTION—PIPES MANUFACTURE BY DAY LABOUR, TO DISAPPROVE.

HON. G. RANDELL moved:

1. That the proposed extension of the day labour system in the manufacture of pipes is undesirable, and that such competition by the Government is calculated to prove injurious to the best interests of the State. 2. That a Royal Commission (the *personnel* of which should be outside of political influence) be appointed to inquire into the whole question of the day labour system *versus* private enterprise; the Commission to report on or before the holding of the next session of Parliament, and that pending the presentation of such report this House is of opinion that farther action in the direction of extending competition by the Government with private enterprise should be deferred.

He said: We have a thin House, but I think it is desirable for me to move the motion standing in my name so as to give the Minister an opportunity of moving the adjournment of the debate if he thinks proper—and it would be proper to have an adjournment on this occasion—and to put him in possession of the reasons why the motion is made. My attention has been drawn to the matter, and really I have been requested to move in it, and I do so with a great deal of pleasure; because I think there are great principles at stake, and it is desirable the country should be in posses-

sion of the facts. Some answers were given the other day by the Minister to questions put, and I believe that since then farther questions have been put in another place; but I am not acquainted with the answers given there to those questions. It appears that the Government are intending, if they have not already begun, to establish the industry of casting pipes, a part of the iron-working trade which has hitherto been carried on by private employers. Personally I think it is very undesirable for the Government to go into trading businesses, because ultimately they may be liable to land us in very considerable difficulties. An understanding was entered into with the manufacturers, not altogether on the part of this Government but another, by whom a promise was given that if certain works were erected in this State the Government would not enter into competition; and unless there are very serious reasons why the arrangement entered into with the previous Government should not be carried out, it should be adhered to. I believe every member, or nearly every member, of this House will express the opinion to which I have given utterance, that it is highly undesirable for the Government to enter into those enterprises which can be carried on very much better in the interests of the State by private enterprise than they can be by the Government itself. We expect the Government to occupy the position of arbitrator to a large extent between different sections of the community. A Government exists to a considerable extent for the purpose of enacting laws which shall mete out equal justice to all classes, to the worker and to the employer and private citizen, and if a Government starts in business itself, it is, to a certain degree, prevented from carrying out what I consider that first essential in the art and science of governing, and to that extent it places itself in a false position. If the Government is running any business we cannot expect it will be uninterested in respect to any Act desired in relation to such industry. We know very well that in Australia the Government has taken on very large businesses which in other parts of the world have been left to private enterprise. I know the railway system is mentioned as being one important business

which the Government, at any rate in these States, can carry on with a greater advantage to the public than a private company could; but I am not quite prepared to subscribe to that assertion. I believe that even in the case of railways the Government would be able to step in with more effect regarding the control, regulation, and management of a railway if run by a company than it is likely to do where the Government itself is carrying on the business. However, the fact remains that the railways have been from the start a Government business, and necessarily so in the first instance, because otherwise the money could not have been found, and it was not as desirable then as it is now for the Government to refrain from carrying on these railways. I need not go into the history of the inception of railways in this country. That is known to all, I believe, even those who are more recent citizens of this State than I and some other members. But I reiterate the opinion that, even in regard to railways, under a proper arrangement and with proper Government control such as exists in England, where they are compelled to have certain trains, to run certain hours, and they are under a great number of limitations and restrictions, it is possible for railways to be run with as much satisfaction or perhaps more by private enterprise than by the Government. By having the railways in the hands of the Government we increase the expenditure, and we maintain a number of individuals who occupy more or less important positions and receive high salaries. We all know that in regard to any works of this description neither a Government nor a city council can obtain the same amount of work from its employees as a private employer can. I think anyone who goes about the country with his eyes open will have met with plenty of instances showing that is so. I have had ample opportunities of ascertaining even very recently the difference between labour employed by the city council and that employed by a private employer; in juxtaposition, one may say, with one another. I have noticed the utter waste of time on many of our departmentally-constructed public works; and this confirms me strongly in the view I have long held that it is undesirable for the Government to compete in these works with private

enterprise. So much for the general question. It appears that a firm in this State was induced by the Government to come here and to establish on a fairly large scale pipe-making works which have employed a large number of hands, and have turned out work much of which was for the Government. I understand that though the price of the pipes was at one time high, reductions have taken place until the pipes are cheaper than any that can be imported from the Eastern States or from England, notwithstanding that the expense of production here is greater than that prevailing in those countries in the items of coal, coke, electric light, and wages. The firm was induced to establish the works on the distinct understanding that there was no possibility of Government competition. So far as I can gather from the replies to my questions, the Government have now started works at Fremantle with the ostensible purpose of giving employment to some men who were unemployed. I say it is unfair, in the circumstances, for the Government to compete with a private firm, which firm they have been largely instrumental in bringing to the State. Perhaps the same remark applies to Fremantle also. However, the volume of private pipe-making work available in the State will not, without the Government work, be sufficient to keep open the private establishment to which I have referred; and it is extremely probable that the proprietor may shut down the works. A large number of pipes has been already manufactured for the Government; and though there may now be some slackness in the demand, there is a considerable amount of work to do. This firm is prepared to do it. It has the men employed; and it is highly desirable, in the interests of the State and of the firm which has been induced by the Government to establish the works, that Government work should be given it to do. It is understood by everybody that the volume of work affects the price. If there is little work to be done, the price is higher; hence the undesirableness of the Government competing with private enterprise. If the Government demand for pipes ceases, the question arises, what will the Government do with the plant they have established and the men they

have employed? I regret that the Government have already taken some of the best men from the shops of private employers. Some of these men were brought to this State and their passages and those of their families paid, by the employers. I may refer to what has been done in the South-East, at Phillips River, where the Government are in a very dangerous position. A large sum has been expended in purchasing and in smelting copper ore; and the Government anticipate a small profit—about £350—certainly not sufficient to justify the enterprise. The profit is purely hypothetical; and the Government are not at all sure that it will be obtained. It is dependent on many circumstances, such as the rise and fall of the price of copper; and that fact is sufficient to convince any thinking man that such a State enterprise is not desirable. The Government intend to cast pipes at Fremantle, and to employ men, some of whom they have taken from private workshops. The State will have to pay high wages; and when the demand for pipes ceases, these men will have to be discharged and thrown on the labour market. Will the Government undertake to employ all the men who will lose employment by Government competition with private enterprise? Owing to hindrances the Government are putting in the way of private enterprise, capitalists are prevented from starting industries which might be highly beneficial to the State. I understand that the Government contemplate launching out into other lines of business; that a Bill will soon reach us having in view what is practically Government competition with financial institutions. Whether that is justified I am not prepared to say; but I understand the Government need considerable supplies of police and railway uniforms, and it is intended to establish a State factory for their manufacture. This is only a sample of the lines on which the Government seem prepared to go. It appears to be a principle with the Government of the day and their supporters that everything in this country should be run on socialistic lines; that men of enterprise, men of capital, and men of ability, should be, if not debarred, at any rate discouraged from attempting to establish businesses in this State. The result in the end must be highly injurious, if not disas-

trous, to the best interests of the country. Most countries in the old world and in America have been established on totally different lines. Their governments have held aloof from industrial enterprises, for the very purpose of holding the scales of justice between employer and employed, and between both of these and the general body of citizens. Any departure from that principle seems to have wrapped up in it very dangerous effects; and the results will sooner or later be apparent here—indeed I think they are already apparent in what I may term the unelastic state of business, the uncertainty and to some extent the unrest observable in the business community; for people do not know what they may expect next, and they feel it is dangerous to embark in any enterprise which involves the expenditure of money or the employment of hands. In this country there is scope for many more manufactures. Not only can the products of the country be worked up here, but our manufacturers can use imported raw material, to the benefit of all concerned. I therefore submit the motion to the House, feeling sure that the underlying principle will be accepted, and that the wording will commend it to members' judgment. I do not anticipate any Government opposition. The inquiry is intended to be far-reaching. Evidence will be taken, not only here, but in the other States; and every proper means will be tried to settle the disputed question of Government day labour *versus* contract work. I repeat that if I had deferred my remarks until Tuesday, I might, perhaps, have been able to speak more effectively. Still, I think I have indicated several places in which, to use an old proverb, "the shoe pinches."

HON. H. BRIGGS (West): I agree with all the general principles which Mr. Randell has adduced. He has treated the subject broadly, reviewing the railways and other public works. I entirely agree with his general principles. But if members look at the first paragraph of the motion, they will see it is specially directed at a pipe-factory in Fremantle. I have been told that the manufacture of pipes has been virtually a monopoly; and I think this one of the instances in which the Government have a right to step in and to compete with

the monopolist. For some years, the only tenderers for pipes have been Messrs. Hoskins & Company, who have tendered at £9 10s. per ton. When the Government found that the manufacture was in the hands of only one firm, they made inquiries and ascertained that the home price of pipes was £7 a ton. The Government had workshops at Fremantle, and with the expenditure of £350 capital it was found they could employ a great number of workmen in making pipes at £8 10s. per ton. The Government thought, as there seemed to be a monopoly—Hoskins & Co. were the only tenderers at £9 10s. per ton—that they should do the work, as they could turn pipes out at £8 10s. per ton. Therefore it was thought well to give the work to our own workmen. This has been done, I am told, because a great many workmen have been removed from Fremantle to the Midland Junction workshops, and there were buildings at Fremantle vacant in which the work could be carried out. I maintain this is one of the exceptions where the Government can step in and try what day labour will cost opposed to contract, where contract is virtually a monopoly. I agree with Mr. Randell in all his general statements. I am a great advocate of private enterprise, but when that private enterprise is narrowed down to one firm it is virtually a monopoly, and then I think this is a time when the Government can fittingly step in and try with their appliances—they cannot supply all the pipes required by this State; but can supply only a certain quantity—what pipes can be made by workmen living in this State. The Government find they can make the pipes at £1 less than the monopoly price. I think the Government have a right to do this, and while I do not agree generally with the extension of the day-labour principle, and while I will also support that portion of the amendment that a Royal Commission should be appointed, yet as this is a peculiar case the Government have to be commended. The work of pipe-making at Fremantle should not be deferred on any sentimental grounds, because the State is acquiring an advantage. The pipes are being made at £1 per ton cheaper, and we are employing our own workmen in a Government building that would otherwise be vacant.

I cannot agree to the whole motion, but to part of it.

On motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, debate adjourned.

BILLS, THIRD READING.

FACTORIES ACT AMENDMENT, read a third time and returned to the Legislative Assembly with amendments.

AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT, read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE, read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

ABORIGINES PROTECTION, read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the previous day.

Schedule (in paragraphs, setting forth amendments to be made in particular sections of the Act):

Paragraph 35—Amendment of Section 403:

An amendment had been moved that the words from the beginning of the paragraph to "in line six and" be struck out.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The object of the amendment of the section was to supply every possible information to the ratepayers. At present a municipality was only required to supply a statement of receipts and expenditure. By the amendment of the section a municipality would be required to place before the ratepayers a statement of assets and liabilities—a very necessary provision.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: The words "assets and liabilities" were not as simple as they seemed in referring to municipalities. The question arose, what were the assets of a municipal council?

THE MINISTER: A road roller.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: A park on which a municipality expended money was an asset. Roads and streets were assets; a town hall was an asset. Take the city of Perth: if the municipality published a balance-sheet they could show assets amounting to anything between £500,000 and £1,000,000. It

was impossible to place in a balance-sheet what were the assets of a municipal council. If a statement was prepared as provided by Section 403 of the principal Act, giving the annual expenditure of moneys received by loan and how expended, and as he intended to suggest later on a statement of all current accounts, these should be sufficient. Could the Minister say how the assets of a municipality would be valued?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It seemed perfectly easy to value assets. A municipality having erected a town hall would know exactly how much the building cost. A certain amount could be written off for depreciation. If a municipality purchased a road roller the cost was known, and a certain deduction could be made for depreciation.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: Was a metalled road an asset?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: One might as well say the whole municipality was an asset. A common-sense meaning must be placed on the words "assets and liabilities." It could do no harm to furnish more information to ratepayers than was done now.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: It would be impossible for a municipality to prepare a balance-sheet. If any ratepayer required a statement of what a town hall cost, or any particular asset, it could be rendered to him by the municipality.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: What about the State furnishing a balance-sheet?

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: That was a different thing altogether. The State went in for public works. How could a municipality set out in a statement of liabilities and assets how much the roads and footpaths cost? It would be hard to put a valuation on public parks, especially on trees. The expense of making a balance-sheet in this form would be enormous for places like Perth and Kalgoorlie, and without any practical advantage. He supported the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

HON. G. RANDELL farther moved that the words "detailed particulars of all assets belonging to and liabilities of the council" be struck out, and the following inserted: "particulars of all current accounts unpaid."

Amendment passed, and the paragraph as amended agreed to.

Paragraph 36—Section 351:

THE MINISTER moved an amendment to insert the following:—

That Subsection 2 of Section 351 be struck out.

A note received from the Parliamentary Draftsman was to the effect that this subsection did not appear in the corresponding section of the Act of 1895, referred to in the margin, and that in any case the meaning of it was not clear.

Amendment passed, and the paragraph as amended agreed to.

Paragraph 37—Schedule 14—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by HON. M. L. MOSS, Bill recommitted for amendment of Clause 27.

HON. M. L. MOSS: In Subclause 4, in an amendment moved by him the word "exclusively" was struck out and certain other words were inserted in lieu. He found afterwards that an error had been made, and he now moved to the effect that the clause be restored to the form in which it stood before amendment.

Amendment passed, and the form of the clause restored.

Bill reported with a farther amendment, and the report adopted.

PRIVATE BILL—KALGOORLIE AND BOULDER RACING CLUBS BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

The Select Committee on the Bill having presented a report, the same was now considered in dealing with the clauses.

Clauses 1 to 15—agreed to.

Clause 16—Committees may make by-laws:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved:

That in Subclause (e) all the words after "racecourse" be struck out.

By reference to the select committee's report, it would be seen that considerable evidence was taken on Subclauses (e) and (f). The committee appointed by another place also took evidence on the Bill generally; but all the witnesses were persons representing the interests of the Kalgoorlie and Boulder Racing Clubs. The

committee appointed by this House had examined witnesses from the West Australian Turf Club, while also inviting representatives from the two goldfields clubs to appear and give evidence. They, however, said they were satisfied with the statement of the case made by Mr. Hare, in his evidence before the committee of another place. The effect of Mr. Hare's evidence was, that it would be in the interest of racing in this State to have two controlling bodies. It was also stated in evidence that all the transactions which the two goldfields clubs had with the West Australian Turf Club showed that the goldfield clubs were treated in the fairest possible manner, and had no complaint to make; also that the W.A. Turf Club adopted certain by-laws which the goldfields clubs had made for the management of the totalisator. The effect of Subclauses (e) and (f) would be to get in the thin end of the wedge for setting up a second controlling body in connection with racing. Members must be aware that the right to fix dates of race meetings was exercised solely by the W.A. Turf Club, and the evidence showed that there was no cause of complaint; but if a by-law were made by the goldfields clubs under this clause, it would have the force of law, and practically the clubs would be able to fix dates of race meetings without reference to the W.A. Turf Club.

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE: Then they must become unregistered clubs?

HON. M. L. MOSS: No; the by-laws being framed under statute, the W.A. Turf Club could not say that the goldfields clubs had abrogated the law. Thus we would have the thin edge of the wedge of dual control, and there would not be the same opportunity of sheeting home rascality in connection with racing that we had now. The W.A. Turf Club could refuse dates, and had powers to prescribe rules for the working and management of totalisators. Parliament had more than once supported the principle that the control of totalisators should rest with the W.A. Turf Club; but this Bill, by this subclause, would give these clubs power to make by-laws with reference to the working and management of totalisators, and they would have the force of law, so that it would not be within the province or power of the W.A. Turf Club

to disqualify horses and owners racing under the goldfields clubs under rules consistent with the law of the land. It was with the idea of avoiding friction that the select committee had come to the conclusion that it would not be in the best interests of racing that the goldfields clubs should have this power. There was no desire to discuss so fine a point as to what would be the effect of these by-laws. The Committee should be guided by the report of the select committee, and by the evidence of Mr. Hale, who said that up to the present there had been complete harmony between the goldfields clubs and the W.A. Turf Club, and that the latter treated the goldfields clubs with every spirit of fairness. Mr. Hale had said, in answer to a question, that the goldfields clubs should be prohibited from using the totalisator, but had added "What is that? We have the book-makers."

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Was that in the evidence?

HON. M. L. MOSS: If not in the evidence, the statement was made while discussing the evidence in the select committee; or if not, he (Mr. Moss) would make the statement. The fact of enabling the goldfields clubs to make rules regarding the totalisator would not give them the right to use it without reference to the W.A. Turf Club; but if they were unable to agree with the W.A. Turf Club they could abolish the use of the totalisator, and probably get the same revenue from bookmakers.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The book-makers would then be unregistered.

HON. M. L. MOSS: It was questionable whether the bookmakers could be disqualified if these clubs were acting under the law of the land. To avoid friction, the select committee thought it inexpedient that this power to make by-laws regarding the totalisator should be given. In the interests of clean sport he moved the amendment.

HON. W. KINGSMILL opposed the amendment. Mr. Moss in pleading so eloquently the case of the W.A. Turf Club had unintentionally created a wrong impression. The power set out in Sub-clause (e) would not infringe the right of the W.A. Turf Club to control racing. Without doubt the custom, which had rapidly grown up and become the racing

law in Western Australia, that the W.A. Turf Club should grant dates to clubs under it, was not infringed. That power was not conferred on the W.A. Turf Club by statute, and we should admire the loyalty of other clubs that had so long honoured the decisions of the W.A. Turf Club as to dates. There was no mention in this Bill of anything that would in any way infringe that right. On page 11 of the evidence members would see enumerated some of the subjects upon which the Kalgoorlie and Boulder Racing Clubs wished to make by-laws, and not one of these subjects would in any way infringe the supremacy of the W.A. Turf Club. The objects were set forth in a letter written by Mr. Hale to Mr. Keyser, as shown on page 11 of the report of evidence, and they were subjects in keeping with the domestic affairs of the clubs. There was no question involving any friction between the clubs and the controlling body of racing. The permission to use the totalisator was the most valuable asset any racing club could have, and the Bill in no way proposed to amend the Acts which conferred on the W.A. Turf Club the sole right to decide what clubs could use the totalisator.

HON. M. L. MOSS: A great deal of time could be saved. A compromise which he would suggest might suit the hon. member. If the following words were inserted, they would suit all sides:--
"For the general management of the said racecourse and all races and race meetings, dates for which have been allotted by the W.A.T.C."

HON. J. W. HACKETT hoped that some compromise would be come to. Those who were great admirers of racing clubs desired to have the matter settled.

HON. W. KINGSMILL: It was not likely he would be able to accept the compromise on the spur of the moment. This was the first he had heard of it, and it had been sprung on him. The members of the select committee appeared to be somewhat divided on this question, and there should be an opportunity of conferring with those gentlemen before accepting the compromise held out. He was glad that Dr. Hackett had expressed a desire to see the question settled. That was the feeling which actuated the greater part of the Committee. In a discussion things might be said which

might be regretted afterwards, and which could only tend to create that friction which all heartily wished to avoid.

HON. M. L. MOSS thought that if the suggestion thrown out were adopted it would meet the difficulty. He had, perhaps, gone a little farther than he should have done. There was no intention on the part of the goldfields clubs to break off from the W.A.T.C., or to set it at defiance, and the best proof of that was that they consented to the W.A.T.C. having power to regulate race meetings and to fix dates, and what the W.A.T.C. wished was that there should be a recognised head regarding racing in Western Australia, as in other States. If these words were inserted, the thing would be put beyond all doubt.

HON. W. KINGSMILL: In order that he might have an opportunity of ascertaining the feeling of the people interested, the representatives of the Boulder and Kalgoorlie Racing Clubs, he moved that progress be reported.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

INSPECTION OF MACHINERY BILL.

AMENDMENTS—ASSEMBLY'S MESSAGE.

The Council having amended the Bill, and the Assembly agreeing to ten amendments and disagreeing with four others, the Assembly's message was now considered in Committee.

No. 4—Clause 16, subclause 2, strike out the whole of paragraph (b):

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the Council's amendment be not insisted on.

HON. W. KINGSMILL did not think it would be fair to go on with these amendments in so thin a House. There had been so much business to occupy the attention of members that they had not had time to sufficiently consider these amendments. He moved that progress be reported.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

DISTRESS FOR RENT RESTRICTION BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Pianos, sewing machines, typewriting machines and mangles exempt from distress in certain cases:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that the word "piano" be struck out.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What was the hon. member's idea of the whole clause?

HON. M. L. MOSS: The word "piano" should come out, also the words "under hire," and he wanted to draw attention to the fact that this was taken from an Act which had been in force since 1898 in New South Wales, but there was no mention of any piano in the New South Wales Act. There sewing machines, typewriters, and mangles were mentioned as being exempt from seizure, but it was going too far altogether to include a valuable piece of property like a piano. This kind of legislation had never hitherto been attempted anywhere else to the extent to which it had been carried in New South Wales. He had given notice of an amendment which was copied from Imperial legislation on this question and which practically gave the same right of exemption from distraint for rent as in the case of an execution under the Local Courts Act. If there were a desire to protect these things they ought to be protected as regarded debt. Hence there seemed some sense in copying Imperial legislation by exempting such articles from seizure under the Local Courts Act.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: It was said in another place that he was an interested party because he managed a sewing-machine business.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the word "piano."

HON. J. A. THOMSON favored the striking out of "piano," which was a luxury.

THE MINISTER: The object was to exempt from seizure the means of livelihood of a music teacher.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: Then none but pianos used by teachers should be exempted.

Amendment put and negatived.

HON. M. L. MOSS moved an amendment:

That the words "or under hire to," in line 3, be struck out.

One who could not pay house rent would not pay rent under a hire agreement; therefore the clause was not protecting

the hirer but the owner. The Bill would exempt from distraint for rent, but would be useless as a protection against a Local Court judgment, which the landlord could easily obtain.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: If the amendment was passed, in 19 cases out of 20 the benefit of the clause would be lost. It was to meet the needs of women in a struggling condition that the Bill was introduced. When in distress they had to hire these articles instead of buying them; and if mangles, sewing machines and typewriters under hire were not exempted from seizure, we should strike a blow at the very persons we were supposed to protect. It was poor women whom we desired to help.

HON. J. A. THOMSON supported Dr. Hackett. Business people who hired out sewing machines and mangles were frequently unable to do so because the applicant could not give security against distraint for rent.

Amendment withdrawn.

New Clause—Clothes, bedding, and tools exempted from distress:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved:—

That subclause 2 be struck out, and that the following be added as Clause 3:—"From and after the passing of this Act the following goods and chattels shall also be exempt from distress for rent, namely, any goods or chattels of the tenant or his family which would be protected from seizure in execution under section of the Local Courts Act, 1904, or any enactment amending or substituted for the same."

Clause 127 of the Local Courts Bill protected from seizure under execution wearing apparel of the husband to the value of £5, of the wife to the value of £5, of each child to the value of £2, and bedding to the value of £5, and £1 for each member of the family dependent on the husband, together with implements of trade to the value of £5. The real desideratum was to prevent beds and bedding being taken from under women and children—a great blot on the law of distraint for rent. An exemption of £5 for tools of trade was quite sufficient.

Motion passed, Subclause 2 struck out, and the new clause added.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BILLS, FIRST READING.

EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT, received from the Legislative Assembly.

ROADS ACT AMENDMENT, received from the Legislative Assembly, and on motion by Hon. W. Kingsmill read a first time.

CITY OF PERTH TRAMWAYS ACT AMENDMENT, received from the Legislative Assembly.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 26 minutes past 6 o'clock until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly.

Friday, 16th December, 1904.

	PAGE
Questions: Hawkers (Indian) in Timber Districts	1947
Government Camels, Treatment	1947
Ringbarking, Blackwood District	1947
Grass Plots, experimental	1947
Return, etc., ordered: Timber Hewing Contracts	1947
Bore at South Perth	1947
Empress of Coolgardie G.M. Lease, report considered	1951
Bills: Third readings (3)	1948
North Perth Tramways, report stage	1948
Navigation, Recommittal, reported	1948
Local Courts, Council's Amendments	1964
Bills of Exchange Act Amendment, first reading	1970
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, Irregularity; No. 2 Bill introduced	1970
Aborigines Protection, first reading	1971
Third readings (2)	1971
Public Servant's Compulsory Retirement (Pomhart), report considered	1971
Annual Estimates resumed, Lands votes concluded	1970

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR MINES: t, Geological Survey—The Mineral Production of Western Australia up to the