

Legislative Council,  
Tuesday 16th February, 1892.

Masters and Servants Act Amendment Bill: first reading—W. A. Turf Club Bill: first reading—Game Bill: Message to the Legislative Assembly—Amendment of Post Office Savings Bank Act—Drill Instruction in Schools—Aboriginal Offenders Act Amendment Bill: third reading—Aborigines Protection Act Amendment Bill: second reading—Patent Act Amendment Bill: committee—Bankruptcy Bill: committee—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Sir T. Cockburn-Campbell, Bart.) took the chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MASTERS AND SERVANTS ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL.

This bill was received from the Legislative Assembly, and read a first time.

WEST AUSTRALIAN TURF CLUB BILL.

This bill was received from the Legislative Assembly, and read a first time.

GAME BILL.

MESSAGE TO THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

THE PRESIDENT: Before the House proceeds to business, I have a statement to make with regard to the resolution which was passed at the last sitting of the House, with regard to a message that was ordered to be sent to the Legislative Assembly asking them to agree to a conference on the subject of the Game Bill. I have since been considering the two reasons given for taking this course, and, in my opinion, those reasons are not valid ones. One reason was that the amendment proposed by the Legislative Assembly, in clause 1, would involve the striking out of certain words that had already been agreed to by both Houses, and I stated, I think, that such an amendment, under the Standing Orders, could not be made. Having, however, since carefully considered the question, I do not now think that the Standing Order on the subject should be interpreted to the extent I first thought it should be. This Bill was sent to us with January 1st fixed as the date of the coming into force of the Act. This House did not agree to that and substituted February for January as the date of commencement. Now the Legislative Assembly proposes another date, that date being

the time of the Governor's assent being given to the Bill. This involves the striking out of other words, which both Houses have agreed to. Although these other words have technically passed both Houses, I think it would be quite unreasonable to interpret the Standing Order in that way, and hence I must rule that the House of Assembly was competent to have made the amendment they have. I have conferred with the Speaker, and I may say he is of the same opinion as myself. Another reason given for the conference was that it was not stated in the message in which clause the second amendment was proposed to be made. That was owing to circumstances which might be altered, and is due to our messages being reported in the Minutes of the Assembly and not in ours. If hon. members had seen this mistake, they would have noticed that the message to us refers to No. 3 in the schedule of our amendments which were sent down to the Assembly, and in those amendments number 3 clause is distinctly given. Therefore, in my opinion, this is not a reason why a conference is desirable. There may be other reasons why a conference is desirable; and if so, hon. members can inform me of them and the message can of course go down to the Assembly at once. With regard to these two objections, which were specially brought to my notice, I feel bound to tell the House that I think they are not valid, before sending the message forward.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: With regard to this message, I do not for my part see any reason why it should not go forward. The object of this House was to invite a conference upon certain changes which have been proposed by us, and which have been partly acceded to, and partly disagreed with by members of the other House. We have already had double messages to and fro, and it appears to me that there is every chance of this sort of "game" being repeated for some time to come. Whether the reasons stated by the President are those which this House has in mind, we are not called upon to decide. It seems to me to be enough that the Legislative Council, in the words of its own message, requests that a conference be granted upon the subject of Message No. 19.

Now the object of the conference, it seems to me, is not to press any point with regard to the Standing Orders or the interpretation of them, but to consider in friendly discussion whether it is advisable that the Bill should come into force on the date it receives the Governor's assent, or whether a certain fixed date should be adopted. The second reason really hinges on the same consideration. We make an amendment. It is not approved of by the Lower House and we wish to meet and discuss it. If we send another message to say we disagree, it will only lead to a further round of messages. In my remarks, in advocating that this message should be sent, I gave two reasons to which the President has referred; but they were not the only reasons I had in mind by any means. I do not wish to weary the House, but I may say that the most important point of all was that in the ninth clause. The Assembly suggested that in the case of imported birds or animals being killed or taken it should be lawful for any person to demand the same from the individual who is in possession of them and detain such person in custody until he could be brought before a justice of the peace. That was altered in this House so that it should be the owner or some person authorised by him. That is the law in the United Kingdom, and I am strongly opposed to any extension of that law here. Nevertheless, I see no good purpose to be gained by sending a Message to the Assembly that we insist upon our amendment, although it is another reason why we should have a conference. I may say I was in private conversation with the Speaker of the Lower Chamber on the subject, and I said it was inconvenient that we should have these messages backwards and forwards, and he entirely agreed with me. He said all these matters could, no doubt, be easily settled by a conference, whereas we might be days in dealing with them by means of messages. Under these circumstances I think the House will be wise in forwarding this message, which will, I hope, lead to the settlement of the points in dispute.

**THE PRESIDENT:** My object was only to ascertain whether there were any other reasons than those I mentioned

just now. The message will now go forward.

#### AMENDMENT OF POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK ACT.

**THE HON. J. MORRISON:** I rise to move, "That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the Post Office Savings Bank Act, 28 Vic., No. 1, shall be so amended:—(1.) That depositors may in any one year deposit a sum or sums of money not exceeding £250, in lieu of £30 as provided by the said Act; and (2.) That the maximum deposit of any depositor may be £500, in lieu of £150 as provided by said Act, and (3.) That the maximum amount loanable in one loan may be £2,500, in lieu of £1,000 as provided by said Act." He said: I may say a few words in favor of this motion. It is well known of what great benefit savings banks are in a community such as that of Western Australia, where settlement is scattered over a large tract of country. In many districts we have savings banks carried on by the Government where ordinary banking institutions could not open branches, and it is in order that those who are willing to save their earnings for a rainy day may have every inducement to be economical and saving, that I beg to move the first section of this resolution. In the Government savings bank, it is against the regulations to allow any one depositor to place to his credit more than £30 in twelve months. That might have been very well at the time when savings banks first came into force, many years ago. In those days the children and working men had not the opportunity of saving the amount of money they are able to now. In those days wages were only nominal—£1 to £1 10s.—per month, and very little could be saved out of that. Since then wages have increased to 8s., 10s., and 12s. a day, and there are ways of making other small sums in addition. Therefore, it is necessary, in my opinion, that the Savings Bank should allow of larger deposits than £30. If a man has £60 to invest, the only way he can do so is to put in £30 in December and £30 during the following January, and then he cannot put any more in for twelve months. There is another class of people who incline to savings banks. These are the new arrivals—perfect strangers—who bring, say, £50

with them. I have known cases where men have brought £200, and they have been unable to lodge it in the Savings Bank, where interest is allowed them, with the result that in many cases the money has never gone into any bank at all. I think our first duty is to try and induce people to be saving, and, secondly, to encourage them by allowing them to deposit more than the limited amount allowed by Act at present. One of the reasons why savings banks are popular in country districts is that everyone knows the post-master, whether it be a child or a working man. He goes to get his letters, and when he does it is very easy to put in his five shillings. In ordinary banks they do not take less than £1; consequently before this sum is saved it is spent and does not go into any banks. In the other colonies (and I take it we are gradually working up to their level) greater facilities are allowed. In New Zealand there is no limit to the amount which can be deposited in one year; but when the total deposit exceeds £500, interest is paid on £500 only. In Victoria there is no limit, but not more than £100 can be paid in in any fortnight, and no interest is paid on deposits over £250. In Tasmania the maximum amount, exclusive of interest, is £200, but when the amount deposited exceeds £150, interest is only allowed upon £150 until the principal and interest reach £200. There is nothing to show that £150 cannot be received in one deposit. In South Australia £500 is the limit, and interest ceases at £250. If you strike the average of the other colonies, you will find this colony is certainly much below it. I now come to the second section of the resolution, increasing the maximum any depositor make make to £500 instead of £150. I may say I put this figure in to get as near the average of the other colonies as possible. I do not feel bound to an odd £50 or so, but it was better to put in some amount than to leave a blank. With regard to the amount upon which interest would be paid, the Government could arrange whether they would allow interest on deposits exceeding £250. Perhaps if the limit were fixed at £500 they would not allow interest upon more than £250. If these two principles were carried out, it is natural to conclude that there will be

more money accumulated in the Savings Bank than at present; and this brings me to the third section of the resolution, that the maximum sum loanable may be £2,500, in lieu of £1,000. At the present moment the Government only lend sums exceeding £1,000 to municipalities, but £1,000 is the limit to private individuals. I know cases in which loans have been refused, although the securities have been most ample and reliable, where more than £1,000 was required. I trust this motion will be accepted by the Government and the House, for I think that savings banks ought to progress in the same ratio with wages and capital.

THE HON. E. T. HOOLEY seconded the motion.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Shenton): Sir, I regret I cannot agree with the arguments of the hon. member who has brought forward this motion. He instances the savings banks of the other colonies and seems to be under the impression that they are on a similar footing to the Savings Bank of this colony. In this colony we have Post Office Savings Banks, whereas in the other colonies they are Government Savings Banks worked by trustees. Our system is more analogous to the English Savings Bank in connection with the Post Office. If the resolution proposed by the hon. member were carried, it would cause a large expenditure on the part of the Government in keeping up these savings banks. The transaction would be of such magnitude that the staff of the department would have to be materially increased. I take it, sir, that in this colony the Post Office Savings Bank is intended more for the poorer classes of people who have small amounts that they wish to put by; but when the hon. member wishes to increase the sum which could be deposited to £250 in one year, that takes the matter quite out of the category of such a Savings Bank. If an investor finds he has more money to invest than the regulation of the Savings Bank will allow, he can easily place it at fixed deposit in one of the ordinary banks, where he would obtain probably five per cent. interest as against  $3\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. With reference to certain people coming here with £200, it is a very simple matter for them to put it in an ordinary bank. As a whole I cannot

agree with the resolution of the hon. member. With reference to extending the amount loanable from £1,000 to £2,500, the Government might consider whether it is advisable to slightly increase the amount, but we have to be very careful in regard to investments. The Savings Bank regulations are very stringent. It is necessary that investments should be made so that there is no difficulty in recalling the money if required. This has been exemplified in connection with the difficulties which have been experienced in New South Wales and Victoria. In both these colonies savings banks had to suspend payment owing to the heavy withdrawals, the reason being that depositors thought the trustees had invested too largely on securities which could not be easily realised. The hon. member referred to the Government being willing to lend larger sums to Municipalities than to private individuals, but I must remind him that loans to Municipalities are on debentures which are negotiable. There is a great difference between Municipal debentures and the security of freehold lands, the one is negotiable and the other would take considerable time to realise upon. The question of increasing the amount of loans will be considered, but I cannot hold out any hope of increasing the maximum amount or the yearly deposit, because it will involve so large an increase in the staff necessary for the keeping up of the Post Office Savings Bank Department.

**THE HON. J. W. HACKETT:** I would point out to my hon. friend Mr. Morrison that it is impossible for the House to accept the motion in the shape in which he has put it before us. He asks us to take a step which is out of all question, namely to tie ourselves to certain details which, on further consideration, I think, I am correct in saying the House may see many reasons to object to. Instead of asking the Government to introduce a bill, or to take into consideration the propriety of increasing the amount which may be deposited each year, he now takes the unusual step of putting down in black and white details to which the House is to be bound permanently, unless subsequently it wishes to stultify itself. If this motion were passed it would necessitate a reorganisation of the

whole system. Has my hon. friend made any inquiries as to the probable cost, and what dangers are likely to arise? The hon. member has referred to the systems in force in the other colonies. The Colonial Secretary has naturally replied that these systems are not analogous with ours, as the one is a Post Office Savings Bank, and the others are savings banks managed by trustees under Government supervision. The real analogy is between ours and the English system. According to my own recollection at the time I was acquainted with the Post Office banking system in England, the figures were the same as they are here. They certainly were the same, although they may have been altered since. I would suggest to my hon. friend the advisability of withdrawing this motion.

**THE HON. J. MORRISON:** There is only one thing I may say in reply. If the Government fail to see the necessity or advisability of allowing depositors to put more money in yearly, or to add to the maximum of their deposits, how can they expect to be able to lend more than £1,000? They will certainly not be able to advance more than they get. If the Government do not see their way to granting all I ask, they might, perhaps, increase the amount of yearly deposit to £100, which would be something. I know cases where men, not having been able to deposit their money, have been forced into land purchases.

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Shenton):** I make no promise that we will extend the amount of loans. I say the Government will consider the matter.

Question—put and negatived.

#### DRILL INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOLS.

**THE HON. J. MORRISON,** in accordance with notice, moved, "That in the opinion of this House it is expedient, and would result in much public advantage, that regular drill instruction should be afforded in all boys' schools where means for such instruction can be obtained, and that the Government be requested to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the resolution of the House." He said: Although the last resolution was not passed, I hope this one will be. The object of it is that the colony should

take advantage of our youth, in order to provide for what is likely to be a necessity in the future. Some people think we are very safe in Australia, because there has never been any fighting. I think the best way to prevent that ever taking place is to be prepared. If our youth, when it is an amusement to them, get proper drill instruction, it will keep them out of mischief, and when they grow up they can the better join the Volunteers, or form part of a paid corps. At Albany there are, I believe, 500 paid infantry necessary for defence, and I do not see why we should not be able, ultimately, to provide them from our own youth. I find that there are in this colony, in Government, Assisted, and Private schools, above the age of seven, 2,848 boys able to receive drill instruction. This is as near as I can get at it. I find that in Government Schools there are 1,816; Assisted Schools, 732; and Private Schools (say) 300, in Perth, Fremantle, and Albany. In Perth alone, 530 boys are fit to receive drill instruction; in Fremantle there is a total of 399; at Albany, 239; Guildford, without taking any private schools into consideration, there would be 57; York, without counting private schools, 84; Geraldton, 77; Northam, 40; Newcastle, 20; and Northampton, 34. These numbers would leave out all boys under seven. This would give a total number of 1,460 boys capable of receiving drill instruction. Let us call it 1,000, and even these would be constantly added to, and could be worked into Cadet Corps, and become defenders of their country later on. We have a school Inspector and he could be safely entrusted to inspect them when inspecting the schools. It would improve the carriage of the boys and it would perhaps in future prevent a conscription or the raising of a militia. There is nothing more objectionable than anything like enforced service, and this drilling of our boys would be one way of obviating the necessity of such methods in this colony. Another benefit would be the improvement in the carriage and behavior of our youths. It would also tend to reduce larrikinism. There are many schools, situated in distant districts, which I have not included in this 1,460 boys. They cannot at present receive drill instruction, but I see nothing to

prevent their getting it later on from our pupil teachers, who if drilled themselves, would naturally be able, when sent to distant schools, to at once commence and drill their charges. My desire is to see drill twice a week, and we should, I am sure, find it readily taken to by the school lads, who would naturally be proud of their school corps and who would work up into valuable defenders of their country.

**THE HON. J. G. H. AMHERST:** As a member of the Central Board of Education I have very great pleasure in seconding this motion. At the same time while the hon. member talks about the boys in the colony he forgets to mention that there are many girls who also want a certain amount of drilling. I would, therefore, suggest that he should add the word "girls" as well as "boys" to this motion. I have not the slightest doubt in the world drilling would improve the physique of the girls as well as the boys, and, therefore, I should have great pleasure in supporting this motion if the hon. member will add this word to the motion.

**THE HON. J. MORRISON:** I have no objection whatever to add this word.

**THE PRESIDENT:** A member cannot amend his own motion; he can accept the amendment if proposed by another member.

**THE HON. J. G. H. AMHERST:** Then I move to add the word "girls" after the word "boys." I think while we look after our boys we should also look after the safety and welfare of our girls.

**THE HON. J. W. HACKETT** seconded the amendment.

**THE PRESIDENT:** No doubt physical training is required for our girls as well as our boys, but I do not think that drilling is the kind of physical training that should be applied to girls. Practically there does not appear to be any opposition to this motion, and, as I feel very strongly in favor of it myself, I will just say that I think it would be well for the Government to take the question up. The motion of the Hon. Mr. Morrison is simply a movement in the right direction, and which I sincerely hope will be carried out, for it will ensure every boy receiving a thorough drill instruction and training in military matters. It is very much the

fashion to ridicule the idea of any danger from outside, but the best authorities who have carefully considered this matter, are of opinion that in the future we shall be far from danger from foes outside. The very best safeguard and the best means of preventing anything of this kind is that it should be known that our manhood is trained to arms in such a way that they can protect their shores from attack, and it seems to me that if drill instruction is given to the young in Government Schools—and I am aware that where this instruction has been given it has been taken advantage of by the young with great pleasure—our schools will form recruiting grounds of a most valuable description. The tendency of democracy is not towards liberty, but rather towards the regulating the affairs of mankind. The time will come when it will be ordained that every man shall share in the defence of his country, not that they will insist upon conscription, but they will insist that every able-bodied young man shall learn the use of arms, and in the meantime nothing more useful can be done than to instruct our youth in the rudiments of military training. Still more may this motion be a commencement of more efficacious methods in future for the development of the bodies of our young. It has always seemed to me strange that more has not been done in the way of developing the body, making it more beautiful, more powerful, and more able to do what was intended of it. Wonderful are the effects of such training as is now being given in the great public schools of England and Germany; in fact throughout the public schools of all Germanic lands, and which is carried out in America in all the large schools and colleges. If we knew the results of such training we should feel the importance of such a motion as this, in view of what may come of it in the future. I was very much struck on reading an essay by Sir Henry Thompson on the prospects of our race physically, in which he stated there was no doubt our middle and poorer classes were deteriorating owing to the rapidity of life. What used to be muscle is now nerve, and our young men are not what they used to be; and he winds up by saying that the salvation of the race will be the drilling ground and the gymnasium. I think the resolution a

very important one, both as regards what is to be done at present and also what it may lead to in the future.

Question—put and passed.

Ordered—That a Message be forwarded to the Legislative Assembly, transmitting the above resolution and desiring its concurrence therein.

#### ABORIGINAL OFFENDERS BILL.

##### THIRD READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Shenton): I rise to move the third reading of this bill.

THE HON. R. E. BUSH: Sir, I beg to move, as an amendment, that this bill be read a third time this day six months. I do this more as a protest against the practice of tinkering with the already faulty system of dealing with the natives of this colony. The system that is carried on now has, I think, been proved to be thoroughly unworkable. Every sensible man, every practical man who puts on one side sentiment, must acknowledge that it is not a fair system, either to the whites or to the natives. The majority of the natives are well disposed, but amongst them, as among every other race, there is a considerable leaven of bad characters, and these bad natives, when they are not properly punished, make others as bad as themselves. Coming, as I do, from the middle of what we may call the disturbed districts, I may be allowed to speak with some authority on this question. The state of affairs in these districts is indescribable. I do not believe hon. members of this House would credit me if I told them of it, and it would be said that I was exaggerating facts. The natives are openly hostile to the settlers, and we must remember when we talk about the settlers we are speaking of the lessees of the Crown. The Government take the rent from these lands, and it is certainly the duty of the Government to protect them, or, at all events, do something to put a stop to this state of open rebellion among the natives of these districts. I do not think, in this part of the country, people recognise the enormous number of natives there are; but I may state, as a fact, that in my district there are ten blacks to every white, and they are not a decreasing people. Every year that the Government

postpone taking really drastic measures to put a stop to the state of things that exists; every year these measures are postponed, I feel sure the remedy will have to be more severe. That is one reason why I make this amendment. Naturally, I recognise that the Government are trying to do something, but it is only tinkering, and in this bill they are only burking the whole question. I do not see why the settlers in these far-distant districts should be considered able to cope with these savage tribes any more than were the people in the Southern districts when they were first settled. I feel perfectly sure that this bill we have now before us is not going to put a stop to the unbearable state of affairs existing in the Northern districts of the colony. Therefore I regret extremely that the Government have not boldly faced this matter. There will probably be a considerable cry made over this whipping Act, and the results will be very small indeed. The matter must be faced sooner or later, otherwise the settlement of these districts is bound to be retarded. Speaking personally, I can say that at our station we are giving the natives best. I have had considerable experience amongst them, and am not easily frightened by them, but I consider upon this particular station a man would only be a fool to go on breeding sheep simply for these savage cannibals to kill and destroy. The settlers would put up with their depredations if they only killed and took what they wanted for their actual needs; but they do not stop at that. I could bring innumerable instances in proof of this. We have been asked, "Why do you not state instances?" Anybody who goes up to these districts could have instances brought before his notice any day of the week. Some of the settlers have gone into fencing their runs at an enormous expense, thinking that by this means they would get rid of the natives, but instead of that they find them breaking in at night and destroying the sheep in the paddocks. Consequently the settlers have had to withdraw the sheep, and put white shepherds over them. This is a scandalous state of things, and should not be allowed to exist in any colony. I do not wish to put the blame on this present Govern-

ment, because they have not been in office long enough to remedy the old and faulty system, and I recognise in this Act that they have tried to do something to remedy it, but the longer strong repressive measures are delayed the greater will be the necessity for such measures in future. At the present time I know lots of intending settlers have been frightened away on account of the state of the natives. I know I shall be told it is a great pity to cry "stinking fish." The time, however, has come when one must speak one's mind on this subject, and I very much regret that more has not been said in the two Houses upon this matter. It was a very painful thing for me to read that even in this House the old, old argument was used that the reason of this state of things was mismanagement on the part of the whites. That reason ought not to be given without some thoroughly sound basis to go upon. We shall soon see in this House the other old argument brought forward—that these troubles occur on account of the relations of the white men with the black women. I consider one argument is just as false, unreasonable, and without foundation as the other. I beg to move that this bill be read a third time this day six months.

The amendment was not seconded.  
Question—put and passed.

#### ABORIGINES PROTECTION BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Shenton): I rise to move the second reading of this Bill, which hon. members will see is brought in for the purpose of punishing aboriginal servants for breach of contract. Clause 2 provides that "subject to the provisions of Part II. of "the principal Act, any aboriginal who "shall neglect or refuse to enter upon or "commence his service according to the "contract, or shall absent himself from "his service, or shall refuse or neglect to "work in the capacity in which he has been "engaged, or shall desert or quit his work "without the consent of his employer, "or shall commit any other breach of his "contract, shall be guilty of an offence, "and shall be liable, upon conviction of "any such offence before any Justice of "the Peace, to be imprisoned for any

"term not exceeding three months, with "or without hard labor." Clause 3 provides that "subject to the provisions of "Part II. of the principal Act, any employer of an aboriginal who shall be "guilty of any breach of a contract "under the principal Act shall, upon the "complaint of any Justice of the Peace, "Protector of Aborigines, or other "person, and upon conviction before any "Justice of the Peace, forfeit and pay a "sum not exceeding Twenty pounds," and clause 4 provides that "it shall not "be obligatory upon any member of the "police force to serve any summons or "execute any warrant of arrest against "an aboriginal, in respect of any offence "under section two of this Act, beyond a "distance of fifty miles from the place "where such summons or warrant was "issued, except when specially directed "by a Resident Magistrate."

Question—put and passed.

#### PATENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

This Bill was considered in committee and agreed to without amendment.

#### BANKRUPTCY BILL.

This Bill was considered in committee and agreed to without amendment.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House at 4:30 o'clock p.m. adjourned until Friday, 19th February, at 3 o'clock p.m.

## Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 16th February, 1892.

Masters and Servants Act: third reading—Estimates, 1892: further considered in Committee of Supply—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 2:30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

#### MASTERS AND SERVANTS ACT.

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

#### ESTIMATES, 1892.

The House went into Committee of Supply for the further consideration of the Estimates for 1892.

*Educational, £13,625 :*

MR. PARKER believed that this educational vote was expended under the direction of a Board, which was established under the Elementary Education Act, 1871, and that this Board also received certain school fees. He did not know whether the Board ever furnished any account of the money so received, but, any way, this sum was expended by the Board, which apparently was not responsible to that House. Under the old Constitution, no doubt, it was all very well to have these Boards, but under the system of Government which prevailed at the present time, which was essentially one of Ministerial responsibility to the members of that House and the country at large, he thought it was obvious that these irresponsible Boards should cease to exist, and that there should be some Minister who should be responsible to the House for the funds voted every year, and for the due carrying out of the Education Act, and who might be questioned in the House, and account for the doings of the Government in relation to educational matters, and tell them all about the progress of education in the colony. He thought it was high time that this irresponsible Board should be disestablished, and make way for some Minister directly responsible to the Legislature for the administration of these funds. He knew full well that they could not expect