Question passed; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 76.—Add new clause, to stand as Clause 272, as follows:—"If either House of Parliament, within thirty days next after any regulations or by-laws have been so laid before it, resolves that such regulations or by-laws ought to be annulled, the same shall, after the date of such resolution, be of no effect, without prejudice to the validity of anything done in the meantime under the same."

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Council had inserted the provision taken from the Commonwealth Acts. He did not approve of it but it had been urged to have it passed because in a health Act, which was an Act of regulation, greater power should be given to deal with those regulations than would be the case in regard to other Acts of Parliament. He moved—

That the amendment be made.

Question passed; the Council's amendment made.

On motion by the MINISTER FOR MINES, No. 77 made.

No. 78 (consequential on No. 52) postponed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 3.55 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 2nd February, 1911.

	Page
Papers presented	3612
Question: Railway project, Wanneroo	3612
Notice of motion, mining industry	3612
Bills: Public Library, Museum, and Art Gallery of Western Australia, Recom., 3R.	3613
Transfer of Land Act, 3R.	3613
Constitution Act Amendment, 2R., Com.	3613
Criminal Code Act Amendment, 2R., Com.	3628
Roads, Recom.	3633
Loan, £2,100,000, 1R.	3634
University, 2R., Com.	3634
Parliamentary Allowances, 1R.	3659
Electoral Act Amendment, Assembly's amendments	3659
Appropriation, all stages	3660
Supply, £1,683,700, all stages	3661
Motion Timber industry, to inquire	3748
Adjournment, state of business	3662

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: Report on investigations into the composition of the gases caused by blasting in mines.

QUESTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, WANNEROO.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY asked the Colonial Secretary: Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill for the construction of a line of railway from Perth to Wanneroo at an early date?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: The Railway Advisory Board has been requested to make an inspection of the Wanneroo district, and submit a recommendation upon the application for a railway from Perth. Upon receipt of the board's report the Government will determine whether the line is one which can be included in the Government programme of public works to be submitted to Parliament next session.

NOTICE OF MOTION—MINING INDUSTRY.

Notice of motion in the name of H[redacted] T. F. O. Brimage, *to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into and report on the mining industry*, called on.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE (North-East): In consequence of the lateness of the session, and also the possibility of the session closing very shortly, it was his intention to ask leave to withdraw the motion. The House would not have sufficient time to give a motion of this importance adequate consideration. The matter was of considerable importance, and he would have liked the House to have had more time to consider it. By leave of the House, therefore, he would withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT: Really the motion was not before the House; it had never been moved.

BILL—PUBLIC LIBRARY, MUSEUM, AND ART GALLERY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Recommittal.

On motion by Hon. R. D. McKENZIE (Honorary Minister), Bill recommitted for amendment.

Clause 12—Quorum :

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE moved—

That in line 1 the word "seven" be struck out and "six" inserted in lieu.

In the original amendment it was provided that five trustees should constitute a quorum; this was altered to seven; it was now found that six would be a better number than five in view of the difficulty in getting many of the professional gentlemen, who would be appointed as trustees, to attend meetings.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The Minister should make the number five; it was a mistake to make a quorum more than one-third, which would be ample security that nothing foolish would be done.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: The question was fully debated in another place, and it was felt that five would be too small a number. As a matter of fact, 10 was suggested first, but a compromise was arrived at and seven was inserted.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 15—Personal property vested in trustees:

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: This clause was amended by inserting after the word "Act" in line 7 of Subclause 1 the words "except so far as any such goods and chattels are on loan to either committee superseded by the trustees or as the Governor may otherwise direct." There was a misapprehension that there were two committees, one to deal with the library and another for the museum. As a matter of fact, one committee controlled both institutions, therefore the word "either" in the amendment might lead to a lot of confusion. He moved an amendment—

That the word "either" be struck out and "any" inserted in lieu.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: There was only one committee, therefore why not substitute the word "the"?

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: Reports were presented to Parliament annually from the Library, and from the Museum and Art Gallery; they were separate institutions, but the committees were comprised of the same gentlemen in each case. The word "any" would apply in the event of there being two committees, and it could also stand if there should be only one committee.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: It was understood from the Minister that there was only one committee, therefore there was no reason why the word "the" should not be inserted.

Amendment put and passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Bill again reported with further amendments, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—TRANSFER OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill read a third time, and *passed*.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North): The Bill before the House is a most important measure and, I think, deserves the fullest consideration. I am not going to say the Bill is a new one, because I understand it has had the consideration of hon. members before; indeed, I am told it has been debated at some length. I had not the opportunity of hearing those debates because I had not then the honour of being a member of the House. When first I saw this measure on the Notice Paper what most surprised me was the fact of the Government submitting a Bill of this description. One could have understood it had the Bill come from the Opposition, but it caused me surprise that it should have emanated from the Government. However, as it has been submitted for our consideration I am sure the House will deal with it most carefully. From what I can gather there has been outside the House no demand whatever

for the measure, little or no request that there should be a reduction of the franchise; that is to say, little or no request beyond that made by a certain section of the public and some portion of the Press. I have not heard of any public meetings called to discuss the matter, nor have I heard of any great weight of popular voice brought forward in its favour.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Almost every member of the Assembly is in favour of it.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I am only considering the voice of the people, and I am supported in my contention by the fact that at the recent elections two or three who stood out stoutly for the present condition were re-elected. Many of those who pledged themselves to vote for the reduction of the franchise did it voluntarily, and I feel quite certain had they not done it they would have been elected just the same. That is my impression. Therefore it does not seem to me it is at all imperative on the House to make such a very substantial change unless it has been shown to be the fullest desire of the people. Of course, there are certain sections of the people most anxious for it to become law, because it means for them a representation pledged to support, if not the abolition of the House, at all events a reduction of the franchise to adult suffrage. We know that, because no secrecy has been observed in making these statements. They say the people are not represented in this House, and that it is necessary to reduce the franchise so that representatives can be sent in to vote for adult suffrage. Notwithstanding that it is on the propaganda of a certain section, nothing will make me believe that they will vote for the total abolition of this House, although I feel certain it will, if possible, be made a House on adult suffrage. To hear some people on the subject one would think every person who did not possess a vote for the Legislative Council was practically disfranchised and really had no representation in the Constitution. Let us look at the position very carefully. Our Constitution is composed of two Houses, one of which is elected on adult suffrage. That House controls the whole of the business of the country, imposes all taxation and regulates all expenditure. Not one penny of expenditure can take place without its consent. And the representatives in that House are sent there by the votes of every adult person throughout the State who chooses to register. What I want to make clear is that every adult person who chooses to register has a vote to send a representative to the House which controls the whole of the expenditure, the imposition of taxation, and practically everything that is worth living for. No matter how poor that elector may be, no matter if he has not a single interest in Western Australia, if he does not own a single penny, he can vote to return a representative to impose taxation on the whole community. I thing this is as it should be. I think every individual throughout the State should have a vote so that he can say under what laws and conditions we ought to live. But, apart from those who, perhaps, have no interest in the State and very little means, and who perhaps do not care very much how things go, there is a large number of people who have the spirit and instinct of thrift, the desire for accumulation, the desire for saving, the desire to have something in their old age, to provide for their children and to provide against sickness. These people have their accumulations and, as a rule, they are chiefly the people who pay the taxes. I may point out again that the imposition of taxation is very often made by people who have not the means to pay those taxes. Under these circumstances it was recognised that while everybody should have a vote for the Assembly it was only fair that another body should be brought into existence which would afford some protection to those who were thrifty and had accumulations. I take it that was the view when the Constitution was framed. This House was created, and I take the liberty to show that during a large number of years the Legislative Council and other bodies of a similar character have carried out their duties faithfully and well. I would challenge anyone to say that this Legislative Council of Western Australia has ever stood in the way of any progressive legislation which has ever been submitted in

a reasonable way, or for which the people have asked. In proof of that I would invite members to turn to our statute-book. They will there find legislation dealing with every class of the community, legislation that provides for all, from the poorest to the wealthiest; the regulation of wages, of thrift, of work, constituting endeavours to do justice to all classes. Therefore, I say when we find on our statute-book legislation of that description it must be accepted as proof that this House has never stood in the way of progressive legislation which has for its object the liberties of the people at large. It is sought to reduce the qualification of this House by something like 50 per cent. And it is given out clearly in some places that the chief object of this is to enable representatives to reduce it by degrees to adult suffrage. I can only say that if ever we have a House like this reduced to adult suffrage I think the time will have arrived when the Government of the State should be conducted by one House alone. It would be absolutely superfluous to have two Houses elected by the same class of electors. If I wanted an instance in proof of my statement I would only have to turn to the present Federal Parliament, the senate of which is elected on the same lines as the House of Representatives, with the consequence that only one class of people are represented. To show the absurdity of it I think I may say that during the last session of the Federal Parliament not a single alteration was made in any Bill sent up; at all events, there were very few in the most important Bills. Consequently, it has become what this House has been untruly accused of being, simply a House of registration. I am pointing to this, not because I wish to be disrespectful to the Federal Parliament, but merely as an illustration to bring to your minds what I wish to convey, namely, that once we have two Houses elected on the same basis it would be better to do away with one altogether. I am sorry that I cannot find myself in a position to support the second reading of this Bill. Apart from any private views that I may have, I do not think that such an action would meet with the views of my constituents. I have not been long elected for my present constituency, but some time ago I met a number of the electors of the North Province, and not one word was said during the meeting as to the reduction of the franchise.

Hon. J. W. Langsford: You never have any contest in the North Province.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: But the electors have a method of conveying their ideas just the same. I also took the opportunity of making a visit to my constituency as far as Broome, and in each centre I held a meeting, but not once did I have a single request made that there should be a reduction of the franchise for the Legislative Council. On the contrary, I heard once or twice an expression of the hope that it would not be reduced. No matter how I am situated with regard to my private views, I am here to represent my constituents, and as I have had no notification that they desire this reduction, and as I feel myself that it would be hardly wise to make it in the circumstances I have mentioned, I feel constrained to vote against the second reading. I think I would, perhaps, be willing to consider some amendment of the present position on the ground that some time ago when the franchise was first fixed the rents of houses were very much higher than they are to-day, and the consequence is that many people who had a £25 qualification then may not be in the same position now owing to the reduction of rents. It would be a great pity and a great loss if people who have had the privilege of a vote were to be disfranchised. In these circumstances, I think I should be inclined to consider some reduction of the franchise. As to the principle of it, I may say I consider that so long as we have two Houses one should be elected on a qualification different from that of the other, but if we are going to be elected by the same class of electors, let us then have only one House and be done with it. I have nothing more to say on the subject; perhaps I have already spoken at undue length, but that is because I have not had an opportunity of speaking before as some members have, and I wished to place on record my views in this matter. I regret

to say that I shall feel constrained to vote against the second reading.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West): On this occasion I intend to be very brief, because I dealt with this matter in a most comprehensive manner during the last session of Parliament; the opinions I then expressed I fully adhere to at the present moment. I do not wish to give a silent vote, and that is why I rise to say that I hold the same opinions now as when the Bill was before the House previously. Indeed, there is no doubt about the attitude which I must assume, irrespective of the opinions which I hold personally, because I am absolutely pledged to the electors of the West Province to vote against any reduction of this franchise. In fact, so far as the West Province is concerned, it is now quite obvious what that opinion is, because the three representatives of the province in the Chamber are all pledged to keep the franchise at £25. This question was a prominent one at the three contests, and the present members had opposing them candidates who were in favour of a reduction. I can speak definitely with regard to the election of Mr. Laurie and myself, but I was away from the State when the President was re-elected. The consequence is that I am bound, in accordance with my platform pledges, to vote for the retention of this £25 franchise. Besides that, hon. members who have been in the House for any length of time know that I hold very strong views on this question and that in many comprehensive speeches which I have made in the House, I have dealt with every aspect of the matter to justify the retention of the present qualification. I say that there is no demand for this reduction; it is a mere electioneering cry, a bit of Parliamentary claptrap that one hears just before an election. I repeat that there is no demand for the reduction, unless it is a demand by those who seek a reduction to £15, then to £10, then to £5, then to get the qualifications uniform, and finally to abolish this House. It is in fact, a question of the existence or the abolition of this Chamber, and I hold firm views that the keeping of this House strong is necessary as a safety valve to the Constitution. I agree with nearly all the observations made by Sir Edward Wittenoom, and it would be waste of time for me to detain the House any further in making anything like a comprehensive speech; indeed, I hesitated about making even these brief observations, and it was only because I desired not to give a silent vote that I rose to speak.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER (Metropolitan Suburban): My position with regard to this Bill was made very clear at my election. The view I then took, and I still hold, was that the country had given no mandate for the introduction of this Bill. I said that if the country did give a mandate, and expressed a definite opinion that a change of this sort should be brought about, I would be the first to support it. As a result of the election which I contested I was returned by a substantial majority, and defeated not only a labour candidate but also a liberal opponent, who advocated the reduction proposed in this Bill. Therefore I claim that the verdict of the electors, as far as the Metropolitan-Suburban province is concerned, is that they do not want a reduction.

Hon. J. W. Langsford: My experience was the other way.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: But my experience is later than that of the hon. member, and is therefore of more value. These are the views I still hold. With regard to the general question of adult suffrage, I say that, although I am one who holds fairly liberal ideas, I am not wedded to adult suffrage. I consider that a stake or interest in the country should be recognised, and that thrift and industry should receive consideration as against irresponsibility and idleness. Political inequality springs necessarily from man's inequality, and man has a right, a natural right, to a share of influence in the State corresponding with his personality, or as Carlyle says his "mights," including his interests and his faculties. He has a right to consideration on the basis of what he is really worth from zero upwards. Applying this view to the question of the franchise I say that inequal-

ity must be recognised, and I go further and say that personal inequality is recognised in nearly every walk of life at the present time. It is recognised in business and industrial concerns. A man has a vote in a company according to the shares which he holds in that company, and even the Labour party recognise inequality in the conduct of their affairs, because in their unions they recognise financial and unfinancial members, and they give a right to a man who is financial which they deny to a man who is unfinancial. All this goes to show that in the ordinary walks of life personal inequality is recognised, and why that doctrine should not be applied to politics I cannot see, for after all, it is only allowing to a man in the politics of the State the same consideration as we allow in the community generally. I would like to ask why is this Bill resisted by members of this House? I think the answer is perfectly plain: it is resisted because we know that another party in this State have on their platform a proposal to gradually reduce the franchise with the view of eventually abolishing the House altogether. As was well expressed by Mr. Kingsmill at one time during an election campaign, that being their desire, are we to be asked to give up the first ditch in the attack? If that is the way the House is to be attacked, naturally members will resist the onslaught at every ditch. I venture to say that if that plank of the Labour party were withdrawn, and they were to agree to a reasonable franchise for this House and say that they did not intend to destroy it, any proposal to reduce the franchise would be more readily considered by members of this House. But members feel that they are on their defence, and cannot, without endangering the existence of the House, give up any line of their defence at all. It has been suggested that the franchise of the House should be liberalised in order to allow of the advent into this Chamber of members of the Labour party. I do not think there are many members of this House, certainly I am not one of them, who would not readily welcome any member of the Labour party into this Chamber. Indeed they would have a certain recommendation, for they would bring with them a wider and more liberal conception of the affairs of the country than perhaps many of us, but if they come into this House we must ask them to leave their pledges behind them. One of their pledges is to legislate in the interests of one particular class only and not in the interests of the State as a whole; but, if they would leave their pledges behind, I, for one, would most gladly welcome any Labour member into this Chamber. The result of pledge-bound members of any party coming into this House would naturally be that legislation would be conducted on class lines; it would become class Government and not party Government. Party Government has been well described by Burke as government by a body of men united to promote by their general endeavours the national interests and some particular principles on which they are all agreed. I emphasise the "national interests"—not the interests of one particular class. It has also been stated that faction government—and we see some of the results of faction Government throughout Australia—does not seek to serve the State, but seeks to make the State serve it. That is undoubtedly true. In these circumstances, and, seeing that the reduction of the franchise, as proposed by this party, is only a step towards the ultimate abolition of this House, and will bring about government by a class, I am bound to resist any innovation in that direction. There is also the danger pointed out by Sir Edward Wittenoom—the danger of duplication. If we reduce the franchise where will the reduction stop? We may be asked to reduce it further and still further, until the two Houses are exact duplicates. What would be the use of two Houses, one the duplicate of the other? As Sir Edward Wittenoom said, we might just as well have only one House. Then again, the Lower House has at present the power of the purse. If the Houses are practically duplicated, what is there to prevent this House ask-

ing for power of the purse also, or that we should have control over money matters, if the franchise is practically the same? There has been used in another place what may be called the "unification" argument. We have been told that if we do not agree to this reduction it will drive the people of the State into advocating Unification. I think that is a cowardly argument to use, and that it is a suggestion of treachery to this State and an admission on the part of those who use it as to their inability to convince the electors of this State that they are right, so that they fly to another power which they consider may give them what they wish. The Colonial Secretary in setting out the conditions in other States omitted to mention New South Wales as having a nominated House. If there is one thing undemocratic or illiberal, it is a nominated Upper House, such as exists in New South Wales and New Zealand, if I understand correctly. I do not think the Colonial Secretary in referring to Victoria laid sufficient stress on the fact that in that State 12 months' residence is required as one of the qualifications for an elector for the Upper House. In that State the franchise is on a freehold annual value of £10, or on a leasehold annual value of £15. In addition, Victoria rightly recognises brains and intelligence as a qualification, and I would be quite ready to recognise the qualification of brains and intelligence for electors for this House in addition to the present qualification. In Victoria power is given to graduates of the British and Melbourne universities, to medical and legal practitioners, to ministers of religion, schoolmasters and naval and military officers to vote for the Upper House. Also in referring to South Australia the Colonial Secretary did not fully represent the conditions existing. Again, in regard to Tasmania, the Colonial Secretary was wrong. So far as I can remember, he mentioned in addition to the freehold annual value of £10 there was a leasehold annual value of £30, but the leasehold value in Tasmania is £80. As a matter of fact, in the other States the qualifications existing are practically the same as the qualification now sought to be reduced for this House. In another case the Colonial Secretary has unintentionally misstated the facts. I understood him to say that the existing qualification for this House has been in existence for 20 years, but really it has only been in existence since 1899. The Constitution Act of 1889 fixed the freehold qualification at £200 and the leasehold qualification at £30; but, in 1899 the freehold qualification was reduced to £100 and the leasehold qualification to £25. So, really, the present franchise has only been in existence for 11 years. I agree with what Sir Edward Wittenoom has said with regard to falling rents being perhaps a ground for making us inclined to reduce the present franchise, but I think very soon that condition of affairs will be rectified. Rents are rising now, and I think very shortly those electors who have lost their qualifications will be put back in the same position they were in before. According to the figures I have made out, the present qualification of £25 means in regard to the ordinary occupier 9s. 7d. a week; that of £15 means 5s. 9d. a week, and that of £20 means 7s. 8d. a week. Of course the present qualification is on the clear annual value, that is the clear annual value outside of the rates and taxes the tenant pays, but we all know the weekly tenant very seldom pays rates and taxes, so that the qualifications I mentioned are really the rental paid by the weekly tenant. The position I intend to take up in the Bill is that I shall support the second reading, but I hope in Committee to alter the present and the proposed qualification to £20.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East): I think the best way to support the Bill is to be very brief in one's remarks. I would not have spoken at all only for the remarkable argument advanced that there is no general demand for this change in the franchise. What is the evidence on the point? It is a funny one, that when members were electioneering their constituents made none. They went round addressing their constituents, and they were met with

no demands for a reduction of this franchise. Now, what does that amount to? We and our constituents are the privileged people; we are already in possession, and why should we make a demand? In other words, why should the electors who have the franchise make a demand upon us to broaden it?

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Some of them wish it.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Exactly, there are some of them broad-minded enough to consider those who are outside. Is it from people who are in we would expect a clamour to open the doors? How utterly illogical it is that we should resist giving justice to people outside when there is no claim from people inside. I give credit to hon. members that they are of a greater mind than they give themselves credit for. I think I am judging them very correctly, more correctly than they are judging themselves. They know that even among their constituents there are many who say, "We are glad to be a privileged people, but we are prepared to welcome into our ranks every settler resident in the country, everyone who has made this country his home, and given evidence of it by acquiring some small freehold, or by becoming a rent payer." Having dealt with that rather shallow, flimsy argument of my friends, I submit that the question is not whether there has been a great demand or not, or whether behind the demand there may not be a risk of a still further demand in the future. No rational member would have anything to do with that aspect of the question in deciding what is right, and what is just. A small part of the people of the State have the franchise for the Legislative Council, but there are practically an equal number of people who have made the State their home, and proved it by acquiring land or renting houses, who are entirely denied a vote for this Chamber. On what principle of justice can we refuse to grant them the franchise? It is not a question of who has asked for it, or how long we may resist it, or as to what may happen in the future if we grant it. But the question is, "Shall right or justice be done to them"? The talk about refusing to give the first ditch utterly misrepresents the position. It is not our ditch. All those settled and resident in the State have as much right to be in that ditch as we have. Why should we call it our ditch, and, because we are in, keep them out? The House belongs properly to the settled portions of the community, and the fact that nearly half of them are disfranchised for the House ought to appeal to any reasonable member. I am going to take the further point that through the reduction of rents £15 a year is practically the same now as £25 a year was when this franchise was fixed. I ask hon. members—why should we refuse these people the right to share with us the privileges we hold? I recognise there is very much in the argument raised by Mr. Gawler as to the necessity for a differentiation between the two Houses, but a fair basis of differentiation is the settled resident as against the shifting population. The nomads who may be here to-day and in another State to-morrow, I do not think should have a vote for this House; but no one who has made this State his home should be excluded from the privileges we possess because he happens to have a few pounds less a year. I hope hon. members will not let it go forth to the public that because somebody has said a reduction to £15 is only to begin with that it has influenced them one iota in refusing what can be proved by sound argument to be a just claim on the part of the large number of residents who are now disfranchised. I hope every member will give a responsible vote on the question. By the way, there is just one other point. My friends who have spoken have a great objection to what they call the pledge that Labour members have, but it is funny that each of those gentlemen had just previously said that he was pledged to oppose this enlargement of the franchise. I object to the word altogether. I am not pledged. When electioneering I declared my views, and left the people to elect me or not; but the basis of my electioneering was this: If you send me there it will be to use my best judgment on every occasion that may arise, and I shall hold myself free, and so should every member. No hon. member

should pronounce himself pledged to one side and object to anyone coming in. I hope every member will give a responsible vote, and also a vote on the ground of justice.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan): I have listened with a great deal of interest, and I hope a certain amount of instruction to the speeches from hon. members, which have been delivered in the course of this debate, and more especially have I been interested in the speech of the hon. member who has just sat down. With that hon. member I agree on, at least, one point—and I suppose any hon. member who speaks as often as Mr. Cullen must be right sometimes—and that is, that we must look at this matter from the point of view of what is right. As far as I can gather, really the only question which affects this subject under discussion from that point of view is a matter which has been touched upon by one speaker during the debate, namely, what is the value of the £25 franchise as it exists at the present time, and whether that value is similar or equivalent to that which it had when this Constitution of ours was framed. We have to consider in that respect whether it is right that this Legislative Council, or the Parliament of Western Australia should, in the first place, alter the Constitution as regards the value of that Constitution. To this I find myself returning the answer that in my opinion—and let me say that I am guided, I am glad to say in my Parliamentary career, which is becoming somewhat long now, by my own opinion, in thinking that I am sent to Parliament, not as a delegate of any section of the community, not as a delegate from any particular portion of the State, but sent as a reasonable being to use that discretion, more or less, with which it has pleased Providence to endow me. Under these circumstances I find myself answering that first question, as to whether this Constitution should be altered as regards the relation of the two Houses, in the negative. The second point is whether that £25 franchise is equivalent now to what it was when the franchise was first granted, and in this connection I find myself rather inclined to agree with Mr. Gawler, who says substantially that it is not. When this Bill was before the House last session it was brought in just about as late as it has been brought in this session, and I maintain bringing in a Bill, which is of such essential and vital importance to this Chamber at this late hour of the session, is not right, indeed, it is more than not right, it is absolutely wrong. It is treating the Chamber with discourtesy, and I found myself not justified, in view of the shortness of time which had to elapse before the prorogation, in not occupying the time of the House to any extent in speaking on it. A great deal of misconception arose subsequently through that action of mine. At that time I was prepared to accept a reduction representing the difference in value of the £25 franchise now, and what it was some years ago, namely, a reduction of £5.

Hon. J. W. Langsford: That is what the bear did.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I alluded to that cartoon on another occasion. I also referred to the fact that the steps of the pole were too far apart, and, furthermore, I also said that bears were timid animals, and if they became too large they would be found to go up instead of down. With regard to the popular clamour, if we should be moved by popular clamour, most certainly whether we should be moved by it or not, I am not going to be moved by the assertion that there is a popular clamour when I have evidence to the contrary. I am in a somewhat unique position with regard to the collection of evidence of the supposed popular clamour. I had the opportunity soon after I cast my silent vote last session on this question, of seeing face to face, and meeting in a political sense a very large number of electors in this State, and I found that the allegations of popular clamour were, in my opinion, and again I beg to mention that my opinion is what I am to be guided by, grossly exaggerated. I think there is a stupendous lack of interest in this question. Shortly after the opportunity that I alluded to, the late campaign for the Federal election, I had to undergo another election for

this honourable House, and I found myself on this occasion, I admit to my astonishment, opposed, but I, who had been branded throughout the State as an opponent of progress, as an arch-conservative, as one who did not desire in any way whatever to meet the wishes of the people, found myself nevertheless in the happy position of beating my opponent. It is true that the opponent was not very well known, but my alleged views were well known, and I beat that opponent by a majority of something like eight to one. It may be said that there was a small poll, but that proves my argument, that if there had been widespread interest in this matter, at all events in the province I represent, if there had been that popular clamour which the Press of this State, almost without exception seemed to think existed, would there not have been a greater interest taken in this election and a larger poll recorded, which would have resulted in my defeat instead of my election. Taking these circumstances into consideration, I find myself of the opinion that the public are displaying very little interest in this matter, that we have very little to guide us in that respect, and that we should not be guided by the alleged opinion of the public, but that we should accept our own estimation of what is just and right. I have already said what my estimation is. I think that the difference in the value of the franchise when it was granted, and the present time, may be represented by a reduction of that franchise to £20. The Government, on the other hand, say that in their opinion the reduction should be £10. I am not prepared to follow them in that connection. I ask myself the further question, shall I, because this Bill does not embody exactly what I wish, vote against the second reading, and I find myself answering myself in the negative. At the same time let me say if that franchise—I am alluding only to the rental franchise—is anything under £20, when the Bill comes up for the third reading, I shall vote against the third reading, even if that will have the effect of destroying the measure. I hope I have made my attitude on this matter abundantly clear. It is practically the same attitude that I adopted last session, except that I took the rather extreme course last session of voting against the second reading, because the Bill was not in consonance with my opinion. Now I am prepared to give the Bill a further chance, and I shall vote for the second reading, but I shall vote against the third reading if at that stage it does not meet with my wishes.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East): I have no desire to take up any length of time on this measure. My views are well known, more particularly to anyone who had the opportunity of taking an interest in the last election which took place in the province I represent. In that connection I may say that the question was made one of the principal features of the election, and there is no doubt that throughout the province it was a fairly live question. I would not have spoken now on the matter were it not that one point in connection with it seems to me to have been missed by previous speakers. We recognise there should be land and income taxation, and those who claim there should be a reduction of the franchise for this House should first of all recognise that there should be a reduction in the exemptions in the case of those people who are paying direct taxation to the country. It seems to me that we are asked to allow a great number of electors to become enrolled, who will have the power of directly controlling further legislation in this direction of direct taxation, and they will be given a vote for this House, and yet, as the present Act stands, with the land and income taxes, those same people, although they will have a direct voice in voting for candidates for this Chamber, will be exempt from direct taxation. It seems to me before we should be asked to reduce the franchise of this Chamber there should be a reduction in the directions I have indicated, namely, the exemption of £250 with regard to land tax, and £200 with regard to income tax. It seems to me that if the people do not occupy places that are worth £25 per annum, or if they have not that stake in the country, which is worth £100, and at the same time are exempt from paying

direct taxation, it is rather unreasonable that they should ask for further powers in returning members to the Upper House of this State. Several speakers have mentioned the value of the qualification to-day as compared with what it was some years ago; that, I understand, is simply due to the different interpretation which has been placed upon the qualification by the legal fraternity. We know that frequently legal opinion changes, and I would not be much surprised if, in the event of reducing this qualification to £15, legal opinion could, if necessary, be found to put the same construction upon it as we had some years ago, and restore the £15 to £25. It is essentially a question of values, and we know that in nearly all our districts, in spite of the fact that many members declare that rents have come down, there is a general tendency to valuing up. In nearly every instance the values for taxation purposes have been wonderfully inflated. There are few homes which do not come within this reasonable franchise we have to-day. My views are distinctly against the second reading. If I find myself in a minority I shall recognise defeat and do my best to meet the wishes of the Government in regard to the measure they have brought in.

Hon. J. W. LANGSFORD (Metropolitan-Suburban): This Bill has been before the House annually for the last seven or eight years. It is difficult to say how far this question has affected the election of any hon. member. My colleague, Mr. Gawler, was not elected because he opposed the reduction of the franchise, but in spite of that, and on account of his estimable qualities. And I think that would apply more or less to those other members who oppose this. Among my first recollections of this Chamber is a brilliant speech made by the then leader of the House, Mr. Kingsmill. I remember the weighty arguments with which he sought to convince the Chamber that this measure was in the interests of the country. It was largely owing to the quality of that speech and the arguments used that my own attitude in the matter was decided, and I have not since altered that attitude. It has been said there is no demand for this reduction. We have had this plank in the platform of successive Premiers for the last seven or eight years; it has been in the policy of each succeeding Premier promising to place before Parliament the reduction of the franchise for the electors of this House. Moreover, every newspaper which reflects public opinion at all is to be found on that side of the question. It has been contended that to use the threat of Unification is a cowardly expedient; but it is no more cowardly than to use the argument of the second ditch. We are told if this franchise is not reduced the people will appeal to the Federal Parliament to have their grievances redressed, and that it will hasten Unification. We need not be afraid of that contingency, neither need we be afraid of the appeal to the second ditch. For if it is not right, if it is not in the best interests of the whole of the State, it can easily be refused by this House. In regard to the test as to whether the £25 of many years ago was equal to the £15 of to-day, we have the outstanding fact that the electors in the Metropolitan province are fewer to-day than two years ago. This is due to the fall in rents in the City of Perth. It affects the Metropolitan province more than any other province in the State. With Mr. Cullen, I would ask is it right? I think there are many worthy people outside who have an interest in the State and who ought to be on the roll of the Legislative Council. Instead of weakening this House I think it would strengthen it in the estimation of the people. Reference has been made to this being a plank in the platform of the Labour party. Is it not clear that if we reduce this franchise it will no longer be a plank in that platform? Personally, I think the people who would most sincerely regret the reduction of the franchise would be the political Labour party, because their base of attack against the Legislative Council would then be removed. I shall support the second reading.

Hon. E. McLARTY (South-West): I happen to be one of those recently re-elected, and I can say that throughout the length and breadth of my province I found no very apparent desire to have

this franchise reduced. On only two or three occasions was the question raised at all at meetings addressed by me, and then it was generally asked by someone with no vote and no likelihood of ever having a vote. I did not find the people generally interesting themselves about it at all. My opponent was in favour of reducing the franchise, if not of abolishing the House, and judging by the result it does not appear that the people favoured his views. When the question was put to me as to whether I was in favour of a reduction I said I was prepared to support a reduction of the franchise to £20, below which I was not prepared to go. Last year when the Bill was before the House I was prepared to adopt that course, and that is the course I intend to take up to-day. I am not prepared to give give my vote to any reduction which will bring the franchise below £20. I am aware there is a certain number of worthy settlers who are disfranchised because they are not paying up to the £25, but I conscientiously believe a reduction of the franchise from £25 to £20 would bring in almost all of these people. So far as the question of having both Houses on an equality is concerned, my reply is that as soon as it comes to an equality in the franchise of the two Chambers we may as well do away with one of them altogether. Those are the views I entertain, and have for long entertained. I am prepared to support the second reading, and when in Committee to move an amendment to fix the franchise at £20.

Hon. R. LAURIE (West): To reduce the franchise from £25 to £15 would be simply tinkering with the question. If the leader of the House belonged to another party and brought along a Bill to reduce the franchise to £15 it would meet with a great deal more opposition than it has in this case. It has been said that when another gentleman was leader of the House and brought in this Bill his speech was very different from the one he made to-day. I think it is because he holds somewhat different views to-day, or, rather, because it very often devolves upon the leader of the House for the time being to introduce a measure with which his views are not in accord, but in regard to which he has to bow to the joint will of his colleagues. If there is any cry at all from any section of the community in regard to this question it is not for a reduction of the franchise to £15, but for a reduction to adult suffrage as a step towards the ultimate abolition of the House. The cry, I say, is for abolition, and I have no hesitation in saying that I would just as soon see the House abolished as reduce the franchise qualification to £15. It will be very interesting to see the action which will be taken later on by those in favour of a reduction to £20. What is a reduction from £25 to £20, or from £25 to £15 for that matter? For members to say that they will vote for the second reading and at a later stage take steps to make the amount £20, is ridiculous. I notice that my friend, Mr. Gawler, is in favour of a reduction to £20, and it was interesting to hear his speech because for a long time during his electioneering campaign it was difficult to know which side of the fence he was on; in fact I remember very well his being invited by a leading journal in this State to state definitely what he intended to do. Personally I do not want to depart from the position I have taken up all through—that the qualification should remain as it is. I have no desire to see this House abolished, and it is perfectly plain that the reduction to £15 is to be followed by attempts at further reduction, and in the long run the introduction of manhood suffrage for this Chamber. Rather than make this reduction to £15 I would sooner see manhood suffrage introduced at once, if that was the desire of the people, but I do not think the people do desire that. We hear a great deal of talk about manhood suffrage, but how many people exercise the franchise when it is conferred upon them? We find that in the Federal elections only 60 or 70 per cent. of the people exercised the right which has been given to them, a right for which people all over the world have been fighting through centuries. To-day we are told that if we reduce the franchise to £15, we will give the people who have settled in the State an opportunity of voting. Mr. Gawler

has pointed out that £20 per annum is equal to about 7s. 8d. per week, and Mr. Langsford says that a great many of the people in the city are not in a position to vote because the franchise is too high. I would like to know how many houses there are in the city of Perth for which the landlords are charging less that 10s. a week. I venture to say that there are not many. Taking into consideration all these circumstances, I cannot see my way clear to alter the opinions expressed by me on previous occasions. I am perfectly open in the matter. I can do as I like; I shall have to face the electors in about twelve months' time, and I am adhering to the position I took up some years ago, because I have heard no arguments why the franchise should be reduced. To lower the qualification to £15 would be only tinkering with the Constitution.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): I have heard people say that there is a popular cry for this reduction, but I have never heard it, and it has never come under my notice. Unlike most hon. members, I have been returned twice unopposed, which, I take it, is evidence that my constituents are satisfied to leave a matter like this absolutely to my discretion. I may say straight away that years ago I held the view that if we take what is called the most democratic man who has not an inch of land and give him a little piece of land, he becomes one of the rankest conservatives. I hold that view still, and that being so, I say I would be perfectly prepared to trust a man with a vote for this Chamber if he held the smallest piece of land, but I have the strongest objection to any man mortgaging my property, so to speak. The time was when it was considered that a hundred pounds' worth of property was a fair qualification for an owner, and that £25 was a fair rental qualification. Not having been taken to task for the way I voted on the last occasion when this Bill was before this House, I take it that I am left a free hand at the present time. I know of my absolute knowledge that in my own district rents have gone down and that persons, who at one time were entitled to vote by reason of paying £25 per annum rent, would, in a great many cases, be disfranchised now, because they are paying less rents. To make a sweeping reduction of two-fifths in the qualification is too sweeping an alteration, and whilst I am in favour of a reduction of the rental value and also the property qualification, I am not going to agree to a reduction of two-fifths. I shall vote for the second reading, and I hope that the Bill will be modified in Committee.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	7
Majority for	12

AYES.

Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. J. W. Langsford
Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. W. Marwick
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. R. D. McKenzie
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. J. T. Glowrey	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Sir J. W. Hackett	Hon. S. Stubbs
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. W. Kingsmill	*(Teller).*

NOES.

Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. R. Laurie	Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. M. L. Moss	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. C. Sommers	*(Teller).*

Question thus passed.

The PRESIDENT: Section 73 of the Constitution Act of 1889 requires that the second reading of this Bill shall be passed with the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of members for the time being of the Council. I declare that this motion has been passed by such statutory majority.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of 63 Vict., No. 19, Section 15:

Hon. M. L. MOSS moved an amendment—

That paragraph (a) be struck out.

There was no call for a reduction in the freehold value from £100 to £50.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If we carried this amendment we would stultify the vote just given. There were only two points in the Bill, the reduction in the freehold value from £100 to £50, and the reduction in the rental value from £25 to £15. If we struck out the one and then struck out the other, the whole Bill was gone.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: During the second reading debate the reduction of the freehold value was not discussed.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I have an amendment to move "That 'fifty' be struck out and 'seventy-five' inserted in lieu."

The CHAIRMAN: Unless Mr. Moss withdraws his amendment, I cannot accept the hon. member's.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I will withdraw mine on the assumption that the Committee will agree to the £20 annual value.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM moved a further amendment—

That in paragraph (a) the word "fifty" be struck out, and "seventy-five" inserted in lieu.

A reduction from £100 to £75 was a very good compromise, seeing that the value of land had gone up tremendously. On the one hand we reduced the qualification, and on the other hand the value of land was considerably increased.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Whatever could be said in regard to the reduction from £25 to £15, there was no question that the man who owned freehold land even as low as £50 in value was a good citizen, and one who should have a vote for the Legislative Council. Whatever could be said against the occupier, that argument could not be advanced against the owner of land. A man might occupy a house and still not be a permanent resident of the State; but if there was one thing more than another by which a man signified his bona fides as a settler in Western Australia, it was the purchase of even £50 worth of land. We should encourage the freeholder, and allow the qualification to stand at £50.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: The Committee should adopt the suggestion of the Colonial Secretary. Any men who owned property worth £50 had undoubtedly more bona fides as a settler in every sense than the man paying a few shillings in rent. Immediately a man became possessed of land worth £50 he became ambitious to increase his property, and eventually became a better citizen of the State. There was a great deal in the saying that the holding of land made a man more conservative. Members need not have the fear of these small landholders they seemed rather inclined to have.

Hon. E. McLARTY supported the amendment, as a reduction of £25 only was in keeping with the opinions expressed by members, and was in proportion to the proposed reduction in the annual value from £25 to £20. Those who held land were so penalised by taxes that they should have some protection.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: It was suggested that because it was proposed to make an alteration in paragraph (b) the same proportion of alteration should be made in paragraph (a), but paragraph (a) dealt with clear freehold value which meant "clear of mortgage." The amount of mortgage might not bear the same proportion to the value of the freehold as the amount of rates to the annual value. It was a fair thing to allow the £50 to stand. He would therefore oppose the amendment.

Hon. R. LAURIE: The amendment might well be withdrawn. Any man owning a block of land worth £50 was a good citizen, and one who evidently desired to become of value to the State. We should encourage the workers to buy blocks and build on them. It would be the better for the State.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: There was no desire on the part of his constituents that the qualification should be reduced, but he was trying to meet the views of the Government in reducing the qualification. If his proposal did not meet with the views of the majority of the Committee, it could very easily be shown.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: There were numbers of men holding blocks worth only £25 capital value. He always felt confidence in those who owned a bit of

mother earth. We generally found them as conservative as the worst of us. The qualification of £50 was a fair thing, and it would entitle many worthy citizens to vote.

Hon. C. A. Piesse: I shall vote for the paragraph as it stands.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: I will withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. M. L. MOSS moved a further amendment—

That in line 2 of paragraph (b) the word "fifteen" be struck out, and "twenty" inserted in lieu.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: One did not quite know what was the object of the hon. member, or what reason the hon. member could advance why a person paying £20 in rent should be entitled to vote any more than a person paying £15. The object of everyone supporting a reduction in the franchise was to make the franchise as far as possible a household franchise. It would be dangerous to insert the words "household franchise," because it would be a matter very hard to define. What we should arrive at was what were bona fide householders, and by leaving the qualification at £20 it certainly would not cover bona fide householders. It was said that the Labour party would be most sorrowful if we adopted the Bill. Was it not better to adopt the Bill and do away with the cry for a reduction? All members could then stand on the same line and say, "We do not favour any further reduction." If we did not reduce the franchise to £15 we would still have the cry raised for reduction.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: There were five members who voted for the second reading who favoured the reduction to £20 only. As to the cry mentioned by the Minister, there was no cry except on the part of some interested politicians who wanted something to use at elections. There was no cry among the community for a reduction. The logical result of giving way to £15 would be a demand for £10 later on, and then a demand for household franchise, and still later for adult suffrage, and then for the abolition of the House. The first plank in a platform of the Labour party was a reduction of the franchise with a view to the ultimate abolition of this House. We could not shut our eyes to that fact.

Sitting suspended from 4.15 to 4.30 p.m.

Hon. J. DREW: The amendment proposed would not give satisfaction to those who had been clamouring for a reduction of the franchise of the Legislative Council, and it would not restore them to the position they occupied some years ago. For many years, indeed ever since this had become an elective Chamber, until the advent of the present Government, there was only one definition of the clear annual value £25, and that was £25 rental, but an interpretation was given to the clause, and it was a correct one, that clear annual value meant clear annual value after deducting for rates and taxes, and repairs, etcetera. It meant that if a man was paying £32 a year rent, in the first place, in order to get clear anual value there must be deducted 20 per cent., which amounted to £6 8s., which brought the rent down to £25 12s., and then reduced on the basis of 2s. in the pound, again a further £3 4s., which still further reduced the rent to £22 8s. clear annual value. The result was that the individual was not qualified to vote for the Legislative Council.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: It was his intention to support the amendment moved by Mr. Moss, and in the event of it not being carried he would vote against the third reading of the Bill.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: The object of the Government would not be attained unless the word "fifteen" was included in the clause. There were precedents in South Australia and Victoria in connection with the reduction of the franchise of the Legislative Councils of both States. Recently in Victoria, which was one of the most conservative States in the Commonwealth, the franchise had been liberalised, and Western Australia would have little to fear by following such precedents. Only a little while ago there was a Bill before the Chamber which involved an amendment of the Constitution and on that occasion the Government

took the precaution to whip up all their forces so as to carry the Bill through the House. It was to be hoped the same serious attention would be given to the measure before the Committee.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was no justification for the remarks of Mr. O'Brien. They were entirely uncalled for, and suggested that the Government were not taking the same interest in this Bill as they had done in connection with a measure which was recently before the Chamber, and which required a statutory majority to enable it to pass into law.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Personally, I am sory you are taking so much interest in this Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The second reading of the Bill had been carried by 19 to 7, and it could not be understood what the hon. member meant by whipping up the forces. The Legislative Council was not a party House, and there was no whipping up of any members. He took the strongest exception to the remarks which were uncalled for and unjustifiable.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: Continued references had been made by hon. members to a certain brand of politicians in this State, and he took those to be aimed at himself.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Not at all.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: Without being offensive, he thought he could say, that while he was aware that the Legislative Council was not a party House, he was justified in the attitude he had adopted.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: The amendment would receive his support. although he was of opinion that there was not a strong demand on the part of electors for any reduction at all; still, as there was a spirit of compromise abroad he would support the reduation to £20. If that was not carried he would oppose the third reading of the Bill.

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

Ayes	.. .. ..	11
Noes	.. .. ..	14
Majority against	..	3

AYES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. E. McLarty	Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. M. L. Moss	Hon. R. Laurie
Hon. W. Patrick	(Teller)

NOES.

Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. J. W. Langsford
Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. E. D. McKenzie
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. J. T. Glowrey	Hon. S. Stubbs
Sir J. W. Hackett	Hon. W. Marwick
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	(Teller)
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: In December, 1908, he had taken the trouble to bring down to this House an amendment of the Constitution in order to deal with the obsolete contract clauses contained in the Constitution, which he had then stated, and he repeated now, were a menace to every member of both Houses. The views he had expressed were set forth in *Hansard*, and he had hoped that at the first opportunity of amending the Constitution the Government would have taken steps to put members on less dangerous ground than at present.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no question before the Committee.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Without being put to the trouble of drafting a clause he wanted to bring under the notice of the Government the necessity for dealing with this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Remarks of that sort ought to have been made on the second reading.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; and the report adopted.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved—

That the third reading be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Before the Bill came forward for the third reading would the Minister have a clause drafted to prevent members of Parliament being shot at as they were liable to be under these contract clauses? If the Minister would look at the report of the speech made by him in 1908 he would see that in the measure giving responsible Government to the Transvaal this matter was placed

on a better basis than the obsolete provisions that existed in our Constitution. He believed that there was no member of Parliament who was not liable to be shot at, and there was scarcely a member who used the railways or had other such dealings with the Government but was liable to be unseated.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member has continued with his advice at too great a length.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The remarks were perfectly in order, and he would continue them until he was ruled out of order.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the House is that the third reading be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: And in supporting that, he was suggesting that the Minister should have an amendment drafted in the direction he had indicated.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Will the hon. member vote for the third reading?

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The vote on the third reading would be in accordance with the views he had enunciated on the floor of this House.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No promise could be made that the Bill would be recommitted. The Bill was for a specific purpose, and for that reason the hon. member must recognise that the Government could not be expected at this late hour of the session to bring in a far-reaching amendment of the Constitution, which had not been discussed except in this House last session.

Question put and passed.

BILL—CRIMINAL CODE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly) in moving the second reading, said: This is a short Bill involving a few amendments to the Criminal Code, but they all aim in the same direction except for one amendment contained in Clause 6. The principal object in bringing down this amendment is to prevent offences on children and young girls. Unfortunately, in this State of late years crimes of this description have been too frequent, and even last Saturday or Sunday we had no less than two committed on the one day. The Bill invites Parliament to inflict a severer form of punishment on this class of criminal, and it is a measure that every right thinking person will endorse, for surely anything we can do in this direction to make the punishment more drastic and to make the path of these offenders harder should be done. At the present time any person criminally assaulting or interfering with a girl or child can be flogged on the first offence, but this mode of punishment has not been resorted to very often, and it has been suggested that flogging should be made compulsory for the second offence. That is the principal object of the Bill. Clause 2 provides for the repeal of the paragraph in Section 185 of the Code dealing with the defilement of girls under 13; that paragraph is as follows: "Prosecution for either of the offences defined in this section must be begun within three months after the offence is committed." That is the subsection which it is sought to strike out. This limitation is, perhaps, advisable in conection with girls over 13 years, but it seems scarcely in place here; moreover, it is scarcely consistent with Section 187, which deals with practically the same thing. Section 185 relates to actual or attempted defilement of girls under 13 years and contains this limitation, while Section 187 deals with attempted defilement of girls under 10 but contains no such limitation. The result is that a prosecution for actual defilement of a girl under 10 would be brought under Section 185 and would be subject to this limitation, whilst a prosecution for attempted defilement of a girl under ten would be brought under Section 187, and would be subject to no limitation as to time. In Clause 3 it is provided that where a person of 16 years or over has been previously convicted of a sexual offence against women and children he shall be flogged for the second offence. The section and offences referred to are:—185, Defilement or attempted defilement of girls under 13; 187, Attempt to abuse girls under ten; 188, Defilement

of girls under 16 and idiots; 189, Indecent treatment of girls under 16; 324, Rape; 325, Attempted rape; and 326, Indecent assault on a female. The intention of the clause is to make it compulsory for the judge to order any person of 16 or over, who, having been convicted of any of these offences, is subsequently convicted of any such offence in respect of a girl under 13 or an idiot, to be flogged. At the present time any offender against Sections 185, 187, 188, 189 (against girls under 13), 324, or 325 may be sentenced to be whipped even for a first offence. But this Bill does not attempt to make it compulsory for the judge to order whipping on the first offence, but only on the second offence.

Hon. C. Sommers: What is the term of imprisonment?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It varies, but it is in addition to any other punishment that may be inflicted by the judge. I know that in certain quarters a good deal has been said against the system of flogging at all, and we all agree that it is not a desirable form of punishment; but there are certain offences and certain criminals that can only be treated in one way, and that is by a brutal process. When a father cannot allow his child to go out without her being interfered with—and I have here a long list of cases obtained from the police records, a list which is not particularly creditable and one I do not wish to read—there is something wrong, and the evil requires to be drastically dealt with. The question we have to consider is how to best deal with offenders of this class. I say that the man who indecently deals with children, in some cases of four and five years of age——

Hon. M. L. Moss: Do not use the word "man."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Well, the brute that commits that offence should be flogged; that is the only way to treat him. Clause 4 of the Bill alters Section 326 to provide that no girl under 16 years of age shall be capable of consenting to an indecent assault. The present section says 14 years, but that is scarcely consistent with Section 189. There is an anomaly there, and the amendment is inserted more particularly to bring the two sections into line. There is a discrepancy between Section 326 and Section 189. As the law stands to-day a man may be prosecuted under Section 326, and the girl's consent would be a good defence; but if a man is prosecuted under Section 189, for indecently dealing with a girl, her consent would be no defence; therefore the amendment is sought. Those are the portions of the Bill dealing with the particular offence I have mentioned. The last clause in the Bill has nothing whatever to do with the previous clauses, but has been prepared at the suggestion of the Crown Solicitor, who points out that whilst procedure is provided by Section 696, when an *ex officio* information is filed in the Supreme Court by the Attorney General, no procedure is provided in respect of such information when filed in a court of quarter sessions. There is no procedure, and no rules, and it is in order that the rules may be made that the last clause is inserted. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER (Metropolitan-Suburban: I congratulate the Government on bringing forward this Bill, which is almost brought in too late, but I must say that I think it has not gone far enough. I think Clause 3 should be altered so that flogging could be made compulsory on the first offence. I do not see why a criminal should wait until he has ruined two families, until he has brought ruin to two innocent girls before he should be dealt with severely. If we are to inflict a flogging at all let us inflict it the first time, so that the man should not commit the offence again; he has to have two victims before he is flogged; he is to ruin two families before we deal with him properly. A great deal has been said about the brutalising effect of flogging and it is difficult to keep one's feelings under control in discussing a matter of this sort. This argument should have no weight. How can you talk of brutalising a man who is brute enough to do what the man has done; you cannot brutalise that man. It has been suggested that a man

in my profession should deal with this matter in a judicial spirit, but I fail to be able to do that. I cannot separate my mind, as a legal man, from my mind as a parent and a man. It has been suggested that we should leave the question of flogging to a jury. I do not believe in that. I do not believe in making the jury the judge of the guilt of the individual as well as the judge of the sentence. It is altogether opposed to British law and to common-sense law. It is also suggested that the judge will not like to have this compulsory order to flog. I do not think a judge will take up that position. If the jury tells him the offender is guilty, then he ought not to allow any feelings he may have in differing with the jury to influence him in ordering the flogging. It is also suggested that a man who commits an offence like this is insane. There, again, I disagree. The fact of a man committing this offence should not be taken to be evidence of insanity. The man may be perfectly sane on all other points, but he has not the control that he should have over his passions. If it is said that a man is insane then he should be put out of the way altogether, put somewhere where he can be kept under restraint, because if he is not to be flogged you must put him somewhere where it is impossible for him to carry on his depredations. There is an institution, I believe, in England, where they carry out what is called the Boswell system. A person is kept there on an indeterminate sentence, until he shows good conduct, and then he is allowed to be released. I think even that is an improvement on our present legislation, but I fail to agree with the idea that flogging should not take place on the first offence. I do not know that I can go altogether so far in the direction of the Bill. The Bill provides that this flogging shall be compulsory under Section 188 for the defilement of girls under 16 years of age, and under another clause for the indecent treatment of girls under 16. I think it might be dangerous and unwise to allow flogging for dealing with girls under that age. I do not think the age is low enough. Everybody knows that there are girls who are sufficiently depraved under that age who will lead a man to almost any length, and there may be some excuse for a man led on in that way. It is dangerous to allow flogging in cases of that sort; a man may be under supreme temptation, and in all possibility it may be as much the fault of the girl as it is of the man. There I think it is dangerous to inflict a flogging. With girls under 14 years of age I think there is not likely to be that depraved character. Statistics have been given as to the number of cases of these offences which have occurred in the State, but I do not think we can altogether go by statistics, for everybody knows that for every one case which is made public there are half a dozen cases which are suppressed, because the unfortunate parents are overwhelmed with the position and will not court publicity. They will not allow their affairs to be dragged before the courts, therefore, I say that for every cause brought under notice there are, at least, half a dozen which are not heard of. I would like very much for someone to move an amendment to Clause 3. I shall be prepared to do so myself if no other member does, to make flogging compulsory for the first offence, and I hope to get members to support me.

Hon. R. LAURIE (West): If no one else will support Mr. Gawler in an attempt to alter this punishment to the first offence, I shall be pleased to do so. There is no question whatever as to whether flogging is a deterrent to crime. There was a discussion in London the other day in regard to the question of whether capital punishment or flogging was the greatest deterrent and Mr. Plowden, one of the magistrates in London, and one who probably has had more experience than anyone else in London to-day, stated that a man of the character of Crippen was carried away for the moment by, shall I say, the wiles of a young woman, and he stated that if Crippen had met the woman he ran away with before he met his wife, then he never would have committed the offence with which he was charged. This magistrate also said that a man committing the crime which Crippen did knew that it was a question of hanging if he was found out, but that if

he had known it was a question of flogging he would never have committed the offence. If a man is given a flogging for a crime, such as we know many are guilty of in Perth lately, they would never come back a second time, because there is no doubt that a man who commits an offence of this character on a little child must be a coward and a brute. In respect to flogging for the second offence, to my mind I think it is wrong.

The Colonial Secretary: They can flog for the first offence now.

Hon. R. LAURIE: That is the point I want to make, and I am glad of the interjection. You pass a measure here that makes it absolutely mandatory on the part of a judge to flog a man for a second offence, and what is the inference? That you shall not do it for the first offence; that is exactly the position. They have not been doing it, but the Bill says you must do it for the second offence. I should take that to be the argument from reading the Bill. We can pass the first offence over, because the flogging must be given for the second offence, and it can be argued that the Legislature must have had good grounds for making it not to apply to the first. There is no question about flogging being a deterrent in cases of this character. A man has only to be on a jury to know that when an individual is brought up on such a charge one looks at the individual and wonders what sort of a brute he has before him. I personally think, and I have no hesitation in expressing it, that instead of putting an offender into an institution after the second offence we should treat him in another manner. I should have very little compunction in treating him surgically. There is one place in America where persons of this character, for a second offence, are treated in the way I have mentioned, and I think the course a very proper one. As Mr. Gawler so ably put it, why should a family have to suffer because a girl has been dealt with by a villain, and we know that for every case reported there are five or six not reported. Take the case which occurred the other day, although it is not well to mention these cases, had it not been for a gentleman who was looking out of a window and saw what happened the criminal would never have been caught. I think the flogging should be inflicted for the first offence, and a man has only to be flogged once and I venture to say that he will not come up again. In Scotland, when I was a boy, many years ago garotting was very prevalent. A man going home at night did not know how he would be dealt with, and the authorities stamped this out by making the criminals feel some physical pain. That is the only way in which to stamp out such crimes. The same thing applies in an even greater degree to cases of this sort. I trust Mr. Gawler will move in the direction he has suggested.

Hon. C. SOMMERS (Metropolitan): I am in accord with the remarks of the two previous speakers. The only doubt I have is as to whether there is any possibility of our carrying the proposed amendment, having regard to the feelings in another place and to the lateness of the session. If it is possible to carry out the suggestion it will have my hearty support, but I am afraid that even if we agree to it it will be impossible to give effect to it.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East): This is one of the most important measures brought down this session, and rather than run the risk of having it left off the statute-book, I would prefer to see no amendments made, although I feel the Bill does not go far enough. I hope that on some future occasion, if we have any more of these dastardly attempts on young children, something very much more severe will be put in the statute-book as against these ruffians. These offences must be dealt with much more drastically than in the past. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Hon. J. W. LANGSFORD (Metropolitan-Suburban): The information in the possession of the Colonial Secretary ought to be given to the House. Suppose the Bill were in force at the present moment, how many of these culprits would it affect? Are there any who have been convicted twice? Are we legalising for the impossible? As far as my knowledge of what is contained in the newspapers goes,

in each case these assaults have been committed for the first time. I think the information ought to be given to the House as to how many times each culprit has committed an offence of this sort.

The Colonial Secretary: I have not that information.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Kingsmill in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Punishment of whipping to be inflicted in certain cases:

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: In carrying out his expressed intention he found difficulty in framing the necessary amendments. If opportunity were given he could achieve his object. It was his desire to make the whipping a penalty for the first offence. This would mean several amendments to the proposed new section, the first of which would be to strike out the first word. Following on this he would move several other amendments, all with the one object in view.

The CHAIRMAN: The best method of amending the clause in the desired direction would be to strike out all the words after "as follows" and insert the words the hon. member wished to have inserted. That would provide an entirely new section, the object of which would be perfectly clear.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: With that end in view it would be necessary to move to report progress.

The CHAIRMAN: Having made a speech the hon. member could not himself make that motion at present.

Hon. C. Sommers: Could we not have a short adjournment?

The CHAIRMAN: If it was the wish of the Committee he would leave the Chair for a few minutes.

Sitting suspended from 5.24 to 5.30 p.m.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: The amendment he had proposed would provide whipping for offences on women as well as girls. In order to make it apply to children of tender years he now only proposed compulsory whipping for the first offence to apply to cases under Sections 185 and 187 which referred to girls under 13 and 10 years. Later on he would propose a new subclause. He moved an amendment—

That in line 5 the words "one hundred and eighty-five and one hundred and eighty-seven" be struck out.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Judging from the debate which took place elsewhere, if this amendment were carried the Bill would not be passed. It might be that the judge would take the Bill as it stood as indicating that whipping should not be inflicted for a first offence, but judges would not be swayed in this way like ordinary justices of the peace. We had also to consider the fact that girls might be consenting parties or might give a good deal of encouragement to boys who under this clause would be liable to be floged for the first offence. It was better to allow the judge some discretion. It was a serious matter to flog a boy for attempting something where there were perhaps extenuating circumstances.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: The judge could order only one stroke; if there were extenuating circumstances the judge could alter his sentence accordingly. He refused to believe there were many girls under 14 who would encourage these things. When people talked about brutalising men they lost sight of the fact that small children were ruined for life or probably killed. It savoured too much of the old doctrine "a dog must have his first bite." The amendment he now moved would lead to the subclause he proposed to move later on.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: By making the Bill too severe members might defeat their object. A jury would readily convict a second offender with the knowledge that flogging would be inflicted.

Hon. M. L. Moss: The jury are not told he is a second offender.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: But was it likely that an ordinary jury would convict a first offender with the certainty that he must be flogged? Over-severity missed the mark every time; reasonable punishment was much more effective. Judges

instead of interpreting the Bill as Mr. Gawler suggested, would rather be strengthened in inflicting punishment for the first offence in gross cases. It was better for us to make sure of the Bill as passed by another place.

Hon. R. LAURIE: We all knew that if a man got a first taste of this he would act again in the same direction. Therefore we should inflict flogging so that it would be a deterrent in the first instance. Notwithstanding what was said about another place he thought they were manly enough not to be carried away with the idea that juries would have a doubt where flogging was to be inflicted. There would always be the same doubt in the minds of juries where there was weak evidence; and even if another place sent back our amendments, we would have let them know our feelings in the matter and the public also, and could accept the position.

Amendment put and passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 7—agreed to.

New Clause:

Hon. D. G. GAWLER moved—

That the following be added to stand as Section 205b:—"Any person being of the age of sixteen years or over who shall be hereafter convicted of an offence under Section 185 or 187 of the Code shall, in addition to any other punishment provided by law which the Court may see fit to impose, be sentenced to a whipping."

New clause put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—ROADS.

Recommittal.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, Bill recommitted for further amendment.

Clause 5—Interpretation:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was his intention to move a number of amendments all of which were consequential on the amendments previously made. There was not sufficient time to have these amendments printed, therefore, they had been typewritten and copies had been distributed among members. The first amendment related to the interpretation of "owner." He moved—

That the interpretation of "owner" be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—1, Any person who is in possession or entitled to possession of the land, or in respect or entitled to the receipt of rents and profits of the land as:—(a) The holder of a legal or equitable estate of freehold in possession therein, or (b) The holder of an estate less than freehold under a lease or agreement granted or made with the Crown; or (c) A mortgage of the land or (d) The Trustee, Attorney, or authorised agent of any such holder or mortgagee; or 2, Any person who (a) Is in the unauthorised occupation of any Crown land; or (b) Under a license or concession relating to any specific Crown land, has the right of taking any profit of the land; or (c) Is in the actual occupation (with or without title) of the surface or any portion of the surface of a mining tenement within the meaning of the Mining Act, 1903.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: In Subclause 2 there was also a straining of words in saying that a person who was in unauthorised occupation of Crown land was an owner.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This provision had been put in for a special purpose. People who were on mining leases were in unauthorised occupation, but were not actually owners.

Amendment put and passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 29—Electors:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved an amendment—

That the second and third proviso at the end of Subclause (1) be struck out and the following inserted in lieu:—"Provided also that the occupier shall not be entitled to be registered as an elector unless, under the provisions hereinafter contained, he applies to the board to have his name inserted in the electoral list; but if such application is made and sustained the occupier shall be registered in lieu of the owner."

This was purely consequential on the decision already arrived at to make the owner, and not the occupier, except with the permission of the owner, the elector.

Amendment put and passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 64—Proceedings at nomination:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved an amendment—

That in line 4 the words "together with the names of their nominators" be struck out.

Under the present Roads Act the candidate had to have nominators, but under this Bill the candidate nominated himself, and therefore these words were not necessary.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 100—Penalties in case of nomination of incapacitated person:

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY the clause was amended by striking out of line two the word "procures" and inserting "nominates himself" in lieu, and the clause as amended was agreed to.

Clause 196—Mode of making valuations:

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY the clause was amended by striking out paragraph (e), and the clause as amended was agreed to.

Clause 202—Valuation of tramways:

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY the clause was amended by inserting after "only" in line four of Subclause 1 the following words:—"(such lines of tramway, land, buildings, and works being deemed for the purposes of this Act rateable land and the Tramway Company the owner thereof)," and the clause as amended was agreed to.

Clause 203—Valuation of gas mains and electric lines:

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY the clause was amended by inserting after the word "land" in line eight of Subclause 1 the following words:—"and such person, company, or corporation shall be deemed the owner thereof," and the clause as amended was agreed to.

Bill again reported with further amendments, and the report adopted.

BILL—LOAN, £2,100,000.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—UNIVERSITY.

Second Reading.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE (Honorary Minister), in moving the second reading, said: I feel it a very great honour indeed to have the privilege of introducing such an important measure as the University Bill, and I feel perfectly certain that every member of this House will be proud of having been associated with the passing of this measure into law, because I think it may justly be termed the keystone in the arch of our system of education in Western Australia. The question of a university has been talked about in this State for some considerable time, but it is only quite recently—and it is to the credit of the Moore Government—that the question has been brought down out of the clouds and is now within the scope of practical politics. It was something like two years ago, in January, 1909, that a Royal Commission was appointed by the Moore Government to go into the question of a university and advise the Government as to its establishment, and also to advise them on the general management of the institution if Parliament decided to enact a measure authorising its commencement. There were eleven gentlemen connected with this State who were appointed on that Royal Commission, and to these gentlemen the thanks of the Government, the Parliament, and the people of Western Australia are due. They have not only given up their time to this question but they have given a tremendous amount of labour, and this has been with them all a labour of love, for no fees were attached to their appointments on the commission in any shape or form. It may be as well that I should mention the names of the gentlemen comprising the Royal Commission, as members of the House may not be acquainted with them. In the first place, there were two mem-

bers of this House, Sir Winthrop Hackett and yourself, Mr. President. Then there was the Right Rev. Dr. Riley, Bishop of Perth, Mr. Andrews the Inspector General of Schools, Sir Walter James, Brother Noonan, Mr. Thomas Bath, Mr. F. B. Allen, Mr. W. E. Cooke, Dr. Saw, and Dr. Smith. Members will see that the gentlemen comprising the commission were a very representative number of men indeed. Before going any further I should like to add that to Sir Winthrop Hackett the thanks of the community are more especially due for not only did he give his time in considering matter when the Commission was sitting in Perth, but he also travelled to the old country, and while there gave his valuable time and attention in inquiring into the methods of the more modern universities of the old country. In addition to all this Sir Winthrop Hackett has most generously come forward and offered to found a Chair of Agriculture should the University be brought into existence. I have no doubt in the course of time we shall have many benefactors to the University, but the honour will rest with Sir Winthrop Hackett in being the first resident of Western Australia to so generously come forward and endow a University with a Chair of Agriculture. His Lordship the Bishop of Perth also visited England while the Commission was in existence, and he took the opportunity of visiting several universities while there, I think, Cambridge, Manchester, Liverpool, and Birmingham, and he then gathered some useful information which he embodied in a report and which is attached to the report of the Commission in the shape of an appendix. I cannot leave this matter without also stating that the thanks of the community are, to a very large extent, due to the secretary of the commission, Mr. Battye, who acted in an honorary capacity and gave up a lot of his time, and proved himself to be a very useful officer to the commission. But that was not all, Mr. Battye prepared a lecture which was delivered in Perth on the question of universities, and not only did he deliver the lecture in Perth, but he travelled to the goldfields and delivered the lecture there. He has done good work in educating the people of the State up to the necessity of the establishment of a university in our midst. The result of the labours of this Commission is the report which was circulated amongst members of this House some time ago. Members have no doubt had time to read the report and the different appendices attached to it. The Bill which I am introducing to-night will also be found attached to that report and is the work of the Royal Commission. At this juncture it may not be out of place for me to refer to the educational system of Western Australia. I find that in 1871 the Elementarly Education Act of that year provided for two classes of schools, the Government schools and assisted schools. The Government schools were under a central board of education with teachers appointed by the district boards, and the vote was limited to £3 10s. per head on the average attendance. The assisted schools received an amount of £1 15s. per head of the average attendance. This system went on until 1893, two years after Responsible Government, then the Administration of the day thought fit in their wisdom to abolish the central board, and transferred its powers to a Minister for Education. Inspectors and teachers were appointed by the Governor, and the right of entry was given to representatives of our religious denominations, at the same time the vote per head of the scholars attending the schools was raised to £4 10s. per head of the average attendance. In 1895 there was an Act passed called the Assisted Schools Abolition Act. This provided for an amount of £15,000 to be paid by way of compensation to the assisted schools, and with the payment of that contribution the assisted schools were abolished. In 1898 we commenced the manual training for boys, and in 1899 the total abolition of school fees was made, at the same time private schools were to be accepted and declared efficient and attendance under our primary system of education was made compulsory, and the ages at which

children had to attend was fixed at from six to 14 years of age. At this same period the State commenced cookery classes for girls, and since that time there has been added instruction in laundry work and general household work. This instruction is given now in all the large centres of Western Australia, and is found to be very beneficial to the girls attending. In 1902 a training college for teachers was opened, and in 1903 central classes for monitors were commenced. In 1907 these developed into the Normal school which we have to-day for educating the future teachers for our State schools. In 1909 the upper classes in large centres of population were collected in the central schools, that is, in centres like Perth, Fremantle, and the goldfields, where there are advanced pupils. They are collected from the small schools and taken to the large central schools, and the small schools are relieved of the senior classes, thus enabling the State to provide more efficient and higher instruction to the children, in fact, it takes the form more of secondary education than primary education. Last year free continuation evening classes were instituted. These classes were instituted so that a boy between the time of leaving school and going into employment should receive some education. In many instances a boy leaving school at 15 years can get no further education, he does not get employment at once, and he becomes a menace to the community by loafing about the streets. It was with the idea of continuing the education of this class of our youths that these continuation classes were entered upon. It is intended during this month to open our first Secondary school in Western Australia. This school has been built during the last 12 months and, I understand, the applications for admission are far greater than the number that can be accommodated. With the building of this Modern or Secondary school the State is further extending the system of education, and the teaching in that school will make the students ripe for the University when it is started. In 1900 we established our first Technical school in Perth, and it has proved itself so useful to the community that branch technical schools have been provided in all the large centres of Western Australia. On the goldfields in particular branches have been established at Coolgardie and Boulder. They are very largely attended and have been found to be very useful to the community. In addition to the technical schools, we opened on the goldfields in 1903 the School of Mines. I think this was one of the finest steps ever taken in Western Australia in the interests of education. I believe the School of Mines is doing such good work that it will leave its mark right through the world. The number of students attending there, and the enthusiasm displayed by those students are alike gratifying. A large number of young fellows have been able to secure positions after being educated there; indeed they have been greatly sought after by the leading mine managers. The influence of this School of Mines will be felt in days to come right through the mining world. It will not be out of place here to draw attention to the comparative cost of education to the State between the years 1900 and 1910. The total cost of education in 1900 was £78,000, while in 1910 it had increased to £183,000. These amounts are partly made up of, departmental expenses in 1900, £8,900; in 1910, £12,060; primary education in 1900, £66,000; in 1910, £152,000. Charges are made for students attending the Technical School and the School of Mines. The average attendance in our primary schools was, in 1900, 14,600; and in 1910 it had increased to 27,000, or nearly double during the ten years; and we may reasonably expect it will extend in the same ratio during the next ten years. With regard to revenue in school fees: in 1900 we collected £470, while in 1910 the amount so collected was £4,520. The question of whether we are going to make a charge for those attending the University will have to be seriously gone into, and if it is decided that we are to provide free education in the University, it will be almost compulsory on us to make education free in our Technical School and the School of mines. How-

ever, that is a question which will have to be very seriously considered by Parliament in the near future. From what I have said about our educational system, it will be seen that the general trend of education and the growth of the State's responsibility for the education of its young people have been fully recognised by the various administrations of Western Australia. There was a time when a parent might decide for himself whether or not he would educate his child; that time has passed. Under our compulsory system of primary education a parent has no option but to send his children to school between the ages of six and fourteen. The State has shown that it realises its responsibility, not only towards primary education but in a great measure in respect to secondary and technical education also. I may here state that in the Loan Estimates which are being brought down provision is made for the extension of the buildings connected with the Technical School and I believe a sum of £10,000 is to be spent in providing accommodation which I am told is absolutely necessary.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Where are you going to have the University?

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE (Honorary Minister): That will have to be considered. I will come to that point later. It is also intended to spend a good deal of money in extending the secondary school buildings. For this purpose some £10,000 is to be set aside while between £30,000 and £40,000 is on the Estimates to be spent on the primary school buildings throughout the State. This brings us to the object for which the Bill has been brought forward, namely, the establishment of a university in Western Australia. In all the other States of the Commonwealth, and in New Zealand and in all advanced countries throughout the world, they have universities. These universities are supported in some cases wholly by the Government, and in others partially by the Government and partially by private benefactions and subscriptions. The modern attitude of the States of the Commonwealth towards the establishment of universities is very clearly outlined in the report sent in to us by the Royal Commission, which no doubt all hon. members have perused. The report recommends what is called the Australian system of university. We in Australia realise that perhaps it is not possible for us to establish a university on the lines of Oxford and Cambridge; we are rather leaning towards establishing a university which will assist us in commercial life and in establishing industries in this great State. All the nations of the world—and the Commonwealth of Australia is not behind hand in this respect—are learning that their commercial and industrial prosperity depends on their methods of educating the whole nation. In no country is this more marked than in Germany. For some ten or twenty years the German people have been very much alive to the value of technical education. They have compulsory free technical education, and we all know how Germany has gone ahead during the past ten or twenty years in regard to the manufacturing industries. She has become a power in the commercial and exporting world which she was not some time ago. This has all been brought about by the technical education she has given to her young people and, to a great extent, to the education which has been imparted to those young people by the universities established in Germany. In Leeds and Manchester they provide for instruction in subjects such as coal mining, textile industries, leather industries, photography and such things as that. I think those are the lines we require to go on in Western Australia. We have a splendid industry in our mining, and it is only a question of educating our people up to the requirements of the industry when we shall find it progress in response to anything we may do. Then we have our agricultural industry. Agriculture has become more scientific of late years, and this necessitates the careful educating of those who are going to carry on that great industry. To this end the University will be most useful. There are many other industries which might be included in the University. All the newer universities give diplomas in electrical engineering, social economy, education,

agriculture, and mining, and I think the University if it is established in Western Australia, might very well take the ideas and carry out the methods of the newer universities in the old country. In 1901 a motion advocating the establishment of the University was passed in this Chamber, and in 1904 Parliament passed an Act creating a University Endowment Trust. Many blocks of land in the vicinity of Perth were given to this trust. I am afraid they have not been able to get very much revenue from that land, but still it was a step in the right direction and one which might in the immediate future be enlarged upon; only when we endow the University with land we should endow it with land from which the authorities will be able to get considerable revenue. In 1906 the University Graduate Union was founded in an endeavour to educate public opinion. In the same year, in the Queen's Hall, Perth, a resolution was passed affirming that the University should be established. In 1907 a deputation from the University Graduates' Union waited on the Minister for Education and urged that a charter be granted for an examining university; but after careful consideration it was felt that that idea should be abandoned, and that we should have a teaching as well as an examining body. As I have said, in 1909 the Royal Commission was appointed to inquire in to the whole question of establishing the University in Western Australia. Turning to the positions of the sister States of the Commonwealth when they established their universities and giving you some comparisons, I think you will see that we are quite entitled and may with every safety go ahead in the establishment of the University. New South Wales established her university in 1851 when she had a population of 197,000 and a total revenue of £400,000. In 1856 Victoria established her university when she had a population of 338,000 people and a total revenue of £2,728,000. In 1870 South Australia established a university, having then a population of 188,915 and a total revenue of £564,000. Tasmania established a university in 1891 with a population of 145,000 people and a revenue of £678,000. Queensland established a university in 1909 with a population numbering 560,000 and a total revenue amounting to £4,488,000. It will thus be seen that Western Australia, with a population of 285,000 and a total revenue of £3,365,000 is absolutely justified in establishing the University. The estimated annual cost of the University will be found on page 16 of the report. It is set down at £13,876. The Bill provides for a grant of £13,500 to be paid annually to the University. This is exclusive of the Chair of Agriculture which, as I have already said, has been endowed by Sir Winthrop Hackett. This amount of £13,500 is inclusive of £2,000 to be given for scholarships, exhibitions and prizes. The Bill is the constitution of the University, the government of which will consist of a Senate, Convocation, graduate and under graduate members. The governing authority consists of the Senate and Convocation, and until the Convocation is constituted it will consist of the Senate only. The Senate shall consist of 18 persons, and not more than three may be professors, lecturers or examiners, and not more than two principals or teachers in continuation, secondary, mining or technical schools. The first Senate is to be appointed by the Governor, and will hold office until the constitution of the Convocation, which will not be established until it has a membership of 60. The Senate is to be appointed within six months of the passing of the Act, and when the Convocation is constituted, the Senate will be divided into six groups, one group going out of office annually in March, the three vacancies created being filled, one by the Governor and two by election by the Convocation; the effect of this will be that when the University is fully constituted the Senate will consist of 18 members, six of whom shall be appointed by the Governor, and 12 elected by the Convocation, the Senate from their own number electing annually a Chancellor and Pro-Chancellor of the University. The Senate will be the executive body of the University, which will control and manage the affairs of the University, appoint all officers and

servants, control the property, and initiate any university legislation. The Convocation consists of a variety of persons, as set forth in Clause 17 of the Bill. This clause reads—

> 17. Convocation shall consist of (a) All members and past members of the Senate: (b) All graduates of the University of the degree of Master or Doctor: (c) All other graduates of the University of three years' standing: (d) All graduates of other Universities of three years' standing who have been admitted to degrees in the University, provided that the standing of such graduate shall be reckoned from the date of his graduation in such other University; (e) Such fellows, members, licentiates, and associates of Colleges or Institutions outside the State, duly authorised to grant degrees, diplomas, licenses, or certificates as shall under the statutes be admitted to be members of Convocation: (f) The representative for the time being of any commercial, industrial, scientific, or educational society, institution, or association within the State having not fewer than fifty bona fide members, and which makes an annual contribution to the University of not less than ten pounds, and has made such contribution for two years immediately preceding that for which the said representative claims to be appointed; provided that such representative shall be appointed by the members of such society, institution or association, and shall hold office for one year, but shall be eligible for reappointment: (g) All individual persons who have made any gift or donation, whether by instalments or otherwise, to the University amounting in money or value in the aggregate to not less than one hundred pounds; (h) The duly appointed representative of the Guild of Undergraduates.

I draw members' attention particularly to paragraph (f). I am sure they will appreciate the fact that on one of the governing bodies of the University will be represented our commercial, industrial, scientific, and educational institutions. When the number enrolled reaches 60 the Convocation is to be deemed constituted, and the provisions regarding the election of the Senate come into operation. Further particulars in regard to this will be seen in Clause 10. Ultimately the Senate will be elected by the Convocation. The chief executive salaried officer of the University is to be named the Vice-Chancellor, and his office shall hold good for a period not exceeding 10 years. The Vice-Chancellor will have a voice in the Senate but no vote. Other clauses provide for the holding of examinations, and the granting of degrees and diplomas, and give power to the governing authority to make statutes in regard to various matters of internal control and general management of the University. Such statutes are to be initiated in the Senate, but must be approved by the Convocation before they are finally agreed upon. The Convocation have power to amend and disapprove. When they are approved by both parties, the statutes are transmitted to the Governor for his approval and are published in the *Government Gazette*, but a copy of such statutes must be laid before Parliament if it is sitting, or if it is not sitting, within 14 days after the commencement of the next session, and may be annulled by Parliament within 30 days thereafter. Power is also given to affiliate educational and other institutions under conditions to be provided by statute. The equality of the sexes is provided for, and the prohibition of the administration of any religious test; also there is provision for an annual audit and a report to be sent to Parliament and laid on the Table each year. Clause 37 provides for the payment of £13,500 annually to the University from the consolidated revenue. Meanwhile the first Senate will be appointed and arrangements made for temporary accommodation: and the appointment of professors and lecturers and other officers will be made in order that the University may commence its operations at once. The question of the site and buildings for the University is one that will probably be left to a small Commission. The Premier, in speaking in another place, said in all probability he would appoint a Commission to go into the question and decide the matter. I have already said in

commencing my speech this evening that I deem it a privilege to have been asked to move the second reading of this Bill, and I know that every member will deem it a privilege and be proud of the fact that he has assisted in bringing about the establishment of a university in Western Australia. What we want is to give the rising generation a practical education, a cheap and efficient education. The science of mining, and the science of agriculture, and the science of applied chemistry and mechanics must be taught at our University. Of course the classics must not be lost sight of, but the education of our people in a practical manner is much more important than teaching them dead languages and classics. There is no need for me to speak any further on the question. I feel sure every member of the House will support the measure almost in its entirety. Therefore I content myself with moving—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. Sir J. W. HACKETT (South-West): I have to express in the first instance my warm thanks to the Honorary Minister for the kind way in which he has spoken of myself and of my colleagues who were engaged in the work of bringing out this report. I confess that for some little time I have been experiencing a sense of despondency. To put it plainly—I hope my friends opposite will not be irritated—I was not quite sure whether my good friends, the Government, were in earnest over this matter.

The Colonial Secretary: Well, here is the measure.

Hon. Sir J. W. HACKETT: Yes. I am going to admit my error and apologise. The measure has been kept so late in the session, but I had no idea of the elastic resources of sitting which seem to be the property of both Chambers, and I had given up the measure for lost; but, as the Colonial Secretary has said, the best proof that the Government were dealing perfectly fairly with me in the matter is that the Bill is before us now, even after passing another Chamber; and I earnestly hope that it will pass into law without a dissenting voice so far as this Chamber is concerned before this evening is over. So now everything is changed from despondency to gratefulness and applause, and I accept the plea of my friends that it was solely owing to the exigencies of business in the two Houses that led to the Bill being left to the last. I could not understand it, for I insisted that our people here are as anxious as those in the East, our parents are as eager to see their children educated as those in the East, and our children, judging from the Inter-State tests, are more than able to hold their own in the examinations. The lists of the Adelaide University examinations will more than attest to what I am saying. The prizes won by the younger members of this community have been to my mind, astonishing, and only when we reflect on the excellent primary system of schools we have, and also, though perhaps not so successful—secondary schools, only then do we realise it is a fair thing to pit our children against those in the East; and though we do not expect too much of them we believe they will come out victorious. Both political sides in the Lower House deserve the estimation and applause of posterity, and they, no doubt, will receive it, but I admit it is to the Government at the present moment we are mostly beholden. It is a fact that very many difficulties confronted the Government in agreeing to this scheme, the least of which was the finding of the paltry sum of £13,000 a year; but as time goes on I believe Ministers will discover that the best investment the country has made for many a long year—putting all the railways together that have been agreed to in this session and the last session—is the establishment of a university in Western Australia. Before I came to the question of the report and the Bill, a matter which I have spent a few months on, and a matter that has been gone into so admirably in another place, and that has received so much attention from the Honorary Minister, I wish to refer to two and a half columns of criticism I came across the other morning when reading the daily paper. From a study of that criticism I came to the conclusion that the critic might know

something about older universities, but he knew nothing about a modern university; and though he seemed to be on terms of great intimacy with a gentleman of the name of Plato, yet to him Plato was a far more familiar word than the names of educational reformers of latter days. I understand from the remarks of this gentleman, that out of a university no good can come, but the instruction is worthless, the thing itself is evil, and the product is worse. The hon. gentleman, or, rather, I should say, this critic might appeal, no doubt, to the university of many generations gone by for justification for what he says. There are lists of names put forward of those who have succeeded because of their not having a university education. To this it is obvious the answer is that if they did so well without having a university education, how much better would they have done with one? The point is that at the time these persons lived—the list of great individuals who have succeeded, no doubt, without any assistance from the university—there was no university of the kind within their means. There was no university waiting for them endowed with the means of teaching them practical work in a practical way. The result was that they did their best, but how much more would they have done if they had what we have at the present time so many universities competing in all directions, and if also they had been able to avail themselves of the immense funds provided for original research in the United Kingdom and America. I might point out that most of the professional men in all countries have passed through universities, in fact I do not know that there is a great divine among the many thousands who have lived, whom some university cannot claim. That being so it was a rash statement to make to pit a man of no university against a man of a university. Nevertheless the criticism was humourous, interesting and not a little suggestive.

The Colonial Secretary: More humorous than interesting.

Hon. Sir J. W. HACKETT: Perhaps he intended to be more humorous than interesting, but there were many points in it that are worthy of consideration. A fact with regard to the ancient universities—I am going back about a thousand years—was the great success of the people from all parts of the world travelled to those universities to acquire such learning as they had to offer, and these men were made famous and prosperous, and that is what we hope to do with regard to the new University of Western Australia. That seems a bold statement to make, especially when I remind hon. members that these ancient universities, medieval universities as they are now called, taught chiefly metaphysics and logic, they taught medicine, such as it was, and law, they taught philosophy, they taught something of the dead languages, and they taught a subject which overwhelmed and swamped all the rest, scholastic theology. In one respect we take these ancient universities as our model. You will naturally ask me to explain; what I mean is that they succeeded in the way every university succeeds, that is every university provides for the needs and the wants of the community, and that was what the medieval universities did. Practical arts were only just coming into existence, and whatever men wanted from those universities they obtained. The duty of the university is to provide the best of every kind attracted from all quarters and supply it to students in the most interesting and effective manner possible. With regard to our Western Australian University, that is precisely the line which we desire to proceed upon; anyone who has taken the trouble to read the report will see that all through, that has been the maxim which we urge upon the Government. This report, if boiled down to its limits comes to this: it provides for a university which shall be popular in its purposes, popular in its teaching, and popular in its constitution. I have collected together some extracts from well-known authorities which will give some idea of what our conception is as to what this university should provide. First of all, take Mr. Pritchett, a leading writer in America, who last year wrote—

> The rise of these great (the State) universities is the most epoch-making

feature of our American civilisation, and they are to become more and more the leaders, and the makers, of our civilisation.

I come next to Principal Remsen, of John Hopkins University. His words are—

> A direct connection has been shown to exist between the industrial condition of a country and the attitude of the country towards university work.

Then I come to the Right Hon. James Bryce, who says—

> Universities ought to provide a cheap education. Further, they ought to provide a practical education, that is to say, all sorts of professional and technical as well as general liberal instruction.

Next is Sir Norman Lockyer, who said—

> Our conception of a university has changed. University education is no longer regarded as the luxury of the rich, which concerns only those who can afford to pay heavily for it. . . Science is now one of the greatest necessities of a nation; and our universities must become as much the insurers of future progress as battleships are the insurers of the present power of states. In other words, university competition between states is now as potent as competition in building battleships; and it is on this ground that our university conditions become of the highest national concern. . . . . Men of science, our leaders of industry and the chiefs of our political parties all agree that our present want of higher education—in other words, properly equipped universities—is heavily handicapping us in the present race for commercial supremacy, because it provides a relatively inferior brain power, which is leading to a relatively reduced national income.

I would like to add to these words a sentence from the report of the Right Rev. Bishop Riley, one of the best educationalists Australia possesses, whose time and labour and intellect are always at the disposal of anyone who wishes to give a lift forward to the education of the people. He says:

> A modern university must take colour from its environment. "It must," in the words of Mr. Chamberlain, "not only be a school of general culture, but it must also practically assist the prosperity and welfare of the district in which it is situated by the exceptional attention which it would give to the teaching of science in connection with its application to local industries and manufactures." Cambridge developed the teaching of agriculture because agriculture had been almost ruined in the Eastern Counties chiefly through want of scientific knowledge. Manchester made a feature of commerce and textile manufactures. Birmingham of mining and mechanical engineering, being the centre of a mining district and the chief town of iron and steel manufactures. Liverpool developed like Manchester, and in addition, considering that she is one of the great ports of the world liable to infection of all kinds, a Tropical School of Medicine comes to the front naturally. So in Western Australia, considering that our chief sources of prosperity are mining and agriculture (including viticulture and forestry) we too should have "a School of General Culture," and give exceptional attention to the Departments of Agriculture and Mining.

By these words we stand. This University is intended to help people to add to their success, to increase their wages, and to make them altogether more comfortable and happier members of our social system than they may be at present. The great subject of classics which has been a feature of all universities of the past 500 or 600 years has been, I will not use the word degraded, but it has been reduced to the rank of lectureship, instead of having a regular bevy of professors to deal with it. With regard to fees, perhaps a matter second only in importance to the subjects which are to be taught, I am glad to say that the Government are not in a hurry to give a pronouncement. It is quite possible it may be found that some

modification will have to be made in the recommendation contained in the report, but it is a particularly difficult and intricate question. There are interests on all sides, public and private. I am sure that the Government will assist the University when it is established in doing the very best to provide such fees as will enable all to avail themselves of them, and at the same time do as little mischief to the Secondary schools, which depend so largely upon those fees for their subsistence. I want to say a word about the Constitution. The constitution of universities varies in all countries. America has samples of all; so, indeed, has England. But two things present themselves to our mind; we must have a Constitution as simple and as little cumbersome as possible. We must see what the interests of the country are and we must make provision for them. The English model was absolutely impossible. In some cases there are five governing bodies, all of which, if they were in the constitution, would claim their full part in the government of the University, and the result would be a deadlock. All modern universities in England and Ireland are founded on the same principle. The American and Canadian universities were equally impossible for our requirements. We come back to the consideration of the Australian model, which is the simplest and most effective for our purposes. The Australian model consists of two chambers. We give them different names in our case. We call one chamber, the smaller and the executive one, the Senate, and the larger chamber the Convocation. The Senate has the entire administration of the University and a share of the legislation it initiates. The Convocation has the entire electoral rights of the University in its hands and a share in the legislation, having the right to amend and veto. The Senate consists of 18 individuals. I need hardly go into these details as my friend, the Honorary Minister, has given them. The Senate is the governing body until the Convocation is appointed. The Convocation is not appointed until there are 60 members, and it will not be so long before this number is made up, because all the members of the Senate at once start the roll.

Hon. M. L. Moss: And the graduates of the university.

Hon. Sir J. W. HACKETT: Yes, Yes, I am sure we shall get many of them, but I am only counting on a small number from that quarter at the commencement.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: I believe they will all join for patriotic reasons.

Hon. Sir J. W. HACKETT: I hope so. As soon as Convocation comes into existence the Senate becomes partly elective. The Governor has the right to appoint six of the eighteen members of Convocation, and all of these have a right to six years' tenure of office. When Convocation comes into existence the electoral side of the university becomes fully operative. That electoral side is a very serious matter, for it really controls the senate to a large extent. Convocation will have the right of electing twelve of the eighteen members of the senate, and it is quite possible that convocation may impress its own character on the senate to the detriment of the university.

Hon. J. W. Langsford: Is the number of convocation limited?

Hon. Sir J. W. HACKETT: No, there is a minimum of sixty, but there is no necessity yet to place any restraint on the growth of numbers. An important matter to consider is that this popular chamber, whichever it may be (either one may be popular and the other unpopular) could refuse to allow the legislation of one body to become law and a deadlock might ensue. Accordingly, a change was introduced into the Bill at the last moment, because of the advice received from other quarters as to the very great dangers of deadlocks, and the possibility of the whole machinery of the university being brought to a standstill. In Clause 32 it is provided that if the senate passes a law which convocation will not agree to, and after three months the senate again passes the proposed statute and convocation is still obdurate, the Governor may take the opinion of two-thirds of the members present at a specially convened meeting of the senate, and their decision will override the objections of convocation. But however this works out, the popular side gains the victory. If the hostile element is in the

convocation and the senate is more popular, then the senate with its two-thirds decision comes in and overrules convocation. On the other hand, if it is the senate that stands in the way of reform, and convocation is the more popular body, only a year or two has to elapse before the electoral powers of convocation will make themselves felt, and convocation can put a majority in the senate in favour of its ideas. I hardly think it necessary to deal at any greater length with the subject. The matter has been explained first by the Premier, next by the Honorary Minister, and now by myself, as fully as it can be. I wish just to say, with regard to the site, that I applaud the intention of the Government to appoint a small commission to go fully into the question. There are four sites apparently available, but the site which of all others would be most suitable, assuming that Parliament is agreeable, is the site of this Parliamentary building.

Hon. J. W. Langsford: Would you abolish Parliament?

Hon. Sir J. W. HACKETT: We would give Parliament a more suitable site and save hon. members the climb up these steps. Parliament is for the aged and the University is for the young. However, it all depends upon whether Parliament is to increase or decrease. It is possible, of course, that so far as the State Parliament is concerned we may be left with a building stranded on the top of a hill; but whatever the decision may be in regard to the site, I am sure that the best will be done for the university. I do not care to discuss the sites now, but I hope that the views of hon. members will be available, and that if there is any further discussion before the Bill is read a second time, the question of site will come in for a certain amount of observation. In the meantime, I will not detain the House further. Before I sit down, however, I would like to read to the House two short extracts. One consists of the concluding words of the Royal Commission's report, and is as follows:—

> Your Commission desires to once more emphasise its earnest hope that the result of its labours may be the early establishment of a people's university for the Western third of the Commonwealth. We need, no country needs it more, a home of higher learning and instruction which shall respond, so far as its means permit, to the call of a million square miles of Australian soil. Is it not time to wipe away a reproach which, among the progressive self-governing possessions of the Empire, can now be levelled at Western Australia alone?

That is a curious fact. Now that Queensland has taken its place in the circle of Australian universities, no self-governing country under the British Crown is without its university except Western Australia. The report continues—

> Your Commission wishes that the gap be closed which divides us in this respect from the rest of the Commonwealth, and the noble primary system of free education we already enjoy extended and perfected, so that our children may be able to gather at will the fruits which grow on the upper branches of the tree of knowledge. We cannot afford to throw away the opportunity now at our doors which should permit us to develop by the same instrument alike the resources of the State and the faculties of its people.

Lastly, I would ask the House to take these words expressing what America thinks about her universities—

> "In some States the university is a public utility, as are the waterworks and post offices. The American people act as if they believed in their universities as necessities. In fact, the universities fill such a large part in the life of the people and come into such close contact with the practical interests of the people that they are felt to be indispensable. The American university is the biggest expression of the American ideal of democracy." It can almost be said that every class of willing student is provided for; every subject finds an instructor; every method by which teaching can be conveyed is enlisted in the public service. The typical Ameri-

can who pays us a visit speaks with astonishment of the fact that Western Australia possesses no university. Mr. Franklin Matthews, of the *New York Sun*, who accompanied the United States fleet on their recent visit to Australia, writes in reference to the project of a university for Western Australia:—"Whatever scheme you adopt the best thing you can do is to get a university started. It would be the most magnificent monument you could leave. The time is opportune for a start at least. I hope if you do get one started along the Cornell lines you will let me come down and help you to give it a send-off. I am intensely interested in the matter, and will be glad to do all that I can to help."

That is all I have to say except to commend the Bill most earnestly and warmly to this House. I cannot believe that any hostile voice will be raised against it, and I trust that the reward of the efforts of this Chamber, conjoined with those of another place, will be the establishment of such a university as will be a source of pride and honour to the Commonwealth and do a priceless service to the sons and daughters of its people. I have the greatest possible pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East): I desire to express the very deepest gratitude to the gentlemen who have brought the university movement to such a point of success, and especially to Sir Winthrop Hackett for his very large share in that work. I must say, however, that I was somewhat startled at his reference to the possibility of Parliament abdicating in favour of the University. His remarks were somewhat of a valedictory, not to say renunciatory, nature. I do hope that the hon. member is not contemplating any withdrawal of his great powers of assistance to the legislature of this State, and I am still more seriously concerned that he should think for one moment that the functions of State Government would wane or become less in any sense. The State administration of Western Australia is only in its infancy; its greatest work lies ahead. Apart from that, when the site for the university comes to be selected, it must be at least four or five times the size of the site which Parliament House now occupies. With regard to the Bill, I do not think that any university has a broader or more liberal basis than the one proposed for Western Australia. I am not now referring to the scope of the teaching power, which, of course, must begin on modest lines and develop as the State progresses, but I am speaking of the basis on which the instrument of incorporation has been drawn. It is liberal, it is modern, it is enlightened, and it leaves room for drawing upon all the wisdom and experience of older foundations. I am especially pleased that women come in on equal terms with men, and that the Bill proposes that the governing authority shall be in a position to make the doors of the university wide enough and free enough to admit every deserving student. I think it is very probable that the governing power will recommend, and that Parliament will endorse, a beginning with moderate fees, and not a free University—moderate fees, which will be a stimulus to every student and his parents, and will cause the people of the State to value education more than they could do if the highest forms of instruction were entirely free. I am satisfied that with moderate fees and liberal bursaries there will be no difficulty in opening the way to every deserving student, and such students will be all the prouder of the education they receive. There are some things with regard to the arrangement of administration of this University that I do not agree with. There are to be a Chancellor, Pro-Chancellor, and Vice-Chancellor. In other universities I think this is avoided by calling the executive officer by a different name. I cannot see why he shall be called a Vice-Chancellor; but that is a matter of detail. I want to sound a note of warning with regard to the proposal to make the governing authority of the University a land jobber. I do hope that the Government and the University authorities will be more wisely advised. In the old days land endowments were

very poor. Now the State has seen fit to vote year by year all the money that education requires, and it will be a bad business and a foolish business to ask the Senate of the University to come down from their high position to enter the lists as a land jobber in competition with the very cute and clever men engaged in that business in this country. Depend upon it, that the Lands Department is quite capable of running the Crown Lands of the State and selling them to the best advantage, and the private land dealers are quite capable of dealing with the private lands, yet the governing body of this University are to enter the ranks of land jobbing, to turn a nimble shilling by the sale of an allotment here and an allotment there. This will mean a blot on the functions of the governing body of the University. I could understand if a bigger site of 100,000 acres had been set apart for University endowment; even then some other managing authority would do double as well as the University itself. The thing is out of date altogether. Where it has been tried in Australia it has been proved a mistake and given up. I want just one other word about the criticism against the University. It has been said that many university men are failures, and not a few of them are fools. A great deal depends on the critic's idea of what constitutes success and what constitutes wisdom. If the object of life here were merely to scramble money together, honestly or dishonestly, and then spend it in a carouse, or luxuriant indulgence, then, perhaps, some men might be looked upon as very foolish. But what is man's life? A man is as he thinks. The university crowns the profession for educating thought, for developing the real man and making him fit to enjoy the life he is intended to live. There can be no more wretched man on earth than the rich man, but the man of a clever refined mind has continued enjoyment. I say education is the greatest work the State has put its hand to. Western Australia has been doing splendidly up to this point, and now this University will crown the structure, and I say with the Honorary Minister, it is an honour and a pleasure for any hon. member to have to do with the founding of this University.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) moved—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and a division called for.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: There has been a promise made by the leader of the House that the next motion should be dealt with, and this promise has not been carried out. The next motion deals with an important matter. The debate on this Bill could be continued to-morrow.

The Colonial Secretary: The hon. member is not right in saying that any promise has not been fulfilled.

Hon Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I distinctly say you made a promise that you would put the motion down for consideration first to-day. You said it in the presence of the Honorary Minister.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Is it reasonable to suppose that an abstract motion would take precedence of public Bills on the last day of the session? It is only a quarter to nine; the debate can go on.

Division resulted as follows:

Ayes	7
Noes	10
Majority against ..	3

AYES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. V. Hamersley	Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. W. Langsford	Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. B. C. O'Brien	*(Teller).*

NOES.

Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. R. D. McKenzie
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. M. L. Moss
Sir J. W. Hackett	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. W. Kingsmill	*(Teller).*
Hon. W. Marwick	

Motion thus negatived.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; Hon. R. D. McKenzie (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 11—agreed to.

Clause 12—Chancellor and pro-Chancellor:

Hon. Sir J. W. HACKETT: A Chancellor was more ornamental than anything else; the Pro-Chancellor took his place in his absence, and the Vice-Chancellor was the executive officer.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: In Sydney the executive officer was called the registrar.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Control and management of property:

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The University should not start land jobbing. This clause gave the governing body power to hold all sorts of allotments and carry out expensive works, the laying down of roads and streets, and for this purpose it could use trust moneys. There would be no objection to the revenue of the University being used for this purpose, but not trust funds. The funds would be for special purposes and should be kept for those purposes.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: There could be no objection to the use of trust funds for the purposes of the University. It was not likely the University would make roads and streets; still if they were to improve their landed property it was necessary to give them the power to do so.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The point would be allowed to pass because it was provided in the Bill that either House of Parliament might disallow anything that was wrong in the administration.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: The University would not be able to use for the purpose of making roads and streets the money furnished by the Government for educational purposes; the only money the University would have for the purpose of making roads and streets would be the trust funds.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 15 to 24—agreed to.

Clause 25—Quorum:

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The quorum of the Senate should be reduced. Eight out of eighteen was altogether too high. Five would be sufficient.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: There was no justification for lowering the number of the quorum. Eight was not too high.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The Sydney University had started with too high a quorum, and within two years it was found necessary to pass a special Act of Parliament in order to lower that quorum. He moved an amendment—

That in line 2 "eight" be struck out and "six" inserted in lieu.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: This matter had been fully considered by the commissioners appointed to go into the question of the establishment of the University. Those gentlemen had had extensive experience in the working of universities.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 26 to 34—agreed to.

Clause 35—Endowment:

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE moved an amendment—

That in line one of Subclause (2) the words "at the commencement of this Act" be struck out.

Amendment passed.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE moved a further amendment—

That after "shall" in line 3 of Subclause 2 the words "on the appointment of the Senate" be inserted.

Amendment passed.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: Some of the lands reserved by the James Administration for the purposes of University endowment were to-day a disfigurement in many of the agricultural towns along the Great Southern.

The Honorary Minister: Those blocks should be pretty valuable in the thriving towns of the Great Southern.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: Nothing had been done to them. Apparently they could not be disposed of, and they were nothing but a disfigurement. In a State like this it would be better to endow the University with a few towns.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 36 to 40—agreed to.

Clause 41—Report:

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: This clause made indirect reference to the University year

as closing in December; there was no provision in the Bill for closing the University year in December.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: There would be no objection to striking out the words "in December."

Hon. J. F. CULLEN moved an amendment—

That in line 2 the words "in December" be struck out.

Amendment passed: clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 42—Discharge of trustees of University endowment:

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE moved an amendment—

That at the beginning of the clause the words "on the appointment of the Senate" be added.

Amendment passed.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE moved a further amendment—

That in line 2 the words "is hereby" be struck out and "shall be" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE moved a further amendment—

That in line 3 the word "are" be struck out.

Amendment passed: clause as amended agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and a message transmitted to the Legislative Assembly requesting that the amendments be made, leave being given to sit again on receipt of a message from the Assembly.

MOTION—TIMBER INDUSTRY.

To inquire by Royal Commission.

Debate resumed from the 27th January on the motion of Hon. M. L. Moss that a Royal Commission be appointed to inquire into the timber industry.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North): In resuming the debate on this motion I must apologise to members for trespassing upon their time at this late hour. As I have already said, had it not been that the leader of the House did not carry out his promise to give me an earlier opportunity I should not have done this.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I rise to a point of order. What I said was that I would give an early opportunity, and the hon. member has certainly no reason for complaint. I do not think it is fair for him to repeat what I have already contradicted.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: The day before yesterday the hon. member informed me that the motion would be at the head of the list for yesterday. I have nothing more to say on that point except that I apologise to hon. members that I have not had an opportunity of speaking before this on a matter of so much importance.

The Colonial Secretary: Why did you not speak on Tuesday when we adjourned at tea time?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: In the circumstances, I have to speak to members who are tired and will listen impatiently to the few words I have to say. I have read the speech of Mr. Moss and I find that he makes some very serious accusations against one company in connection with the timber industry. Of course it is a very old story, this matter he has brought up, and it has been ventilated several times before. Indeed, a great many of the details were brought forward during the election of the late Premier at Bunbury, and I have no doubt is within the recollection of many members. However, there are some members who are not acquainted with the details, and therefore I propose to make a few references to this portion of the timber industry referred to by my friend. His statement is shorn of a great deal of its importance by the qualification he made. He said in one place he could not vouch for the accuracy of his statements as he did not know them of his own knowledge, and then again he said it might turn out that the allegations he was making were ill-founded and that the company were doing their best to utilise these areas. Of course members will recognise that all the references were made in connection with the one company, Millars' Karri & Jarrah Company. It is no use disguising

that fact, and I will reply under that impression. To use the words of my friend as he would perhaps address a jury, I would ask members all to put away from their minds anything they have heard outside and to approach the subject without prejudice and listen carefully to my explanation; and after that explanation has been made, if hon members are still willing that a Royal Commission should be appointed, or that the country should be put to the trouble and expense of a Royal Commission, I shall make no objection and shall in fact afford the Commission every assistance I possibly can to see that information is submitted to them. Indeed, had the hon. member himself come to me beforehand, I could have given him many details of an authentic nature and of a much more responsible character than he has heard in the form in which he has brought the matter forward. I am sorry to see that some members made up their minds decidedly and spoke decidedly on the subject before they heard any explanation. It almost seems that they were judging the case from one side only without hearing the other. The accusations of the hon. member were rather varied, numerous, exceedingly comprehensive and far-reaching. Therefore to get them into some order, I have tabulated them into seven different remarks, and these are: 1, That large areas are being dummied for Millars': 2, that these areas are not being developed as the Act requires: 3, that a monopoly has been created; 4, that the price of timber has been put up: 5, that the company have beaten the men on most occasions in disputes; 6, that the company have received tens of thousands of pounds from the Government in railway freights: and 7, that if the company worked to the advantage of the State he would be satisfied. I think these cover most of his statements fairly comprehensively. Now, with regard to the question of dummying, on the face of it there is a great deal to be said for the argument, and, indeed, to a superficial observer it would appear as if the company had dummied a large area of land. Had it been a new company starting not long ago, the accusation would have fitted very well and the strictures would have been deserved, that is, if it had been a company starting out by taking up an odd lease or two and adding to their area from time to time until they accumulated a large area under different names. The explanation, however, in this case is quite different, and a very different aspect can be placed upon it. It will be within the recollection of hon. members that prior to 1902 there were a number of struggling companies in the timber industry belonging to various owners. They were struggling to pay their way, dispose of the karri and jarrah, and develop a trade and make some money out of it. Each company had a board of directors, a clerical staff and agents; each company was vyeing with the other in Western Australia, in London and abroad and cutting the prices to such an extent in these different places that it was impossible for them to make money. The consequence was they were working at a loss, the shareholders had no return, the timber was sold below its value, the companies paid poor wages and everything was unsatisfactory, and there was a great deal of grumbling on the part of the public because the companies were selling the timber so cheaply that they were unable to pay decent wages to their workmen and the State was not getting a fair return for what they were taking off the country. After a great deal of trouble a federation of eight of these companies was arranged under one management. The various interests, leases, plants, and everything in connection with the industry were transferred to this particular company, namely, Millars' Karri & Jarrah Company. But no money passed. Each company was paid for its assets in shares. In the first place the number of shares each company had was reduced to a large extent, but even after reducing the shares in this way they amounted to a large number, so much so that many people have the idea that the company has been over-capitalised. It is on account of its having taken over all these shares from the different companies that it appears the concern has been over-capitalised. When these eight companies were amalgamated it

was found impossible under the land regulations of the day to hold the amalgamated leases in one name, because the Act provided that no one holder should have more than 75,000 acres. Therefore, when the transfer of these leases was undertaken, the Government were approached; and seeing the nature of affairs, the Government agreed that these leases belonging to the indvidual companies who were still interested in the land should be transferred to the names of nominees. This has been done all along with the knowledge and consent of the authorities, and the rents have been paid by Millars', and it has never been objected to. Therefore there can be no fraud about it, because the Government have recognised it from the commencement. We do not admit in any case that there has been any dummying in the true sense of the word; and though the Act provided that each lease should have a mill upon it, the company claim that they have more than carried out the full spirit of the Act by the number of mills they have placed on the different holdings to work them. For instance, where there are three or four leases adjoining, they put one mill down with a larger capacity than is required for the whole of the four leases, and the consequence is they set to work and cut out one lease and made their establishment on it. They had their mill there, their storehouses, water supply, post office and all sorts of things that have to be provided on this particular lease. It would be an absurdity to ask that four plants like this should be put up on the four leases. Instead of that they put up one mill with a capacity for the four leases, and, instead of transferring all these arrangements to each lease, they put down a line of railway and bring the logs to the mills instead of taking the mills to the logs. That is a very reasonable proposition, and I think any of those gentlemen who have had anything to do with farming in this country will know that if any person has three or four conditional purchase leases adjoining, they can be included within one fence and the improvements can be concentrated on one which will represent the whole lot; therefore, it is not at all unreasonable that what is a fair thing with regard to conditional purchase leases should be fair in connection with timber leases. Another thing, a company of the size of this has an immense amount of plant, and they cannot work the whole of their leases at once, they must keep a little in reserve otherwise no one would put their capital into such a concern. Therefore, even if they are not working all the leases, it is claimed that a good many of them are being worked and that is a fair and reasonable thing. A return was laid on the Table of the House, to which I will briefly refer to show the exact position of affairs. That return shows that Millars' hold 26 leases; the requirements of the Act are that five loads per square mile shall be cut to carry out the working conditions of the 26 leases. This would represent 2,215 loads. As a matter of fact, the capacity of the mills is 14,660 loads. There are 12 mills altogether, so that it will be seen they are carrying out far and away more than is required by the Act. I propose now to give a few details, but before I do so I would like to say one word as to the land regulations in existence in connection with timber at about this time. Previous to 1902, when this amalgamation took place, there were a few leases existing in connection with timber: but before 1898 the method by which the timber lands was held was under a license, and there was no limit to the number of the licenses. When it came to the question of transferring a license to an English or other company, it was found that the title was of an insecure nature, and, therefore, in the Land Act of 1898 a clause was inserted which allowed the timber owners to take up leases, giving them the exclusive right to cut timber in those leases. The consequence was that all those who owned licenses transferred them under the 1898 Act into leaseholds. The 1898 Act specified that no one could take up more than 75,000 acres under the new Act but there was this proviso, that holders of more than that area under the old licenses should still have the right to hold their full areas under the new Act. We, therefore, have all these companies

in existence at the beginning of 1902, each holding leased timber lands, some under 75,000 acres and some over 75,000 acres. Only one of these companies to this time had done any good for itself. Some had to reconstruct, and some tried to get more capital, and others were on the verge of bankruptcy, and all were trying to cut the others throats, to obtain such orders as were offering. In 1904 a resolution was passed in the Legislative Assembly, having for its object the prevention of the leasing of any more timber lands, and that accounts for the fact that nearly all the leases in existence happen to be absorbed in the Millars' Karri and Jarrah Company. No one after 1904 could possibly take up a lease, but there was a clamour to allow people to get more land, and the consequence was that a new method was brought into vogue for dealing with these lands. Provision was made for the working of further timber areas by the issue of what was known as saw-mill permit areas, and the difference between that and the original leases or licenses, was that instead of paying rent they paid a royalty on the timber actually used. That accounts for the fact that there are very few leases outside those absorbed by this company. A serious attempt was made in 1901 to bring the various leaseholders together, and the result was, with the exception of one company which stood out, the present Millars' Company was formed. The new company mutually agreed with the old companies as to how much stock in the new company they would take in exchange for its interests. After this came the question of the transfer of the leaseholds to the new company, but there was a difficulty, owing to a condition in the 1908 Act, that no one person or company could hold more than 75,000 acres, and the Government recognising the position of this amalgamation, recognising that it was two or three individuals who had taken up the land, and recognising that it was several companies which had been labouring for years and years, and had held land before amalgamating, they allowed the transfer of the extra lands to be put into the names of nominees of the new company, and permitted the old companies to be wound up. It cannot be contended that these lands are wrongly held. It has never been so contended by any Government, and each year the rents have been paid by Millars', and receipts given. To show that Millars' have not a monopoly of the timber, that although most of the leaseholds, with one or two exceptions, came into this amalgamation at the time it was made, I will state that the areas actually held under this Act—that is the Act of 1904, which allowed these saw-mill permit areas—is 515,000 acres, absolutely independent of Millars'. One of the conditions of the saw-mill areas was that no one who held a lease could have a saw-mill area. The consequence was that under no circumstances could Millars' increase their areas. The areas actually held under this Act amounted to 515,000 acres, and the amount applied for was 208,500 acres, which makes a total of 723,000 acres. How can anyone say that Millars' are absorbing all the timber lands of the country when we remember that the holding of Millars' is 281,000 acres. Another point is that the rents paid by Millars' every year amount to the same per load of sawn timber as is paid by royalty on those under the Saw-mill Area Act, so that Millars' get no advantage over the permit holders. Still another point is that the price of good land in Western Australia is 6d. per acre per annum, and after 20 years the holders get the freehold. The rent paid by Millars' amounts to 7½d. per acre, and they never get the freehold. It will thus be seen that Millars' pay more in rent for their land without a chance of getting the freehold than those people who take it up under the improvement clauses and get the freehold at the end of their payments. Some people argue that Millars' do not take the timber off the land, but even if they are not doing that they are paying the State 7½d. per annum, and the timber still remains. The next point is that areas are not being worked as the Act requires. It is not contended for one moment that there is a mill at each lease, and I think I have explained to some extent the rea-

son. I think the intention of the Act, and Mr. Moss will recognise it, is that more land shall not be taken up than can be worked. The idea of enforcing the labour conditions is to see that the people do not hold leases without doing anything with them. Although these leases are held by various people, who still have interests in them, they are all being worked. A gauge of what was considered a fair rate of work by the Lands Department was that five loads should be cut per month for every square mile contained in the lease. That meant that the capacity required for the mills would be 2,200 loads. The capacity of the mills owned by Millars' is 14,660 loads per month, or nearly seven times the requirement. Millars' hold 26 leases, and according to the strict letter of the law these would entail the erection of 26 mills. They are operating, however, with eleven mills, which are capable of doing seven times more than is required by the Act. Can anyone then say that Millars' are attempting to evade the law? Modern saw-milling is not what it was years ago; it is a different matter. The trouble that comes in at the present time is, that the distance of the logs from the railway line is a serious question. Years ago the logs were close to the railway lines; now they have to go some distance, even 30 miles away from the Government lines, to work these logs. The consequence is they cannot be worked without railways, and railways, as we all know, cost a good deal of money. The principle of scattered saw-mills is a bad one; it is far better to have good mills concentrated at fewer places, for the reason that nowadays the workmen connected with these mills require more comforts and conveniences than they did in the past. In addition to higher wages they want good homes; they require post and telegraph conveniences, water supply, sanitary services, a savings bank, money order office, stores, and workshops.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Do you provide the money order offices?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: No, but we provide the buildings. We also provide the hospital buildings and they provide the patients. I think it will appeal to every reasonable person that it is far better to have one big centre where all these conveniences can be established and maintained, than to argue that they ought to be taken away directly one lease is cut out and put on another—a system that must involve considerable expense. Now the logs can be brought to the mills and conveniences instead of the mill and conveniences being taken to the logs. What would be the use of a mill to a small man desiring to start twenty or thirty miles away from the Government railways? How would the timber be conveyed to market without a private railway? The industry could not be worked without these conveniences, and they all cost a lot of money. As an example of the company's mode of operation I may quote the very latest work they have undertaken. There was a mill at a place called Waterous and all the timber in the surrounding country was cut out in 1909; there was a very large plant, a good mill and a great number of men on the spot and some new place had to be found for the employment of the men and the plant. By the foresight of the Company that was done. They transferred the whole of the plant and staff to a place called Kirrup, where the mill was re-erected and set to work. Waterous was situated 11 miles from the Government railways and had cleaned up country as far east of the mill as 16 miles. The mill had worked at ten times the rate required by the Act, and the same mill re-erected at Kirrup is now working at five times the rate required by the Act. In its new position the mill represents two leases, one of 29,200 acres and another of 17,300 acres, and is placed near the boundary of the two so that it can operate both. Surely no one would say that the company ought to put a mill on each of these adjoining leases. The capacity of the mill under the Act would be 225 loads per month for one lease and 135 loads for the other, but the company, instead of putting up a mill with a capacity of 360 loads per month as required by the regulations, have established a mill with a working capacity of 1,500 loads per

month, and the capital value of the whole establishment at this new centre with its railways, buildings, houses and huts, represents a cost to the company of not less than £40,000. That will give some idea of the amount of capital there is required. I have had a return made showing the distances of the forests from the Government lines at different stations and they are—7 miles, 30 miles, 28 miles, 23 miles, 14 miles, 28 miles, and 13 miles; whilst at Karridale the mill is distant over 14 miles from the company's own port at Flinder's Bay. In regard to the statement that a monopoly has been created, I have already dealt with the question of timber areas and shown that the company do not monopolise all the timber areas, and that while they hold 280,000 acres of leasehold others hold 500,000 acres more. In the face of these figures no one can contend that this company have a monopoly. We now turn to the production of sawn timber. We find that Millars' work twelve mills producing 143,000 loads of sawn timber per year, whilst outside Millars' there are 26 mills producing 137,000 loads per annum, and to show that this is no mere statement, I may say that these figures were given in sworn evidence before the arbiration court recently. Surely there cannot be a monopoly when those figures are considered. As to other woods, the company do not sell nearly one-half of what is sold in the State. Just to mention a few firms that are importing independently and working in opposition to this Company, there are in soft woods, Bunning's, Whittaker's, Franklin & Finlay, Port, Honey & Co., J. Cowan, Buckingham Bros., Jones & Co., and George Wills & Co., whilst on the goldfields there are Anderson & Co., Stubbs, and Wills & Co., and at the northern port of Geraldton, Fallowfield. The combined trade of these firms amounts to probably three times that of Millars'. And, so far as sleeper hewing is concerned, it is well known that a large co-operative concern, ably managed by Mr. Jackman, is always working in competition with Millars'. These facts alone ought to remove any impression that Millars' have a monopoly. In regard to the price of timber, it was stated that the prices of jarrah, other woods, and joinery work, had been put up to such an extent in Western Australia that within two years the prices of piles has more than doubled, the price of sleepers has more than doubled, whilst joinery work has been increased to such an extent that work is being brought in from Melbourne, thus losing valuable industrial work to the State.

Hon. M. L. Moss: I said three years.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: It was also stated that jarrah is being sold cheaper in London and in Sydney than in Perth. The reply to that is that the price of jarrah sold by Millars' in ePrth was practically not altered for eight or nine years until two months ago when, for certain sizes the price was raised 6d. per hundred super feet on account of the extra cost of production, wages, etcetera. In one item, certainly an important item, namely flooring, contractors are now paying Millars' less than they were six years ago and are demanding a higher quality. I have here the price lists for 1909 and 1910 and they show that, with this exception of the increase of 6d. per hundred super feet, there is absolutely no difference in the prices. Millars' price for piles is less than it was five years ago, but prices for long piles, 50 feet and upwards, have been increased slightly on account of the difficulty of getting them on the company's areas. In fact the difficulty of getting piles of this length is so great that it hardly pays the company to sell them, and they would much sooner be without orders for them. In regard to slepers, it was stated that the prices had increased enormously. They certainly have gone up, especially the prices for sleepers for Government works. Some years ago the price for sleepers would be about 1s. 8d. but so far as the Government were concerned, the price had to be raised considerably for the reason that inspection by the Government inspectors is so severe that it is almost impossible to please them. They will not take a sleeper that is damaged, or has a gum crack, or is split, and their demands are so rigid that it is almost impossible to supply them; yet the sleepers

that the Government reject are exported and are willingly taken at other places abroad. Therefore, it was found necessary that the price to the Government should be put up, otherwise the company would rather not have Government work. There was no hardship in this because the Government could go to other companies, or could put on men to cut for them in their own forests. With regard to joinery, it was stated that orders were sent away for joinery because it could be imported cheaper. I have made inquiries and I can hear of no information of these orders having been sent out of the State; and so far as Millars' are concerned, they have as much as they possibly can undertake; they are working overtime and paying overtime rates in order to cope with the work, and if they can get the men are quite willing to put on 20 more carpenters and joiners tomorrow morning. I believe that a similar state of things exists in other shops. It must be remembered that a great incentive was given to the joinery trade owing to the Federal tariff, which prevented a lot of joinery work coming from America, particularly doors. Previously a great number of doors used to be made in America, but now most of them are made within the Commonwealth. As to a monopoly in joinery work, I can point to at least nine shops in Perth working independent of Millars' and in addition a number of contractors do their own work. So far as the price of soft woods is concerned, although there have been increases they have not been as much as they should have been, owing to the prices having gone up abroad; but to show that the prices and profits have not been excessive, I may mention that two of the largest firms in that line have had to close their doors. Probably some members may say that it was owing to Millars' selling too cheaply, but it cannot be argued that they sell cheaply enough to drive competition out of the market, and at the same time have a monopoly and charge high prices. Mr. Moss stated that the cost of building in the State had increased by about 30 per cent., and he inferred that it was owing to the increased price of timber and the monopoly in connection with soft woods and jarrah. That is not so. To give a case in point, Millars' company, to show what unbounded faith they have in Western Australia, have recently purchased the premises in St. George's-terrace, formerly occupied by the *Morning Herald*, and it is their intention to put up a building there at a cost of about £40,000. Early in 1910 they had estimates and plans prepared, but recently, on going into the matter again their architect told them that the estimates and plans must be revised with an addition of 25 per cent. to the cost. That could not be on account of the cost of timber, because the company would provide their own timber. With regard to the advance in the price of buildings, I have been told that the undoubted explanation of the increased cost of buildings at the present time, as compared with three or four years ago, is principally the fact that bricks have increased from 10s. to 12s. 6d. per thousand. That shows that the cost of building, although it has gone up, and I know it has, is not entirely confined to the timber business; and during the last eighteen months the cost of the production of jarrah has gone up at least 6s., mostly due to the rise in wages and partially due to the long distances over which logs and timber have now to be carried, and partially to the imposition of extra charges of railage and wharfage at the different places.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Six shillings per hundred?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: No, 6s. per load. One factor is the long distance which the logs have to be carted now. The logs have been cleared out near at hand and they have to cover a longer distance to haul the logs. It must also be remembered that the imposition of Federal duties has raised the price of rails and machinery and everything the company import. These three factors go a long way towards raising the price of timber, first the distance it has to be carried, next the higher price for wharfage, I think it is double, and the imposition of the Federal duties. Against that the company have made the most untiring efforts to realise better prices in the United Kingdom and other places, and

to some extent they have been successful, or probably if they had not obtained increased prices they would have had to close down. As to the statement made that jarrah was sold at a less price in London and elsewhere than in Perth, it is too absurd to answer; whoever informed the hon. member did not know what he was talking about. In Sydney there is some ground for the statement because Sydney has a large quantity of hardwoods which come into competition with the West Australian hardwoods and they are sold at a cheaper rate. The timbers disposed of in Sydney are what are called off-cuts or the small sizes, of which there is a plethora in Western Australia, but the trade is small, it does not amount to 200 loads a month; but the depot is kept there so that the company may keep in touch with the trade that comes along; it is, however, done at a loss so far. The next statement I have is that the company have beaten the men on most occasions. Mr. Moss gives one the impression that Millars' have always won in the industrial troubles with the men.

Hon. M. L. Moss: I think you are misquoting me there, I did not say that; the statement I made was that, although Millars' had had industrial troubles they generally came out first best as the result of the increased facilities they obtained from the Government and the advantages they get in railway freights.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: As far as the disputes with the men are concerned, for four years Millars' were working under a mutual agreement, the price was raised from time to time, but there have been no disputes since the great strike, and we have been working in accord at a raised price. The agreement the men are working under is hardly twelve months old, but as evidence that it is considered satisfactory by the men they are trying to get the other companies to adopt it. A return has been made out as to what the men get on an average, and I find that the working employees get from 9s. a day for eight hours work, and if the piece work men are included it comes to 10s. 2d. a day. These are substantial wages, and if you go to any part of the world, certainly to any part of the Commonwealth, I do not think you will find a better paid class of men than those employed by this company. Now I come to the statement that the company have received tens of thousands of pounds from the Government in cheaper railway freights. The hon. member no doubt was referring to the agreement made in June, 1907, on the settlement of the big strike. People have come to the conclusion that the company gained an advantage. It was a ten per cent. discount on all timber forwarded in train load lots, and train load lots consist of 130 tons. This same system of giving a concession to train load lots is in vogue in all parts of the world. On this occasion it was given as a sort of concession for the strike. This concession was cancelled after it had been 2½ years in existence: it was cancelled in September, 1909, and the total rebates received by Millars' in the 2½ years amounted to £13,000. This concession, which perhaps a great many people think a lot about, is no more than that given every day by the Railway Department to people owning stock. If a person sends seven trucks of stock that person receives a reduction of 10 per cent, and if a person sends eight or nine trucks of stock that person gets a reduction of 20 per cent. Anyone can get that concession to-morrow, therefore, in this case, the department were not giving anything away, although it appeared like it. This concession was made at a time to enable the company to come to some agreement with the men on a certain point of wages, seeing that the men were out on strike and would not work under an award made by the Arbitration Court. I believe there was a certain amount of arbitration, and the result was that if Millars' paid a certain increased rate a reduction would be made to them. Millars' had to pay an average per year of the allowance which amounted to £5,200 a year, whereas the extra wages, which Millars' had to pay, came to about £9,000 or £10,000 a year. When the Government withdrew the 10 per cent. concession they also doubled the wharfage rates at Bunbury and elsewhere, and made

up in one year the concession which was granted to them in 2½ years. That increased the cost to the company by £8,000 a year, the excuse being that the State was hard up for money, and it was thought the timber trade was best able to provide the necessary revenue. Therefore, the hon. member's charge is brought down to this: that in 2½ years, from June, 1907, to December, 1909, the company received in rebates £13,000, the whole of which was recovered by the Government in 1910 in extra railage and wharfage. No extra concession whatever was ever given to the company. This 10 per cent. reduction was only a fair trade reduction, but was given under the special circumstances. The only reduction the company ever had was to work under the same conditions as anyone else. I shall not weary the House much longer, but I want to deal with the question as to whether the company do good or harm to the State. At the risk of repetition I must point out that the company rescued the timber industry in this State from chaos and put it on a substantial and good footing. Instead of eight struggling companies with eight different directorates and establishments, each trying to compete with the other both in this State and London, each trying to undersell the other, none of them able to employ a large number of men or pay good wages, a state of affairs Mr. Moss would have us return to, as I gather from his statement; I say instead of this we have a company doing fairly well, able to employ a large number of men, able to pay the best wages in the Commonwealth, able to export and exploit the timber business throughout the world. Where would the business have been if it had not been for the enterprise of this company? Besides the United Kingdom, they have, at great expense and trouble and energy, established depots in New Zealand, four in Africa, four in India, two in South America, Manila, Egypt, Straits Settlement, Shanghai, Germany, Antwerp, and Holland, and all over the Commonwealth. They are doing this, and out of the jarrah trade they are now getting some return for their energy and enterprise. It has taken them some seven years to expend their money in finding out these depots and to place on a good footing their business, and it has only been during the last two years that they have had any dividends at all. I do not think many of us would like to put our money into industries which would not return any revenue for seven years. I will now give a few particulars very briefly, as to the operations of the company and leave hon. members to judge as to whether the company are doing good to the country, or, as Mr. Moss says, whether we have a monopoly built up which is working to the detriment and disadvantage of the State. Their railways, plant, mills, machinery, buildings, etcetera, in Western Australia represent a value of £650,000, independent of their freehold possessions, which are assessed at £84,000, on which they pay taxes to the Government of this State and the Federal Government, in addition to their dividend duty tax on their Western Australian profits, while their stock and book debts amount to just on £400,000. They paid in timber leasehold rents in 1910, £9,189. The total actual cash expended from the Perth office during 1910 amounted to £1,019,000. The total number of men employed according to the latest figures is 2,364, and the actual wages paid for 1910 amounted to £456,500. They operate 278 miles of railway, and they have in work something like 700 horses, and consumed during the year 1910, 3,300 tons of chaff; 93,000 bushels of oats, and 96,000 bushels of bran, while to feed the men whom they employ they used £4,500 worth of flour and £14,000 worth of sheep and cattle. The bill paid to the Government railways for 1910 amounted to £112,800. Three-quarters of Millars' jarrah trade is an export trade and every load of timber that leaves the country represents about £3 5s. per load actually spent in this State and, consequently, foreign money brought into the State. This industry is not like the industry of wheat-growing, where each man is cutting against the other, but it sends its produce out of the country and introduces here what we want in exchange, namely, hard money, and that is one great advantage

in connection with this business. They have exported during 1910 no fewer than 177,000 loads, so that you will find the company have been instrumental in bringing into Western Australia during 1910 the sum of £578,000. The company constitute a most valuable consumer to have within the State, consuming a large amount of produce of different kinds, and offering an incentive to people to breed good draught horses. Moreover this is all done with foreign money. As far as the shipping is concerned, I need only refer to the town and port of Bunbury. Hon. members know Bunbury pretty well, and are probably quite aware that the ships are brought into Bunbury as fast as they can be got to take the timber away; so no one can say that the company are not working their leases to the best of their ability and trying to send their produce away and realise on it as quickly as possible. Three of the chief statements urged against the company by Mr. Moss were dummying, monopoly, and the raising of prices. I think you will all agree with me that I have answered him, and, I hope, satisfactorily. I have given all the information I can, and if you still think it necessary to have a Royal Commission I will see that all possible information is afforded to the commission. At the same time I may add that very little more than this can be given, because I have placed frankly before you every detail in connection with the office. Before sitting down I would ask the Press to give a full report of what I have said. The remarks of Mr. Moss have been publicly set forth in their columns and, having on the one hand published the remarks of Mr. Moss, it is only fair that the Press should publish my reply. I have nothing further to say other than to again ask hon. members whether, in view of the information and facts I have placed before them, they think we have a monopoly built up which is working to the detriment and disadvantage of the State?

Hon. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): I cannot allow this discussion to go without having a few words to say. I contend that no better advertisement could be given to Millars' Company than to ask for a Royal Commission. I am pretty well cognizant of the working of that company, but at the same time it does one good to hear the facts and figures supplied to us by Sir Edward Wittenoom. What do we find? That that company are employing a large number of men. I contend that what Western Australia is languishing for at the present time is industrial life. This I count, at all events, about the third industry in Western Australia. I say, and I know what I am talking about, each and every one of the men employed is a bona fide producer of wealth. What we suffer from to a great extent is that too many of us are living one upon the other. This is not the case in respect to this industry. They are bona fide turning into money what otherwise would be useless to the State. The figures given show that the company have hitherto carried on successfully, and I say that any industry which does well for itself is doing well for the community at large. We take, for instance, the amount of carriage over the railways. I will ask any hon. gentleman, in view of the figures given, can we avoid regarding this timber carriage as one of the main factors contributing to the prosperity of our railways? One has only to go to Bunbury to see six or seven steamers alongside the jetty, all loading timber. In my opinion Millar Brothers have more than carried out the spirit of the Act. It was contended they should be compelled to have a mill on every concession and to turn out with each of these mills a tiddly-winking quantity of timber in order to comply absolutely with the letter of the Act. But what have they done? They have gone at it in a business-like way, and have planted huge mills on two or three concessions, and the aggregate output of timber from these mills more than exceeds the total amount they would be compelled to turn out under the conditions of the lease. Now it appears to me that what is asked is that they shall do away with their business-like methods, and, in order to comply with the conditions of the lease, shall have a number of small mills erected at a cost so enormous that no company could stand against it. I do not desire

to say much about this, but it may be contended that they are denuding or destoying the forests, and that the country is getting nothing for it. It has already been pointed out that they are paying more per acre per annum to the Government for the right to cut that timber, which in years to come will renew itself, than do the people who actually buy the land. I think that should commend itself to all. I would like to have something to say on this. I was in hope the hon. gentleman who mentioned the question was going into the subject of what is to be done to restore the timber now being cut out. There is this difference between timber and gold. The gold is in the ground, and so long as it is there it is of no use to anybody, while once it is taken out it is no longer there and will not come back again. The timber also is there until such time as it is turned into money. Until then it is of no use to anybody. But, unlike the gold, the timber will reproduce itself. What has been going on in the forests for thousands of years is obvious. Jarrah trees have been growing up, maturing and going to decay. It is nothing but common domestic economy to assume that, once matured, these trees begin to deteriorate; and that being so, it is in the interests of the State that they should be converted into a marketable commodity before deterioration and decay set in. I would like to hear the hon. member's views as to the conserving of young forests after the timber has been taken off them. It has been contended the company should simply work each of their separate concessions with a little mill. That, to my mind, is absolutely ridiculous. So long as the company carry out the spirit of the agreement nothing more should be required, and I contend that they have exceed this by far. We come next to the complaint that they have made money. I rejoice to think that they have; for I like to see all who invest their money in Western Australia secure a reasonable return for the outlay. I say this Royal Commission should not be appointed if it is going to cost the State anything at all. However, if the appointment is insisted upon it will prove the best advertisement the company ever had.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE (South-East): After the explanation given by Sir Edward Wittenoom I think Mr. Moss should withdraw his motion. Having heard what I have, and knowing the surrounding circumstances, I think the motion should be withdrawn.

Hon. E. McLARTY (South-West): I feel called upon to make a few remarks in regard to this motion. As one living in that particular part of the country where the timber is secured I am in a position to know pretty well what is going on, and I can assure hon. members that unless they have happened to travel through the South-West province they can form very little idea of the enormous quantity of timber being turned out every day. If the complaint is that the timber is not being cut fast enough, I think there is very little foundation for it. What troubles me is the question of how long this output can be kept up. The timber in the South-West is employing an enormous number of men, and also providing a market for the agriculturists, thus affecting the railway to an astonishing extent. Again, at Bunbury one can see the busy state of affairs on that jetty, all due to the timber industry. One cannot help but wonder what will be the result when these forests have been cut out. What is then going to keep the railways and the shipping going? With regard to the price of timber, I believe it is pretty high, but at the same time we must consider that wages and the general cost of producing are equally high. As Sir Edward Wittenoom has pointed out, these mills soon cut out the timber over a considerable area, and, consequently, the company have to extend their railway at great expense, and haul the timber over long distances to the saw-mills. Necessarily the expense keeps on increasing; however, I think no exception can be taken to Sir Edward Wittenoom's explanation as to the putting down of big mills to work two or three leases. It is surprising to go to those timber mills and to see how well the workmen are provided for. It gives the impression that mills are not put up simply to last a few weeks, but that they are built with a view to carrying on work

for many years to come. I think there can be no question with regard to the company doing their duty with reference to the output of timber; they are carrying on the export at an enormous rate. I have no desire to see any more timber cut than there is now, because I fully realise how disastrous it will be when all the people engaged in the industry are thrown out of employment, and the production will be considerably lessened. There is no need for this Commission. I am not prepared to say whether the timber is at a higher price than it should be in a country where it is so plentiful; but with this exception, I am in a position to say the company have done splendid work, and have been not only of immense advantage to the timber industry, but have given an impetus to every other industry and calling throughout the South-West.

On motion by Hon. V. Hamersley debate adjourned.

BILL—PARLIAMENTARY ALLOWANCES.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—ELECTORAL.

Assembly's amendments.

Schedule of six amendments made by the Legislative Assembly now considered.

In Committee.

No. 1.—Clause 1, line 8, strike out "March" and insert "May" in lieu thereof.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Most of the amendments were small. This provided that the Act should come into operation in May. He would—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

No. 2.—Clause 6, strike out paragraphs (c) and (d) and insert the following new paragraphs in lieu thereof:—"(c) By inserting in Subsection one, after the words 'to vote,' the words 'at any polling place in the district'; and (d) By inserting after the word 'district' in lines two and four of Subsection two the words 'or sub-district.'"

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This provided that where one person passed from one subdistrict to another subdistrict in the same electoral district he should not be disfranchised. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

No. 3.—Clause 8, insert after "amended" in line 31, "By adding the following words to Part iii. of paragraph (e): —'who are wholly dependent on relief from the State except as a patient under treatment for accident or disease in a hospital,' and."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This provided that inmates of charitable institutions not wholly dependent on the State should not be disfranchised. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

No. 4 (consequential)—agreed to.

No. 5.—Strike out Clause 30 and insert provisions relating to questions to be put to voters (*vide Minutes*).

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amendment provided that certain questions were to be put to the elector who was on a roll for a district where he did not reside at the time of an election. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

No. 6.—Add the following new clause to stand as Clause 39:—"Section 208 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the word 'officer,' in lines two and three, and inserting 'attesting witness' in place thereof."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This was an amendment to provide that the person to attest an illiterate elector's name need not necessarily be an officer of the department. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Assembly.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

All Stages.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly) in moving the second reading said: It is not necessary for me to speak at any length in moving the second reading of this Bill. It is not usual for the House to debate at any length the Estimates for the year. This is a Bill covering the supplies provided on the Loan Estimates and the Revenue Estimates for the current financial year. If hon. members desire any information I shall be very pleased to give it in Committee, but I presume, as these Estimates have been thrashed item by item in another place, all the information that is required has already been conveyed to hon. members. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East): There are two or three things to be said more emphatically in this House than in the other. I want the Colonial Secretary to convey to the Minister for Railways an urgent message that many of the trains are unable to carry the traffic, and before long, if he does not expedite the provision of more trucks, and conveniences for passenger traffic as well, a very serious condition of things will result.

The Colonial Secretary: That matter is receiving attention now.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: As far as can be seen the Minister for Railways has not not yet been seized by the seriousness of the position, and with the enormous acceleration of railway building this country will be in a very bad way for trucks and travelling conveniences. Another matter I would like to touch upon is that in the general administration, both Houses of the Legislature desire that every civil servant shall be fairly considered and that it shall not be left to any civil servant to go and fight his own battles to gain the rights due to him under the Statutes. The civil service should have the best men and get the best work done and pay the best wages in the State, and that it not being done.

The Colonial Secretary: They have all had increases this year.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: All?

The Colonial Secretary: Not all; the rank and file.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: There are a number of men who will not set influences to work and cannot get their rights.

The Colonial Secretary: They are all treated under a scale.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: I fear they are not. These servants must be the best, and that result can only be obtained by every civil servant being treated fairly and justly. I believe we shall have to deal with a Bill to increase the salaries of members shortly, but, while I am not permitted to discuss that just now, I may be permitted to refer to the servants of the State who are not treated with due consideration. Some I shall mention, and as I cannot possibly refer to the officers I shall refer to the offices they fill. In New South Wales in the Legislative Council the clerical service costs £2,690 a year; Western Australia pays £800. In the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales the cost for clerical service is £3,173, whereas in Western Australia the cost is £950. I admit that the affairs of Western Australia are on a smaller scale, but if hon. members will think a little they will find that the scale does not make such a great difference in the actual work to be done. There is practically the same ground to be covered in the duties of these officials; they have the same time and labour. The chief officers of the House occupy not merely a place of service in the House but a kind of representative position. They are looked to to supplement the representative positions filled by the President and Speaker. Western Australia has not begun to treat her chief clerical officers as she should do. Imagine the Clerk of Parlia-

ments of Western Australia with all his responsibilty receiving £450 a year, and the Clerk Assistant, who is Clerk of the Executive Council and Usher of the Black Rod, drawing £350 a year. I hope the Minister will have this matter looked into and see that justice is done. This State could afford to do what is fair and just to all who are in the service, and especially those who hold responsible positions.

Hon. E. McLARTY (South-West : I would like to say a word or two to supplement the remarks made by Mr. Cullen with regard to the railway rolling stock. I put two or three questions to the leader of the House a few weeks ago and the answers I got were very unsatisfactory, and I say without hesitation that they were absolutely incorrect. In answer to one question as to whether the department expected to be in a position to meet the requirements for rolling stock the Colonial Secretary replied that they would be in that position if they got sufficient notice. I would like to know what they call sufficient notice, because a little while ago three solid days were allowed to elapse before a reply could be obtained regarding rolling stock and I believe last week one hundred head of fat cattle which were waiting to be trucked on market day were left behind because rolling stock could not be obtained to take them to the market. In this matter the department are not up to date. The requirements are becoming very great and nothing appears to have been done during the past twelve months to increase the facilities for trucking of live stock. With such an establishment as we have at Midland Junction it should not take very long to turn out 30 or 40 stock trucks. I hope this matter will receive urgent attention and that some provision will be made to meet the requirements of the trade.

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.

Read a third time and *passed.*

BILL—SUPPLY, 1911-12.

All stages.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly) in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and from moneys to credit of the General Loan Fund the sum of £1,683,700 to the service of the year ending 30th June, 1912. This is a somewhat unique measure in the history of the Parliament of Western Australia, although not so in other Parliaments. It is briefly to provide for supply for the first four months of the financial year 1911-12. The circumstances are somewhat peculiar, inasmuch as Parliament is in session very late this year, and the general elections for another place will take place in the middle of this year. Those facts, together with the absence of the Premier in connection with the coronation celebrations in London, and the possible absence of other members, are responsible for the fact that there will be no session until after the new Parliament is elected, which will probably be in September or October. That being so, and the supplies we have just obtained only being sufficient to take us up to the end of June, it would be necessary to have a short session of Parliament, say in June or July, for the purpose of granting supplies for the first part of the next financial year. In order to obviate that, we are asking for a supply for the months of July, August, September, and October. If Parliament did meet in June or July in the ordinary way, a Supply Bill would come down and would be endorsed by the passing of an Appropriation Bill in the same way as we have done to-night. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

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.

Read a third time and *passed.*

ADJOURNMENT — STATE OF BUSINESS.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly): I intend to move that the House at its rising adjourn till 10.30 to-morrow morning.

Hon. T. F. O. Brimage: Cannot you clear the Notice Paper first?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think we have done a fair thing, seeing that we have been sitting since 2.15. It is hoped that to-morrow we may be able to get through the business of the session, and then adjourn for a fortnight. Provided that can be done, it is proposed to prorogue Parliament by proclamation. It has been usual in the past to prorogue in another form, but it is considered that on this occasion it will be more convenient to prorogue by proclamation. It is intended, therefore, on the completion of business to adjourn, probably for a week.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Have you no fixed hour for the adjournment?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Perhaps we may not be able to get through the business, and in that case we would have to meet again next week. I beg to move—

That the House at its rising do adjourn till 10.30 a.m. to-morrow.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The Colonial Secretary might have given hon. members some idea of the Government's intentions in regard to the motion dealing with the Bullfinch water supply.

The Colonial Secretary: I had hoped to reach it to-day.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The Minister gave me to understand that it would be brought on to-day.

The Colonial Secretary: And I hoped that it would.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: I hope that the Notice Paper will be cleared. There are only a couple of motions on the Paper, and that dealing with the Bullfinch water supply would take only a few minutes to dispose of.

The Colonial Secretary: It would take longer than that.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: We have been doing Government business all the day, and private business ought now to receive some consideration, especially having regard to the urgency of the matter I have brought forward. To-morrow, I suppose, we will adjourn the House for a long term, and no expression of opinion will be obtained on this motion. It seems to me that the Colonial Secretary is trying to gag members by not bringing this matter before the Chamber.

The Colonial Secretary: I object to the hon. member's statement that I am trying to gag members.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: I say it, and I mean it.

The Colonial Secretary: I ask that the hon. member withdraw that statement.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think that it is offensive.

The Colonial Secretary: Well, I do.

The PRESIDENT: If the Minister feels that it is offensive I am sure that the hon. member will withdraw the remark.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: I do not know whether it is offensive or not, but that is my opinion.

The PRESIDENT: I am afraid that the hon. member cannot hear me. If the Minister personally feels it offensive I am sure that the hon. member will withdraw the offensive term.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: I do not want any statement I make to be offensive. I say what I mean.

The Colonial Secretary: That is not satisfactory. The hon. member repeats the statement and says he means it.

The PRESIDENT: I say again, that I do not think the hon. member can hear me. Will the hon. member withdraw the expression because it is offensive?

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: I withdraw the remark.

The Colonial Secretary: There is no justification for the hon. member making that remark at all. I was hoping to get that motion on to-day, and was just as

anxious as the hon. member to have it disposed of.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: I would have been quite satisfied if the Minister had made a statement regarding the matter, and given the House some encouragement that there would be a reduction in the price of water at Bullfinch.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.9 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 2nd February, 1911.

	PAGE
Papers presented	3663, 3700
Questions: Education, Modern School	3663
Police district, Northern	3663
Bills: Health, Council's amendments	3663
Public Library: Museum, and Art Gallery of Western Australia, Council's amendments	3665
Transfer of Land Act Amendment, Council's amendments	3665
Loan, £2,100,000, 2R., Com., 3R.	3666
Appropriation, all stages	3679
Parliamentary Allowances, 2R., Com., 3R. ...	3679
Supply 1911-12, all stages	3686
Cemeteries Act Amendment, 2R., Com., 3R.	3687
Permanent Reserves Rededication, 2R., Com., 3R.	3688
Roman Catholic Church Property, 2R., Com., 3R.	3698
Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Amendment, 2R., Com., 3R.	3698
Fisheries Act Amendment, 2R., Com., 3R. ...	3698
Jury Act Amendment, 2R., Com., 3R.	3700
Fremantle Harbour Trust Act Amendment, 2R., Com., 3R.	3702
Game Act, Amendment, 2R., Com., 3R. ...	3706
Loan Estimates, General discussion concluded, votes discussed	3671
Coronation ceremonies, the Premier's invitation	3677
Supplementary Estimates	3679
Bills returned from the Council	3698

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

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Mines: Report on investigations into the composition of the gases caused by blasting in mines.

QUESTION—EDUCATION, MODERN SCHOOL.

Mr. PRICE asked the Minister for Education,—1, Is the construction of the Modern School sufficiently advanced to allow of intending scholars receiving proper tuition therein during the first term? 2, Is it a fact that Mr. Brown, when receiving scholars on the opening day, notified them that it will be fully three months before the school is in proper working order? 3, If so will steps be taken to provide that scholars shall receive further tuition in a subsequent term so as to compensate for any lost time?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Yes. 2, No. 3, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—POLICE DISTRICT, NORTHERN.

Mr. HEITMANN (without notice) asked the Premier: Has he yet received information concerning the postponed questions asked by myself in reference to the expenses of Sub-Inspector Sellenger?

The PREMIER replied: I furnished a reply to the two postponed questions two days ago.

Mr. Heitmann: I was not aware of that.

BILL—HEALTH.

Council's Amendments.

Consideration resumed from the previous day on postponed requested amendments.

Mr. Taylor in the Chair; the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

No. 52.—Clause 229.—Strike out this clause.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: When originally the Bill was before the Chamber the member for North Fremantle had succeeded in inserting a clause providing for exemptions from vaccination. This clause had been struck out in another place, and he proposed to ask the Chamber to agree to the striking out of the clause. He had discussed this matter with the member for North Fremantle and it had been agreed between them that the matter had been sufficiently debated