

Government had undertaken to allow an opportunity of discussing the principle not later than Wednesday next, the member for the Murray would, perhaps, be well advised in withdrawing the amendment, feeling assured, as well he might, that he had done the State good service in ventilating the question.

MR. ATKINS thanked the Colonial Secretary for the tone of his remarks. He asked leave to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

On formal motions by the MINISTER FOR WORKS, ordered: That Clause 10 be struck out (as unnecessary); that in Clause 12, line 4, "(1)" be inserted after "power," and that in line 5 "also the" be struck out, and "(2.)" subject to the provisions of "The Permanent Reserves Act, 1899," inserted in lieu; that in Clause 20, lines 1 and 2, "Crown land or a reserve" be struck out, and "a public reserve" inserted in lieu; that in line 4, "withdraw the land from any lease or license, and" be struck out, and that in line 5 "to the like extent" be struck out; that in Clause 96, lines 11 and 12, "the penalties provided in section one hundred and thirty-four" be struck out, and "a penalty not exceeding £10, and if the obstacle is removed by the local authorities the cost of removal may also be recovered by the local authorities from the occupier or owner in any court of competent jurisdiction" inserted in lieu; also that in Clause 99, lines 1 and 2, "and stream up to high-water mark, or in the case of non-tidal rivers," be struck out, and that before "river," line 1, "tidal" be inserted.

Bill reported with farther amendments.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at five minutes past 11 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 18th September, 1902.

	PAGE
Questions: Railway Materials, Cost, etc. ...	1162
Railway Trucks, Delays ...	1163
Schools of Mines, Goldfields ...	1163
Kalgoorlie Local Express Trains ...	1163
Return ordered: Timbers for Railway Use	1163
Bills: City of Perth Building Fees Validation, third reading ...	1163
Marine Stores, third reading ...	1163
Railways Acts Amendment, recomittal, reported ...	1164
Fremantle Harbour Trust, in Committee, progress ...	1169
Ministerial Statement (Harbour Trust Bill), as to divisions ...	1176

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR WORKS AND RAILWAYS: 1, Return of expenditure in connection with the Chief Mechanical Engineer's Branch (moved for by Mr. McDonald).

Ordered: To lie on the table.

QUESTIONS (3)—RAILWAY MATERIALS, COST, ETC.

MR. RESIDE asked the Minister for Railways: Whether it is a fact that the Railway Department are importing "Stone's Bronze Metal" at a cost of £167 per ton, when as good an article can be manufactured in Fremantle at £75 per ton.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: For the year ended 30th June, 1902, Stone's bronze was purchased as follows:—

Tons	Cwt.		Price per ton.
			£ s. d.
6	0	at	147 18 6
1	0	at	145 19 9
2	0	at	170 15 0
15	15	at	129 4 0
0	5	at	157 10 0

It is questionable if as good an article could be manufactured in Fremantle at £75 per ton, but the subject will be fully inquired into.

MR. RESIDE also asked: 1, Who is responsible for the prices being paid for Class F locomotive engines? 2, Whether there is not a large number of engines which could be put on traffic with the expenditure of a comparatively small sum of money per engine.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied : 1, Tenders were called and dealt with by the Agent General. 2, No.

MR. RESIDE also asked : 1, What has been the cost of putting extra balance weights on locomotive engine wheels ? 2, What has been the benefit of this work ?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied : 1, To the 30th June, 1902, £520 16s. 9d. 2, Engines run steadier, and the alteration has resulted in greater mileage being obtained from the wheel tires.

QUESTION—RAILWAY TRUCKS, DELAYS.

MR. HOPKINS asked the Minister for Railways : 1, Whether he is aware that Messrs. Walsh Bros. paid a deposit on 14 trucks at Day Dawn on the 27th August, 1902, and that the trucks were not provided till the 6th September, causing a loss to the consignees of over £200 sterling. 2, Whether he will have the matter investigated with a view to preventing its recurrence.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied : 1, The Acting Chief Traffic Manager, on the 25th August, received a letter from Walsh Bros. advising of their intention to truck 2,000 sheep about the end of the month, and asking if arrangements could be made. A reply was sent giving the information desired, and requesting definite order to be lodged, as the trucks would have to be worked from Perth to Day Dawn at the convenience of the Midland Railway Company. No further advice was received until the 29th August, when the District Superintendent, Geraldton, applied for wagons. Other orders had in the meantime been accepted, and it was not possible to supply the wagons forthwith, but they were supplied as available. We have no knowledge of Messrs. Walsh Bros.' loss. 2, Inquiries are now being made, and the matter will be dealt with on its merits.

QUESTION—SCHOOL OF MINES, GOLDFIELDS.

MR. HOPKINS asked the Minister for Mines : Whether he will make inquiries with a view to ascertaining whether two separate Schools of Mines should be erected on the East Coolgardie Goldfield, or whether one centrally-

situated school would not be more economical and efficient.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES replied : The Government have no intention of establishing more than one School of Mines in the East Coolgardie Goldfield. The site for same has not been finally determined, but an area has been reserved in Egan Street, Kalgoorlie.

MR. HOPKINS : That was hardly an answer, with regard to two schools or one. Would the Minister make inquiries?

THE MINISTER : Certainly.

QUESTION—KALGOORLIE LOCAL EXPRESS TRAINS.

MR. HOPKINS asked the Minister for Railways : 1, Why the express trains are not run on Saturday nights to and from Kalgoorlie. 2, Whether he is aware that those trains are urgently required. 3, Whether he will cause inquiries to be made with a view to running the express on Saturdays, and, if necessary, equalise matters by not running it on a week day.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied : 1, The "up" express is run from Kalgoorlie on Sunday in order to connect with the mail steamers, and the alteration was made at the request of the Coolgardie Municipal Council. There is a fast mail from Perth to Kalgoorlie on Saturday, leaving at 3.30 p.m. 2, No. The traffic is not sufficient to justify these trains running daily (Sundays inclusive). 3, Inquiries will be made, and the matter will be dealt with as early as possible.

RETURN—TIMBERS FOR RAILWAY USE.

On motion by **MR. YELVERTON** (Sussex), ordered : That a return be laid upon the table of the House showing the total quantity of karri, tuart, or other locally-grown timber used by the Locomotive Branch of the Railway Department during the last five years.

CITY OF PERTH BUILDING FEES VALIDATION BILL.

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

MARINE STORES BILL.

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

RAILWAYS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL. RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by the PREMIER, Bill recommitted for amendments.

MR. ILLINGWORTH in the Chair; the COLONIAL SECRETARY in charge of Bill.

On motions by the Colonial Secretary, amendments made as follow:—

Clause 2—Interpretation: Strike out definition of "Commissioners," and insert "Commissioner means the Commissioner of Railways for the time being."

Clause 3—Strike out, and insert in lieu: "The Commissioner.—The person holding the office of Commissioner at the commencement of this Act shall, subject to the provisions hereinafter contained, continue to hold such office for five years from that date. (2.) On the occurrence of a vacancy in the office of Commissioner the Governor may (a.) Appoint a person to be the Commissioner who, subject as aforesaid, shall hold office for the term of five years from his appointment; or (b.) Appoint an acting Commissioner who, while so acting, shall have the powers and perform the duties of the Commissioner."

Clause 4—Constitution of Commissioners: Insert "Commissioner" instead of "Commissioners;" strike out "railway" in line 2; insert after "Commissioner," in line 2, the words "of Railways."

Clause 5—Strike out.

Clause 6—Strike out, and insert in lieu:—"Salary of Commissioner: (1.) The Commissioner shall receive the salary of Fifteen hundred pounds a year. (2.) Such salary is hereby charged on the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and such fund, to the extent required for the payment of such salary, is hereby permanently appropriated."

Clause 7—Strike out, and insert in lieu: "The Commissioner shall, at the expiration of his term of office, be eligible for reappointment for a like term of five years."

Clause 9—Strike out.

Clause 10—Deputy Commissioners: Strike out "any" in line 2, and insert "the"; also in lines 3 and 4 strike out "the deputy of such Commissioner," and insert "his deputy"; in line 6 strike out "such" and insert "the."

Clause 11—Powers of Commissioners: Strike out the word "Commissioners" in line 1, and insert "Commissioner" in lieu; in line 4 strike out "their duties," and insert "his duty."

Clause 12—Fares, tolls, and freights: Insert after "regulations," in line 1, the words "made in accordance with the Railway Acts and."

Clause 15—Commissioner may requisition for rolling-stock, etc.: Strike out "railways" in line 5, and insert "all Government railways open for traffic."

Clauses 16, 17, 18, and 19—Strike out.

Clause 20—Quarterly reports to Minister: Strike out, and insert the following:—"Quarterly reports to Minister: In the first month in each quarter of every year the Commissioner shall report in writing to the Minister upon (a.) The state of the traffic returns, with the approximate cost and earnings of trains per train mile, in respect of passengers and goods respectively carried during the past quarter; (b.) The general conditions of the lines, and accommodation for the traffic; (c.) The appointments and removals of employees, with the circumstances attending each; and (d.) Such other matters as the Minister may direct. Such reports shall be laid before Parliament if Parliament is sitting, and if not, then immediately upon the re-assembling of Parliament."

Clause 21—Annual report: Strike out, and insert in lieu:—"Annual report: (1.) The Commissioner shall prepare an annual report upon the Government railways and the working thereof, and an account of all moneys received and expended during the preceding year. (2.) Such annual report shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament in the month of September in each year, if Parliament is then sitting, and if Parliament is not then sitting, then within one month after the commencement of the next ensuing session thereof. (3.) He shall also prepare estimates, in such form as the Minister may from time to time direct, of receipt and expenditure for each period of 12 months ending on the 30th day of June in every year."

Clause 22—Deputations:

MR. DAGLISH moved that in lines 1 and 2 the words "in which a member of Parliament takes part or at which he is present" be struck out. The object

was to place members of Parliament on the same footing as anyone else in accompanying or introducing deputations. If deputations were to be received by the Commissioner, the question as to who was on the deputation or accompanied the deputation was beside the point. The Commissioner should not be allowed to receive deputations or make promises to deputations, but the principle having been decided upon by the Committee, if members of Parliament were allowed to go to the Minister the principle should apply all round.

MR. THOMAS: If the amendment were passed, the clause would provide that any deputation could interview the Minister and not the Commissioner. The arguments made use of during the debate were that work should be taken from the shoulders of the Minister, and now members wished to throw on the shoulders of the Minister many little things which it would be better for the Commissioner to do himself.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The object of inserting the clause was not that persons should not have an opportunity of laying their requests and wants before the Commissioner, but that they should not, in laying their wants and requests before the Commissioner, make use of political influence. Members of Parliament should not wait on an officer who was the servant of the House. That would be, he thought, using undue influence.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Presuming a body of men representing certain interests wished to interview the Commissioner, and amongst that body were one or two members of Parliament whose business interests were concerned in the requests of the deputation, these members would be prevented from attending on that deputation. Questions of rates or the management of goods-sheds or the handling of traffic, and matters of that character, might concern members of Parliament in their business, and if a deputation went direct to the Commissioner it would save delay. A case came under his notice recently dealing with the handling of goods at Fremantle, and it was necessary to approach the Commissioner to point out certain anomalies that existed and injustices that were done. On that deputation there were

two members of Parliament who were interested. If it was decided that members of Parliament should not accompany deputations to the Commissioner, then it would be necessary to define what a deputation was, to prevent the clause applying to a deputation on which were members of Parliament who were interested in the matter under discussion.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The deputation could go to the Minister, and no doubt the Minister would make inquiries of his executive officers and send a written reply. But members of Parliament could stay away from deputations to the Commissioner, and if the cause which the deputation wished to espouse was a good one, it would not suffer through members of Parliament being away. Very little injury would result by preventing members of Parliament from attending on deputations. This subject had been fairly debated already, and a division taken on the clause, with the result that it was decided that members should not accompany deputations to the Commissioner.

MR. THOMAS: Seeing there was no definition of the word "deputation," would the Colonial Secretary give the Committee a definition? Would one person constitute a deputation?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: One person would not constitute a deputation, from his way of thinking. If he were asked to give a definition of deputation, that definition might not be acceptable to members of the House. The word "deputation" had a commonly accepted meaning. The only difference that would arise would be as to the numbers. A deputation must consist of more than one person.

MR. DAGLISH: If a man was deputed, did he not become a deputation?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In that case, certainly.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: If members were prevented from attending deputations to the Commissioner it would have a serious effect on certain industries. Why should a man's business suffer because he was a member of Parliament? The Commissioner could deal promptly with matters if persons were allowed to interview him. If a deputation went to the Minister delays would occur. There would be a great danger in preventing members of Parliament approaching the

Commissioner on matters that concerned members' businesses.

MR. NANSON: The object of the clause as stated by the Premier was to prevent undue political influence being brought to bear on the Commissioner. If the clause would prevent that, there was, no doubt, good reason for supporting it. After all, the effect would merely be that instead of preventing political influence from being brought to bear on the Commissioner, we should be encouraging the bringing to bear of the most dangerous form of political influence—concealed political influence. The clause would tend to hide abuses and so make them more dangerous. Members of Parliament attending a public deputation would be restrained by the pressure of public opinion, if by nothing else, from using arguments which possibly might be used in private. In this matter, the good intentions of the Government were likely to have the evil result of intensifying the evil sought to be destroyed.

MR. HOPKINS: The clause might be retained with the addition of a sub-clause providing that the Commissioner should receive no deputations whatever. On his quarterly or half-yearly tours of inspection, the Commissioner should be accompanied by the Minister for Railways. It was *infra dig.* for members of Parliament to wait on either the Commissioner of Railways or any other subordinate officer. We should not tolerate a repetition of such a practice as had prevailed in the past, of the Under Secretary to the Premier's Department receiving deputations and promising favourable consideration of applications for grants of money.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The two cases were utterly different.

MR. HOPKINS: The Minister alone should receive deputations.

THE CHAIRMAN: The member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) would attain his object by simply supporting the amendment.

MR. THOMAS: The clause did not prevent a member of Parliament, when concerned as a private individual, from interviewing the Commissioner; and therefore the objection of the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) did not hold. A reference to Webster's dictionary showed that a deputation might consist of one person, "deputation" being de-

fined as "the person or persons deputed or commissioned by another person, party, or public body." If members of Parliament, however, wished to move the Railway Department in connection with a matter which had been brought to their notice as members of Parliament, they must interview the Minister. This clause represented one of the few features of the Bill which met with his approval, and he would therefore like it to remain intact.

MR. JACOBY: In practical business operations, members would often find it far more convenient to go to the Commissioner direct.

THE PREMIER: That was exactly what we wanted to check.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Ministers were making the mistake of taking much work on themselves unnecessarily.

MR. JACOBY: Certain residents of his district desiring an alteration in the running of a certain train were able to settle the matter in a quarter of an hour with the acting Traffic Manager, whereas, had they approached the Minister, much delay would have been occasioned.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The clause did not forbid members of Parliament interviewing the Traffic Manager.

MR. JACOBY: The clause would result in endless difficulties, and therefore should be struck out.

THE PREMIER: This matter had been fully discussed previously, with the result that the House had agreed to the clause. The Government were not endeavouring, in the course of recommittal, to reintroduce matters on which they had previously been defeated; and therefore hon. members should stand by the Bill as amended in Committee; otherwise there would be no end to the discussion. It was not quite fair on the part of the member for the Swan (Mr. Jacoby) to imagine a case where the clause might operate harshly. Admittedly, it must operate harshly in some cases; but, on the other hand, cases as to which every member of the Committee would agree that the clause ought to apply could easily be cited. Three or four hundred people might wait on the Commissioner to prefer requests, and the Commissioner might give a promise dependent on the indorsement of the Minister, on whom would then be thrown the onus of saying "yes" or "no" to requests already approved by the

Commissioner. As a matter of principle, the Commissioner, who after all was a subordinate officer, should not be placed in a position where he would have to receive deputations of members of Parliament. Why should members of Parliament be compelled directly or indirectly to appeal to a subordinate officer really holding his authority from them? It was true that the amendment did not attack the principle laid down by the clause, that political deputations should not be received by the Commissioner; but the amendment went too far. The main object of the Government in introducing the provision was to prevent members of Parliament from going before the Commissioner.

MR. DAGLISH: The Government objected to the Commissioner's time being wasted.

THE PREMIER: No; that argument was used by the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie).

MR. DAGLISH: And by the Colonial Secretary.

THE PREMIER: The argument was first used by the member for Kanowna; and after that hon. member had spoken, he (the Premier) had said that the reason, although a good one, did not represent the main argument, which was that members of Parliament should not take part in deputations to a subordinate officer, who was really the servant of members, to ask for favours or concessions. Mr. John Davies, as general manager, had not received deputations, as a rule.

MEMBER: Mr. Davies used to receive deputations at Boulder.

THE PREMIER: Mr. Davies might, when travelling, have received deputations for the purpose of ascertaining local views. We all knew exactly what deputations introduced by members of Parliament meant. We ought not to affirm that the Commissioner should receive no deputations whatever, but we had a right to affirm that members of Parliament should not accompany deputations to the Commissioner. Moreover, it was to be borne in mind that if one or two members of Parliament initiated the practice, all other members would be morally compelled to adopt it.

MR. YELVERTON: To debar members of Parliament from accompanying deputations to the Commissioner would

result in unfairness. Shortly after the increase in railway freights, eight or nine timber managers waited on the Commissioner to urge that certain timber, of which particulars were given, ought to be carried at the old rates. The Commissioner gave it as his opinion that the whole of the claims advanced, with the exception of his (Mr. Yelverton's), were unjust.

THE PREMIER: That illustration justified our retaining the clause.

MR. YELVERTON: Great hardship would have been inflicted on his company if he had been prevented from accompanying the deputation. Again, the residents of outlying districts would be at a disadvantage if their member was forbidden to accompany them on deputations to the Commissioner when that officer was on tour.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: According to Clause 11, the Commissioner was to have the management, maintenance, and control of all Government railways open to traffic. Certainly, deputations dealing with matters from a political standpoint should not be allowed to wait on the Commissioner, who ought to receive merely deputations representing a community of private interests. A case came under his notice two or three days ago in relation to the traffic over the jetties at Fremantle. The traffic was under the management of the shippers. The goods were dealt with by the shippers, and placed in the Government sheds, and carted thence to other sheds under the control of the Railway Department, whence they were despatched up country. The point was raised that the traffic ought to be sent up country direct from the Government sheds. That was a matter not of political administration of the railways, but of management, and who was better able to deal with that than the manager? The Commissioner was the manager of a department, and certainly the manager should have represented to him business points which people wished to have adjusted. That was the only way in which the Commissioner could be saved a great deal of detail. The management was provided for under Clause 11, and if the Committee were going to take that management out of the hands of the Commissioner by requiring deputations

to wait upon the Minister, they would place upon the Minister a great deal of that which the Minister wished to be absolved from. There was a point raised by the Premier with regard to the late General Manager, Mr. Davies, who he said received no deputations. They were not deputations, but he (Mr. Piesse) had known a number of instances in which men interested in certain things, where they could bring about a change, had waited upon the general manager and represented to him the facts from their standpoint. Amongst those men had been members of Parliament, and they had obtained immediate redress, or immediate action, with regard to a matter which might have taken days to be dealt with if they had gone through the ordinary Ministerial course. The word "deputation" in such a connection was a wrong one, what was referred to being a community of interests, men who were concerned in a certain thing, and who would place their facts before the general manager with a view to immediate remedy. He did not see why a member of Parliament who might be concerned in a particular thing should be debarred from going to see the general manager. With regard to the Minister, he (Hon. F. H. Piesse) was just as anxious as any member, and as the Government itself, to avoid what might be termed giving a right to a deputation to go to the Commissioner when that deputation properly should wait upon the Minister; because there were many instances where it should be so. In regard to a general question of policy, deputations should wait upon the Minister, and not the general manager; but in regard to questions purely of management, in which things could be immediately remedied, there should be deputations to the general manager, and he could not see why a member of Parliament should not be present.

MR. TAYLOR: If this amendment were carried, no deputation would be able to wait on the Commissioner, and that would be unfair. The Commissioner should be able to receive deputations of railway employees on matters concerning which he would have a thorough knowledge, and which he would be able to settle without going to the Minister at all. We should add the words "except

the railway employees." Clause 22, as it stood in the Bill, should be carried. When members of Parliament were asked by deputations to introduce them to the Minister, Commissioner, or any head of a Government department, the object was that their political influence should be used. It was unfair that a member of Parliament should use his political influence with a subordinate officer for any deputation. After hearing the frank statement of the member for Sussex (Mr. Yelverton), he was firmly convinced that the numerous deputations hitherto introduced without a member of Parliament failed, and a deputation with a member of Parliament was successful. That was proof that the clause should pass as it stood in the Bill.

MR. DIAMOND: The intention of the Government, and he was sure of the majority of members, was he apprehended simply to prevent members of Parliament, as such, from taking part in deputations to the Commissioner. He looked upon a deputation as a person or persons deputed by a person or persons to represent the interests of the latter. There was nothing in the clause, as he understood it, to prevent a member of Parliament in his private capacity from going to the Commissioner of Railways as he would to a shopkeeper, professional man, or trader, and representing to him what was wrong. The object was to prevent members of Parliament in their official position from going to use the weight of their political influence on behalf of a deputation. It was not desirable that members of Parliament should be continually called upon by their constituents, or certain interests, to go and represent them, virtually to use their position as a vote in this House to advance certain causes or certain interests. As long as he understood that his private action as a customer of the railways was not interfered with by the fact of his being a member of Parliament, he thought the clause was desirable.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The hon. member (Mr. Taylor) was on the wrong track. He (Mr. Piesse) was only speaking of a number of men, any number over one, who might go to the Commissioner with regard to certain matters which they wished altered in connection with the management of the railways, the traffic

of the railways. This clause would prevent a member of Parliament from going to see the Commissioner about such matters, because it said no deputation with a member of Parliament should wait upon the Commissioner.

MR. THOMAS: The question must be looked at from the point of view of the greatest good for the greatest number. There might be a case of hardship to an individual member; but he contended that, on the whole, if we allowed deputations embracing members of Parliament to wait upon the Commissioner, we should immediately have political influence brought to bear upon the Commissioner. We had cases arising in this country of big public moment for the time being. A little time ago there was a big agitation over the railway rates, as far as the timber companies were concerned, and people even went so far as to have large public meetings in Perth and Fremantle. Supposing at that time there had been a Commissioner with the powers given by this measure, and there had been a deputation with 26 or 27 members of Parliament, the very presence of those members would have shown the Commissioner that the majority of the House were in favour of what the deputation asked for, and seeing that the railway vote would come before the House at an early date, there might have been a temptation to the Commissioner to try to conciliate the deputation in a certain way which he might not have been prepared to do if those members had not been present. Members could see the Commissioner in their private capacity, and lay their grievances before him. He objected to the striking out of the whole of the words proposed by the member for Subiaco to be struck out, and making every deputation for every little pettifogging matter wait upon the Minister. If that were done, we might find it necessary to appoint three or four deputy Ministers. At present, numerous deputations waited on the Commissioner; and they should be forced to go to the Minister.

MEMBER: The Minister might not see them.

MR. THOMAS: Surely deputations had a right to interview someone.

MR. HASTIE: Let them write to the papers.

MR. THOMAS: The Minister was paid to administer the department.

MR. JACOBY: Not in detail.

MR. THOMAS: No; therefore let the Commissioner do that, leaving the Minister to deal with the broad issues, as Ministers themselves had frequently suggested during this session. Believing that there should be at least a semblance of nonpolitical control, he opposed the amendment.

MR. DAGLISH: The discussion had been foreign to the amendment, for members had debated whether the Commissioner should receive any deputations. [MR. TAYLOR: What about employees?] The employees could always approach their master the Commissioner, whose servants they were by statute. A member had said he would support the clause unaltered, retaining the right to approach the Commissioner as a private person. It was such private persons who did mischief. A member of Parliament could not dissociate himself from his position, nor free himself from his political power and influence, for the Commissioner could not forget he was speaking to a member of Parliament. The adoption of the amendment would not involve a continuance of Ministerial control, but would have the effect simply of forcing the Minister to receive deputations.

Amendment put and negatived.

On motions by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, formal amendments made as follows:—

Clause 23—Suspension and removal of Commissioner: Strike out the word "a" and insert "the" in lieu; and to Sub-clause 5, line 2, add "but otherwise may be removed from office."

Clause 25—Strike out, and insert: "All Government railways shall be vested in the Minister on behalf of His Majesty."

New Clause, 28—Strike out "fifty" (pounds), and insert "ten."

Bill reported with farther amendments.

FREMANTLE HARBOUR TRUST BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

MR. ILLINGWORTH in the Chair; the COLONIAL SECRETARY in charge of Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners:

MR. PIGOTT moved that the word "five" in line 1, be struck out and "seven" inserted in lieu. In constituting the commission the Government had given merchants, the principal users of the wharves, large representation, but had forgotten the people most interested, most affected by bad management, and on whom the State relied for the success of the harbour; these were the owners of the ships that traded to the port. Most members agreed it was right that the merchants whose goods were taken over the wharves should have representation on the board. It was equally right that the owners of the ships that brought the goods to the port and paid the larger proportion of the dues should have representation.

MR. DIAMOND: The owners paid nothing at all.

MR. PIGOTT: If members would turn to Clause 40 they would see sixty different provisions, fifty-nine of which applied to the shipowners. He agreed that merchants should have representation, but those who were interested in the working of the wharves, and who were called upon to pay the wharf charges should also have representation. In the working of the harbour a great deal depended on the treatment meted out to owners of vessels trading to the port. The duties of the board were to look after pilotage, the question of tonnage dues, lights and light dues, the berthing of vessels, anchorage in any part of the harbour, discharging and loading of ships, towage, and all other questions relating to tolls on ships. For a number of years he was mixed up in the shipping business, and he knew that many owners of vessels absolutely refused to send their ships to certain ports in the world on account of the excessive charges levied there. The harbour board would have to consider the management of all vessels that came within the limits of the harbour, and the owners had to pay a great many charges. He hoped the board would see fit to make the charges as low as possible, commensurate with paying the cost of management and something towards the sinking fund. In addition to the charges levied on the shipowners, which gave them as much right to be represented as the merchant, there was another

matter which had not yet been brought up by members. The shipowners would be the only people affected to any great extent financially by the mismanagement of the harbour. Take the question of discharging, if a vessel came to the port and got good dispatch, no doubt the owner of the vessel would be glad to accept another charter to this port; but in the event of a vessel coming to the port and being delayed through bad management, the real loss in money fell on the shipowner and not on the public. If a vessel was delayed in discharging at a port, the owners of the goods which were brought over in the vessel were not put to any great loss. Of course a merchant might lose monetarily by his goods being detained for a time, but in the event of a vessel of three or four thousand tons being detained five or six days, as had occurred and probably would occur in the future, the loss to the owner of the vessel was enormous; therefore shipowners should have an equal say with the merchants in the management of the harbour.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The tolls had to be approved by the Governor-in-Council.

MR. PIGOTT: When appointing members on the board it was just as well to appoint persons who could make good suggestions to the Government. If the Government objected to increase the number of members on the board, and were determined to keep the number at five, then the shipowners should have some representation. The Government could still keep the preponderance of power on the board, by allowing the chamber of commerce to nominate one member and the shipowners to nominate another. The shipowners had a greater right than the merchants to representation on the board. The main thing that concerned the merchants was the wharfage. That was the one thing the merchants were interested in; but, as far as the ships were concerned, there were many other considerations. The board had to control pilotage, and if the pilots were not managed in a proper manner there would be delays. The board to a certain extent controlled the towage and the way in which the cargo was discharged. It would be far better to have no nominees of the chambers of com-

merce on the board if the shipowners were to have no representation. We were told that the Government were likely to nominate as one of their representatives a gentleman who to a great extent would be a representative of the shipowners. It would be well if a franchise could be created so that the shipowners could elect a representative. With all the brain-power available on the Ministerial bench, it was absurd to say that some scheme giving shipowners due representation could not be devised. No doubt there were many conflicting interests in the shipping community, but if the local owners of vessels and the representatives of foreign owners whose vessels regularly traded to our ports were asked to nominate, no doubt a nomination satisfactory to all parties concerned would result.

MR. HIGHAM: The shipowners would be only too pleased to nominate the whole board.

MR. PIGOTT: Even such a system would produce fairer results than the nomination proposed by the Bill. The hon. member interjecting represented merely the people to whom goods came, and had no sympathy with the shipowners. If the hon. member's arguments were sound, it followed that the best policy would be to impose no charges whatever on vessels trading to Fremantle, and to throw the whole cost on the goods imported. If the Government objected to an increase of membership to seven, the shipowners should be given the same representation as the merchants; otherwise the Government ought to nominate all five members.

MR. DIAMOND: The amendment ought not to be carried. For a start, at any rate, the membership proposed was adequate. Circumstances might necessitate amendment of the measure in the near future even, when the Government would no doubt rise to the occasion. The hon. member (Mr. Pigott) in raising the issue of shipping interests *versus* commercial interests had sought to prove that the former were altogether superior to the latter; but that contention was absurd. If the conditions of freightage to Fremantle did not suit shipowners—who, by the way, exacted heavy freights for their services—there were other ports. Fremantle merchants were tied by substantial

interests to Western Australia, and moreover had to contribute towards payment of interest on the one and a quarter millions of money represented by the Fremantle Harbour Works. The hon. member had forgotten the preponderating partner in these harbour works, namely the people of Western Australia. Disaster would result if either the shipping interest or the commercial interest were allowed a predominating influence. The Colonial Secretary, in introducing the Bill, had said that one of the members to be appointed by the Government would represent shipping interests. A satisfactory franchise for the commercial representative could be easily arrived at; but to secure a proper franchise for the representation of the shipping interest was in the last degree difficult. Although not a slavish follower of the Government, he had complete confidence in the ability of Ministers to nominate a reliable and satisfactory man to represent shipping interests. Of course, he had no idea as to whom the Government might nominate.

MR. PIGOTT: Why did not the Government propose to nominate a representative of the mercantile interests?

MR. DIAMOND: Because in this case there was no difficulty in securing a franchise. Indeed, the Perth and Fremantle Chambers of Commerce in themselves afforded a satisfactory franchise. No one body in Fremantle, nor even any two bodies, represented shipping interests generally. The management of the harbour ought to be such as to lead to a decrease rather than an increase in charges; but it was certain that if charges were increased, the shipowner would "blow" the extra harbour dues on to the freights. Certainly, the mercantile interests in the past had worked for the benefit of the shipowners. The result of the erection of the sheds at Fremantle, which work was due entirely to the unceasing efforts of the mercantile community, had been to render the discharging of vessels quicker and cheaper, while the cost of wharfage to the merchant had been increased in consequence of the provision of the additional facilities represented by these very sheds.

MR. TAYLOR: Did the shipowners carry any cheaper because of these facilities?

MR. DIAMOND: No; freights were now higher, if anything. The commercial interests were certainly twice as large as the shipping. While always glad to serve the shipping interests, he would not give them an equal voice with the commercial interests in so small a board as here proposed. Possibly in the course of time it might be found advisable to increase the membership, and then the claims of shipowners to equal representation with merchants might be considered.

At 6:30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.

At 7:30, Chair resumed.

MR. HASTIE: Clause 3 was irrevocably bound up with Clause 4. For instance, if we were to have direct representation of a number of different interests, it seemed to him essential to increase the members to seven; but if we were not to have direct representation of different interests, it would be unwise to increase the number to more than five at present. Five would be sufficient, seeing that the Bill was of such a tentative character; even if it were wise to go so far as five. The Fremantle harbour was a national work, paid for by the country at large, and did not in any way belong to the people at Fremantle; therefore it was unwise to hand over even indirect control to any particular body connected with Fremantle. The interests of merchants there would be to make charges so that the Fremantle Harbour Works would become unpayable. If there were direct representation of chambers of commerce or the shipping interests, those representatives would be there simply by the goodwill of the particular bodies, and would serve the interest of those bodies. The whole interest of those bodies would be to have the charges made as cheap as possible. That would be unwise, unless we made this board responsible for the finances. The Bill provided that not only was the harbour to be handed over to the board, but the Minister was to receive advice as to what improvements ought to be made. The member for West Kimberley (Mr. Pigott) said the shipowners should be represented. If we allowed chambers of commerce to be represented, we ought, as a matter of fairness, to allow shipowners to be represented also. The member for South

Fremantle (Mr. Diamond) had remarked that it was the intention of the Government to appoint one member of the board as a representative of shipowners.

MR. DIAMOND: The Colonial Secretary had said so.

MR. HASTIE: Then we were in this position, that the board would consist of five, two being representatives of chambers of commerce and the third being a direct representative of shipowners. Those three being a majority of the commission, where did the country come in? Was the country willing to hand over this valuable property to those people? He hoped the House would not agree to increase the number of members of the board. This measure was an experiment, and it would be very dangerous for us to allow a very big representation from a small and very exclusive section of the population. If the country had to find the money, the country must have predominant power. It was all very well to say that the Governor-in-Council could veto anything and everything that was done, but if the board was to be of any use at all the Governor-in-Council would very rarely veto things that were done. If this clause were disposed of many members would, he believed, do their utmost to get Clause 4 amended so that either the Government would directly appoint every member of the board, or else we should have an elective system by which all the people of the State might partake in the election.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was to be hoped the Committee would not seriously take into consideration the proposal of the member for West Kimberley (Mr. Pigott) to alter the number of commissioners from five to seven. He had already pointed out that the experience of other places taught us that the larger the number on the board the slower their deliberations, and that the old proverb about wisdom lying in a multitude of counsellors was not invariably true, at all events in regard to harbour boards. As to the representation of shipping, both inside and outside this Chamber, he, speaking as a Minister, had said it was the intention of the Government to appoint a representative of shipping, and it was unfortunate perhaps that this representative could not be appointed upon exactly the same term

as those upon which the representatives, not so much of commerce but of Perth and Fremantle, were sought to be appointed. The member for West Kimberley evidently had a good knowledge of the circumstances surrounding shipping in Fremantle. One must point out to the hon. member that it was rather difficult to get a body or even a meeting which would adequately represent all classes of shipping that came to Fremantle. If it were possible to get an association which would nominate a member, he most certainly would be only too pleased to leave nomination in the hands of such an association. It was impossible so to do. If the hon. member could devise a practicable franchise on which a commissioner to represent shipping could be elected, the Government would adopt the suggestion, or might themselves appoint such commissioner. As to the relative values of the commercial and the shipping interests, the point raised by Mr. Diamond was important. This was a Western Australian Bill, which would give representation to those who had their all in this State, rather than to mere "birds of passage."

MR. HOPKINS: The inhabitants of Fremantle and the shipowners were not the only persons interested in the harbour trust. The harbour represented about one and a half millions of national debt, for which all persons in the State were liable; and yet the Government, after appointing only one commissioner to manage the railways, were about to appoint seven to manage this harbour, which had a much smaller revenue! Reduce the harbour commissioners to three; and if the Government were not capable of appointing three commissioners competent to manage the undertaking, neither were the chambers of commerce nor the other bodies mentioned. He took strong objection to Ministerial responsibilities being handed over to such bodies.

MR. PIGOTT: It was not on behalf of the shipowners but for the State that he had spoken. He had no interest as a shipowner or a merchant; but shipowners were those most vitally interested, and ships might well be allowed the free use of the harbour, with advantage to the State. If ships entering the harbour

were detained for 10 or 14 days, the owners lost heavily, such loss falling ultimately on the public, when shippers found their vessels could not get quick dispatch; for charters would then be obtainable only at high figures. Bad management meant big freights, and these were ultimately paid by the consumer. The amendment would secure an efficient board, which by reducing the cost of freights would benefit the community in general. There was no comparison between the harbour and the railways. The interests of the shipowners and of the merchants were different. The latter were not interested till they took delivery of the cargo; and if they had a preponderating voice in harbour management, the expenses of the ships would increase; for the merchant would not tax the goods but the ships, and through them the public. The chambers of commerce, or the merchants of Western Australia, should have a say in the appointment of members to the board; but the shipowners as a whole, on whom the country were dependent for cheap freights, should also have a say. The Colonial Secretary had stated that it was almost impossible to make a franchise on which shipowners' representatives could be elected. That was a point which he had not gone into; but if the representatives of West Australian shipping, and the representatives of vessels trading directly to Perth, were asked to appoint one or two members to the board, he had no hesitation in saying they would be able to decide amongst themselves upon a gentleman to be appointed. The owners of ships in Western Australia, and of ships that traded to the port, were not so biassed or antagonistic to one another that they could not decide on a representative. It had been said that the agents of vessels had to do what their principals told them to do. It was absurd to say that big firms who were trusted to manage large companies could not act on their own. There were higher freights paid in Western Australia than in any other portion of the globe. The only way in which freights could be brought down to a proper standard was by introducing competition, and we should not get competition unless the owners were induced to send their ships to this port. The member for Kanowna had the idea that

the people were not going to be considered, and was under the impression that the board would act only in the interests of the shipowners. In handing the harbour over to a board the Government were taking a wise step, and the work of the harbour would be carried on, if the commissioners were given absolute power, at a cheaper rate than at present. He hoped the members of the board would always bear in mind that the fact of a port being considered a cheap port amongst the owners of vessels tended to reduce the freights charged to and from that port.

MR. HASTIE: The country made up the balance.

MR. PIGOTT: If heavy charges were made by a shipowner, those charges eventually came out of the pockets of the public. The shipowner was not in a position to lose money, and he would be able to charge what freights he liked. He would raise the freights and the public would pay them. A harbour board might make the harbour pay a profit of 20 per cent., but it was the people who would have to pay that profit. In the constitution of the board he hoped the Government would see that those who thoroughly understood the working of a harbour were placed on the board. If the Government appointed an expert to take charge of the harbour, and placed the management entirely in his hands, that would be preferable; but he took exception to the Government allowing the merchants to nominate two members to the board while the shipowners were not thought of at all. The Colonial Secretary said that it was his intention to appoint a member who represented the shipowners on the board. That, to a certain extent, proved there was some justification for the amendment. But while the present Colonial Secretary gave that promise, there was no knowing what another Minister might do when there was a re-election. If the shipowners were to have a representative on the board, it should be mentioned in the Bill. Men should be appointed on the board who understood the business, or there would be a tremendous loss to the country. The larger the revenue that was obtained from an institution of this kind, the greater the extravagance would be. He did not want the public to be

overcharged. In one instance freight was brought to Western Australia from Germany. The freight charged was £26. The goods were landed at Fremantle and taken to Bunbury, and the wharfage charges amounted to £10 10s. That proved that at the present time those who administered the harbour department really did not understand the business.

MR. HIGHAM: That showed the need for a board.

MR. PIGOTT: There was a need for appointing a shipowners' representative on the board who understood the business.

MR. GORDON: The member for West Kimberley said it was to the interests of the merchants to raise the freights, for then they got a larger profit. That was most extraordinary, because freights were always being cut, and the merchants took the cheapest freights. Thus the foundation of the hon. member's argument was absolutely rotten. We all knew that the cut freight was that which the merchant accepted. Some hon. members urged that the number of commissioners should be seven, whilst others argued that it should be three. In the circumstances, it seemed we should be safe in adopting the number proposed by the Bill, namely five.

MR. NANSON: It seemed probable that a more efficient board would be secured if the shipping interests received the same amount of representation as the mercantile interests. The Bill provided that the Perth and Fremantle Chambers of Commerce should each nominate a member, but, although dealing with the harbour, made no mention of a member to represent either coastal or deep-sea shipping. The Colonial Secretary had promised that the Government would nominate a member to represent shipping interests; but it was not satisfactory that the measure itself should omit all reference to that representative. Necessarily, to render the Fremantle harbour attractive was to benefit the people as a whole. Fremantle should be made the great distributing centre of Australia. Admittedly the interests of the mercantile community and those of the shipping community were not in all respects identical; and for this reason the shipping interest felt strongly that it should

be represented equally with the mercantile interest. Such equal representation would be attained by raising the number of commissioners from five to seven, three of whom would be Government nominees, two mercantile nominees, and two shipping nominees. To the objection that under such circumstances the three Government nominees were in a minority as compared with the mercantile and shipping nominees, it might be replied that, apart from the improbability of the mercantile and shipping members combining against the Government-nominated members, the fact remained that the powers of the board were so overshadowed by the powers reserved to the Government that the general interests of the State were adequately protected. Under later provisions of the Bill, the exercise of every power granted to the board was subject to the consent of the Government, who would be perfectly justified in disallowing proposals tending to serve private rather than common interests. A board of three members, however, was likely to prove as efficient as, while certainly costing less than, a board of seven. The chairman of a board of three would be a Government nominee, the second member would represent mercantile interests and would be nominated by the Perth and Fremantle Chambers of Commerce, while the third would represent shipping interests. The experience of Melbourne went to show that the creation of large boards did not tend to expedition in public business. Seeing that the powers of the board under this Bill would be purely administrative, and that in all matters of policy the sanction of the Government was required, the membership ought to be kept as small as possible. For his part, he would be prepared to accept a board of one, provided the right man could be secured. If the member for West Kimberley (Mr. Pigott) was prepared to compromise and agree to a board of three members constituted as stated, he (Mr. Nanson) would be prepared to support the hon. member. A board of five members was undesirable because it would be lop-sided, giving too much power to the commercial interests and too little to the shipping interests.

MR. THOMAS: While not prepared to support an increase of membership from five to seven, he was prepared to

agree to reduction of membership from five to three. As had been pointed out by the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins), the consistency of the Government in respect to commissioner Bills was truly admirable. To manage an immense business like the State railways the Government proposed a board of three commissioners, whilst to manage a comparatively trivial concern like the Fremantle harbour a board of five was proposed. The leader of the Opposition had stated that the Fremantle harbour ought to be made as attractive as possible in order that freights might be cheapened. Here, however, the question arose, was it possible to make Fremantle harbour attractive at all? Freights from England to Fremantle were now higher than freights from England to Melbourne, because the former port was regarded with great disfavour. Of course, extended facilities would be obtained by bringing the harbour up the river nearer to Perth. Still, what was bad in the first instance could not be made good by the appointment of a board of management. Freights had been high in the past, were high now, and would continue to be high because shipowners recognised the danger of the entry into Fremantle harbour.

MR. DIAMOND: Absolute nonsense!

MR. THOMAS: That interjection had been heard many times before. Certainly our endeavour ought to be to devise some means of making Fremantle harbour at all events sufficiently attractive to prevent endless reiteration of such declarations by shipmasters and shipowners as had frequently appeared in our Press, that their vessels should never enter Fremantle at night time and, preferably, should remain outside Fremantle during day time as well. The clause fixing the number of commissioners was intimately connected with that dealing with their nomination. What right had either the Fremantle Chamber of Commerce or the Perth Chamber of Commerce to a nominee on the board of management? Ought not the bulk of the people, who had had to pay for the improvement of the harbour and who were entitled to any benefits which might by any possibility accrue from such improvements, to have representation on the board? If the number of commissioners were not reduced, the Kal-

goorlie Chamber of Mines ought certainly to have a nominee on the board; then the Amalgamated Workers' Association at Kalgoorlie, the Amalgamated Miners' Union there, and the Trades and Labour Council should have a right to nominate one each; and the Albany Chamber of Commerce most decidedly should have the right to nominate one if not two members. If this was a question which so vitally affected the interests of the State as a whole, we had no right to allow the Perth Chamber of Commerce and the Fremantle Chamber of Commerce to come in and have the whole of the say in the matter. Practically a pledge had been given to the House that the shipping community should have the nomination of one member. That made a total of three out of five. The Government were going to appoint the engineer and the chairman. We had no shipping companies in Western Australia. As far as the good and benefit of Western Australia were concerned, the shipowners were foreigners. In discussing the question whether we must have three, five, or seven members, we must take into consideration what the constitution of the board would be. We would then have a majority on that board composed of a combination of merchants and shippers, who had mighty little consideration for the consumer, except to see how much they could get out of that consumer. The Government then would be left with a minority upon the board. This country owned the Fremantle Harbour Works, and had a right to say who should be appointed on the board and how many the board should consist of. Three were ample, and one was better if we could get hold of the right man. If there were to be three they should either be elected by the whole of the people of Western Australia or the Government should appoint them, and if the Government did not appoint properly qualified men to carry out the duties we could blame them for it.

MR. HIGHAM: It was to be hoped members would not consider the question of striking out "five" for the purpose of inserting "three," because if there were to be only three, the remuneration for those three would have to be altered. If there were three to replace five, we should have to pay large salaries to those three.

He was quite ready to admit that a board of three could manage the harbour as well as a board of five.

Amendment put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	15
Noes	16

Majority against ... 1

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Atkins	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Hassell	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Holman	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Higham
Mr. Morgans	Mr. James
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Pigott	Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Reside	Mr. Rason
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Reid
Mr. Yelverton	Mr. Stone
Mr. Thomas (Teller).	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. McDonald (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

THE PREMIER: If this clause were not passed, that would dispose of the Bill.

Clause put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	17
Noes	15

Majority for ... 2

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Holman
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Higham	Mr. Johnson
Mr. James	Mr. Morgans
Mr. Kingsmill	Mr. Nanson
Mr. McDonald	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Pigott	Mr. Stone
Mr. Quinlan	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Rason	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Reid	Mr. Yelverton
Mr. Reside	Mr. Jacoby (Teller).
Sir J. G. Lee Steere	
Mr. Wallace (Teller).	

Clause thus passed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

THE PREMIER: Unless a clear statement were now made by him as Premier, his duty to the House and the country would not be discharged. The Government occupied the Treasury bench for the purpose of carrying on the country's business. They strongly and violently objected to any attempt to use the powers of the House for party or improper purposes. As stated when introducing the Bill, Ministers were quite prepared to consider the question of reducing the number of commissioners, therefore raised no objection to the first

division. The Government had never asked Ministerial supporters to stand by them for party purposes. But the first division having gone in favour of the Government by a narrow majority, he said unhesitatingly that calling for a second division immediately afterwards on the same point was almost unprecedented. It savoured to him of obstruction, though in so thinking he might be mistaken. Thanks to one or two members who realised the position, the Government succeeded on the question. It should be distinctly understood that the Government would not hold office on the sufferance of the House. Ministers had a right to advise His Excellency; they realised that the business of the country could not be conducted unless they could control the business of the House; and he would not hold office for ten minutes if the House were under the impression that members could play battledore and shuttlecock with its business. He made this statement, not because he objected to the first division, but in deprecation of the unprecedented course of calling for the second division, which was demanded not to serve the interests of the country, but to endeavour to inflict a defeat on the Government. If such attempts succeeded, the Ministry knew their powers, and would not hesitate to avail themselves of them. (Applause by Ministerial members.)

MR. NANSON: The second division had not been, as the Premier seemed to imagine, a party move; for it was the action of Opposition members that had saved the Government from defeat. The division had not been taken on the initiative of Opposition members.

MR. HASSELL informed the Premier that he (Mr. Hassell), while he sat in the House, would not be dictated to by him or anyone as to how he should vote, even if his refusal to accept dictation resulted in immediate dissolution.

DEBATE.

Clause 4—Appointment of Commissioners:

MR. HOPKINS moved that all words after "Governor," in line 2, be struck out. Any Government in power should accept the responsibility of appointing commissioners. He took exception to the Fremantle Chamber of Commerce—

which it had been asserted consisted chiefly of oyster saloon proprietors, grocers, and similar people; and to the Perth Chamber of Commerce, which he was told consisted principally of hair-dressers—having power to appoint this responsible board. Referring to the Premier's remarks, his (Mr. Hopkins's) position was quite independent. Had the clause been inserted to placate these bodies?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine himself to the clause.

MR. HOPKINS: On the division he had not been in the House, but he had previously opposed the Bill, and if his opposition had brought about a dissolution, he would have welcomed it.

THE PREMIER: A different issue was raised by Sub-clause 3. That should be excepted from the amendment.

MR. HOPKINS: Alter the amendment accordingly, so as to strike out all the words after "Governor" to the end of Sub-clause 2. However reputable the public bodies concerned, there was always the possibility of log-rolling if they appointed the harbour commissioners; therefore let the Government make all the appointments.

MR. PIGOTT: An amendment he had intended to propose would have permitted one member to be nominated by the chamber of commerce, and one by the shipowners' representatives. His previous amendment had aimed at preventing any section of the community being specially privileged to use the harbour; therefore he seconded the present amendment. The Government were quite capable of appointing the best men as commissioners.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amendment was not very objectionable; but the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) was in error when insinuating that the course adopted by the Government had been taken to placate anybody. The Government were guided by their desire to benefit by the nomination of representatives by two bodies which, in spite of the sneering observations of the hon. member, were among the most representative associations in Western Australia.

MR. HOPKINS: Did not the remark of the Colonial Secretary, "sneering observations," impute a motive, and if so should not the remark be withdrawn?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not exactly in order.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: "Humorous observations" he might say. He rose to deny the motive imputed to the Government. It was simply for bringing to the aid of the Government a right knowledge of the circumstances that the suggestion was made. It might perhaps be better, in view of the debate that arose on a previous clause, that the course suggested should be taken. As far as he was concerned he would be glad to accept the amendment moved by the member for Boulder.

Amendment (to strike out certain words) put and passed.

MR. HIGHAM moved that in Sub-clause 3 the words "one as engineer to the harbour" be struck out.

THE PREMIER: In reference to the question as to whether the engineer should be a member of the board, there was a good deal to be said on both sides. The Government handed over to the board an asset that cost about a million and a quarter of money, and it was most essential that the harbour should be protected by a vigilant and effective engineer, as it rested on his efficient work whether the harbour itself was properly maintained, whether scour was counteracted or repairs to the harbour maintained, and whether the structure which had cost so much was kept in a proper state of repair and efficiency. He had no strong opinion on this matter, so difficult was it to see what was best in the circumstances; but it seemed that the engineer would be occupying a much stronger position if he was a member of the board than by merely being a servant of the board. It might happen that the board would not be so keenly anxious to make provision to protect the harbour works as an engineer would be, because repairs were expensive. The effect of scour might be such as to entail a burdensome amount of work to prevent injurious consequences following. There might be a great deal of alteration in the harbour work itself suggested by the engineer. As all realised that the engineer was a responsible man, well-paid and well-trained, that fact should impress itself upon members, and also the farther fact that he occupied a responsible and onerous position. If the Committee

placed the engineer on the board, as had been pointed out, we would put him there as a professional man, and perhaps for that reason he would be apt to overpower the lay members of the board. If the engineer was not a member of the board he would be a servant of the board, for he must either be a member of the board or to a large extent a subordinate of that body. Inasmuch as his duties were of vital importance to the State, because he would protect this enormous asset, why not make an exception in this instance and say that to the man on whose judgment Parliament relied and to whose professional skill Parliament trusted, should be left the maintenance and safe-keeping of an asset so valuable? The engineer should have a well-defined status in connection with the board. Assuming the Bill passed as it stood now, there would be a body of commissioners paid per sitting—two guineas in the case of the ordinary commissioners, and a salary of £600 per year in the case of the chairman. If the chairman was only to receive three guineas per sitting, the arguments which he (the Premier) had submitted were much stronger. If we had an engineer in connection with the board receiving a salary of £800 a year, whether a member of the board or not, he might acquire in connection with the board a position of dominance. The objection to the engineer being a member of the board because he might overshadow or overawe, as it were, the lay members of the board would equally follow if the engineer was not a member of the board. One must bear in mind that a professional man, an engineer receiving a large amount of money, if nominally a servant of the board, would equally influence the board whether a member of that body or not. As a member of the board the engineer would occupy a better status. Personally, if the Government could find a man who could occupy the position of engineer and chairman as well, that would perhaps be the best man to get. The Government ought to be able to obtain an engineer with a certain amount of business experience. He wished to place before the Committee the peculiar importance of the position occupied by the engineer in relation to the Bill, for it largely depended on the ability of the

engineer and his status as to whether the structure which Parliament was handing over was kept in a proper state of repair or not. It was because the engineer would have such important duties to perform that the Government thought to give him a higher status by placing him on the board. It might be thought that the engineer would equally be able to discharge his duties if he were a subordinate.

MR. ATKINS: The engineer to the board ought to be independent of the board. Would it not meet the position if the Government appointed the Engineer-in-Chief or the Assistant Engineer-in-Chief of the State to a place on the board, and left the engineer of the board as a servant of that body?

MR. THOMAS asked where the expenses of the management were going to stop? The Government came down with a proposal to hand the railway system of Western Australia over to the management of one man, yet here was an idea to appoint five men to manage the Fremantle Harbour Works. He had an idea that three persons would be sufficient to manage that work. We were wasting too much money in management.

MR. MORGANS: The suggestion of the member for the Murray was a good one. It would not add in any way to the expenses if the Government appointed the Engineer-in-Chief, or any other engineer in the service of the Government, to the board, because such a member would not be paid the two guineas per sitting, being already in receipt of a salary. It would be difficult if the engineer of the harbour was a member of the board, because positions might arise as to the engineer properly carrying out his duties, and in such a case the engineer would have to adjudicate upon the case. Supposing the engineer made a mistake in some of the work, being a member of the board he would have to adjudicate upon the position.

HON. F. H. PRESSER: That would apply if the Engineer-in-Chief were on the board.

MR. MORGANS: No; because the Engineer-in-Chief would not be engineer for the harbour. Many positions might arise if the engineer who was made responsible for carrying out the works of the harbour was a member of the board.

It would be difficult for a man to be placed in such a position, for he would have to sit at the board and discuss questions for which he himself would be held responsible. If the suggestion of the member for the Murray were carried out, the engineer to the board would then be absolutely under the control of the board and have no voice in the management of the harbour. He would be subject to all instructions received from that body. The engineer should be an absolute servant of the board, and not in any way allowed to enter into discussions as to any scheme brought before the board or any expenditure it was proposed to make. He hoped the Government would accept the suggestion of the member for the Murray.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The arguments on each side were so evenly balanced that decision was difficult. Much was to be said for the Premier's contention that the work of the engineer in looking after one and a quarter million pounds' worth of State assets was so important that he ought to be a member of the board. On the other hand, there was much force also in the contention that the engineer, if a member of the board, would practically have to deliberate on his own findings. When the Bill was before the public, so to speak, criticism on this point was unanimous. Not desiring to set up his individual judgment against that of so many other people, he had no objection to accepting the amendment.

MR. HOPKINS: Would the carrying of the amendment mean that the board would consist of five members and an engineer?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: No.

THE PREMIER: The engineer would be a servant of the board.

MR. HOPKINS: Would additional fees be payable to the engineer as a member of the board?

THE PREMIER: No; since his salary as engineer was provided for. Under Clause 10, the engineer would not receive the fee of £2 2s. per sitting.

MR. HOPKINS: But, presumably, someone else would receive the fee?

THE PREMIER: The person taking the engineer's place on the board would receive the fee.

MR. YELVERTON: The fee would not be drawn if the Engineer-in-Chief were appointed to the board?

THE PREMIER: No. Necessarily, construction works would be going on year after year, and a Government engineer would be required in connection with those works. It was not desirable, however, to adopt a system under which there would be a Government engineer on one side of the harbour and the board's engineer on the other side.

MR. JACOBY: Could not both sets of duties be discharged by one engineer?

THE PREMIER: Yes; but the same engineer must not have two masters. The suggestion of the member for the Murray (Mr. Atkins) perhaps overcame the difficulty.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: This matter was of far-reaching importance and should not be disposed of hastily. If the Engineer-in-Chief were appointed to a seat, a great deal of his time would be taken up by the work of the board. For that reason, amongst others, the appointment was not desirable.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amendment did not propose the appointment of the Engineer-in-Chief to a seat on the board.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. TAYLOR moved that the following be added to stand as Sub-clause 4:

No member of either House of Parliament shall be eligible for appointment on the board unless he has ceased to be a member of Parliament for at least twelve months before the appointment is made.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: A later clause, 18, dealt with this matter.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: An amendment that Clause 18 be struck out appeared on the Notice Paper.

MR. NANSON: While quite in accord with the amendment, he thought considerations of time and convenience should lead to its postponement until Clause 18 was reached.

THE CHAEMAN: Would the member for Mount Margaret accept the suggestion to postpone the amendment?

MR. TAYLOR: This was the proper time to move the amendment. If it were carried, Clause 18 could still be dealt with. Appointments to the harbour board ought not to be political appointments. To test

the feeling of the Committee, he pressed the amendment now.

MR. THOMAS: Agreeing with the member for Mount Margaret that this was the proper time to settle the question whether members of Parliament should be allowed to take offices of profit, he had pleasure in supporting the amendment. When speaking to the Address-in-reply he had stated his intention to move, if necessary, a motion affirming that no member of Parliament should, except with the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be eligible for appointment to an office of profit under the Crown, other than a portfolio, for a period of six months after he had ceased to be a member of Parliament.

MR. HOPKINS: Would it not be better to insert this provision, which had his support, in the Public Service Act Amendment Bill?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: No; it would have to be inserted in the Constitution Act Amendment Bill.

MR. HOPKINS: Perhaps the Colonial Secretary would state when the Constitution Act Amendment Bill would be introduced? However, to make assurance doubly sure, the provision might be inserted in this Bill as well.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Certainly; quite right.

MR. JACOBY: In speaking on the second reading, he had stated his opinion that this amendment was necessary. He accordingly supported the insertion of the sub-clause.

Amendment put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Term of office:

MR. DAGLISH: In view of the circumstance that the first appointments would be experimental, the first term of office should not exceed one year. It was unlikely that a first selection would result in the appointment of the best men available. To test the feeling of the Committee, he moved that, in line 1, the word "three" be struck out.

MR. HIGHAM: This amendment should not be carried. The first board ought to be afforded an opportunity of showing what it could do. Twelve months at least would be occupied in providing the necessary facilities for a

harbour. In the circumstances, a three-years term was short enough.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was to be hoped the Committee would not carry the amendment. The members of the board would need a year to get into their stride, so to speak. It was quite possible that the Government would not secure the five best men available at a first selection, but it was to be remembered that the preliminary work in connection with the harbour was work of purely a business nature, involving little technicality. It was the work of organisation, and he thought that as long as the Government got those they knew, whose careers were open to them, they surely could be trusted to make a fairly judicious selection; and it would be absolutely unfair to the board, more perhaps through either political or journalistic criticism, that these men should not have an opportunity of proving their worth to the State. The course suggested by the hon. member would not be at all a wise one, and he hoped the Committee would let the term of service remain as at present.

MR. NANSON: A term of three years was none too long. If members regarded the appointment of this board with such suspicion as not to appoint it for more than a single year, it would be almost better not to have a board at all. The responsibility rested on the Government of appointing suitable men, and the Government in a matter of this kind might be trusted to exercise their best endeavours to appoint good men who could certainly be trusted to remain in office three years. In one year they could not do very much more than get a full grasp of their duties, and, if there was to be anything like continuous policy, we must give the men sufficient time to carry out their policy. If members were elected for only one year, and were to be liable to be then displaced, we should, if they were displaced, break the continuity of the policy, and bring in new men who would have to do the work all over again.

MR. DIAMOND: Any business man considering the subject would recognise that a body of men of this description, commencing an entirely new work, would have no chance at all of showing within 12 months what could be done. He

trusted the hon. member would withdraw the amendment.

MR. JOHNSON said that he also trusted the member for Subiaco would withdraw the amendment; because he thought it would fail in the object aimed at. He believed that if the board were appointed for one year, the members would not have time to show whether they were competent men or not. Consequently they would be reappointed, and then the same board would practically have been appointed for four years.

MR. DAGLISH said he could not withdraw the amendment, because he did not think that members had realised the purpose of it. When once we got a board established, it was a very difficult thing to get any unsuitable man off that board, unless he had done something very glaring indeed; and if there were one unfit person on that board—he did not mean a man who had any grave vices, but a man who was proved to be a round peg in a square hole—he could considerably mar the efficiency of the board. One did not in any way question the efforts of the Government to select the best men, while recognising that any Government was liable to make mistakes. The Government realised this when they proposed to give the chambers of commerce power to make nominations. In fact, that was the very reason given by the Colonial Secretary for the clause which provided that the right of nomination should rest with the chambers of commerce. The argument which the Minister used with regard to that clause would apply equally in relation to this, and amply justified the amendment now proposed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was one point which the hon. member had not touched upon, and in which his analogy seemed to fall to the ground. It might be quite possible for the Government, having found they had made a mistake, to make a worse one in the new appointment. The analogy did not hold, because in the case of the Government making the appointment they had not the advice of anybody, as was suggested in the proposition.

MR. TAYLOR supported the amendment. Twelve months would be long enough for a sufficient trial of the board, and if at the end of that period the

board had proved itself a success, and the members were eligible for reappointment, the Government could reappoint them. Three years would be too long. Men might be appointed to high positions, and within 12 months might fail, but for three years there would be no opportunity of replacing them. The board, if appointed, should be able to convince the Government and the country at the end of 12 months that they were capable of managing this harbour trust efficiently.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: It was to be hoped that when we had the Constitution Bill brought down, the member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor) would be consistent and would move that members of Parliament should be elected for one year. In this case we wanted men to acquire experience, and he thought that less than three years would hardly be sufficient.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clauses 7 and 8—agreed to.

Clause 9—Tenure of office:

MR. HOPKINS moved that the word "suspend" be struck out, with a view of inserting "remove." His reason for this amendment was to give the Government exactly all the powers they were asking for under the Civil Service Bill discussed the previous evening. In New Zealand the Government had the same word in relation to their railway commissioners. They had the power there to remove.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The position of civil servants and that of the commissioners whom it was proposed to appoint were not altogether parallel. These commissioners were specially appointed by Parliament, and it was proposed to give the power to suspend them, in order that their removal, if it were decided to remove them, should come from their masters, Parliament. They would be statutorily appointed under this Bill, and it was proposed that Parliament should be the power that could remove them. The circumstances surrounding suspension could be fully discussed in Parliament, and he presumed the hon. member would not deny that Parliament was the best tribunal and the fairest court for these commissioners to appeal to.

MR. TAYLOR: Was one to understand that the Government would appoint

these commissioners, and expect Parliament to dismiss them? If the Government were capable of appointing them, they should be capable of dismissing them. They should take upon themselves the responsibility of dismissal, and not ask Parliament to do so. The amendment should be carried.

MR. HOPKINS: Perhaps it would meet the wishes of the House if he were to say the Governor "may suspend or remove." [**MEMBERS:** No.] He did not feel disposed to go back on the amendment he had proposed, for if the Government were intrusted with the control of this country, they should *prima facie* be suitable persons to be intrusted with the question of dismissing or removing the commissioners of this board.

Amendment put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	15
Noes	15
A tie			0

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Russell	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Higham
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. James
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Kingmill
Mr. Nanson	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Piesse	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Reid	Mr. Pigott
Mr. Beside	Mr. Quinlan
Sir J. G. Lee Steere	Mr. Bason
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Stone
Mr. Telferton	Mr. Wallace
Mr. Thomas (Teller).	Mr. Diamond (Teller).

THE CHAIRMAN gave his casting vote with the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. HOPKINS: The second paragraph of Sub-clause (d) exempted a commissioner from being suspended on the ground that he, in the ordinary course of business, sold goods to or performed work for the harbour trust. Such exemption was undesirable. During last week members had noticed a case where a member of a roads board had sold a boiler to a certain person, and that person got the board to repurchase it at a higher price. Similar things might happen with the harbour trust. He moved that all the words after "members," in line 3, be struck out.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was no objection to the amendment, which only restricted the area of choice of commissioners. But even

members of Parliament might, without any corrupt motive, sometimes sell goods to the State.

MR. PIGOTT: Would the amendment prevent a commissioner from supplying goods to other departments?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No; only to the harbour works.

Amendment put and passed.

THE PREMIER: Sub-clause (e) provided that the chairman might be suspended if he engaged in employment outside the duties of his office, or absented himself for 14 days without leave. The chairman should be the engineer and the real head of the board. The matter might be discussed on a motion to strike out the sub-clause.

MR. JACOBY: It would be impossible to get a good business man for £600 a year. A chairman engaged in other pursuits might look after the business of the trust for three guineas a sitting, while the engineer discharged the professional duties.

THE PREMIER: Better deal with the sub-clause on recommitment.

MR. HOPKINS moved that after the words "shall," in line 1 of sub-clause 3, "not" be inserted, and that the words "removed from," in lines 4 and 5, be struck out, and "restored to" inserted in lieu.

MR. PIGOTT: The commissioners should have no remuneration except out-of-pocket expenses; and such men would not wait till they were criticised by Parliament before resigning. These sub-clauses were unnecessary. Allow the Governor to suspend a commissioner, but do not give directions as to details.

MR. JACOBY: As many business men acted willingly as directors at one guinea per sitting, these positions, at two guineas, would not be honorary.

MR. HASTIE: A commissioner would vacate office by death; but the Bill did not provide for his resignation.

THE PREMIER: The power to resign was assumed. One could not compel a man to work.

Amendment put and passed.

THE PREMIER moved that the words "or otherwise shall be removed from office" be added to the clause.

Amendment put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 10—Remuneration of commissioners:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that in lines 1 and 2 the words "and the engineer" be struck out.

MR. DAGLISH: Would the engineer be paid the fee of two guineas per sitting in addition to his official salary?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Certainly not. He would be prevented from doing so by departmental regulations.

MR. DAGLISH: The clause said the members of the board "shall" receive a fee. Would the departmental regulations be stronger than a provision in this Bill?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Certainly.

MR. PIGOTT: Although an engineer might be appointed from a Government department to a place on the board, that officer should be entitled to receive the fee, as he would have to do more work.

MR. TAYLOR: The officer could not be doing the work of both his positions at the same time.

MR. DAGLISH: The object of paying members of the board was to recoup them for loss of money through absence from their ordinary business. A member of the public service would incur no loss, as his salary would be going on all the same.

MR. PIGOTT: There might be an officer at present in the public service appointed to the board who was able to do extra work, therefore he should receive the fee. If there was a man in the service who was capable of giving better service to the State he should be paid for it. Officers should be given a chance of bettering their positions.

MR. NANSON: It would be wise if the clause were amended so as to prevent a civil servant being paid the fee should he be appointed on the board. The Premier had moved to strike out the words "and the engineer," and if the words "unless a civil servant" were inserted, that would overcome the difficulty.

THE PREMIER: It was not wise to say that any civil servant should not get more than his present salary. The clause said that each member of the board, except the chairman, should receive two guineas per sitting. The Committee might insert the words "a fee not exceeding two guineas."

MR. NANSON: It should be made clear that a civil servant would not be paid.

THE PREMIER: The Public Service Act provided for that already.

MR. QUINLAN: If the word "shall" were struck out and "may" inserted in lieu, that would overcome the difficulty.

THE PREMIER: Perhaps that was the best suggestion.

Amendment (to strike out "and the engineer") put and passed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that in line 2 the word "shall" be struck out and "may" inserted in lieu.

MR. NANSON: In the event of the word "may" being inserted instead of "shall," had the Government power to pay a civil servant the fee?

THE PREMIER: Under the Public Service Act a civil servant could receive a fee if he obtained leave from the Minister.

MR. NANSON: It should not be left to the discretion of a Minister to increase the salary of a civil servant. If a civil servant was appointed on the board, he would not have so much time to perform his other duties; therefore he should only be paid the salary he was receiving when appointed. This clause should not be made an excuse to increase an officer's salary on the one hand and to limit his duties on the other.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the officer was unwilling to accept the position, one did not suppose the Government would insist on his accepting it. The Government when appointing highly-paid officials did not bind them to certain hours. The Government availed themselves of all the time an officer was able to give to his duties, and this was cheerfully recognised by officers. There were instances in which civil servants not only cheerfully took up onerous and arduous duties in addition to their ordinary duties, but did so without extra payment. He could understand an engineer doing this in order to gain farther experience. An application was made recently by an officer to undertake other work, and his (the Minister's) reply was that if the officer did so it would be without farther remuneration. The officer gladly accepted the extra work in order to add to his experience.

MR. HASSELL: It ought to be clearly set out whether a civil servant appointed on the board could accept fees.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: An officer could accept a fee only with the consent of the Minister.

MR. TAYLOR: What would be considered a sitting of the commission?

THE TREASURER: The point raised by the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) was whether a salaried officer could receive a fee in addition to his present salary. The Government took rather a strong stand on this matter. The Government paid an officer for all his time, and he could not receive anything else. The Committee would be establishing a dangerous precedent if a man could work in one department until 4 o'clock, and then go to another department and work until 7 o'clock. After a while such an officer would probably not give the whole of his time to the Government.

MR. PRIGOT: What did the Government consider all an officer's time.

THE TREASURER: All the time that was required to carry out his duties. If the officer had one duty to perform and was leaving that duty aside in order to attend to another, the probability was that neither duty would receive adequate attention.

MR. DIAMOND: This State had possessed civil servants of high position who had done work outside the scope of their duties without any desire for reward. The late lamented Engineer-in-Chief had done much valuable work in connection with the board of technical education in Fremantle, and had sought neither praise nor pay for that work. The principle of paying civil servants in two different capacities, however, was not a beneficial one.

MR. QUINLAN: Like the Premier, he thought that this matter might well be left in the hands of Ministers. Whatever the faults or virtues of this or any future Administration, surely the House could trust the Executive in such a matter. If the officer here in question were compelled to work late at night by reason of his appointment to the harbour board, the Minister might, on more than one occasion, allow him a fee of two guineas.

Amendment put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 11—Salary of Chairman:

THE PREMIER: In connection with this clause, we ought to bear in mind that if we considered the chairman should not be allowed the right of private practice or private work, but should devote the whole of his time to the work of the board, a large salary would be necessary. If, on the other hand, it was thought we might avail ourselves of the services of an ordinary member of the board as chairman, a payment of two or three guineas per sitting would be adequate. With such a remuneration, however, we should of course not be justified in demanding that the chairman should do no other work. We wanted not only a chairman who would preside at meetings and whose payments would be limited by the number of sittings, but also a chairman who would attend at the office of the board for an hour or two every day and from whom the secretary or administrative head of the board could at any time receive instructions. Such a chairman would not only have work to do when the board was actually sitting, but would have work to do on every day of the week. We wanted to treat the chairman as a member of the board, differing from other members only in the circumstance that as chairman he had more work to do. The wisest plan would be to fix an amount to be paid for his work as chairman, and to allow him the right to carry on his private business in the same way as any other member of the board. We ought to consider, therefore, what would be a fair remuneration to pay a man sitting not only as chairman at meetings and therefore controlling meetings to a certain degree, but also engaged throughout the week in seeing that the office work went on and in supervising the work of the staff generally. If, however, we approached the matter with the view that the chairman's services should be devoted exclusively to the work of the board, we must be prepared to pay a high salary in order to get the man we wanted. Inasmuch as the whole Bill was tentative, and designed to secure a tentative board for the practical management of the harbour, we ought not to go to the expense of importing or locally securing a highly-paid man as chairman. Moreover, such a man would not accept a three-years tenure, which was all that

could be guaranteed, as this House, before the three years had expired might reopen the subject and make other arrangements.

MR. NANSON said he was inclined to fall in with the Premier's view, and to support the appointment to the chairmanship, as an experiment, of a business man who would not be required to sacrifice the whole of his private business to the work of the board. A salary of £400 per annum would meet the case.

THE PREMIER: A salary of £300 would suffice.

MR. HOPKINS: The better course would be to start by paying the chairman a salary of £600 for the whole of his time, with an understanding that if the work was done to the satisfaction of the Government the salary would be raised by annual increments to a maximum of £1,000. A capable business man should be secured at a commencing salary of £600 per annum on such an understanding. It was true that the appointment could be only for a term of three years, but if the chairman did good work his reappointment was practically certain. It was highly desirable that the chairman, who exercised a guiding influence over the whole of the members, and who had considerable power of suggestion, should know the details of all propositions coming up for discussion. Such had been the experience of municipal councils, and such was likely to be the experience with this board. The position was sufficiently important and onerous to occupy the whole of a man's time.

MR. DIAMOND: The remarks of the hon. member were such as largely met with his acceptance. The Premier apparently had overlooked the fact that a man capable of carrying out the work must be a man whose business training or daily avocation qualified him for the position. To appoint such a man, and to allow him to continue his private business, would be to set up two clashing interests, because any commercial man qualified for the position would be doing business with the harbour every day. It was absolutely necessary that the chairman should be available to the public and to his officers all day long. No business man whose services were worth twopence could possibly do the chairman's work satisfactorily in return for a salary of £300 per year, even if he were allowed to continue in

private business. The fitness of the chairman was a far more important consideration than the calibre of the ordinary members of the board. The clause should be so amended as to provide that the chairman would receive a salary not exceeding £1,000 per annum, on the understanding that the whole of his time and talents would be devoted to the work of the board. That work was such as to demand all the talents and all the time of a highly capable man.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: If the board was to be a success, we should seriously consider the question of appointing a chairman who should have no other engagement than his chairmanship of the board. Although not much work in the nature of initiation had to be done, still the proper administration of the harbour works would be sufficiently onerous. The services of a good man should be obtainable for £700 or £800 a year. The matter was worthy of the fullest consideration of the Government, and therefore progress might be reported at this stage.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In view of the importance of the question raised and the necessity for consideration, he moved that progress be reported.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 23rd September, 1902.

	PAGE
Questions: Railway Refreshment Rooms, Sunday Drinking	1186
Rabbits Incursion, Fencing	1187
Metropolitan Waterworks, Government Officials	1187
Coolgardie Water Scheme, Resident Engineer	1187
Motions: Telephones, Country Districts	1188
Metropolitan Waterworks, to Inquire	1189
Papers, etc., ordered: Government Clothing Inspector	1189
Wharfage Payments at Fremantle	1189
Bills: Agricultural Bank Amendment, first reading	1186
Perth City Building Fees Validation, first reading	1190
Public Works, first reading	1190
Marine Stores, first reading	1190
Explosives Act Amendment, Council's Suggestions	1190
Administration (Probate), in Committee (resumed), reported	1191
Justices, in Committee, progress	1191
Railway and Theatre Refreshment Rooms Licensing Amendment, second reading, in Committee, reported	1200

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: 1, Report of Governors of the High School for year ended June, 1902. 2, Report of Department of Public Works for 1901. 3, Report of Board of Management of Perth Public Hospital for year ended June, 1902. 4, Geological Sketch Map of Lennonville, Murchison Goldfields.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the MINISTER FOR LANDS, and read a first time.

QUESTION—RAILWAY REFRESHMENT ROOMS, SUNDAY DRINKING.

HON. G. RANDELL asked the Minister for Lands: 1, If the attention of the Government had been directed to a statement made at a meeting of the Licensed Victuallers' Association, reported in the *West Australian* of the 1st instant, as follows:—"That any person purchasing a 'platform' ticket at the Perth Railway station on Sunday can obtain what liquor he requires." 2, If the Minister will cause inquiry to be made, and if the statement is found to be correct, represent to the Government the importance of at once taking such steps as shall prevent