

Norseman, and had to indent his material, would he be satisfied with getting his goods from Coolgardie?

THE PREMIER: There were many other advantages to counter-balance that.

MR. CONOLLY: Granted there were, they did not compensate for it.

THE PREMIER: They more than compensated.

MR. CONOLLY: The Norseman people were not in the same position as the Menzies people.

THE PREMIER: Why? The Norseman people had suffered all these years from being isolated.

MR. CONOLLY: There was something in the isolation argument, but it did not compensate for the many other advantages which the line from Esperance would confer. He would like to place both sides of the question before the House. With a line from Coolgardie to Norseman, the Norseman people would have the advantage of being connected with the other mining centres of the eastern goldfields, with the capital of the colony, and with the railway system generally. Norseman was as nearly equidistant as possible from Coolgardie and Esperance, one place being about 110 miles from Norseman, and the other about 120, by road. If the line were constructed from Esperance to Norseman, it would give to Norseman not only the means of a cheaper supply, but also the means of treating refractory and other ores cheaply, in a way that Fremantle could never expect to do it. A line from Esperance would have a better chance of paying than a line from Coolgardie, because of the back-loading, though he granted that in the case of goods going to Norseman the Government would have the benefit of the extra freight over their lines.

THE PREMIER: Also the produce from this part of the country.

MR. CONOLLY: Although the Government would get that extra freight, it would come out of the pockets of the people, and it should be the object of the Government to enable people to live as cheaply as possible. Widgemooltha was the only mining district between Norseman and Coolgardie; and, in spite of the advantages it formerly had, that field was now deserted. Many persons

at Esperance were giving attention to the cultivation of the soil; and it was a mistaken prejudice on the part of members to assume that the soil on that side of the colony was barren. As to Esperance receiving its produce and supplies from South Australia, it should be remembered that every goldfield and every port in the colony received produce from the eastern colonies. He would like it placed on record that although this survey was now being granted, he did not believe the line was going to be constructed so soon as the Premier would have the House think. Even now he did not consider it too much to say he believed that when the line was ultimately constructed it would come from Esperance. In any case, however, he had much pleasure in supporting the survey from Coolgardie to Norseman.

On the motion of MR. LEAKE, progress was reported and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11.21 p.m. until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 7th September, 1898.

Question: Foreign Companies and Share Registers—Imported Labour Registry Act Amendment Bill, first reading—Companies Act Amendment Bill, first reading (debate)—Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill, third reading—Public Education Bill, third reading—Interpretation Bill, in Committee, reported—Adjournment.

The PRESIDENT took the chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION: FOREIGN COMPANIES AND SHARE REGISTERS.

HON. A. P. MATHESON asked the Colonial Secretary: Are the Government

proposing to introduce, this session, a Bill to amend the Companies Act by compelling foreign companies to open local share registers in accordance with the views lately pressed on the Hon. the Minister for Mines by Messrs. Lyall Hall, Monger, Rason, and myself?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell) replied: The Government propose to do so.

IMPORTED LABOUR REGISTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the Hon. F. M. Stone, and read a first time.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

HON. H. G. PARSONS moved for leave to introduce a Bill intituled "A Bill to amend the Companies Act, 1893."

HON. A. P. MATHESON rose to a point of order. We had just been informed by the Colonial Secretary that the Government intended to introduce a Bill this session to amend the Companies Act. It was impossible for the Legislature to deal with two Bills on the same subject, in the same session.

THE PRESIDENT: The notice given by Mr. Parsons would take priority, but if Mr. Parsons was assured that the Government would bring in a Bill, in the circumstances no doubt Mr. Parsons would withdraw the notice.

HON. H. G. PARSONS said he was unwilling to withdraw his motion, as he did not know the nature of the Bill the Government intended to introduce. If it was absolutely necessary for him to withdraw his motion he would do so, but he preferred to submit his Bill to the House. Question put and passed.

FIRST READING.

HON. H. G. PARSONS moved that the Bill be read a first time.

HON. A. P. MATHESON asked if he was in order in making remarks at that stage?

THE PRESIDENT: It was usual to make remarks on the motion for the second reading.

HON. A. P. MATHESON said he wanted to point out what effect this Bill might have on the Bill brought forward by the Government, when that Bill was introduced.

THE PRESIDENT suggested that Mr. Parsons should set down the second reading of the Bill at an extended date, so as to enable members to have the Government Bill before them, and it would then be for members to decide which Bill they would take.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: If we dealt with the first reading, we should be obliged to deal with Mr. Parsons' Bill first.

THE PRESIDENT: It was always competent to withdraw a Bill at any stage.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a first time.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, on the motion of the Hon. F. T. Crowder, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

PUBLIC EDUCATION BILL.

Read a third time, on the motion of the Colonial Secretary, and returned to the Legislative Assembly with amendments.

INTERPRETATION BILL.

On the motion of the Hon. R. S. Haynes, the House resumed consideration of the Bill in Committee, with the amendments recommended by the Select Committee.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 18, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 19—Interpretation of "may" and "shall":

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved that the clause be struck out. He had been asked to refer to paragraph 2 of the Select Committee's report. When a Bill was introduced to consolidate the law, the draftsman should get together all the Acts he could and repeal them. Sections 6 and 7 of 29 Vict. dealt with almost everything contained in the Interpretation Bill, and yet 29 Vict. was not repealed by this Bill. The Select Committee had thought it dangerous to pass such a clause, because it would affect many Acts of Parliament, and would practically amount to a repeal of the common law. In a great number of statutes, the words "may" and "shall" had already received judicial interpretation, and to pass the clause would be to turn those decisions upside down. The words "may" and "shall" were well understood by lawyers, because decisions as to their construction had already been given, and were well-known.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE suggested that the object of Mr. Haynes would be best served by the insertion of the words "or future enactments," as an alternative to striking the clause out.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The meaning of the words "may" and "shall" depended on the context of the clause, and to introduce a new meaning would be altogether dangerous.

Amendment put and passed, and the clause struck out.

Clause 20—agreed to.

First Schedule—agreed to.

Second Schedule:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as an amendment, that there be added to the second schedule the following paragraph, to stand as paragraph 1:—

That in all cases where on any summary conviction under this Ordinance of any person, not being a convict, the sum adjudged by one justice to be paid shall exceed £10, or by two or more justices shall exceed £20, or the imprisonment, whether adjudged by one or more justice or justices, shall exceed one calendar month, any person who shall think himself aggrieved by such conviction may appeal to the next court of general or quarter sessions, which shall be holden not less than twenty days after the day of such conviction at Perth, in the said colony, unless such conviction shall take place within one hundred miles of Albany, in the said colony, in which case any appeal from such conviction shall be to the next court of general or quarter sessions, holden not less than ten days after the day of such conviction at Albany aforesaid.

A number of Acts had been passed in the last fifty years; and he moved the insertion of the new paragraph simply for the purpose of reference to past Acts. Paragraph 1 was in the old schedule, and he wanted to make the present schedule the same as that in the present Act. He understood it would be unnecessary to introduce this paragraph into future Acts; but it was necessary to keep it in this Bill, for the purpose of reference to past Acts.

Put and passed, and the schedule as amended agreed to.

Preamble and title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 5.10 p.m., until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 7th September, 1898.

Question: Kalgoorlie Gold-Mining Lease No. 3364 (Ivanhoe Venture Company), Alluvial Dispute and Removal of Ore—Question: Petition of Right by Mr. M. F. A. Canning—Ivanhoe Venture G.M. Company, Select Committee's Report—Motion: Tick in East Kimberley, Quarantine and Inoculation; debate continued; Divisions (5)—Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill, first reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION: KALGOORLIE GOLD-MINING LEASE NO. 3364 (IVANHOE VENTURE COMPANY), ALLUVIAL DISPUTE AND REMOVAL OF ORE.

MR. VOSPER asked the Attorney General,—1, Whether he was aware that Michael Burke, Edward Burns, and James Millar, on or about April 24th last, entered upon Gold-Mining Lease 3364, Kalgoorlie, and pegged out an alluvial claim under section 36 of the Goldfields Act. 2, Whether the manager of the lease, or any other person authorised by the Ivanhoe Venture Syndicate, within forty-eight hours, or at any time after service of notice by the claimholders in accordance with Regulation 103, marked off or delineated any alleged reef or lode on the claim pegged out. 3, Whether Burke and party were summoned for trespass to the warden's court, on or about May 27th, after having worked their claim for several weeks. 4, Whether upon the warden intimating that he was against Burke and party, a special case was arranged to be stated on certain points to the Supreme Court. 5, Whether the warden delayed the transmission of the special case to the Supreme Court until the month of August, although the case was originally heard on or about May 27th. 6, Whether, on or about August 4th, an injunction was granted against Burke and party working their claim on the application of the syndicate, while a similar application by the claim-holders against the syndicate was refused. 7,