ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned accordingly, until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 1st October, 1902.

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

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—RAILWAY TRAINS, GREAT SOUTHERN.

HON. C. A. PIESSE asked the Minister for Lands: If the Government is aware—(*a.*) That passengers from Albany are frequently greatly inconvenienced through the unsatisfactory running of the trains on the Great Southern Railway. (*b.*) That such delay and annoyance are attributable to the class of engine used on that line being unsuitable for the service. (*c.*) That the port of Albany and intervening townships *en route* are suffering through this unsatisfactory service.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: (*a.*) No. The up mail from Albany averaged only five minutes late during the month of September, and during the same period the up mixed reached Fremantle on time, except on four occasions, when it was 40, 10, 23, and 58 minutes late, owing to heavy traffic, hot boxes, derailment, and engine failure respectively. (*b.*) and (*c.*) (*a*) replies fully.

MOTION—PRINTING COMMITTEES.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. A. Jameson) moved:

That the Printing Committee of the Legislative Council have power to confer with the Printing Committee of the Legislative Assembly, with the view of considering the advisability of curtailing the cost of printing and issuing the *Hansard* debates and all other parliamentary printed papers.

The object was to bring about a conference of the two committees, in order if possible to reduce the printing bill. Every member would doubtless realise the enormous quantity of printing now carried out for the Legislature, consisting of a mass of reports, minutes, returns, etcetera. The number of papers printed might be largely reduced, were these to be obtainable by members on application only; for when a copy of every printed paper was sent to each member there must be serious waste, as many members had no time to read everything received. There was great need for economy in printing such returns, and possibly in the *Hansard* reports also. Economy in regard to those reports was certainly a more delicate subject, but it might be possible to appoint an editor of *Hansard*. However, the Printing Committee might be left to decide on the best of the various ways of dealing with the question. The motion was made simply to secure a conference with a view to reducing the cost.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT (Metropolitan): Once a certain document was set in type, the printing of 20 or 30 extra copies would surely make little difference in cost; for it was not the printing but the setting in the first instance which was expensive; and the saving of the few copies given to members of this House, whether or not they took them away, would make no difference in the printing bill.

THE PRESIDENT: As chairman of the Printing Committee of the Legislative Council, he might state that the attention of the committee had already been unofficially drawn to the question. Un-

doubtedly there was much in the contention of Mr. Wright, that after the type had been set up the mere cost of printing was not great; but one question which the two committees would consider was whether there was any necessity for the whole of the documents presented to the House being set in type; whether much of the printing could not be dispensed with, and, as had already been done with several returns, typewritten copies laid on the table. With Mr. Wright's contention he agreed.

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON (North): Undoubtedly a reduction of the printing bill should be effected, and the committee be given a free hand. It was absolutely necessary to cut down expenses wherever possible.

HON. R. G. BURGES: It was really to report on what they did in both Houses.

HON. M. L. MOSS: This was not to report, but to confer.

Question put and passed. On farther motion, a message sent to the Legislative Assembly asking for concurrence.

MOTION—IMMIGRATION, HOW TO INCREASE.

HON. C. A. PIESSE (South-East) moved:

That with a view to the encouragement of immigration, and the settlement of our soil, Part VIII. of the Land Regulations be amended so as to provide—1, For the granting to married men of 100 acres additional on account of the wife, and 50 acres each for all members of a family below the age of 16 years; 2, The reduction of age minimum to 16 years; 3, The extension of conditions to females other than the heads of families.

He said: Members will agree that the crying want of our State at the present time is that of more population; and the object of the motion I submit is to encourage more people to come to these shores. Any movement having that object in view will no doubt be seriously considered by members; and if it be possible to make my motion or something approaching it law, they no doubt will help to do so. A few years ago legislation was brought in to encourage immigration, but unfortunately it failed to be successful. Probably the country was unpopular then, but now we are in a prosperous condition, and a motion in this direction no doubt will be more successful. Part VIII. of the Lands Regulations, which I seek to amend, deals, as members are aware, with free selections of land. Provision is made for granting 160 acres to a member of either sex under certain conditions. There is a fee of 30s. for a homestead block. A youth of the age of 18 can apply, but a female cannot apply for a freehold farm unless she happens to be the head of a family. My motion is intended to alter this, and to provide for the granting to married men of 100 acres additional on account of the wife, and 50 acres each for all the members of the family under the age of 16. Members must agree that it is hardly fair to give to a single man who comes here untrammelled the same privilege as is given to a married man. His expense is not nearly so great as that of a married man. To put it in another way, it does not seem fair to limit a married man to the same conditions as a single one. The increased liberal conditions that I ask for are after all very small. [Interjection by Hon. R. G. BURGES.] Mr. Burges has repeatedly said that 160 acres are not enough to give for a selection; I have heard him say so times out of number. At any rate the fact remains that so far as it has gone it has been pretty fairly successful; but it does not go far enough, and I seek to amend the Act in the way mentioned, and to encourage married people to settle in this country. If by this means we increase our population by something like 50,000, it will be advantageous, and there is no reason why we should not increase the population and encourage people to come to our shores by making a liberal land concession. It will not cost us very much. It will not be a loss to the State really, because the conditions are so stringent and so clearly laid down that the very act of improving that land would be a sufficient reward to the State for giving away the extra quantities I have mentioned. I may state in connection with this matter that in our district there is someone who has just come from England, and he said the Canadians were advertising for 50,000 settlers, and offering to place them on improved farms. This I believe was perfectly true. I was very much struck with the inducements

offered. After all there is not such a lot in it, for it is possible to improve a farm at the expenditure of £500, and it would not cost the country more than £20 a year in interest. I can understand a go-ahead people like the Canadians taking that course. I do not suggest anything of that kind here, because we know it would involve a large outlay. All I ask is that these special inducements be held out to people, and, if members approve of them, by that means we shall no doubt encourage more people to come than we have been able to do hitherto. I hope the House will support me in the motion, but I would also, before I sit down, like to say a few words with reference to the portion dealing with the reduction of the age to sixteen years. In certain societies in Perth lads of sixteen are considered men, and have all the privileges of men, and I maintain that youths of that age should have extended to them the privilege I refer to with regard to the land of the country. At sixteen years of age many are quite capable of working farms. We will take families, for instance, where there are lads of sixteen. Under present conditions they have to be two years at a place before they can take their stations. What happens? Others come along and take up land, and these lads have to shift 20 or 30 miles in order to make their stations. These boys or young men give their time to farming, and are shut off from the privileges of the Land Act longer than they should be. I ask the Minister for Lands to give this matter very earnest consideration. I have placed the matter before him and pointed out the difficulties under which these lads labour. Taking the last portion of my motion, that is as far as women and girls are concerned, I think it is a crying shame that we do not extend these privileges to them. We grant a woman a vote. We give her all the privileges of the Land Act except with regard to a freehold farm. She may have an interest in 1,000 acres under the other clauses, and why not give her the right to obtain a grant of freehold? I know the Minister has previously had his attention drawn to some points in connection with this subject. I urge members to support the motion I bring before the House, and I am sure they will not regret the inducement it will hold out to intending settlers.

Hon. C. SOMMERS (North-East): I second the motion, but I do not agree with the whole of it. I think the same objects could be achieved if the area granted to the head of a family were increased from 160 acres to, say, 260 acres. The reduction of the age to a minimum of 16 has my support. I think the provision with regard to allowing extra areas for all members of the family would not work well at all. Land would be taken up for infants perhaps a few months old, and we know the mortality among children is often very great. The question would be what would become of that land? A difficulty would arise there.

Hon. C. A. Piesse: I do not propose to give it to a baby. If a man has four children he would take up 200 acres on that account, and he would have another 100 acres for the wife.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: I formally second the motion.

Hon. J. W. Hackett: What are the land regulations?

Hon. R. G. Burges: 160 acres.

Hon. J. W. Hackett: There is nothing about that in the land regulations. You mean the Land Act.

The President: I presume the hon. member referred to the Act?

Hon. R. G. BURGES (East): I do not altogether approve of this motion, but I certainly approve of increasing the area of 160 acres. On the Address-in-reply I spoke pretty strongly on that point, and I have always said the area was too small; but I do not know whether this motion is altogether advisable. I know a man who has 16 children——

Hon. C. A. Piesse: They cannot all be under 16 years of age.

Hon. R. G. BURGES: Over and under. I quite approve of increasing the area granted; but if an additional area be given each member of the family, I think it will lead to a lot of jobbery. When we are amending the land regulations, I shall certainly support a motion to increase the area in some way. The idea of some people is that nothing else is necessary than to give a man 160 acres; but undoubtedly 160 acres never were enough to induce any man to stick to his holding, for an area of 160 acres in this country is not equal to 160 acres in Canada, and it was from Canada that the 160-acre provision came. We shall

have to increase the area to something like 260 acres.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Are not you prepared to encourage the married man as against the single man?

HON. R. G. BURGES: If we are to amend the land regulations, I should advise the hon. member to do so next year, when perhaps we shall have another Parliament in one House if not in both. I do not think there will be much change here; but there is no telling what some hon. members will do. It is no use continually tinkering with the Land Acts. If we do so, we do not know where we are. Next year we may get a Parliament which will turn the country upside down. The land regulations are pretty liberal now; and I do not see why we should tinker with them every year. I know the hon. member is aware that it takes the Lands Department all their time to keep in touch with the everlasting amendments which we make in the Acts. It is only seven or nine months since we amended the Land Act; and here is a proposal to amend it again! Let it alone, unless some more important amendment than this be required. I am sure the Minister for Lands is quite aware that 160 acres are not a large enough area. If we put on that area the hall-mark of the State land regulations, and say that 160 acres are enough for a man to live on, we are acting foolishly; and that is what the regulations mean. I say the area is too small. A member says the selector can acquire more. He forgets that as soon as one man takes up 160 acres, others come in and take up the land around him. I could mention good settlers who cannot get enough land in their immediate neighbourhood; and therefore they are not permanently attached to the soil. We should put men on the land, and give them selections on which they can make permanent homesteads.

HON. W. G. BROOKMAN: What do you propose?

HON. R. G. BURGES: Postpone the question till next year. The Minister for Lands (Hon. A. Jameson), who is an active Minister, may then be able to bring in another amendment of the Land Act; and he can no doubt liberalise the section to which this motion refers.

HON. W. G. BROOKMAN: Would you fix the area at 250 acres?

HON. R. G. BURGES: Yes. Give a man 160 if you like; but mark off another block alongside of that and let him have it for five or ten years at an almost nominal rent; and then if he will not take it permanently, let it be open for selection by someone else. That plan I have recommended to almost every Minister in this State since responsible government. When I spoke of it to Sir John Forrest, he said a man could get more than 160 acres; but I pointed out that a man could not always get more. Selecting land hitherto unsettled is the same as a new rush on the goldfields, or a land boom in town. As soon as a man takes 160 acres, the surrounding blocks are rushed. The man should have enough to live on; and 160 acres in some parts of this country are not enough, as Mr. Loton and Mr. Piesse himself are well aware. I shall not vote against the motion; but I say that if carried it will not work out satisfactorily.

HON. W. T. LOTON (East): I shall not, like the member who has just spoken, speak against the motion, and then say I will not oppose it. I think it is not at all desirable to be continually tinkering with the land regulations. Hon. members who were in the House when the regulations were formulated will recollect that several members, including myself, were strong opponents of the giving away of such a limited area. I always said that at all events in what we then called the settled portions—the Eastern Districts and the North—the area was not in any way sufficient; and I dare say *Hansard* will show that I was in favour of reserving at all events another 160 acres alongside the 160 selected, in order that the settler might extend his holding. I was always in favour of more than that. I should have reserved a certain amount of land for pastoral purposes in connection with the 160 acres selected, up to three times that amount—something like 1,000 acres in the arid districts of the colony. A man should have the right to make that freehold, the same as the 160 acres now granted, on effecting certain improvements. But 12 years have elapsed since these regulations were established; things have materially changed; and although the 160 acres in the Eastern

Districts is not sufficient for a man, a smaller area than that would, in many parts of the South-Western Districts, be ample if it could be improved; and I think it would be a great mistake to pass a regulation enlarging the area to anything like the extent proposed in this motion, if the motion were made to cover all the districts in the State. We cannot afford to give away land to that extent in the Southern Districts, granting perhaps 160 acres to start with, and if the applicant be a married man, an extra 100 acres, and if he have a wife, I suppose another 50 acres. Is that the meaning—another 150 acres? And for every child under 16—and there is no reason why he should not have six or eight children under that age—if a man have a family of eight children under the age of 16, he is to be allowed 400 acres? (Hon. C. A. Piesse: Why not?) I do not object; but I say that in the Southern Districts the man who selected this area of land for his eight children would not be able to do anything by way of improvement, unless he had a large capital.

Hon. C. A. Piesse: You do not know the country.

Hon. W. T. LOTON: I have travelled in the country as much as the hon. member.

Hon. W. G. Brookman: What would it cost to clear?

Hon. W. T. LOTON: It would cost £20 an acre to clear. It is not advisable to alter the land regulations as here proposed; and when they are altered, we should discriminate as to the areas granted in the various districts of the country. They are not all the same; and any practical man, such as the last speaker and other hon. members, will recognise the value of the country's land. All we want is farther development by railways, and that will come in due time; and we shall not attract any greater population by giving men or women land which they are not in a position to utilise. The State had much better hold the land in its own name until the land can be utilised in a fair and liberal way. I maintain that our land regulations are at present very liberal, and that in certain districts it would not be desirable to extend these regulations. We are told that a man cannot live if hemmed in on 160 acres. Of course he cannot live thus in certain districts; but in the South-Western Districts, from Pinjarra to Albany and beyond it, there is plenty of good land which, though very heavily timbered, is favoured with a great rainfall; and I follow Mr. Burges to the extent of saying it is not desirable to make any such tentative alterations in the land regulations. On those grounds I oppose the motion.

Hon. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): I have no doubt the mover has good intentions; but there would be many difficulties in giving effect to a motion of this sort. Rights have been established under the existing regulations; and it would be an act of injustice to those who have already selected land if they were not given the same privileges as those it is proposed to accord to new settlers. I do not like this continual tinkering with the regulations. The land regulations are as liberal as anyone can possibly expect them to be; and by every alteration we create difficulties of which it will be very hard to get rid. It may be very well to say that the free homestead blocks ought to be larger; but we must remember that every selector has a perfect right to select other land under regulations which are as easy as could be wished; and for that land he has 20 years in which to make his payments, and he pays a very low amount. It would be very unwise to approve of any amendment of the existing regulations. The idea of extending the right to take up land to a person 16 years of age has, I think, something in it, because if a man has a son who is working at home, I do not see why that son should not have the right to hold a block in conjunction with that of his parents. The idea of extending the privilege to wives and daughters would lead to a good deal of jobbery and many complications; there would be great trouble.

Hon. C. A. Piesse: Give it to the man on account of his being married.

Hon. C. E. DEMPSTER: The regulations are as liberal as they can possibly be. A man can secure what he is entitled to under a homestead lease, and under the regulations he can secure a piece of land to settle upon, and make a good homestead. I cannot see that it would be in the interests of the country

to make the alterations the hon. member suggests at the present time.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): Continually we have a proposition made to us to advance the settlement of the country and to improve the condition of the agricultural population, and no member here is more ready or enterprising in making suggestions to the House than Mr. Piesse. In the present instance I do not know whether this feeling for land settlement is a sentimental one that has run away with him. I want to know why the privilege should be confined to married men. I think the unmarried men should have 200 acres in addition, to make up for the loss of a wife. Why should the married people have all the good things of this life?

HON. R. G. BURGES: What good are the single?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Francis Bacon says that single men have made the world, and he works out that paradox in a most ingenious and satisfactory manner. At all events I protest against the theory that married people are to have all the consolation and good things of this life, and that unmarried men are to be put under a ban almost, whether they are to try to carry on their business, whether they are to lead a cheerless or barren existence, or whether they are to go to the country.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: You may encourage them to get married.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: They look around and watch their friends, and some of them are frightened. If the hon. member will not give the unmarried men a fair chance in this country I am astonished at it, and the only thing is that they must go to some other State. Through grief and sorrow you drive them out of Western Australia. I again urge that the unmarried man's life is the better lesson of the two. If I had a majority of bachelors here, I am sure they would agree with me. Bachelors live the life of neuters, labouring to store up honey in order that the drones and married folk may feed upon it. To come to more serious points: if the motion be adopted, it will have to be very carefully drafted. The hon. member does not say under what conditions these additional acres are to be granted. Take the case of children: if 50 acres be taken up for each member of the family, I presume each member will have the right.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: I propose to encourage married men to come, and to give 50 additional acres on account of bringing an extra child to the country. The extra population is worth something to us.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: You mean to sweat the children and give them no right. Say a man has five children, he can take up five blocks of 50 acres each.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: There would be no division in the matter. A man comes and applies on account of five children, the quantity of land being 250 acres, and there would be a hundred for his wife and 160 for himself. He can take it out in one block.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That is the whole point. You allow him to make these additional selections, one for the wife and five for the children, and pick out the eyes of the country.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: No.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: This motion may work a very serious wrong to the South-Western country, where you will get unrivalled patches of orchard ground scattered over a large area. When you have secured those, as some in that province have done, there will perhaps be 20,000 acres practically worthless. I hope—and I say this without any sense of cynicism or satire—that a time wil come, at some distant date, when we shall see Mr. Piesse occupying the position now so worthily filled by Dr. Jameson. I am sure we should have a land Bill of the most progressive and modern type, and that it would contain a good deal that the House would prune away, yet what was left would be valuable. There is much in what Mr. Loton said to induce Mr. Piesse to withdraw this motion. We had this question threshed out to some extent last session.

HON. R. G. BURGES: This very year.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Last session but this very year, in connection with pastoral holdings; and the cry in all parts of the House from members acquainted with the question was for greater subdivision and greater classification. What is essential in one district may be ruinous in another. I do not think that anything farther should be effected in the way of granting large quantities of

land until something of that kind is done. Take the South-Western country: a large area of country would be rendered worthless by having its eyes picked out, when we might have some democratic legislation which would make the hon. member flinch. To grant a man 100 acres in the richest and most fertile parts of the South-Western district would, as I think my friend Mr. Brookman interjected, be absolute ruin. I know a little about the cost of clearing. The case I am most familiar with is a case of very fertile land indeed, and by the time the fruit trees were put into that country it cost £100 per acre.

Hon. R. G. Burges: That was because the owner did not live on it.

Hon. J. W. HACKETT: Perhaps so. Land of that kind would be useless to the poor man. I believe he would do as so many have done—seize these valuable blocks and hold them for the purpose of selling them at a largely increased rate. Unless you attached stringent conditions of improvement you would be only injuring the country; and if you attached stringent conditions of improvement you would, at all events in the South-Western portion, be shutting men out.

Hon. C. Sommers: There is no provision for the case of a man being divorced from his wife.

Hon. J. W. HACKETT: That would have to be dealt with separately. An endeavour to help forward agriculture in this community by such a motion as this is so crude and needs so much farther consideration that I think it would be well to drop the motion.

Hon. C. A. Piesse: I wish the House to adopt the principle.

Hon. J. W. HACKETT: The principles here are details.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. A. Jameson): I say at once I am entirely in sympathy with the hon. member in his desire for the settlement of our soil. At the same time I am entirely with members who have stated it would be rather dangerous at the present time to tamper with the Act in this direction. An amendment of the Land Act is now before the other place, and it will be here next week, and then the amendment may be brought forward, if the hon. member (Hon. C. A. Piesse) so desires. I think it will be better to follow the suggestion of Mr. Burges and postpone the discussion until such time as we can consolidate the whole of the land laws as they exist at the present time. But it is becoming very clear, as Mr. Hackett has pointed out, that very small areas of land in the South-Western district are sufficient to enable a man and his family to live. I believe that even 10 or 20 acres are sufficient in some portions, and this motion, if passed, might lead us into grave complications. I think the matter needs to be very carefully considered. It would lead to a great deal of debate, and I hope the hon. member will not press his motion at the present time.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE (in reply): I will withdraw my motion, with the permission of the House; but before doing so I wish to say, and I think other members will agree with me, that I object to the statement which has repeatedly been made in the House that we are not to amend the Land Act. If we find there are mistakes, it is our duty to amend them. Last session it was stated to be the intention of the Minister for Lands himself to reduce the area of the selection of second-class land from 1,000 acres to 300, and a motion was brought in to that effect. I introduced an amendment that the 300 acres should adjoin the holding of the applicant, the object being to prevent the eyes of the country from being picked out in small blocks, and that was carried. But we still compel a man to take up 1,000 acres when it does not adjoin the holding, and farther amendments are needed. For three or four years people have been asking for an alteration. I am prepared to withdraw the motion, and no doubt an opportunity will be afforded of speaking in relation to the subject when the measure now before the other House is introduced here. I hope we shall hear the last regarding this matter of objecting to continual tinkering with the Land Act. I say it is our duty every session, if we find a mistake in it, to amend the Land Act until we get it in proper working order.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

RETURN—KIMBERLEY DISTRICT LEASES.

On motion by Hon. C. Sommers, ordered: That a return be laid upon the table of the House showing:—1, The

number of applicants for pastoral leases in the Kimberley district recently explored by Surveyor Brockman and party; 2, The area in acres so applied for; 3, The number of leases granted, with names of lessees, and area in acres of each lease.

MOTION—HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT (NEW), COMMITTTEE.

CHANGE OF MEMBER.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. A. Jameson) moved:

That the Hon. G. Randell be elected a member of the Parliamentary Committee of Advice on the erection of the new Houses of Parliament, in lieu of Hon. A. P. Matheson.

The name of Mr. Matheson had been inadvertently allowed to remain on the list of members, and must be replaced. Mr. Randell had a large practical knowledge of building, and as he resided in Perth he could give considerable time to the working of the committee. The hon. member had had such a long parliamentary career that he probably knew the requirements of Parliament Houses better than any other member of the House.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan): The courtesy of the Minister in proposing him as a member of such an important committee was highly appreciated; but he (Mr. Randell) having expressed himself as he had regarding new Parliament Houses being built now, and also as to the site selected, it would be highly improper for him to take the proposed position. He trusted to be excused, and declined to accept the courteous offer of the Minister.

HON. M. L. MOSS (Minister): In the circumstances, he moved as an amendment:

That the words "G. Randell" be struck out, and "J. D. Connolly" inserted in lieu.

THE PRESIDENT: As chairman of the committee so far as this House was concerned, it was necessary for him to inquire whether Mr. Connolly was constantly in Perth, because none knew the times at which this committee must be called together.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Mr. Connolly resided in Perth, and his name was suggested because he had been for many years a practical builder and contractor.

THE PRESIDENT: Quite so. The only point was that the members of the committee must act on short notice.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Then why had Mr. Matheson's name remained so long on the list of members?

THE PRESIDENT: There had not hitherto been opportunity to fill the vacancy.

Amendment passed, and the motion as amended agreed to.

SUPPLY BILL, £500,000.

ALL STAGES.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motions by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, Bill passed through all stages.

CITY OF PERTH BUILDING FEES VALIDATION BILL.

Read a third time, on motion by Hon. G. RANDELL, and *passed*.

EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, on motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, and *passed*.

AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, on motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

JUSTICES BILL.

RECOMMITTAL.

Resumed from the previous sitting; HON. M. L. MOSS in charge.

Clause 68 (postponed)—Justices may prohibit publication of evidence:

HON. A. G. JENKINS moved that the clause be struck out. The clause gave the justices power which was not even claimed at the present time by Judges of the Supreme Court in the State. It was a power that was open to very grave abuse, and was entirely novel in principle. Judges, at the present time, might prohibit the publication of evidence during the course of a trial, but supposing a man were acquitted, all the evidence came into the papers, or so much as the papers thought fit to publish, and the public were the real judges of the guiltiness or otherwise of the parties concerned. Under this clause there would be nothing to prevent justices who

might be friendly to a man from discharging him, although he might be guilty, and prohibiting the publication of the evidence. That sort of thing should not be allowed. We could not make laws for the individual. People might say, "Look at the harm it may do to an innocent man to have all the disagreeable incidents in the papers." That might be so, but the abuse the other way would more than counteract that, because, as a rule, the Press never dragged in any incidents unnecessarily.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Speaking entirely for himself, he did not like the clause, but probably the powers provided in it would not be exercised except in very unusual circumstances. He could conceive of a case where it would be prudent and desirable to prohibit the publication of evidence even after a man's acquittal; but whilst holding that opinion, he thought there was great force in what Mr. Jenkins had said. With regard to the first part of the clause, he believed that the power ought to be vested in the justices. This power was possessed by Judges of the Supreme Court; in fact, he thought the Judges of the Supreme Court had the right to prohibit publication in any circumstances, even after the conclusion of the case. It was a power which would not be exercised, he supposed, except in very peculiar circumstances, circumstances which were not likely to arise. As to that portion of the clause relating to the non-publication of proceedings after the case was disposed of, he was not inclined to defend it. He thought that the more publicity generally there was of these things the better it was for the community at large. It was probable that in an isolated instance great injustice would be done to an individual by publishing the proceedings in a case where the complaint was dismissed; but the question was whether Parliament would allow that to weigh against the greater good that was going to result in the majority of cases by the publication of the proceedings. He moved that the following words after "thereof," in line 3, "and if the defendant is discharged or the complaint dismissed, may prohibit the publication of the proceedings or evidence or any portion thereof," be struck out, and the words "by the justices" inserted in lieu.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The objection (by Mr. Jenkins) to the clause he entirely agreed with. The great guarantee of justice being done and the innocence of a person being proved, was that the proceedings in which one party or the other was concerned should be made public. Even in a case of blackmailing—which was clearly one to which this clause was directed—the more it was known the more would justice be done. Under this clause justices who were friendly to a man might forbid the publication of the evidence or proceedings, and the man might be acquitted, but everything be hidden under the cloak of silence.

HON. R. G. BURGES: Not the Supreme Court.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: No. He was talking of justices. A man would be tried and acquitted in the court below. The only way for that man to justify himself and to go without a stain on his character was for all the facts to be made public. One might multiply cases where such power as this should not be put in the hands of justices, especially the class of justices referred to by Mr. Thomson. If proceedings were not to be published, there must be some means provided to enable newspapers outside to convey that information; but if this clause were passed such an announcement in the paper would under the Act be an offence against the law, and the paper would be liable to a penalty of £20. The amendment consented to by Mr. Moss was something, but he would prefer that Mr. Jenkins divide the House upon his amendment—and he would certainly be on his side—that the whole clause be struck out. Let the amendment be pressed to a division.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: By the interpretation clause, "complaint" included "information." If a complaint were lodged against a man and he were committed for trial, that would not be the "determination," for the determination was not till the case was disposed of by the criminal court.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Then let the words "by the justices" be inserted after "determination;" and the clause would be highly beneficial to the administration of justice. In cases before justices, lasting two or three days, where witnesses were ordered out of court, much

mischief arose through the witnesses reading newspaper reports of evidence; and parties to proceedings had opportunities of interviewing witnesses and moulding their evidence for the purpose of corroborating or of rebutting evidence previously given.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That argument applied to every case, civil or criminal.

HON. M. L. MOSS: But the principle was good. Supreme Court Judges had frequently prohibited the publication of evidence; and this was sometimes indispensable. Take the case of a desperate criminal, who had previously been convicted of subornation of perjury, the publication of the evidence might bring about the very mischief the exclusion of witnesses was intended to prevent. At the risk of having the clause struck out, he would press his amendment. In grave cases only would magistrates exercise the authority.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Or for a friend.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Even so; such justices ran the risk of being struck off the commission.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: No. The charge could not be sheeted home.

HON. M. L. MOSS: But the public were not precluded from reading the evidence at a later stage, after the case had been determined; therefore the justices were still made amenable to public opinion.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Whether or not the evidence was published, it would be conveyed to the witnesses outside the court.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The amendment proposed by him would minimise the evil.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Impossible.

HON. R. G. BURGES: For such an important amendment to be rushed through without being printed was objectionable. So that legal members might inquire, he moved that progress be reported.

Motion put and negatived.

HON. R. G. BURGES: The clause would only assist crime. All newspaper readers knew the deterrent effect of the publication of evidence.

HON. G. RANDELL: Publication enabled many a criminal to escape.

HON. R. G. BURGES: It had a deterrent effect.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: True. There was nothing of which criminals were more afraid.

HON. R. G. BURGES: To prevent the publication would only lead to crime, and would not attain the object sought; for anyone could employ a shorthand writer to fully report the evidence, and give it to witnesses who had been sent out of court.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER supported the amendment. There were serious objections to the invariable publication of evidence, which often defeated the ends of justice.

HON. G. RANDELL: Supreme Court Judges could prevent the publication; and the only question was whether justices should have similar power. He could conceive of cases—many of them occurred recently in this State and others—in which it would be highly desirable that the evidence should be kept back until such time as the trial was ended. That would tend very much to the benefit of the community at large. In fact, he was much in sympathy with the whole clause as it stood, but he knew it was open to a charge of being liable to abuse, and it might be used to shield a man in a high position who might be charged with some crime, from the obloquy which would be attached to him if the evidence were published. Notwithstanding all that, he thought such power put into the hands of reputable justices—and he thought they were all so—could be exercised to the benefit of the whole community. There had been in our newspapers recently—he was sorry to say in the respectable portion of those newspapers—reports of cases that had occurred which he thought tended very largely to the demoralisation of public opinion. That low moral tone was increasing, not only in this State but in others, and he believed it was very much promoted by the publication of such cases as those to which he had referred. He would like to see the prohibition of the publication of wretched details in relation to cases in which persons were charged with certain offences. He did not refer to one newspaper particularly, but they were all tainted with the same thing. The power given to justices to exclude persons from being present at certain trials was very wholesome and beneficial.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: We had that power now.

HON. G. RANDELL: We had, and he trusted it would be maintained, but he thought the other part of the clause was perhaps carrying the matter too far, and if the evidence were afterwards published the danger to which Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Hackett referred would at any rate be obviated. He would support the amendment by Mr. Moss.

HON. M. L. MOSS said his amendment did not aim at preventing the publication of the evidence at all, but allowed the justices in certain cases to prohibit publication until they had disposed of those cases. One object of the amendment was to prevent a comparison of notes; and it was easier to get that comparison from the publication of the proceedings in newspapers than by those who were inside informing those who were ordered outside of what took place. No respectable practitioner would tell the witnesses outside what had taken place inside a court.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: There were two cases doubtless in the mind of Mr. Randell, and he (Hon. J. W. Hackett) entirely stood by the publication in full of those two cases. One was reported from Adelaide, and another came down from Kalgoorlie, and in neither case would justice have been done to the public if the details had not been given in full. As regarded the case from Kalgoorlie, there would have been a general outcry at the sentence imposed by Mr. Justice Parker if the public had not had the evidence in full before them; but as it was, they felt that the learned Judge, in going to the utmost limits of the law, was doing his duty. As to supposing that witnesses would not be put in possession of all the facts, it was too absurd. Mr. Moss stated that no respectable practitioner would give such information; but it was the other class of practitioners we were afraid of. Cases should not be made known in a garbled or half-hearted fashion, but all that was necessary to be told should be published.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The public would know the whole of the case, and not a garbled version of it; and the observation as to a garbled version was not a fair one to make. If the clause were amended as he proposed, the proprietors of a newspaper could, if they felt so disposed, insert a *verbatim* report.

HON. G. RANDELL: Almost the only newspaper he read was the *West Australian*, which was a most respectable one, but he had been exceedingly pained at seeing the publication of certain cases even in that newspaper.

Question (to strike out words) passed, and the words struck out.

Farther question (that the clause as amended stand part of the Bill) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	8
Noes	9
Majority against	1

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. C. E. Dempster	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. A. Jameson	Hon. W. G. Brookman
Hon. R. Laurie	Hon. R. G. Burges
Hon. W. T. Loton	Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. M. L. Moss	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. G. Randell	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. C. Sommers	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. B. C. Wood (*Teller*).	Hon. C. A. Piesse
	Hon. J. W. Wright (*Teller*).

Clause thus negatived.

Bill reported with an amendment, and the report adopted.

At 6·35, the PRESIDENT left the Chair.
At 7·35, Chair resumed.

MARINE STORES BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

On motion by HON. M. L. MOSS, progress reported, to permit of two new clauses being printed.

TRANSFER OF LAND AMENDMENT BILL.

ASSEMBLY'S AMENDMENTS.

Schedule of five amendments made by the Legislative Assembly now considered, in Committee.

No. 1—Clause 4, line 2, strike out the word "wholly" and insert "certificate" in lieu:

HON. M. L. MOSS: The Bill had left this House with only one operative clause, while there were now five. He would explain the amendment, which would not be comprehensible without reference to the principal Act; and progress could then be reported, so that members might study the Bill as altered. When the Bill was last before the House it was pointed out that a certificate of title comprising a

block of land which had been subdivided became smothered with memorials of transfer, so that it was almost impossible to understand exactly how much land was left included in the certificate; nor could that be ascertained save after considerable research, by comparing the deposited plan and extracting from the whole block of land every transfer made, to find how much was left To overcome that difficulty this House had provided that in case of any untransferred portion of land, if the certificate were taken away from the Titles Office, the proprietor of the remaining portion of the land should take out a new certificate. The Assembly considered that to call on the proprietor to take out a new title in every instance would inflict hardship, which could be obviated by amending Clause 4 to provide that the authorities could not compel the taking out of the new title unless the existing title had indorsed on it at least 10 memorials of transfer. He moved that progress be reported.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

RAILWAYS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING (MOVED).

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. A. Jameson): In moving the second reading of this Bill, I would point out that this is making provision for the appointment of a Commissioner. It is simply a measure laying down the duties and powers of the Commissioner in contradistinction to those of the Minister for Railways or Minister for Public Works. Under the Act of 1878 provision is made for the appointment of a Commissioner of Railways, but it was not at that time contemplated that the Commissioner of Railways should be a Minister of the Crown. In those days so frequent were the applications made to the Commissioner of Railways that it was thought advisable to have him as a member of the Executive Council.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Is there any evidence that he was not intended to be a Minister of the Crown?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: You cannot find any evidence in the Act of 1878 assuming that he ought to be a Minister of the Crown. He was simply a Commissioner of Railways, and as a Commissioner of Railways he was called upon to take his position. I do not know exactly why he takes a position as Minister of the Crown, at all events as a member of the Executive Council. Of course it was at a time when Western Australia was a Crown colony, and the conditions were somewhat different. Under that Act of 1878, where provision is made for appointing a Commissioner of Railways the Commissioner of Railways was appointed by the Government of the day; and now this Bill provides for the salary of the Commissioner at £1,500 a year, and the various conditions under which that Commissioner holds his office. The duties of the Commissioner are clearly laid down in this Bill, and I should like to point out that although this Bill is an amendment of the Railways Act or Railways Acts that exist at the present time—I think there are nearly a dozen Railways Acts now existing—all that exists in those Railways Acts as to the management of railways still holds good in those particular enactments. This is a measure which merely defines the line of cleavage between the management of railways and the construction of railways. You will find that under Clause 9 of this Bill "the Commissioner shall have the management, maintenance, and control of all Government railways open for traffic, and, with the approval of the Minister, may make additions and improvements to existing lines, and in the performance of his duty shall have the powers and be subject to the liabilities of a Commissioner of Railways under the Railways Acts." That clause is to be read in conjunction with Clause 20, and you will see there that "the powers, duties, and obligations under the Railways Acts of the Commissioner of Railways, in relation to the acquisition of land and construction of railways, are transferred to the Minister for the time being administering the Department of Public Works." That is really the gist of the whole Bill. It is laying down the line of cleavage, so to speak, between the works and duties of the Commissioner of Railways and those of the Minister for Railways. The Minister has still to do with the construction of all lines. The Commissioner has to do with the management, control, and maintenance of these lines. You will see by Clause 10 that "all fares, tolls, and

freights shall be fixed by regulations made in accordance with the Railways Acts, and approved by the Governor and published in the *Government Gazette*." These rates have to be made in accordance with the Acts that exist at the present time, and it rests with the Government of the day to decide what these fares, tolls, and freights shall be; not with the Commissioner of Railways for the time being. I think that in the debate on the Address-in-reply the question came forward and was discussed somewhat fully, whether it was desirable that the Commissioner of Railways should have only the management of railways and have nothing to say with regard to the rates, tolls, and freights. It has been decided by the Government that it is desirable that the Commissioner of Railways shall not have the power to determine what the running rates of the railway shall be, owing to questions of policy that may arise and the necessity the Government may have from time to time of deciding perhaps to reduce the rates. In regard to questions of land settlement and so on, the policy of the country ought to lie in the hands of the Government and not in the hands of the Commissioner of Railways, and there I think we have the dividing line between the duties of the Commissioner and those of the Minister for Railways. You will see by Clause 11 that "all railway employees, except the clerical staff, shall be subject to the provisions of any classification Act for the time being in force." I believe a Classification Bill will be brought into force before very long, and then the employees will have to fall in under that measure. You will see that another power is given to the Commissioner under Clause 12, and a very important one it is, and it rests with the members of this House to decide whether it be not too great a power even to give to the Commissioner. The clause says "the Commissioner shall decide on the position, character, and suitableness of all stations, station platforms, gate-houses, station-yards, and sheds required," and so on. This of course gives the Commissioner the power to decide where a station is to be erected on a line. It leaves the Government very little to say in this matter. It rests entirely with the Commissioner for the time being. Of course the object of that is to place the matter beyond political control for the time being. It may be a very good provision, but certainly it is open for discussion whether it is well to place these matters in the hands of the Commissioner outside the control of the Government of the day.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: He cannot construct.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: He cannot construct without the Minister. The Minister still has the power to decide whether a station shall be constructed upon the spot referred to or not, but the Commissioner will decide which is the most suitable position. You will see by Clause 14 that a report has to be made every quarter by the Commissioner. That is a very desirable provision. Clause 15 provides that an annual report shall be made and placed upon the table of both Houses of Parliament. The quarterly reports will go to the Minister, and as a general rule the reports that come into departments are published. This is always recognised so that any report of interest to the public is published, but it is not laid down anywhere in the Act. I presume, however, it would be a report available to the public. You will see that under Clause 17 the Commissioner may be suspended from his office by the Governor. I may point out that this clause is taken from the Act of New South Wales and also that of Victoria. It is almost word for word the same as the section which exists in those States at the present time. Under Clause 18 provision is made with regard to a penalty upon the Commissioner, and the penalty is a very severe one, but we have also a precedent for this. You will see that we have the precedent of the New South Wales Act. The Commissioner may be liable to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three years. It would, of course, be a grave offence for the Commissioner to be personally interested in any contract or agreement made by or on behalf of the Government, or otherwise in any way to participate, or claim to be entitled to participate, in the profits thereof, or in any commission, and so on. For that offence I think no punishment could be too great, considering the position of trust held by the Commissioner and his large salary. He

must, of course, be altogether above suspicion; and if he be proved guilty of any such act, the penalty ought to be exemplary. Clause 19 provides that:

> All Government railways shall be vested in the Minister on behalf of His Majesty.

That is a provision which naturally arises from the previous clauses of the Bill. It would never do to vest the railways in the Commissioner for the time being; and they are vested in the Minister on behalf of the Crown. I think I have outlined all the principles of the Bill; the technical points can be dealt with in Committee; but what I have tried to make clear is the principle involved in this measure, which is that of laying down the duties and powers of the Commissioner for the time being, in contradistinction to those of the Minister of the day. Clause 23 is simply an amendment of 58 Victoriæ No. 22, Section 3, in regard to lost goods. In the past, the cost of advertising these in the public Press has been great; and it is now proposed, as in the Act of New South Wales, to advertise them in the *Government Gazette* only.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What is the circulation of the *Government Gazette?*

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is very considerable, but I cannot state exactly.

HON. R. G. BURGES: It is not what it ought to be.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: At all events, it is open to anyone to look at the *Government Gazette* with regard to any matter in which he is interested.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Justices of the Peace get it free.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is always obtainable on application at the Treasury.

HON. R. G. BURGES: It should be supplied to every leaseholder.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The duties of the Commissioner are purely those of a managing director; and the construction of railways lies in the hands of the Minister. I hope that with this introduction hon. members will have no difficulty in dealing with the Bill, of which I now move the second reading.

HON. G. RANDELL: Clause 23 seems foreign to the Bill.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: True; but its insertion will be useful.

On motion by HON. J. W. WRIGHT, debate adjourned till the next Wednesday.

WIDOW OF LATE C. Y. O'CONNOR ANNUITY BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. A. Jameson), in moving the second reading, said: I need not bring forward any strong arguments on behalf of this Bill, knowing how sympathetic were hon. members towards Mrs. O'Connor during the debate on the Address-in-reply; and I feel sure the measure will receive the unanimous support of the House. But although out of sympathy with the widow of the late Engineer-in-Chief we shall naturally support this Bill, I should like only to point out that as a matter of justice we are called upon to find this small annuity of £250 a year; for when the late Engineer-in-Chief came to his untimely end, he had due to him, had he chosen to take his accumulated leave of absence, a sum of nearly £3,000. Moreover, if he had been spared instead of meeting his sudden death—if his health had been preserved so that he might have enjoyed his retirement—he would have been entitled to a pension of £525 a year; so that in recognising the claims of his widow, we are doing so not in charity but in justice; for undoubtedly it would have been the delight of every member of this House if the late Engineer-in-Chief had lived to enjoy his full pension for his natural term of existence. Undoubtedly Mr. O'Connor's death was due to the strain he suffered during the construction of the great works he carried out for this State. For eleven years he worked hard, threw his whole life into the interests of our State, and took no rest. He had no leave of absence during the whole of that time; and in putting all his heart and soul into the work he had to do, he had no time to provide for the wife and family he left behind. It is often the lot of professional men who have their whole soul in their callings, to devote all their time to the work which they have in hand, and to give no thought to the position of those who are near and dear to them. Then when that work has been on behalf of the State, it falls on those who control State affairs to provide for the wife and family. I ask of hon. members to support the

second reading of this Bill; and I think as a matter of courtesy it would be well, knowing how complete is our sympathy with Mrs. O'Connor and the family, if we put the Bill through all stages to-night, and let it be an accomplished fact as quickly as possible.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE, ETC.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Standing Orders suspended.

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

MOTION—TELEPHONES, COUNTRY DISTRICTS.

Debate resumed from the 23rd September, on the motion by Hon. C. A. Piesse, for extending the telephone lines throughout country districts.

Hon. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): Telephones as a supplement to the telegraph system could be generally availed of, and they would be of great benefit, especially to the country parts. There were, however, difficulties in the way of giving effect to this motion. If it would have to be sent to another place for approval: the wording would have to be altered by "Parliament" being substituted for "this House." The motion opened up one of the most interesting questions which had yet come before Parliament. It was clear that if the motion were passed, the proper quarter to forward it to was the Federal Government in Melbourne. By the Constitution Act the telephone system along with the telegraph and postal system of the State passed over to the Federal Government, and these new telephones would be of very little service unless they were connected with the telegraph system of the State. The question was, how was this motion to be transmitted? As far as he knew, it raised a question which had not yet been decided or even debated in other Houses of Parliament.

Hon. M. L. Moss: A message was sent from both Houses in South Australia in reference to the customs.

Hon. J. W. HACKETT: Was it transmitted through the Ministry or a private member?

Hon. M. L. Moss said that he could not say.

Hon. J. W. HACKETT: That raised the whole question. Were these motions first of all to be addressed to the Federal Minister or the Federal Government—that was the Premier, who had the arrangement of outside matters in the Federation—or were they to be sent to one or both Houses of Parliament; and if one or either of these courses had to be adopted, what was to be the channel? Were we to approach the Ministry by motion, or were we to send the motion through our own Ministry, or was it to be forwarded by the President or the Speaker? Or again—there were endless possibilities to this question—were we to approach the Federal House by form of petition, if we passed by the Federal Government or Federal Minister; or would someone from this State appear before one of the Federal Houses? Were the President and the Speaker expected to appear at the bar of the House of Representatives, and, like mayors of the principal towns of Great Britain, to present the resolutions of the bodies over which they presided? In view of these difficulties, the hon. member should reconsider and redraft the motion, which in its present state would not be very welcome. The cost of establishing, however cheaply, a long line of wire for telephone purposes would be great. The hon. member seemed to think the State should pay for it; but that would be expensive, and if the line were of considerable length, the cost must fall on private shoulders.

Hon. C. A. Piesse: In most districts the lines were cheaply constructed.

Hon. R. G. Burges: By private people.

Hon. G. Randell: By some of the timber stations.

Hon. J. W. HACKETT: Such lines cost £25 per mile, he was informed.

Hon. C. A. Piesse: Nothing like that.

Hon. J. W. HACKETT: If not, how much? The expense would fall on the few persons served at the terminus; or, if there were receiving stations along the line, clerks must be provided to collect fees. That the mover was not in a position to state the cost was an additional reason for deferring the motion, which ought to be withdrawn.

THE PRESIDENT: In any case, it was not in the province of the House to deal with the construction of telephone lines.

HON. C. A. PIESSE (in reply): Apart from the difficulties mentioned by hon. members, there were others which he had discovered. He was informed the Federal Parliament had recently passed an Act dealing with telephone systems, which Act should be before us ere such a motion was passed; and as something could probably be done at a later stage, he asked leave to withdraw the motion with a view to gaining farther information.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 8·35 o'clock, until the next Wednesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 1st October, 1902.

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

PRAYERS.

PETITION—FACTORIES AND SHOPS BILL, DAIRYMEN.

MR. F. McDONALD (Cockburn Sound) presented a petition signed by 44 dairymen of Perth and Fremantle, praying for the extension of the provisions of the Factories and Shops Bill to their business.

Petition received and read.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

CAMELS IMPORTATION, FAIZ MAHOMET.

THE PREMIER, in presenting papers relating to the proposed importation of 500 camels by Faiz Mahomet, moved for by the member for South Perth (Mr. Gordon), said that the Government, having been threatened some time ago with an action in respect to this matter, had obtained legal opinions from the Crown Law officers. He had thought it advisable that these opinions should be extracted from the jacket, since they did not affect the facts of the case.

OTHER PAPERS.

By the TREASURER: Papers relative to the retrenchment of Mr. George Berry (moved for by Mr. Nanson).

Ordered: To lie on the table.

QUESTION—COOLGARDIE WATER SCHEME, MUNDARING.

MR. HASTIE asked the Minister for Works: 1, How many acres of timber land have been ringbarked within the Mundaring catchment area. 2, At what cost per acre. 3, Who authorised the work. 4, Why it was done.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS replies: 1, 21,020 acres. 2, 3s. 2½d. per acre. 3, It was recommended by Mr. T. C. Hodgson (late Engineer-in-Charge of Coolgardie Water Supply Scheme), concurred in by the late Engineer-in-Chief, and approved by the then Hon. Minister for Works. 4, To increase the percentage of rainfall flowing off the catchment area to the reservoir.

SUPPLY (TEMPORARY)—BILL, £500,000.

Message from the Administrator having been received and read, the House resolved into Committee of Supply.

THE TREASURER moved in accordance with the Message: "That there be granted to His Majesty, on account of the service of the year 1901-2, a sum not exceeding £300,000 out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and £200,000 from moneys to the credit of the General Loan Fund."