

**PAPERS—RAILWAY CARRIAGES
CONSTRUCTION.**

On motion by *Mr. W. D. Johnson* (Guildford), ordered: "That all the papers relating to the proposal to construct additional railway carriages, and the subsequent decision to call tenders for the same, the tenders received, and the final acceptance of the tender of the Westralia Ironworks Ltd., be laid upon the table of the House."

**RETURN—ADVERTISING IN
PRESS, COST.**

Mr. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford) moved—

"That a return be laid upon the table of the House showing amount spent in advertising each year for the past three years, the newspapers advertised in, and the amount paid to each."

The information was required to see if it were possible to economise in advertising in this State. In his opinion, a good deal of economy could be effected in this direction. The return would be an education to the House and would assist Ministers in ascertaining whether economies could be effected in this direction.

Mr. A. J. WILSON (Forrest): Similar motions had been moved in the House. It was not fair that a member under cover of a motion of this kind which might merely be brought forward to gratify a morbid curiosity should ask the House, without showing some justification, to put the country to the expense of getting out a return of this kind. No member should unnecessarily waste the funds of the State in getting a return prepared, unless there was public necessity for the information. Surely the hon. member should show some justification, and not sit down with an indifference worthy of the motive for requesting such a return. The time for the hon. member to give information was not after a motion was opposed, because members opposed the motion or agreed to it according to the case the mover had made out. These remarks were directed at the haphazard method of some members in putting the country to expense to get returns which served no useful

purpose other than gratifying their curiosity.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore) could appreciate the desire of the last speaker to study economy in connection with these returns; but the matter the subject of debate would not entail great expense. At the same time, members would recognise that some of the returns asked for entailed a great deal of expense and labour. As a matter of fact, a motion was carried in another place last night for a return that would entail an expenditure of at least £250. It did not seem reasonable that the country should be put to this great expense, without some very important object was to be served. In the case under review the Government did not intend to offer objection, because it was believed the information could be supplied at a reasonable cost.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9.35 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 1st August, 1907.

	PAGE
Leave of Absence	600
Standing Orders Revision, as to the Committee's Recommendations	600
Bills: Police Force (consolidation), 2a.	604
Police Offences (consolidation), 2r. concluded	606
Obituary (Dempster) Arrangements	606
Adjournment of House	607

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

Prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary : Return of amount expended in connection with Deep Drainage and Sewerage, etc., moved for by Mr. Moss.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by the Hon. G. Randell, leave of absence for one month was granted to the Hon. W. T. Loton, on the ground of urgent private business.

STANDING ORDERS REVISION.

As to the Revised Orders.

Resumed from the 24th July.

Hon. J. W. Langsford : May I ask whether there is a clerical error in Standing Order 385, which is as follows:—"A member who has spoken to a question cannot speak to another amendment thereon until such amendment has become the main question." Should it not be "an amendment?"

Hon. W. Kingsmill : I think it is a clerical error.

The President : It is a clerical error. Undoubtedly it was intended to be "an amendment."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly) : While agreeing on the whole with these Standing Orders as revised, which I think are a distinct improvement on the existing Standing Orders, it appears to me that in regard to Standing Order 243, of which there has been a good deal said by the mover and Mr. Moss, there may be something in the contention raised by the Standing Orders Committee of another place—I do not say there is, but I would like to draw the attention of the House to this—that it is *ultra vires* of Section 46 of the Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1898. I refer more particularly to subparagraphs 1 and 4. It seems rather contradictory to say "That the request be pressed." It is laid down that this House has not the right to make an amendment straight out in a money Bill, but may "request" an amendment. Therefore it seems rather contradictory to say that we

"press" or "insist" on a request. If we have the right to make that Standing Order under the Constitution, I would be the last to ask the House not to stand up for it; and I am not saying we have not the right; I am simply raising the point so as to draw the attention of members to it. I do not wish to take anything from the rights and privileges of this House, but what I wish to avoid is this: If this question crops up later on, presuming we adopt this Standing Order and another place does not adopt a similar Standing Order, when a Bill goes back a second time with a request and the Assembly refuses to receive it, and if it is then ruled that we are out of order in sending it back, the onus of the Bill being lost will be thrown on this House. I can quite agree with the other paragraphs that modifications be agreed to or some other modifications of the original request be made—that is a farther request, but what I wish to point out is the "insisting" or "pressing" of a request. That seems to me where the Standing Order is somewhat at fault to my mind; and after all I do not know that it makes any material difference to this House; because, for instance, if a measure of taxation comes down fixing the rate of the tax at say 1s. and this House requests it to be altered to 10d., and when it goes back to the other House they refuse to accede to that, the request could be repeated again at 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ d., we would have a perfect right to do that, but it seems contradictory if we "press" or "insist"; it does not matter which term we use; both have the same meaning.

Hon. W. Kingsmill : We can use subparagraphs 5 and 6, and make some modification of the original request.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : I think we are perfectly right in making another modification; but this "pressing" or "insisting" on our first request seems contradictory. Then again, if the request is not accepted a second time, have we the right to send it up a third time?

Hon. W. Kingsmill : Yes.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : It appears to me that if we have the right under Section 46 of the Constitution Act

Amendment Act of 1899 to send it back once, we have the right to send it back twice or thrice. I wish to avoid putting this House in a false position afterwards. Of course if members are satisfied, it is well; but I mention this to the House purely out of consideration to members, because I do not want this House to be placed in the position that the onus of having a Bill lost is through this House having agreed to a Standing Order that is, so to speak, *ultra vires* of the Constitution of the State.

Hon. M. L. Moss: They passed it in the Federal Senate.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I agree that they passed it in the Senate; but I have heard that it was objected to by the House of Representatives on one occasion.

Hon. M. L. Moss: It was quite in accordance with the views of Sir Edmund Barton, Mr. Higgins, and other authorities on the Commonwealth Constitution.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: It was accepted by the House of Representatives on that occasion.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was at the time. When the Customs Tariff went to the Senate they repeated or insisted on a request, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Deakin), though he did not agree with the right of the Senate to repeat that request or insist on it, yet since they had to pass the tariff within a limited time and as that time had been almost reached, he accepted it, but protested and said it was not right. However, I should be better satisfied if there were any appeal later on; but unfortunately there is not. If we send up a Bill under paragraph 1 of Standing Order 243 and the Speaker rules against it, we come to no finality. I wish to avoid placing the House in a false position by having a Bill lost apparently through our fault. At the same time if members are satisfied we have a right under the Constitution to make the Standing Order, by all means stick to it, because certainly we should not give away any of the privileges conferred by the Constitution Act.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (for revising committee): I have a few words in answer to the points raised during the debate. First, I should like to thank members for their kind remarks. I would point out before I touch upon what is after all the crux of these Standing Orders, No. 243, that my attention has been drawn to another clerical error, in Standing Order 44, which commences, "A member who is absent for six consecutive sittings of the Council." The intention of the committee was not to alter the present rule. The existing Standing Order recites in somewhat indefinite language that a member must not be absent for more than a fortnight, which at our ordinary rate of sitting would include more than six consecutive sittings. The new Standing Order should read, "A member who is absent for more than six consecutive sittings." That alteration can be made by the Clerk. The Colonial Secretary has raised certain points on proposed Standing Order 243, and apparently his mind has not been set at rest by the arguments which I used when proposing the adoption of the report. For that I am sorry. Let me recite once more, for the hon. member's benefit, and as shortly as possible, the reasons which have actuated the committee in proposing this Standing Order. In the first place, the Minister will I think admit that the Commonwealth Constitution Act and our own Constitution Act are identical. He will also admit, I think, that this subject was fairly fully discussed at the Convention, part of the debates of which I read when moving the adoption of these Standing Orders. I then pointed out that the crucial point in those debates was whether a request which was made by the Senate could be made more than once, and that, in order to test the question, a motion was made by the Hon. Mr. Higgins, now a member of the Federal Judicature, that the words "at any stage" be struck out, with a view to inserting in lieu the word "once." Could any point be clearer than that? Here we have fully explained, in my opinion, the intention of the Convention when framing the Federal Constitution. That

amendment by Mr. Higgins was negatived, and farther, was negatived on the voices. There was not even a division taken on it. Amongst the gentlemen who composed that Convention, and who were responsible and in this case primarily responsible for the drafting of that Standing Order, was Sir Edmund Barton. He was one of the drafting committee who prepared the draft of the Bill upon which the Convention deliberated; and we find that a man like Sir Edmund Barton, together with a great many more members of the Convention—men who are regarded throughout Australia to-day, and were regarded then, as constitutional authorities—were perfectly satisfied that this should be so. Again, I pointed out, in order to show the powers it was proposed to confer on the Upper House of the Commonwealth, that Mr. G. H. Reid proposed that the whole subsection dealing with this power to return a Bill at any stage should be struck out. That amendment was also negatived, and negatived on the voices. I think this is fairly conclusive evidence that the Convention carefully studied the subject, and came to the conclusion they did arrive at only after considerable deliberation. If that evidence be not sufficient, I have taken the trouble to look up some of the debates in the Senate when this matter was under consideration, and I find that one of the foremost in debate was the Hon. R. E. O'Connor, who, I think the Minister will admit, is entitled to some little consideration as an authority on this subject. I should like to say that in the draft Standing Orders submitted to the Senate it was proposed to place after the Standing Order which we are now discussing another which was to stand as Order 246, providing that if a request were made three times by the Senate and were refused by the House of Representatives, the Senate should then be allowed to demand a free conference. There I think we have absolute proof that under Section 53 of the Commonwealth Constitution, which is identical with our Section 46, it is legitimate to make a request more than once. Mr. O'Connor, not satisfied with this, was of opinion—and

members can find the speech to which I refer on page 3432 of Volume XV. of the Federal Debates—that the return of a request three times was apt to tie the hands of the Senate, and on that account he moved to omit Standing Order 246, which was accordingly omitted. With him in this connection, if members will read the division list to be found on page 3447 of the same volume, will be found the names of some gentlemen who are recognised as authorities almost equal to Mr. Barton. We find Sir Richard Baker, Sir J. W. Downer, Mr. W. G. Higgs, Mr. G. McGregor, Mr. R. E. O'Connor, Mr. G. F. Pearce, Mr. J. T. Walker and Mr. E. Pulsford. I may say that the Standing Order disappeared by the fairly large majority of 18 to 5. [*Hon. J. W. Langsford*: Did Sir Josiah Symon take part in that division?] He was not there. I am sorry to call attention to his absence. The gentlemen who voted for the retention of the Standing Order were Mr. R. W. Best, Mr. H. Dobson, Mr. A. P. Matheson, Mr. T. Playford and Mr. J. S. Clemons. [*Hon. W. Patrick*: None of them legal gentlemen.] None of them legal gentlemen. I think the evidence I brought forward in the first place, supplemented by what I have said to-day, should be a sufficient proof to the Colonial Secretary that we are absolutely *intra vires* of the Act, and not *ultra vires*. There is another point to which I called attention, and I think I may be allowed to refer to it without transgressing the rules of debate; at all events, I feel sure that if I do I shall be promptly called to order. When this matter was being discussed by the joint committee, a proposition was made that as the word "pressed" seemed rather harsh—no reason was given for thinking so—the word "repeated" should be inserted in lieu. I ask the Colonial Secretary whether the very word "repeated" does not show on the part of those gentlemen who wish to deny to this House the right of making a request more than once, that they are prepared to admit the right. To me, and I think to practically all the members, the proposition must appear as plain as possible. Here we have in our own case powers abso-

lutely identical with those conferred on the Commonwealth Senate. Here we propose to put in our Standing Orders an order absolutely identical with a Standing Order which has stood the test of time for four years amongst the Standing Orders of the Commonwealth Senate. Here we have the evidence of one of the foremost parliamentarians in the Commonwealth, an officer of the Federal House in Australia, as to how that Standing Order has worked and his opinion of its applicability. No stronger case could be made, and no stronger case should be asked for; and I venture to say that if we could go to any other tribunal, the verdict must undoubtedly be in our favour. And farther, I venture to say that in asking for these powers to be explicitly expressed we are not going as far as we might go. It was proposed, and members who read the debates of the Senate on these very Standing Orders will find the proposal, that these Standing Orders should be much less explicit than they are to-day; that the procedure as to money Bills should be absolutely the same as with regard to ordinary Bills, with the exception that the phraseology, and only the phraseology, in which the amendments were made should be altered. That goes a good deal farther than we propose to go in our Standing Orders; and if gentlemen like Mr. O'Connor and other constitutional authorities thought they could go that far, their opinion is worth the respect of this House; and that strengthens me in the view I take that this House in the attitude it is assuming is well within its rights, and is *intra vires* of Section 46 of the Constitution. I am reminded by Mr. Randell that this is an effort to avoid deadlocks, to obviate disputes between the two Houses; and I would point out that the responsibility for causing deadlocks must be upon those who take up an attitude antagonistic to the solution of a dispute. This proposed Standing Order 243, as members will plainly see, gives this House the power enjoyed by the Commonwealth Senate of repeatedly asking the other branch of the Legislature, if not in one form then in another,

to agree to our demand or to a modification of our demand. Sooner than bring it to that finality which indications are not lacking to show they wish, sooner than do that, we are prepared to repeat our request, to "press" the request, as the phraseology of the Commonwealth Standing Orders has been followed, or even to modify it. Now I maintain that such a proposition must tend to do away with those awkward differences which may arise between the two Houses, rather than to emphasise or accentuate them. I have to thank members for the reception they have given to the new Standing Orders, and I now formally move—

"That the House adopts the Standing Orders as submitted by the Standing Orders Committee, with their report brought up on the 4th July, with modifications suggested by the same committee in their farther report brought up on the 24th July."

I also move—

"That an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, praying him to approve the new Standing Orders adopted by this Honourable House."

Hon. J. W. LANGSFORD (Metropolitan-Suburban): In seconding the motion, I should like to express my thanks to the revising committee for the very able manner in which they have carried out the work confided to them by the Council.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West): I want to point out—probably it is unnecessary—that in connection with the approval of Standing Orders by the Governor, under the original Constitution Act these Standing Orders have to be approved by the Governor, which does not mean the Governor-in-Council. Unlike other statutes in force, where the word "Governor" appears in that Act, it means "Governor." In other statutes, where it appears it means "the Governor-in-Council"; but in the Constitution Act it does not mean Governor-in-Council unless otherwise specified. Therefore it would be your duty, Mr. President, through your officers to submit these

Standing Orders directly to the Governor, and not through the Government. Question put and passed.

BILL—POLICE FORCE (CONSOLIDATION).

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly): In moving the second reading of this Bill it is unnecessary I think for me to detain the House at any length, because this Bill with the exception of one clause and a slight modification of another which I will refer to later on is the existing law. The Bill merely re-enacts Parts I. to V. of the Police Act, 1892, which I explained in dealing with the Bill the other evening entitled an Act relating to Police Offences. At the present time the law relating to the government of the police and police offences is all contained in one Act, or in several Acts called the Police Offences Act. On account of there being several amendments necessary in the Police Offences Act, this session it was deemed wise to separate the two Acts and make one the Police Offences Bill and one relating to the police force, or perhaps it should be more correctly called police regulations or the government of the police force. This enacts in a separate measure those clauses in the Police Offences Act which apply to the government of the police force. The measure provides for the appointment of a commissioner, non-commissioned officers and commissioned officers; it establishes police districts, controls the discipline of the police force, and deals with inquiries as to misconduct on the part of officers and constables and the conduct of the police force in general. The Bill does not call for any comment at this stage because it is the existing law, and I think I have explained the reason why the Bill is brought forward. The only alteration made is in Clause 30, which is an entirely new provision. Under the existing Police Offences Bill if a constable commits a breach of discipline or any offence no matter how

slight the offence may be, he has the right to demand a board to hear his case. Very often the offence is so trivial that it should not be heard by a board, but under the existing law it is necessary to appoint a board to consist of a police officer, a police magistrate, and probably a justice of the peace. It may be a very trivial offence for which the constable is fined a shilling or he may be cautioned for some slight misconduct on his part. This clause obviates the necessity for a board. It should be remembered that an inquiry takes time. In the first place it takes some time for the board to be appointed by the Governor-in-Council, and during this time the constable is under suspension. This Bill gives the Commissioner power in trivial cases to impose a fine, or if not a fine, if a constable is reported to him by an officer, the Commissioner can administer to the constable a caution or inflict a small fine. If members will turn to Clause 31 which re-enacts Section 26 of the present Act they will see that the Minister is given power to refuse a board at any time; for although the right exists to demand a board, it is purely at the discretion of the Minister that a board is appointed, for a constable can be removed without a board being appointed, but it is unusual to remove a constable or to dismiss him without a board.

Hon. W. Kingsmill : Then the board cannot dismiss him ?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : The board cannot dismiss him, but can make a recommendation to the Commissioner and that is sent to the Minister who makes a recommendation to the Governor-in-Council. If the dismissal is recommended by the board it is carried out, or if a fine is recommended that fine is inflicted. With that exception, also with the exception of Clause 42 in regard to search warrants which has been redrafted—it is Section 7 of the Police Offences Act—the Bill is a re-enactment of the present law. Clause 42 is redrafted to express the law in accordance with its present practice. The section does not

clearly set forth the practice now in vogue. I beg to move :—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West) : I want to point out to the Minister a small matter dealing with the Bill which I have no doubt he will agree to, and if he does agree to it I hope he will put a new clause on the Notice Paper with the idea of incorporating it in the measure. The Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners appoint detectives at the wharves and sheds at Fremantle. Members are aware the Harbour Trust Commissioners control hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of goods in the course of the year, and in order that the public revenue should be protected these sheds and wharves have to be properly watched. Unfortunately we know that pilfering takes place at the sheds, and the Harbour Trust Commissioners, in order to deal with the difficulty, have appointed two detectives so that one shall always be on duty to watch what is going on. These detectives not being appointed by the Police Act have not the powers of police constables, and it is absolutely necessary in order that the detectives shall carry out their work that they shall have authority to stop suspected persons and search them and search packages which they are carrying. I know the Commissioners have felt the difficulty in the detectives not having this power, and I would suggest that the Government should put one more clause in the Bill providing that the detectives should have all the powers and authorities entitling them to perform all the duties of constables sworn in under this Bill. The Government will see that in doing that they will be assisting the Commissioners to prevent pilfering going on in connection with the working of the harbour at Fremantle, and it must be a direct aid and gain to the revenue, for when goods are stolen from the wharves and sheds, as a matter of fact the Government have to pay the claims. I see no objection to vesting these detectives with the full authority of police constables. I believe

the Police Department have objection to this course.

Hon. R. W. Pennefather: Why does not the Police Department appoint them?

Hon. M. L. MOSS : The fact is this : these detectives are officers of the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners and not officers of the Police Department. If the Police Department appointed these detectives they would have to pay them, and I suppose that is the reason of the objection. My point is that it is highly important in the public interests that these persons should be told off to do this duty, and to have authority to stick up certain persons who are suspected of having plunder in their possession or who are carrying it in any vehicle. At the present time they have not that authority. I do not think the Commissioner of Police ought to have control of these persons. The Harbour Trust Commissioners are not asking too much, that these detectives should have all the authority of ordinary constables. I hope the Minister will bear in mind what I have said and see what can be done to insert a clause to meet the objection raised.

Hon. W. Patrick : Would you make the clause generally apply to all parts of the State?

Hon. M. L. MOSS : No. Within the harbour at Fremantle.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (in reply) : I would like to say, in reply to Mr. Moss, that I will ask the Government to take into consideration the suggestion made; but I think the difficulty could be got over under the existing law. There would be no difficulty if the Harbour Trust so desire, for I take it the men are employed for the whole of their time as detectives, and if that is so the difficulty can be overcome by having two detectives stationed there from the ordinary police force, which the Harbour Trust Commissioners would pay for. Members must know that constables are frequently paid for. The constables at the Mint are paid for and constables who are sent to entertainments.

Hon. W. Kingsmill : I suppose the constables sent to Parliament House are paid for?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Probably these men are paid for, but often at entertainments and gatherings where the police are specially required the Police Department are paid so much a day for the services of the policemen. I do not agree with Mr. Moss when he says that these men should be sworn in as ordinary constables and detectives and yet be servants of the Harbour Trust Board. That proposition is unreasonable, and it could not reasonably be expected that the Commissioner of Police could properly accept the responsibility of these officers and have no control over them.

Hon. M. L. Moss: They do not want him to accept any responsibility.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the men are under the Police Act the Commissioner of Police is responsible for the men.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You have missed my point.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not think so. You cannot specially exempt any two constables and say they shall not be amenable to the rules and regulations governing the police force although they are members of that force. I will note the point raised by the hon. member; but I certainly think at the present moment the difficulty can be got over in the way I suggest, by the Harbour Trust Commissioners applying to the Police Department for two constables or detectives

Hon. M. L. Moss: They do not want the constables that Mr. Hare would send.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The constables would be instructed in their duties. They would have to carry out the work they were sent to perform, in the same way as a constable who is sent to a race meeting or to this House or to entertainments is instructed in his duties; the constable would take his instructions from the officers and the Commissioner would know what work the man has to do. If he instructs them, no one can ask for a dual control in this or in anything else

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—POLICE OFFENCES (CONSOLIDATION).

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 30th July.

Hon. C. SOMMERS (Metropolitan): I desire to support the Bill, for it appears to me that it is one which meets the case in every respect. I would like to draw attention to Clause 58 which refers to any house or room, or any place whatsoever, used for any of the purposes then following, that is for making bets, and so on. What I wish to know is whether the words "any place whatsoever" mean the registered course of the W.A. Turf Club, for instance. I want to understand whether it is proposed to make betting on the course illegal. [*The Colonial Secretary*: It is illegal now.] Well what is the use of our perpetuating this system of taking no notice of an illegal act? I am not in favour of making laws to prohibit men from betting on racecourses under proper supervision. I believe in prohibiting street or shop betting, but if a man goes to a racecourse and puts his money on a race I have no objection.

Hon. W. Patrick: It is illegal now.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: I do not know that it should be illegal.

Hon. R. F. Sholl: You may bet on the totalisator.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: If one is wrong, then the other should be wrong as well. I would like to be consistent and do not approve of the authorities winking at breaches of an existing law; either the provision should be in the Bill and steps taken to see that it is carried out, or else it should not be in the Bill at all. Apart from this the Bill is a good one, and when the Committee stage is reached I will have more to say on this subject of betting on horse races.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

OBITUARY ARRANGEMENTS.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Before moving the adjournment of the House I would like to tell hon. members that, as I understand it is the desire of a

number of them to attend the funeral of the late Hon. C. E. Dempster on Tuesday next at Northam—I desire to do so myself—I propose to ask that the House at its rising shall adjourn until Wednesday next.

Hon. C. SOMMERS : I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Government to make arrangements for a special train so as to enable members who desire to attend the funeral to travel to Northam without having to catch the train leaving at 6 a.m. I understand that the funeral takes place at 3 p.m.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : I am afraid that we would hardly be warranted in putting the country to the expense of a special train if there is one leaving at 6 a.m. I will make inquiries concerning the matter, but I do not think it is likely that there will be a special train.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 5.22 o'clock, until the next Wednesday.

construct or set apart any other buildings for the proposed new Stores Department, will give due consideration to the present buildings most centrally situated to rail and sea coast of this State, and which were erected for the Stores Department and in such a position as was considered most central for distribution of stores or supplies for the various Departments throughout the State by a previous Government, such building being erected and situated at North Fremantle. 2, Whether the Minister before coming to a decision in regard to any removal will ascertain from such firms trading as general merchants as Messrs. J. W. Bateman, W. D. Moore & Co., or any other firms of long standing at Fremantle, whether such firms have had any losses, or their goods affected by having their stores so near the sea shore. 3, Whether the Minister is aware that a private firm that deals largely in galvanised iron, etc., chose a site for their stores near the position of the present buildings at North Fremantle. 4, Whether the Minister will ascertain that the goods reported to be damaged by being so close to the sea shore, namely, fencing wire, etc., were stored inside or outside of the buildings, and whether the damage, if any, was caused more through neglect than from the position of the store buildings; the goods reported damaged in Stores Commission Report.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 1st August, 1907.

	Page
Question: Stores Department Site	607
Bills: Bankers' Cheques, 2s. moved	608
District Fire Brigades, 2s. moved	610
Permanent Reserve Revestment, 2s., Com., reported	612
Electoral, 2s. moved	614
Statistics, 2s. moved	626
Vaccination Act Amendment (Mr. A. J. Wilson), 2s. (irregular)	627
Motions: Water Meters, return	629
Hospital Cooks, how Imported	629

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

QUESTION—STORES DEPARTMENT SITE.

Mr. ANGWIN asked the Premier: 1, Whether the Ministry, before deciding to

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. There are, however, other considerations besides the fact that the present stores at North Fremantle are on the sea-beach. For instance, of the 618 officers in the clerical division, no less than 539 are stationed in the Metropolitan District, and nearly all of whom are in Perth. In any case, it is probable that a bulk store for certain lines will still be located at Fremantle. 2, I shall be glad to have the information referred to when considering this question. 3, No. 4, Yes.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Treasurer: Return showing cost of Government advertisements for the past three years.