

successful recommit the Bill and insert the electorate in some province.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved as an amendment that the words "Hannans" and "Kalgoorlie" be inserted in the North-East Province.

Amendment passed, and the schedule as amended agreed to.

Second Schedule (Assembly electorates):

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

KALGOORLIE TRAMWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and on motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, read a first time.

KATANNING ELECTRIC LIGHTING AND POWER BILL (PRIVATE).

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and on motion by HON. G. KANDELL, read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 13 minutes past 10 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 3rd December, 1903.

	PAGE
Speaker-elect, Presentation	2439
Chairman of Committees, elected	2443
Election Writ, Nelson vacancy	2439
Business Orders and Hours, Additional	2440
Standing Orders Suspension, to expedite business	2441
Leave of Absence, Dr. McWilliams	2441
Bills: Kalgoorlie Roads Board License Validation, report	2439
Supreme Court Act Amendment, Council's Amendments	2443
Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs, Recommendation, reported	2445
University Endowment, Recommendation, reported	2446
Lunacy, Recommendation, reported	2447
Audit Bill, Council's suggestions and procedure	2450
Roads Act Amendment, in Committee, reported	2453
Collie-Narrogin Railway, second reading resumed, adjourned	2464
Municipal Institutions, Council's amendments	2473
Private Bills: Katanning Electric Lighting and Power, Report, third reading	2444
Land Act Amendment (Salvation Army), in Committee, reported	2460

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

PRAYERS.

THE SPEAKER-ELECT, PRESENTATION.

A few minutes after assembling the Speaker-elect, accompanied by hon. members, proceeded to Government House, where His Excellency the Governor was pleased to approve of the election of Mr. C. Harper as Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: Collie-Narrogin Railway Plans, etc. Eastern Goldfields Firewood Supply, Return.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

KALGOORLIE ROADS BOARD LICENSE VALIDATION BILL.

MR. BATH brought up the report of the select committee appointed to consider the Bill.

Report received.

ELECTION WRIT, NELSON.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Walter James), by leave without notice, moved:

That a vacancy having occurred in the electoral district of Nelson, owing to the death of the late member, the Hon. Sir James George Lee Steere, Mr. Speaker do issue a writ for the election of another member.

Question passed.

BUSINESS DAYS AND HOURS, ADDITIONAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Walter James), by leave without notice, moved :

That on and after Monday next, in addition to the present business days and hours, the House shall for the remainder of the session meet for the despatch of business on Mondays and Fridays at 2.30 p.m. and shall sit till 6.30 p.m., and if necessary from 7.30 p.m. onwards.

Due notice of the motion would have been given but for the unforeseen circumstances which had practically tied our hands for the last two days. Let us see whether, by sitting two extra days per week, we could by a vigorous effort dispose of the remaining business of the session in a reasonable time.

MR. THOMAS : Which Bills would the Government withdraw ?

THE PREMIER : Few of the Bills would give rise to difficulty when the House got to business.

HON. F. H. PIESSE (Williams) : While anxious to assist the Premier, country members would find a difficulty in complying with this proposal. To sit on Fridays he (Mr. Piesse) was agreeable, in order to clear the Notice Paper ; but members with country businesses, who had to return home weekly, would suffer hardship if the House sat on Mondays. Much had already been conceded by sitting at 2.30 ; for this materially interfered with members' city businesses.

THE PREMIER : Some members attended the House on every sitting day.

MR. PIESSE : Even if we sat for two extra days there was no guarantee that the session would finish before Christmas. Anyhow, the Premier should except next Monday.

THE PREMIER : As to next Monday he would be glad to meet members' requirements.

HON. F. H. PIESSE : Let the motion take effect after next Monday.

MR. F. ILLINGWORTH (Cue) supported the Premier's suggestion. There were but two Mondays before Christmas ; and if we wished to close the session this year we must sit on every available day.

MR. A. E. THOMAS (Dundas) opposed the motion. To sit on Fridays he was agreeable ; but to ask country members to sit on Mondays also was asking too much, for they would then be

prevented from paying weekly visits to their homes. Much time had been wasted at the beginning of the session by early adjournments ; and it was unfair at this stage to penalise country members.

MR. H. J. YELVERTON (Sussex) protested against Monday and Friday sittings. As a country member with a large private business, he, when elected, fully expected that the House would sit on the usual days only. It was unfair, because the Government introduced innumerable Bills, many of them wholly unnecessary, to ask members to sit for five days a week at the fag-end of the session. He would agree to sitting on Fridays. To members who had to travel hundreds of miles to and from the city, the proposed arrangement was unfair. For instance, returning to his home on Friday, he had to work late on the Saturday and all Sunday, and must leave again for the city the Monday afternoon to attend the sitting on Tuesday.

MR. HASSELL (Plantagenet) protested against the motion. Having to travel 700 miles a week, it would be impossible for him to attend the House on Mondays, and he desired one day at home in each week to attend to his business. He had been willing to sit longer hours at the beginning of the session, but it was unreasonable now to ask the House to accept the motion.

MR. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) : When moving at the beginning of the session that the House should sit at 2.30 each day, he anticipated that just before Christmas we should be rushing measures through, and that members would be called on to sit earlier and on extra days. What now happened should serve as a lesson to the next Parliament to sit earlier and get through the work more speedily. He noticed that the same members carried on the business of the House no matter at what hour the House met. The members now opposed to sitting on extra days in a large measure rarely attended the House.

HON. F. H. PIESSE : Members who had spoken were most constant in attendance.

MR. TAYLOR : If a record were kept of the hours members sat in the House the statement of the hon. member would be disproved. It was idle to say that Opposition members kept the House going. Not one seat on the Opposition

benches was occupied during the passage of the Constitution Bill.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: As a member of the Opposition he had sat in the House all the time.

MR. TAYLOR: Opposition members, if they were in the precincts of the House at all, were in the Refreshment-room. When the Mining Bill was going through eleven to thirteen members only were present during the discussion on many occasions, and on divisions they were out-voted by members resurrected from the Refreshment-room. The business of the country could be carried on better by sitting from 2-30 o'clock to 10-30 o'clock than by sitting from 4-30 p.m. to 3 o'clock in the morning. Members did better work during the day. He desired to emphasise the fact that members did not attend the House regularly, and he hoped that there would be a proper system of recording attendances. At present members who only attended for five minutes were recorded as being present at the sitting. He had seen Fremantle members time after time come into the House; say "Hear, hear," walk out, and be recorded as present.

MR. HAYWARD (Bunbury): Though one of those who had to travel a long distance, if we had a guarantee of finishing the business a few days before Christmas he would be willing to make a sacrifice to sit on Mondays.

MR. HOLMAN (North Murchison): As one who travelled long distances to reach the city he supported the motion. Some members desired the session to continue until after the holidays; but such was not his desire, for he was willing to sit every day in the week to get the business over. Members were returned to attend to the business of the country. They should not have asked their electors to choose them if they complained that their private businesses would suffer.

MR. QUINLAN (Toodyay): While not concerned as to the days on which the House met, he differed from some of the opinions already given, and took the opportunity of expressing what he considered to be the general opinion of the country, that it would be best served if the House would shut up for the next two or three years with the exception of passing the Estimates. He was quite certain the opinion of Western Australia

was that there was too much legislation, and that it would be better for all parties if the House only met for the next two or three years to pass the Estimates.

THE PREMIER hoped the House would agree to the motion. He was the last to ask any member to make a greater sacrifice than the needs of the State demanded, and that was the position he took up when the annual motion came before us in the earlier part of the session to alter the hours of meeting. Now, however, we might make an effort to discharge the business on the Notice Paper. Members very rightly referred to the fact that in the earlier part of the session the sittings closed too early in the evening. He recognised that fact as well as hon. members; but on the other hand a number of the items on the Notice Paper had been dislocated because he had been always anxious to meet members on both sides of the House in deferring Orders of the Day so that members might look farther into them. Now he thought we might make some sacrifice for a week or two to get through the business.

Question put and passed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by MR. HIGHAM, leave of absence for one fortnight granted to Dr. McWilliams, on the ground of urgent private business.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

TO EXPEDITE BUSINESS.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Walter James) moved:—

That for the remainder of the session the Standing Orders be suspended so far as to enable Bills to be passed through all stages in one day, and Messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration on the day on which they are received.

This was the usual motion made at this stage of the session, and in which he asked the concurrence of members.

MR. MORAN (West Perth): One could not imagine a motion of this importance going through with the Notice Paper in its present state. While he refrained from saying anything about the hours of meeting, because a member's first duty was to the country, and he would be quite willing to sit on Saturdays to get through the business, he would

consider himself a traitor to Western Australia if he allowed the safeguards of hundreds of years and the barriers raised in the interests of the people to be thrown down at this stage of the session, as there were important measures on the Notice Paper in their second-reading stage. One sympathised with the Premier in his desire to get through with the business before Christmas; but he would never dream of allowing Bills to be rushed through without any consideration whatever.

THE PREMIER: No one would ask that.

MR. MORAN: Were we to pass through all stages at one sitting a Railway Bill involving the ultimate expenditure of half a million of money? One never heard of such a proposal. Were we to pass at one sitting a measure of great importance deserving publicity and consideration from members and from the people—the Metropolitan Sewerage and Water Supply Bill, involving the expenditure of a large sum of money and fixing a system that would endure for all time? Were we to pass at one sitting the Government Railways Bill altering our system of railway management? He would not consent to do so, and would hesitate to be so presumptuous as to say that he could make up his mind at one sitting on such an important Bill. No man could do so. Members should see reports of the discussions taking place on the second reading of Bills, and should weigh matters over-night. [**THE PREMIER:** Undoubtedly.] Even though the session extended over Christmas, he was not going at this stage to throw down the usual barriers which were put up so that Bills might be considered by the House and by the people; and though he had always supported the present motion when only routine matters remained, and when we had practically arrived at a unanimous decision on matters, the Notice Paper was now in that stage which one might call half through. Pearlshell Fisheries Bill, Railway Traffic Bill, Agricultural Lands Purchase Bill, Roads and Streets Closure Bill, Municipal Institutions Bill; all these had not been considered in this Chamber yet. He asked the House to stick to its rights. Members did not know what danger was

in store for the people of this country when the people's House would ruthlessly, in this manner, throw down all the usual safeguards, especially when we knew that every member could not be here at every stage, and members who made up their minds to offer stubborn resistance to certain clauses in Committee would not know when the Committee stage was coming on. The Premier had always shown a desire to be courteous and considerate to all sides of the House, but that was not the point. We wanted rules, regulations, and rights, and not courtesy and consideration. He hoped the House would not consent to this sweeping motion to cast down all the Standing Orders so that Bills might be rushed through at one sitting.

MR. A. E. THOMAS (Dundas): Each session during this Parliament he had opposed such a motion as this, even when only routine work had to be put through. Now we had 26 orders on the Notice Paper, and there were four important notices of motion. Moreover, there were other Messages and also Bills to come from another place. The Standing Orders should not be suspended to allow important Bills to be rushed through.

THE PREMIER: The motion was the usual one made at this stage of the session, he thought, not only in this Assembly but every other Assembly.

MR. MORAN: As far as the date was concerned, but not as regarded the state of the Notice Paper.

THE PREMIER: If the motion were passed, no one would think of rushing on an important Bill like a Railway Bill or a Sewerage Bill at one sitting. Members must always bear in mind that, although the Standing Orders were suspended, Bills could not be put through all stages without the consent of the House. If, for instance, a Bill passed its second reading and we wanted to go into Committee at once, a motion to that effect would have to be submitted, and unless the House agreed the Committee stage could not then be taken. It would be entirely wrong to put important Bills through all stages at one sitting, but there were other Bills which could be dealt with. Take, for instance, the Lunacy Bill. That Bill had not been passed through Committee, but was waiting for new clauses, and he was going to suggest

that we might pass the Bill through Committee, recommit, and deal with clauses on the Notice Paper. If that course could not be adopted, this thing would be hung up.

MR. MORAN: Why not have a conference and see if we could not pick out routine measures?

THE PREMIER: The House itself would not allow an important Bill to be rushed through.

MR. MORAN: Men in a hurry to get away would do anything.

THE PREMIER: If men were anxious to get away a little earlier, they could suspend the Standing Orders Bill by Bill. After all, the suspension of the Standing Orders mostly governed small matters, and prevented needless delay which would be occasioned by applying to almost formal Bills what would be necessary in important things. He asked the House to extend to the Government the same consideration as it had extended to other Governments, and pass the motion.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	14

Majority for ... 3

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Burgess	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Ewing	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Holman
Mr. Holmes	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Moran
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Pigott
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Stone
Mr. James	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Wallace
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Yelverton
Mr. Quinlan	Mr. Thomas (Teller).
Mr. Mason	
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Higham (Teller).	

Question thus passed.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN.

THE PREMIER moved:—

That Mr. Illingworth do take the Chair and be appointed as Chairman of Committees of this House.

He said: I move this with pleasure, for all of us who have been in this House during the time Mr. Illingworth has been here must appreciate the constitutional knowledge he has and the grasp of the practice and procedure of the House. I have had the pleasure of being in this

House nearly the whole time Mr. Illingworth has been here. I think, indeed, he came in at the same time as I did, and during the whole of that time I have appreciated that there is no man in the House who has shown a greater knowledge of constitutional law and the procedure of the House than the hon. member himself. I have great pleasure in moving this motion, and I am confident it commends itself to the House as being a reward well merited by one of the ablest constitutional lawyers in this House.

MR. QUINLAN: I second the motion.

MR. PIGOTT: I move as an amendment:—

That Mr. Daglish, the member for Subiaco, do take the Chair and act as Chairman of Committees for the remainder of the session.

MR. A. E. THOMAS: I second the amendment.

MR. F. ILLINGWORTH: If my proposer and seconder are willing to consent, I shall have great pleasure in withdrawing in favour of Mr. Daglish.

Several MEMBERS: No.

Question put, and passed on the voices, Mr. Illingworth being thus elected Chairman.

MR. STONE: Should there not be a ballot?

THE PREMIER: No; there is no provision for a ballot.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I have to thank members for the honour which it has been their pleasure to confer on me, in placing me in this honourable position. I cannot say it is a pleasure to myself, as far as I am personally concerned, for the reason that I like the active politics of the House; but I realise we are all the servants of the public, and the will of the public has been expressed, as far as the House is concerned, through their representatives. I accept the position as an honour to myself, and I am grateful for the kindness expressed by the motion carried in the House.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

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

No. 1—Clause 2, line 5, strike out the word "includes," and insert "may include":

THE PREMIER: Members would recollect we passed a Supreme Court Bill to confer jurisdiction on persons appointed as commissioners of the Supreme Court, and it was provided that the jurisdiction capable of being exercised by the Court, and which under the Supreme Court Act was assigned to the persons, should include all the jurisdiction a Judge was capable of exercising. The Council had struck out the word "include" in Clause 2 and inserted "may include" in lieu, which would leave it to the Governor who issued the commission to indicate in the commission whether the whole or any part of the commission of a Supreme Court Judge should be exercised by a commissioner. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed.

No. 2—Clause 2, add the following words: "But no appellate jurisdiction shall be assigned unless the commission is granted to a Judge of the Supreme Court, or a practitioner of the said Court of at least seven years' standing":

THE PREMIER: Under Section 12 of the Supreme Court Act of 1880 provision was made to enable appellate jurisdiction being conferred on barristers of seven years' standing, or upon a Resident Magistrate. Power was given to enable jurisdiction to be conferred on a Resident Magistrate to deal with cases chiefly in the distant North, mostly minor cases, indictable but not serious. By the Bill appellate jurisdiction was given to persons holding these commissions. By the amendment appellate jurisdiction could not be exercised by a Resident Magistrate who was appointed a commissioner, but only by a barrister of seven years' standing. He could hardly imagine any Attorney General or Government conferring appellate jurisdiction on a Resident Magistrate, but it was possible for this to be done. The amendment avoided that possibility. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

KATANNING ELECTRIC LIGHTING AND POWER BILL (PRIVATE).

MR. FOULKES moved that the report of the Committee of the whole House be adopted.

MR. MORAN: Care should be taken that important matters were not rushed through the House hurriedly. He had not had time to read the report of the select committee which inquired into this Bill, and as the Standing Orders had been suspended to enable Bills to be passed through the whole of their stages in one day, he would have to read the report to the House. (Report read.)

THE PREMIER: We were dealing with the report of the Committee of the whole House, not the report of the select committee.

MR. MORAN: We were adopting the report of the House, but it was necessary to see if that course was wise. The only object in dealing with a matter of this kind was to see that the power given to one person would not act injuriously against the interests of what might become a very large town.

MR. FOULKES: The Bill did not provide for a monopoly.

MR. MORAN: It was necessary to be assured on that point; also whether there was any objection by the local authorities to this Bill.

MR. FOULKES: The facts in regard to this Bill were brought forward at the Committee stage. The select committee had carefully examined the Bill, and saw that the person applying for the right to supply electric light for the district of Katanning should not have the sole right.

MR. MORAN: Was there any clause in the Bill which would prevent anybody else coming in?

MR. FOULKES: No. The applicant had to supply any person in the district with electric light. The applicant was tied down to supply lights, but the people of Katanning were not obliged to get their lights from this particular person.

MR. MORAN: Was the undertaker in this case obliged to supply any quantity of light demanded by any person in the district?

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member had already spoken.

THE PREMIER: The Bill was almost an exact copy of the measure which was now in force in the Cottesloe district.

The undertaker was bound to supply light under certain conditions.

Question passed and the report adopted.

THIRD READING.

MR. FOULKES moved that the Bill be read a third time.

MR. MORAN: Had the Standing Orders been suspended to enable private Bills to be dealt with?

THE SPEAKER: To deal with all Bills.

MR. MORAN: Did that include everything?

THE PREMIER: If the hon. member thought that the third reading had better be put off till to-morrow, there would be no objection.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS BILL.

RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, Bill recommitted for amendments.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the words "and include assistant inspector" be added to the definition of "inspector"; also that the following be inserted: "'prescribed' means prescribed by this Act or the regulations thereunder."

Amendment passed.

Clause 29—Saving of civil remedy:

THE MINISTER moved that in Subclause (c.) the words "to be served by" be struck out, and "of" inserted in lieu. Also the subclause to stand as Subclause (a.).

Amendment passed.

New Clause—Offences by sellers:

THE MINISTER moved that the following be inserted as Clause 12:—

Any person who—

(1.) Sells or describes as bonedust or bonemeal any fertiliser containing less than the prescribed percentage of tricalcic phosphate derived from bones; or

(2.) Sells or describes as superphosphate or super any fertiliser containing less than the prescribed percentage of water soluble phosphate, and less than the prescribed total percentage of water soluble phosphate and citrate soluble phosphate; or

(3.) Sells or describes as Thomas's Phosphate any fertiliser composed of basic slag containing less than the prescribed percentage of tricalcic phosphate and so prepared that less than the prescribed percentage of the fertiliser is capable of passing through a sieve having three thousand six hundred meshes to the square inch; or

(4.) Sells for use as food for cattle any article which contains any ingredient deleterious to cattle, or to which has been added any ingredient worthless for feeding purposes and not disclosed at the time of the sale,

commits an offence against this Act.

THE PREMIER: In the Bill which members had before them they would find Clause 12 the same in substance as that contained on the Notice Paper. The select committee struck out this clause, and put in a recommendation that the matter should be dealt with by regulation; but as the clause created a substantive offence it should be dealt with in the Bill and not by regulation thereunder. Therefore it was thought desirable to reinstate that clause. It was unusual in regulations to give power to create an offence. If a person sold a certain article that did not contain the prescribed strength of certain ingredients, that person was guilty of an offence, and should be dealt with by a clause of the Bill and not by regulation.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Offences under the Stock Act were dealt with by regulations.

THE PREMIER: The Stock Act did not deal with a matter like this; and although the select committee recommended that this offence should be dealt with by regulation, it was found on consideration that this provision should be made in the Act and not by regulation, as a regulation could not prescribe what should be an offence, but might regulate it. This offence stood by itself as a substantive matter, whereas regulations were to regulate matters and not to create a substantive offence. The select committee's recommendation was found to be utterly unworkable; therefore the provision had to be made by enactment and not by regulation.

MR. BURGESS: The effect of fixing this standard in the Bill would almost certainly be to raise the price of the phosphates at once. This was not what the

select committee recommended, and he for one would not accept the method of fixing the percentage in the clause.

THE PREMIER: Subclause 3 prescribed that it should be an offence to sell as "Thomas's phosphate" any fertiliser composed of basic slag containing less than 30 per cent. of tricalcic phosphate, or if less than 90 per cent. was capable of passing through a sieve of a certain size of mesh. These were the tests and standard for Thomas's phosphate, therefore they could be put definitely in the clause; but as to other manures, objections could be raised on the ground that the percentage might be altered. Members would see that this amendment did to a large extent embody the recommendation of the select committee, by saying in each case that the strength of the manure must answer the test prescribed by regulations, whereas in this clause the test would be fixed.

[Sitting suspended for 10 minutes.]

THE PREMIER moved that the words "having three thousand six hundred meshes to the square inch," in Subclause 3, be struck out, and the words "of the prescribed mesh" inserted in lieu.

MR. MORAN: Quorum not present.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was not necessary for a quorum to be present if the hon. member did not call attention to the fact.

MR. MORAN would not call attention to the fact, but later on if members did not come in he would do so.

MR. JACOBY: If the Minister for Lands desired this class of manure to be a benefit to the dry portions of the country, particularly such a place as Meckering where the annual rainfall was only about 14 inches, it would be necessary to provide that the manure shall not be of the class provided for in the clause.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The proposal was being altered.

MR. JACOBY: The select committee proposed that the sieve should have 10,000 meshes to the square inch. The Minister must have been approached in the meantime by importers.

THE MINISTER: The words in the clause were drafted in error.

MR. JACOBY: If Thomas's phosphate was to be of any benefit to the dry districts, the sieve must have nothing less than 10,000 meshes to the square inch;

otherwise the manure would be useless. When regulations were being issued, this matter should be thoroughly considered.

MR. STONE: Who had the power to make the regulations?

THE MINISTER: The Governor-in-Council, as was usual.

MR. STONE: The recommendations of a practical committee should not be thrown out.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The amendment sought to meet the requirements of the select committee, and the regulations would provide precisely what the select committee asked for.

MR. BURGESS: Would the regulations provide what was asked for by the select committee?

THE MINISTER: Yes. There was no intention to deviate from the recommendations of the committee.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended inserted in the Bill.

Bill reported with farther amendments, and the report adopted.

UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT BILL.

RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by the **PREMIER**, Bill recommitted for amendments.

Clause 7—Power to lease, and with the approval of the Governor to transfer, exchange, or mortgage lands:

THE PREMIER moved that the words "of any lands granted or demised to them as aforesaid," be inserted after "leases," in line 1. It was also intended to insert a new clause appearing on the Notice Paper; thus giving to trustees the privilege of dealing with land granted to them, subject only to the trusts of the person who gave the land. As the Bill was drafted now, the limitation imposed would apply to all the land given, so that if a testator gave land it would be limited in the way prescribed by the Bill. That, in his opinion, was undesirable.

MR. MORAN: The principle of giving to the university board a free hand in reference to grants made to them by other than the State was one to which he was opposed. If a donor gave land to a university without limitations or conditions, that should come under the ordinary handling of university property the same as land given by the State, and

if a trust was imposed, the proposed new clause would be redundant.

THE PREMIER: The limited power prescribed would be right as to land given by the State, but if a private donor wanted to give land, why should we not leave his hand free?

MR. MORAN: We did leave his hand free.

THE PREMIER: No.

MR. MORAN: A man knew the conditions before he made his will, and if he imposed a trust that trust must be carried out.

THE PREMIER: One might or might not know the conditions. A donor ought to have a perfectly free hand.

MR. MORAN: If one left land without express conditions and the trustees had power to deal with it as they pleased, they might act in a way which would be in conflict with the wishes of the donor if they sold that land.

THE PREMIER: In his opinion, in the great majority of cases where land was given, it would not be land which it would be profitable to develop.

Amendment put and passed.

THE PREMIER farther moved that after "and," in line 4, the words "may with the like approval" be inserted.

MR. STONE did not like the word "mortgage."

THE PREMIER: This was subject to the approval of the Governor, and the trustees might need to mortgage land.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

New Clause—Power to dispose of land acquired by gift, etc.:

THE PREMIER moved that the following be added as Clause 6:—

The trustees may dispose of any real or personal property acquired by gift, demise, or bequest as they may think fit, subject only to the express trusts of any deed, will, or instrument under which such property is acquired by them.

Clause passed, and added to the Bill.

Bill reported with amendments and a new clause, and the report adopted.

LUNACY BILL.

RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by the PREMIER, Bill recommitted for amendments.

Clause 43—Resident medical practitioner; visiting medical practitioner:

THE PREMIER moved that the word "fifty," in line 1, be struck out, and "twenty-five" inserted in lieu. When the Bill was passing through Committee, an opinion was expressed that the number "fifty" was too large.

Amendment passed; also a consequential amendment made in line 1 of Subclause 2, "ten" being inserted in lieu of "twenty-five."

Clause 146—Where property small, the Inspector General may apply same directly for insane person's maintenance:

THE PREMIER: This clause related to the summary method of dealing with property of the insane patient where that property did not exceed £500 in value, and enabled the Inspector General to act as trustee. We wished to make that clause a bit clearer by inserting a new subclause giving the court power, by summary order, to vest in the Inspector General any small estates of insane persons, so that the Inspector General might exercise the same powers in regard to a small estate as would be exercised by a committee of the estate. The power in the clause as it stood was not sufficiently extensive to enable this to be done.

Amendment passed, and the subclause added.

Subclause 3 (consequential), relating to fees payable to the Inspector General, also added to the Bill.

Clause 161—Misprint amended by striking out the words "the Commissioner of Public Health or," the clause then reading "any health officer," etc.

New Clause 180—Bringing prohibited thing into a hospital for insane:

THE PREMIER: It was found that no provision existed hitherto for prohibiting certain articles from being passed into or thrown over the wall of an asylum for lunatics. Experience at Fremantle and elsewhere had shown the necessity for prohibiting such articles from being introduced, and hence it was necessary to provide for this kind of offence.

Clause passed, and added to the Bill.

New Clauses 26 to 32—Part IV., Habitual Drunkards:

MR. PURKISS, in moving the first of the new clauses, said: These clauses were framed to meet the cases of persons suffering from the dangerous physical effects resulting from the excessive use of alcohol in any form. Dipsomania

was recognised by the medical profession everywhere as a disease ; so much so that in all enlightened countries professing advanced civilization the necessity for treating dipsomania as a disease was recognised by the erecting of asylums, usually on the cottage system, for the treatment of patients who submitted themselves voluntarily to such treatment or were committed by order of a court for detention and treatment. Such institutions were to be found in England, France, Germany, Austria, and most notably in America, which had led the way in the curative treatment of this class of disease by the establishment of houses of detention for the treatment of dipsomaniacs. In young countries, where the expense of such establishments with staffs and medical officers on a large scale would be almost prohibitive, resort was had to the expedient of utilising a portion of some large enclosed ground, such as a lunatic asylum, so that one portion of it, perhaps a corner of a large enclosure, could be utilised for persons of this class undergoing curative treatment. In New Zealand, legislation for this purpose was introduced about the year 1881, so that it had been in operation some 21 years ; and having himself had personal observation of the working of the system under these provisions, which were copied in all essential parts from the New Zealand Act, he could speak with confidence of the beneficial results of the system. He had seen patients in an asylum of this kind engaged in various useful occupations, such as making boots, clothing, printing all that was required in connection with the establishment, erecting their own buildings, also having a billiard-table, a reading room, ploughing ground for sowing wheat, gathering in their crops ; and all this within an area which in some cases was part of a larger enclosure. Members would understand that in a lunatic asylum with one or two hundred patients there would be a certain proportion, perhaps 30 out of 100, who could not do anything ; while the larger proportion of those patients would be mad or wrong on some one subject, and apart from that particular subject they could perform acts in a rational manner such as he had seen. A large area of ground had been set aside in this State at Claremont for a lunatic asylum ;

and it would be easy there to follow the New Zealand system, by using a portion of that ground, say one suitable corner, for the purpose of treating dipsomaniacs in the way he had described. When an inebriate was sent to an asylum of this kind on the order of a Judge, it was found that after about 48 hours he caused no farther trouble, because he understood what was being done for him, and consequently it did not become necessary after those first few hours to place him under restraint by having warders or doctors to attend him constantly. Derelicts who were the victims of drink could not be treated without some restraint, and this kind of restraint could best be practised in an institution such as these clauses would provide for. A wonderful number of cures had been effected by placing people under restraint for a greater or less period. Under the provisions of the proposed clause no person could be incarcerated except on his or her motion, or upon the motion of father, husband, wife, child, or friend ; and no Judge could make an order except upon evidence of the clearest character from two medical practitioners, and from any other person he thought fit to call. No case occurred in New Zealand of a person being incarcerated except on his or her own motion. People seized every chance offered of curing themselves. None went in who did not come out blessing the provisions of the Act. There was no fear that the part of the asylum set apart for the purpose of these clauses would be inundated with patients. It was recognised that a dipsomaniac could be cured ; and if we were not prepared to go in for a regular asylum for the purpose, we should dedicate a portion of our asylum grounds for the treatment of the disease, and thus do a humane and God-like act. After 21 years' experience of the operations of the clauses in New Zealand, they had not been repealed. Every safeguard was taken. Friends of sufferers usually induced the victims to apply for admission to the retreats, as they hesitated to apply to the court on behalf of the sufferers. A case had come under his notice in New Zealand where a young man of bright promise and great parts went into one of these asylums on his own motion for three months. At the end of that period he came out, but

having a relapse, went in again for farther treatment, and came out the second time absolutely cured, though his appeared to be one of the worst cases of dipsomania. If we only cured one person in a hundred it would be a good thing. Knowing the effect of the operation of the clauses in New Zealand he thought it desirable to have similar clauses inserted in our Lunacy Bill. Taking the first of the new clauses, he moved that the following be added as Clause 26:—

Application may be made to a Judge for an order of detention by the following persons and in the following cases:—1, By the habitual drunkard himself declaring that he is willing to submit to curative treatment under the order of the Court; or 2, By the parent, husband, wife, child, or friend of such habitual drunkard, in cases; (a), Where such person is suffering or has been recently suffering from *delirium tremens* or other dangerous physical effects of habitual drunkenness; or (b) Where such person, through habitual drunkenness, has recently been wasting his means and been neglecting his business or insufficiently providing for his family, or a wife has been wasting the means of her husband; or (c), Where such person has recently, under the influence of drink, used or threatened violence towards himself or any member of his family.

THE PREMIER: The provision enabled habitual drunkards to be dealt with in one of two ways. The sufferer might himself declare his willingness to submit to treatment, or the law might be put in motion by the parent, husband, wife, child, or friend. In every case there must be an order of the court. No power existed by which the individual could knock at the door of the hospital for the insane and ask for admission for so many months. Provision was made for any person other than the individual himself to apply for an order. Should an application be made, the Judge would direct a notice to be served on the habitual drunkard, and would take the evidence of not less than two medical practitioners, and of such other persons as he thought fit, and he might make an order for the detention of the individual for any term not exceeding twelve months in a ward, should the individual be sent to the hospital for the insane, set apart from the wards of the other inmates of the asylum. Provision was made that at any time the order might be rescinded by the Judge, but it was insisted that

the habitual drunkard must be under control during the existence of the order. The provisions were useful and wise. At present in this State we could not afford to have a separate inebriate retreat, and even if we could afford it, it was questionable whether there was need for it. However, we could, in connection with our asylums for the insane, have separate provision made and a separate building for such people, the building extending as the needs of the State demanded. In future, if need be, a separate retreat could be established. We should adopt the principle applied so successfully in New Zealand for many years, and as the member for Perth said, if the clause only succeeded in reclaiming a few we would be justified in trying the experiment. It must be understood that persons under treatment were to be kept apart from other insane persons. No doubt public opinion required that the State should provide for the treatment of habitual drunkards.

MR. HASTIE: Would these provisions apply to licensed houses?

THE PREMIER: It must be a licensed house in which habitual drunkards only were received. Probably in practice the few cases which would crop up would be dealt with in a hospital for insane.

MR. MORAN: Whilst having great sympathy with the object of the member for Perth, yet what was proposed was not at all satisfactory. Drunkenness was in no way allied to insanity, and if there was one thing calculated to make a man "queer" it was to take him from the unreal visions and "jim-jams" of his imagination when drunk, and when he came to his senses have to find himself in the region of raving maniacs. We could not control the voices of the insane locked up in such institutions, and those noises were the least desirable to be heard by a man recovering from drunkenness. It would even be better for him to be in a gaol than in a lunatic asylum, provided it was thoroughly understood this person was not to be herded with criminals. This power existed in New Zealand, but he did not think that drunkards were locked up in an asylum.

MR. PURKISS said he had seen it.

MR. MORAN: The administration of this power was seen by himself when in New Zealand, but he did not think the

person referred to was locked up in an asylum. He believed there was no country in the world which got more revenue from drink than Western Australia, per head of the population, and no State in Australia came near it. It would not be asking too much to request that an inebriates' retreat should be provided out of the surplus in the hands of the Government. We did not want elaborate stone walls or a big building. If a man went in voluntarily he would welcome gentle restraint which he would get in a place where he was not surrounded by stone walls, but would receive attention, proper food, and care. The reason why we obtained so much revenue in Western Australia was because people were living in places where a certain amount of drink was necessary, and where the great bulk of the people did not drink to excess. Dipsomaniacs were not so numerous here as in the Eastern States.

MR. HASTIE: We could only anticipate that in some cases there would be applications before Judges which never should be made, and in a certain percentage of those cases people would be locked up who ought not to be under restraint. It had been laid down that we were not in a position to have an inebriates' retreat built in this State. We might, however, have a part of the asylum grounds away from the lunatics altogether, which could be used as an inebriates' retreat; but according to the wording of the measure such persons would be ordered to be detained in an asylum, and would be looked after by the ordinary attendants of the asylum. From what he knew of those attendants they were very much the same as ordinary attendants at a gaol; people who had very little sympathy in their composition, who looked upon every inmate as a prisoner, and who would do very little good towards the cure of habitual drunkards. Whatever was done in this way, we should, if we could have an inebriates' retreat, make it as distinct as possible from an ordinary asylum, and those who went to that retreat should not be attended by an asylum attendant. In framing regulations he would make it a disqualification for any person to be engaged at an asylum of this kind who had ever worked in a

lunatic asylum or gaol. We should join with other countries in trying to cure habitual drunkards.

Question passed, and the clause added to the Bill.

New Clause 27—Superintendent and officers may be appointed for each hospital:

THE PREMIER: The Government intended, if we passed this clause, to have an entirely separate building. We did not think of mixing these people up with insane patients. There was no need to have an elaborate building, but a plain comfortable one would meet the wants of those who occupied it.

MR. DAGLISH: It was desirable that the Government should go a little farther, and inquire into some of the cures which had been brought forward. A politician in another State, now holding office as a Minister, submitted himself to one of these cures, which proved in every sense successful; and the fact of his being able to retain office seemed ample evidence that the cure retained its efficacy after lengthened experience. It was one of the cures exercised by a private individual in Victoria.

THE PREMIER: That was an old case.

MR. DAGLISH: Whether it was old or new, it proved effective. It would be of no use to have a retreat if after confining an inebriate for a few months we liberated him with the unfortunate tendency not eradicated. We wanted such persons to get a treatment that would, if possible, kill the taste for undue indulgence in strong drink.

Question passed, and the clause added.

New Clauses 28 to 32—agreed to, these completing the new part dealing with habitual drunkards.

Bill farther reported with amendments and new clauses, and the report adopted.

AUDIT BILL.

COUNCIL'S SUGGESTIONS AND PROCEDURE.

The Legislative Council having suggested amendments in the Bill a second time, and the Assembly having refused, under the then Speaker's ruling, to make the suggested amendments on the ground that the procedure in making amendments a second time was contrary to Section 46 of the Constitution Act, and the Council having replied by a message

with reasons for adhering to the procedure in returning a Bill for amendment a second time, the Council's farther message was now considered in Committee.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Walter James), in moving that amendment No. 1 be agreed to, said : Members would recollect that the Audit Bill was passed by this House and transmitted to the Legislative Council, which body suggested certain amendments in it, which amendments the Assembly then assented to and duly made in the Bill. The Council afterwards returned the Bill again with three other amendments, and the Speaker of this House thereon ruled that it was not competent for the Council to return a Bill a second time to this House with amendments, on the ground that there would be no finality to the amendments which the Council might make in a Bill if such procedure were followed. The point of procedure arose on the meaning of the words "at any stage." The late Speaker of this House was of opinion that "any stage" meant one stage and that only. The Council now quoted the precedent of the Federal Convention held in Melbourne in 1898. The section in our Constitution Act was very similar to Section 53 of the Commonwealth Constitution Act. When that measure was passing through the Convention in Melbourne, an amendment was moved, he thought by Mr. Higgins, to insert words for making it clear that "any stage" should mean one stage only. A short discussion ensued, in which the opinion was expressed that it was undesirable to limit the power in the way proposed, and the amendment was not made. The point was a doubtful one, but however that might be, he (the Premier) was confident that the Council in making this second set of amendments had no intention or desire to usurp any power they did not properly possess. In fact, these amendments were moved in the Council at the instance of the Government, consequent on a recommendation made by Mr. Witton after his examination of the Audit Department, when he pointed out certain things, and suggested the desirability of certain amendments in the Bill. These amendments were accordingly moved in the Council, and adopted there. The amendments were in themselves

highly desirable, and in his opinion most essential; therefore he submitted to hon. members that we should have done sufficient by asserting and reserving our rights, and at the same time agreeing to make these amendments in the Bill. We could, in the message to be returned to the Council, reserve our rights in such a way as to make it clear that the present case should not be regarded as a precedent. What need was there for us to sacrifice a very valuable Bill? because that was what it came to by insisting in an abstract way on the strict maintenance of our right as to the procedure. The Council's message had to be considered; for whether we agreed to or dissented from it, the point would be raised either way.

MR. MORAN : By taking the course suggested by the Premier, if it was found afterwards that the course was wrong we should be doing an illegal act by agreeing to these amendments.

THE PREMIER : There was a grave doubt, and a good deal to be said on both sides; still he submitted to members that there was no need for us now to do more than to assert the reservation of our rights, and we should do this rather than sacrifice this Bill.

MR. MORAN : By this course we should reserve our right, and the Council would get their way.

THE PREMIER : There was a *bona fide* doubt, and why should we say we were right and would sacrifice the Bill rather than agree with the Council's contention? The course he proposed was wise, and would be consistent with the dignity of the House. He moved that the Council's first amendment be agreed to.

MR. PIGOTT regretted to say he could not agree to the motion nor the reasons for it. This House had accepted the ruling of the late Speaker, and then refused to make these amendments as being unconstitutional. He agreed with the Premier in saying that the amendments were necessary and desirable; but there was a larger question involved, and that was, how far should this House go in abrogating its own rights? With regard to Section 46 of the Constitution Act, he did not think there should be any doubt as to the meaning of the words "at any time." If these words meant not only at any one time but at

any time and as often as the Council might think fit, then how could we ever depend on coming to finality as to amendments which the Council might make or might ask us to make in a Bill?

THE PREMIER: That would leave unanswered this last message of the Council.

MR. PIGOTT: The Bill should be passed without these amendments. His Excellency the Governor could send the Bill back with suggested alterations, which could be adopted. There would be no objection to that course. If the amendments were sent back by the Council we should absolutely refuse to consider them, and he hoped the Committee would not agree with the motion.

MR. HASTIE: No one doubted the utility of the amendments, but surely there was some other way in which they could be accepted than by adopting them as sent to us from the Council. He was rather interested in the Council's interpretation of the Standing Orders. The Council quoted what was done by the Federal Convention, and apparently considered that they were in the position of the Federal Senate, and that they should have the same powers as the Federal Senate. This appeared to be a piece of presumption.

MR. MORAN: Perhaps they would like the federal franchise.

MR. HASTIE: If members of the Upper House looked upon themselves as in the position of federal senators, they should accept the conditions of federal senators. Only the other day, these gentlemen so interested in the finances declared that they would not allow a person to vote for them unless he possessed a certain amount of property. They looked upon themselves as superior beings, and in this they were encouraged by the attitude taken by members of the Assembly.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should not reflect on another place.

MR. HASTIE was only speaking of certain members of another place, and was trying to point out how these requests sent back by them must be in the nature of a joke, because it was inconceivable how members of another place could act in such a manner. The method suggested by the late Speaker of allowing the Governor to send down the suggestions should be adopted, or a small amending

Bill might be brought down. Was it because these learned geniuses in another place declared they must have some particular powers that we should agree with the amendment? They did not desire to improve the Bill, but merely desired to increase the dignity and importance of their House. Under the circumstances the suggestion of the late Speaker should be adopted rather than the method proposed by the Premier.

MR. MORAN: Was it worth while, over such a trifle, to establish what would undoubtedly be a precedent, for it would be so claimed by the party who got their own way, although denied by the party who gave way? The question was whether on money matters we were going to consent to extend the powers of another place beyond what we always understood were their powers, and beyond the limitation which such a constitutional authority as the late Speaker had placed upon the Council. If we gave way now because of the importance of the Bill, while asserting that we would not do it again, we could be positive that in other Bills the Upper Chamber would apply to have its powers asserted, and those other Bills would not be of less importance than this Bill. If it would be illegal and unconstitutional to give way, it would be an illegal action and unjustifiable. Where there was any doubt the people's House should have the benefit. No other Upper Chamber had as yet demanded a similar power in money matters. The power should always lie with the Lower Chamber. It would be time enough for us to reconsider the interpretation we placed upon the Constitution when the Federal Parliament discussed the question and established a precedent. Then also it would be time for us to consider whether we should give to the other House, so unrepresentative of the people, a power not yet given to the Senate which, on the other hand, was so representative of the people. In the meantime we must stand to our rights until a precedent was established. The best course to adopt was for the Minister in the Upper House to drop the amendments and allow the matter to stand in abeyance. For the sake of an important Bill he (Mr. Moran) was not prepared to give way and let the Council have their way while still asserting our rights.

Otherwise it would be a historical case of amendments being moved by the Council and the Assembly giving way to them. He hoped the Premier would not press his proposal to give way.

THE PREMIER always believed that the rules and regulations of the House were made to be the servants and not the masters of the House, and he was not one of those so keenly anxious to stand on the dignity of the House. It was always unwise to raise this point where, in connection with any matter, there was serious doubt; and it was not wise for either House to say positively it was in the right. The point was bound to come up for interpretation in the Federal Parliament, but the member for Kanowna was ungenerous and unfair to another place when he said that the Council were presumptuous in likening themselves to the Senate. They were not doing so. In the Federal Constitution there was a section worded almost the same as the section in our Constitution, and the Council only alluded to the discussion raised on the section at the Convention because they claimed it supported their interpretation of the section of our Constitution Act. We were not always bound to say that we were in the right or that we would let the matter drop, for last session we took up a different attitude. In the case of a money Bill in which the Council made certain amendments, we took up the attitude that inasmuch as the amendments made did not deal with the money clauses, we should accept them, and we dealt with them accordingly. In this case I am quite confident that there was no intention on the part of the Council to raise a doubtful discussion, because the difficulty has cropped up inadvertently, and therefore we may well waive the point. If a majority of the members of this House think that this is a matter affecting the principles of this House, it will simply mean that we will have to disagree with the amendments; and then I will have to ask the House to assist me in getting the amendments brought down in another way, because I think they are desirable.

Question put and negatived, the Council's reasons and suggestion thus not agreed to.

Two farther suggested amendments not agreed to.

Resolutions reported.

ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of 2 Edward VII., No. 48, Section 4:

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS moved that the words after "possession" be struck out and the following inserted in lieu, "and includes any person who, under a license or concession relating to any specific land belonging to the Crown, has the right of taking any profit of the land." The clause as it stood might be interpreted to include such a licensee as a timber cutter. Such was not the intention of the Bill. It was intended to include only persons who held specific land from the Crown with the right of making a profit out of the land.

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 24; Governor may supersede Board:

MR. BATH moved that the words "or in any other case when the Governor shall think fit" be struck out. The clause would give rather a large latitude to the Minister to take away the powers of a board.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: On the face of it, rather elastic powers were apparently being given to the Minister; but, on the other hand, if we tied any Minister down to the strict wording, as it would be if the amendment were passed, we would make it very difficult indeed to apply the remedy here sought in very many cases. A board might manage to keep within the provisions of the Act, and yet not do its duty, and it might be very desirable to get rid of such board. Could the Committee imagine any Minister recommending to Cabinet, and the Cabinet agreeing, that a roads board should be superseded, unless there were strong and urgent reasons for that being done?

MR. JACOBY: The clause should remain as it stood. The last Act passed was a stringent one, and he thought there was a feeling on the part of some

boards not to work under it. Power should be given to the Minister to say, "If you cannot carry out the Act, somebody else shall do it." We had a case recently where the Minister had to supersede a board, and no one who followed that controversy would think any Minister likely to lay himself open to these things more often than was absolutely necessary.

MR. DAGLISH: It was a bad principle to give power to the Governor to entirely abolish an elective body, unless some petition had been made by a certain proportion of the electors of that body. Probably the Minister would agree to the insertion of a few words to effect the alteration suggested.

MR. BATH: An elective body ought not to be superseded by such particularly elastic powers as those proposed.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Clause 4—Amendment of Section 25:

MR. BURGESS referred to the number of votes given in relation to the unimproved value and also the annual value, and desired to know on what basis the annual value had been worked out.

HON. F. H. PRESSE: It had been worked out on a five per cent. basis.

MR. JACOBY: The way in which this was fixed up at present would in his opinion put the voting power in the hands of owners of ground put to no use whatever. If we assessed upon the unimproved capital value, it would mean that where we had a large unimproved estate, with nothing whatever being done upon it, the owners of that estate would probably have the full voting power, whereas the owner of an adjoining place, where the unimproved value might not be more than 10s. an acre, but where £20,000 worth of improvements might have been effected, would perhaps only have one vote under the clause as it stood at present. The only equitable way to arrange this matter was to have the votes allotted on the capital value of the land. The whole object that underlay the principle of taxation on the unimproved value was as far as possible to encourage the improvement of the holding, and to put a fair proportion of taxation upon the man who did absolutely nothing with his ground. But in distributing the votes, this plan would give a greater number to the idle man, and

take away from the man who improved his land. He moved that the word "unimproved," in line 17, be struck out.

THE MINISTER: Last year we passed a new Roads Act, and at the instigation of the member for the Swan we made provision for a board to rate on unimproved capital value, if so desired, or upon the annual value. The board must adopt one or the other of those courses. Provision made for voting under that Act was only provision for voting on a scale of the annual value. It therefore became necessary to make some provision for voting where the system of rating on the unimproved capital value was adopted. The hon. member said we ought to recognise the improvements effected upon the land when we distributed the voting power. When he (the Minister) first considered this point he was inclined to agree with the view put forward, but upon farther consideration it became evident that would be very unfair. That there should be no injustice to the man who improved his land, we rated on the unimproved value, and said, "We will not rate you on your improvements, but only on your unimproved value." Manifestly then we should not turn round and say, "We have only rated you on your unimproved value, but we will give you voting power on your improved value." If we brought the rates of the man who improved his land down to the level of those of the man who did not improve the land, we must treat both men alike with regard to the voting power. Having adopted the principle of rating on the unimproved value, all ratepayers must be rated alike on that system.

MR. STONE: The fairest way of rating was on the unimproved value, and he did not agree with the amendment.

MR. HASTIE: The idea set forth by the Minister seemed to be fair on the face of it, if all of the conditions were equal; but the conditions in this case were not equal. The bulk of those who held improved land would be in the district, while the bulk of those who held unimproved land would be out of the district. If any difference was made, it should be in favour of those ratepayers actually resident in the district.

MR. FOULKES: It was a mistake to assume that all the owners of unimproved

land resided out of the particular district. His experience in the metropolitan area was that a large proportion of those who held unimproved sections of land were residing in the district. It was a common thing for a ratepayer to hold two or more sections, his house being on one section and the other one or more sections being unimproved; and as the practice of roads boards was to rate each block separately where the blocks were separately registered, therefore he did not agree that absentee owners could control the election of a roads board. On the other hand, those who resided in the district practically controlled the expenditure, and the ratepayer residing away from the district had little or no voice in its distribution.

MR. DAGLISH: Absentees who had little or no knowledge of local conditions caused much evil by voting in connection with roads board elections without sufficient knowledge. Absentees, when they did vote, usually did so on hearsay statements made by some persons who were interested in particular objects. Many of the evils in connection with the management of local governing bodies would be abolished if we made everyone vote within the district, and not allow votes to be sent from outside the district. The ignorant vote, as it was called, was felt in every local governing body. He also thought that the maximum of four votes, which a large owner might exercise, was too great a power to place in the hands of one owner of unimproved land, and that a fairer proportion would be a maximum of two votes, because the intelligence of voters should not be measured by the size of their holdings. A man living on 10 acres of garden land, which represented the whole of his living, was entitled to exercise as much voting power as a man owning 20,000 acres of unimproved land in the rating district, especially when that owner was an absentee.

MR. JACOBY: With regard to the argument used by the Minister that each ratepayer must be treated on the same basis when unimproved value was the principle of rating, there was much to be said on the other side. Ratepayers residing in a rating district had to bear all the other burdens incidental to local residence, such as wheel tax, dog license,

and other burdens that had to be borne in helping to improve a district. It was to be hoped the Committee would accept his amendment.

At 6:30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.
At 7:30, Chair resumed.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: A board had power to adopt either of two courses. It could strike a rate upon the annual value or upon the unimproved capital value. If a board rated on the annual value, to a certain extent it placed increased taxation on the man who effected improvements, though in return the man who effected improvements received increased representation on the board. On the other hand, if a board adopted the unimproved capital value system of rating it at once removed the increased taxation which alone gave the person who received increased representation an equitable right to it. If we levelled down those who improved and those who did not improve so far as regarded the payment of rates, manifestly we must level down their representation on the board. The scheme proposed by the member for the Swan, even if equitable, would be hard to carry out. It was proved in the Bill that a board in its rate book should place either the annual or unimproved value of land according to the system adopted; but if while we rated on unimproved value we yet gave representation on the annual value, both values would have to be shown in the rate book. The hon. member should not press his amendment, which could not be accepted by the Government, and which was at all events impracticable.

MR. ATKINS: Could we not put in a clause providing that no one should vote unless he was living in a district?

THE PREMIER: That principle did not apply in any roads board or municipality anywhere, so far as he was aware.

MR. ATKINS: The owner of unimproved land, whether he resided in a district or not, had a big voting power. By giving votes to resident land owners only, we could get over the difficulty.

MR. HASSELL: The clause was a fair one, and would work very well.

THE PREMIER: A very important principle was involved in the discussion. In local bodies the measure of voting power was determined by the amount of

rates paid, and voting power was given to the ratepayer and not to the individual. If we departed from that principle in connection with unimproved values, we would be opening a door by which the principle could be departed from in municipalities. The absentee would not influence the local authority. As a matter of fact, everyone knew that the effective voting strength was the active resident voter.

MR. ATKINS: Proxy voting existed.

THE PREMIER: The active force in local matters was the man who made his voice heard locally, and after all that man had the biggest say. If we departed from the principle of measuring voting strength by the amount of rates paid, it would be a departure that would also extend to municipalities and other local bodies.

MR. JACOBY: In a large number of cases taxpayers had no representation whatever. It was only when they were landowners that taxpayers obtained representation, and even a large number of landowners paid a considerable amount of taxation for which they had no representation. For instance, the man who employed a considerable number of teams paid a considerable amount of taxation, and the man who owned dogs also paid taxes. The man who paid comparatively a small amount on the unimproved basis would, if he was a large employer of labour, contribute a considerable amount to the revenue.

THE PREMIER: The man who paid a wheel tax paid for the special use of the roads. If he had fifty carts it was only right that he should pay more than if he had only one cart.

MR. JACOBY: There was a good deal to be said on the other side of the question as well. The Minister contended that an extra column would have to be put into the rate book; but it was already provided in the Bill that taxation might be on the annual value or on the unimproved value.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Not on both.

MR. JACOBY: The rating could be on the annual or capital value, and on the unimproved value also.

MR. BURGESS: One or the other, not both.

MR. JACOBY: A board might have the annual and capital value together, or instead it might have the unimproved value.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: A board might rate either according to the annual value or the unimproved value, and there was the option of two ways for estimating the annual value.

MR. JACOBY: If a column were provided in the rate-book to show the annual value and the capital value, as should be done under the Bill, we should not require an additional clause to get the amount of taxation on the unimproved value. He was contending for the principle that where we had a chance of favouring one of two sorts of people in a district, we should favour the man working his business as against the man owning land and doing nothing with it.

An amendment by leave withdrawn.

MR. HASTIE moved that the word "ten" (not exceeding ten pounds) be struck out, with a view of inserting "twenty-five" in lieu. The multiple system of votes was confined almost, if not entirely, to Australia. We were content to have the system of one person one vote for either House of the Federal Parliament and of the State Parliament. It had been said that votes for roads boards were determined on the rates paid; but such was not the case, for we recognised that it would be unwise to let one man have a considerable number of votes, and so we compromised by a limit of four as the greatest number of votes. It would be still wiser to limit the number to two. The vote was given on account of one species of property alone, whereas many paid a good bit to roads boards on account of owning vehicles. Those people did not get multiple votes on account of the number of vehicles they possessed. We should not get a satisfactory rule until we put every man on absolutely the same footing.

THE MINISTER: The Roads Act passed last year after considerable debate made precisely the same arrangement as this Bill in regard to voting in return for annual value of rates, and the hon. member had raised no objection then. This Bill had been on the table a considerable time, yet only at the last moment was a proposal for such a sweeping change sprung upon us. The hon. member said

we should do away with multiple voting; yet he did not seek to accomplish that, but sought to reduce the multiple. Roads boards raised the money locally and expended it locally, so that whatever was raised and spent was the result of local taxation. It would be a different thing if this were not purely a local matter, but he contended that the man who paid a large amount in rates was entitled to a larger voice in the selection of members who had to spend the money than one who paid a small amount. He hoped the hon. member would not press the amendment.

MR. HASTIE: The great bulk of the money spent by roads boards was not raised by the local people. If it was fair and reasonable that the people who had votes for representatives of this House, who had full charge of taxation, should only have one vote each, roads board people should be contented with one vote each.

MR. HAYWARD: In some districts there were very many small ratepayers, and these men could get the rates greatly raised in order that a big amount might be obtained.

MR. STONE: Never had he noticed any injustice done in roads board matters by those who had plural votes.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	21
				—
Majority against	...			13

AYES.
 Mr. Bath
 Mr. Diamond
 Mr. Hastie
 Mr. Holman
 Mr. Johnson
 Mr. Reid
 Mr. Taylor
 Mr. Daglish (Teller).

NOES.
 Mr. Atkins
 Mr. Burges
 Mr. Butcher
 Mr. Ewing
 Mr. Ferguson
 Mr. Foulkes
 Mr. Gardiner
 Mr. Hassell
 Mr. Hayward
 Mr. Higham
 Mr. Holmes
 Mr. Hopkins
 Mr. James
 Mr. McDonald
 Mr. Nanson
 Mr. Picasso
 Mr. Rason
 Mr. Stone
 Mr. Wallace
 Mr. Yelverton
 Mr. Jacoby (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived, and the clause passed.

Clause 5—Amendment of Sec. 26:

MR. JACOBY suggested that a column showing the capital value should be provided.

The Minister said he would see to that. Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Amendment of Sec. 125:

MR. WALLACE: It was desirable that a definition should be added showing distinctly the several kinds of lease to which the clause would apply. Apparently it would apply to quarries and timber concessions, but to what other kinds of lease would it apply?

THE MINISTER: The clause was intended to apply to quarries, timber concessions, and all concessions in which a profit was made out of the land. To specify all these would be impracticable, and there was a risk that something necessary might be omitted. It was better to leave the clause as it stood.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11 to 14—agreed to.

Clause 15—Minister may extend time for making up rate-book:

MR. HOLMES: This clause was intended apparently to validate the striking of a rate by boards which had not been able to strike a rate in a regular way by the second Saturday in June. If such cases were validated, what became of the right of the ratepayer to appeal?

THE MINISTER: The clause was inserted for validating the striking of a rate in cases where a roads board had not been able to strike a rate before the date prescribed in the Act. Some boards had even deliberately advanced this as an excuse for not striking a rate at all. He agreed that if the striking of a rate after the proper date was to be validated, the right of appeal by the ratepayer should be maintained; and if this was not sufficiently provided for, he would take care it should be so.

MR. WALLACE: As this clause was to be retrospective, would it apply to the case of such a roads board as he had in view, which omitted to strike a rate for two years in succession? A board so neglecting might possibly claim to recover rates by reason of this retrospective clause.

THE MINISTER: The validation could be made effective only by an order from the Minister in writing, and he felt sure no Minister acting in that matter

would give such order if the effect was to enable a roads board that had neglected to strike a rate for two years to collect that rate under this clause. The intention of the clause was to provide for difficulties which had arisen in the striking of a rate through the late period at which the Roads Act of last year was passed.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 16—Liability for rates after sale until notice given:

MR. WALLACE, referring to the subdivision of land and the registration of title under it, said a suggestion had been made to him by the Yalgoo roads board that there should be a provision added as a subclause, making it obligatory on a landowner to notify the particular roads board of any change of tenancy or occupancy in regard to land for which he was previously rated as owner. It might also be made to apply to the Lands Department. As it opened a rather big question, one would like the assurance of the Minister that he would give the suggestion consideration, and that if an amendment was found necessary, it could be inserted in another place, since there was not time to have it dealt with here. It would be impossible to collect rates from a man once his property had passed from his hands; so that an amendment was really required.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The points raised by the hon. member were noted, and the Crown Solicitor would be consulted. If there was any necessity for an addition to the clause, it could be made in another place.

MR. HASSELL: The occupier could always be found, as he was on the land.

MR. JACOBY could hardly see that this clause was going to work well. Many people not regularly dealing in land would not know of the existence of the clause.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: There was a similar provision in the Municipal Institutions Act.

MR. JACOBY: The clause was likely to cause some trouble in the country. He could not satisfy himself that it was not a good clause, but he was rather doubtful about it.

MR. FOULKES: The Minister should give the clause farther consideration. There might be some doubt as to whether the liability should not be placed on the particular owner of the land, and he

would suggest the addition of the words "without prejudice to the rights of the board to adopt all remedies to which they are entitled under the provisions of the principal Act." The roads board would then maintain the right to sell the land or sue the past owner for the rates. As the clause stood it might be held that the only person liable to pay rates was the past owner of the land.

MR. WALLACE: If it were necessary to make provision against the sale of the land, why was it not equally necessary to make provision for the transfer from landlord to tenant and from one tenant to another? Either his suggestion should be adopted or the whole clause should be struck out.

MR. STONE: The land was always responsible for the rates, and the board should have the right to sell the land if the rates remained unpaid. Municipalities had to be advised of a sale of land, and roads boards should be similarly informed, copies of transfers being forwarded to them.

MR. FOULKES: While not desiring to move his suggestion as an amendment, he hoped the Minister would consider it.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The point was noted.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 17—Arrears may be written off:

MR. WALLACE: Local bodies were better able to judge as to what arrears of rates should be written off, but by the Bill they would be unable to write them off without the approval of the Minister.

MR. HASTIE: The Minister might also explain why rates should be written off at all.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was necessary to have some provision for writing off arrears of rates. At present roads boards did not possess the requisite power; and the clause provided that a roads board, with the approval of the Minister, could have power to write off arrears, public notice having been given containing a list of the arrears intended to be written off. In the course of ordinary business it was found absolutely necessary, if not desirable sometimes, to write off some debts as being either hopeless of recovery or not worth the trouble of recovering. Roads boards had a similar experience. Some trifling sums

in dispute might remain unpaid for many reasons, but the boards at present had to show these amounts as outstanding year after year. It was manifestly to the advantage of the working of roads boards that there should be power to write off these arrears as bad debts.

MR. HASSELL: The land might be sold for the rates.

THE MINISTER: There were countless reasons why arrears should be written off; but it would not do to give a roads board or the Minister unlimited power in that direction, so provision was made that the board had no power to write off arrears without the approval of the Minister, while the Minister could not give his approval until a list of arrears intended to be written off was published. The public therefore having an eye on the matter, every one's attention would be directed to the list, and if there was anything wrong in it, if anyone was to be favoured, or if the board sought to write off what could be collected, the Minister would hear of it in time. It was a very necessary power, and we should pass the clause.

MR. WALLACE: The member for Plantagenet evidently viewed the clause from the point of view of an agricultural roads board, but in the case of goldfields roads boards there was no chance when ground reverted to the Crown of seizing it for rates. It would be far better to set aside the cumbrous machinery and allow roads boards to write off arrears.

THE MINISTER: The necessary power in the clause would prevent the abuse of the power.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 18 — Footways, jetties, etc., may be built :

HON. F. H. PIESSE: This was a most important clause and introduced quite a new feature in regard to roads board administration, by giving the same power to roads boards as was given to municipalities in regard to the construction of footpaths—the right to call upon the owner of an abutting property to pay a moiety of the expense. The principle was correct, but some notice should be given to an owner with regard to the carrying out of any such work. In an up-country district a municipality formed a footpath along the frontage of a certain property, but did not notify the owner

until the work was carried out, and then asked him to pay one-half of the cost. Some right should be given to the owner to either object to the work being carried out, or to enter a protest against it. No doubt boards, being composed of practical men, carried out the work with discretion, and probably at a cheaper rate than the owner of the property could carry it out; but some explanation was needed from the Minister as to why the Act was amended in this way.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: This clause would only apply to important suburban districts. The hon. member suggested notice should be given to the owner that the owner might be able to lodge an objection. That, however, would be of little avail unless the objector could do more than object. If additional power were given, we should be making the owner and not the board the judge of the necessity for the work.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: In Perth the authorities would not carry out the work without giving notice.

THE MINISTER: The owner of the land might argue with the board and say, "There is really no necessity for this work, and no reason why you should put me to this expense." If the board said, "We are of opinion that there is," that would be an end of the matter. The most the hon. member could obtain—and one would probably always obtain that as a matter of courtesy, if not of right—would be notice of the board's intention to do certain work. Manifestly we should not make the owner of the land the judge of the necessity for the work.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: In one of the largest up-country towns the municipality had put down a tarred footpath where perhaps good sound gravel would have met the requirements for many years, and people had been put to great expense. Now we were going to give to roads boards the same opportunity to make an excessive charge. In some instances the charges made were most immoderate. If we could not give the owner the power to object, we might direct the board to give notice of their intention.

MR. STONE: The clause would in his opinion work very unfairly, particularly in roads board districts. He had seen such a provision work very unsatisfactorily.

MR. HASTIE: This clause would affect suburban roads boards, and every man who lived in the suburbs of places like Perth knew that when a roads board made certain improvements which enormously enhanced the value of the property of a large number of people, those men refused to pay a shilling. He hoped the clause would be passed.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 19, 20—agreed to.

New Clauses:

On motions by the MINISTER FOR WORKS, the following were added as Clauses 6 and 14:—

6. *Amendment of Section 63.*—Section sixty-three of the principal Act is amended by inserting in the last line of subsection five, after the word "same," the words "indorse upon it the number of votes to which the voter is entitled and," and by adding at the end of the subsection "the indorsement of the Returning Officer of the number of votes to which the absent voter is entitled shall be conclusive."

14. *Amendment of Section 154.*—Section one hundred and fifty eight of the principal Act is amended by striking out the words "of the" in line one, and the words "mentioned in the Seventeenth Schedule" in line two. The Seventeenth Schedule is repealed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and new clauses, and the report adopted.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PRIVATE).

SALVATION ARMY SETTLEMENT.

IN COMMITTEE.

MR. NANSON in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Power to exchange lands:

MR. TAYLOR rose to move that the clause be struck out.

MR. NANSON: As suggested by the Minister for Lands during the second-reading debate, he wished to amend the clause, and then if the amendment were carried the hon. member could move that the clause be struck out. He moved as an amendment,

That after "Crown," the words "not exceeding 2,000 acres" be inserted.

MR. BURGESS: The whole object was to have the land classified, and after that had been done the matter should be left in the hands of the Minister.

MR. TAYLOR: It was generally understood that this clause was objectionable, and it was intimated on what he considered very sound authority that

the Army desired to exchange 2,000 acres of their land for 2,000 acres on the proposed Narrogin railway route.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It would be subject to classification.

MR. TAYLOR: That presumably went without saying, but if the land along the route of the proposed railway was as good as the Minister said, it would be first-class land.

THE MINISTER: Certainly it would be better than this.

MR. TAYLOR: Those who represented the Salvation Army were not asleep, and they wanted to exchange land which they believed to be bad for other land along the proposed Collie-Narrogin railway route which they believed to be good, perhaps first-class. There was no necessity for putting in the Bill this power to exchange land, for he had good reason to know that those representing the Army would be well satisfied if they got reclassification of the land they now held in one continuous area. If they were not satisfied with that, they ought to be; and if they had really been deceived in the first instance by the land agent of the Government who recommended the land to them as first-class, that agent ought to be censured. Mr. Suttor, who gave evidence on behalf of the Salvation Army to the select committee, said they wanted to get some land on the route of the proposed railway, and all they wanted to exchange was 2,000 acres.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. NANSON farther moved as an amendment,

That there be added after "schedule" the words, "provided the portion so proposed to be surrendered is in one continuous area."

MR. JACOBY: It was to be hoped the Minister would take care that any land which was to be exchanged in this way should be reported upon by some competent person who understood the value of land for citrus culture. Land had lately been selected on the Moore River on behalf of the Government, and it was to be hoped the officer who reported on that land as suitable for citrus culture was really capable of judging, and was not an ordinary officer of the department.

THE MINISTER: That selection on the Moore River had been checked by the most expert officers of the department.

MR. JACOBY: The possibilities of land for fruit-growing were only beginning to be understood in this part of the world. For instance in Tasmania land which was formerly thought to be of little or no value was now found to be worth £100 an acre in its unimproved condition, and some improved orchards were selling at the rate of £240 an acre. The Minister should be careful to have this land properly reported on before any exchange was made, so that its possible value for fruit-growing could be ascertained in a reliable manner.

MR. TAYLOR wished to strike out the clause.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote against it.

MR. TAYLOR: The land held by the Salvation Army was at present in one continuous area, and there should not be put in the Bill a power to exchange land away from their present holding. The real desire for the purpose of exchanging land was to get some land along the route of the proposed railway. Several members of this House had informed us, and we knew in other ways, that the land held by the Salvation Army was regarded by many persons as practically of no value. If so, the fault lay with the Government officer who recommended that land to the Army in the first instance. The select committee which inquired into this Bill did not have enough evidence before it, and the Bill was rushed through without sufficient investigation and in a scandalous fashion.

MR. JOHNSON opposed the clause. When the Bill was previously discussed he felt there was not sufficient evidence before members to justify the request for reclassification of this land. Now we found it was desired that the Army should also have the right to hand back to the State 2,000 acres of waste and barren land, and get back first-class land in return.

THE MINISTER: They would have to pay on a *pro rata* basis.

MR. JOHNSON: That was understood, and if he could trust the Minister he would be quite willing to withdraw his opposition to the clause; but the Minister had a soft corner in his heart for the Salvation Army. After reading about the scheme the Minister had propounded in connection with the Army bringing out immigrants, he (Mr. Johnson) was satisfied that, where the Army was con-

cerned, he could not trust the Minister. There was no question in the previous debate on the Bill as to whether a portion of the land should be handed back to the State.

MR. NANSON: The whole question was thoroughly gone into.

MR. JOHNSON: The debate ranged on the question as to whether the State would allow reclassification of the land.

THE MINISTER: The Bill was clear enough.

MR. JOHNSON: We were not doing justice to the State if we not only reclassified the land, but gave the Minister power to take back a portion of it and give good land in return.

THE MINISTER: That could not be done.

MR. JOHNSON: The Army should not have got the land at all, and were not deserving of the consideration some people desired to give them.

THE MINISTER: The hon. member had not seen the land.

MR. JOHNSON had heard a good deal of it. The Army had received a fair bargain by gaining reclassification. They should not receive any farther consideration.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: There was nothing in the clause with regard to improvements on the land to be exchanged. Was the land to be given in fee simple or under conditions of improvement?

THE MINISTER: Certainly under conditions of improvement. He would look after that.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: There was nothing in the Minister's promise. This should be stipulated in the bond. The principal Act stated that 20,000 acres of land should be granted to the Army under certain conditions of improvement. Were we to understand that the Army were to carry out on the 2,000 acres proposed to be exchanged the conditions of improvement enforced in the principal Act?

THE MINISTER: Certainly.

MR. HAYWARD: The portion of land the Army wished to give up was of very little value for pastoral purposes, but there was a large quantity of timber on it, and if the Government exchanged acre for acre they would lose nothing. If the land the Army desired to take up

was proved to be superior they would have to pay for it accordingly, but the Government would neither gain nor lose by the exchange. The land the Army desired to take up did not go far enough to get into what was first-class land, as they only required it for pastoral purposes.

HON. F. H. PIESSE : The impression should not gain ground that he offered any objection to the reclassification of the land. His sympathies were with the Army, who had evidently taken up the land in good faith, believing that under a proper system of development they could receive some proper return for their outlay. However, they had apparently been disappointed. It seemed strange that a good portion of the land similar to this land in question was the land through which we were going to construct a railway. Here was a case where people, through representations made to them, had taken up 20,000 acres, and been disappointed in their work. They had attempted to do good work and had been disappointed, and under the circumstances we were justified in passing the clause.

MR. BURGESS : In order to contradict some statements made, attention might be drawn to some of the evidence given before the select committee. In answer to a question, "Were you satisfied the land was first-class, or that you were given fair value?" Major Suttor replied, "We were dissatisfied, and relied on the land being reclassified, or it would have been abandoned." This put a different construction on the case from that which some members put forward. The select committee had ample evidence.

MR. JACOBY : Only *ex parte* evidence.

MR. BURGESS : With regard to the clause, it was not important, because the Army could take up more land if they wanted it; but there was no doubt that the army were dissatisfied with the quality of the land.

MR. JOHNSON : The Army might have been dissatisfied, but there were hundreds of other people dissatisfied.

THE MINISTER disputed the statement.

MR. BURGESS : The evidence showed that some persons on behalf of the Army did inspect the land, and were not satisfied with it. The select committee

did not require half the evidence given to satisfy them in advising the House that the land should be reclassified.

MR. WALLACE : Had the hon. member seen the land?

MR. BURGESS : No. The land should be classified by the officers of the department. It was not members' business to go about classifying land.

THE CHAIRMAN : This was not a question of classification, but a question of exchange of land.

MR. BURGESS : It came to about the same thing. The land had to be classified before the Government would be justified in making any exchange. The evidence showed that the Army were not treated properly, and had a right to ask for reclassification.

MR. TAYLOR : The hon. member relied on the evidence given by Major Suttor, the manager for the Army at the Collie blocks; but to show that these people repeatedly had privileges which other people did not obtain, he would read some of the evidence taken by the select committee. [Extract read as to being allowed to concentrate the required improvements on one block.] They had not quite completed the boundary fence, though they had done a great portion of it. The matter was rushed through by the select committee at the last moment, and apparently there was a desire to rush the matter through this House. The whole of the evidence was taken in one day, in something under an hour, and all the evidence called was that which was favourable to reclassification.

THE CHAIRMAN : The hon. member must confine himself to the question of exchange.

MR. TAYLOR : It was necessary for somebody to stand up in defence of the land of this State. He had desired to get evidence before the committee which would have thrown full light on the Bill, but this was a proof to him that the desire of the committee was to hoodwink the country. He thought so long ago, and never had he seen such a brutal piece of work as the passing of this Bill through the select committee, and forcing its recommendation. So brutal was it that the member for the Swan withdrew from the committee and said, "I will not be a party to it." Why did the select

committee not allow the light of day to shine in upon the Bill?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was at liberty to read any portion of the report which related to the clause under consideration; but the hon. member had said there was nothing in it concerning the clause, therefore he was not justified in quoting the report or discussing it under this clause.

MR. TAYLOR resumed his argument, and said this Bill was the second which had been introduced for assisting these people. He hoped the clause would be struck out.

MR. JOHNSON: According to this clause, the Army would obtain 2,000 acres of first-class land, and would give back to the State 2,000 acres of inferior land. Then they would take up other first-class land in consequence, so that they would have something like 4,000 acres of first-class in return for which we should get 2,000 acres of inferior land. He wished to know what the Minister proposed to do with the 2,000 acres obtained from the Army? How could the Minister expect other selectors to take it up if there was no first-class land in it? Was it the hon. gentleman's intention to take back the 2,000 acres of no use to the State or anybody?

MR. TAYLOR: The report, he now found, did refer to exchange of land. It was urged by the representative of the Army that they only wanted a small exchange, but the exchange was not pressed for. He was satisfied the Army would be perfectly pleased if they got reclassification. Never during his three years of Parliamentary experience had he seen so much lobbying as occurred in connection with this simple little Bill. One person communicated with him on the telephone in relation to this Bill, knowing he was the disturbing element on the committee. The member in charge of the Bill (Mr. Nanson) had also intimated that the Army did not particularly desire an exchange, and that it was practically one of the claims they would not press.

MR. NANSON: After what had been said, he must explain that this exchange was strongly recommended by the Government land agent at Collie, particularly because there was valuable timber on the 2,000 acres which the Army officers wished to exchange, and that timber

would be made available to timber-getters in the township of Collie. The only reason for the exchange was that the Army had proved by experience they could not keep sheep on their present land, their experiment having resulted in a loss of 3,500 sheep. It should not be the desire of members of this House to impose unnecessary difficulties in the way of conducting the Salvation Army settlement in this State.

MR. WALLACE: The clause for enabling an exchange to be made ought to be passed, and he hoped the Lands Department would take care in future that no persons should be encouraged by any inducement to settle on land that was really not fitted for the purpose required. Greater care should be exercised in the future by officers of the department in making recommendations than appeared to have been used in the past.

MR. EWING: A large State reserve for timber purposes had been made in the Collie district, and was used by timber-getters; but it would be a great advantage if these men could obtain timber from the 2,000 acres held by the Salvation Army so near to the Collie township, and which the Army desired to exchange.

Clause as amended put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	22
Noes	14
Majority for ...				8

AYES.
 Mr. Atkins
 Mr. Burges
 Mr. Ewing
 Mr. Ferguson
 Mr. Foulkes
 Mr. Gardiner
 Mr. Hassell
 Mr. Hayward
 Mr. Holmes
 Mr. Hopkins
 Mr. James
 Mr. McDonald
 Mr. Mornu
 Mr. Nanson
 Mr. Oats
 Mr. Piesse
 Mr. Purkiss
 Mr. Quinlan
 Mr. Eason
 Mr. Wallace
 Mr. Yelverton
 Mr. Higham (Teller).

NOES.
 Mr. Bath
 Mr. Butcher
 Mr. Daglish
 Mr. Diamond
 Mr. Gordon
 Mr. Hastie
 Mr. Holman
 Mr. Johnson
 Mr. Pigott
 Mr. Reid
 Mr. Stone
 Mr. Taylor
 Mr. Thomas
 Mr. Jacoby (Teller).

Clause as amended thus passed.
 Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

COLLIE-NARROGIN RAILWAY BILL.

SECOND READING.

Order read for resuming the debate from the 17th November.

HON. F. H. PIESSE moved that the debate be adjourned till the next Tuesday.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	23

Majority against ... 10

AYES.
Mr. Atkins
Mr. Butcher
Mr. Daglish
Mr. Hassell
Mr. Holman
Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Moran
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Pigott
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Yelverton
Mr. Thomas (Teller).

NOES.
Mr. Burges
Mr. Diamond
Mr. Ewing
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Gordon
Mr. Hastie
Mr. Hayward
Mr. Holmes
Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. James
Mr. McDonald
Mr. Oats
Mr. Purkiss
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Rason
Mr. Reid
Mr. Smith
Mr. Stone
Mr. Wallace
Mr. Higham (Teller).

Motion thus negatived, and the debate resumed.

HON. F. H. PIESSE (Williams): I regret that the Government apparently could not see their way clear to an adjournment of the debate on this Bill until next Tuesday. It is an important Bill, requiring a great deal of consideration at the hands of hon. members, and it is one that, after all, needs much more information to be placed before members as to the advisability of constructing this line under the proposed conditions. In regard to the Bill generally, any Bill which will provide for the opening up of country in the direction in which this railway is proposed to be taken meets with my approval; but there are some questions in regard to it which I should like to deal with, and some matters on which I should like information from the Minister provided the Bill reaches the Committee stage, for the information might enable me to give unqualified support to the Bill. There are certain questions to be settled: the most important in my mind is whether this proposed railway is to be considered a railway for the conveyance of coal from the Collie coal-

fields to the goldfields. If so, the nearest route should be taken.

MR. THOMAS: There is no hurry for that for the next twenty years.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: We have heard a statement from the Minister in regard to this railway. The Minister has given a most glowing account of the country through which it will pass, and he has given us the agricultural possibilities of the district. I do not doubt his enthusiasm with regard to his view of the country, but I dispute his estimate of the capabilities of the country near Collie. We have had before the House a matter dealing with the classification and exchange of land taken up by the Salvation Army under conditions of improvement; and if we read the report of the select committee made in connection with that matter and the evidence given by one officer of the Army, we shall find that the evidence given does not support the statement made by the Minister in regard to the prolificness of that country. For the first 35 miles the country is not capable of agricultural development in the way I might look upon it, or from what may be termed a successful point of view.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: What route are you speaking of?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I am speaking of the first 35 miles from Collie towards the Great Southern Railway.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: By either route?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Yes; I do not care which route is considered. If we are to consider this question from a coal-producing point of view for the benefit of the goldfields, the question of the poorness of the country is immaterial. It will then be necessary to construct a line with the object of obtaining the shortest route to the goldfields. There is no doubt in my mind with regard to the other portion of the country. A large proportion of it I will admit is capable of great development, and we have seen most successful settlement in many parts of it; but if we are to carry out a developmental scheme in connection with our railway system for the purpose of improving our agricultural settlement, we can do it better from some point on the Great Southern Railway, than from the point this railway is proposed to start from at Collie. With the money

we intend to expend in connection with this railway to construct it from Collie to some junction on the Great Southern Railway, we could put into the agricultural districts four spur lines of 25 to 30 miles in length, which would answer the requirements of that district very much more advantageously than the proposed railway could do.

MR. EWING: Do you advocate that?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Yes; in preference to the present scheme, if we are going to make it a joint railway for the purpose of opening up land from an agricultural and coal standpoint; but if we are to open up the land for the purpose of opening up the coal country with a line of easy grade specially constructed for heavy mineral traffic, I am prepared to agree to carry out the work. It seems to me, however, there is an endeavour first to make out that it is a coal line, and then to say that it is an agricultural line. What is it to be? Is it to be a line for the carriage of coal? Then I agree that there is some justification for its construction, but let us understand this. When will this coal be required on the goldfields?

MR. JOHNSON: In 40 years' time.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: We have had evidence that a very large quantity of timber exists on the goldfields.

MR. EWING: You are going outside the question.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: It is sufficient for the consumption of the goldfields for 20 years. I am dealing with this matter from a fair standpoint. My desire is to see the country opened up. I am ready to see the railway built if there is sufficient to justify it; but the Minister appears to me to have laid greater stress upon the agricultural possibilities than on the conveyance of mineral for the purpose of supplying fuel to the goldfields. That is a question which will no doubt be dealt with later on. If we are to take it as a mineral line for the purpose of conveying coal, then I consider that the object to be attained is to take a line by the most direct route and upon the easiest grades, and to construct it upon such a basis as will insure our being able to convey the traffic at the least possible cost, so that the fuel may be delivered on the fields at a price at which the mines can afford to take it. If we are to deal

with the question from an agricultural standpoint, we can well commence the work from some junction on the Great Southern Railway. I admit that point may be Narrogin. I do not say I will give favour to any other point on that railway, for I am quite willing to deal with the requirements of the district upon fair and just lines. I am now leading up to a certain point, and I will finish with a motion; but I say now that farther inquiry is needed. If we are to construct a line for the development of agriculture, let it be started from Narrogin. Let the people of Narrogin have the first railway, or let the line junction with the Great Southern Railway at that point. Let it open up that part of the country, and then traverse the Williams district and go down to that settlement which should be served by a railway from the Great Southern Railway. What do the Government suggest in their proposal? They suggest, or at least they recommend, to the House a certain route which is termed the No. 2 route, starting at Collie and being common up to a certain point with the No. 1 route, which goes farther to the south. There was another route proposed called the No. 3 route, the original route over which a trial survey was made, passing up towards the Williams, and which certainly would have served the existing settlement much better than either the No. 1 route or the No. 2 route. Those people on the Williams have for a long period urged that they should be connected with the railway system of the State. As shown by this proposal the Government evidently do not know sufficient of the country, otherwise they would not have put forward their proposal under the present conditions. They are going too far to the south with both their No. 1 and No. 2 routes. If they are going to serve the Williams country, they should take the No. 3, that is the red line over which the survey has been made, and by that means they would bring the people of Marradong and those settlements which have so long been promised communication into connection with a line which I am sure would more commonly serve the existing settlement and would be much more advantageous to that district. In the desire to serve both the southern and the

northern interests this line goes too far to the south by the No. 2 route; that is the proposed line under the Bill. By that means they are taking from the district of which Wagin is the township its natural advantages. They are passing through the Darkan Area, and robbing that portion of the railway of its natural advantages. They have to do this, as will be seen by what has been placed before the House, to justify their action in connection with Narrogin; unless, of course, they follow that red line, known as No. 3. If they follow the first proposed route, the No. 3, they will serve those old-settled districts, and do much to improve that country. In their effort to serve, by their No. 2 route, the newly acquired Marjadin Estate they have kept too far to the south, with a desire to open up the immediate country, thus placing the line some seven miles south of the old Williams settlement. They will not serve those people in the way they should be served, nor will they benefit the country as it should be benefited. In their endeavours to meet the wishes of all those people they will please none of them. From my knowledge of the country, from the point where the railway crosses the Albany road, right through into Narrogin, the land is, except a small piece near Wagin, of a worthless description. It is country which has lain ready for the applicant for the last 30 years. It has been used partly as a sheep run, but if members look at the map they will see that the selector has carefully avoided taking up land in the locality; and not because it is farther away from a railway. If members take the surroundings of Narrogin and the surroundings of Wagin they will find that the land which has been settled is marked in green. That large tract of country which is still white upon the map shows the land could not be of that character which would be very suitable for settlement, otherwise it would have been taken up long ago.

THE PREMIER: That was the argument taken ten years ago.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: There is the very map. It condemns the proposal to construct the line upon the route which he proposes it should be constructed upon. My desire is to give justice to the people of the Narrogin district, to those of the

Williams and those located along what I may term the proposed alternative, No. 3 route. This is a very important question, and it is one, too, which requires the careful consideration of this House, and also needs verification at the hands of members. Notwithstanding the reports which have been placed before members by the Minister, and notwithstanding the information given to the House by the hon. gentleman, I say I disagree with some of those reports.

MR. EWING: They do not suit you.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I say I disagree with them. Next perhaps to Mr. Ransford I have travelled that country more than any other man who resides in the district. I do not wish to disparage the whole of the country. There are patches which are exceptionally good, and there are patches which are bad, also patches which in the next 30 or 40 years will not be settled. That, however, is beside the question. When we wish to construct a work of this sort it is not well to bring in a proposal so late in the session.

MR. EWING: It has been in a long time.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: It has not been in a long time, and I say in justice to the large number of people resident in the neighbourhood that all the information which can be given by the Government should be furnished to this House.

MR. EWING: It is all before you.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: It is not. There is not sufficient information. Notwithstanding the fact that the reports are well written, admittedly, and that the officers have done their best under the circumstances, I am convinced it was quite impossible for any of those officers, excepting the men who have travelled over the country previously, it was quite impossible for the two special officers, Mr. Brookman and Mr. Muir, to give what may be termed a report upon which we could safely judge, firstly as to the capabilities of the country, and secondly as to the grade. When these two officers visited the district the whole of the country was under water. They had to confine their travelling to the main road, and therefore they had not the opportunity of viewing the whole of the district. If we are to have this line, let us have it up to the country which it will best serve, because after all it is, I take

it, the object of members of this House to fairly deal with the question and to obtain information to enable them to form an opinion as to which is the best locality through which the line should be constructed. The Government, in their desire to place before members all the information they have had at their disposal, have taken a course which I agree with. They sent out their officers, but did so at a season of the year when those officers could not fairly give a report as to the capabilities of the country, and as to the grade over which the proposed line was to be constructed.

THE MINISTER: That would make their reports all the more conservative, would it not?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: In regard to the report of Mr. Ranford upon the character of the land, of course there is no one who has done more for the settlement of land in relation to the Great Southern Railway than he has; but concerning the expressions in connection with the superiority of the land, one is rather open to doubt as to his judgment in connection with the Collie land. We have seen the evidence before us to-night in regard to this land of the Salvation Army, yet they say that the officers of the Lands Department recommended them to take that land up. If that is the case, we should look with some suspicion upon the recommendations made for the first 35 miles of the line. [Interjection by Mr. EWING.] My opinion is that it is worthless.

MR. EWING: What is Mr. Ranford's opinion?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: My opinion is that his judgment has been at fault in regard to the first portion of the line. That is proved by the question of the Salvation Army. [MR. TAYLOR: Hear, hear.] In connection with other portions of the line, that is the land he knows more about and which he has had an opportunity of judging more particularly. I do not question his judgment. He has done well there, but a man may be misled by the different characters of soil, and it is evident he has been misled in regard to the first portion of the line, for the first 26 or 30 miles from Collie. I do not wish the House to infer that I disagree with what the Minister said in regard to the capabilities

of this country, although he has painted rather a glowing picture in connection with it. Some parts of the country no doubt are good, but when the Minister travelled through it he saw the best of it. He was taken through a good deal of the best of the land.

THE MINISTER: He saw a good deal of the worst of it.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I am not going to quarrel with the hon. gentleman with regard to that, but what I say is that it is a question of opening up the country, and admittedly there is a large area for selection. If we can make a line of railway which will be available for the two purposes of obtaining coal and developing agriculture, I take it that it is our duty to do that.

THE MINISTER: What is to prevent it?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I assert that to enable us to judge as to the best route we should have farther information. Before I sit down I shall propose that a select committee be appointed to inquire into this question with a view of placing before the House farther information than has already been given.

THE MINISTER: I suppose that will be next session.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: That will be a question for the Government to decide. If there is not time now and the Government think it can be done next session, so much the better for the State. I want to make myself clear that as far as the junction is concerned I do not quarrel with that. [Interjection by Mr. EWING.] I am sorry to hear the hon. member make that remark. If it had been a question of bringing it to some point, I dare say I could have made terms and have done something to bring it to a junction farther south; but I have maintained silence in regard to the matter, and I will ask the Premier or anyone else to say whether I ever on any one occasion till now have expressed myself with regard to either of these routes. Even with regard to Narrogin I have been cautious. The hon. member knows that when speaking I said I would not pledge myself to either route. My desire was to do justice to that community, and not only that community but the community of the future, so that the line should be put through that portion of the country which I consider

would best be served, and which could be served at the least cost and by a railway which would have a low grade. All we needed was to obtain proper information of the route taken. The Government have put before us a map, and have given us the route mentioned in the Bill. I say that is not the route which should be followed. If we decide by this Bill to construct a railway from Collie to Narrogin, let us follow the Williams route, let us take route No. 3, because I am confident that if the engineers set to work they will be well able to find a route with a grade equally easy as that proposed by the Government in their No. 2 route. In the Bill they are permitted to deviate to the extent of 10 miles on either side. That deviation would not help us, because it would not bring us along the red line down at Coolakiner, which would serve the Maradong and those districts. If we are to open this country by sending our line on the proposed No. 2 route, we shall be serving neither centre in the way it should be served.

THE PREMIER: We cannot serve both.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Leave the southern line altogether and keep away to the north, and by that means we shall serve a district which is admitted by everyone to be most productive. We shall serve a district which has long asked for railway communication. People are asking for bread, and the Government are giving them a stone in the shape of No. 2 route. Let us be certain that when we do build a line of railway we shall give one which will be for the development of that country and be suitable for the conveyance of coal to the fields. I do not wish to leave the subject before I again deal with the question of starting lines away from the Great Southern railway. It would be preferable, considering the fact that there is such a large quantity of firewood still available on the Eastern Goldfields sufficient to last some 14 years, if we were to build this junction somewhere from the Great Southern line, say 25 miles from Narrogin towards the Williams, subsequently building a farther line from another centre, at a later period running a line out eastward. The railway extensions could be made in that district for about one-fourth the cost of this proposed railway, and would

serve those districts equally as well as a line from Collie to Narrogin. Why go to the expense of constructing a farther 40 miles of railway when you can equally well serve the districts you propose to serve from an agricultural standpoint? If we are to construct a line to carry coal eastward and that coal will not be wanted for some years hence, we will be doing a good service to the country as a whole and saving the expenditure of a large sum of money, while serving these agricultural districts more rapidly; by the method I suggest than we are likely to do under the proposed Bill. If it is desired to have a line constructed in such a way as will insure heavier rails for carrying heavy traffic, then build the Narrogin line 20 or 30 miles farther south. If we can serve that country equally well by a 25-mile spur-line, that will be preferable. I do not wish to take away from the people of Narrogin or the Williams the advantages of a railway. I am willing that they shall have the first railway to be constructed from their station to the Williams; but let us serve the Williams by a railway, and do not let us construct a railway into what may be called no-man's-land as is proposed by the route marked No. 2 on the map. A great portion of the land along that route is unsuited for selection.

THE PREMIER: They said that ten years ago about your country.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I have spent enough money on that country to build this railway, but I have not yet seen much return for it. I say there are parts of that country that are good; but for a time we should serve the State better by building a line 25 miles in length, thus serving a district 10 miles farther; and we should for a time let the remaining portion of this line stand. Then we should also deal with the other places that need communication. Mr. Thompson, one of the Government inspectors of land, returned to Narrogin the day I passed through, and I understood from him that he had been some 25 miles east of Wagin. He told me he was amazed at the good character of that country. As to building a line at present to convey coal to the Eastern Goldfields, that coal will not be required for some years to come; therefore this matter should be farther inquired into, if we

wish to save expense and at the same time serve the agricultural districts equally well. We shall have an opportunity of then judging, and we can deal fairly with all the people resident in those districts because we shall have an opportunity of giving them the best line, and can take it through settlement already existing rather than through a part of the country where there is no settlement nor likely to be. We should build the line where settlement has already taken place, down the Williams and down the Hotham. In regard to the reports of officers that have been laid on the table, they are admirable in their way, and those men have done their best under the circumstances. Some have reported on the quality of the land, others on the question of route. We need farther confirmation both as to route and quality of the land; therefore with the object of obtaining this information I have decided that, notwithstanding I am anxious to see this railway put through, I think it can be put through quicker if this House will agree to the appointment of a select committee. I therefore move as an amendment on the motion,

That a select committee be appointed for the purpose of inquiring into the question of the relative routes, and to report to this House.

MR. A. E. THOMAS (Dundas): I second the amendment.

MR. R. HASTIE (Kanowna): I have at various times stated my opinion in this House that before any railway proposal is agreed to by the House, the question should be referred to a select committee or to a Royal Commission, because Parliament is incompetent to consider all the pros and cons of the case. If I thought there was an opportunity of this Bill being considered by a select committee during the present session, I should vote for the amendment just moved; but I understand this House will be in session only two or three weeks longer, and in that case no select committee could really consider this question.

MR. MORAN: They could sit during the recess.

MR. HASTIE: No. The moment the House adjourns at the end of the session, the committee could not continue

its meetings; and that being so, I shall, if an opportunity is offered, vote that the Bill be read a second time this day six months. I shall do this largely because no case has been made out to justify the construction of a railway as proposed. The member for the Williams, who has made a very able speech, seems to assume that one or more lines are necessary, and the only objection he made was that the proposed line was to start from the wrong place. He told us that if the line were made it should start from a part of the district which the hon. member represents. No doubt his constituents will greatly appreciate his sentiments. He has told us also that Mr. Ranford is a grand and thoroughly reliable officer, so long as he expresses opinions about land in the Katanning district, or land that he is used to travel over frequently; but that if he expresses an opinion in regard to land outside of the district where he has been accustomed to travel, his report is to be taken with a grain of salt. However, I suppose we will be able to get some reliable expert opinions on the subject from the hon. member and perhaps from others. I listened with great attention to the speech of the Minister for Lands in moving the second reading; and so far as it went the speech showed that a line of this kind was desirable. It is perfectly true that the Minister did not give us all the information we require or all the information many members wish to have, for the purpose of showing that a line is required from the Collie coal-mines in the direction proposed; but the Minister took what was the fairest view of the case; that he believed it would be best for the country to have a line of railway from Collie to the Great Southern line, and he asked us to build that line in such a way that it could be used to supply coal to the Eastern Goldfields at some future time. I am not aware that he said coal would be required there at any particular time; but a report which is on the table of the House, written by Mr. Muir, a Government officer, based principally on this, that a coal supply would be required on the Eastern Goldfields within a comparatively short time somewhere between two and four years, shows that on this basis he calculated that the line would be a payable proposi-

tion and would be justifiable. As regards that, I have had many opportunities of judging as to the period that must elapse before the Eastern Goldfields require coal to a large extent. Those persons who are best acquainted with the subject believe that there is on the Eastern Goldfields a supply of firewood sufficient to last 15 to 20 years.

MR. EWING: Why not say a hundred years?

MR. HASTIE: That is the opinion of some of the most reliable men on those goldfields, and they agree absolutely on these limits. The hon. member (Mr. Ewing) told us in the most alarmist terms, some time ago, that within two or three years the mines on the Eastern Goldfields would require coal; and I said then that I was not surprised at the statement, for this reason, that up to about four years ago all the mines in the Boulder belt were supplied by the ordinary cartage of firewood, and many of us connected with the goldfields were considering the question of obtaining an increased supply of fuel. Probably five out of every six persons well informed on the question then believed that the supply of firewood on those fields was very limited, and that within four or five years at the utmost a continuous supply could not be relied on. It has been found since then, however, that the extensions of tramways into the bush for bringing in firewood have made such a change in the system of supply that there has been practically a revolution of opinion on the subject. So I was not surprised that a casual visitor like the member for the S.W. Mining District, when he was on the goldfields, picked up the opinion that the supply of firewood on the fields was almost at an end. I take it, however, that there is a supply of timber there sufficient to last 15 years; but while believing this to be so, I think it would be unwise to say we do not require to consider the question of building a railway that shall be suitable for carrying coal to the Eastern Goldfields. I take it that in about 10 years it will be absolutely essential for us to consider whether we shall then require a farther supply of fuel, and whether that supply shall be obtained from the coal-mines, because in 10 years' time timber will be

undoubtedly scarce, mainly because to any extent there is no second growth for the timber. However, for the next 10 years I do not think firewood will be scarce or dear on the goldfields, and by that time we should require the railway. Therefore it was wise for the Minister to consider, if we are to build a line from Collie to the Great Southern Railway, whether he should ask the engineers to take into consideration the fact that the line may eventually be extended to the goldfields. If I were interested in the south-western districts from Pingelly in the north to Katanning in the south, I should find no fault with the work of the engineers; but some complaint has been made with regard to the opinions of the experts. Mr. Muir has been over that route two or three times.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Mr. Muir has only been over it once, but he reported to the best of his ability under the circumstances.

THE PREMIER: No man can do more than that.

MR. HASTIE: I remember speaking to Mr. Muir after one visit. Though there might have been plenty of water about then, he has been over the route lately, and he should be able to form a favourable opinion of the district. So far as the other experts on the condition of the land are concerned I cannot say much, and I do not know if they would have come to any better agreement if they had gone over the country at a time when there was no water at all. I do not know any piece of land in this State that any two experts would agree upon. On nearly every bit of land we have in the State we would find that experts would give different estimates of the value. Although the land along the route might not be the very best from an agricultural point of view, we must always bear in mind that we have people settled, as the hon. member mentioned, down at Wagin, and some near the Williams and some near Pingelly, and that it will be impossible for us to consider all these people at the same time. The member for the Williams is going out of his way to say that if we build this line along the proposed route to Narrogin we are robbing the people of Wagin. How are we doing so?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: We come down right opposite to them and bend back again.

MR. HASTIE: That is against the vested interests of the people of Wagin; but the line is not to be built for the vested interests of any portion of the State. It is to be built for the interests of the State as a whole.

MR. THOMAS: The line is not to be built.

MR. HASTIE: If it is to be built it cannot be built for the special sake of the people in the district. The Minister wishes the line to be built first to open up an agricultural district. That means that it is primarily a speculative line. In starting a line of that kind the hon. member is not doing anything very original. The same thing has been done in different parts of Australia dozens of times. I know of my own knowledge that it has been done at least fifteen times in Victoria.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes; and the railways are shut up now.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: You do likewise.

MR. HASTIE: I am much obliged to the hon. member for his information, but if he allows me to proceed I think I shall get on a little better. It has been done in Victoria to my knowledge fifteen or sixteen times—building railways for agricultural purposes and agricultural purposes alone.

THE PREMIER: Mostly spur lines.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The conditions are not the same.

MR. HASTIE: The conditions are never the same. I was in Victoria at the time Mr. Gillies was Premier, and Mr. Gillies found out that a large number of people wanted lines of their own, and that everyone declared that they always differed from the other people and that their conditions were peculiar. Mr. Gillies took them at their word, and brought in a Bill for twenty-eight different lines, showing that he was willing to cater for the wants of the peculiar people of Victoria. What has been the result? I will not ask the result of these 28 particular lines because only two or three of them were opened; but what has been the result of the agricultural lines in Victoria? I have been unable to find a single case where such line has paid.

MR. TAYLOR: Some of them are closed up.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Which are closed up?

MR. HASTIE: I do not think the member for Mount Margaret will have any great difficulty in naming them if he looks at any of the Victorian reports. During the time the late Commissioner, Mr. Mathieson, was in power eight lines were closed, six of them absolutely, while on two of them instead of running daily trains only ran once a fortnight. All these have proved failures.

THE PREMIER: What is the test of success in agricultural lines?

MR. HASTIE: In the first place a line ought to be able to pay the expenses of running it.

THE PREMIER: Oh!

MR. THOMAS: What is the Premier's idea of a test?

THE PREMIER: To open up and settle the country.

MR. HASTIE: What I contend is a fair thing. In 13 or 14 of the Victorian lines, not one of them could pay expenses or a single shilling for interest, or for the upkeep or tear and wear. Surely it is not too much for us to expect that two or three years after an agricultural line is laid, the line ought to be able to pay the expenses of running it. That is a moderate test, and I am not aware that this proposed line could be expected to do that much. I was not in the House at the time the Minister for Lands delivered his speech, and I do not remember whether he advanced the reason that a considerable amount of coal is used on the Great Southern Railway and on the Eastern Railway from Northam eastward. By building this line we will shorten the train mileage over which Collie coal will travel.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: By only five miles.

MR. HASTIE: I should say it would be 50 or 100 miles.

THE MINISTER: On the grades it will reduce the cost 2s. 2d. per ton.

MR. HASTIE: The saving in this case will be enormous, so far as that limited coal supply is concerned.

MR. EWING: Limited? That shows how much you know about it.

MR. HASTIE: I expect it will be limited for a considerable time. That

reason is to my mind fair, and more important than all the eulogistic reports the Minister has quoted about the land. If he can show us that there will be an immense demand for coal from the Eastern Railway and the Great Southern Railway, it certainly will be an element to be considered. Even with that I do not expect the Minister will be able to persuade the House at the end of this session and at the end of this Parliament to enter into such a huge speculation. Hon. members have asked several times before: "Is it wise for us to go in for this big affair without first referring the question to the people?" If ever there was a matter of great consideration, surely this is one of those matters which might be considered at the time of a general election, although candidly I admit if the question is brought before the electors at the general election, no candidate will ever dare to go before the people of Collie and Narrogin unless he is pledged up to the hilt to build the line, whereas in a place not to be benefited at all, if the line is mentioned, it certainly will not be supported enthusiastically. However, it is necessary before we go in for a system of agricultural lines that we should place the matter before the country. It is true this is not our first agricultural line. We had one from Northam and one from York, but neither of them has yet been successful.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: They are both promising very well.

MR. HASTIE: As far as I recollect, all the members of the Ministry at the time the proposals were brought forward were opponents of the lines, and they have never yet been very enthusiastic in their favour. I am very glad of the announcement of the Minister for Lands that at the present time these two lines promise very well.

MR. THOMAS: The Minister might give us some particulars of these lines.

MR. HASTIE: We will have the Estimates on shortly, and the Minister for Railways might give us the information. One peculiarity I cannot help mentioning in connection with this line. For some time we had three projects: a route from Collie to Pingelly; a route from Collie to near Narrogin; and a route from Collie to near Wagin. Each party sent down huge, eloquent, and

influential deputations, and they came down to Perth convinced that they had each a most impregnable case. Each side was particularly anxious that the State should run a line to its locality. The engineers of the Government and the surveyors have gone over the particular routes, and I am credibly informed that the people of Pingelly and Wagin assure us that to build a line to Narrogin is absolutely throwing away money, and that they are opposed to it. If I had any doubt as to that information it was confirmed after hearing the speech of the member for the Williams, who showed us that in judging of the line, geography after all is the principal consideration. If we can get a line to our own back door we will invariably vote for it; but we are always willing to believe that the line to some other fellow's part of the country is only a waste of money.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: I do not say that. I say that I want an inquiry.

MR. HASTIE: Can the hon. member assure us that we can get an inquiry by a select committee in a fortnight?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is absurd.

MR. HASTIE: If the hon. member wants that select committee he must be chairman of it; yet he told us to-day that he cannot possibly come here next Monday or on the next Monday again. A select committee cannot get the required information. If the hon. member, like myself, wishes to throw out this Bill altogether, he will vote for it being read this day six months. I for one do not wish to waste the time of the House by fooling about with a select committee.

MR. THOMAS: Have a Royal Commission.

MR. HASTIE: If a Royal Commission is to be appointed I have no objection. I believe inquiry should be made about the construction of this line, but I think I have said enough to show my opinion as to the utility of the line. I do not know what is the exact procedure in a case of this kind—whether a proposal to remit the Bill to a select committee takes precedence over an amendment to have the Bill read this day six months.

THE SPEAKER: The amendment to a motion for the second reading is "that it be read this day six months."

MR. HASTIE: Will that take precedence?

THE SPEAKER: Certainly.

MR. HASTIE: I have pleasure in moving that all the words after "that" be struck out, and the words "the Bill be read a second time this day six months" be inserted in lieu.

MR. J. EWING (South-West Mining): I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion (adjournment) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	16
Noes	14

Majority for	2
--------------	-----	-----	---

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Burges	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Ewing	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Holman
Mr. Holmes	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Moran
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Nanson
Mr. James	Mr. Pigott
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Stone
Mr. Oats	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Quinlan	Mr. Wallace
Mr. Rason	Mr. Thomas (Teller).
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Higham (Teller).	

Motion thus passed, and the debate adjourned.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

Amendment and new clause inserted by the Legislative Council now considered in Committee.

Clause 2—Subclause 3, line 2, strike out all the words after "municipality":

THE PREMIER: This Bill dealt with the question of power for the Perth Municipal Council to carry on the business of quarrying. Members would recollect the council had established a quarry and proposed using it for their own purposes, and also selling stone to other local bodies. Objection was taken that they had no legal power to carry on a quarry, and he believed that was upheld. This Bill was introduced on behalf of the Perth City Council to overcome the difficulty. A discussion arose in this House whether the council had power to sell the product of their quarry to other local bodies, or were limited to their own supply. The question was considered by the Legislative Council, and they struck out all the words after

"municipality" in Subclause 3 of Clause 2. The effect of agreeing to the amendment would be to authorise the municipal council to carry on the work for their own purpose, but not to authorise the sale of stone to other bodies. The difficulty in which the city council would, he thought, find themselves was that unless the Bill passed they would not have power to carry on the quarry for their own purposes, and might find their hands tied. Although he believed personally in giving them power to sell to other local bodies, and would also be willing to give them power to sell to private bodies as well, he did not wish to run the risk of putting the municipal council in a false position by their being tied up with regard to supplying their own wants, if anything happened to this Bill. He proposed to ask the House to agree to the Legislative Council's amendment, and he hoped next session the Assembly would support him in endeavouring to give wider powers to municipalities than proposed under this Bill. Motion made accordingly.

MR. DAGLISH: It was important not only to the Perth Municipality but likewise other municipalities, to have their own supplies of stone, and that this power should be given or retained. In supplying other public bodies with stone from the municipal quarry, the Perth City Council had been doing a public service to people outside their own area; and, considering that the supply was kept mostly within the metropolitan radius, it seemed reasonable that this power should be conferred on the Perth City Council. Great difficulty was experienced here in obtaining supplies of stone for road-making purposes at anything like a reasonable cost, and as the improvement of the suburbs around the city depended upon the existence of these supplies at a moderate cost, the passage of this Bill was essentially in the interests of the public in and around Perth. We should not assume that if this amendment was objected to in the first instance the Bill would necessarily be lost, for he believed the other place would have the option of again sending the measure back to this Chamber and insisting on their amendment. He would be quite willing as a last resort to see the amendment agreed to.

MR. THOMAS: The proposal of the Premier would be supported by him, and he was glad the hon. gentleman had given up his previous attitude and was going to support that taken up by the Opposition. The Opposition at the time moved that the words referred to should be struck out, but the Premier would not accept anything of the sort, and defeated the Opposition in a division. He was glad the Premier had been converted.

THE PREMIER: No; he was not.

MR. HIGHAM: Two quarry proprietors by trade combination were working for their own ends, and to the detriment of all the local authorities surrounding them. The effect of this motion would be to prevent the Perth municipality from competing against those quarries on a trade basis, and from enabling municipalities to get the metal at a fair price. With all deference to the Premier, he hoped the Committee would insist on power being given to the Perth council to sell stone to other public bodies. It seemed absurd that the Perth council should not be allowed to work a quarry which it had opened and wished to carry on in a businesslike manner by supplying the surplus product to other public bodies. It was evident that the owners of other competing quarries were acting in combination to keep up the price.

MR. WALLACE was not in favour of municipal councils being allowed to trade in the manner proposed, and he believed from information obtained that the ratepayers of Perth did not desire this power to be given to their council. He supported the amendment made by the Upper House.

MR. HASTIE: If the great body of ratepayers in Perth were in favour of the amendment made by the Council, that was to be regretted, but how did the hon. member know that it was the opinion of ratepayers? The fact was that this amendment was borne of distrust towards the municipal council, there being a fear that the council would compete with one or two private owners of quarries. No one had shown why the Perth council should not have the power to sell stone to other public bodies, nor why they should be distrusted in regard to using the power which this House, when the Bill was before it, had resolved to give. This amendment made by the Upper House

was one of the cheekiest things he had seen.

MR. THOMAS, on a point of order, asked whether the hon. member should speak disrespectfully of members of another place.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order. He must not reflect on members of another place.

MR. HASTIE said he was strongly protesting against members of another place reflecting on the municipality of Perth. He hoped the proposal of the Premier would not be supported, but that members here would insist on the clause remaining as it was when the Bill left this House.

MR. PURKISS: Having consulted with the Mayor of Perth, he understood that if members of the Assembly did not accept the amendment made by the Upper House, the probability was that the passage of the Bill would be jeopardised. The municipal council were prepared, therefore, to accept the half loaf rather than lose the whole, and would allow the Bill to be amended by the Upper Chamber in the manner proposed.

MR. FOULKES: There were other municipalities and legal bodies concerned within a radius of 15 miles of Perth. It was a great convenience to these bodies that they should be supplied with stone from the Perth council quarries at a reasonable rate; and he did not see why those local bodies should not have power to purchase stone in this way, as well as the Perth council having power to sell. He was in favour of sending the amendment back to another place to be reconsidered.

MR. TAYLOR: It was necessary that the Perth council should have power to sell stone to other public bodies for the proper carrying on of their quarries, and he hoped the members of this House would not stultify themselves by supporting the amendment which the Upper House had made. This amendment had been rejected previously by the Assembly, and its supporters who were always opposed to municipalisation had gone to another place and been successful. He was, however, surprised to see the Premier accept the amendment made by the Upper House, for it was strange to see the Government at first oppose an amendment, and then for expediency's

sake accept it. It was the same old cry of want of backboue. The Government should have some grit on the question, for the amendment was promoted by the Opposition. The municipality of Perth should be allowed to equip their quarry and sell the stone to sister municipalities. There had been a strong canvas in the interest of those who owned quarries; but if these people could not compete in a fair, open market, they should go down, for there was no unfair competition on the part of the municipalities, who did not pay lower wages than private firms.

MR. GORDON : They gave longer terms.

MR. TAYLOR : If so, the sister municipalities benefited. While the municipalities did not sweat their employees, we were justified in allowing them the same privileges as other persons had, to meet their opponents in open market.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	9

Majority for ... 5

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Atkins	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Burges	Mr. Fonlkes
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Higham
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Holman
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Johnson
Mr. James	Mr. Reid
Mr. Pigott	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Purkiss	Mr. McDonald (Teller).
Mr. Rason	
Mr. Stone	
Mr. Thomas	
Mr. Wallace	
Mr. Holmes (Teller).	

Question thus passed, and the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2—New Clause 5, Dissolution of Gingin Municipality :—

The municipality of Gingin is dissolved, and the district thereof is included in and shall henceforth form part of the Gingin road district; and all the property, assets and liabilities of such municipality are hereby vested in and shall attach to the Board of the Gingin road district.

THE PREMIER moved that the amendment be agreed to. There was no provision in the Municipal Institutions Act for the closure of a municipality, and this amendment was brought forward in the Council at the instance of the Government. The municipality of Gingin had not held an election for the last couple of years, no rates had been struck, and there

was no authoritative power in existence. There was only a revenue of about £60 a year, and it was desired to dissolve the municipality and make it a roads district, which it ought to be.

MR. TAYLOR : Was there no machinery by which municipalities could be dissolved?

THE PREMIER : There was no existing machinery.

MR. TAYLOR : Would this only apply to Gingin?

THE PREMIER : Yes.

MR. TAYLOR : Would it not be better to create machinery by which the clause could apply to any municipality.

THE PREMIER : That raised a difficult question as to what the machinery should be.

Clause passed, and added to the Bill.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER : It was intended to entertain the Federal Judges at luncheon on Monday at half-past one o'clock; and in view of that fact it would be wise for the House to commence its business later than the usual time. He therefore moved that the House at its rising do adjourn until half-past four o'clock on Monday next.

MR. THOMAS rose to move an amendment.

THE SPEAKER : The hon. member could not debate the question.

MR. THOMAS : What he wished to move was that the House should meet to-morrow.

THE SPEAKER : The hon. member could move that, but not debate it.

After explanations,

Question passed, and the House adjourned accordingly at 11:25 o'clock, until half-past four the next Monday afternoon.