ments of the various colonies expressing themselves as quite prepared to do their utmost to support us in our endeavors to obtain free and autonomous institutions: but we found that they were somewhat damped by the correspondence that took place between their Governments and that of this colony. I am not saying that I, in any way, blame the Government here for the course of action they felt called upon to adopt on that occasion. In the position this Government is placed I do not see very well how they could have adopted any other course in the circumstances. This House separated at the close of last session without proposing any action in the direction of seeking the aid of the sister colonies; and I think it would have been the proper thing to have done if we wished to ensure their assistance. I think it was more the province of this House to do so than that of the Government. Now, I think the time has arrived when we may well ask our neighbors to assist us in this matter, and solicit their influence with the Imperial Government, through their Agents General, or otherwise, as they may deem advisable, so as to endeavor to ensure the passage of the Constitution Bill through the House of Commons this session. I do not know that, even with the aid of the neighboring colonies, we shall see the bill through this session; I fear that, owing to the late period of the session—Parliament will probably not sit more than another three weeks or so—and the pressure of other work, it will be found impossible for the Government to do more than get the bill read a second time this session. But I *think it is* bound to have a beneficial effect when it is found that we have the sympathy of all the Australian colonies in our present position; and that when the Imperial Parliament discovers that this is not a question affecting Western Australia alone, but one in which the whole of Australia is interested, it will be more likely to accede to our demands than it is at present. I feel certain that in Lord Knutsford, himself, and in his colleagues, we have very warm friends and advocates. We know that the Secretary of State has, so far as he is concerned, carried out his pledges, and that he is prepared, apparently, to do his utmost to see that the colony obtains Responsible Government on the same terms as it was granted to the other colonies; and I think it would certainly be gratifying to him to find that all the other colonies are in accord with us in this matter. I should imagine it would be of vast assistance to him in passing the bill through the House of Commons to be able to point out that the whole of Australia joins in supporting the measure to give this colony the privilege of self-government. My object in moving this resolution is to secure that support which we have every reason to believe our neighbors are ready to extend to us, and I cannot help thinking that such support would be very useful to us at the present juncture.

Resolution put, and passed unanimously.

The House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past ten o'clock, p.m.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Monday, 29th July, 1889.

Constitution Bill: Replies to telegrams sent to the other Colonies—Stock Route between Dongara and Perth—Further Re-Appropriation Bill: first reading—Message (No. 3): Coded Telegram sent to the Secretary of State—Electoral Bill: second reading; referred to select committee—Railways Act Amendment Bill: second reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at seven o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

CONSTITUTION BILL: TELEGRAMS.

THE SPEAKER announced that he had received the following telegrams from the Premiers of New South Wales and Tasmania, in reply to the Resolution adopted by the House on Friday evening, with reference to the Constitution Bill:

To the Honorable Sir J. G. Lee Steere, Speaker Legislative Council.

Your telegram received. This Government fully sympathises with the Legislature and

people of Western Australia in their desires and efforts to obtain Responsible Government, in the achievement of which the whole of Australasia have a deep and equal interest. Will instruct Agent General to support your cause, and address circular despatch to other Colonies urging united action.

Sydney, 28th July, 1889.

HY. PARKES.

To Sir James Lee Steere.

Have anticipated the message of your Council and am communicating with Colonial Premiers suggesting simultaneous address from Parliament to Her Majesty that delays of Imperial Parliament in granting your Constitution are regarded with much disfavor.

Hobart, 29th July, 1889.

P. O. FYSH.

MR. PARKER moved that the telegrams be inserted on the Minutes of the House.

Agreed to.

STOCK ROUTE FROM DONGARA TO PERTH.

MR. A. FORREST, in accordance with notice, moved, "That an Humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, praying that he will be pleased to cause a Stock Route to be declared between Dongara and Perth and Fremantle, the width of said Route to be not less than half-a-mile; also that a Reserve be declared as near as possible to Perth, on the coast, of at least 5,000 acres." He did not think it was necessary for him to say very much in support of this resolution, for it would be in the minds of hon. members that he was asking only for what was a necessity. The time had now arrived when a stock route between Dongara and the settled portions about Perth and Fremantle should be declared by the Government. The leaseholders between here and Dongara were fencing in their runs, and the main road was only one chain wide, so that it was impossible to bring down fat stock into this market without trespassing. In nearly every instance that stock was now brought down the agents were mulcted in fines or threatened with law proceedings; and he asked the House to agree to this resolution so that a proper stock route might be declared at once. He did not think it would be a very great hardship to the leaseholders along the road that a strip of land half-a-mile wide should be declared for travelling stock between Dongara and Perth. If this was not done at the present time, the longer it was put off the worse it would be, and it would be hard upon those who intended to fence their lands in. He asked further that a reserve should be declared somewhere about ten miles from Perth—they would have to go that distance before they could get any Crown land—so as to enable the people who brought down stock to this market to have some stopping place without trespassing on other people's land. He hardly thought the Government would oppose the motion,—in fact, he believed they would support it; because it was right in the public interest that this stock route should be declared. It was in the interest of the consumers as well as breeders that there should be every facility for bringing fat stock into the market; and he was sure that the good sense of the House would agree with the proposal. The Commissioner of Crown Lands was not in the House, but he hoped the Colonial Secretary would tell them that the Government intended to support the resolution.

MR. PEARSE said he could fully confirm all that had been said by the mover of the resolution; and he thought it was very desirable indeed that this stock route should be opened up as soon as possible. No doubt, as the hon. member had pointed out, the longer it was delayed the more difficult it would be to do what was required. It was very necessary in the interest of all parties that something should be done at once, both as to declaring a stock route and also a reserve or stopping place.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said that so far as he was concerned he was entirely in support of the proposition, and, in the absence of the permanent head of the Lands Department, he had addressed a note to his *locum tenens*, Mr. Brooking, asking him to oblige him with his views on the subject; and, though perhaps not very material to the question, he might as well read to the House what Mr. Brooking said. (Letter read.) Mr. Brooking, it would be seen, was of opinion that the time had arrived when a stock route should be declared, but he hardly thought it would be desirable to have it half-a-mile wide the whole distance. However, that was a matter of detail which could be

easily arranged, if some hon. members who were interested in the matter were to see the Commissioner of Crown Lands.

Motion put and passed.

FURTHER RE-APPROPRIATION BILL, 1889.

Read a first time.

MESSAGE (No. 3): CODED TELEGRAM TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE *RE* CONSTITUTION BILL.

THE SPEAKER announced the receipt of the following Message from His Excellency the Governor:—

"The Governor has the honor, in reply "to Address No. 3 of the 26th instant, "to enclose, herewith, copy of a telegram "sent by him to the Right Honorable "the Secretary of State on the 27th "instant, in accordance with the request "of your Honorable House.

"Government House, 29th July, 1889."

TRANSLATION OF CODED TELEGRAM.

To Secretary of State for the Colonies, London.

"At request of Legislative Council, com- "municate following resolution passed in "answer to your telegram of 23rd July. "Begins: — 'This House desires express "'strong fixed opinion Colony now reached "'stage development when present Constitu- "'tion no longer adapted to circumstances. "'Delay Responsible Government Bill will "'most seriously affect material prospects "'Colony, produce universal irritation, strik- "'ing fatal blow at the trustful confidence "'fair dealing justice of House of Commons "'hitherto reposed in a body credited through- "'out civilised world with reputation giving "'cordial support sympathy principles of self- "'government enjoyed by all other Australian "'Colonies and now demanded by Western "'Australia in accordance with section thirty- "'two thirteen fourteen Victoria chapter "'fifty-nine. Legislature earnestly requests "'that Imperial Government will reconsider "'position as to Bill, and, in the interests of "'Colony, so seriously affected by further "'delay of Responsible Government, will en- "'deavour to pass measure this session. The "'whole of Australia unanimous as to extreme "'unwisdom injustice shelving bill another "'year.' Ends. Legislative Council have "also appealed by telegram from Speaker to "all Australian Governments and Houses of "Parliament for assistance.

"GOVERNOR, Western Australia.

"Perth, 27th July, 1889."

ELECTORAL BILL.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. C. N. Warton): No doubt it is in the recollection of hon. members that His Excellency the Governor some time ago appointed a Commission to inquire into the state of the electoral law, and, if possible, to amend and consolidate that law with the view of the introduction into this House at the present session of a bill that would be appropriate either to the new or to the old Constitution. That Commission consisted of you, sir, of the hon. and learned member for the North, the hon. and learned member for Sussex, the Resident Magistrate of Fremantle, and myself. We had many meetings, giving up our time of an evening, generally meeting at 8 o'clock and sometimes staying until 10 or half-past, or eleven sometimes;—I mention this to show the House that we have taken some pains with the bill. Of course we did not expect much credit for it, for it is always open to any member who has had a bill like this in his hands for a quarter of an hour to write of its imperfections and to find fault with those who prepared it. But we do not care for that kind of feeling. We submit our work to the judgment of the House. It seems to me—and on this point all the members of the Commission heartily agreed—that it is very important that the electorate of Western Australia should consist of West Australians. I mean by that, that pains should be taken that the Government of this colony should not fall into the hands of persons who come here from any part of the world, stay here a very few months, and then somehow or other get on the electoral lists. What we have striven to do is to carry out the spirit of the Constitution Bill, in which it is provided that before a man shall be entitled to vote he shall have resided in the place for twelve months at least. That we considered an essential qualification. We have learnt from what has happened here that persons have had their names placed on the electoral roll who had no right or qualification whatever to have their names there,—persons who were under age, and persons who were in no way entitled to exercise the franchise according to law. The feeling of the Commission, knowing that, was that we ought to start fairly with a new register altogether, composed only of persons who are entitled to get there and to remain there. I have taken very great

pains in this bill in regard to the schedules. Under the old Electoral Act there was only one form of claim for all voters; a claimant was told to put his qualification down, or state the nature of his qualification, and the same form served for all qualifications, whether a man qualified as a householder or a freeholder, or what not. I have taken some pains, as the House will see, to provide a separate form for every possible kind of claim; so that every man's qualification shall have its own appropriate form of claim, all of which is provided for in the schedules attached to the bill. For instance under Schedule "A" there are no less than nine different forms dealing with nine distinct qualifications, so that the freeholder, the leaseholder, the householder, the lodger, and all the different classes which the Constitution Bill contemplates shall have a right to vote, will each have its own distinct form of application. The Commission also were very careful to carry out the idea that no claim should be entertained unless it was made in writing, and that writing witnessed; and that in the case of any claim made in which there was a false statement to the knowledge of the person claiming, there should be a penalty attached. I have also taken care—we have heard of the necessity for it—that every application made to be registered shall commence with the declaration that the claimant is of full age, and not, so far as he knows, subject to any legal incapacity. It is also provided that all who claim to be entered on the register shall give a description of the property in respect of which he sets up a claim, so that there may be no difficulty in identifying the property. These are some of the precautions we have taken in regard to claims. We have also—I won't say invented a new officer, for although we have given a fresh name to him he is easily identified as an old officer,—though we have given him additional powers. Instead of the Returning Officer we have provided that for each electoral district there shall be appointed an Electoral Registrar, to whom all claims for registration as a voter must be made in writing. If the Electoral Registrar considers a claim obviously deficient in point of law he will have the power to reject that claim, but notice in writing must be delivered to the person whose claim has been rejected; and the claimant will still be entitled to come forward to establish his claim before the Court of Revision. It is proposed that there shall be a Revision Court for each electoral district, consisting of two or more justices of the peace or persons specially appointed by the Governor in Council, or of a Special Magistrate appointed by the Governor in Council. The lists made by the Electoral Registrars will be sent to the Court of Revision, and the Court will revise and complete the list. The Court will also finally determine upon the validity of all claims and objections. We have allowed considerable time for carrying out the various steps that may be necessary to establish a claim and to complete the register. I should not be surprised if the House thought it too long a time; but that can be dealt with in committee. With regard to the issuing of writs, it shall be sufficient to telegraph the writ and the return to the writ, also the notices required to be given under the Act, so that no undue delay may take place in the conduct of elections; but, in case of telegraphic communication being delayed, it will be lawful for the Governor in Council at his discretion to extend the time for the return of an election writ. With regard to the first general election under this new Act, it is proposed to give power to the Governor in Council to make such arrangements and fix such dates as he may think the circumstances require. It is not for me to comment on matters beyond the scope of the bill, but I cannot help thinking that whatever disappointment has been felt—and no doubt it has been keenly felt—by those who expected that the Constitution Bill would become law this session, still there is some consolation in the fact, and it may mitigate and assuage their disappointment, that more time will be allowed for taking the necessary steps for preparing the first set of electoral lists under this bill, so that the first election under the new Constitution may be conducted under the revised and purified register. The probability now is that, instead of the Constitution Bill becoming law about the end of this year, it will be delayed until about the end of May, which will give ample time for the preparation of

the new rolls and making the necessary electoral arrangements. So far, then, all is plain sailing. There was no great divergence of opinion in the minds of the members of the Commission as to these details. This House also, I presume, will be inclined to adopt these ideas as to the establishment of claims, and the securities provided against a perpetuation of the evils disclosed at a recent election. But there is one point I should like to bring before this House, and upon which I do not scruple to say there was some difference of opinion among the members of the Commission; and that is with reference to the trial of election petitions and the proper Court for conducting such trials. It is well known that about twenty years ago the constitutional practice was that the House should be the judge in these matters, and a committee of members used to be appointed for the trial of election petitions. This was afterwards changed, and, contrary to the indignant protest of the Judges and their unanimous wish, the duty of trying these petitions was cast upon the Chief Justice. At the present moment the duty is cast upon two Judges of the Supreme Court. Some members of the Commission were in favor of reverting to a certain extent to the old constitutional practice, and let each House—that is to say each representative House, the House of Assembly now and the Legislative Council when it came to be elected—choose at the beginning of each session four of its own members to constitute this Court for the trial of election petitions, with the assistance of one Judge of the Supreme Court. That opinion, however, was negatived by a majority of the Commission, and the effect of it is that no such provision appears in the bill now before the House. But if it be desired by the House that everything relating to elections, from the machinery for establishing voters' claims and the revision of the registers to the constitution of the court for the trial of election petitions should be embodied in one and the same bill, it will be competent for the House to introduce that provision into the bill now before it, by incorporating with it the clauses of the existing Election Petitions Act, and if considered desirable, embody the idea entertained by some members of the Commission that the proper Court for the trial of such petitions would be a committee of its own members having the assistance of a Judge. I do not think it is necessary for me at this stage to further elucidate the provisions of the bill; no doubt it will receive the consideration of the House, and when we go into committee this question may be discussed with other details of the bill. I now move that it be read a second time.

Motion agreed to, *sub silentio*.

MR. MARMION thought it would be desirable to refer the bill to a select committee.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL: Perhaps the hon. member will inform the House with what object?

MR. MARMION: The object is to have the bill thoroughly examined by members of the House. It must not be said—it cannot be said—that because the bill has been prepared by a Commission it must necessarily commend itself to this House. The House might not agree with many of the details of the bill, and I think the best way of dealing with it in the first instance would be to refer it to a select committee of its own members. Personally, I have no particular wish one way or the other, but it has been suggested to me that such a course might be advantageous. There have been but very few ideas expressed on the subject either inside the House or outside the House.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. C. N. Warton) said he had no objection, if the House wished it, to have the bill referred to a select committee, and if the committee wished, he would be happy to attend before it as a witness and furnish any information in his power.

MR. PARKER: I had the honor of being one of the commissioners on this bill, and I must say I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Fremantle is a right and proper one. The bill is the joint production of the Commission in one sense, but as the Attorney General knows, it does not represent the opinion of each member of that Commission; of course the minority were obliged to give way to the majority, and there were several important questions which I think it would be very desirable should be discussed by a select committee of this House previous to the bill being considered in committee of

the whole House. For instance, there is one important provision in the South Australian Act, with reference to canvassing at elections. In South Australia it is provided that no candidate shall personally canvass for votes after the nomination day; and it is reported on all sides that that provision has worked admirably in that colony. When this question came before the Commission there was a divergence of opinion on the subject of introducing it in the present bill. I hope I may not be considered as divulging any secrets when I say that for my part I regarded it as a very important and very desirable provision indeed. I thought it would tend to relieve candidates from a good deal of unpleasant work during election time, in the shape of personal canvassing, which they are obliged to resort to now because the opposition candidate does the same thing. It will relieve candidates from a good deal of what may be called humiliating work, and I firmly believe it would tend to bring forward better men in many cases, because they would avoid having to go through the unpleasant work of personally canvassing the electors, and so escape a good deal of the dirt and mire through which candidates have now to go through. At present one candidate does it because the rival candidate does it; but I cannot but think that every candidate would be only too glad if it could be avoided. I think the electors should have a free choice in the election of representatives, without any personal pressure being brought to bear upon them by candidates. I think the present practice is not only humiliating to the candidate's own sense of self-respect, but that it is also contrary to the spirit and intention of the Ballot Act and the principle of secret voting. There is another point which I think the select committee might discuss. There is a provision in the Victorian Act to the effect that every person who desires to be placed on the electoral roll shall not only make a personal or written application, but also pay a small sum—a shilling, I think—for having his name registered. That I am told has been found to work uncommonly well in Victoria. It has not been introduced in this bill, and the select committee might consider the question, and suggest to the House whether it would not be desirable to introduce a similar provision in our own electoral law. These are matters of detail which the hon. baronet knows full well cannot be considered and discussed in the House so well as they can in select committee. I think it is very desirable that questions of this kind necessitating the introduction of new clauses or important amendments in a bill are better dealt with by a select committee, in the first instance, than in committee of the whole House. If it is agreed to refer this bill to a select committee I think it would be desirable to depart from the usual course and appoint a somewhat larger committee than usual, so that all shades of opinion may be represented upon it. I would also suggest that the Attorney General, who is in charge of the bill, should be a member of the select committee; but I think that all the other members of the House who were on the Commission should be relieved from serving on the committee.

MR. BURT: I thought that was coming.

The proposal to refer the bill to a select committee was then agreed to; and on the motion of MR. MARMION, it was resolved that the committee should consist of Mr. Speaker, the Hon. C. N. Warton, Sir T. C. Campbell, Mr. Randell, Mr. Venn, Mr. Harper, Mr. Keane, and the Mover.

RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. J. A. Wright): I rise to move the second reading of a bill to make further provision for the management and working of railways. The bill, I feel sure, will secure the sympathy and the support of the whole House. It is divided into three parts; the first portion provides more severe punishment for persons who endeavor to throw trains off the line, or to maliciously injure or demolish telegraph poles or do other injury to railway property; the second portion proposes to confer upon the Commissioner of Railways the necessary powers for holding inquiries in the case of railway accidents, and sets forth the procedure to be observed; while the third portion of the bill deals with the question of limiting the pecuniary liability of the Government or any other railway company in the event of an accident. I

may say that the first part of the bill, dealing with the punishment for wilfully attempting to upset a train, has been introduced in consequence of the recent diabolical attempt made, I believe, by an insane woman, to throw the mail train off the line between York and Beverley. When this matter came to be inquired into it was found that the extreme penalty which the Railways Act at present provides is a £50 fine or six months imprisonment. This to everyone must appear a totally inadequate punishment for an offence that might have entailed the hurling of twenty or thirty people into eternity in a moment and without a word of warning,—a wholesale murder, in fact. The English law provides a punishment in such cases varying from imprisonment for three years to penal servitude for life, or, at the discretion of the justices, two years with or without flogging. For myself I think that the sting of this discretionary punishment lies in the tail of it; and even if the sentence was penal servitude I should like to see it accompanied by the application of the "cat" of many tails two or three times during the year. I think no punishment can be too severe for a man who deliberately seeks to upset a train of human beings, without a moment's warning, and who may send scores of his fellow-creatures to a violent and sudden death. To fine a man £50 or give him six months imprisonment for an offence like that is a mere mockery of justice. Provision is also made for the punishment of persons who maliciously damage or destroy telegraph poles or wires; and this is provided for by introducing in the schedule of the bill the clauses of the English Act dealing with these offences, which, in the opinion of my hon. and learned colleague, does away with the necessity of introducing these clauses into the bill itself. The second clause of the bill provides that certain sections of the Imperial Act shall have full force and effect in this colony, and these sections are set forth in the schedule of the bill. As regards the second portion of the bill, which provides the necessary machinery for the holding of inquiries into railway accidents, and invests the Commissioner with the necessary powers to conduct such inquiries, I may say that although provision was made in the contracts entered into with the Hordern and the Waddington railway syndicates, as regards the Great Southern and the Midland Railways, that the Commissioner should be empowered to hold inquiries, no machinery was provided by means of which this could be done, so that the powers vested in the Commissioner remain a dead letter. I may "call spirits from the vasty deep"; but the difficulty is to make them come. In the same way I may summon witnesses to come and give evidence at an inquiry into an accident, but if they do not choose to come I have no power to compel them to come or give any evidence, nor have I the power even to administer an oath to a witness at such an inquiry. It will be seen, therefore, that the law as it stands is deficient in a very material point; and one of the objects of this bill is to supply that deficiency. It provides the necessary machinery to enable the Commissioner to carry out an inquiry. I may say that the whole of these clauses are taken from the Tramways Act, which was passed by this House a few sessions ago without any question whatever. The only alteration that has been made is in the commencement of the 4th Clause, so as to make it applicable to railways. Now we come to the third portion of the bill, and to what will probably be considered the most important,—the portion dealing with the compensation to be paid in the case of a railway accident. This part of the bill proposes to limit the liability of the Government and also the liability of other Railway Companies in the event of their being sued for compensation. This portion of the bill has been taken from the South Australian Act dealing with the same subject. It provides that no person or representative of any deceased person shall be entitled to recover more than £1,000 damages from the Government for any injury caused by an accident on the railway, except under an insurance ticket, when the amount of compensation may be increased to £5,000. At present, as members are aware, there is no limit whatever to the amount of compensation which juries may give against the Government in a railway accident, no matter whether that accident may have been caused through any neglect of a culpable nature or not. The State is liable to unlimited damages, and

liable to be plundered to any extent. It is within the bounds of possibility, while the law remains as it is, that the Government of this colony may some day be called to pay a sum of £130,000 in compensation for a railway accident, as the Victorian Government had to do some time ago, after the Windsor accident. Such a verdict in the case of a colony like ours would be simply disastrous; and it is now proposed to follow the legislation of South Australia, and place some limit on the amount of compensation that the Government may be called upon to pay in such cases. I think this is a proposition that will commend itself to all the members of the House having the good of the colony in view. I think such a provision is particularly required in this colony. There is no knowing what accident may happen some day or other on our railways, especially with our steep inclines, although every care may have been taken by the servants of the railway, and the Government might be called to provide such an amount of compensation as would be a most serious tax upon its resources. It is in the interest of the colony itself that the bill is brought forward, and I hope it will commend itself to the House. I now move its second reading.

MR. BURT: This bill, as the Commissioner has just explained, is in three parts; and with regard to two portions of it, so far as I am concerned, I can see no objection; but with regard to the third part, it introduces a principle which, as members know, is a perfectly novel one in this colony. I do not think it obtains in England; and I do not know that any of the other Australian colonies has adopted it except, as we are told, South Australia. I think it is a principle that requires very serious consideration at the hands of this House, and one that ought not to be accepted without a moment's hesitation, or without thinking what the effect of it may be. I cannot help remembering, myself, that we have some very difficult and dangerous portions of railways in this colony,—portions of lines where, I am sorry to say, we all look to an accident occurring more than we do on ordinary lines. I refer of course to the terribly heavy grade we have to face on the Darling Range. Many members of this House were very strongly opposed at the time that line was formed to its going by that route; but we were assured by the then Commissioner, the late Mr. Thomas, that there was no danger at all, that every thing was perfectly safe, that we could get engines these days that would draw a train up anywhere, and that 1 in 30 was as good a gradient as anything else. But that does not seem to be the opinion now; for here I see it is proposed to limit the liability of the Government in view of an accident. I hardly think members will consider that the amount of compensation limited by this bill is sufficient to compensate us in the event of our being injured for life, or to compensate our families in the event of our being killed, and hurled into eternity some day coming down Greenmount. I know in my own case I should like to stipulate for a very much larger amount than £1,000.

MR. PARKER: You couldn't claim anything; you travel free.

MR. BURT: I do not generally travel free, especially when I expect to be killed. If I happen to have to go up Greenmount, I generally protect myself and buy a ticket. Seriously, I do not like this part of the bill, myself. I think it would tend to make railway servants less careful than they are at present, if they find that the liability of the Government is limited as it is here proposed. I think that if through the carelessness or negligence of their servants the Government are responsible for a serious accident, such an accident as that referred to by the Commissioner as having happened in Victoria, the Government here, like the Government there, ought to be made to pay any reasonable sum by way of compensation which a jury might award. I think it would be very hard indeed that the damages in all cases should be limited to £1,000. However, it will be open for me or any other member to move an amendment in this clause in committee, without at present objecting to the second reading of the bill, some portions of which are probably very necessary.

Motion for second reading agreed to.

The House adjourned at eight o'clock, p.m.