

missions at Beagle Bay and New Norcia, and while it is recognised from time to time that you can divert these peoples' wild notions in the matters of commerce and in a general way, you cannot succeed in making them citizens of the State in the ordinary sense of the word. Why go to so much trouble over the report of Dr. Roth, which has been exaggerated by the Press of the day to secure political ends, and Dr. Roth does not stand altogether clear of suspicion, not only in this State, but in his own State. I am not a champion for Dr. Roth, whom I have never seen; I am not a champion of the squatters in the Nor'-West, a portion of the State I am profoundly ignorant of. It would be absurd for some of us to try and legislate for the people who exist in the Nor'-West just as it would be inconsistent for us to legislate for people in China, of whose customs and manners we know nothing. In this instance I ask members not to be guided so much by the sweeping provisions of the Bill, not to be led by the Press of the day, when they say we that have robbed these people of their country; that is utter twaddle. Shall we say that Columbus, when he discovered America, robbed the Indians of their country. It would be absurd to utter such nonsense in this Chamber, where we claim to be deliberative and sensible. If these people cannot conform to the advancing reforms of civilisation, then under the inevitable law of the survival of the fittest, they must give way. I do not wish them to be unjustly treated. Let us do as they did in Tasmania and as they do in New Zealand, although there they have a different and more intelligent type to deal with. What did they do in Tasmania when the remnant of a dying race passed out, when Truiggannie, the queen of the last tribe there expired she was treated to almost a State funeral—the last of a race which fought so valiantly in times past for what they deemed the rights of their country, but which were inconsistent with the rights of civilisation. If it comes to something of the same kind here, it is simply the carrying out of the law of the survival of the fittest. I hope no extraordinary course will be taken, but that members will recognise they are treating the remaining portion of the aboriginal race in as kindly a fashion as possible,

and that they will not go out of their way to be unduly sympathetic on the one side, or unduly forgiving on the other, or unduly cruel on the side of the squatters, who are well represented in this House. I think members will agree with me that a legitimate view should be taken of the situation and no harsh measures adopted on one side or the other.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at six minutes past 11 o'clock, until the next afternoon.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 14th December, 1905.

	PAGE
Question: Pilbarra Railway Project, how advertised	434
Bills: (3) read a first time	435
Metropolitan Waterworks Act Amendment, 3a.	437
Banking Companies Act Amendment, 2a., Com., reported	437
Municipal Institutions Act Amendment, 3a.	438
Roads and Streets Closure (William Street Bridge, etc.), Com., reported	438
Motion: Perth Town Hall New Site, to disapprove of gift	435

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Western Australian Government Railways—By-law No. 34, Classification, Rates, and General Regulations for the conveyance of Merchandise and Live Stock; also Jetty Regulations, Wharfage Charges, etc., operating from the 17th July, 1905.

QUESTION—PILBARRA RAILWAY PROJECT, HOW ADVERTISED.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Have offers been invited outside the State by newspaper advertisement for building the Port Hed-

land-Nullagine railway? 2, If so, where? 3, What was the date of the first insertion? 4, The date on which offers were to be in?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, No. 2 and 3, Answered by No. 1. 4, 30th November, 1905.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT, introduced by the Hon. T. F. O. Brimage.

BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT, introduced by the Hon. M. L. Moss.

SECRET COMMISSIONS, received from the Legislative Assembly.

MOTION—PERTH TOWN HALL, NEW SITE.

TO DISAPPROVE OF GIFT.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY (North-East) moved—

That in the opinion of this House the Government is not justified in making a gift to the Perth Municipal Council of the Perth Police Court Offices and land, unless the consent of Parliament be first formally obtained.

A few points in regard to this matter deserved the attention of hon. members. A few days ago he asked the Colonial Secretary a question relating to the land and building in Barrack Street, and received replies to the effect—(1) that a distinct promise was made by a former Government to give the Police Court Offices (Barrack Street) and site to the Perth Municipal Council; (2) that the whole of the papers (including the promise) were submitted to Parliament in the years 1903-4, and no objection was raised; (3) that the frontage to Barrack Street was 75' 3", the estimated value being £18,800; (4) that the cost of buildings now on the land was £4,900. He took exception to the answer given, particularly to question No. 2, for strictly speaking that answer was not in accordance with fact. The Colonial Secretary had said the whole of the papers were submitted to Parliament. Without defining what constituted a submitting of papers to Parliament, the fact in this case was that the papers were laid on the table of the other House on the 20th September, 1903, and remained there until 23rd January

following. Surely the mere fact of laying papers on the table of another House was not submitting the question to Parliament, nor was it submitting the question to this House. Members did not usually take particular notice of papers laid on the table, as such papers were mostly of a formal nature. Also the Legislative Assembly was not the whole of Parliament but one branch only, the Legislature consisting of two Houses. Therefore the laying of the papers on the table of the Assembly was not, as the Minister stated, submitting the papers to Parliament. This question had never been submitted to Parliament, and the mere fact of laying papers on the table of another House was not submitting it to Parliament at all. Therefore, as he had said, the answer to that question was not in accordance with fact. Apart from this, he took exception more particularly to the answer given to this question, because in looking up the *Hansard* record he found that on the 11th August, 1903, the present Colonial Secretary was asked whether it was the intention of the Government to obtain the ratification of Parliament to the proposed gift of the Perth Police Offices and land to the Perth Municipal Council. The answer was that the matter was under consideration. Therefore the Colonial Secretary must have known that it was the desire of members of this House to have the papers submitted to this House, one member having asked whether it was the intention of the Government to do so. Two or three weeks later, those papers were actually laid on the table of the Legislative Assembly; and in this matter the Minister showed a want of courtesy in not making mention of that circumstance in this House, so that members might be made aware that the papers were on the table of the other House. It was understood, when Mr. Gardiner was Colonial Treasurer, that on the municipal subsidy being increased as was then proposed, the indiscriminate grants made previously to municipal councils would cease; and to that proposition members were apparently agreed. Yet the present Government now declared their intention of making a gift to the Perth Municipal Council of land and buildings to a value (as estimated by one of their officers) of £18,800 in land and

£4,900 in buildings, being a total gift to the City Council of State property to the value of £23,700. He wanted members to bear in mind that it was not as if the Government had spare buildings or spare land in the city and did not know what to do with them; but Perth being the capital city, and as the country was progressing, so instead of requiring less office accommodation for Government purposes in the future, a great deal more would be required. Members also should bear in mind that even at the present time the Government were paying a large amount for renting offices outside the present Government buildings. He had obtained the other day a return showing that several large departments of the Government were renting offices outside the ordinary buildings and in various parts of Perth, at a total cost of over £800 a year. Yet in the face of that state of things, the present Government were giving away the police buildings in Barrack Street and the land on which they stood.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Who was giving them way?

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: The present Government. He had taken this action because he saw in a newspaper report that a deputation to the Premier had obtained from him a definite promise that the land and buildings in Barrack Street, known as the Police Court Offices, should be given to the City Council.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: No; asking that a promise made previously be carried out.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY understood from the Premier's reply that he promised to do so. Neither this Government nor any Government had the right to give away land and buildings of such large value without having the consent of Parliament to do so. As a representative of the country he objected to this altogether. The City Council was no more entitled to have the land and buildings in Barrack Street as a gift than was any other municipal council in the State entitled to a similar gift of State property.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: All municipal councils, nearly, had obtained grants of land as sites for municipal buildings.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: This was a gift that was apparently to be made to the City Council which had already a

town hall erected and owned the fee simple of the land. It was only in the year 1901 that they got the freehold of the site granted definitely; and Mr. Victor, who had lately valued the town hall, set down the value as £62,000 or £63,000. So the City Council had done very well to get that site finally transferred to them. On top of that, the present Government proposed to give away part of the Government buildings in Barrack Street and the land on which they stood; although the buildings there were badly wanted for public purposes, instead of renting offices in different parts of the city. Another aspect of the case was that not only must the market value of the site be taken into consideration, but we must bear in mind the position of it. The way some of the Government departments were working at present must be very expensive, for they had certain offices in one part of the city and offices in another part of the city. The Public Works Department, for instance, had offices in one place and another set of offices in another place, and as there was need for constant communication between the several branches of a large department, there must be need for more messengers, with a consequent waste of time and increase of expense in carrying on the work of the department. The land and buildings which the Government proposed to give to the City Council were in the very heart of the public buildings in Perth. Could not the administrative offices of the Government be worked more cheaply if situated in a central position, instead of being scattered over the town as was now the case? To give away this land and the buildings on it would entail another £800 a year for providing necessary office accommodation for those officers who would be displaced by handing over this building to the City Council; thus bringing up the cost for Government offices away from the public buildings to a total rental of £1,600 a year. Also about £400 had lately been spent in adapting the Police Offices to the requirements of certain other public officers, and that expenditure would also be so much money thrown away when this gift was made to the City Council. To provide accommodation for these officers outside would entail an expenditure of £800 a year, according to a return pre-

pared by the Under Secretary for Public Works. So by giving away this building, the Government would have to rent other offices at £800 a year to provide accommodation which was now obtainable in the Police Court Offices, which the Government proposed to give away. According to a report in the *West Australian* newspaper of June 23rd, 1903, a deputation waited on the then Premier, Mr. Walter James, in regard to this site, and asked if he would give to the City Council the old Assembly Chamber. But Mr. James replied that he would not; while he also made a proposition to this effect, that he was willing, if the City Council surrendered to the Government of the day the freehold of the town hall site, he would undertake, on behalf of the Government, to extend the block of public buildings in keeping with those now existing in Hay Street and Cathedral Avenue, which were a fine block indeed; that this block would be extended along the Hay Street frontage and round into Barrack Street, covering the present town hall site and the Police Offices site; that if this were done he would undertake to provide for the City Council accommodation for municipal purposes in the basement of the building and on the ground floor and the first floor over all the portion of ground now covered by the Town Hall and the Police Offices in Barrack Street. This was the only distinct promise which had been made by a previous Government, so far as he (Mr. Connolly) could discover; and if this proposal were carried out, it would be a business-like arrangement, because the Government would in that way get the use of the upper floors right over the ground occupied by the Town Hall and the Police Offices. He did not know what the Colonial Secretary meant when he stated recently that the Government were only carrying out the promise of a former Government.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: A promise was made to the Perth Council while he was a member of it, that they should get the Police Offices and land as a gift.

HON. J. D. CONOLLY: Coming now to the time of the Daglish Government, he found that on the 21st August this year Mr. Daglish, as Premier, wrote a minute to the effect that the Cabinet objected to the transfer of this property

to the City Council without the direct authority of Parliament. In view of these facts, he (Mr. Connolly) must emphatically protest against this grant of State property valued at £24,100 as a gift to the Perth City Council, which body had no more right to get this property from the State than had any other council in the State a right to get a similar value of State property as a gift. He asked members to give this motion fair consideration, and say by their votes that they did not approve of this or any Government giving away this amount of State property to any particular body without Parliament being directly consulted, and not in the way the Colonial Secretary mentioned in saying they had consulted Parliament by simply laying papers on the table of one branch of the Legislature.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, debate adjourned to the next sitting.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WATER- WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time, and *passed*.

BILL—BANKING COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. W. Kingsmill): In moving the second reading, I may say that the title of the Bill is by far the most formidable part of it. The Bill consists of but one clause, amending an Act passed in the eighth year of the reign of His late Majesty King William IV.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: In what year was that?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member ought to know. The Bill was assented to on the 10th July, 1837.

HON. M. L. MOSS: In that year His Majesty was dead.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then I presume that the assent was given by his successor. This historical point having been fixed, I will proceed to explain the purposes of the Bill. In those days, in British Crown Colonies throughout the world—and practically all colonies were then Crown colonies, the days of Responsible Government not having then arrived—it was the custom to repose in the hands of the Colonial

Secretary, who was almost the direct representative of the Crown, the task of performing certain functions, which, since the granting of Responsible Government have in many cases been reposed in the hands of the Colonial Treasurer. Especially does this apply to the supervision of banking companies. Members who turn up the parent Act will find that the marginal notes amply explain the function which the Colonial Secretary of those days were supposed to perform. For instance, we find in Section 2 that banking companies are to make annual accounts and returns containing the particulars mentioned in the section, which accounts or returns are to be delivered to the Colonial Secretary at his office. Farther, the Colonial Secretary is charged with the duty of keeping such accounts and returns in his archives, and with the duty of delivering to applicants certified copies of the same. As banking is a branch of industry which more particularly appertains to the Minister who controls the finances, it has been thought well in the interests of the public service that these banking accounts and returns—the parent Act being still in operation—should be lodged in the office of the Colonial Treasurer rather than in that of the Colonial Secretary. This is better, not only for the reason mentioned, but because it will facilitate the administration of other Acts, such as the Dividend Duty Act and cognate statutes. The object of the Bill, as members will see, is to strike out, wherever they occur in the parent Act, the words “Colonial Secretary,” and to insert in lieu thereof “Colonial Treasurer.”

HON. R. F. SHOLL: More work.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I can assure the hon. member that the work will not be very heavy; but it is thought far better that these accounts should be lodged with the financial department of the Government rather than with the Colonial Secretary, who has no concern whatever with finance. I have much pleasure in moving the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

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

BILL—MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

RECOMMITTAL, ETC.

Bill recommitted for amendment.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the figure 3 (clerical error) was altered to 2; so that the amendment as to the onus of proof of wholesale sales would be added to Clause 2 as intended.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

BILL—ROADS AND STREET CLOSURE.

WILLIAM STREET RAILWAY BRIDGE, ETC.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the previous day.

Clause 1—Closure of certain roads and streets:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: When progress was reported at the last sitting, the following amendment, which he had moved, was practically agreed to:

Provided that the roadway and footpaths of the bridge crossing the Government Railway at William Street, Perth, are hereby dedicated to the public use, and it shall be unlawful for any building to be erected thereon or on any part thereof.

Mr. Loton, however, wished to add to that proviso—“Provided farther that the aforesaid bridge, roadway, and footpaths shall be maintained and kept in repair by the Commissioner of Railways.” Unfortunately, Mr. Loton’s amendment was of special application, while the Bill was of general application. Since the last sitting, he (the Minister) had consulted the Hon. M. L. Moss, who agreed that this Bill was not only an improper place for Mr. Loton’s amendment, but that the amendment was foreign to the title of the Bill. Yesterday he (the Colonial Secretary) had indicated the Railways Act as a proper place for the amendment; but on farther consideration, he thought that the hon. member’s object could best be achieved by an amendment of the Public Works Act. The amendment should be withdrawn.

THE CHAIRMAN: The only question before the Committee was the Colonial Secretary’s amendment.

HON. W. T. LOTON: The Minister had said this amendment was foreign to the purpose of the Bill; but surely it was on the contrary very appropriate. This, we were told, was a special Bill; and undoubtedly it was very special, as it

handed over to the Railway Department a portion of one of the main highways of Perth. A fresh means of transit across the railway had been provided by a bridge at the William Street crossing; and he (Mr. Loton) desired to ensure that the bridge should be kept in thorough repair. He failed to see that his amendment was in any way foreign to the objects of the Bill. It would show definitely who should keep the new road in order. The local authority admittedly had not any control over the bridge.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : That was very doubtful indeed.

HON. W. T. LOTON : Therefore provision should be made whereby the maintenance and repair of the new roadway and footpaths should be undertaken by some definite authority. His amendment was practically a proviso, which might be added to the amendment moved by the Minister; and unless the Government were prepared to bring in a measure to the effect that the Commissioner of Railways or the Government should undertake the maintenance and repair of the new roadway and footpaths, he must press his amendment.

HON. G. RANDELL : If the amendment moved by the Minister was not foreign to the object of the Bill, then Mr. Loton's amendment was not foreign to it either, because one supplemented the other. Representatives of Perth were bound to see that provision should be made for the proper maintenance of the new roadway. This was not a general but a special matter.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY had said it was a special matter, but a general amendment for another Act.

HON. G. RANDELL : The Commissioner of Railways was using a number of offices under the bridge; and that had been one object in erecting the bridge. The amendment proposed by Mr. Loton should certainly be added, there being no reasonable objection to it; and he understood the two Ministers had assented that it was the duty of the Government to keep this road in repair.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : That was not disputed.

HON. G. RANDELL : Then there appeared to be no objection to the amendment. In dealing with this special work, this was the proper place for inserting

the provision as to maintenance of the roadway. If the maintenance was to be left to the City Council, it would probably be kept in bad order, and the Railway Commissioner might find the rain leaking into the offices beneath the roadway.

HON. W. MALEY : It was well that the City Council had at last awakened to the desirability of protecting the interests of the citizens in this respect. For many years past the aggressive action of the Commissioner of Railways had been quietly submitted to by the City Council; but it was gratifying to see that the Council had such defenders of their interests as Mr. Loton and Mr. Randell, although the City Council should be able to protect themselves. In dealing with this question, a red-berring seemed to have been drawn across the trail by the proposal that we must depend upon the Commissioner of Railways for the upkeep of the roadway over the bridge. As a citizen, he (Mr. Maley) would prefer to look to the City Council to keep the roadway in order; but it ought to be a matter of arrangement between the City Council and the Commissioner. It was to be hoped that the Railway Commissioner would not be allowed to erect buildings on any portion of this land that he might choose to use for the purpose. It appeared that under the Railways Act passed in 1904, the Commissioner had power to take possession of any Crown land which was reputed to belong to the Government Railways; and that certainly was a strong power to have, and might be used in a dangerous way.

HON. M. L. MOSS : It should be remembered that railway property was not vested in the Commissioner of Railways; for, as provided in Section 4 of the Railways Act 1904, all Government railways were vested in the Minister on behalf of His Majesty. Therefore, if this Bill passed, and the portion of William Street formerly crossing the railway were legally closed under this measure, the land would not vest in any Commissioner of Railways or in the Railway Department, but would become properly vested in His Majesty, like ordinary waste lands of the Crown. With regard to land of that character which became vested in the Sovereign, there was no possibility of any buildings being erected on the land without the

ordinary procedure necessary in disposing of Crown land.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: What about the building which the Commissioner recently began to erect in Wellington Street?

HON. M. L. MOSS: That was a different case. He then proposed to erect a building on a railway reserve. Under Section 103 of the Public Works Act, there was no doubt the responsibility of repairing the roadway and footpaths over this bridge would not devolve on the City Council. There were three subclauses; but referring particularly to the second subclause it placed the maintenance of public roads under or over railways in the care of the Commissioner of Railways. With regard to the William Street bridge, with the exception of the end pieces which abutted on the bridge the bulk of the bridge was entirely on railway property, in the shape of a horseshoe construction; and the lower portion of that construction was utilised for railway offices. It was a rule with regard to the law of real property that as far down or as high up as an owner chose to go was regarded as part of the freehold. So far as the railway Commissioner was concerned, in this case the bridge was entirely on railway property; therefore under Subsection 2 of Section 103 which he had referred to, it was obvious that there was no responsibility on the City Council to maintain the roadway over the bridge, but that the maintenance would fall on the Commissioner of Railways. In declaring this roadway over the bridge, it was not a dedication to the City Council nor even to the public in Perth, but was a dedication to the public at large. Hon. members would agree that it was highly inexpedient to give the control of this roadway and the footpaths to the City Council; because were it to become necessary to effect any alteration to the bridge, the responsibility must rest on the Railway Department. To allow the bridge to be tampered with while railway work was going on underneath, there must be responsibility placed on the Railway Department. Therefore there should not be divided control in regard to this bridge. Personally he did not object to the inclusion of the amendment in the clause; and the

Colonial Secretary had objected to the extent only that it was somewhat foreign to the title of the Bill, and that this might cause objection in another place. No objection was made on the part of the Government to the amendment, and there was no shirking of responsibility in regard to the maintenance of this bridge. It would be undesirable to have divided control. In the case of ordinary roadways, the absolute property in the roadways was vested in the municipal council as the local authority; but in dedicating this roadway and the footpaths over the bridge, no responsibility for maintenance would be cast on the City Council.

HON. G. RANDELL: What power of control would there be as to traffic over the bridge?

HON. M. L. MOSS: The by-laws of the City Council would not operate in that case; but there was another way of regulating this traffic under the Police Act of 1902.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Now that there appeared to be no objection to the amendment, in order to make the intention more clear he would withdraw the words "Commissioner of Railways" and substitute "Minister" in lieu.

HON. Z. LANE: While agreeing with Mr. Loton, he would point out to the Attorney General that he was in error in making the statement that no one could build on land in that new roadway crossing the railway. The whole of the available land on the southern side was already built on, and there was not a foot to spare; also the whole available space underneath the bridge was used for railway offices. That being so, it would be necessary for the Commissioner of Railways to see that the roadway was kept in repair, so that there should be no leakage through to offices below.

HON. W. MALEY: As to the construction and running of trams over that bridge in the future, would it be likely that the Commissioner would raise any objection if application was made for power to run trams over the road?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The agreement as to trams would have to be made between the Tramways Company, the Commissioner, and the Minister. Referring to Section 16 of the Government Railways Act, it provided that the

Commissioner of Railways should have the maintenance, management, and control of Government railways. So the railway must embrace premises above and below the surface of any particular railway and of land reserved in connection with the railway. There would be no need for Mr. Loton to alter his amendment. As to the objection raised to-day, that could be met by amending the title, so as to make it include "other purposes."

HON. G. RANDELL: After the lucid explanation given by Mr. Moss as to the legal position, suppose there was a railway strike, would there be any effective protection of the interests of citizens and of the railway itself? Persons breaking the law in such cases might cause serious difficulty.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Police Act of 1892, in the section already referred to, contained ample provision to deal with all classes of traffic that did not come under the control of the municipal authority. There was in that Act a code of what might be called municipal laws to be applied for the control and management of any public roadway where municipal by-laws were not in operation.

Amendment (by the Colonial Secretary) put and passed.

Farther amendment (by Mr. Loton) put and passed.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Schedule:

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY moved an amendment—

That in the paragraph headed "In the City of Perth," on page 4, the words "All that portion of William Street lying between the southern side of Roe Street and the northern side of Wellington Street" be struck out.

At the last sitting he gave reasons for this. An overhead railway would at some time be erected, to cross William Street. Meanwhile, it was not desirable to allow William Street to be blocked by buildings.

Amendment put and negatived.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved an amendment—

That the following be added under the heading "In the Town of Popanyinning": "All that portion of a public road, bounded by lines starting at a point on the Eastern side of the Great Southern Railway Reserve, situate 14 chains 65 and $\frac{1}{10}$ th links South, and 4 chains 62 and $\frac{7}{10}$ th links East from the

North-East corner of Popanyinning Town Lot 20, and extending 89° 54' 11 chains 22 and $\frac{1}{10}$ links; thence 78° 26' 5 chains 38 and $\frac{1}{10}$ links; thence 118° 0' 1 chain 57 links; thence 258° 26' 6 chains 70 links; thence 269° 54' 11 chains 42 and $\frac{1}{10}$ links; and thence 5° 26' 1 chain and $\frac{7}{10}$ of a link to the starting point."

Amendment passed, and the schedule as amended agreed to.

Preamble—agreed to.

Title—amended consequentially on Mr. Loton's amendment, by adding the words "and for other purposes."

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at ten minutes to 6 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 14th December, 1905.

	PAGE
Questions: Premier's Private Secretary, other	
Employment	441
Timber Inquiry, how proceeding	442
Sunday Work on Mines	442
Bills: State Trading Accounts, 1s.	442
Stamp Act Amendment, Recommittal, reported	442
Totalisator Duty, 2s. concluded, in Com., progress	443
Assent to Bills (2)	460
Estimates (Annual), financial debate resumed, motions for adjournment, progress, divisions; all-night sitting, count-out	460

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—PREMIER'S PRIVATE SECRETARY.

OTHER EMPLOYMENT.

MR. WALKER asked the Premier: Is it a fact that the Private Secretary to the Premier is, beside his ordinary clerical duties, engaged as shorthand instructor at the Railway Institute, Perth, and, if so, is he in receipt of two salaries?

THE PREMIER replied: Mr. Kessell, in his private capacity, was invited, and,