by Mr. Kingsmill, showing that goods could be carried 100 miles farther at a less rate. I am hopeful that the Government will see fit to take back the railways and have them placed again under Ministerial control; or if that is not done, then the control should be put under three commissioners instead of one; for I think that department is too large to be managed efficiently by one commissioner. Five years ago I opposed the Bill for appointing a commissioner, and subsequent events have fully justified my anticipations; and I really think the present commissioner is partially to blame for the introduction of this land tax to-night. I intend to support the second reading, and I regret that the Government have had to bring down this Bill. I have this much confidence in the Government, that I think they would not have brought it down unless they felt it was really necessary to have more taxation for carrying on the work of the country.

On motion by the HON. C. E. DEMPSTER, debate adjourned.

FEDERATION RESOLUTION—TO WITHDRAW.

Message received from the Legislative Assembly, requesting the Council's concurrence in a resolution affirming that Western Australia should withdraw from the Federal Union (as proposed by Mr. Monger).

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Will any member take charge of this motion?

HON. M. L. MOSS: I have had no request to take charge of this, but I will move that consideration of the Message be made an order for this day week.

Question passed.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I believe there is another hon. member who desires to father the resolution.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY expressed a hope that the debate would be concluded at the next sitting, because the Treasurer had arranged to deliver his Budget on Monday evening next, and having to leave for Melbourne on the Tuesday the delivery of the Financial Statement could not be delayed. It was necessary therefore that the debate in this House should be concluded in order that the Treasurer might know the effect this Bill would have on his financial arrangements. If the debate were not concluded at the next sitting, it would be necessary to adjourn till Friday, and conclude it then.

The House adjourned at 10·30 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 26th September, 1906.

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: 1, Balance-sheets of the Government Refrigerating Works for the three years ended 30th June, 1906.

By the MINISTER FOR MINES: 1, Papers relating to the Sale of the Government Smelter at Ravensthorpe.

PAPERS ON TABLE, REMOVAL.

THE PREMIER: Was there any period for the papers to lie on the table, or had they to remain there during the session? There were several files that

had been produced; would it be possible to take them away?

MR. SPEAKER: They were under the control of the Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Presumably if they were to be removed, members would give notice a day or two beforehand.

MR. SPEAKER: It was not necessary to give notice. Of course if there was a desire to remove papers, he would deem it his duty out of courtesy to inform members.

MR. TAYLOR: In the past, before papers were removed the Speaker would inform the House that the papers were required by a certain date, and that he hoped members would read them up within the next three days, as they would be taken away. There was no compulsion about it.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Only to-day he was asked if he would be able to bring back the papers relating to assistance to prospectors. They were wanted in the office. He was going to suggest that if a Minister wanted papers back he might ask for the time to be fixed when they might be released, so that members might know.

QUESTION—SURVEYOR'S IRREGULARITIES.

MR. TROY asked the Premier: 1, Was an inquiry recently held into the conduct of a surveyor licensed under the transfer of Land Act, in declaring to plans of surveys not personally made by him, and other irregularities? 2, How many charges were made against him? 3, How many were investigated? 4, What was the finding of the Board of Inquiry? 5, Was any action taken in the direction of cancelling his license, as provided under the Transfer of Land Act and the Regulations thereunder?

THE PREMIER replied: 1. Yes 2. Six. 3. Five. 4. In the course of a rather lengthy finding, dealing to a large extent with technicalities, the officers conducting the inquiry stated that the surveyor was guilty of negligence, errors in survey, and noncompliance with certain of the Regulations. 5. No. The Government considers that the case will be met by a reprimand intimating that a repetition of such conduct will result in the cancellation of his license under the Transfer of Land Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by MR. TROY, leave of absence for one fortnight was granted to Mr. Lynch on the ground of urgent private business.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK.

CONSOLIDATION AND AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the HONORARY MINISTER, and read a first time.

REPORT—BATTERIES INQUIRY BOARD.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret) moved—

That the Report of the Inquiry Board on the State battery system, together with appendices, be printed.

This motion was moved by him some days ago, and withdrawn on the advice of the Minister for Mines, who stated that if it did not cost more than a certain figure to print the report it would be printed. The Minister having informed him that it would cost rather more than that figure and that it was not his intention to have the report printed, he (Mr. Taylor) now moved the motion again to allow the House to decide. He desired to have it printed wholly on account of its value to the State; not alone to the mining community, but to the whole of the taxpayers in Western Australia. The report was not a voluminous one. It was found that the cost was far in excess of what the Minister anticipated when he appointed the board. He believed the Minister intimated then that it would cost something like £400, whereas we found that it had cost, as admitted by the Minister himself, £1,100. We found also from inquiry at the printing department by the Minister that the cost of printing would be something like 40 and odd pounds; £41 or £43, if he remembered correctly.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Between £42 and £43.

MR. TAYLOR: The State battery system had caused a great deal of comment, not alone in the mining areas, but

throughout the length and breadth of this State, and this was practically the only systematic inquiry which had been held since the system had been initiated in Western Australia. It had only grown into great prominence within the last few years, and we found the system had been lauded to the skies both in this Chamber and out of it. It was eulogised by the various Ministers who had had control of the Mines Department since its initiation. It was also one of the things which members in the goldfields electorates, at any rate, used at elections as being something which the Government of this State had done to farther the interests of the goldfields, to give cheap facilities for prospectors to open up our new goldfields, and in the case of private enterprise to offer crushing facilities where necessary. The State battery system had been proved to be of value in mining centres which previous to the introduction of the system were considered places which one would do well to keep away from. The system had cost the State a very large amount of money, and he believed the report dealt with something over 200 and odd thousand pounds. He did not want to pass any strictures on the Minister controlling the department or upon the officers. He would leave the report itself to speak in that direction? The questions submitted to the inquiry had been answered, and he wanted them to be in print so that they would be in the records of this Parliament for all time. A typewritten copy of the report was presented to the House. Of what value was it to members? The only opportunity afforded of perusing it was during the day time before the House sat or on days on which the House was not sitting. Many members desired to peruse it, and no one could get the gist of the report from one reading. Whatever merit it had in dealing with practical questions it had no semblance of literary talent; one could see that the report was drawn up by practical men; but the absence of literary talent was nothing to the discredit of the members of the board, who had devoted considerable time and study to the questions submitted to them. The report was valuable to all concerned with the public battery system. It dealt with the political chief of the system, presumably the Minister for Mines, with the executive chief, presumably the Secretary for Mines, with the superintendent of the system, and with the managers of the batteries. That being so, it was absolutely necessary that all directly concerned in conducting the system should be in possession of a copy of the report, and every prospector treating stone at the battery should have a knowledge of the system under which our batteries were conducted. With all due respect to the Minister for Mines and his desire for economy, it was false economy to object to printing the report, which would only cost £40 at the Government Printing Office, and judging by the opinions expressed by members from time to time, that was not the cheapest form of printing. Could it be said that a typewritten copy of the report was giving the State proper value for the expenditure of over £1,100? The £40 odd, which would be the cost of printing the report, would be a mere cypher on the total cost of the report; and seeing that the report had such far-reaching effects on so many persons, it should be printed and circulated and placed within reach of all concerned. Also, since private batteries were contrasted with our public batteries, the report would be valuable to many not immediately connected with the public battery system. Again, the whole State was taxed for the construction of these batteries, so the report was of public interest and should be made available to the taxpayers of the State. The Minister should reconsider his previous decision as to cost being in the way of printing a report which was the most valuable we had had on the public battery system. He (Mr. Taylor) did not know the gentlemen concerned in framing the report. He dealt with the report on its merits, and assumed that it was based on facts gleaned after the closest scrutiny and investigation; yet all the Minister furnished to the House was a document containing 23 pages of foolscap, containing merely the recommendations of the board.

THE MINISTER: The rest would have followed had it not been for this motion.

MR. TAYLOR: No one would argue that material could be typewritten more cheaply than printed. It seemed almost an insult to the intelligence of the House for the Minister to submit such a docu-

ment as this. The people should know fully how our money was expended and the value obtained from the expenditure. Members representing other than goldfields constituencies should be impressed with the value this report would have if fully circulated. In order to have the report bound up in the printed papers of the House we should have the report printed. That in itself was almost sufficient reason for carrying the motion.

MR. HOLMAN seconded the motion.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): It would be wrong if a large number of members desired the report to be printed to oppose such a motion on the score of the small saving of expenditure, and as the Leader of the Opposition had informed him that he (Mr. Bath) desired the report to be printed, he (the Minister) would give instructions that it be printed immediately. As members knew, the inquiry had cost £1,100, which was considerably more than he (the Minister) had any idea of when it was first started; and as the cost of printing the report would be £40, he had considered that it would be sufficient if he had typewritten copies made for the purpose of enabling members to peruse the report, and if a copy was sent to each prospectors' association. It did not cost much to run off typewritten copies; 100 copies cost £2 15s., and another 100 copies of the balance of the report could be produced at about the same sum. Probably the member for Mount Margaret was not aware that a typewritten document would be placed among the papers of the House. Orders would be given to have the report printed, and it would be distributed to the various goldfields centres to give the greatest possible publicity to it.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—FEDERATION DETRIMENTAL, THIS STATE TO WITHDRAW.

Order of the day read for resuming debate on the motion by Mr. Monger—

That the Union of Western Australia with the other States in the Commonwealth of Australia has proved detrimental to the best interests of this State, and that the time has arrived for placing before the people the question of withdrawing from such union.

MR. MONGER: Has no member on the Opposition side anything to say? I am prepared to go to a division.

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

Ayes	...	...	19
Noes	...	...	13
Majority for	...	...	6

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Brebber	Mr. Bath
Mr. Brown	Mr. Bolton
Mr. Carson	Mr. Collier
Mr. Davies	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Ewing	Mr. Holman
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Hudson
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Gull	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Hayward	Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Layman	Mr. Taylor
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Male	Mr. Walker
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Troy (*Teller*).
Mr. Monger	
Mr. Smith	
Mr. Stone	
Mr. Veryard	
Mr. A. J. Wilson	
Mr. Hardwick (*Teller*).	

Question thus passed.

CONSEQUENTIAL MOTION.

MR. MONGER moved that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Legislative Council, and their concurrence desired therein.

MR. TAYLOR: If no other member desires to express his protest against carrying this stupidity any farther, I will enter my protest.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not reflect on members' votes.

MR. TAYLOR: I have no desire to reflect.

MR. SPEAKER: That does reflect.

MR. TAYLOR: The vote itself does that without any mentioning of it by me. I want to say that we have done sufficient this afternoon to point out not alone to the Federal Parliament, but to all the Parliaments in the Commonwealth and Parliaments beyond the Commonwealth, the idiotic position taken up by passing a resolution of this description.

POINT OF ORDER.

MR. FOULKES: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in describing a decision arrived at by this House as being idiotic?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw. That it is a reflection on members.

MR. TAYLOR: I did not say anything about the vote. I spoke of the resolution as an idiotic resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: It is a reflection.

MR. TAYLOR: I want to be perfectly clear. I said it was an idiotic resolution.

MR. FOULKES: Again I rise——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw. The expression is taken exception to by a member of the House, and therefore must be withdrawn.

DEBATE.

MR. TAYLOR: In accordance with the forms of the House, I withdraw the observation to which the member for Claremont takes exception; but I want to enter my protest against the resolution going any farther than it has gone already. I think that no matter where you discuss it in this State you cannot make it any way effective. If members, or any section of this community, desire to withdraw from the Federal union, I want to see them go into the matter in a whole-hearted manner and do something that will reflect credit upon those who take up that attitude, and not have a resolution of this description. I am perfectly satisfied it may not be received in another place with the warmth perhaps members may think it will be; but I certainly want to enter my protest as a member of this Chamber against being in any way responsible at all for its passage or transit from here to another place, though that place is very close, being at the other end of this building. I want to hear members express themselves. Members have taken but very little interest in the resolution, and the resolution from its very inception was only a joke in the eyes of the majority of members of the Chamber. I want members to be thoroughly in earnest. Now that members have seen the action taken on the resolution, I am sure that they would be much more pleased if a division had never been taken on it. [MEMBERS: No.] It is absurd. I am echoing the sentiments of the best brains of this House when I say the matter has only been treated lightly. One or two members who were enthusiastic either as anti-feds or federalists during the referendum gave the House the value of their mature ideas upon the question of federation or otherwise, and some of the speeches were very able. They were delivered in this House and in the country during the anti-federal fight. I must again enter my protest against this resolution staggering along to some other Chamber.

MEMBER: Virtuous indignation.

MR. T. H. BATH (Brown Hill): There is just one point about the proposal moved by the member for York which I wish to place before the House, and that is that the hon. member owes it as a duty to this House to give members some information as to how he proposes to carry this resolution into action now.

MR. MONGER: You will have it later on.

MR. BATH: The hon. member has just as much right to preserve the dignity and the reputation of this House as any other member, and that dignity will be seriously imperilled by the passage of a resolution which it is absolutely impossible to carry into effect. The hon. member comes along and moves a motion, and it is pointed out to him in clear and lucid language that it is a motion which, if carried in this House, it will be utterly impossible for the House to give effect to. There can be no disputation of the procedure that is laid down in the Constitution. I would remind the hon. member that the Constitution has not only been adopted by all the Parliaments of Australia, and therefore has become legal, but it has also received the approval of the Crown; and therefore the procedure laid down in the Constitution must be followed if any amendment of the Constitution is to be made; and of necessity an amendment of the Constitution must be made before Western Australia can withdraw from the Federation. We have for good or ill thrown in our lot with an indissoluble Commonwealth; and the only possible method of severing the bond is by the procedure laid down in the Commonwealth Constitution. It might be very well, and I should have no quarrel with the member for York, if in order to ventilate his opinions and his objections to Federation—objections which no doubt the hon. member honestly holds, and for which we have every right to give him credit——

POINT OF ORDER.

MR. FOULKES: Is the hon. member in order in discussing the whole question on this motion for the transmission of a resolution to another Chamber? I gather that he is discussing the whole question, and the disadvantages of altering the Federal Constitution. The motion before us is that the resolution passed a few minutes ago be sent to another place, and their concurrence desired therein.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is certainly a little wide of the mark; but I cannot say that his remarks are out of order in their bearing on the question whether the resolution should be transmitted.

DEBATE.

MR. BATH: My reason for stating the facts of the case was that the motion proposed to send the resolution to the Legislative Council for concurrence. And I have asked the mover for some reason why that course should be taken, and why the prestige of this House should be imperilled by taking such a course. I therefore pointed out the difficulty, the impossibility, of giving practical effect to the resolution moved by him and adopted by this House. I think that is perfectly within the scope of the motion which the hon. member has now moved. As I have already said, it is impossible to give effect to the resolution we have passed; for in order to carry out the resolution, in order to import into the agitation something more than mere wind, there is only one resort, and that resort is conflict, not by mere words and resolutions, but conflict by means of arms, between Western Australia and the rest of the Commonwealth. Members can argue round the point as long as they like. They can talk of instances which have occurred in other parts of the globe. But the conflict between the northern and southern States of America was about a resolution almost similar to that of the member for York, a resolution that the southern States secede from the northern. Under the United States Constitution the southern States could not carry that into effect; and the only resort other than the procedure laid down in the Constitution was a resort to arms. That is the only resort which the member for York has—to try, as the Don Quixote of Western Australia, to promote a revolution and to fight the armies of the Commonwealth. Surely members will recognise the absurd limits to which the hon. member's opposition to Federation have carried him, and will not contend that they have acted wisely or sensibly by adopting the resolution passed this evening. I do not wish to argue the question of Federation or no Federation, but merely to show the absurd position in which those voting for the resolution have placed themselves.

MR. T. WALKER (Kanowna): I desire to support the motion, for the simple reason that there can be no harm in letting the other House deal with the resolution we have passed.

MR. TAYLOR: Do you think the other House is competent?

MR. WALKER: It may or may not be. What right have we to presume that the other House will treat this matter as this House has treated it to-night, or to presume that the other House will treat it differently? Surely the other House can be trusted to exercise its discretion on a motion of this kind; and it is a matter of courtesy to try to ascertain whether it shares or does not share the sentiments of this Assembly. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that the resolution passed by that (Government) side of the House to-night has my heartiest sympathy. I support it for the reasons adduced by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not want to see us placed in a false position. If the other side of the House could show me a mode of giving effect to that resolution, they would find in me one of their most enthusiastic supporters. I realise that some good may be done even by the expression of a sentiment; and when two Houses come to an agreement they ought to be able to go a step farther. I do not see what step farther can be taken by this House and by this Parliament at the present time; and therefore when I voted this afternoon I voted simply to prevent the House from stultifying itself. As soon as I can see a way open to declare more forcibly the position of this State in relation to the rest of the Commonwealth, so as to obviate those difficulties under which we have been suffering, and those

grievances of which we have a very clear right to complain, then I will vote strongly with the Government side. One speaker insinuated that those who spoke in favour of the resolution were not sincere. As I was one of the speakers, I wish it to go forth to the world that the statement that the House is not sincere in the resolution is absolutely without foundation. I can speak for myself, and I believe I know something of the sentiments of others. No greater earnestness, no greater sincerity, could be thrown into anything than was thrown into the expression of my views on this subject. They were not reminiscences of speeches delivered during the federal campaign. The facts arose from the circumstances of the moment, the hardships that this State has suffered, is suffering, and will suffer. Just a word of warning to my colleagues on this (Opposition) side.

MR. UNDERWOOD: They will pull through all right.

MR. WALKER: I have no doubt they will. They may disdain my opinion; but it is just this rushing to express self-conceit and this self-sufficiency that spoils States as well as individuals; and my friend interjecting, with all his sense of security and omnipotence and omniscience, may himself come to grief by-and-by. We are too much governed by sentiment; and a day will come, and is not far distant, when absolute stress of circumstances, suffering, and misfortune in this State will compel its inhabitants to do something more active than to pass a mere resolution. I shall vote for this motion simply because I wish to know what the Upper House thinks of it. I should like to see all citizens of the State allowed to express an opinion on this great question, which is not a frivolous one, but concerns the whole future of this country, fettered as it is by the Eastern States, who are at the present moment extorting from us our sources of life and of hope. Against that extortion I am pleased that a protest has been made; and if it could have been carried farther I should to-night have been on the Government side of the House instead of on this, Opposition, side.

MR. A. C. GULL (Swan): I think that members who voted for the resolution have undoubtedly to thank the preceding speaker for his dignified and sensible remarks. We are not for a moment discussing the advisableness, nor are we thinking, of taking up arms against any of our kindred States. But realising, as I have realised from the very inception of the federal agitation, that Western Australia is bound to go to the wall, I say that we have to-day taken a proper course, and we are following that course by sending the resolution to another place with a request for concurrence. Recognising that there is no question, and hoping that there never will be a question, of arming ourselves against any other British people, still I say that a solid protest like this resolution, sent home to the imperial authorities, will, if it does nothing else, arouse the people of the other States to a sense of the injustice under which Western Australia is labouring. I sincerely hope that this protest, backed up as it may be by an expression of opinion from the Crown of England, will carry some weight with those in the other States who have sought to crush Western Australia and keep it as an open market for their own produce. I was surprised that the debate on this motion terminated so quickly, and was surprised into missing an opportunity of making a personal explanation which I ought to have made at the beginning. It will be remembered that when I first spoke on the resolution I said that "a Mr. Hugh Mahon and another gentleman, I think, were struck off the roll of justices of the peace." I do not wish to speak at length; but I propose to read a letter which Mr. Mahon sent to me, and my reply thereto:—

I notice in the *Hansard* report of the proceedings of the State Parliament of Western Australia, at page 733, a statement in the course of your speech on the 1st instant, "Mr. Mahon and another gentleman, I think, were struck off the roll of justices of the peace for the parts they played" in issuing voters' rights at the federal referendum in 1900.

Being an official record, the report of your remarks is, I presume, correct. I therefore wish to inform you that so far as I recollect, no complaint was every made against me in respect to the issue of voters' rights. I was not struck off the roll of justices of the peace, nor can I recollect that any proposal was ever publicly made to that effect. I remained a justice of the peace for East Coolgardie district until 1905, when the Government of

the day enlarged my commission by appointing me as a justice for the whole State.

Apprehending that you had no intention of doing me an injustice, I am sure you will not refuse to take the first convenient opportunity of correcting the statement referred to, and of placing on official record the real facts of the case.—H. MAHON.

I turned up *Hansard* and found as a matter of fact Mr. Mahon was not struck off the roll. I have no wish for a moment to make a misstatement, and I am very glad to contradict it. I have replied to Mr. Mahon in the following terms:—

I am in receipt of yours of 23rd ultimo, and in reply I may state that at the time of speaking I was relying on my memory as to the events of 1900, and therefore added the proviso, "I think." On receipt of yours yesterday I looked up *Hansard* of October 10th, 1900, and therein I find that actually you were not struck off the roll of justices of the peace. As to whether you should not have been I must refer you to the debate that took place in the House on that date. I think that a perusal of that debate will revive your memory as to whether there was any complaint as to your conduct—you will note that you explained that you misread the instructions—and also as to whether any proposal was made publicly to that effect. The final remarks of Sir John Forrest (page 958, *Hansard* 1900) will, under the circumstances, make interesting reading to you. As to my mistake, I will take an early opportunity in the House of correcting the same and quote from *Hansard* in explanation thereof.

THE PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore): I, with the Leader of the Opposition, regret very much that the mover of the motion did not have an opportunity of replying, and stating how in his opinion, if the motion were carried, it could be given effect to. There is no doubt the majority in favour of the motion to-day is largely due to what has happened in the Federal House quite recently—[MEMBERS: No]—to a very large extent. Personally I feel as disappointed and indignant as any member of the House at what has taken place; at the same time I realise with the member for Kanowna, that we are in a very difficult position in carrying a motion which at the present time we can see no means of giving effect to. Under the Constitution there is no provision for seceding from the Union. Provision is made for an alteration of the Constitution, and at the present time there are one or two Bills before the Federal House of Parliament to enable a referendum to be taken on certain questions, whether State debts should be taken over as they exist at the present time as against the provision in Section 87 or Section 105 of the Constitution Act, which provides that the Commonwealth Parliament may have power to take over the debts as they existed on the 31st December, 1900; also a proposal to submit a referendum to allow a certain specific tax to be struck, ostensibly the object of which is to provide a certain sum to allow of a fund for old age pensions being established.

MR. GULL: And bonuses.

THE PREMIER: And bonuses. It is a very important question, and as members are aware, the Government proposes that the Treasurer and the Leader of the Opposition shall represent this State at the Conference in Melbourne, with the idea of protecting the State interests in that respect. According to an estimate made two or three years ago by the local Actuary, if the proposed duty was struck on tea and kerosene of 5d. it would bring in something like £80,000, and we would be entitled under the old age pension fund to have only returned to us something like £45,000, so that this State, if that particular tax were struck, would be in a very much worse position than any other State in Australia. I consider the division which took place was considerably influenced by the action taken by the Federal Senate in throwing out the third reading of the Port Augusta to Kalgoorlie Railway Survey Bill. The The member for York may have an opportunity of indicating in what way he thinks we may give effect to the motion that has been carried. At the same time it has been stated by the Leader of the Opposition there would be no other way out of the difficulty than a recourse to arms.

MR. TAYLOR: You are well equipped for that.

THE PREMIER: I am in an awkward position; at the same time that is the last thing we want to see, and it may be advisable before anything farther is done to see whether the whole question might not be gone into, with the idea, if it is possible at the next election, to make it a vital point whether a candidate is

going in solely to protect State rights or on any other particular issue.

MR. TROY: Or some other platitude.

THE PREMIER: It is a very serious question as far as Western Australia is concerned. I am an anti-federalist, at the same time I realise the position I am in here, that it is my duty to uphold constituted authority; consequently the position I have taken up to-day is that it is my duty to vote against the motion.

MR. WALKER: It is only that the resolution go to another House for discussion.

MR. J. C. G. FOULKES (Claremont): I have only risen to reply to the statement of the Premier that this motion has been brought forward on account of the action of the Federal Parliament.

MR. MONGER: It was cabled two months ago.

MR. FOULKES: Well, it has been influenced, which is practically the same thing. I wish to bring before the Premier's memory that his predecessor, Mr. Rason, 12 months ago expressed strong disapproval of the actions of the Federal Parliament and the manner in which they had treated this State. I wanted to disabuse the Premier's mind also the opponents of the motion, that it was not on account of the action on a certain Railway Bill that we have come to the conclusion we have to-night. I am quite sure of the fact that such a large majority of members would not have voted for the motion if they had not learned from bitter experience, to follow the words of the motion, "that the Union of Western Australia with the other States of the Commonwealth has proved detrimental to the best interests of the State." A good deal has been said by the Leader of the Opposition that the carrying of the motion would have no effect at all, that if we carry out the matter to its logical conclusion it means having recourse to arms. I am surprised that the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier think that is the only remedy. We belong to the British race, and the one thing that the British people are united on is that there shall never be warfare between the different branches of the Empire. [MEMBER: What about Home Rule?] The Irish people are some of the most loyal to the British Empire. What is the motion which we have passed? I can hardly believe the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have read the motion that was tabled by the member for York.

MR. TAYLOR: I made a statement that it was not taken seriously.

MR. FOULKES: The motion is, "That in the opinion of this House the Union of Western Australia with the other States in the Commonwealth of Australia has proved detrimental to the best interests of this State."

THE PREMIER: It should have stopped there.

MR. FOULKES: Then it goes on to say, "And that the time has arrived for placing before the people the question of withdrawing from such Union." The last part of the motion means practically that the time has arrived for taking a referendum on the subject. To my surprise, to-day I saw members of the Labour party voting against the taking of a referendum.

MR. BATH: What is the good of having a referendum when we cannot give effect to it?

MR. FOULKES: A referendum for years past has been one of the chief planks of the Labour platform. Members of the Labour party have urged for years that all important questions should be referred to the people. They were quite ready a few years ago—not only they but a large number of people in the State—to have the question of federating with the other States, submitted to the people. All the member for York asks for is, and what we voted on is, that this question should be submitted to the people.

MR. BATH: It is only useless expenditure to give effect to it.

MR. FOULKES: The Premier asks how. It is as simple as possible: all the Government have to do is to take steps for having this question referred to the people; let a referendum be taken on the question.

MR. HOLMAN: How much forward would we be then?

MR. FOULKES: As far as I am concerned, I know how I would vote if the question were referred to the people. The people should have a chance of deciding whether we wish to separate from the other States or not. Members

on the Government side are not afraid to trust the people on the question. It has been said that if we carry the question to its logical conclusion there will have to be a recourse to arms. I will remind the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition that in the other States we will have a large number of sympathisers with the motion. If representatives of the State of Tasmania and the State of Queensland were in this House, I believe I can say with all sincerity and from inquiries made by myself, that a great number of those members would vote for the motion.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: They voted against the railway.

MR. FOULKES: We know from what we read in the Press that the State of Queensland particularly has expressed frequently its intense dissatisfaction at its treatment at the hands of the Federal Government. The motion that has been tabled by the member for York has my hearty sympathy, and I hope the Premier and his colleagues will take the necessary steps to carry the motion into effect. The interpretation I place on the motion is this: it is asking the Government to take steps to have the question of secession referred to the people. I am surprised that some members on the Government side are objecting as strongly as they can, also the member for Mount Margaret, to this question being referred to the people.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. N. Keenan): The motion before the House, although it is somewhat difficult to know where we stand, is that the resolution which has just been carried shall be transmitted to another place and their concurrence desired therein. My experience of the House is certainly a limited one, but I have made some inquiry from others, and I fail to find any member who can call to mind a resolution carried in this House followed by a motion of this character. It is, therefore, a most exceptional course to take, and indeed it would bear this suggestion on its face, that the other House requires a good deal of pricking before it is prepared to act in a certain direction on any question. I venture to think that if the other place holds strong opinions on this matter it will not require the incentive of a message such as this in order to take any action it considers proper; and in the absence of any evidence that such an incentive is required it would be far preferable that the mover of the motion should consent to withdraw it, and certainly not ask this House to divide on it. It has been said here by many members that there is a certain provision in the Constitution of the Commonwealth which may be invoked for the purpose of dissolving the union of any one of the States with the Commonwealth. However, I venture to differ from that. The Constitution Act does not make any provision whatever for the withdrawal of any of the States from the Union they entered into. In fact, I may call the attention of members to the wording in the recital of the Act. It is recited that the sovereign States therein named and the people of those States have agreed to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth; in one that cannot be dissolved; and therefore it is impossible to invoke any provision in the Constitution Act on which it would be open for any State to withdraw from the union it then entered into.

MR. FOULKES: The British Parliament can amend that Act.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member suggests another course as soon as he finds that the one already suggested is not a practicable one. Supposing that were the case, supposing the imperial authority had the power, and I will not question it, to remove from the provisions of the Constitution Act one of the original constituent States; is it at all likely they would exercise that right? Surely the hon. member must know that if we were to ask the Imperial Parliament by petition to act in that direction, we should be absolutely certain of a refusal on their part. Their reply would certainly be this: "Of your own free will you entered into a union only a few years ago, and we are not going to dissolve that union merely because acting under some temporary stress of difficulties you come and ask us to do so." Let me make this confession, that in common I think with every one—in common certainly with a great majority—I am disappointed with the results of Federation. I was one of those who actively advo-

cated the union of this State with the other States of the Commonwealth in a common Federation, and I did so not with a desire of producing unification but only Federation. Unfortunately matters have so trended that instead of remaining a pure Federation there has been a considerable attempt to centralise everything in one particular State to the detriment of the outlying States—[MR. BROWN: Did you not advocate separation from the coast?]—and in so far as that tendency has produced ill effects I am prepared to admit at once it is our duty to strongly oppose it, and if in the long result every legitimate effort were made and such legitimate effort produced nothing but failure, then it would become necessary to consider not namby-pamby resolutions expressing disgust or dissent or anything else, but whether the price we were paying for Federation as it then existed, the unification of the whole of the Commonwealth in one centre, as it might be if the Constitution were abused, was not too great, and whether it would not be better to face the risk of a direct attempt to break away by physical force rather than continue to belong to it. That can only arrive when as men we have come to the conclusion it is worth the acceptance of the risk to adopt physical force, because it is perfectly safe to say that if we wish to break the bond of Federation we can only do so by absolutely setting our own physical force against any force the Commonwealth can bring to bear. [MR. WALKER: We could present our case to the British Parliament.] The hon. member talks of presenting a case to the Imperial Parliament. Which, does he think, would have the big end of the stick if we presented our case, this State or the Commonwealth? Does he imagine that his voice would reach all the way to the Parliament at Westminster?

MR. BATH: Supposing they did interfere, what would be the result then?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Supposing it were possible to reach there, does the hon. member really in his senses think that the power and influence of the Commonwealth and the expression of their determination and that of other States would be put on one side, and that the objection of a fraction of the whole of the population of one State would prevail?

MR. FOULKES: You may find there are other States.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: At any rate let us wait. The member for Claremont gives vague assurance of support from very vague quarters. Let us wait till they become tangible. Let us wait till we see that consent.

MR. STONE: Somebody must start.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: At present it is open to any member of this House to say that he believes that Queensland would to-morrow favour a referendum for breaking away from the union. I might also say that New South Wales would break away from the Union, if I chose, and who could contradict me? Or I might say that New South Wales would vote solid for the union, and who could contradict me? The member for Claremont has the advantage of some correspondence of a nebulous character with people over there who assure him it is a tangible fact. I dispute it, and I do so for this reason, that after all the people will be governed by common sense and will not break away from this Federation until they have given it a fair trial. The years that have passed over our heads do not constitute sufficient time to warrant us in saying it has been given a fair trial. I admit, as I have said before, my own grave disappointment with the results of Federation; I admit that this State particularly has cause to complain of its results; but I am prepared, just as we all would be prepared in our private lives, to allow a sufficient time to elapse that the machine may get into proper working order; and then if after we have given it every fair trial it proves a failure, let us make up our minds not as movers and seconders of resolutions which look very mighty on paper but really amount to nothing, rather let us act to the fullest extent of our manhood in asserting the rights which we believe require their assertion by physical force. It would be disgraceful on my part, holding an official position, to advocate physical force; but I only point out what I think is the alternative to which we must be driven if we adopt the attitude apparently some members wish to adopt of now and for

ever expressing our dissatisfaction with Federation. The motion now before the House does not concern itself with this matter. I feel I have trespassed probably on Standing Orders in discussing it to the limit and extent I have done; nor should I have ventured to do so had I had an opportunity of speaking on the main question. As regards the motion proper before the House, I again submit that there is no precedent for the action taken by the member for York. I submit it is absolutely unnecessary, because if the Upper House is possessed of the same sentiment as this House has expressed itself possessed of, it would take action without action being taken on our part. Therefore, I hope that the hon. member will see fit to withdraw the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not want to interrupt the last speaker, but the debate has digressed somewhat from the question before the House. As the question is so important I allowed the debate to go on; but I must insist on the rules being adhered to, and that therefore subsequent speakers must confine themselves to the actual question before the House.

MR. F. ILLINGWORTH (West Perth): I regret that I have to differ from the Attorney General with regard to the motion itself. It is customary in parliamentary practice whenever an important resolution is passed to transmit it to the other House with a request for concurrence. This House in its wisdom has been pleased to pass a resolution. I voted against that resolution because I considered it would be futile. I differ from the Leader of the Opposition and the Attorney General as to what procedure may be taken, if this House is really in earnest; but a resolution passed in this House with the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition against it is not likely to be very effective in its consideration anywhere. I do not think it is absolutely necessary in dealing with this question that we should resort to arms, and in my opinion that is a suggestion which ought not to be made in this House or anywhere else.

MR. BATH: No one suggested it. It was merely pointed out that it was the only alternative.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I differ from the Leader of the Opposition and the Attorney General on that question. I think there is in the Constitution a proper means of dealing with this question without resorting to arms. The question before the Committee is whether we shall transmit this resolution which has been passed to another place. I think it is courteous to them and also to the members who have been pleased to vote for the resolution that it should be transmitted to another place, and therefore I support the motion now before the House.

MR. H. BROWN (Perth): I trust that the member for York will go on with his motion, and that we shall get the same fair dealing from the Ministry in regard to this vote as in the previous vote. They abstained, particularly some of them, from taking part in this action at all, and I trust that now it has got so far they will show us the same courtesy by abstaining from voting on this question. I would remind the Attorney General when he talks about separation that he was I believe one of the leaders not many years ago when it was a question of the goldfields seceding from the coast. I believe he was one of the original gentlemen who took great part there, and he tried to do it by constitutional means, by petitioning I think the home Government to allow them to separate. Why did not the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition who are admonishing members here have the courage of their convictions and stand up before a vote was taken on the resolution and give their reasons? Not one of the members of the Ministry took part in this debate to show what they believe. But they are now willing to show us the mistake which we have made. I think they should have had more backbone and should have supported this. The Treasurer has said practically that the country is in a state of beggary through entering Federation. We have the imposition of a land tax proposed, and we have heard the Premier even this evening telling us what we shall get by Federation with reference to old age pensions. I would remind him that at the present time it will only mean another

relief for Victoria and those States which have already old age pensions. It will be taking the expense off the States and putting it on to the Commonwealth, and naturally they would be in favour of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is going beyond the question.

MR. BROWN: I thank the Speaker for the courtesy he has shown me. I would repudiate entirely the charge as to the so-called levity of this vote. I am quite certain that every member of this House was deeply in earnest over it, and it has not been expedited one bit by the resolution carried in the Senate the other day. It is simply the feeling that Western Australia is not getting the fair and proper treatment she should expect under Federation, and there is not the slightest federal spirit prevailing now in reference to Western Australia.

Question passed, the resolution to be transmitted to the Council.

BILL—VACCINATION ACT AMENDMENT.

SECOND READING.

Resumed from the 19th September.

No member rising to speak—

MR. TROY said: The member for Dundas moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: This is the second time I have had to wait for hon. members. I do not intend to do it again. The business must be proceeded with.

MR. J. B. HOLMAN (Murchison): I am not in favour of vaccination. I have had experience of it, perhaps more than any member, because I had to be vaccinated three times as an infant: and after all I did not reap any benefit, and I still had to suffer considerably from the disease; but after the able speech last week of the member for Roebourne, who is the only medical man in the House, I think it would be wise if we gave the matter full consideration. It is hard for a layman to pit his knowledge in a medical matter against a member of the medical profession, though when we speak from practical experience we should be in a position to place our views before the House. I intend to support the second reading of this Bill because, in my opinion, some farther latitude should be allowed to people in the State to say whether their children should be vaccinated or not. I am of the opinion, and that opinion has been borne out by medical gentlemen who have made a life study of this question, that almost every civilized nation, if its people live properly and look after sanitation and health, will outlive even such a dread evil as smallpox. It has been shown that since modern ideas of sanitation have been brought about and people have been taught to look after their health as well as that of others, the dread disease of smallpox has greatly diminished in every civilized country. It is now very rarely that we have an attack of smallpox in Australasia, and almost every case that has occurred has been traced to visitors from some of the eastern parts of Asia. I think that, instead of compelling people in Australasia to submit to vaccination whether they consider it necessary or not, we should take farther precautions against allowing Asiatics to intermingle so freely with people of our race as they have done in the past. I think that would do away with a great deal of the evil.

MR. T. H. BATH (Brown Hill): I have listened attentively to the remarks made in connection with this question, both from lay members and from the only medical gentleman we have in the House, the member for Roebourne. I waited with anxiety for information in regard to the question which would give a member with the ordinary lay mind an opportunity of judging; because I have long been of the opinion that it is a rather serious problem in modern times to say that by sowing disease in the bodies of children we can hope to reap health, and I believe that in the discoveries of science in the way of sanitation and the improvement of sanitary appliances and the health of cities we have more to hope than in the use of vaccination or any other method such as that, in an effort to stem epidemics. I have here the opinions of medical men certainly in contradiction of those given by the member for Roebourne. This is essentially a matter on which medical men differ; not the ordinary medical men, but those of

standing in the medical world. This opinion, taken from the researches of a number of medical gentlemen, goes on to say:—

The microbe (if any) that produces the disease set up by vaccination (vaccinia) has, in spite of much patient search, not been discovered, nor has the most powerful microscope enabled Dr. S. Monckton Copeman, Dr. McVail, Sir Crichton Browne, Lord Lister, and Sir Michael Foster to detect the germ of smallpox. Moreover, cowpox itself is not a disease to be coveted, and many parents, notwithstanding Conn's *Story of Germ Life*, are, not without good reason, terrified at the very thought of it. The following is Jenner's own description of vaccination:—"There is a disease to which the horse, from his state of domestication, is frequently subject; the farmers have termed it 'the grease.' It is an inflammation and swelling of the heel, from which issues matter, possessing properties of a very peculiar nature, which seems capable of generating a disease in the human body which bears so strong a resemblance to smallpox that I think it highly probable it may be the source of that disease. Some particles of this infectious matter adhering to the human fingers, the disease is communicated to cows, and from cows to dairymaids, and it then obtains the name of cowpox. The animals themselves become seriously indisposed and the secretion of milk is very much lessened. But on the hands of domestic servants inflamed spots appear; on the different parts of the body, sometimes on the wrists. The inflammation runs on to suppuration, first assuming the appearance of small vesications like those produced by a burn. Most commonly they appear about the joints of the fingers and their extremities, or whatever parts are affected; these suppurations put on a circular form, with their edges more elevated than their centre, and of a colour approaching to blue. Absorption of matter takes place, and tumours appear in each axilla (inflammation of glands in the armpits), the system becomes affected, the pulse is quickened, shiverings succeeded by heat, general lassitude, and pains about the loins and limbs, with vomiting, come on. The head is painful, and the patient is even affected with delirium. These symptoms leave ulcerated sores, which are very troublesome, and commonly heal slowly, frequently becoming phagedenic, like those from which they spring, and sometimes affect lips, nostrils, and eyelids. Thus the disease makes its progress from the horse to the nipple of the cow, and from the cow to the human subject. But what renders the virus cowpox so extremely singular is this. The person who has been thus affected is for ever after secure from the infection of smallpox, neither exposure to the variolous effluvia nor the insertion of the matter into the skin producing this distemper."

That is Professor Jenner's opinion of the results, practically the ills that accrue from what is known as cowpox, and it is this disease that is used as the matter that is injected into children as the vaccine used in the process of vaccination. This report goes on to say—

The patient researches of Professor E. M. Cruikshank, M.D. (London), M.R.C.S., J.P., and Dr. Charles Creighton, M.D., M.A., our greatest epidemiologist, have clearly proved that the affinity of cowpox is not to the smallpox, as ignorantly asserted by Jenner and Copeman, but is an acute specific disease akin to syphilis, and yields to the same specific medical treatment. A Baltimore publication for April, entitled *Dawn*, says: "Vaccination means the poisoning of the blood. It is the introduction into circulation of toxic pus poison that exudes from a running sore. Those vitally strong are able to resist its influence, and apparently recover without noticeable harm; but many suffer severely, and pneumonia, diphtheria, and scarlet fever are only a few of the diseases that are often produced as after-results of the lessened vital strength and polluted blood that vaccination frequently causes. This statement applies in a large measure, we feel, to all serums which are produced from artificially diseased animals."

It is a most peculiar thing that in almost every case where the question of vaccination has been made a burning issue we find that those strongest in favour of vaccination, outside the medical profession, are those who are more deeply interested in preventing any very serious or stringent regulations being made for the sanitation and ventilation of dwellings. They favour anything that tends to treat a disease by injecting a disease, rather than by going to the root of the matter and preserving the health of the community by making the most stringent regulations in regard to the sanitation of cities and other means for the prevention of epidemics. It is better to lay the axe at the root of the matter rather than have vaccination to prevent these epidemics; but it is found throughout the world that the greatest opponents of these methods are owners of properties. They object to methods adopted for the protection of the health of the people. I remember that in the city of Perth, when statements were made about the condition of portions of Perth, when not only the local board of health but the central board declared that stringent provisions must be made and that in some cases buildings must be pulled down, we found property-holders objecting to those pro-

visions; they seemed rather to favour vaccination as a means for preventing sickness in preference to what is the best of all means to be adopted in modern civilisation, that is the proper sanitation of cities and the reducing to a minimum of the possibility of epidemics making any great headway in populous centres. For these reasons—I do not say they are full and sufficient, because I know there is a great difference of opinion on this question—I feel constrained, from all I have read on the subject and from what I have heard, and from my knowledge of the evil effects that have resulted in a great many cases from vaccination of children, to support the second reading of this measure.

MR. E. E. HEITMANN (Cue): I have listened with interest to the various speakers on this measure, and not being myself a medical man I am not in a position to judge of the merits of the case. If vaccination were so injurious to those vaccinated as some persons would lead us to believe, I feel sure we have sufficient humane medical men in this country and in England to at once say that vaccination is injurious and at the same time futile as a preventive of smallpox. [MR. A. J. WILSON: They do say that in England.] I differ from the hon. member as to the extent to which medical men do say that in England. If a case could be made out against vaccination, I feel sure that a number of medical men would rise and endeavour to get the practice abolished. For these reasons, I am prepared to leave things as they are, and continue to enforce vaccination.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret): I am in a position somewhat similar to that of the member who has just spoken. It is evident almost on the face of the debate how futile it is for laymen to advance arguments either for or against vaccination. We have the best men in the medical world expressing opinions for, and some against, vaccination. Since this Bill has been before us, members will have noticed that the medical faculty in Perth have practically besieged the daily papers with letters over the names of practitioners, some in favour of vaccination and others against it. While we notice this in the whole of the arguments advanced by medical men, that vaccination will not prevent a person from getting this terrible disease, yet what it will do, in the opinion of those who are most enthusiastic in favour of vaccination, as also the statistics of those affected by the disease clearly prove, is that those who had been vaccinated and afterwards got smallpox were attacked by the disease in a less severe form than those that had not been vaccinated before the attack. We notice the cures effected in smallpox are greater by far in those patients who have been vaccinated, as against those who have not. Members will recognise also that as soon as smallpox becomes epidemic in a locality, as shown by experience in any of the Australian States—and I can only speak from practical knowledge of Australian States, and a little of New Zealand—the people are almost unanimous in rushing to be vaccinated. [MR. HARDWICK: That is the time to be vaccinated.] I have not had the pleasure nor the opportunity of hearing the member for East Perth on this question, and I do not know whether he is in favour of the existing system of compulsory vaccination or in favour of the Bill. One would suppose, from his interjection, that he is not in favour of the law as it stands, for he says the time to be vaccinated is when an outbreak of smallpox occurs. Therefore in the hon. member's opinion, vaccination is of some value when an epidemic of smallpox occurs. As prevention is better than cure, it should be better to have been vaccinated before an outbreak does occur. I do not know whether the hon. member has had any medical training, but if he has had that training I am pleased he has given his opinion to the House that when an epidemic does occur, that is the time to be vaccinated. That being so, vaccination is of some value as a protection against an epidemic. I only know that, as statistics point out, those who have been vaccinated do not catch the disease in so virulent a form as those who are unvaccinated. I listened with patience and great interest to the speech of the member for Roebourne (Dr. Hicks), and, as has been pointed out by other members, he is the only medical man in the House, and I certainly paid a great deal of attention to the arguments and the

statistics advanced by him. I am sure the House is indebted to the hon. member for the careful preparation of his figures. He dealt with almost every country where smallpox exists, and pointed out clearly that in places where sanitation is more carefully looked after, smallpox does not rage with the same rapidity or virulence as in other places where sanitation is not sufficiently attended to. He also pointed out that the value of vaccination is in a large degree, as other medical men have said, that it is much more easy for the patient to recover from an attack of smallpox if vaccinated before the attack than it is for persons attacked who have not been vaccinated. I recognise that one cannot simply say, "I will not have my child vaccinated," and there the matter will end. I find in this Bill that if a parent has any scruples about his child being vaccinated, if he believes that vaccination will be detrimental to its health, there is a provision that such a parent may go to the police magistrate within the municipality or district and state his complaint, and if he can satisfy the magistrate that his ground of complaint is sound, the magistrate will give him a certificate of exemption from the compulsory vaccination of his child. That, to me, is one reason why I should support the second reading of the Bill, because I do recognise that in a large degree the people do not take their children to the public vaccinator or have them vaccinated because of the trouble in doing so, and because of the possibility of bad lymph causing serious evils to follow the vaccination. When I had the honour to be Colonial Secretary, I had a long conversation with the Principal Medical Officer on this subject, and he pointed out to me the great care and caution he always took when purchasing lymph for vaccination purposes, because he said there was a possibility of its sometimes being damaged so that it would not take, and any persons who used that damaged lymph would not be effectually vaccinated. Seeing that the principal seaport of this State is so close to countries where smallpox is epidemic, there is great necessity for other than lay minds to deal with this difficult question. [THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: You ridiculed that before.] I did not ridicule it, because it is a sound statement, and a genuine stand for any person to take who is unqualified to give a decision on a question which requires special training. [THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: You are progressing.] I have been accused times out of number in this House of knowing perhaps a lot on most questions; but on this question it is impossible for a layman, in my opinion, to give an accurate or binding decision that will be a guide or of some value to the constituency he represents. Moreover, when we find in the medical and scientific world, where men grind and study to reach the highest rungs in the professional ladder, that those men disagree on this question, laymen should not attempt to settle it. It is argued that the weight of evidence is in favour of vaccination, and that therefore vaccination should be compulsory. That is the opinion of scientific minds in the highest line of reasoning. They are in favour of vaccination. Many persons who have little knowledge or are untrained are also in favour of vaccination, for as soon as the disease shows itself, we find they rush to be vaccinated. In view of the weight and the trend of thought in favour of vaccination, and seeing that those persons who had little or no exact knowledge in regard to it were ready to run to be vaccinated as a protection against smallpox whenever an epidemic came near them——

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: You are showing a modesty which I have never seen you exhibit before.

MR. TAYLOR: I am sure nobody in the House would accuse me of being anything but modest. It is my modesty through life that has prevented me from carrying out my good intentions in many ways, and it is not necessary for the Minister for Works to remind me of that modesty.

MR. P. STONE: Is the hon. member in order in referring to his modesty, on the question before the House?

MR. SPEAKER: That is not the subject of discussion.

MR. TAYLOR: I know the member for Greenough has a monopoly of modesty, and does not want any competition in that line, but I do not know that there is too much modesty even at Greenough.

At 6·30, the SPEAKER left the Chair.
At 7·30, Chair resumed.

MR. TAYLOR (continuing): When we adjourned I was pointing out that the medical profession differ as to the value of vaccination. Personally, I am unable as a layman to say whether vaccination is that safeguard against smallpox that those doctors who are enthusiastic in its favour claim it to be. In conversation with medical men, especially those on the goldfields, who thoroughly believe in the value of vaccination, I have heard that on the goldfields during certain months in the year the climate is so trying that in their opinion an exemption from vaccination during these two or three months would be a wise provision. The climate is trying to young children, who are thrown back by the additional strain of vaccination. Those doctors have told me that they believe so strongly in vaccination that if they were leaving Western Australia to-morrow for a country where smallpox is prevalent, they would be vaccinated before leaving. I have already pointed out that so far as I can gather from medical men who have studied the subject, as well as from the speech of the member for Roebourne (Dr. Hicks), vaccination is not recognised as an absolute safeguard; but what it does is to render those vaccinated capable of being more easily cured, or the disease does not take the same hold of them as it takes of the unvaccinated. As to the value of vaccination I am open to conviction. I wish to know whether any of those who advocate the amendment of the principal Act can give me some reason for this amendment, on account of the hardships it has inflicted on any section of the community. We know that smallpox is not indigenous to Australia, but is imported. We find that we are close to countries where smallpox is prevalent; and any outbreaks we have had have resulted from smallpox patients touching our shores or landing here. The very situation of our main port of call necessitates the fullest consideration of this question, not by laymen but by practical doctors, and more than that, by practical medical experts who have given special consideration to smallpox and to the value of vaccination as a safeguard. I will support the second reading of the Bill, and will reserve the right to get what information I can before the Bill reaches Committee, and to deal with it at that stage.

MR. A. C. GULL (Swan): I have always understood that vaccination is a preventive for seven years only; that is, its effect remains in the system for that period. It is now compulsory to vaccinate children. To be consistent, it should be compulsory that everyone be vaccinated every seven years. That is not insisted on; therefore, if the vaccine remains in the system for seven years only, why should not a conscience clause be added to the Act, to allow people to decide whether they will or will not incur the risk? It is worth bearing in mind in this connection that many healthy children have, after vaccination, become unhealthy, and have undoubtedly through vaccination contracted diseases of which they showed no sign before the operation was performed. And although what is called pure calf lymph is generally insisted on for vaccination, still, when there is a sudden rush such as has been experienced time after time in this country in consequence of a scare, the vaccine has been taken from a child and injected into hundreds of other children. And although that child may to all appearances be sound and healthy at the time the vaccine is taken from it, still, it may have an inherent disease not then detected. Moreover, there is nothing to show that the calf when the lymph is taken from it may not be the descendant of a tuberculous mother. If so, we are only perpetuating tuberculosis by passing it on from the calf to a child and from one child to another. If it is considered necessary to compel vaccination every seven years, I fail to see why the infants should be subjected to it whether the parents approve or disapprove.

MR. HUDSON: Do you think the cause of the disease is a microbe organism or a protoplasm?

MR. GULL: I do not know what it is. There are people in this community who refuse point blank to have their

children vaccinated. Many prefer to pay a fine. If that is so, when they confidently believe vaccination to be injurious and when their opinion is borne out by the fact that they have not to revaccinate I am in favour of a conscience clause being inserted in the principal Act.

MR. F. ILLINGWORTH (West Perth): This is a question concerning which I know actually nothing at all.

MR. HUDSON: A good ground for a speech.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That is so; and I believe that the most effective speeches in the House—at any rate the longest—are usually made from that standpoint.

MR. TAYLOR: Do not look at the member for Swan.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No; I will look at the member for Mount Margaret. I have made it my duty to inquire into this question all through life. I have never met with a single medical man who did not say that vaccinacion was valuable; not that it is wholly preventive of smallpox, but that it is a valuable assistant should smallpox be around. I will support the second reading of this Bill, though for reasons perhaps entirely different from those of the member by whom it was introduced. During the short time I occupied the Colonial Secretary's chair I ascertained that a large number of people have failed to vaccinate their children; and I believe that at the present time a very large number of people are not vaccinated. I believe that we run a considerable danger in consequence of their not taking this precaution.

MR. GULL: The effect lasts for only seven years.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Well, generally speaking, when there is a scare, the people who have not been vaccinated for seven years are vaccinated again. I have been twice vaccinated, but was not vaccinated at the time of the last scare, though I was very close to the contagion. A large number of people are neglecting what I believe to be a manifest duty; and when approached they generally say they have conscientious objections to vaccination. There is in our Act no section which permits of this defence; and I think it would be wise to allow the defence to come into our Act. By so doing we should open the door to those who really have conscientious objections. It is a serious thing to ask people to submit their children to vaccination when they think that so far from protecting them from disease they are rendering their children liable to disease. Some people do not trouble themselves about the question at all, and when approached they say they do not believe in vaccination. If these people do not believe in vaccination, if they think it is undesirable, and have conscientious objections to it, I think provision should be made for these persons, and that they should be able to avail themselves of such a provision as this. If we are to have Acts on the statute book we should have them enforced in the interests of the community. I think that vaccination should be enforced. In order that this may be more effectually done I think the conscience clause is necessary. For that reason I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill.

MR. A. J. WILSON (in reply as mover): I beg to say, in reply to the criticism offered, that the Bill is brought forward with a view to placing our legislation in regard to vaccination on precisely the same footing as the law stands in the Eastern States of Australia; as it stands in Canada, and as it stands in the United Kingdom. No one in the House listened with keener interest to the well thought out speech of the member for Roebourne than I did, and I had wanted to, or thought it necessary, I have no doubt by producing about 26 volumes of the House of Commons *Hansard*, I could have supplied the hon. member with more excellent, or equally excellent medical authorities to those he quoted in his speech on the question the other night. In the debate in the British House of Commons when this provision was debated, and the debate occupies 23 or 25 volumes, medical opinion after medical opinion was quoted in the House of Commons by medical gentlemen themselves questioning the real efficacy of the system of vaccination, and pointing out cases, almost innumer-

able, where very serious injury had resulted to the future health of some of those who had been subjected to the practice of vaccination. The charge was laid not in the value or the method of application, but the charge was laid against the practice itself. There is one aspect of the case I want members to take into their consideration, and it is this. What is the use of us in the State of Western Australia insisting on the practice so far as our rising generation is concerned, when a great majority of the people have no necessity to undergo vaccination at all? For in the cases I have quoted in regard to the Eastern States the conscience clause exists, and in South Australia the Act itself is practically suspended, although the Governor-in-Council in the case of an outbreak has power by proclamation to make vaccination compulsory if an outbreak suddenly arises. It will be necessary to keep a supply of vaccine on hand for emergencies that may occur.

DR. HICKS: How will you keep it?

MR. WILSON: The member for Roebourne knows very well we already have to make provision in case of any other emergency, such as bubonic plague, or any epedemic that is likely to occur.

DR. HICKS: I know in this State you cannot get vaccine at this moment.

MR. WILSON: The difficulty is not insurmountable, and the member for Roebourne, if he liked could find the ways and means of overcoming the difficulty. Whatever difficulty may arise, we may be safe on this ground that our conditions are no worse than the conditions existing in the Eastern States, or in Canada, or the United Kingdom. We will be practically on the same footing, and I daresay those countries have made provision, and they are practically safe. We hear a good deal about the trend of medical opinion on this question. We heard the member for Mount Margaret dilating at considerable length, and with considerable enthusiasm about the injustice of laymen offering to express an opinion on this question To my mind the most important and most effective experience is the domestic experience of the wives and mothers, who know in many instances following on the vaccination, that their children have suffered in consequence of having had to submit to this practice. In the metropolitan area a petition is being signed, and the canvassers have come in contact with innumerable cases where parents trace practically to vaccination very many unfortunate ailments that children have had to suffer from. After all there is room for the possibility, as far as medical expert opinion is concerned, of a divergence of opinion, and there is a divergence of opinion in the United Kingdom. As far as domestic experience is concerned, those opposed to the principle have conscientious objections to running any risk of injuring the health of their children, and the experience they have had certainly justify them in holding to the fears that possibly following on the practice their children may suffer from some ailments. I think we ought to pay considerable regard to the domestic experience of people, and in view of the fact that there are hundreds and thousands of parents in the State who have honest and conscientious objections to a continuation of the practice, and having regard to the fact that the immunity is limited, and that we have no provision for re-vaccination in order to obtain immunity; and farthermore, in view of the fact that there are hundreds and thousands of people in the State who have never been vaccinated, through living in countries where the practice is not compulsory, I think compulsory vaccination is placing an unnecessary hardship on people, who, under the provisions of the Bill would have an opportunity of being freed from the practice which they believe to be obnoxious and injurious to the well being and health of their children.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	12
Majority for ..	7

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Barnett
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Brown
Mr. Brebber	Mr. Eddy
Mr. Carson	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Collier	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Davies	Mr. Hudson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Keenan
Mr. Gull	Mr. Male
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Monger
Mr. Holman	Mr. Price
Mr. Horan	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Layman (*Teller*).
Mr. Smith	
Mr. Stone	
Mr. Veryard	
Mr. Walker	
Mr. Ware	
Mr. A. J. Wilson	
Mr. Hardwick (*Teller*).	

Question thus passed.
Bill read a second time.

BILL—JURY ACT AMENDMENT.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from the 12th September.

MR. T. WALKER (Kanowna): I regret that this measure is imperfect in two aspects. First of all if we are going to alter the Jury Act we should do it in a comprehensive manner. There are far more important reforms needed in the Jury Act than this presumes to be necessary. For instance, the system of nominating the jury, the selection of them all throughout the State, is a somewhat dangerous one. The jury list is not at all what might be expected in a State so advanced as this is, and it is not always possible, it is somewhat the exception in civil cases to obtain the best class of jury, those most capable of thinking. From various parts of the State I myself have received letters requesting me to do what can be done by myself to introduce or support a measure for the purpose of having the juries selected by a different system. Without dwelling on that point I only wish to show that this Bill is imperfect in not touching the actual difficulties of the Jury Act, and it is also a dangerous innovation in the proposals it actually does make. It makes a differentiation between trial in a criminal case and trial in a civil case as far as the jury is concerned, and I cannot discover its object unless it be for the purpose of securing a verdict of one kind or another. I do not know what experience members of this House have had, but as often as not it has been my observation that it is the minority of one or two who hang out, that in the majority of cases have right on their side. And it stands to reason, if you look at the facts, that such should be the case. The thoughtless, the careless, those who take no interest really in investigating the facts in connection with the trial, go freely with the majority; but the man who thinks, who compares facts, who analyses the case as it goes along, and has made himself familiar with the evidence at every point, is the man generally in the minority, and he may be the one who sticks out and prevents that perfect unanimity which our friend who introduced the Bill thinks is so desirable. What is the object of this Bill? I am informed from outside sources—I do not know how true they are, perhaps I may be corrected by the hon. member for Perth if I am incorrect—that the Bill is for the purpose of securing freedom from bribing of jurymen. In other words the position is that if one man can be made to hang out, no verdict will be arrived at and a guilty person may escape, and those who should suffer will escape from suffering; the insinuation being that it is easy to get one man and bribe him. I think that supposition is more or less a libel on the State. I admit the possibility of it; but will the Bill obviate it? It will in every instance give the rich man an opportunity still of carrying out that evil design in cases. The only difference is that he has to pay twice the cost of his bribery, and bribe two instead of one; and that leaves the result just the same. That is all that it obviates. It only makes double bribery necessary, if that be the reason for bringing in the Bill. If that be not the reason, what is the reason? Why is there dissatisfaction with the present state of affairs? It is not in this respect that we require reform, if reform is to be had, but we absolutely require reform in the method of empanelling the jury. What is the means now of selecting a jury? I have had some experience of it myself. More than seven days before the trial comes off—I am not sure whether it is not a fortnight, I forget the exact number of days, but it is a considerable time—both parties go to the Master and a certain number of names is balloted for by the Master, and both the defendant

and the prosecutor are allowed there and then to delete names they do not wish to be on the jury, each one having the right to erase a certain number of names. What is the result of that? It is that both sides know a fortnight or so before the case is heard precisely who are going to be on the jury. I cannot conceive anything that would more facilitate bribery, if bribery exists. Think of it: both sides knowing all this time beforehand what the jury is to be. The hon. member would do good, if he sought to make a reform here, to allow neither side to know who was to be on the jury until the case was called on for hearing, and only at that moment allow the parties to erase names of those they had reason to suspect were interested or adverse to them. I am as anxious to have an uncorruptible jury as any man in this country, but our present method of electing jurymen in civil cases is open to multifarious abuses, and the one I have indicated is the chief of them. If there be a desire to get at jurymen, to use a vulgarism, it is as easy as daylight to do so with the system we have at present of empanelling them so long beforehand. What is the reform for that? Simply to prevent the selection of the jury until the day of the trial. This Bill is only for two specific purposes; one being to limit the majority for a decision, in other words to enable five-sixths of a jury to pronounce a verdict—that is the chief object—and the other being to prevent mine managers from sitting on a jury. How can you build upon this a suitable measure to arrange for the correct panelling of juries, for the method of challenging jurymen, and for that of selecting them from the community? This is one of those dangerous experimental pieces of legislation that have become a scandal on our statute-book, doing no good to anybody and requiring patching or repealing session after session. Half the time of Parliament is taken up repealing these amateur laws, these measures that serve no useful purpose, and which the moment they are put into practice are discovered to be defective. I hope the House will not entertain a measure of this character, which will not serve a useful purpose. The member for Perth smiles. What purpose can this measure serve?

Mr. H. BROWN: Majority rule.

MR. WALKER: Let us have a majority, an absolute majority. Let us have unanimity; that is what it should be. That is what our laws are for. We are whittling away liberties that have been established by long practice. How has our jury system of trial been obtained but by virtue of long trial to enable us to get this law which the hon. member is now attempting to tinker with. At one time the mere statement of a Judge or an influential juror was quite sufficient to condemn a man, and for his life, liberty, and property to be taken away from him. What was the evil of the Star Chamber, but the evil of doing away with this unanimity of juries and putting the rights, liberties, and property of the people in the hands of those high in authority? This great victory we have earned through long centuries. It is looked upon as a milestone in the history of the British system, that we have trial by jury established. We know how nebulous it was for many centuries, and how at last this principle for the people was obtained that there should be unanimity among jurors before a verdict could be given; and I assure the hon. member that it is the dearest privilege to every man to know that when he goes into the dock to be tried for any offence, whether he be innocent or guilty, he will have 12 jurors who shall agree absolutely before he can be convicted. One of the British safeguards is to be tampered with as proposed here by providing that a five-sixths majority is to be sufficient. Next session there might be a smaller majority, and so it might go on until we got down to a bare majority, and if the hon. member wants bare majority rule why does he not say that one above half the number is sufficient to deliver a verdict? Let him be consistent. Do members not see that we are introducing the thin edge of the wedge? My friend, I dare say, would admit that in criminal cases we should have 12. (Interjection by Mr. BROWN.) The hon member would not tamper with a jury sitting in criminal cases.

MR. H. BROWN: In a good case I would not have a jury at all.

MR. WALKER: The hon. member is going right back upon juries altogether. If he does not believe in juries, what does he mean by amending the Jury Act? Where is his consistency? It

only shows we are now dealing with a measure in charge of a man who has no fixed ideas or clear opinions of what he is dealing with, but who has taken this haphazard from another place with these confused opinions. He says that in a good case he would have no juries at all. In some other cases he would have a jury. He tells us he wants majority rule, and here he is pulling down majority rule. He is absolutely confused as to what he does require; therefore I trust the House will not make this alteration, because it is obvious that this is a shaving off of our rights and liberties, and eventually they will be all whittled away and we shall lose them. If it be right to have a dozen in a criminal case, it is right to have a dozen in a civil suit; for though we may say that in a criminal case life and liberty are involved, in a civil case character may be involved which, to some men, is dearer than life or liberty. Take away from some men their good name, that reputation, that feeling within themselves of rectitude, and you have done more to them than if you had given them a severe physical castigation. It is a moral castigation otherwise. Therefore, if it be right in the case of a criminal suit to have 12, I hold it is right to have our characters protected by 12 in civil suits; and not only characters, but often property is involved in civil cases, and property requires protection just as much as liberty in the case of some men. We are making distinctions which have no foundations in logic. There is no reason for them at all. If it be majority rule, then let us have majority rule in our criminal suits as well as in our civil suits. Let us have consistency in our law. It should be the aim of this House to avoid making our laws absurd and ridiculous, one law inconsistent with another, and we should avoid tinkering with legislation. Fault was repeatedly found with the tinkering that went on by the last Government, and are we to permit it at the hands of a private member, this altering and whittling away of principles that have been tried and have worked well? There is nothing that would set Englishmen in England aflame more than the fact that the jury system or the Jury Act was likely to be tampered with, or interfered with in any way And shall we be the ones to set an example of forgetting those liberties which have been won by such severe battles in bygone days? It is our duty to preserve what we have, to maintain intact, not to give them up. These are the safeguards of our characters, of our lives, of our liberties; and on that score I shall vote against the second reading of this Bill, and I trust that hon. members will likewise do so. If we do require amendment to the Jury Act—and I admit we require an amendment—it is not in this direction, but in the direction of getting a better class of jurors, and in the direction of preventing juries being selected so long beforehand that it may be possible to tamper with them before they go into court. In this direction there may be need for reform, but there is absolute danger in the step the hon. member asks us to take in passing this Bill.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret): Whilst I recognise the necessity for the House being careful in passing any legislation dealing with juries, either in civil or criminal cases, I believe there may be some arguments advanced in favour of a measure of this description; but when I follow the arguments to their logical conclusions, it generally means that some of the jurors are capable of being bribed by one side or another. Those who have had experience in civil litigation to a greater extent than I have, may be more competent to judge; and I hope the member in charge of the Bill, when replying to statements made by opponents to the measure, will give some specific cases tried by the law courts of our State, where a miscarriage of justice has been done through the principal Act which this Bill seeks to amend. I believe there is some force in the arguments advanced by the member for Kanowna in regard to counsel being advised perhaps a week or a fortnight before the case is heard who are to be the jurors. [Mr. GULL: They should not know.] I consider they should not know until the case is called at the court. Then the names of the jurors should be called out, each side having the right to challenge. A week is too long for the list of jurors to be in the hands of counsel for either side, to be able perhaps to reach the jurors in a way which I

believe would be against the best interests of justice. I have certain feelings with reference to the qualifications of jurors, and if this Bill reaches the Committee stage it is my intention to move in the direction of making the qualification male adult suffrage. I think by that means we would put our juries more on the footing of other institutions which are equally, if not greater, deliberative bodies than a jury is. I feel confident that if the qualification for our jurors was as I have indicated, there would be less necessity for such a measure as is now proposed. I think the opportunity for counsel to know who are to be summoned on the jury should be prohibited. It would be of great benefit in carrying out the parent Act. I think I am justified in saying that I have some knowledge why this Bill is brought down. I have no desire to cast reflections on the hon. member in charge of the measure; but I gather that in connection with some cases that have recently been before our courts, it has been the opinion of a large section of the community that though a miscarriage of justice may not have been brought about, a very heavy expense had been incurred by litigants before the courts that would not have come about if this measure had been in existence. That being the case, we are justified in amending the law relating to juries, but there is danger in tampering in any way with the jury system. The only logical reason for arguing that a unanimous verdict is not necessary in civil cases as distinct from criminal cases, is that in the criminal case the prisoner is charged with an offence which might mean the loss of his life, certainly the loss of his liberty. The member for Kanowna spoke of twelve jurymen in civil cases, but it is generally six. I am not anxious to support the second reading, but if the Bill reaches the Committee stage—and I have no reason to doubt that it will—I shall move to amend it as I have indicated.

MR. T. HAYWARD (Wellington): I have watched the jury system for many years, and have long come to the conclusion that some alteration is necessary. When the late Mr. Purkiss was a member of this House some years ago, I induced him to bring forward a similar Bill to this. I understood then that the principle was in effect in New Zealand. I have long thought that it should not be in the power of one man, through ignorance or, as has been said, through being "got at," to put litigants to unnecessary expense to the extent of hundreds of pounds. It has been pointed out that a decision arrived at by five out of six jurors in most civil cases would suffice; but it frequently happens that the panel consists of twelve jurors, and in such cases a verdict by a majority in the same proportion would be required. I am inclined to think that were it not that the present jury system is advantageous to the gentlemen of the legal profession, we would have seen an alteration in this matter long ago. It is of course to the advantage of the legal profession to have two or three trials, if it can be managed, or if the vagaries of a jury enable it. Since a similar measure to this has been in operation in New Zealand for a number of years, I think we can be running no risk by adopting it here. I agree with the member for Kanowna that it is desirable there should be some better system of empanelling juries introduced; and I think this is a step in that direction, therefore I intend to support the second reading

MR. H. BROWN (in reply as mover): I am pleased indeed at the eulogies which have been showered upon my first Bill, and that it should have evoked such criticism. I am prepared to believe that the rough handling the Bill received from the Attorney General was merely the effect of an attack of biliousness which seized him after the defeat of his Bills of Sale Bill in another place. I was quite prepared to learn that the members for Kanowna (Mr. Walker) and Coolgardie (Mr. Eddy), as lawyers, would naturally be opposed to this Bill; for we know that every disagreement of juries means more fees for those legal gentlemen. I would, however, remind hon. members on the Opposition side of the House of their old cry that the majority should rule in every case. I think it only fair in cases of this kind that if five jurors can agree on a verdict, such verdict should be received. I would like members to dismiss from their minds the idea that

the Bill is intended to apply to criminal cases. It is specifically stated in the Bill that its provisions shall apply only to civil cases. Mention has been made in another place that the Bill is the result of recent happenings in some of courts of law. Whether that is correct or not I do not know. The gentleman who introduced the measure in the Upper House simply asked me to pilot it through this House; but what prompted him to introduce the measure in the first place I have not the slightest idea. I simply ask now that the Bill be allowed to go to the second reading; and if in Committee it can be amended with advantage, as the member for Mt. Margaret claims, it can then be amended. It is admitted that our present jury system is not all that can be desired. Sometimes in civil cases a couple of juries are struck, and then we find the lawyers on either side going before the Master fighting to get the particular half-dozen men selected whom each believes are likely to be in his favour. In this Bill an endeavour is made to amend that state of things; and if it passes, the jury in a civil case will be selected in the same way as in criminal cases, so that the parties to the suit will not know until the jury enters the box which particular men have been selected to constitute the panel. That case, I think, will be a step in the right direction.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—EMPLOYMENT BROKERS ACT AMENDMENT.

SECOND READING.

MR. A. J. WILSON (Forrest) in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to amend the Employment Brokers Act of 1897, and I wish to point out to members that since the passing of the principal Act, which provided for the registration of employment brokers, there has been no legislation dealing with this question to overcome its defects and remove the disabilities under which the clients of these brokers labour in seeking engagements. In my experience I have found some employment brokers fair and honourable to deal with; but, on the other hand, I have known a number of cases in which persons looking for employment have invoked the assistance of certain employment brokers, by whom they have been subject to treatment against which I think it is the province of this legislation to protect them. The people perhaps who are most severely victimised—and I can think of no more suitable word in this connection—are domestic servants. As the law stands, there is no provision regulating the fees that may be charged by employment brokers; and although there is a provision in the parent Act that a certain record shall be kept, the value of such record is nullified by the absence of regulations which would make the record, when kept, much more correct and more advantageous in protecting the interests of the clients of these brokers. Cases have been brought under my notice from which it would seem to be the practice with some employment brokers to send girls long distances after situations, involving heavy expense; and frequently when they arrive at their destination they have found that the position they were sent to had been filled an hour or a day or some time before, or something of that kind. In such cases the clients have absolutely no redress against the employment broker. Some brokers are not over scrupulous in their manner of conducting their calling; but there are others, I am pleased to be able to say, in the city of Perth and in Fremantle, who are strictly honourable. Some of those latter charge a fee for their services, and if their client does not, for any reason, remain in the situation obtained for one month, the brokers are honourable enough to undertake to provide another situation for them. When we find there are brokers prepared to do that, it is an evidence that they are carrying on a legitimate and *bona fide* business. But there have been innumerable cases in which girls desirous of entering domestic service have been entirely at the mercy of unscrupulous employment brokers; and they have been sent to situations for which the broker knew perfectly well they were unsuited. His only concern in many cases is to obtain the fee charged for securing the engagement. The fees which are charged by some brokers are in my opinion excessive, and out of proportion to the scale fixed

by regulation in Victoria. And while I admit that, all other things being equal, having regard to the varied circumstances of employment here and the higher rate of wages ruling in Western Australia, clients may be reasonably called upon to pay a higher fee than in Victoria; yet there is no reason why the difference should be so great as to amount to extortion in most cases. In Victoria the fees which employment brokers may charge are fixed by regulation made by the Governor-in-Council; and it is with the object of bringing about that position of affairs in Western Australia that I have introduced this amending measure. I have incorporated those clauses in the Victorian measure that deal with this aspect of the case, making provision for a scale of fees to be prescribed by regulation and for those fees to be posted in a conspicuous place in the offices of employment brokers. A question which may crop up is the fixing of the scale; but I think that is a matter which may well be left to the discretion of the powers who for the time being are responsible for the administration of the measure. That there are existing evils there can be no doubt, and I think the best means of overcoming those evils is, in the first place, by prescribing for a scale of fees to be fixed by regulation, and also, as an additional safeguard to the employee, by prescribing that the employer shall pay 50 per cent. of the fee. This innovation was suggested to me by a gentleman who has been in the habit of engaging employees through registry offices; and he tells me that he has repeatedly found cases in which servants have been sent to him from registry offices who were absolutely unsuited for the class of work for which he had asked the employment broker to send him servants. This gentleman tells me he has reason to believe that the practice adopted in many registry offices is to say to a client, "We will send you to this place, and if it does not suit you we will get you another place." The girl pays the fee, gets the position, and may remain in it only three weeks or a month, because she finds it is not suitable, having gone there simply because she had paid a fee, and the broker had undertaken to find her another situation. The broker does find her another situation, which probably lasts three weeks or a month; and if he is an unscrupulous broker he will charge an additional fee. It is to minimise these evils that I introduce this Bill, and I hope in Committee to make one or two amendments which will render it more effective. There can be no more despicable act than to take advantage of the necessities of people who are looking for employment, to insist on the payment of exorbitant fees for securing engagements, and then to send the servants to situations for which the broker knows they are not suitable because they do not understand the work required. I ask the House to pass the measure; and when in Committee other members who have had some experience of the matter will be able to suggest amendments additional to my own, so that we may place on the statute book a piece of legislation which will be of material advantage to a class of people who unfortunately are not organised as unionists, and who, when travelling about from place to place, are frequently the victims of unscrupulous employment brokers. I have much pleasure in moving that the Bill be read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—WINES, BEER, ETC.

NO NEW LICENSES.

SECOND READING

Resumed from the 12th September.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. N. Keenan): This Bill has few clauses; and I venture to say that on reading those few clauses members will find it difficult to reconcile themselves to its acceptance, at any rate on the grounds advanced by the mover. I desire to call attention in particular to the prominent feature of the measure, which practically erects a ring fence round all existing licensed premises, thereby enormously adding to their value; and apart from erecting that fence and prohibiting any possible competition by other premises in the vicinity, the Bill will achieve no useful purpose whatever. Why do I say that? Because it is to my mind just as important to get rid of licensed premises which do not supply the public with the requirements for which they are justified in asking, as

it is to avoid the granting of unnecessary licenses. If we have in our midst many licensed premises which are not, even in the least degree, carrying out the intention for which they were first licensed by supplying the wants of the public, I think that to secure the continuance of trade in those premises must in itself be an object of which members will hesitate to approve.

MR. TAYLOR: Rarely are licenses ever cancelled on that ground.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I was about to suggest when interrupted that it would be far preferable to bring in a measure to enable the bench to cancel those licenses, rather than a measure such as this, which really preserves them in existence so long as the measure remains on the statute-book. If we wish to proceed on lines of reform, let us not perpetuate existing evils, but rather let us remove those evils. In many parts of this State new communities spring into existence. The wants of such a community are few, and are at first fully supplied by licensed premises of little value, affording very scanty accommodation. In course of time that community may become an important settlement; and the question then arises, is not the licensing bench not only justified but bound to see that the accommodation progresses with the settlement, to see that the licensed premises which in the first instance were perhaps sufficient, though constructed of wood and iron only, be put on one side and proper premises of a more advanced type, with better accommodation, erected in their stead? Surely, if we have at heart the interest of the public, we should legislate with that object, by giving the licensing bench power to impose conditions on licensees, to make them keep their licensed houses at least in some degree commensurate with the wants of the district in which they happen to exist. But will that result be achieved by this Bill? Quite the contrary. The Bill provides that after the commencement of the Act, and so long as the Act shall continue in force, no publican's general license, hotel license, wayside-house license, gallon license, or wine and beer license, and no provisional certificate, which means one granted for premises about to be erected, shall be granted under the provisions of the Wines, Beer and Spirits Sale Act of 1880, for any premises not licensed at the commencement of the new Act. That simply means that the Act will grant a monopoly, without exception, to existing premises, no matter how unworthy, no matter how inferior, no matter how far they may fall short of the requirements and demands of the neighbourhood in which they exist. That, I think, is an object which we certainly ought not to make any attempt to achieve.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The Bill does not seek anything of the kind.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: If the hon. member will allow me, I will read the whole Bill if necessary, to prove that no power whatever is given to any bench to take away the license from any premises on the ground that those premises are unfit, or at any rate if the word "unfit" be too strong, are not adequate for the requirements of the neighbourhood. The remaining portion of the Bill reads—

> Nothing herein contained shall prevent the granting of a license for premises in respect of which a provisional certificate shall have been granted before the commencement of this Act.

The Bill has no retrospective effect. The clause continues—

> Provided also that the Governor may from time to time suspend the operation of this Act in any place where no licensed premises are situated within a radius of twenty miles or upwards.

The ring fence has a radius of twenty miles. There is a farther proviso that—

> The licensing magistrates shall have full power and authority as heretofore to grant the transfer of any existing license to any new premises erected or in course of erection, or to grant a publican's general license to the holder of an existing wine and beer license.

This simply means the transfer of an existing license. The licensee will have this Bill protecting him, giving him a monopoly without fear of competition, with no danger, no matter how rotten his premises, of losing his trade because of the erection of new premises more commensurate with public requirements. If the licensee is so foolish as to build premises worthy of the place, he can obtain a transfer. But that is the only redeeming provision in the Bill. The Bill is as I described it; and I am sorry that the member for West Perth inter-

rupted me, because I have been forced to read the whole of the measure.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You have not proved anything.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I think I did prove that the Bill gives a monopoly to existing licensees, no matter how rotten may be their premises.

MR. TAYLOR: For 12 months only.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: While the Bill operates. I am informed by the member for West Perth that this is not so. If he is right I shall certainly be pleased to have my error pointed out, pleased to see what single word in the Bill can possibly convey a meaning different from that which I have put on it. The Bill provides simply that while it is in force no hotel license, no license granted under the Wines, Beer, and Spirits Sale Act 1880, for any premises not licensed at the commencement of the operation of the measure, can be granted.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The Bill will not prevent the bench from closing any licensed premises which they wish to close.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The bench have no power to close any licensed premises which they wish to close. If we are to bring about reform we must advocate reform on right lines. If we are to have a reform Bill, let us have a genuine reform Bill; not a sham Bill such as this, that merely creates monopolies—a Bill that after all will be heartily welcomed by every publican in the land. There is a test which the member for West Perth can well apply to his Bill. Who will welcome it? Will it be welcomed by temperance reformers, by those who have the interests of the public at heart—[MR. ILLINGWORTH: Yes]—or will it be welcomed by those who hold licenses? The hon. member can easily find out, if he likes, who will be the people to welcome the Bill. The Bill provides that so long as it remains in force—and certainly there is a fixed limit to its duration—the existing licensees have an absolute monopoly, with not the slightest danger of competition, no matter how unworthy may be their premises, no matter how slovenly and disgraceful may be the conduct of their businesses. For this session the Government found it necessary to prepare many Bills at short notice. Members will grant that at least. We had a very short time at our disposal in which to meet the House and bring down measures of great importance.

MR. HOLMAN: The preceding Government had plenty of time.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I take no responsibility for any preceding Government.

MR. TAYLOR: You have managed to introduce 31 Bills.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: That shows we have not been idle. But I believe there is room for a genuine reform Bill to amend our Wines, Beer, and Spirits Sale Act. I believe there is room for a Bill which will not, as this Bill seeks to do, intensify most objectionably the evil it seeks to cure, but will deal on broad lines with the whole spirit trade; a Bill not only empowering magistrates to refuse licenses on the ground of local objections, but to deal with existing licensees who do not properly cater for the public wants.

MR. TAYLOR: The liquor law needs reform from top to bottom.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon member, to use a phrase which he is always using, "reminds me" that the law needs reform; and I admit it. It needs reform, for instance, to deal with existing licenses, and that I believe is one of the most important requirements, because members will recognise that when settlement first takes place in a locality we have no right to ask for anything more than the most primitive form of hotel accommodation. The settlement may consist of only half-a-dozen shanties, and a working population on mines round about which may "peter out" in a few months. There it would be absurd to ask for a brick hotel. The licensing benches allow hotels to be put up of a flimsy character. They contain very little accommodation, but when settlement does progress, the accommodation is not sufficient. Every one of us knows this; we know places where it happens—even the town I represent contains houses that would disgrace a back country settlement, or a village. These houses have been there since the early days. The court at present has no power over premises that complied with the original provisional certificate. If a man is given a provisional certificate, and has carried out the requirements of the Act as to the

accommodation, the court cannot say, because it is a wood and iron building, you must pull that building down and erect one of stone. Even the Building Act only applies to a limited portion of the towns of Boulder and Kalgoorlie. There is no town on the goldfields that complies with the building Act, and only a portion of Kalgoorlie and Boulder.

MR. E. E. HEITMANN: Wardens have refused licenses because the houses were not in a fit state.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: In the first instance?

MR. HEITMANN: No. Subsequently.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: They are only entitled to refuse renewal of a license if the house has fallen into disrepair.

MR. TAYLOR: But if the requirements of a district increases after the erection of the hotel, has not the bench power to say, "Your original certificate does not meet the requirements of the district; you will have to build a better place"?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Certainly not. A bench has no right to say, "Owing to the progress of the district this wood and iron building is not sufficient, and you must erect a stone one."

MR. TAYLOR: But if the general accommodation is not equal to the growth of a district, has not the bench power to say—"You must add to the structure so as to meet the requirements"?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: If the house contain the statutory number of bedrooms and accommodation, that is all that is requisite. According to the law a certain number of bedrooms has to be provided, and the number is very limited. But if these conditions are complied with, the power of the bench ceases. I am aware that the benches exercise an influence, and a very beneficial influence; but it is entirely outside the scope of their authority. Still I am not here to criticise the benches for not doing so, or to commend them for doing so. Under the existing law it is not within the province of a licensing bench to do that which is absolutely necessary, to take away a license from a building which is behind the times, because the building may be in good repair, but constructed of materials which it is absurd to ask the public to be satisfied with, according to the advanced state of the town. The Bill will give an absolute sinecure to those who are holding licenses to-day, therefore it is unworthy of acceptance by the House. The Bill is also objectionable because it is attempted to deal, in a very small measure and to a limited extent, with a very big question. It is only on account of the number of measures that we have had to draft and bring before the House that we have not before the House a measure dealing on broad and proper lines with this question of the liquor traffic. This session we cannot do that. Members are aware, after all a wheelbarrow has a limited amount of capacity, and our political wheelbarrow is very full. To undertake to deal with this question in a glib manner is absurd. I am prepared, and I will carry out any undertaking I give, to bring down in the early part of the new session, when we meet again, not a measure of this character; but a broad measure dealing with the question of local option; the question of enabling licensing benches to require that accommodation which the circumstances of the neighbourhood justify; a measure which I hope will provide an adequate and proper scheme for the extinction of licenses which exist in too large numbers in some districts, on a basis which it is not necessary to forecast now; but which will supply a proper system of compensation without unduly taxing the purse of the State. Such a measure I feel sure the House will give grave attention to. But this measure is only meant for one purpose. It is meant for a very worthy purpose, to restrict the granting of licenses by licensing benches, because some do not believe licensing benches can be trusted. Is that not the reason? If they believe that licensing benches can be trusted, there is no reason for the Bill. Altogether apart from the fact that the Bill establishes an undesirable state of affairs, the desire of those who have brought it forward is to take away from the licensing benches a power which they believe licensing benches are not to be trusted with. If they say licensing benches are fit to be trusted, why do they bring forward such a Bill? I am not prepared to take up that position. Admitting a Bill of this character in other

respects is desirable, I am not prepared to say that licensing benches, taken all in all, are influenced except with a desire to serve the public interest. It is perfectly true mistakes are made, but is that to be taken as sufficient reason for legislation of this character? When we remember the possibility of these mistakes is limited by the fact that in a short interval of time a full measure will be brought before the House, then I say we are still farther debarred from taking any action of this character. I hope I have explained to the House why we object to the Bill. I object to it for the reason stated, that it will create a monopoly in the drink traffic to those who hold licenses at the present time. I farther say on other grounds that can be substantiated, it simply amounts to a vote of censure on our existing licensing benches, which I entirely dissent from. I have no reason to doubt that mistakes have been made, but I am not prepared to say that the conduct of the licensing benches throughout the State warrants the passing of a measure of this character. I hope the House will see fit not to pass the Bill.

MR. H CARSON (Geraldton): I regret exceedingly the remarks made by the Attorney General in regard to this Bill. We all know that four separate Governments have promised a Bill which will give us local option; the James Government three or four years ago, the Daglish Government 18 months ago, the Rason Government, and now the Moore Government have made these promises. Yet we have not had the Bill placed before us. I think it is absolutely essential that the House should pass this Bill, if it is only the means of bringing the Government to consider a full measure next session. But all Governments do not care to deal with the drink question. It is not a nice subject, for various sections of the community disagree about the drink traffic, and no Government likes to take the question up in an extensive manner. I hope the House will pass this Bill. The Attorney General says the measure is creating a monopoly, but I think at the present time there is a monopoly. He stated that people who have miserable houses can still conduct them without interference. That is a mistake. The benches are empowered to cancel licenses if houses are not conducted properly, or are unfit for the community in which they are situated. There is a case in point in my district. At the last licensing meeting, the license of the Walkaway Hotel was granted on the understanding that before the next licensing meeting the place would be improved. [MR. TAYLOR: The member for Greenough is looking at you.] He is the owner of the property. The longer the measure is put off, the greater the compensation we will have to pay to those who have their licenses taken from them in the future. This is a phase of the question we all have to look at. Undoubtedly licensees must receive compensation of some character, whether as a time limit or a money grant. I regret the Government cannot see its way to support this Bill. A similar measure was brought before the House last session, and was passed, but unfortunately it was thrown out in another place. I hope the Government will see its way to assist in the passage of this measure, and then there will be some prospect of it getting through another place.

MR. E. C. BARNETT (Albany): I intend to support this measure. If the Government had carried out the promise made last session, there would be no necessity for this Bill. There was a definite promise made by the last Government, that a Bill dealing fully with the licensing question would be introduced this session. I differ from the Attorney General. I believe the residents in the locality of a proposed hotel should have a right to say whether the new license should be granted, and not allow the licensing benches to decide as they think fit. It is in the best interests of the State that this measure should pass, and the sooner it is left to the public to say whether additional licenses shall be granted or not, the better. I support the Bill.

MR. P. STONE (Greenough): I do not see the necessity for this Bill, as the Government has given the assurance several times this session that it intends to bring down a measure dealing with the whole question next session, embodying local option and the different ques-

tions which a Licensing Bill should deal with. The member for Geraldton referred to the hotel which I happen to own. There is a case in point. I proposed to put up a building costing £2,000; but the bench being constituted mostly of teetotallers desire that I should spend about £3,000 in a place where accommodation is not required, and the trade does not warrant it; and I think that when a bench is selected as a licensing bench the Government ought to be careful to see that people of this class are not put on the bench. I consider that the publicans or brewers have as much right on a licensing bench as a rabid teetotaller; they possess as much sense and as much knowledge. I have much pleasure in opposing the Bill.

MR. J. VERYARD (Balkatta): It is my intention to support the motion before the House. The increase in the public-house and hotel licenses has been more than in proportion to the progress of the State for some years past; and one feature of the licensing magistrates is that they refuse to grant licenses unless certain accommodation is provided. The result of that is that these places have a very large number of spare rooms. Evidence of this has come before the licensing bench within the last few days. I think it is sufficient to show that there is no particular need for farther licenses to be granted for some time to come. The scope of the Bill is only 12 months, and three months will have to elapse before the next licensing court, so that the Bill will only have effect for a term of nine months. The drink bill of this State is an enormous one. The average per head is probably the largest in the world, and that I consider a serious reflection on Western Australia. The increase of arrests for drunkenness is going on year after year, and the Police Commissioner has informed us in his report that 75 per cent. of the criminals in the prisons have been brought there through the result of drink. [Interjection.] Some member says "rot." I do not know whether the report is rot or not; I am only quoting from the Commissioner's report. This alone I think should be sufficient to cause the House some anxiety with a view to arresting this increase of criminals. I do not think that the Bill can do any real harm to anybody in the State. There may be a monopoly for some of the publicans for a few months, but I think that will be compensated for if the Bill becomes an Act by the probable reduction of compensation under the proposed Local Option Bill which is likely to be before the House in the very near future. I have heard some objections raised by the Attorney General, but my opinion is the member for West Perth will be very glad of the Attorney General's assistance to amend the Bill somewhat in the direction he suggests, with regard to the bench having power to withdraw licenses from certain houses. The Attorney General has also said that this Bill is practically a censure on licensing magistrates. I think that is an absurd remark coming from the Attorney General. There is no attempt by this Bill to censure any bench of licensing magistrates. The idea is to withhold a farther increase of licenses, so that when the Local Option Bill comes in we may not have to pay so much compensation. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): On account of the unavoidable absence of members who I know desire to speak upon the measure, I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. H. E. BOLTON (North Fremantle): If one could accept the argument or interpretation of the Attorney General there would be sufficient ground to oppose the measure, but I intend to support it for one reason alone.

MR. HEITMANN: He is opposing it.

MR. BOLTON: Not necessarily. It is because I believe it will bring pressure to bear upon the Government to introduce their promised reform. I remember the promise given to this House, and on the hustings, and in the delivery of policy speeches, that we were going to have local option and general reform of the liquor laws. That has not yet come about, and surely we cannot be expected to take the word of the present Attorney General any more than we could that of the head of any previous Government.

MR. TAYLOR: He seems earnest.

MR. BOLTON: So they have all seemed earnest, they all promised, and still it has never come about, and I very much doubt if the next session will bring forth the promised measure. [Interjection by the MINISTER FOR WORKS.] Perhaps the hon. member is referring to my pairing. I did make that promise at a late hour last night, and I candidly admit that I forgot I had paired.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I was not referring to that; that is all right.

MR. BOLTON: It was thrown at me that I voted, although I had paired, so I may as well make the explanation; and I saw the hon. gentleman in his seat before that vote was taken.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, pardon me; not in the precincts.

MR. HEITMANN: That is not in this measure.

MR. BOLTON: In any case, if the Attorney General is prepared to introduce in the early stages of next session this long-promised measure, will it not be advisable to amend Clause 3 of this measure by inserting the words "or until the passing of the consolidated measure," so that the period for which the Bill would remain in force would not be limited to 12 months, and only the passing of an amending or consolidating measure would cancel this one?

MR. TAYLOR: It only means that it will remain in force 12 months.

MR. BOLTON: I think that if this Bill passes, and it is only to remain in force 12 months, it will be necessary to bring in a Bill to be in operation for another 12 months. The consolidating measure will not come down this session. If it does, the present Government will be a shade ahead of any other Government, and I am not prepared to give it credit for that now. I shall support the Bill because I believe it will impress upon the Government the necessity of introducing a consolidating and amending measure.

MR. E. E. HEITMANN (Cue): I think we ought to be able to speak quite feelingly on this measure, seeing that we have the credit of consuming more liquor than any other country in the known world. I intend to support the Bill. I was rather inclined to follow my friend from Kalgoorlie, but I cannot see that any great injury will be done by preventing new licenses from being granted for a period of twelve months. I think that the member for West Perth should have brought down a more comprehensive measure than he has. I should have thought that he, as one belonging to a party which has for years advocated temperance, would after all these years of agitation have been well able to bring forward such a measure, instead of placing the responsibility upon our worthy friends opposite. Reference was made to-night to the Bill being a censure upon the licensing benches in this State. I agree with the Attorney General that is not necessary, nor does the Bill imply that such is the case. Seeing the way in which licenses have been granted right and left in Perth and in the suburbs of late, I think it is really necessary that some Bill of this description should be brought forward. It appears now that a man with money can get a license every time. A man has to put up an expensive building, and if he cannot get a license this year he is almost certain to get it next. I have been reminded that some of the parsons even have been applying for licenses.

MEMBER: Ex-parsons.

MR. HEITMANN: I think the hon. member who introduced this measure is sincere; and as it is necessary to do away with some of the evils following upon the drink traffic, I shall be pleased to support the Bill, and shall be still farther pleased next session to support a proposal, if brought forward, to embody in the measure a provision for local option.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): Before the member in charge of the measure replies, I would much prefer to have the debate adjourned, but I see there is no chance of it. I know members who have taken a very active part the last two sessions in connection with the liquor traffic, and they ought to have an opportunity of speaking on the second reading of this measure. Some I know would like to have an opportunity of supporting the measure, and others may perhaps desire to oppose it. There should be the fullest discussion possible on a measure of this description. The Attorney General pointed out in a very

able manner his views on this measure, indicating that the Bill would create a monopoly and would build a ring-fence around the existing licenses. I am not here to accept that statement. There is ample ground to argue from that standpoint; but the Attorney General has promised a comprehensive measure next session dealing with the liquor traffic, and I take it that such a comprehensive measure will, according to the statement of the Attorney General to-night, do away in some instances with licenses that are already granted.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: It will not prevent the creation of new licenses, if they are required.

MR. TAYLOR: It would be impossible for any Government in this State to carry a measure that would absolutely prevent the creation of new licenses, if required. The public desires have to be catered for, and perhaps in the near future licenses will be required in goldfields areas which are at present uninhabited. At the same time, if the Government are sincere in bringing down a comprehensive measure which will meet the requirements of this State, in dealing with the liquor laws, that measure will have to make provision for compensation, if licenses are taken away. That being so, the Bill by the member for West Perth is in my opinion justified. We have no desire, in view of the depleted state of our Treasury, from all we can gather, to create any farther conditions which will be a strain upon that Treasury. This Bill will not in my opinion, taking a practical view of the matter, create that monopoly which the Attorney General has argued it will do. No one is more opposed to monopolies than myself. Perhaps I may be accused, according to the line of argument used by some members opposing this Bill, as being one incompetent to sit on a licensing bench, or to deal in any way with a measure concerning the liquor laws, because I am practically a teetotaller. Hon. members may consider I am incompetent, but I am dealing with the liquor traffic with just the same open mind as any other member. It does not necessarily follow that because a member of the licensing bench is a teetotaller or a heavy drinker, he is not competent to know whether a license is justified or not. I think the argument used by members in that direction is not of much value in considering this measure. As the Bill will only continue for 12 months it will not work any hardship. I feel confident that no matter how expeditious the Government may be it will be impossible for them to place on the statute-book the comprehensive measure this session which their predecessors promised last session. I believe last session a similar Bill to this was introduced by the member for Claremont, and the then Premier (Mr. Rason) prevailed on the House not to tinker with legislation, saying that his Government had just taken office and fought an election campaign, and that they were unable to bring down a large comprehensive measure dealing with the liquor traffic; but he promised with all that seriousness and faithfulness he was accustomed to do, to deal with the question this session. I do not say the Attorney General's promise to-night will be a similar promise to that. However I may disagree with the Attorney General in politics, I believe that when the hon. gentleman gives his word in any walk of life, it is his object and desire to carry it out; and I believe that if he is a member of the Government next year he will bring down that comprehensive measure; and this small measure being in force 12 months only, will just enable the Government to deal in a practical manner with existing licenses. We know that people desiring licenses, who have that particular mental fibre to try to get licenses for speculative purposes, will bring as much political, social, and other influence as they can conjure up on licensing benches to grant them licenses, so that when the comprehensive measure is passed and their licenses are abolished they may receive compensation. No doubt that position will be taken up; and to prevent that state of affairs coming into existence, the member for West Perth desires, and he should be commended for it, to save the country from heavy compensation fees which are likely to follow on the comprehensive measure being passed by this House. I support the second reading of

this Bill. When it gets into Committee, if opportunity arises, the member for West Perth should provide for those shortcomings which the Attorney General was so eloquent on. I think the hon. member will have no hesitation in accepting amendments which will deal with the licensing benches in the matter of granting the power they now lack, as indicated by the Attorney General. I hope the second reading will be passed to-night.

MR. H. R. UNDERWOOD (Pilbarra): I do not know a great deal about liquor, but at the same time I intend to oppose the Bill, because I am opposed to monopolies, and because I think the Bill would certainly have a tendency in that direction. There is another point. In a State like this there are many towns, particularly mining camps, that come into existence very rapidly.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Provision is made for that.

MR. UNDERWOOD: The provision is 20 miles from the nearest licensed house, but mining camps very often spring up within five or six miles; and it is often necessary that public-houses should be on these camps. In regard to the number of hotels increasing the consumption of liquor, I do not think it always follows. I know that in many cases where there are no hotels the men get whisky into their camps in cases, and often drink considerably more than if they had to buy the whisky at hotels. I intend to oppose the second reading of this Bill.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (in reply as mover): I have to thank the House for the kindly way in which the Bill has been received. The Attorney General made one statement to which I desire to call attention. He said that the Bill will enormously increase the value of existing licenses. If there is any word at all that would emphasise the necessity for passing this Bill, the Attorney General has supplied it. If that is the state of things, if this Bill will enormously increase the value of licenses, the more licenses issued the more compensation will have to be paid. How can it enormously increase the value unless farther licenses are granted? And every fresh license granted means another license to deal with when we are dealing with the comprehensive Bill. Out of the 50 members in this House, 40 are pledged to the principle of local option; and the Premier has definitely promised, and that promise has been repeated again by the Attorney General, that this question, including the local option principle, shall be introduced next session. If it is intended to transfer the principle of granting licenses from the magisterial benches without casting the slightest reflection on them, to the people themselves—and that is the principle of local option—why should we continue to grant farther licenses when we know that the people desire to deal with this question themselves? Since we know that 40 members of this House are pledged to the principle of local option, it is quite certain that if the comprehensive Bill is introduced, the principle of local option must pass; and that principle is to transfer the granting of licenses from the will of the magisterial bench to the people in the several districts. It is to prevent this enormous rush for new licenses during the incoming year that the Attorney General speaks of, that this Bill is introduced. We want to leave things as they are. If a new district arises, provision is made. I am not bound to 20 miles; any reasonable distance suggested I am prepared to accept. The principle of local option is a definite one so far as members are concerned, and we wish to leave the question to the people. If the local option principle is accepted—and it was accepted by the people at the last election, because 40 members were elected pledged to it—we should leave the question of issuing licenses to the people themselves. If the people want this—and they have returned members to vote for the principle—why should we continue as is being done now, because at every meeting of the licensing bench there is a rush for licenses? It is considered that these licenses are of great value. If they are, when the time comes for compensation the compensation will be considerable. Therefore we ask the House to suspend the principle of granting farther licenses until the principle of local option

has had a fair trial. It is a fair request, that we should not increase the licenses if it is the intention of the people to alter the present conditions. It is a question for the people to decide if they close the hotels, or if they increase licenses, and not for us; but it is fair for us, at any rate, to say that we will issue no farther licenses until people have had an opportunity of deciding the question.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

PAPERS—POLICE LAUNCH "CYGNET."

Debate resumed from the 1st August, on Mr. HOLMAN'S motion, "That all papers in connection with the purchase and fitting with an oil engine of the police launch Cygnet, also the occurrence or report book in connection with the trial runs and general working of the launch since the fixing of the engine, be laid on the table."

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. J. Price): The Government had no desire to oppose this motion. Having gone through the file, he regretted that, between the Minister's approval of one type of engine and the determination to purchase another, there was no record of any professional opinion having been obtained. Probably the late Minister would offer what he might deem an excellent explanation, but it was eminently desirable that a transaction of that nature should be fully recorded by documentary evidence. This matter did not occur during the tenure of office of his colleague the Colonial Secretary. There was no objection to placing the papers on the table.

Question put and passed.

[Mr. ILLINGWORTH took the Chair].

MOTION—RAILWAYS TO BE CONTROLLED BY MINISTER.

Debate resumed from the 8th August, on the motion by Mr. Ewing to revert to Ministerial control of our railway system.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. H. Gregory): The motion moved by the member for Collie the other evening dealt with the question with the object of reverting to the system which was in force in Western Australia up to 1902. The hon. member apparently is desirous of going back to the old system of Ministerial control of our railways, and the abolition of what we know as the Commissioner system. As far as I could see, his speech was an attack more upon the Commissioner himself than upon the system. I fail to see that he brought forward anything which should induce this House to revert to the old system. In the majority of the other States we have the commissioner system. A statement I have here shows that Victoria, in 1883, was the first of the group of States to adopt the system of placing the management and maintenance of the railways under the control of three commissioners. From the 1st February, 1884, to the end of 1891, the construction as well as the working of the lines was vested in this body, but on the 1st January, 1892, the duty of construction was transferred to the Board of Land and Works under the provisions of the Railways Act 1891. During 1896 the number of commissioners was reduced to one; but under the Victorian Railway Commissioners Act 1903, the control of the lines of the State was placed in the hands of three commissioners from the 1st June, 1907. That is the system they have at the present time in Victoria. In South Australia during 1887 the control of the railways was entrusted to three commissioners. In 1895, however, the number was reduced to one, who is responsible to Parliament. In New South Wales up to October 1888, the control of the railways was vested in the Minister for Works, the direct management being undertaken by an officer under the title of commissioner. I am reading extracts which have been supplied from the Commissioner's department, and I do not take any responsibility for any opinions given in this statement. It was, however, recognised that political influence entered unduly into the management of this large public asset, and as a consequence the

Government Railways Act of 1888 was passed, since consolidated as the Government Railways Act 1901, with the object of removing the control and management of the railways from the political arena, and vesting them in three railway commissioners, who were required to prepare for presentation to Parliament an annual report of their proceedings, and an account of all moneys received and expended during the preceding year. While the avowed object of State railway construction has been to promote settlement, apart from consideration of the profitable working of the lines, the principle has nevertheless been kept in view that in the main the railways should be self-supporting. In Queensland for many years the construction, maintenance, and control of the railways were carried out by a branch of the Public Works Office, and subsequently by a separate Ministerial department with a secretary responsible to Parliament and administering the details of the office in a manner similar to any other Crown Minister. The Railways Act of 1888 however, while leaving the Minister in charge of the department, vested the construction, management, and control of all Government railways in three commissioners, of whom one was to be chief commissioner. The number was subsequently reduced to two, and later a single commissioner was appointed, holding the authority formerly vested in the three. In undertaking railway construction the State is guided by other considerations than those which would direct the action of private investors, and is content for a time at least to recoup the expenditure in an indirect form. There are some other remarks dealing with the drought, which I think would hardly interest members. In Tasmania the control of the railways is vested in the Department of Lands and Works, the active management being undertaken by an officer with the title of General Manager. In New Zealand the management of the railways was placed in the hands of three commissioners in 1887, but early in 1895 the Government resumed charge of the lines, the active control being vested in an officer with the title of General Manager, who is responsible to the Minister for Railways. These are the systems which are in vogue in the various States. We find that with the exception of Tasmania and New Zealand the railways are under the control of commissioners. In Tasmania they have always been under political control. In New Zealand they were transferred some time ago. In 1887 they were placed under commissioners, but in 1895 they reverted to Ministerial control. I thought that in dealing with a matter of this sort members would appreciate being informed of the systems in vogue in the various States, so that they would be able to give consideration to the principles adopted elsewhere when dealing with the question here. Dealing with the administration in Western Australia the member for Collie gave us a good many figures, and more especially did he deal with the increased expenditure upon our railways. He pointed out that during the time the present Commissioner was in office it had increased by 2½ millions, and yet very little in the way of increased benefits to the State could be shown for this increased expenditure. In the first place I want to point out that to a very small extent indeed is the present Commissioner responsible for the 2½ millions—£2,380,000, but taking it roughly 2½ millions as quoted by the member for Collie. The Commissioner was, I say, responsible for a very small amount indeed of that large item. Of that amount which has been expended since he took office, £1,151,000 was expended by the Public Works Department in work over which the Commissioner of Railways had no control in any shape or form. The amount expended by the Commissioner has been £1,246,000, and of that there was £800,000 for rolling-stock; and as to that £800,000, £633,000 worth of work had been ordered prior to the Commissioner's taking office; so that the present Commissioner is responsible for an expenditure of only about £600,000 out of that 2½ millions since 1902. The member for Collie then pointed out that in regard to this increased expenditure, results were not being shown for it; that it did not show increased profits. Members must take into consideration

the fact that during those few years we have had a very large amount expended in rolling-stock on our new corridor cars and dining cars, and there have been improvements to stations and fencing upon railway lines, and conveniences afforded everywhere to the public. These increased conveniences do not necessarily mean increased revenue for the Railway Department. They are very necessary for the convenience of the public, but they do not bring us increased revenue to any great extent. On the other hand, it must be admitted that they cause increased expenditure. Extra haulage and other charges must without doubt increase the working expenditure in connection with the railway system. I would also like members to take into consideration in regard to our revenue that in 1903 the Railway Department lost control of the large revenue earned by the Fremantle Harbour Works, the estimated profit in connection with which amounted to £40,000 a year. So that meant a fairly considerable loss to the present Commissioner of Railways. The member for Collie pointed out that the profits for the three years 1900, 1901, and 1902 amounted to £239,541. The figures he gave were quite correct, but he did not give those figures in detail. Had he done so he would have shown that the profits in 1901 and 1902 indicated a considerable reduction on the profits made in 1900. For the year 1899-1900 the profit of the Railway Department was £162,066. In the following year that profit was reduced to £65,307, and in the following year the profit was only £12,168, so that during those three years there was a considerable reduction. In the three following years the profits were: for 1902-3 £30,887, which was a fair increase on the profits for 1901-2; in 1903-4 the profits were £111,784; for 1904-5, £100,957. I would like to point out in dealing with the question of these profits for 1904-5 that the Commissioner includes £78,000 spent in ballast and in otherwise improving our permanent way, the charge for which could well have been made out of capital account. We can also fairly add to those years the amount which should have been received, or has been received by the Harbour Trust, which had not been created during those years. The amount in regard to 1902-3 was £20,000 for a half-year, and in each of the following two years £40,000. Were these included, the profit would be for 1902-3 £50,887, for 1903-4 £151,784, and for 1904-5 £140,957, or an increased profit as compared with the three preceding years. Members may say of course that there were the increased rates which were given effect to during 1902. They must remember at the same time that there were increased wages given to the staff, and I am advised that over 1,000 of our officers have had increases which have averaged more than £30 per head, increases which were well deserved, and which the Government have been very pleased to be able to give to those workmen and officers; yet it is a very large increase indeed in connection with the railway system. Then in addition to that there are other figures which should have been added for expenditure which was never incurred in previous years. In the year 1902-3 we placed upon the Estimates a sum of £26,350 for locomotives and £28,136 for wagons, and for a few other items charged to working expenses. In 1902-3 we spent, as I have pointed out, £54,000 in rolling-stock, and charged that to our working expenses. In 1903-4 we spent £33,787, and in 1904-5 there was a charge of £40,331. Those items were for the replacing of rolling-stock. They were new items charged against the working expenses of our railway administration, and therefore I think could be well charged, seeing the increased profits earned by the Railway Department. The summary prepared for me shows that with the provision for locomotive replacement and the provision for bringing up our wagons to standard, the profits in 1900 were £162,000, in 1901 £65,000, and in 1902 £12,168; whereas, since the appointment of the Commissioner, the railway system *plus* the Harbour Trust, which has been taken out of the Railway Department, and making provision for locomotive replacements and for bringing up our wagons to standard, shows profits as follow: 1902-3, £105,373; 1903-4, £185-571;

and 1904-5, £181,288. That shows very clearly indeed that the profits earned during the past three years have been much higher than those earned during the preceding three years. We have also to consider the increased interest bill. The member for Collie pointed out that during the past three years 2½ millions were expended. Our interest bill in 1901-2 was £252,000; in 1902-3, £274,000; in 1903-4, £296,000; whereas for 1904-5 it was £331,000. As I pointed out before, much of this money has been expended in giving increased facilities to the travelling public, and has earned very little indeed for the State. I should like to deal with the question of economy. I did not trouble to read the figures showing the increased revenue received by the department during the last four years; but we all know there has been a very large increase in the revenue, and on the other hand we have had a very largely increased mileage also. The working expenses of the Railway Department during 1901-2 were £1,256,000, and we had then 1,360 miles of railway. In 1902-3 working expenses were £1,247,000—much less than in 1901-2, though we had in 1902-3 1,516 miles of railway. In 1903-4, with 1,541 miles of railway, the working expenses were £1,179,000, or less than the expenses for the two preceding years; while in 1904-5, with 1,605 miles of railway, and a good many of the railways are not the paying propositions that our railways were when we had a smaller mileage, the working expenses were £1,177,000.

MR. BATH: Paid out of revenue?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The working expenses of the railway system were £78,000 less in 1904-5 than in 1901-2, prior to the appointment of the present Commissioner of Railways, although we had 245 additional miles of road. I think those figures particularly bright; for before considering the profits on the railways we look first to the expenses. And when I have pointed out that the large expenditure of last year includes over £40,000 added to our working expenses for supplying the place of obsolete stock, we nevertheless find that our working expenses even with that addition, were £78,580 less in 1904-5 than in 1901-2. Yet, although the working expenses were £78,000 less, we carried in 1903-4 2,443,000 tons as against 2,040,000 tons in 1901-2, or 400,000 tons additional traffic for an expenditure of £78,000 less. In 1904-5 we carried 11,845,000 passengers as against 8,158,000 passengers in 1901-2, that is over 3½ million additional passengers. It may be thought that with this increase of passenger traffic the revenue should be very much greater. But the revenue from passengers in 1904-5 was £481,000 as against £430,000 in 1901-2, or only £50,000 more for the extra 3½ million passengers. I think the reason is to be found in the great facilities granted during the past 12 months for special excursions, which are highly valued by the public. I think I am justified in saying that the rates for those special excursions are not equalled in any other part of Australia.

MR. BATH: Excursion rates are pretty low in New South Wales.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Commissioner stated the other day that special excursion fares granted by him, especially for long distances, are lower than in any other part of Australia. My main object in drawing attention to these figures is to show that although we are carrying an additional 400,000 tons of traffic, although we carried 3½ million additional passengers, although we have been working 250 additional miles of railway, and although our working expenses include £40,000 for replacement of stock which did not appear in the Estimates of 1901-2, we are able to do this work for £78,580 less than the work cost in 1901-2. I do not propose to deal farther with this question. My figures show clearly that the administration has certainly been economical. It cannot for an instant be claimed that this economy has been achieved at the cost of the worker. The wages paid to our railway men are, I think, fairly high, and have given great satisfaction to all classes, and to myself personally. I do not think by any method of argument it can be said there has been any desire for economy in that regard shown by the Commissioner.

MR. BOLTON: There is a little saving attached to the men working on Sunday.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: We do not find that such is the case. The member may be able to show one or two instances where this may occur, but under the arbitration award the men are not compelled to work more than 96 hours in a fortnight, that is 48 hours a week. A little quibble was raised over the question a short time ago, but it did not do much good for the railway workers. These little quibbles make one feel that it would be well to give effect to the Arbitration Court awards. It is not wise to use these little pin-pricks on every occasion. It cannot be in the best interests of the workmen employed on the railways. Our desire is to see that all the men get a fair wage, but I do not want to deal with that phase of the question to-night. We have shown very large economies in connection with the Railway Department. I do not think any person can say that those economies have been effected at the expense of the workers. We want at all times to get rid of the "waster," the man who thinks because he has a Government billet he ought not to work, only to receive his pay. I want to see these men put on one side. We pay a good wage, but we must see that the work is done. When we can show that we are able to carry the extra tonnage, when we carry more than 3½ million passengers, when there are more miles of railway worked, and when we have not cut down the wages but have considerably increased them during the past three years, I think we have done well. We have shown that the working expenses are £78,000 less than in the preceding year. I think it is idle to labour this question, but there are one or two other points raised by the member for Collie I would like to deal with. First some comments were made by the member as to the Armadale duplication, and the Commissioner of Railways was castigated by the member for Collie in regard to the construction of the Fremantle railway station. I want to emphasise this, that the Commissioner has not the power to spend any loan moneys without the authority of the Minister having been first obtained.

MR. HORAN: Why was the Armadale duplication approved?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Commissioner obtained the full authority of the Government to carry out the work. The Government of the day approved of the work being carried out, and the same can be said in regard to the Fremantle railway station. The present member for Guildford authorised the expenditure of £80,000 at Fremantle. Of course the Commissioner recommended the work, but the member for Guildford, who was then Minister for Railways, gave formal authority for the expenditure of £80,000 on that work. As far as the ordinary Estimates go, when they are passed by the House the Commissioner gets his authority, and spends the money without interference by the Minister. But there are many cases of urgency and small matters which it is not worth while asking Ministerial authority for. There are cases where work is wanted promptly, to be done quickly, and the Minister delegates a certain authority to the Commissioner to have the small works and urgent works carried out; but in connection with larger works—say the Commissioner desires to put an overhead bridge over the railway line somewhere at a cost of £200 or £300, he sends that request on for the approval of the Minister, and if the Minister will not find the money the work cannot be carried out. Sometimes members desire to blame the Commissioner for expenditure on the railway system, more especially loan moneys, but the Government are more responsible than the Commissioner for this expenditure. The Commissioner recommends the work; he wants a certain work carried out, but the Government deal with the financial aspect of the question, and if the Government does not think the work should be carried out it cannot be done. I wish to point that out, because in the speech of the member for Collie the Commissioner got a great deal of blame in connection with the construction of the Fremantle railway station and the Armadale duplication.

MR. EWING: Was no portion of the money for the Fremantle station expended without authority?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Not that I am aware of. I went carefully through the jacket, and I do not think one 6d. was spent in connection with that work before the authority was given by Mr. Johnson, the then Minister for Railways.

MR. BATH: There was the purchase of the land—the secret purchase for the station.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That occurred some few years back. The member for Collie in dealing with the qeustion the other night referred to the erection of the Fremantle station, and the expenditure in the railway station yard, the laying down of the rails, the removal of plant, and so on. He did not deal with the purchase of the land, and he was making the Commissioner responsible for that expenditure. The Commissioner was responsible to the extent that he had recommended that the work should be done. After careful consideration by the late Administration I believe the original estimated expenditure was cut down by £15,000 or £18,000. The original estimate was about £98,000, and I believe it was cut down to £80,000, but since then it has been farther cut down by myself. But that is beside the question. The real question is who was actually responsible for the expenditure of the money, and I am only referring to these questions to point out that there is clearly a line of demarkation between the Commissioner and the Minister. The Commissioner has special powers given to him under the Railways Act to control the management and maintenance of the railways. He has absolute control of all the workmen, and I think it is a particularly wise thing that political influence does not come in between the workers and the Commissioner. We have our law that provides that any person employed on the railway system, if he is dissatisfied with the decision of the Commissioner, can have his case placed before an appeal board. I do not think the workers object to that board. They may object to some individual member on it. But a resident magistrate is made chairman of the board. the department nominates one of the members, and the workers themselves elect the other. I think the desire of the board is to see that justice is done; and if the workers were under Ministerial control, the Minister's life would be something awful if he interfered in the least with those workers.

MR. BOLTON: The member for Katanning (Hon. F. H. Piesse) did not find it so; and he was a very successful Minister.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: If he were to say that he was never troubled in connection with such matters, I should accept his statement; but I do not think he has ever made that statement. nor do I think he is likely to. I know that when I first took office I was deluged with letters asking me to assist men who had been dismissed from the service, and many letters came from members of Parliament. I wrote to the secretary of the association, and stated that I would not interfere in any way between the workers and the Commissioner. The workers have their appeal board. An Act of Parliament clearly sets out their position; and I stated that I would rely on that Act, would have no log-rolling and no political influence in connection with the men.

MR. BOLTON: Could you not take that stand if the department were under Ministerial control?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Possibly; but many Ministers might be too weak to do so.

MR. EWING: Then they ought not to be Ministers.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: But such men become Ministers, and like to favour members with grievances. It is quite possible that this has been the experience of other States, else why the various changes in the control of their railways? Here, before by-laws can be made by the Commissioner, they have to be approved by the Governor-in-Council. All expenditure is controlled by the Government of the day. I pointed out that all the Eastern States, with the exception of Tasmania, believe in commissioner control. Thus we get absolutely outside political influence. Parliament

has full power to direct the policy of the railways. If we tell the Commissioner that he must work the railways at a profit, he has to increase the rates accordingly. If, on the other hand, we wish to assist any special industry, the Commissioner gets his instructions, and loyally carries them out. If we have such power, we ought not to ask for more.

MR. GULL: Now I shall always know where to go when I want anything.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes; but when we find our funds low, and we have people asking for special assistance to industries, the Minister is not too anxious to see reductions made. I should have liked on several recent occasions to make promises of reductions in many of our rates. The member for Collie knows how anxious I was a little while ago to do something to enable large orders for Collie coal to be delivered on the Day Dawn goldfield, thus securing the employment of a great number of men at Collie, so that instead of sending out 1,200 or 1,500 tons of Newcastle coal each month, we should send out from 1,500 to 2,000 tons of coal raised locally. At the same time, we could not afford to abandon a good profit and make a certain loss. The distance was too great; otherwise, if we could have seen a small margin of profit, the Government would have been only too pleased to give the assistance needed by that industry. One must cut his coat according to the cloth; and at the present time we find great difficulty in making reductions. I think it would be a great mistake to revert to any system whereby political influence and perhaps log-rolling would be introduced to the Railway Department. The returns I have read show that the administration has been economical. I think our Perth-Kalgoorlie service is equal if not superior to any special service within the Commonwealth. Travellers from the Eastern States have complimented the department on our Kalgoorlie express, and have said that in the Eastern States there is not its equal. True, we cannot carry our trains at the same rate of speed as can our neighbours, because we have a narrow gauge; but for convenience, and for ordinary travelling facilities, I say that what we are giving to the public would be very hard to beat.

MR. TAYLOR: Travellers cannot be so well provided for anywhere else in the Commonwealth.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The general impression of travellers, as I have been told, is that our Kalgoorlie express is superior to any of the expresses in the East. This improvement has been effected during the past three years. The administration has been proved to be economical. We have carried a largely increased quantity of goods. We have carried over 3½ million additional passengers. We have opened up more lines of railway, and are doing this work for £70,000 odd less than we paid four years ago. In these circumstances, I think it would be absolutely suicidal to revert to a system which I think was not highly approved of in the old days. I am not for a moment wedding myself to the system of one Commissioner. The question will arise next year whether we shall have one Commissioner or three, or no Commissioner at all. I think that better work would be done by three Commissioners; and I should prefer three to one. At the same time, I hope there will be no departure from the present system. It is a system new to us; and apparently the Eastern States consider it in their best interests to administer their railways through Commissioners. I hope, therefore, that the House will not approve of the motion.

MR. EWING: Do you mind telling us why the Commissionsr of Railways did not consult with the Engineer-in-Chief as to saving expenditure on the Fremantle station?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: There was some delay; and I would ask the hon. member to call at the office and see the files. I can explain the whole position. There was some little friction, but I do not care to ventilate the details. I shall be pleased to let the hon. member have all the files, and to give him the fullest particulars.

On motion by MR. BATH, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at half-past 10 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 27th September, 1906.

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: 1, Public Works Department—Papers in connection with the Survey and Construction of the Katanning-Kojonup and Wagin-Dumbleyung Railways, Return to Order of the House of 12th September. 2, Roads Act, 1902—By-laws of the Claremont Roads Board. 3, Government Railways Act, 1904—Report on the working for year ended 30th June, 1906.

QUESTION—RAILWAY STATION BRICKS.

Hon. W. MALEY asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, In the contract now advertised for the erection of Railway Station Buildings at Narrogin is it specified that machine-made bricks only may be used, thereby preventing competition? 2, Is the Government aware that the local hand-made bricks have been proved to be of excellent quality, and accepted by the best architects, and that by their use a considerable saving may be effected in the cost of the work? 3, Will the Government take the necessary steps to amend the specifications with a view to effecting an economy?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1. No. The specification provides that the bricks must be sound, hard, well-shaped, and kiln-burnt. The contractor must submit sample for the Department's approval, but can purchase where he likes. Alternative prices have, however, been asked for brickwork with machine-pressed bricks. 2, The Department has been informed to this effect by the Narrogin Town Council. 3, This is not considered necessary.

QUESTION—RAILWAY REVENUE.

HON. W. MALEY asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Does the sum of £77,701, which appears in Statistical Abstract No. 75 as the amount collected from railways and tramways for the month of July, represent the full amount collected. 2, What is the cause of the average monthly revenue suddenly diminishing by about £60,000?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, The amount appearing in the Statistical Abstract No. 75, viz. £77,701, represents the collections from railways and tramways from the 1st to the 26th of July, being the business for the month (1st to 26th). In addition, £35,000 was collected between the 1st and 10th of July and brought to account in the financial year ending 30th June, 1906, in accordance with Treasury Regulation No. 6. There was also collected, from the 27th July to the 31st July, the sum of £18,029, which has been taken to account in August, making the total collections from the 1st to the 31st July, £130,730. The collections from the 1st to the 31st July, 1905, were £129,425. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, SUBLETTING.

HON. G. RANDELL asked the Colonial Secretary: Is it a fact that the Public Works Department has sublet to various persons its contract for the construction of the agricultural railways, or for any one of them?