

his employees in the character of Tom Pinch. He absolutely denied the assertions of the member for the Murray relative to the operation of the Factories Act in Victoria. Farther, he objected to any member of this House continually holding himself up as a pattern. It would be better for the people of the Murray if they got a little more representation here, and the Black Swan Foundry a little less.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: The hon. member had the impudence —

THE PREMIER: Was this in order?

MR. GEORGE: It was to be hoped he would be within the Standing Orders in saying that the hon. member had had the assurance to offer gratuitous advice to the Murray constituency. The best answer he could return was to refer the hon. member to the figures at the last general election. The electors of the Murray were satisfied that their interests were safe in his hands.

THE PREMIER: The question was as to the granddaughter.

MR. GEORGE: He was replying, as he had a perfect right to do, to a member who had attempted to dictate to the people of the Murray. He might refer to another matter, but to appreciate that some intelligence was required, and the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) could certainly not be accused of the possession of a surplus of intelligence. The question of the granddaughter might now be put; but his attention had just been drawn to the fact that there was not a quorum.

[Bells rung; quorum not formed.]

COUNT-OUT—ADJOURNMENT.

THE SPEAKER, finding there was not a quorum present, adjourned the House at 11.46 o'clock until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 9th October, 1901.

Question: Fisheries Inspection, Islands — Motion: Kurrawang Syndicate, to stop farther Concessions (negatived) — Leave of Absence—Summary Jurisdiction (Married Women) Amendment Bill, third reading—Land Act Amendment Bill, in Committee, resumed, reported—Excess Bill (1899-1900), second reading, in Committee—Assent to a Bill—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—FISHERIES INSPECTION, ISLANDS.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM (South) asked the Minister for Lands: 1, If it is the duty of the Inspector of Fisheries to visit the islands off Fremantle, in connection with the supervision of fishermen and the interests of the department. 2, If so, if a thoroughly fast and seaworthy boat is provided by the department. 3, What are the dimensions of the boat at present provided for the Inspector. 4, If a request has been made for a steam launch for outside work. 5, If so, why has one not been provided.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Yes. 2, No. 3, Open boat, 17ft. over all, 6ft. beam. 4, Yes. 5, £2700 has been provided on this year's Estimates for the purpose.

MOTION — KURRAWANG SYNDICATE, FARTHER CONCESSIONS.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM (South) moved:

That, as the Kurrawang Syndicate is concerned in the charges made against the General Manager of Railways, it is essential that no farther concessions be granted to the syndicate until Parliament has had an opportunity of considering the report upon such charges against the General Manager.

He said: Within the last three weeks a deputation representing the Kurrawang Wood Syndicate waited on the Minister for Lands, asking for a concession to go through certain reserves that had been declared for the purpose of protecting the firewood on the lines at Mt. Burges, Kunanalling, and other districts. The Kurrawang people asked the right to go through these reserves and cut timber on the Crown lands beyond. Another

deputation consisting of woodcutters and small contractors also waited on the Minister for Lands, and pointed out that under the present conditions they were not allowed any right of laying down lines for the purpose of getting fuel. The only right they had was to get sidings from the Government, for which they have to pay from £300 up to £700 or £800, and they have to cart all their timber in by teams and carts to those sidings and then send their fuel over the Government lines. Those sidings extend from just this side of Kalgoorlie to 60 or 70 miles down the line, and the freight which is paid by these smaller contractors and smaller men is a very large consideration to the Government, whereas the Kurrawang Syndicate only pay freight for about 12 miles over the Government lines, and if this concession be granted to the Kurrawang Syndicate there will be practically a private wood line running in opposition to the already constructed Government line, and the Government through that will lose a very large amount of trade. The line between Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie has been duplicated at a very large expense to the Government, and the purpose of that duplication was the carriage of fuel and the carriage of water for the supply of the mines at Kalgoorlie. The consumption of fuel on these mines is something very large, and can be adequately supplied by the smaller men who have simply the sidings, and at the present price of fuel supplied by the Kurrawang Syndicate. The report of the board of inquiry which has been appointed during the last week to inquire into the charges against Mr. John Davies will be in the hands of Parliament I suppose within the next couple of months, or something like that, and, as a good many of those charges are the outcome of the Kurrawang Syndicate, it is only reasonable to ask that no farther concession shall be granted to the syndicate until that report is laid on the table of the House.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. Sommers): I hope this motion will not be carried. I do not wish to appear here as an advocate for the Kurrawang Company, but it appears to me that whatever the Kurrawang Company may have done in the past, or whatever undue privileges they may have enjoyed, would

not affect the present Administration in any way. The Kurrawang Syndicate have approached the Government, not asking for a concession, but with a certain business proposal.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Who are the members of the syndicate, do you know?

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: That is not known.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: No: I am not sure. I believe Messrs. Smith and Timms are members. There are four or five members belonging to it; but I am not sure of their names. The syndicate have made a certain business proposal to the Government.

HON. J. M. SPEED: Can you not tell us what is the proposition?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The proposition is that the syndicate should have the right to cross a certain reserve which has been proclaimed by the Government for the protection of mines in the vicinity, and after crossing that reserve to cut firewood in the forests there and to bring it in to Kalgoorlie.

HON. G. RANDELL: Is that on the Eastern line?

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: It is north of Coolgardie.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: north of Coolgardie. The syndicate propose to pay the Government any reasonable charge for the use of rolling-stock on the line they wish to lay down, and also to pay to the Lands Department any reasonable royalty the department may see fit to impose for the right to take away this timber. It is not an exclusive right, but a right that will be open to everyone. The Government, being desirous of hearing all sides on this question, delayed in coming to any decision until they heard the views of all interested. A great many deputations have waited upon nearly all the Ministers and given their various views on the case; and seeing there is a likelihood of the supply of firewood close to the Government lines being shortly cut out, there are now certain regulations being prepared whereby at an early date it is proposed to throw open to anyone the right to make these spur lines under regulations which will protect the public interests. I think it wrong for hon. members to endeavour to tie the Government in any business proposition they may be asked

to consider. With regard to the past transactions with the Railway Department, the Kurrawang Syndicate have been served with a writ for, I think, £3,000; and from this circumstance I assume that is the only amount the department claim from the syndicate, and the total amount due to the Government. If that be paid, or if the case be fought out in the law courts, whichever party is right will get its due; and that suit should not in any way interfere with any fresh proposal for laying down a new railway line. The Government, believing that in the past the syndicate have had privileges which others did not enjoy, will naturally be careful to see that the public interests are protected in any new arrangements made. To carry this motion now would, I think, prejudice the case of Mr. John Davies, which will shortly be heard by a board of inquiry. Now that the Government have the views of all those concerned, I think the matter might well be left in the hands of Ministers, and at this juncture I do not think the House should interfere.

HON. M. L. MOSS (West): I rise to support the motion. I cannot see how the carrying of the motion will prejudice Mr. John Davies, or what connection one subject has with the other. So far as Mr. Davies is concerned, no person in the community wishes more earnestly than I that he should have the fullest and most impartial trial it is possible to give him. Suggestions are abroad as to the *personnel* of the board appointed, and I hope that if there be the slightest suggestion of partiality, those constituting that board may see fit not to act, or that the Government will do what is necessary to revoke any appointments about which there is a breath of suspicion. At a time when it is fashionable to vilify the ex-General Manager of Railways, I say it is all the more necessary that members of Parliament should see that nothing is done which will prevent his getting an absolutely fair and impartial trial. But while I hold this strong opinion on that phase of the question, I cannot see for the life of me what is the connection between a fair trial and investigation of the charges against Mr. Davies, and the motion proposed by Mr. Bellingham. I support the motion because I believe it is the policy of the

country—or it should in my opinion be the policy of the country—that all the railways should be in the hands of the Government; that the public carrying should be conducted by the Government; and that the benefits to be derived from the carriage of goods, particularly on the goldfields where carrying is so profitable, should accrue to the State. The Kurrawang Syndicate got a certain concession, I believe for the cutting of firewood.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: No; for the carrying of it.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Very well. The syndicate, without the authority of Parliament, practically secured a right to make a railway. I may be wrong, but I understand that right was acquired in this way. Where land is taken up under certain regulations, the holders may construct a tramway through it; but this Kurrawang line is to all intents and purposes a railway; for I understand it is of the three feet six inch gauge; that the Government trucks are used, and Government rails and Government sleepers; and whether Mr. John Davies or the Minister in charge at the time was responsible for what occurred, I do not know and do not care; nor do I think it has anything to do with this motion, which, I take it, aims at preventing the syndicate from getting any concessions in connection with the carrying trade, of which trade the Government railways should undoubtedly have the benefit. If it pay the Kurrawang Syndicate to increase the length of their line and to carry this firewood, it will pay the State to do that.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Question.

HON. J. M. SPEED: Not this Government. It would have paid the last Government.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Is the Kurrawang Syndicate carrying firewood out of motives of charity to the industries on the goldfields? As a matter of fact, it is a pure business speculation; and if Mr. Smith and the other persons who form the syndicate are men of business, able to drive the bargain which undoubtedly was driven with the Government or the Government officers at one time, they are not such stupid as the Minister would like to make us believe. They are men capable of driving a bargain calculated to put money in their pockets.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I did not suggest anything to the contrary.

HON. M. L. MOSS: What did you suggest when you said "question"?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The question about the profit on carrying timber.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I say, the members of the syndicate see well before them prior to asking for additional concessions. This concession is going to be productive, and will put money in the pockets of the syndicate. The Minister has told us the concession is to enable the syndicate to get the benefit of a larger area of timber-producing country for the purpose of supplying the mines on the fields. My opinion, which I intend to express most emphatically here, and for not expressing which I and other members would be brought to task by our constituents, is that if this large carrying trade will pay a private company, the Government should have the benefit of it. I do not know that the carrying trade, so far as the goldfields are concerned, has been unprofitable to the Government. I believe the bulk of the railway profits is due to the fact that we have a large consuming population on the fields, and that everything required for the maintenance of the population is bound to be carried on the railways; and it seems to me that by granting additional concessions to the company, we shall throw away a profitable part of our business and give it to a private syndicate. Such a policy is altogether opposed to the idea of a very large majority of the people of this country, who believe that the whole of the railways should, as far as possible, be under Government control. We know that our friends who represent the districts round about Geraldton are continually asking for papers with reference to the Midland Railway Company. We hear from time to time in this House loud condemnations of that company, which is inflicting great injury on the country. And the Kurrawang Syndicate are, perhaps in a smaller degree, a perpetuation of what has been condemned right and left. Mr. Bellingham is to be commended for having brought up this motion; and if we can do anything, even at this juncture, which will prevent further concessions being granted to the syndicate, I think we are in duty bound to do it. If I could see for one moment that the carrying of

this motion would do any injury at all to Mr. John Davies, I should be the first to say it is not to pass so far as my vote is concerned. But the Minister has given no reasons for coming to that conclusion; and I cannot see the connection between one point and the other. Mr. Davies's connection with the Kurrawang Syndicate will form one of the subjects of inquiry; and what connection can that have with what may be done now, long after his suspension? I think it is idle to say this motion will prejudice Mr. Davies. It will do nothing of the kind. I think a very serious wrong will be done if we grant additional concessions to a syndicate, the transactions of which are shrouded in a good deal of mystery, and have been so severely condemned by all gentlemen who represent the district wherein the concession was granted which formed the subject of such loud protests throughout the country.

HON. D. M. MCKAY (North): I shall support the motion, because I think it essential that the report of the board of inquiry should be seen before any farther action is taken.

HON. J. M. SPEED (Metropolitan-Suburban): I shall support this motion, chiefly because in another place the Ministers themselves have thrown a great deal of doubt upon the transactions of the Railway Department with the Kurrawang Syndicate. A speech was made there condemning Mr. John Davies; these very transactions form one of the strongest accounts in the indictment on which Mr. Davies was suspended; and it seems most peculiar that the same Government which condemned Mr. John Davies, and, incidentally, condemned the Kurrawang Syndicate, should now come to us and say they are going to give the syndicate a farther concession.

HON. A. G. JENKINS (North-East): I cannot support the motion as it stands. I think this matter may safely be left to the Government. The Government should know the past and present transactions of the syndicate; and the great point the goldfields members especially have to consider, is as to the probability of the firewood supply being cut off, and the mines at Kalgoorlie placed in temporary difficulties. [HON. J. M. SPEED: Question.] That is a matter on which strong representations have been

made to the Minister from both sides interested; and I think the Minister and the Government are best able to weigh the various arguments brought before them, and to decide which is right. But I, at all events, will not be a party to passing any motion which at the present time would in any way hamper the gold-mining industry, and throw a good many people out of employment.

HON. J. M. SPEED: Then let the Government give some reasons. We have heard nothing from them.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY (North-East): I have a certain amount of sympathy with the motion, and think Mr. Bellingham deserves some credit for bringing the matter forward; but at the same time I feel with my colleague, Mr. Jenkins, that the first consideration in the province we represent is to see that the firewood supply of the mines be not endangered. I think, as this matter has already been so well threshed out, and as the present Government know how the syndicate got unfair concessions in the past, we can safely leave the matter in the hands of Ministers. The Minister for Lands knows the facts of the case, and I think it would be rather injudicious to tie the Government, or seek to tie the Government, as is proposed in this motion. Hon. members are well aware of the great hardship it would be, not only to the mining belt at Kalgoorlie, but to the State as a whole, if anything should happen to compel the mines to cease work either in whole or in part, thus throwing a great number of men out of employment.

HON. J. M. SPEED: There is no fear of that.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: I venture to express the opinion that there is some fear of it. I certainly agree with the remarks that have fallen from the Hon. Mr. Moss. If the Kurrawang trade can be done by the Government railways, then it most certainly should be done, but I think that in the wording of this motion some mistake has crept in, in this way, that no farther concession should be granted. I do not know that the Kurrawang Syndicate are asking for any farther concession; they are asking to extend their lines, certainly, but I do not know whether that can be classed as a concession or not.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: They want to go through a reserve; that is a concession.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: I do not know whether you would call it a concession. At any rate, the Minister for Lands is fully seized of the facts, and I think we may safely leave the matter in the hands of the Government. If this wood can be secured along the Government line, I trust the Government will give those people every assistance to supply the wood. On the other hand, I say that if the wood cannot be supplied at the same cost as now to the mines, a farther extension or something of the kind should be granted to the Kurrawang company, or any other firewood company, because at all hazards we must keep the mines fully supplied.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE (South): I regret exceedingly that I cannot support the motion of the Hon. G. Bellingham, and it is for this reason, that not long ago—at least last session—I moved a motion in this House for the right to run a timber concession south of Coolgardie from the Government railway. At the present time the difficulty of obtaining timber for the mines in Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie is even greater than it was last year. Of course it must be so, and if we stop the Kurrawang syndicate at the present time we shall have to throw something like 1,100 men out of employment. A short time ago a deputation came from Coolgardie, to favour the prevention of farther concessions being granted to the Kurrawang company, and one of the prominent members of that deputation was asked if they could supply the mines at Kalgoorlie at the present time. He answered that they could not. The timber difficulty in Kalgoorlie is very very great indeed, and I can only impress upon this House at the present time that, if the Kurrawang company is not granted this concession to supply timber to the mines, there is a very great fear—in fact there is a very great possibility—that the mines will not be supplied with timber, and some of them will have to shut down. As you are all aware, I am a member of the South Province, in which Coolgardie is situated, and I have all along suggested and proposed that lines should be run from Coolgardie to the southern districts, to that particular town.

HON. M. L. MOSS: To Esperance, I suppose.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: We shall get Esperance without Fremantle's assistance. If Fremantle has the same treatment as Esperance, Fremantle will be like some place where there are only about two or three hundred people. I have suggested all along that timber lines should be run south of Coolgardie for the purpose of obtaining timber not only for Coolgardie but for the Kalgoorlie mines, and to-day the mine managers in the vicinity of Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie are in great fear that they will not be supplied with timber for working their mines. I made very deep inquiries when I was in Coolgardie last week with regard to timber country around Coolgardie, and I found that the concession asked for by the Kurrawang company is 17 miles due north of Coolgardie. If any attempt were made to take the timber from the neighbourhood of Coolgardie, or any mines working in that vicinity, I would strenuously oppose such attempt, because I think that where mines are working every opportunity should be given to these companies to retain the timber concessions in the vicinity of the mines that are working. In this case it is not so. The timber that is proposed to be tapped by the Kurrawang company is quite 17 miles from Coolgardie, and is not in the vicinity of any mines that are worked.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Why cannot the Government do it? Why do you want the Kurrawang syndicate to do it?

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: If the Government would propose to run a timber line, I would support that proposal, but I have made inquiries and find that the Government cannot give that assurance. Consequently, sooner than I would see something like 3,000 or 4,000 men thrown out of employment—

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: There is no chance of that.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: I intend to support the motion at present moved. What on earth has the Kurrawang company to do with Mr. John Davies? Are we not anticipating the John Davies inquiry? I think we are. I do not think we have any right to inquire into that matter until the board appointed to inquire into the actions of the Traffic

Manager of Railways has done so. I therefore think that the motion is most inopportune now, and I cannot help opposing it to-day, because I feel that if the motion be carried it will be a direct censure on the present Government, who have looked very carefully into this matter. I know from the civil servants on the goldfields who have spoken to me on the matter that the Government have been very careful in their inquiries as to whether the mines can carry on without the Kurrawang at the present time. I fear that if the Kurrawang company is shut up there will certainly be a great number of men thrown out of employment, and some mines will not be able to proceed in their work. I regret, as representing the Southern Province, in which this has taken place, that I cannot support the motion, because I know that my constituents will think I ought to do so. Still, I know, having conversed with the direct representatives in another place, members of the Legislative Assembly, that if this motion be carried, very grave results will accrue in the mining districts.

HON. J. M. SPEED: How do you know?

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: How do I know? You have only to see the statistics produced on the occasion when the deputation waited on the Minister recently with regard to the Kurrawang syndicate. They will show that the people cannot possibly be supplied with timber without the syndicate at the present time.

HON. J. M. SPEED: What do the other side say?

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: I told you just now that one of the leading men of the deputation on the other side said that if the Kurrawang were shut down they could not supply the timber, and on those facts I am opposing the motion to-day.

HON. J. M. SPEED: What is his name?

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The hon. member can look up the newspapers and find his name. I intend to oppose the motion, because I feel sure that if carried it will be a direct censure upon the Government, for one thing, and they are in a position at the present time to know whether it is right or wrong to let the company have that concession.

HON. S. J. HAYNES (South-East): When I first read the motion it seemed to me a very reasonable and proper one,

but on reconsideration I cannot see my way clear to support it. Judging from what I have seen in the papers, the Government seem to have had both the *pros* and *cons* of the Kurrawang syndicate placed before them. They have also had numerous deputations, as is well known to everybody, and I think they are the very best judges at the present time of how to deal with this company. Certainly, unkind things have been said of the company in the past, and have been referred to in the public Press, the chief of which, I think, is—and perhaps it is not blameworthy as far as they are concerned—that they got a very good bargain. The Government have the whole of the particulars in the office, and undoubtedly they will look into them very carefully. As I have before stated, they have had deputations representing the Kurrawang interests and also other deputations representing the other woodcutters in the neighbourhood. Moreover, the requirements and the demands of the mines have been placed before the Government by people from the district who ought to know their wants, and also by representatives from those districts. It is right and proper to leave a business transaction like this in the hands of the Government. It is for the Government to consider whether they will carry the wood themselves or not. If they cannot do so, surely the next best course is to enter into a transaction with others. If they enter into a transaction which may be condemned, they will be responsible to Parliament, and no doubt after past experience, or any discovery or anything that may come out in the John Davies inquiry, the Government would put themselves into a serious dilemma if they entered into a transaction which could not be supported by this House.

HON. M. L. MOSS: They would not ask the House to ratify it.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I do not say they would, but I say that if an agreement were made by the Government which would be condemned by any right thinking person, the Government would put themselves into the position of being condemned by Parliament. I think that in business transactions the Government are the best judges of how to deal with them. If many motions of this class were brought forward in the House, the Government of the country could not be

carried on. The Ministry of the day are in office for the purpose, and those transactions are open to the opinion of other members of the House.

HON. J. M. SPEED: When they are finished.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan): I think all members will admit that this is a very important motion, inasmuch as it deals with the supply of firewood to the important mines at the Boulder. Hon. members like myself will try to have all the information it is possible to get on this question. We have seen reports in the newspapers of the deputations which waited upon various Ministers, and whether those reports are full and give us a concise statement of the exact position, I am not able to say. We have one gentleman representing the goldfields moving a motion, and three others also representing those constituencies are opposed to it. I take it the only desire of members is that the best thing in the interests of the State shall be done. Without going so far as to express an opinion, which I am not in a position to do, as to which side is right in its contention, I think we might reasonably ask that the Government shall take us into their confidence a little bit on the question, as to what is proposed to be done, and how they view the representations which have been made to them. We all know of course the condemnation which has been expressed on every hand almost of the concession which was given to the Kurrawang syndicate some considerable time ago, and we find them now coming and asking the new Government to give them a farther concession. It is a serious matter, for the company wishes to go upon reserves against the express desire and wish of a large number of people round about Coolgardie and going down towards Boorabbin. Representations have been made that there is a danger that mines in the vicinity will be deprived of the fuel which is naturally theirs because of its situation, and that it will be taken from the mines at Kalgoorlie. If the Minister is able to assure us that the Government are taking this matter into serious consideration, and that they will be guided, as I am sure they desire to be, by a regard for the country's best interests, and not by any desire to favour

the working men who formed one of the deputations, or on the other hand to favour the syndicate, then the matter may be left to the Government. But I hope the Government will deal with this question with a view to the importance of the interests concerned. In contradiction to Mr. Brimage's statement, we hear that the firewood cutters to the south or the west, I do not know which --[HON. G. BELLINGHAM : Along the line]—are fully able to supply, and more than supply, the requirements of the mines in the Kalgoorlie district, and also to accumulate stocks. If that be so, the statement of Mr. Brimage is to some extent discounted. I quite agree with Mr. Moss's remark that in dealing with this question, the case of Mr. John Davies will not be prejudiced in any respect. I do not think that is the object Mr. Bellingham had in moving his motion. I take it his motion has sprung from a desire to promote the interests of the people concerned. I quite concur in what Mr. Moss has said. If I thought for one moment it would prejudice the case against Mr. Davies, I should not be a party to passing this motion; but I do not see that it can. I think it is the desire of every member that Mr. Davies should have a fair and impartial trial. Regarding the general question, I also favour the opinion that the Government should control all railways in this country. That is, I think, the almost universal desire, not only of members of this House, but of the country generally; and when we allow such syndicates to enter upon these railway enterprises, we are to a certain extent doing injury to the public interests, and to some extent, at any rate, depriving the Railway Department of the full earnings they would otherwise secure. If, as is asserted, the woodcutters are able to supply and more than supply the mines, there does not seem to be any reason for haste in this matter; and though I should be indisposed to hamper the Government while they are the Government, I think they must be allowed to exercise discretion, and that in such matters as this we must trust to their honesty of purpose. At the same time, I think it very desirable that in this case, upon which so much has been said on one side and the other, and in which such serious charges have been

made, the Government should let the Legislature know as soon as possible in what direction they intend to move. To do so would allay a good deal of unrest, perhaps dissipate some prejudices which have been formed, and be, on the whole, most acceptable and beneficial to the country. Of these matters I am not able to speak from local knowledge. Of course we should all deplore anything which would prevent the mines from continuing in full operation. At the same time, I think the Minister has not given sufficient reasons to satisfy hon. members not personally acquainted with the subject, with the locality, and with the truth of the statement that there is an absolute need for the syndicate continuing their operations. I do not think any of us care for one moment about the expenditure already incurred by the syndicate. They must have incurred it with their eyes open; they were limited in their operations to a certain district; and if they are trading upon the idea that, having, in vulgar phrase, got in the thin end of the wedge, they can drive it home by getting farther concessions, I think they ought to be undeceived. I hope, whatever may be the result of the hon. member's motion—and I think he is quite right in moving it considering the great interests involved—that the Government will remember that public opinion has been formed upon this question, and will keep in view the desirableness of acting in equity to all concerned, and at the same time in the best interests of the mines.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM (in reply) : If I thought for one moment that this motion would have a tendency to stop any of the mines on the Kalgoorlie belt, I certainly should not have brought it forward; but I am so satisfied that the present arrangements with the small contractors and the timber-cutters along the line can keep the mines going, that there is no need to consider that question. The last deputation which waited on the Minister for Lands—the deputation of the men who are working there with their teams, and who are prepared to cut wood and carry it for the benefit of the Government railways and of the country—they, as the Minister knows, offered to deposit £10,000 in cash as a security that they would keep six weeks ahead with a supply of fuel for the mines. As

to what Mr. Brimage says, that if this motion be carried there will be a likelihood of the mines shutting down and 2,000 men being thrown out of employment, I say that is absolutely absurd; and I am surprised at the hon. member's having been hoodwinked by members of the Kurrawang Syndicate into making such a statement. When the deputation waited on the Minister, one of the directors of the company said that within one week the Kalgoorlie mines would shut down. That was three weeks ago, and the Kalgoorlie mines are still at work, and they are likely to be at work long after the Kurrawang Company ceases to exist. The supply of firewood on the fields is quite sufficient without the Kurrawang Company. Some members of the deputation said that at the present time they could not get rid of the fuel they had to offer to the mines: the mines were overloaded, and absolutely refused to take fuel. Then I think it is absurd to say these mines are likely to be shut down through the want of fuel; and it is only the Kurrawang Company trying to hoodwink hon. members and the public.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. Sommers): I regret that I did not make myself clear, so that the House could understand me on this very troublesome question. Were the Government to allow this motion to be carried, it would probably get them out of a very awkward fix, by determining a question which has given to every member of the Ministry a great deal of anxiety. The Government cannot be accused of having approached this matter with any great haste. When the first deputation waited on me as Minister for Lands, I distinctly asked that it be made known that before coming to any conclusion I desired that time should be given for all sides to be heard.

HON. G. RANDELL: Are you sending up an officer?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I will come to that. I represent the North-East Province, in which Kalgoorlie and Boulder are situated; and with my brother members from that province, I say that to run any risks whatever by tying the hands of the Government would be unwise. As a representative of the district I have a special knowledge of the subject, and I do not believe the House

would uphold the idea of laying down Government railways for the purpose of carrying firewood only. I do not think such lines would pay. I think, seeing the Government would be asked to put down more costly lines than are laid by private companies, the extra cost would more than counterbalance the possible profit made from the carriage of firewood. Moreover, the public would not be content that the line should be laid down for the carriage of firewood only, but would ask us to carry goods and passengers also, which would involve an expenditure of a very much larger amount than would be necessary for firewood only. Therefore it is clear that though it might pay a syndicate to put down a short line 10 or 20 miles long, knowing that the line was required for only two or three years, the syndicate could more profitably handle the firewood traffic than could the Government; and I do not think this or any House would for one moment advocate the idea of laying down Government railways for the purpose of carrying firewood only. It is only by allowing syndicates to put down these short lines to isolated patches of timber that such timber can be made profitable. However, as I have already told several deputations, the Government are now preparing a scheme. I am afraid I will have to repeat some of the remarks I made earlier when I was interrupted by the elements. I was about to say that with the Hon. Mr. Connolly and the Hon. Mr. Jenkins I have the honour of representing the North-East Province, in which the towns of Kalgoorlie and Boulder are situated, and I claim to have a special knowledge of the requirements of these places. The Government have been accused of undue haste in regard to this matter. I may tell hon. members that no decision has been come to in reference to this application of the syndicate for an extension of the line.

MEMBER: Who are the syndicate?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not know who they are. I believe they consist of four or five persons, of whom Mr. Smith is one.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Surely the Government know whom they are dealing with!

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Which Smith?

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: Teesdale Smith.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: A former Minister for Lands gave a permit to lay down a line for the carriage of firewood only, and the Minister for Lands at the time was justified in doing so, because under the Lands Act and under the Mines Act permission can be given to any person seeking to lay down a tramway for the purpose of bringing in material for the mining interest. With regard to the Lands Department, permission has been given to various saw-millers on the South-Western railway, and no objection has been taken to running Government trucks on those lines, except what has been taken here. I am not advocating the cause of the Kurrawang syndicate, and from the knowledge of the past and believing that in the past the company have had undue privileges given them in the arrangements made, the present Government will take every precaution to see the public interest and public revenue protected. Rightly or wrongly, advisedly or inadvisedly, the company have had the right to lay down a tramway for carrying firewood. Certain reserves were made to protect the mines in the vicinity. The company do not ask that these reserves shall be interfered with in any way, but simply ask to have a tram to go into that waste country.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: Three miles away.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The company want to go to waste country where there are no mines, and where there is no possibility of this wood being carted into any railway station on our own lines. The company employs something like 500 woodcutters, and each of these woodcutters is licensed by the Government at a sum of 5s. per month, or £3 per annum, or a total of £1,500 per year for the whole of them. The syndicate ask the Government to charge the price they consider right for the use of the rolling-stock over their line, and they also state they are willing to pay any reasonable royalty the Lands Department would like to impose for carrying that timber; in addition to the license. These 500 men are employed there, and the Government supply something like 100 trucks a day. The advantage the Government derive from this carriage is that, notwithstanding that they haul the trucks a

distance of only nine miles, that is from the Kurrawang siding into Kalgoorlie, the syndicate have to pay the minimum rate, which is for carriage a distance of 16 miles. Although they only haul nine miles, they pay at the rate of 16. Then again, if, as has been asserted, we get wood lower down the line, westward of Coolgardie, it is patent to everyone that more trucks will be needed for the carriage of this trade. If a number of smaller sidings are to be accommodated, the quantity of trucks required (owing to the time of loading and unloading them) would, instead of being 100, be more like 500 or 600. I do not say we could not find those trucks, but there is a doubt whether that regular supply could be kept up if this syndicate for some reason were suddenly curtailed. If there is a proper business proposition to the Government in regard to an extension of that line, and the public interests can be protected, there is no reason why it should not be entertained. As far as I am concerned, and the whole of the Government are concerned, any arrangements made with this company will be on strictly business lines. There will be no payment for material by instalments of water, and when a dam is empty it will be no excuse to come to the Government and say "The dam is empty, we cannot supply the instalments of water, and you will have to wait for the rains again." There is a line laid down of 30 miles, and they desire to go another eight or ten miles to bring in this timber. They do not propose to go within 15 miles of Coolgardie. Anyone knows that on the goldfields, where horse feed is dear and horses are scarce, it will never pay to cart firewood 15 miles.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Will the Government construct the line?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: No; the Government will allow people to construct lines under certain regulations which will be advertised, so that everyone will have an opportunity.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I thought so. That is encouraging private railways.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: There are already applications from a mine manager at Kalgoorlie (Mr. Sutherland) for a line running from Ubini southwards for 10 miles. There is another application from Coolgardie to run southwards

something like 12 or 15 miles, and we find that the Hampton Plains Company, now that their railway proposal has been thrown out, are making an application to run a tramway from Lakeside to the company's property for the purpose of bringing in firewood only. If these three applications seem to be necessary in the interests of the mining companies, and we cannot see sufficient wood ahead to supply the demands, we will be wanting in our duty if we do not protect mining industries. When a deputation waited upon me, I was particular to ask where they proposed to get their wood from, and how long it lasted. They said that on the longest sidings westward of Coolgardie down towards Boorabbin there was at least 12 months' supply, and one member of the deputation went so far as to say there was 18 months' supply. If there is only 18 months' supply within reasonable carting distance, the position is serious, and either the Government should lay down this line or allow someone else to do it.

HON. J. M. SPEED: We want to make the Government do it.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Ministers cannot see their way to lay down a permanent line for the purpose of carting firewood only. Would any reasonable member ask the Government to lay down a railway 20 miles to a desert simply to bring in firewood which may give out in two or three years? I do not think we could expect it to pay.

MEMBER: How does it pay the company?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: They do not make their profit only in carrying firewood, but they enter into contracts, whereas this Government cannot employ men to cut wood and then sell it to mines and carry it.

MEMBER: Why not?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am not prepared to go that far, and if you go that far why not go into every class of trade and do the same? As I say, these companies do not make their profit exclusively out of the haulage of firewood, but out of contracts they enter into. Every year this firewood must be getting less. We have to establish pumping stations on our lines, and the Lands Department on the Coolgardie line are making reserves around these

stations, with a view of conserving the wood for their own use. The trouble has been in the past that various small wood contractors have made contracts with various mines. There has been always a good deal of anxiety and trouble over these contracts, and when these syndicates came into existence mine managers came to town to make a three years' contract with these people; with a reputable company. They had an opportunity of making a three years' contract, and knew they would get their wood at a certain price, and without any further anxiety. As to the small woodcutters combining and putting down a deposit, when that statement was made to me by this deputation the amount suggested was £1,000. They said they were prepared to put down £1,000 cash as a guarantee that they would supply the wood. One gentleman, towards the end, said that they would be quite prepared to put down £10,000.

HON. J. M. SPEED: What are the Kurrawang syndicate prepared to put down?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: They have certain contracts with certain mines, and that does not concern the Government. These people have made contracts, and so far they have been able to carry them out. That does not concern us, but what does concern us is a proper business arrangement.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I wish you could tell us who the syndicate are?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: If the hon. member wants the names, I dare say I can get them. I have not them at present, but I shall be only too pleased to obtain them. I think the Government are endeavouring to find out who they are; the whole of them.

HON. J. M. SPEED: And yet the Government make contracts with them.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Government only need to make a contract with one man or to be satisfied that man represents someone else, and that whatever contracts he desires to make he is in a position to carry out, or to put down the deposit the Government asks for. I wish I had known that this question would have been dealt with in such a way, for I could have brought up the Government reports. Those who happened to know Mr. Ellis, the Govern-

ment surveyor on the goldfields, will know he is a cautious man, and a very able man, who knows the whole of the surroundings and the whole of the requirements of the company in that district. This matter has been referred to Mr. Ellis, whose report is a very lengthy one. He deals with the whole firewood question, and he says he sees no reason why this company should not be allowed to cross that reserve and go out into the waste lands and bring wood from there, because there is no likelihood of any mine being there, and there is no reason why the Government should not have the money for licenses. Anyone has a right to cut wood if he pays for the license; and will be able to have a tram if the Government regulations are agreed to. Take the case of Coolgardie, which I know most about. I resided there for some years. Had the residents of Coolgardie obtained the right to run a tram south of Coolgardie we should never have heard about this Kurrawang syndicate concession. I say that, as late Mayor of Coolgardie. I believe that if permission to-morrow were given to lay down a tramway south of Coolgardie to bring in firewood, the people of Coolgardie would jump at the opportunity, and we would not hear a word about this application. That is the whole trouble, that they want the Government to make a line north or south for these firewood cutters; but the Government are not going to do it; they do not see why other people should not have the right to bring timber down provided the public interests are served and the tramways are for firewood only. Mr. Kelso, forest ranger near that district, also deals exhaustively with this matter, and he says he sees no reason why this company should not have the right applied for. No arrangement has been made with the company, and whatever arrangement is made, it will be on business lines. The Government have not been hasty in the matter. It has been a very troublesome question; and if we had liked to shirk our duty, and let the mines go by the board, we should have welcomed this suggestion of Mr. Bellingham; we should have said, "Parliament took the matter out of our hands, and we are not under the necessity of deciding." Instead of being hampered by the House, the

Government deserves sympathy and encouragement for tackling a question which has given a great deal of trouble to past Governments, and to this Government ever since its accession to office. I may say, a very influential requisition has been signed by practically the whole of the mine managers on the Golden Mile. They view with alarm the possibility of the Kurrawang syndicate closing down, and of the mines being unable to get the firewood required. We must take notice of this, and of the different deputations. There have been about as many deputations for the syndicate as against. The Government is seized of all the facts of the case; they desire to deal with it in a businesslike way; and what I ask the House to do is to leave the Government to make that contract, believing that, knowing all the *pros.* and *cons.*, and knowing the way in which the syndicate have undoubtedly got the best of the Government in the past, the Government will be prepared, and willing, and able, to see that in the future the syndicate are dealt with on a business footing.

HON. A. JAMESON (Minister): I should like to point out what would be the effect of this motion if passed. It reads, "It is essential that no farther concessions be granted to the syndicate until Parliament has had an opportunity of considering the report upon such charges against the General Manager." That report cannot be presented during this session; and the motion really means that hon. members will tie up the hands of the Government for the ensuing year. Now from the evidence we have that it is possible we may not have more than a year's supply of firewood, we can see the great danger in which the mines may be involved. The House is asked to tie the hands of the Government, although the Government are taking every care, and have spent a great deal of time in investigating the question. That does not seem a good precedent to establish in this purely business arrangement, which involves a great deal of detail—to tie the hands of the Government by such a motion as this. If it were purely a question of policy, it might be for the House to lay down the course the Government should pursue. But in a matter of this kind, the precedent sought to be established is very dangerous, and I think

it would be very unfortunate if the motion were to pass. I should like to say one word about the railways. I have long thought that the Government might carry out these contracts; but it is perfectly clear that the standard of Government railway throughout this State is a really high standard.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The Engineer-in-Chief recommends pioneer lines of this sort.

HON. A. JAMESON: That, of course, would be a question of entering upon a new policy.

HON. J. M. SPEED: I thought this was a new Government with a new policy.

HON. A. JAMESON: It seems to me very rational to believe that a light line of railway carried out by private enterprise, and built simply for the purpose of making a contract pay, would be successful; while the mere carriage of the material would not pay the Government for a moment. Certainly its carriage would not pay on the high standard of line at present built by the Government. However, that is another issue. I simply want to point out the very great danger of passing a motion of this kind. I hope hon. members will support the Government, and not harass them in work which they find difficult, and which they are doing all they can to carry out in the best interests of the State.

HON. E. McLARTY (South-West): I hope the House will not agree to this motion, which I think is very inopportune. The reason given for the motion is that the General Manager of Railways is concerned. But I think hon. members have no right to prejudice the case of the General Manager, or in any way to prejudice its hearing. The General Manager may very probably prove that the charges made against him cannot be substantiated; and I think the House should be very careful not to carry such a motion without the fullest information. I can quite understand the difference between the Government constructing these fire-wood lines and their being constructed by a private company. I am quite sure a private company could construct a line at half the cost of a Government line; therefore I am altogether opposed to the Government handling such enterprises.

HON. H. J. SAUNDERS (Metropolitan): I think that after the very

explicit statement we have just heard from the Minister for Lands, it would be well if the motion were withdrawn. The matter has been thoroughly ventilated, and we are surely safe in saying that the interests of the State may be left to the Minister for Lands. We cannot charge against him the faults of the past Government. They entered into this contract, and the present Ministry have been put in a fix through the acts of their predecessors; and I think, after the clear and explicit statement of the Minister, we ought to vote against the motion.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	15

Majority against ... 9

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. G. Bellingham	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. H. Briggs	Hon. W. G. Brookman
Hon. D. MacKay	Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. W. Maley	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. J. M. Speed	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. M. L. Moss (Teller).	Hon. R. S. Haynes
	Hon. S. J. Haynes
	Hon. A. Jameson
	Hon. E. McLarty
	Hon. C. A. Piesse
	Hon. G. Randell
	Hon. J. E. Richardson
	Hon. H. J. Saunders
	Hon. C. Sommers
	Hon. A. G. Jenkins

(Teller).

Question thus negatived.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by HON. G. BELLINGHAM, leave of absence for one week granted to Hon. J. T. Glowrey, on the ground of urgent private business.

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (MARRIED WOMEN) AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL. IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from 3rd October.

New Clause:

HON. C. A. PIESSE moved that the following be added as a new clause:

Land may be applied for under Clauses 59 and 68, in one holding, the annual payments to be calculated on the acreage of each class in area.

The object was to simplify as much as possible the existing state of affairs, and enable a selector for one application to

obtain first, second, and third-class lands. It would mean that there would be one application, one deposit, one survey, and one title, whereas at present there were three applications, three deposits, three inspections, possibly three surveys, and the expense of three different titles. The trouble the Lands Department saw in this matter was the difficulty of classification; but we had them carrying out at present the very system of classification. When an inspector was on the ground, it would be no more trouble to say there were 200 acres first-class, 300 acres second, and the balance third. Such system would enable the selector to get the three different classes of land he required to carry on successful farming. It would also include third-class land which was now shut out because the cost of the present system debarred one from taking it. This matter was fully dealt with at an agricultural conference, and a motion in favour of the alteration carried unanimously. Owing to the patchy nature of our lands, the alteration was urgently required. It would be a simple matter to calculate the value of these lands. In the case of second and third-class land, half the survey fee was paid by the selector. At the present time if a selector got a block adjoining a first-class piece of land he was made to pay for the survey, where it bordered upon his first-class land, although the regulations did not provide for it. If he took up a third class block adjoining second-class land, he had to pay again. One had actually to pay twice over. He knew instances in his own district where that had happened. That system, which was of no benefit to the selector or the Government, should be done away with. He thought the surveys were a source of loss, and therefore any suggestions which would help to save this great cost of survey should be welcomed.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Perhaps it would be well if he gave reasons why this proposal was not a desirable one, but before dealing with that, he might say with regard to survey fees charged, that this was a matter which could be amended. It was not a matter for legislation, but just for regulations. In this State holders were lucky in having the State to pay for surveys. He thought that in many States surveys

were paid for by the selectors. Section 59 was not an applicable section; it merely gave the Governor power to throw open the lands in different specified sections. Under Section 59 the leases were for 20 years, whilst under Section 68 they were for 30 years. Therefore, there were two different terms for which the hon. member wanted one official issue.

HON. C. A. PIESSE said he wanted to make the term 25 years.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then again, the price, the returns, and the conditions were all different. He thought that Clause 5 of the Amending Bill provided pretty well all that Mr. Piesse was aiming at. That clause provided for second and third-class land being disposed of under conditions mentioned, at reduced rates. The hon. member had detailed the practice in case of a selector desiring to take up 1,000 acres. As far as he (the Minister for Lands) knew, the practice was this: An application came in for 1,000 acres, and the report of the inspector stated that 100 acres, say, was first-class, so much second, and so much third, and then he made a suggestion. He generally made a recommendation that the applicant be allowed to select the whole of this at second-class rates, or that provided the selector would select 200 acres as conditional purchase the balance should be given as third-class. The matter was averaged up as nearly or fairly as the Minister thought right from the reports before him. In most cases the recommendations gave satisfaction, but of course there were some people who objected to pay second-class perhaps for third-class land. The desire was to get as many people to settle on the land as possible, and the land was averaged as fairly as it could be. The hon. member wished to make the land laws as liberal as possible, and he was glad to assist him, but he could see no way of bringing about the system the hon. member advocated. Mr. Piesse had suggested that the term of lease might be altered from 20 or 30 years to 25. [**HON. C. A. PIESSE:** No.] Seeing that the new clause would involve so many alterations, it would be wise to allow it to go by the board.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: No alterations would be effected in other clauses. Their terms would remain as now, and the new clause would carry its own terms. Sec-

tion 59 covered all the sections regarding first-class lands, and referred to first-class lands held on a tenure of 20 years only. The difficulty of classification was overcome by a provision already adopted by the Lands Department. When the area of first-class land in a block was small, the applicant could take up the whole block as second-class. In any case, there was no reason why two applications should have to be made for adjoining pieces of second-class and third-class land. Both were taken up for 30 years, one at 6s. 3d. and the other 8s. 9d.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: That suggestion might be adopted.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: As suggested, he would insert the word "the" before "area."

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

Ayes	5
Noes	11

Majority against ... 6

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. C. A. Piesse	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. J. E. Richardson	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. J. M. Speed	Hon. S. J. Haynes
Hon. D. McKay (Teller.)	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
	Hon. W. Maley
	Hon. E. McLarty
	Hon. M. L. Moss
	Hon. G. Randell
	Hon. C. Sommers
	Hon. W. G. Brookman (Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

New Sub-clause:

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the following new sub-clause be added:

In Section 63, Sub-section 5, of the principal Act, the following words are repealed:—"Provided that possession may be taken, and the residence condition may be performed by an agent or servant of the lessee."

The first consideration of the Government was to settle the people on the soil; and although it might be hard that a man living in a town could not, by means of an agent or deputy, comply with the residence conditions, yet the right to do so by an agent might be and was abused. At present a man might take up land and fulfil the residence conditions by making one of his workmen reside on it for six months. There were numbers of striking instances of land being dummed and large estates built up in this manner. Judging by the experience of the Lands

Office, when the selector was compelled to live personally on the land, a far better class of settler was obtained than was possible under the existing Act. By the Bill, anyone taking up land had, in nearly every case, to reside on it for six months only in each year; and in case of illness, etc., the Minister had some power to modify that condition. Again, most residents in towns or engaged in other businesses could take up land under the non-residence clause, by effecting double the value of improvements otherwise required.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: That did not apply to second-class land.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: True; but the idea was to settle people on the soil, and the first rule was to insist upon residence. Land was offered on easy terms, with free surveys, and no interest. All the Government asked was that the selector reside on it for six months in the year; but no results were being obtained from the present Act. Big estates were being built up, because selectors could, through agents, comply with the residence conditions. The man who had the most money could put on most agents and build up the biggest estate. The section in the existing Act did not exist in the Acts of any of the other States; and it was time it was repealed here.

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that progress be reported.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Did the Minister propose to sit after the dinner hour?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes; That had been arranged outside the House.

Motion put and negatived.

At 6:32, the **CHAIRMAN** left the Chair.

At 7:35, Chair resumed.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The Minister had stated this was to stop the abuse of certain privileges; but he challenged the Minister to produce one instance in the South-Western Division where the conditions embodied in the Land Act had been abused. He was averse to doing away with privileges at present enjoyed. How could there be any abuse? The land dealt with was held under tenure of 30 years, and the Land Act was only

passed in 1898. If the proposal now made were adopted, it would do a great injustice to the country. Take a tenant residing on first-class land. That tenant could, in spite of this proposal, take up second and third-class land, provided it was within 20 miles of his holding, but if the land were 21 miles from his holding he was barred from doing so. The idea was to get at pastoralists in the North; but if it were desired to get at them, why not introduce special legislation?

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: One could have a nominee.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: No. He was with anyone who sought to prevent dummying; but he challenged the Minister to prove one instance in the South-Western District where dummying had been carried on under the Act.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: If the distance were made 30 miles or 50 miles, the same argument would apply, if a man were a mile farther off than that.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: So long as we limited the area and imposed conditions regarding improvements, and the improvements were fair, the land was made a source of benefit to the State.

HON. D. McKAY: This clause was as objectionable as others. This was a jumble of ill-considered and worse matured suggestions which would be adaptable to a wholesale system of blackmail and jobbery, and a piebald, hybrid thing like this would be maiming, distorting, prevaricating, and disfiguring a good Act. He was surprised at the forbearance of the Committee in putting up with a thing like this for so long.

HON. D. McLARTY: The remarks made by Hon. C. A. Piesse met with his concurrence, and he intended to support the clause as it stood. He thought the intention and desire of the Government and the country was to see land settled and improved, but, if a man had an agent and found the capital to carry out the improvements, the State would benefit just as much as though the man were there himself. He thought there was no member in the House who had had more experience of land, and who was more capable of giving an opinion than Mr. Piesse, and he thoroughly agreed with him that that would be unwise to strike that proposal out.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Why should there be in this Bill a clause authorising dummying, which in New South Wales was punishable by imprisonment?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: A selector living 20 miles away from his land, and never going near it, could get a title. There was no dummying in this State.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Here dummying was legalised; but it should be made illegal.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: The provision in Sub-section 5 of Section 68 of the Act that residence conditions might be performed by an agent of a lessee, was one of the most thoroughbred provisions for dummying he had ever seen. In days gone by, there had been a similar provision on the Victorian statute book, which had enabled the large landowner to pick out the eyes of the country to the detriment of small selectors; and its effect was not to settle people on the land but to build up large estates and to prevent settlement. He supported the Minister.

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

Ayes	9
Noes	6

Majority for 3

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. W. G. Brookman	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. D. McKay
Hon. J. W. Hackett	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. R. S. Haynes	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. S. J. Haynes	Hon. G. Randell
Hon. A. Jameson	Hon. J. E. Richardson
Hon. C. Sommers	(Teller).
Hon. J. M. Speed	
Hon. J. D. Connolly	
(Teller).	

Sub-clause thus passed.

New Clause:

HON. R. S. HAYNES, on behalf of Hon. J. M. Drew, moved that the following be added as a new clause:—

Notwithstanding anything in Section 17 of the principal Act, the Minister may, in cases where it seems to him that *bona fide* land settlement would be assisted thereby, declare by notification in the *Government Gazette* that, with respect to agricultural areas or any land resumed from pastoral leases, applications for land shall not necessarily take priority according to the order of their being lodged, but may be dealt with in such manner as the Minister may set forth in the said notification.

Under Section 17 of the Act, applications for land took priority according to the order in which they were lodged; and it

was provided that if two or more simultaneous applications were lodged, the priority should be determined by lot, or the Minister might hold an inquiry to determine to whom the land should be granted. In the Northampton district and elsewhere, when large sections of land were thrown open for selection, a good deal of difficulty was found in making the necessary allotments. That might arise again. The consequence was that the land was taken up not by squatters but by speculators. If the land were taken up for speculative purposes it would only lead to other land having to be taken up afterwards by selectors, and consequently it would be better to allow the Minister to have a discretion where a large area was thrown open for selection at one time, to make other provisions, and, in other words, appoint a board. In all ordinary cases the application would be received and take effect according to priority, but where there was a rush after land as there was in the Northampton district it would be unfair that some persons should come in and take up a whole lot of land and pass it out to *bona fide* selectors afterwards. This proposal did not say the law should be altered, but the Minister might, if satisfied that selection would be improved thereby, make rules, with respect to certain reserves only, which he must notify in the *Government Gazette*.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The clause was one which he desired to support, for it was very desirable. He had submitted it to the officers, and also the draftsman, and the draftsman approved of the clause as it stood. It might not be abused, because it only provided that where land was acquired for agricultural leases or pastoral leases the Minister should, where there was a chance of *bona fide* settlement being debarred through the present law operating, have power to put this clause into force, after first of all notifying in the *Government Gazette* that it would be done. That was with the idea of giving *bona fide* settlers greater opportunities of having their applications dealt with.

HON. D. MCKAY: The clause should be opposed; he considered there was nothing fairer than priority of application.

HON. E. McLARTY: One could not imagine a greater injustice than depriving

a man, who put in his application to-day, of a certain piece of land, and allowing the Minister to give it to someone else who applied to-morrow.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The Minister could not do so. The application would have to be referred to a board.

HON. G. RANDELL: No board was mentioned in the proposed clause.

HON. E. McLARTY: It ought not to be in the power of the Minister to say who should have the land. The first man to apply for it ought to have it; otherwise the system would lead to all kinds of abuses. The Minister would seek to do what was just and honourable; but influence was brought to bear, and how was the Minister to decide who was the most competent to work the land? No other system than making a grant according to priority of application would give satisfaction.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: This proposal was aiming another blow at the unfortunate pastoralists in the Northampton district. Were the pastoralists to be legislated against altogether? If a pastoralist applied for a piece of land out of a holding which had been in his possession for years, the Minister might say, "I am not going to grant it to you." This proposal was manifestly unfair, and he liked people to have fair play.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Only when an agricultural area was proclaimed, or where land was resumed from a pastoral lessee, would the clause operate. The Minister must give notice in the *Gazette* that this clause would be brought into operation, and in all cases where there was more than one application the custom was to submit the applications to the consideration of a board. If it was necessary to safeguard the public interests by adding that all applications should be considered by a board, he would have no objection to that being done. The Minister could not take the law into his own hands. The desire was in resuming agricultural areas to settle people on the land in small holdings. It might happen that by priority of application a pastoralist would get a number of people to put in claims and obtain a whole lot of land. As he had said, notice would be given in the *Government Gazette* of an intention to put the clause into operation when it was

decided to do so; and it would be open to everyone to make application.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The present law would not be altered except in certain instances, those instances being where the Minister dealt with a certain description of land. The Minister would have to run the gauntlet of public opinion, and if once a regulation were passed it would apply all round. He took it that where the Minister intended to make such a proclamation he would fix a certain day by which all applications must be in, and if there were two or three applications the Minister would allow the whole of them to be dealt with by a board. The clause would carry out in its entirety the scope and object of the Bill.

HON. G. RANDELL: Section 17 of the Act, which the new clause proposed to amend, was passed in 1900. The principal Act had received much more careful consideration than this Bill; and Section 17 embodied the very spirit of justice and equity. If the principle of the new clause were good for two classes of land, why not make it apply to all lands? The new clause would open the door to favouritism, and this objection would apply even if a board were appointed.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The clause would apply only to areas that had been resumed from the Crown for closer settlement. Where the Crown had probably paid a larger amount as compensation for resumption, the Government should have every opportunity for settling upon the land those whom they considered *bona fide* settlers. The clause provided that applications might be lodged in such a manner as the Minister set forth in the *Gazette* notice. At present, the first application lodged took priority. Thus, an application sent by wire from Katanning to Perth would take precedence over one lodged at the Katanning land office the same day. [HON. C. A. PIESSE: No.] Undoubtedly it would. It might be said, let all applications lodged anywhere throughout the country on the same day be treated as lodged simultaneously; but that would result in great delay. The object in resuming land from a pastoral lessee and declaring it an agricultural area, was to settle more people on that land than it had pre-

viously carried; and that object could well be attained by the new clause.

HON. G. RANDELL: The Minister had left out of account the words "or at such other places or offices as the Governor shall notify in the *Government Gazette*."

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Section 12 of the Lands Purchase Act contained a much better provision, to the effect that if there were more than one application, the Government might appoint persons to select the man to whom the land should be sold, the preference being given, other qualifications equal, to the applicant who could give satisfactory proof of his intention to make his home on the land; and the decision of the board was final.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That section had been opposed tooth and nail by the pastoralists.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: To having these pastoral leases cut up, he had no objection; but the lessee should be given as much right to take up the land as was given any other applicant. Why not provide for a board, as was done in the Lands Purchase Act? Mr. Haynes complained of other members being prejudiced; but there was such a thing as "the pot calling the kettle black."

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Suppose an agricultural area were thrown open on 1st November. Applications came in for half the year. It was not to be assumed that the whole area would be snapped up in one day. If one-half the land were allotted to various settlers, the next day the pastoralist might apply for the whole of the remainder.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: He could not do so.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Dalgety and Company could do it for him.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It had been done elsewhere, and could be done in Western Australia. The pastoralist might have received thousands of pounds for resumption; and the object of resuming was to promote close settlement by *bona fide* selectors. If 50 lots were left open out of 100 the squatter might get his friends to take them up, and the Minister was powerless. Then the squatter might wait two years before taking possession, and he would find a way to gain his point, unless he was very different from pastoral lessees in other

States. Unless the new clause were passed, the whole object of the Government in resuming land for close settlement would be defeated. He had taken expert and legal advice on the clause, and was advised that it was a good clause which the Government should support.

HON. E. McLARTY: If this clause were so necessary, it was wonderful the Minister had not spontaneously introduced it, instead of waiting till it was brought in by Mr. Drew.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: And why not make it apply to all lands?

HON. E. McLARTY: The necessity for the clause was not apparent. Assuming there were 50 allotments open for selection, did anyone think the squatter would pay 6d. per acre per annum for the land?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: All the land might not be first-class.

HON. E. McLARTY: Would not the same conditions of improvement be imposed on the squatter as on the selector?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: But the squatter would nevertheless keep off the selector.

HON. E. McLARTY: If the squatter were the first applicant, and if there were no demand for the land, why should he not have it if he could carry out the improvements? Speaking from his own experience, he (Mr. McLarty) said the more selectors went on his land, the better he was satisfied. Often, "fools rush in where angels fear to tread." Small selectors rushed in, took up land regardless of its quality, and soon cleared out, leaving the squatter with the improvements. Every man of experience knew that pastoral leases in the settled parts of the State were of little value to the squatter. When the hon. member (Hon. R. S. Haynes) spoke upon legal matters, one listened to him with great respect; but when he dwelt upon matters connected with roads boards, land, and that sort of thing, one paid more attention to men who had had more experience, and knew what they were talking about, because he was satisfied the hon. member did not. The hon. member referred to Mr. Piesse as a squatter. Mr. Piesse was cultivating and cropping over 2,000 acres of land, and

besides that he had 200 acres of orchard, and no firm had done more to improve the land than had the Messrs. Piesse. As for their squatting, it was on a very small scale, and if the runs they held on pastoral lease were taken all together and put under close settlement, he did not think they would be any worse off. He (Hon. E. McLarty) had no object to serve but to do what he thought was right and just, and it would be an injustice to deprive the first applicant for the land applied for. Other people had the same right to make application. No Minister or board would give satisfaction if it were left to them to name the applicant who should have the land. We had had a land board, and we knew of certain areas that had been cut up for selection, and in regard to which the same principle had been applied, but there had been the greatest dissatisfaction. Letters had appeared in the papers regarding one case in which a high official in this very State was granted a certain area of land for which there were several other applications. That was only one instance out of many. He knew another case where a late Minister for Lands set apart a certain portion of land as a reserve. Another man came in who had a little influence behind him and applied for the same land, and it was granted to him. That land had previously been applied for and the money paid to the Government, and held for some time, and then the applicant was informed that he could not have the land, for it was reserved and the Government would not let it. The money was returned, and shortly afterwards another applicant (who, as he had stated, had a little influence behind him) came forward, and the Government took his money and allowed him to select the land right up to the door of the settler who had applied before.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: That did not apply to this.

HON. E. McLARTY: It did apply; it was a case in point.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Under this clause, notification would have to be given.

HON. E. McLARTY: That did not make any difference. Even granting that the matter were left to a board, satisfaction would not be given. Unless the land was given to the first applicant

not only would there be dissatisfaction, but injustice.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The instance quoted by the Hon. E. McLarty showed gross mismanagement, and he understood that it happened under the *régime* of the late Government, which his friend so slavishly supported. His (Hon. R. S. Haynes's) experience of squatters had been with people of a different class from the squatters or pastoralists in this State. Those in New South Wales were a different class of men. Their houses were mansions, and their runs were something worth looking at. He had seen more dummieing than had the hon. member, and had checked more dummieing, he hoped, than would perhaps ever take place in this State, for it was not worth while to take up land and run the risk of a criminal prosecution. In the New England district there was a risk of such prosecution. There was no branch of the law in New South Wales with which he was more conversant than the land laws. The object of this new clause was to a certain extent to prevent dummieing. The hon. member, who was most eloquent when he had least information, should confine himself to Pinjarra. The hon. member said he (Hon. R. S. Haynes) should confine himself to Perth. If he did so he should see that only respectable tenants occupied his houses.

POINT OF ORDER.

HON. E. McLARTY rose to a point of order. If the hon. member was referring to him, he would challenge that hon. member by saying he had as respectable a class of house on his property as had anyone in Perth; and persons who were disreputable would be quickly removed. He spent £3,000 in the erection of buildings in which none but respectable people lived. If the hon. member had no other argument—

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Was this a point of order?

HON. E. McLARTY: If the hon. member had no other argument to adduce in aid of this clause than to speak in this manner, he had better say no more about it.

THE CHAIRMAN said he would ask the hon. member (Hon. R. S. Haynes) to assure Mr. McLarty that there was nothing personal.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: What was the point of order?

THE CHAIRMAN: There was no point of order: it was a personal explanation.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That had been given, and the hon. member ought to be satisfied.

HON. E. McLARTY said he was not satisfied.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The words uttered by him conveyed no insinuation.

HON. D. McKAY: There was a dirty innuendo.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: What was the point of order?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member (Hon. R. S. Haynes) had said something offensive with regard to houses.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: One was talking about the hon. member's knowledge of Pinjarra, and speaking of confining himself to Perth he (Hon. R. S. Haynes) said that if he did so he should see that the tenants of his houses were respectable people. If the hon. member thought the people were not respectable he had better say so, but until he assumed that position he had no ground to go upon.

HON. E. McLARTY appealed to members of the House to say whether it was not an insinuation.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: What insinuation did the hon. member mean?

DEBATE RESUMED.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The object of this Bill was to wipe the pastoral industry out for the purpose of putting more people on the soil. That was the trend of legislation, but the hon. member (Hon. J. M. Drew) had assured him that the proposal was in the interests of the pastoralists as of others.

HON. W. MALEY: An important principle was now at stake, namely that of the priority of application being successful. He had seen many methods tried in dealing with land, but certainly the person who applied first had a great claim. That person was the one who realised that the property was worth taking from the waste lands of the Crown, and that it was worth working, and such person should be encouraged. We could only deal with one block at a time. If the Minister really wished to serve certain interests and see the land held by different people, it would be his plain duty only to

offer certain allotments, so that one person could not get 50 blocks. He could get three or four blocks together, or even two, or he could reserve every alternate block until he saw settlement worked out. With the capable Ministers we had now, the present legislation was altogether sufficient, and the new clause proposed would be a very improper one. The whole question of land legislation required examination. There was a very good system by which in certain places local boards had the disposition of Crown lands, and that principle might be a very good one to adopt in this State. He hoped shortly to bring a motion before the House to get a select committee appointed to investigate the subject with a view to further legislation.

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

Ayes	4
Noes	11

Majority against ... 7

AYES.
Hon. R. S. Haynes
Hon. A. Jameson
Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. W. G. Brookman
(Teller.)

NOES.
Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. S. J. Haynes
Hon. D. McKay
Hon. W. Mailey
Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. C. A. Piessse
Hon. G. Randell
Hon. J. E. Richardson
Hon. J. M. Speed
Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
(Teller.)

Motion thus negatived.

New Clause:

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS moved without notice that the following be added as a new clause:—

The Governor may exclude from the Crown grant of any land held under lease from the Crown with a right of purchase, any portion of such land which has been legally resumed or taken between the date of the lease and the issue of the Crown grant.

In the Lands Office there seemed to be a doubt as to whether the lease issued for, say, 1,000 acres should be issued as a Crown grant for 1,000 acres in a case where some area had been taken out of that lease for public purposes.

HON. G. RANDELL: This was simply a departmental amendment?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Simply departmental; and the Surveyor General desired a decision. There was no object in issuing a Crown grant of 1,000 acres if some of the area had been

previously taken during the time it had been held under lease. The Crown Law Office had suggested this new clause.

Motion put and passed.

Preamble and title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

EXCESS BILL (1899-1900).

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. Sommers): I desire to move the second reading of this Bill, which provides for passing expenditure amounting to £189,997 17s. 5d. It appears this is an excess expenditure incurred in the year 1900, and the Bill has come to us from another place. These excesses have been incurred, but up to the present have not been authorised. I may quote from the speech of the Colonial Treasurer in another place, who said this was a matter he knew very little about; and I may repeat that. The money has been spent. The Audit Department have certified to the correctness of the amounts expended; and it is little use saying very much about it.

HON. G. RANDELL: Proper authority was obtained for the whole expenditure.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I believe proper authority has been obtained. At any rate, it is an Excess Bill; and it is gratifying to know that it is not larger. I am afraid I can say very little about it. The Bill speaks for itself. The items are scheduled. An Excess Bill reminds me of the story of the little boy whose father took him to task for breaking a cup. The boy in reply said, "When the cup's broke, what's the good?" The money has been spent.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: And as Mr. Randell spent it, let him explain how.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I formally move the second reading of the Bill.

HON. S. J. HAYNES (South-East): I think it a scandal that such Excess Bills as this should be brought down, and that this House should say nothing about them. The enormous amounts included in Excess Bills show how misleading have been the figures given us in the past. [HON. R. S. HAYNES: Hear, hear.] When such large excesses, practically a twelvemonth old, consisting of amounts expended without the authority of Par-

liament, have been passed, I say the fact reveals a scandalous state of affairs, which should be altered. I believe the present Government have stated they will endeavour to devise a method by which the bringing down of Bills of this nature, at any rate Excess Bills for any large amount, may in future be avoided. Judging by the Excess Bills we have had, it is clear that in the past, when we were told by the Government of the great prosperity of the State, we were misled, and the public finances were not in the satisfactory position alleged, but were in a state that was most unsatisfactory. And had these figures, or an intimation that great excesses were being incurred without the authority of Parliament, been given to the Legislature, I am sure that neither this House nor another place would have tolerated such a state of affairs.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member overlooks the fact that the Bill comes from another place.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I know that. It cannot come from anywhere else. But though we in this House have nothing to do with reducing money Bills, still our vote is required to get them through. I say that as a member of this House, and as a citizen of Western Australia, I protest against Excess Bills of this class. Undoubtedly Excess Bills cannot be avoided to a certain extent, but we should not have them to the degree we have before us; and I understand—whether rightly or wrongly the future will show—that in addition to this there is another serious Excess Bill which will have to be passed by this House. I have seen from a report of the proceedings in another place that the present Government have resolved that Excess Bills, at any rate of this nature, should be avoided, and although certain excesses cannot be avoided, they certainly need not approach any amount like this. Large sums like this should not be expended without the sanction of Parliament having been obtained. The figures are exceedingly large, amounting practically to £200,000, and, as I say, I believe that another Excess Bill will come before the House ultimately, for 1900-1901.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member can only refer to the Bill now before the House.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I desire to refer to the Bill before the House.

THE PRESIDENT: You were referring to another Bill not before the House. The only question is the Bill before us for the present time.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I do not wish to refer to another Bill coming before the House, but I submit I have a right to make that statement.

THE PRESIDENT: The only question before the House is the Excess Bill for 1899-1900.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I have made my protest against that Bill, which only brings us up to 12 months ago.

THE PRESIDENT: That is all we have now before the House—the Excess Bill of 1899-1900.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I say that this excess brings it up to only 12 months ago, and I certainly trust it will not be repeated in the future, but from what we hear in another place I believe this House will be shocked hereafter by an Excess Bill for the following year.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I do not agree with the hon. member (Hon. S. J. Haynes) that this House will be shocked by any Bill that will come down here from the Legislative Assembly. For six years we have been so accustomed to these Excess Bills that we have become hardened, and the only thing that would shock us would be for a Government to come down some year without an Excess Bill. I was indeed pleased to find that my hon. friend (Hon. G. Randell) so willingly seconded this Excess Bill, seeing that he was one of the members responsible for this expenditure. I think the House cannot do anything but pass the Bill, and I quite join with Mr. Haynes (Hon. S. J. Haynes) in the hope that we shall hear no more of these Excess Bills. There may be occasions when excesses are necessary, but to bring them down as a regular thing is shocking. I have spoken against it every time an Excess Bill has come down, and I think Mr. Haynes and other members have taken the same stand. Still I think we should do nothing now beyond expressing our protest, and we had better bury this Bill with the remains of the late Government and put over it a notice, "To be avoided in future."

HON. C. A. PIESSE (South-East): I think the Minister for Lands said very little in introducing this measure. We are told that we should bury the Bill, but if we bury a thing it must be objectionable. If members will look the Bill through, they will find £8,331 in connection with our military unit sent to South Africa. Can you show me any members who were not ready to agree to the sending of that unit?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You will all blush with shame before it is over.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: All members agreed to the course adopted. Here is a very large amount, and you speak of this Excess Bill as if it were something that should be buried; as though the sooner you bury it the better. But you shared in all the glory. Take another item on page 14, £3,990 14s. for survey of leases, areas, etc.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Railway expense, £63,000.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Did the Government anticipate that they would have to spend about £4,000 in surveys? We are, I say, told to bury this thing out of the way—get rid of it as soon as we can. You will find that as long as there is a House or Government in existence, and as long as we progress in this State as we have done, we shall have Excess Bills, and they will be as big as hitherto. All I hope is that they will be as satisfactory.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (in reply): The hon. member (Hon. C. A. Piesse) has remarked that I did not say very much about this measure. I did not desire to say much. It may shock members to know that there will be another Excess Bill for half-a-million before this session is over, and knowing that, I did not desire to say very much. I did not want to blame, and I could not praise.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

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

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read, assenting to the Customs Duties (Reimposition) Bill.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 9th October, 1901.

Papers presented—Question: Leonora Railway Construction, Particulars—Question: Cue-Nannine Railway, Particulars—Question: Coolgardie Goldfields Water Scheme, Joint Rings—Questions: Coolgardie-Kalgoorlie, Cost—Question: Coolgardie Goldfields Water Scheme, Pipes—Question: Kalgoorlie Railway Duplication, Cost—Question: Northam-Goomalling Railway—Question: Boulder Railway Duplication, Cost, etc.—Questions (2): Railway Administration, G. W. Davies Inquiry; charges withdrawn, how—Question: Jarrahdene Public School—Question: Lunatic Asylum, to improve—Question: Advertising by Government in Sunday Newspapers—Question: Electoral Rolls, Education Boards—Public Notaries Bill, Select Committee's Report—Papers ordered: Inquest (Menzies), Evidence—Papers ordered: Railway Administration, G. W. Davies Inquiry—Return ordered: Railway Workshops Construction, Particulars—Motion: Kurrawang Wood Syndicate and J. Davies Inquiry—Assent to Bill—Annual Estimates: Financial Statement—Summary Jurisdiction (Married Women) Bill, first reading—Adjournment.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: 1, Cost of losses through deaths of animals and birds in Zoological Gardens, return to order, 2nd September; 2, Report of the Acclimatisation and Zoological Gardens Committee for 1900-1; 3, Reports by the Chief Inspector of Stock, the Director of the Zoological Gardens, and others on the condition of animals in the Zoological Gardens; 4, Minutes of Evidence taken by the Board appointed to inquire into the charges preferred against Mr. G. W. Davies.

Ordered to lie on the table.