

## ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.34 o'clock, p.m.

## Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 17th September, 1895.

*A Correction—Personal Explanation—Coolgardie-Kalgoortie Railway Bill: third reading—Parks and Reserves Bill: consideration of committee's report—Copyright Bill: second reading; in committee—Fencing Bill: second reading—Estimates, 1895-6: further considered in committee—Adjournment.*

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

## PRAYERS.

## A CORRECTION: PUBLIC WORKS, SUPERVISION OF.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said that, at the close of the debate in the Public Works vote, when the Estimates were under consideration the other evening, he inadvertently made a mistake in stating that the percentage of the cost of designing and supervising public buildings amounted to about 9 per cent. He had since had a return prepared, showing the exact percentage of the cost of plans, supervision, etc., which he would lay on the table for the information of hon. members. It would be seen from that return that the actual percentage was only 4.60 per cent., including the cost of supervision, and that, excluding supervision, the percentage of cost for preparing designs or plans did not amount to more than 3.1 per cent.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said his attention had been called to the fact that the hon. member for North Fremantle (Mr. Moss) felt himself somewhat hurt and aggrieved at some remarks which he (the Commissioner) made the other evening, in the course of his speech on the Railway Workshops question. He wished to assure the hon. member that, in what he said,

he had no intention whatever to cast any personal reflection upon the hon. member. It was not customary with him to make any remarks of a personal character, and he desired to assure the hon. member that any observations which fell from him on the occasion in question were merely of a general character, and had no personal reference to the hon. member in any way.

## COOLGARDIE-KALGOORLIE RAILWAY BILL.

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

## PARKS AND RESERVES BILL.

## COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

On the Order of the Day for the consideration of the committee's report on this Bill,

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) moved a consequential amendment, in Clauses 3 and 5, to provide for the establishment of zoological gardens in connection with public parks or reserves.

Amendment put and passed.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt), in accordance with notice, moved, without comment, that the following sub-clause be added to Clause 3:—

(3.) A Board may sue and be sued, and all legal proceedings may be taken by and against a Board in the name of the President of the Board.

Put and passed.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) also moved the insertion of the following new clause, which he said, was introduced to meet a suggestion thrown out by the hon. member for Albany, when the Bill was under discussion:—"The owner of any cattle within the meaning of the Trespass Act, hereinafter cited, which are found trespassing on any enclosed park or reserve, whether damage is proved to have been committed or not, shall forfeit and pay to the Board the like sums as mentioned in the Trespass Scale of the Cattle Trespass, Fencing, and Impounding Act, 1882, in respect of trespass on a public street or thoroughfare in a town or city, or in an enclosed public cemetery."

Clause put and passed, and committee's report adopted.

## COPYRIGHT BILL.

## SECOND READING.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S.

Burt) : In introducing this Bill to the House, I think there is not much occasion for me to make any lengthy remarks upon it, because it embodies no innovation. Generally speaking, it is simply the law relating to copyright as it exists in England at the present time, and which has also been adopted in the Australian colonies, particularly in Victoria and South Australia. The Bill deals with the copyright of literary, dramatic, and musical productions, also of lectures, engravings, and works of sculpture; and it proposes to establish a registry office here where the proprietorship in these productions can be copyrighted. No doubt, as the colony progresses in material advancement and intellectual development, the necessity for such a Bill as this becomes more and more apparent; and the Government think the time has arrived for the introduction of the present measure. It will be observed that it is rather a lengthy measure, but I may assure the House that it has received very careful consideration, and I think the Bill will be found a very good and useful Bill indeed. It in no way goes beyond the English law in regard to these matters, and the only alteration it makes in the existing local law is in regard to the copyright in telegrams published by newspapers. At present, under a short ordinance called the Telegram Copyright Act (36 Vic. No. 7), which this Bill repeals, no newspaper is allowed to re-publish telegrams or cablegrams which have appeared in another newspaper, until seventy-two hours, or three days, have elapsed from their first publication by the newspapers that receives them and pays for them. This provision, it appears, does not prevent some country newspapers from making use of the telegrams received by the metropolitan press, without paying for them or acknowledging them in any way. They simply pirate the telegrams, which are wired to them by correspondents, immediately upon their publication in the Perth newspapers, and they republish them in their ordinary issues, when the three days' protection have expired. It is now proposed that such telegrams shall not be allowed to be transmitted from Perth, or the place of their first publication, until after the expiration of seventy-two hours from such publication, instead of being transmitted as at present as soon as they appear in the metropolitan paper, ready for publication by country journals on the ordinary day of the issue of such journals. If these telegrams are not

allowed to be sent from Perth by the correspondents of country newspapers for three days after their publication, they will become stale, and will probably reach the newspapers that are in the habit of pirating them too late to be of any use to them. I think, myself, that is only fair and reasonable towards the more enterprising papers, which incur a large outlay in obtaining these telegrams and cablegrams. That is the only alteration which the Bill makes in the local law of copyright. The rest of the Bill, as I have said, merely introduces the legislation at present in force in England with regard to copyright legislation.

Motion put and passed.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—Division of Act:

Put and passed.

Clause 2—Short title and commencement: THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) moved that the Act should come into operation on the 1st January, 1896.

Agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 19:

Put and passed.

Clause 20—"Messages by electric telegraph not to be published during three days after receipt, without consent:

MR. RANDELL asked whether similar provisions existed in other countries.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said they did. The same law was in force in South Australia and also in Victoria. Some of the newspapers in Perth incurred a large expenditure in obtaining telegraphic news, and it was only fair that such news should be protected from piracy. This clause gave these papers three days copyright in their telegrams and cablegrams, before the news could be transmitted from Perth to country papers, who were willing to make use of it without paying anything for the privilege. He did not mean to say that all country newspapers were sinners in this respect. Some of them, he believed, paid something towards the cost of receiving these messages, but others contributed nothing, and had not even the decency to make any acknowledgment of the source whence they derived their news.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 21 to 29:

Put and passed.

Clause 30—Authors of lectures or their as-

signs to have the sole right of publishing same, etc.:

MR. ILLINGWORTH asked whether this clause would bar a newspaper from taking and publishing a report of a lecture delivered.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said that in the case of a copyright lecture being sold or assigned to a person for delivery in a school, seminary, or institution, the person representing the proprietor would have to give two days' notice of the copyright in which case the lecture could not be reported without his consent. If the two days' notice were not given, the lecture might be reported in the ordinary way, as the notice would be necessary to protect the copyright.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 31 to 59, inclusive:

Put and passed.

Schedules 1 to 5, inclusive:

Put and passed.

Preamble and title:

Put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Report adopted.

## FENCING BILL.

### SECOND READING.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): In asking the House to agree to the second reading of this Bill, I am not asking hon. members to enter upon any new work. This Bill has been before the House on several occasions—indeed I do not know how many years ago it was introduced into the Legislature—but unfortunately we have not been able to agree, up to the present, in regard to what shall be the fencing law. I have taken a little trouble in regard to this Bill, and find that, although it is not very different from the Bill as introduced last year, it does differ in one important provision. In the first place, hon. members will notice that this Bill is not retrospective in its operation, except in one clause, and there the Bill merely affirms what is the law at the present time. In the interpretation, the term "land" is restricted to freehold land, or to land held from the Crown under special occupation lease or license, or conditional purchase lease or license, or as a homestead farm or homestead lease; but it does not include lands held under lease from the Crown for pastoral purposes. By Clause 4 it will be noticed that occupiers of adjoining land will have to assist in making a dividing fence, after the

passing of this Bill, that is to say, if a contributing person wishes to fence in his land, the proprietor or occupier of land adjoining the dividing fence will have to pay half the cost of erecting such fence. Clause 5 provides that if an owner or occupier of land fences in his land, and there is Crown land adjoining, as soon as such adjoining Crown land is taken up, the person taking it up shall pay to the owner of the fence, at once, one-half of the then value of the fence. That seems to me a fair provision, because a person taking up land from the Crown does so under a condition that he shall fence in the land; therefore it will be no great hardship for him to pay to the owner of the dividing fence one-half the then value of the fence which he can use. The only difference between this provision and that in the existing law is that a person taking up Crown land at present has not to pay until he begins to use the fence, whereas under this clause he will have to pay one-half the value of the fence as soon as he takes up the land. Clause 6 provides that if any occupier of land, or any pastoral lessee of the Crown, either before or after the passing of this Bill, has erected a fence dividing the land held, occupied, or leased by him from any land or pastoral lease adjoining thereto, and if the occupier or owner of the adjoining land or lease shall, in inclosing the same avail himself, of the dividing fence or any part of it, the person so availing himself of the fence will have to pay one-half of the present value of the fence. Clause 7 makes it quite clear that any pastoral lessee who uses the dividing fence of another pastoral lessee must pay one-half the value of the fence as soon as it is used. These are the main provisions of the Bill. I think there is nothing unreasonable in them, and they seem fair enough. They provide that, in the case of what we call land—that is land in fee simple or land held from the Crown under any form of tenancy, except that of pastoral lease—the owner or occupier will have to pay one-half the value of a dividing fence, after the passing of this Bill; and, in regard to pastoral lessees, the fencing law will remain the same as it is at present—that, is when a dividing fence is made use of by an adjoining lessee, the latter must then pay one-half of the value. These provisions are fair and reasonable, and I hope hon. members will support them. Clause 8 provides that a person using a fence on the further side of a road is made liable to pay interest on one-half of the cost of the

fence, and to pay one-half the cost of repairs. It is often the case that where land is laid out on survey before selection, a fence along a road divides one occupier from another, having been erected by one of them, and the other takes advantage of the fence by stopping up the road or putting a gate across. By that means, he is making use of a fence which he has not erected, and if he does so he is to be liable to pay interest on one-half the cost, and to pay one-half the amount of repairs. Clause 9 provides that the owner of a hedge shall be responsible in certain cases. Clauses 10 and 11 provide that each adjoining proprietor shall bear one-half the expense of keeping fences in repair. Clause 13 provides for the apportionment of cost as between landlord and tenant, this being the same provision as was in the Bill of last year. Clause 16 is important, as it provides that this Bill shall not apply to unalienated Crown lands. I think it is right that the country should not be made to pay for the fencing of Crown land that has not been dealt with, and which adjoins a portion already taken up, but that the person who eventually takes up such adjoining portion should pay his half share of any dividing fence. It seems to me that the objections which were raised last year by so many members with regard to the retrospective operation of the Bill as it was then brought in have been eliminated from this measure; and, although I do not think it was unfair in that respect, still, looking at the circumstances of the colony, I think it is wise for us to leave out the retrospective provisions. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. PLESE: I desire, Sir, to express my pleasure at the fact that the Government have again introduced this Bill to deal with the fencing question. The measure is one very urgently required, and it has been frequently demanded by the people whom it concerns. Owing to the large amount of settlement that has taken place in all parts of the colony during the past year or two, the necessity for a Fencing Bill has become more and more apparent. The Premier has mentioned that the Bill, as it is now before the House, is really an old friend, owing to the fact that it has been under the consideration of hon. members so often before. My only regret in the matter is that the Bill brought forward last session, and which reached a certain stage, did not actually become law, because a considerable amount of fencing has been done

since then, and people have had to improve other people's land, as well as their own, without getting the benefits derivable under the provisions of a Fencing Bill. I trust there will be no difficulty in making the present Bill the law of the country before the end of this session. The Bill is a most useful measure, and no doubt, whatever difference of opinion there may be as to its several provisions, they will be more satisfactorily settled in committee. At this stage I need only say that certain additions appear to me to be necessary, and I will give notice of these. I think there should be a clause dealing with cases where one person keeping cattle adjoins the property of another keeping sheep, and *vice versa*. It stands to reason that the man who only desires to keep cattle will strongly object to being compelled to pay one half the cost of a fence suitable to a person who runs sheep on his land. There should be a clause dealing with such cases as these. I believe the question is dealt with in the South Australian Act, and I have been told that the provision made there has been found most useful. Such a clause would work well here, and aid very largely in the settlement of the country; and I propose to give notice of the addition, so that it may receive the careful consideration of hon. members. Clause 8 is a most useful clause, and I am sure it will be found to work well. It provides for a person using the fence erected on the opposite side of the road by another owner, the only condition of such use being that the person using it must pay the owner of the fence interest on one half the cost of the fence, and contribute to the cost of repairs. The proposal is a fair one, and the person who takes advantage of such a provision should not be called upon to pay interest on more than a certain proportion of the cost, for the simple reason that the roads he crosses with his fence are under the control of the Roads Boards, and he may be compelled, at any time, to erect a separate fence on the boundary of his own land, and on his own side of the road. At present there are numerous instances where separate fences are not at all necessary, and being compelled to erect them is both irksome and troublesome to the settlers. If, by a clause in this Bill, an alteration can be made giving the right to the use of the fence on the opposite side of the road, it will be found very useful indeed. There is one thing I should like to see, however, and

that is the rate of interest on half the cost of construction raised from 7 per cent. to 8 per cent. It is hardly likely the additional one per cent. would act as a bar to the use of these fences, for the simple reason that the privilege to use a fence on the other side of the road confers a very great advantage on the owner of the land, who has only to pay interest on one half the cost of construction; and the slightly increased rate of interest would not deter him from taking advantage of this particular provision in the Bill. The Bill is certainly a step in the right direction, and I am sure will be well received by all those who are interested in the settlement of the country, and be a most valuable measure to those compelled to fence their land.

MR. COOKWORTHY: I certainly have very great pleasure in supporting the second reading of this Bill, and in doing so I would like to say that so far as fencing is concerned, as applying to adjoining properties, I think there should be some alteration by which where a person only proposes to keep cattle, and consequently only requires a fence to restrain large stock, he should not be called upon to pay the cost of a fence of the character known as sheep-proof. Personally, I should like to see this altered when the Bill is in committee, and I propose to submit the necessary amendment for the consideration of hon. members.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson): It appears to me, Sir, that there may be some difficulty, as has been suggested, with regard to the definition of a fence. The definition given in the interpretation clause is that "fence" shall mean any substantial fence reasonably "deemed sufficient to resist the trespass" of great and small stock." It appears to me that, if this definition is carried out, it may possibly work a hardship upon people who do not desire to keep small stock, and consequently do not require a fence such as that provided in the interpretation clause. If this interpretation remains as at present, it means that in order to compel an adjoining owner to contribute one half of the cost of fencing, the person desiring to erect the fence would have to erect one sufficient to resist small stock, when neither he nor his neighbor desired or intended to run anything but cattle. That would entail upon both unnecessary expense, merely in order to justify the person erecting

the fence claiming the proportion of cost from the owner of the adjoining land.

MR. HASSELL: The only difficulty I can see about this matter is the manner in which we can meet such cases, where the land is used for different purposes by the different owners. It is quite likely one man may erect a sheep-proof fence, and his neighbor, who only proposes to keep cattle, will not care to pay for what he does not require; and this is a difficult matter to deal with. Possibly the matter may be got over in committee.

MR. LEFROY: I think it is quite right that this measure should have been brought before the House again. Everyone will admit, I suppose, that any person who obtains the benefit of a fence which has been erected by his neighbor should also bear a portion of the cost of construction. There are, however, several provisions in this Bill which, if agreed to, will create hardship and injustice upon some holders of land in the colony. One of these proposals I referred to when the question was last before the House, and it is where a leaseholder, who acquires the freehold of a piece of land within his lease merely in order to secure water, can be called upon by another person, who takes up an adjoining area, to bear half the cost of constructing a fence, which the leaseholder does not want, which can be of no use to him, and which would only create inconvenience by keeping his stock from getting to the water as freely as they would do otherwise. I moved an amendment in this matter last year, and it is my intention on the present occasion also to protect the interests of leaseholders in my own district, as well as those outside of it, as much as possible. There are many people who will come under the operation of this Bill, merely because they have had to purchase the right to water areas, and it will be an injustice if these are compelled to bear half the cost of constructing fences they not only do not want, but which would be in their way if erected. The point is one upon which I should like the Hon. the Attorney-General to give his attention and I shall be happy to consult him, with a view of some amendment being made. There is another point, I think, that might well be considered in connection with this Bill, and that is with regard to the erection of barbed-wire fences along public roads. At present there is nothing to prevent a man erecting a fence of three barbed wires, and this means

that, whenever sheep come along, and endeavor to get through that fence, they are cut about, and much injury is done. Some provision might be made in this Bill to deal with the erection of this class of fence, as I believe is done in other colonies. With the exception of where it is provided that people may be called upon to contribute towards the cost of erecting fences which cannot possibly be any good to them, I think the Bill is a good one. So far as those people I have referred to are concerned, I hope I shall have the assistance of the House in protecting their interests, and preventing an injustice being done to them.

MR. LEAKE: I do not intend to oppose the second reading of this Bill, but I do desire to direct the attention of hon. members to one or two of its provisions, and more particularly with regard to the method proposed to be adopted for the recovery of amounts due from one person to another in respect of fencing. The Bill does not leave the parties to their ordinary common law remedy, which would be to let a man make his claim in an ordinary court of justice, but it provides means whereby a man be brought summarily before two justices, and the fact that he has not paid for fencing done on the boundary of his land is made a criminal offence, and the offender, if he does not pay up, may find himself temporarily sojourning at Fremantle, or some other prison, or place of confinement. The Attorney-General will, I am sure, agree with me that this will be one of the effects of including in the Bill, as proposed, certain sections of the Shortening Ordinance. Then, again, there is Clause 24, which provides that the amount due, and the costs incurred against any person, if not paid, may be made a charge on the land.

MR. A. FORREST: Subject, of course, to a mortgage.

MR. LEAKE: Of course. The suggestion in this clause is foreign to the law in the colonies at the present moment, and I cannot see any necessity for this new departure. The Hon. the Premier did not touch on this question in moving the second reading, but we shall doubtless have some explanation of it in committee. The provision for the registration of judgments is inconsistent with the provisions of the Transfer of Land Act, which requires proceedings to be commenced by *fi. fa.* before the title to lands can be affected. I trust the Attorney-General will turn his atten-

tion to this subject, and show what the effect will be if this clause becomes law. It creates for one class of people rights and interests never contemplated before, and this would be the first time for them to be recognised in our Statute Book. However, these objections are not sufficient to justify me in objecting to the second reading of the Bill. I only desire to direct the attention of hon. members to what I regard as blemishes in it. I trust the result of the consideration of this matter in committee will be that parties affected by this Bill will be left to recover judgment in the ordinary way.

Motion put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### ESTIMATES, 1895-6.

The consideration of the Estimates, in committee, was resumed.

Vote—Works and Buildings, £445,136 13s. 4d. (debate continued):

MR. MORAN said he desired to take this opportunity of expressing satisfaction with the correction the Director of Public Works had made that evening, showing that the cost of designing and supervising the erection of public buildings amounted, not to 9 per cent., as had been stated by the hon. gentleman the other evening, but only to about 4½ per cent. When the statement was made the other evening, he thought at the time that 9 per cent. was an enormous sum for the country to pay for designs and supervision. Speaking of the architectural staff, generally, he had a high opinion of the officers of the department, although, of course, as was the case wherever there was a large body of men, there were one or two exceptions who were not a credit to the service.

MR. ILLINGWORTH asked whether the amended return as to the cost of supervision, etc., showed the cost of the works actually erected, while the statement of the Commissioner the other evening included the cost of plans of buildings and other works which had been designed but not constructed.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied that the error had been made by charging all the money which had been expended as expenditure upon public works, whereas a great deal of preparatory office work in connection with unexpended votes was included in the outlay.

MR. RANDELL, while congratulating the Director of Public Works upon the fact that

his department did not cost for designing and supervision more than 4½ per cent. of the amount of the expenditure on public works, regretted that all the works authorised last session had not been carried out. Of course, he was willing to make allowance for the fact that the Estimates were passed very late last year, and, possibly, there might not have been time to carry out these works; but, as the Estimates would probably be passed earlier this session, he hoped that all the works provided for would be carried out within the year.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) pointed out that, owing to the late period when the Estimates were passed last year, the Department had only six months in which to carry out the works passed last session, namely, between December and June. This year, according to the rate at which the Estimates were being passed, the department would have nine or ten months to get through with the work.

MR. RANDELL: It is now September, and we are not through with them yet.

MR. A. FORREST, referring to Item No. 13 (Assistant Engineer-in-Chief, £600), said that the title of this officer was a very misleading one, as the so-called Assistant Engineer-in-Chief was really the head of the architectural branch of the Public Works Department. He wished to draw the attention of the Director of Public Works to the necessity that existed for this officer to travel about the country, and visit the principal centres of the eastern goldfields, in order to find out the architectural requirements of those places, which were now very inadequately provided for in the matter of public buildings. In fact, the first impression a visitor to Coolgardie was likely to form was that the Government had not been alive to the importance of erecting suitable public buildings for such large centres of population. The public buildings at Coolgardie were so squat that most of the money had been expended upon the roofs, the walls being hardly higher than a man's head. The public buildings, indeed, were not at all what might have been expected in a place that was expanding so rapidly as Coolgardie; and he hoped that the head of the architectural branch would be sent there, in order that designs might be prepared more in keeping with what Coolgardie and other important centres needed for the proper accommodation

of the large amount of public business that was done there. The head of the architectural branch would be of greater service to the country if he were not always kept in the office, but allowed to travel to the different centres, as he had suggested, so that the designs of the Public Works Department might be of a suitable character for the places where they were to be constructed. The Post and Telegraph Office at Coolgardie was a notable example of the insufficiency of the public buildings of that place, and he hoped that the Government would soon erect one that would be a credit to such a large mining centre. The money had all been spent on the top of the building, and very little had been done at the bottom of it, to provide either suitable or adequate accommodation.

MR. R. F. SHOLL regretted that all the plans of the public buildings were of a uniform kind, with the result that buildings were put up in the more tropical districts that were only suitable for the cooler regions of the South. Some of the buildings were especially unfit for a warm climate, notably the post and telegraph office at Broome, which compared very unfavorably with the offices of the Eastern Telegraph Company in that town, which were constructed to suit a tropical climate. It should be the aim of the head of the architectural branch to plan the buildings for the different localities with a view to the necessities of each place, instead of having all the designs alike, all over the colony. These buildings generally were very expensive, and they should be adapted to local requirements in each case.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the hon. member for the Gascoyne had referred to the public buildings at Broome. He did not know that the present Government had erected any public buildings at Broome, those now standing having been put up before the present Government came into office. The Government, when erecting new buildings, would be found to be quite equal to present requirements. At the same time he might draw attention to the fact that the offices of the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company cost £14,000 or £15,000, and, if the Government asked the House to sanction such a vote for public buildings at Broome, the House would not be likely to agree to such expenditure. The Government telegraph office in the town referred to had cost only

£300 or £400, and no doubt it did look insignificant beside the fine offices of the Telegraph Company, which provided even a billiard room and every possible comfort for their officers. The Government could not be equally luxurious, but the best would be done in the matter of public buildings, so far as the finances would allow. The hon. member for West Kimberley had referred to the fact that Coolgardie had outgrown the public buildings at that place. No doubt that was so, but Coolgardie had taken enormous strides in the last two years, and the growth of a goldfields town could not always be accurately forecasted. At Southern Cross ample provision had been made in the matter of public buildings; but if Southern Cross had grown at the same rate as Coolgardie, the Southern Cross offices would have been condemned as being quite behind the times. The Government would have to build up to the present requirements of Coolgardie, and he hoped that now that the colony was making such rapid progress, the Public Works Department would be enabled to properly provide for the public requirements of any place where new offices were to be built, such as at Kalgoorlie and Hannan's. At the same time it might be difficult to do so, for it was difficult to predict to what extent Hannan's might grow. But a telegraph station and Warden's quarters would be erected there that would be a credit to the town. On the other hand it would not be wise for the Government to over-estimate the requirements of a place, and spend a very large sum upon a building in excess of what would be needed to meet the growth of any of the towns of the colony. It was being arranged that a great deal of the office work that was now being done by the Assistant Engineer-in-Chief should in future be performed by the officer next to him, acting under his direction, so that the head of the branch might be left more free than he had hitherto been to visit the different places where public works were required, so that the plans might be adapted to the different districts.

MR. MORAN said the public buildings at Coolgardie were designed about sixteen months ago, when the place was going ahead very rapidly, but, notwithstanding that fact, nothing but tin shanties were put up, which were altogether inadequate for the Coolgardie of to-day. He would like to point out to the Director of Public Works that the lesson to

be derived from the rapid development of Coolgardie was that in the goldfields centres the Government should, in the first place, erect only temporary structures until it was seen what a mining township was going to become. Then, when the growth of a town demanded it, the temporary buildings should be taken down, and moved on to new centres that were bound to be opened up; and substantial permanent buildings should be erected in the older places. He was glad that new telegraph offices were to be erected at Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie, for the pigeon boxes which at present did duty as telegraph stations at those places permitted the public to both see and hear the messages which were received and transmitted. The sooner the new offices were built, the greater the public satisfaction.

MR. CLARKSON remarked that it was easy for every one to be wise after the event, as to the phenomenal growth of the goldfields towns such as Coolgardie; but, a year or two ago, no one could have predicted that it would have been the Coolgardie it was to-day. Hence the Public Works Department could not be blamed for not putting up larger public offices when the town was first laid out.

MR. GEORGE asked the Director of Public Works whether the Assistant Engineer-in-Chief was responsible for the work of the architectural branch of the department, and whether he (Mr. Venn) had ascertained who was to blame for the blunder which he (Mr. George) had pointed out the other evening in regard to the erection of the public offices in Perth.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the hon. member for the Murray spoke so often that he did not quite remember the particular statement to which the hon. member referred.

MR. GEORGE said he would refresh the memory of the Hon. the Director of Public Works, The mistake to which he alluded was that in the plans prepared by the Department it was provided that heavy cast-iron gutters should be used, and, when the gutters were being put up, it was discovered that the building was not of sufficient strength to carry their weight.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he would ascertain the facts of the alleged error, but he expected it would be found that the hon. member for the Murray had again been misinformed.

MR. RANDELL, referring to Item "Gov-



ernment Electrician and Electrical Engineer, £350," said he understood, from what the Premier had stated on a previous occasion, that the officer holding that appointment (Mr. Hancock) also discharged the duties of Inspector of Boilers and Engines, under the Boat Licensing Act, at a salary of £150 per annum. Was that the case?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said it was intended that Mr. Hancock should discharge the duties of Boiler and Engine Inspector, as well as those of Government Electrician and Electrical Engineer, but that he would not draw the extra £150 a year attached to the former office.

MR. RANDELL hoped the officer in question was qualified to inspect and report upon the condition of boilers.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn): He has that qualification.

MR. RANDELL: Is he a boiler-maker?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said Mr. Hancock was well qualified for the work of inspecting and reporting upon boilers, because the examinations which he had had to pass before he could practise as an Electrical Engineer were upon mechanical subjects, embracing a scientific knowledge of the working of boilers.

MR. RANDELL said he thought the two positions — Electrical Engineer and Boiler Inspector — were entirely incompatible, and that if Mr. Hancock were allowed to fill the dual position, a practical boiler-maker would have to be secured to do the work of inspecting and reporting upon the condition of boilers. The combined salaries attached to the two positions he had referred to amounted to £500 a year, and he did not consider that this officer should draw the extra £150 a year for inspecting boilers, if he were not qualified as a practical man to do the work.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn): He does not receive the extra £150 a year.

MR. GEORGE said he would like to know what Mr. Hancock really did for his salary, and what his duties were. If the information he had received regarding that officer was correct, his services as Electrician to the Post and Telegraph Department were not appreciated; and, as there was already a competent officer in charge of the railway telephones and another one in charge of the general tele-

phone system of the city, he would like to know what particular work Mr. Hancock was supposed to supervise.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said Mr. Hancock's duties were various, because, although the Government had thought it desirable to specially engage competent officers to supervise the working of the railway telephones and the general telephone system of the city, they also found that a competent officer was required to report upon the general electrical lighting of the city, and on the condition of the electrical appliances in use, and also to prepare correct indents for telegraphic material which was required in the extension of the telegraph service all over the colony. Those duties were being performed by Mr. Hancock to the satisfaction of the Government.

MR. GEORGE said he was satisfied, after hearing the statement of the Director of Public Works, that the Government were exercising all necessary precautions in indenting telegraphic material, but he was under the impression that the work of preparing the indents was done by the Telegraph Department. At any rate he did not think the Electrical Engineer's time would be fully employed in preparing those indents. While he was on his feet, he would like to know from the Director of Public Works whether the Electrical Engineer was the official who was responsible for the indenting of the copper wire for the Wyndham to Hall's Creek and Hall's Creek to Derby telegraph line, which had involved the country in a loss of £2,000, in consequence of the wire not being sufficiently strong for the purpose. As to Mr. Hancock's alleged fitness to inspect and report upon boilers, he did not think he was qualified as a practical man to do that work, although he might have the necessary scientific knowledge.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said, with regard to the matter of the Wyndham to Derby telegraph line, he did not think the blame for the loss of the £2,000 mentioned by the hon. member could be cast upon Mr. Hancock, because the fault rested with the manufacturers in not supplying the material that was indented for.

MR. WOOD said hon. members appeared to be getting away from the question as to whether the Electrical Engineer should, in addition to his salary of £350 a year for that

office, draw an extra £150 a year as Inspector of Boilers and Engines under the Boat Licensing Act; and he would like the Government to assure the House that that officer would not receive the extra salary.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the Government did not intend to increase the Electrical Engineer's salary at all, and he assured the Committee that this officer would not also receive the £150 a year for inspecting the boilers.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: Who will draw the £150 then?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he would repeat the assurance that the Electrical Engineer would not receive it.

MR. KEEP asked, in view of that assurance, whether the Electrical Engineer would still be Inspector of Boilers and Engines under the Boat Licensing Act, without pay? If it were intended that the present Electrical Engineer should be also Inspector of Boilers, he considered that the Government would be taking too great a risk in entrusting those duties to this officer—especially in regard to marine boilers—because, in his opinion, this officer was not competent to do the work. The Board of Trade would only accept the certificate of a qualified inspector of marine boilers, and he considered that the Government should secure the services of a thoroughly efficient and qualified officer to fill such an important position.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he quite agreed with what the hon. member for Pilburra had said, and, having had his attention particularly drawn to the whole question of boiler inspection, both as to land and marine boilers, he would ascertain what was really being done at present. At the same time, he did not think that Mr. Hancock was required to examine marine boilers.

MR. GEORGE said that, having certain information in his possession which questioned this officer's competency to fill the position of Electrical Engineer, he moved to strike the item out.

MR. PIESSE said that, having had an assurance from the Government that Mr. Hancock would not receive the extra £150 a year for inspecting boilers, he was satisfied. He thought that £350 a year was quite sufficient salary for the office of Government Electrician and Electrical Engineer. With

regard to the question of boiler inspection, he was of opinion that only a thoroughly competent man should be entrusted with that work, and, although Mr. Hancock might possess all the qualifications for the work from a scientific point of view, still he thought—

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must understand that we are not now dealing with boiler inspection. The Government has assured the committee that the salary of £150 will not be paid to the Electrical Engineer, and we are now dealing with the salary for that officer.

MR. MORAN said, with regard to the ruling of the Chairman, that he understood that part of the Electrical Engineer's duties was to inspect boilers, and that consequently hon. members could refer to the question of boiler inspection.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he would like to explain that the reason why Mr. Hancock had up to the present time been regarded as the Inspector of Boilers and Engines under the Boat Licensing Act was because, at the time the Act referred to was passed, no sum was provided for the Inspector's salary, and he was asked to do the work. As a matter of fact, he had not done anything in the direction of inspecting boilers at all, and it was not intended that he should do so. Perhaps hon. members would allow the item to pass when he, as well as the Director of Public Works, assured them that the Electrical Engineer would not receive the £150 voted for an Inspector of Boilers and Engines under the Boat Licensing Act. That item had been placed on the Estimates at the request of the Chief Harbormaster, who no doubt considered it necessary that there should be an Inspector of Marine Boilers.

MR. SIMPSON said he certainly thought that the position of Government Electrician and Electrical Engineer had been specially made for Mr. Hancock, because it was well-known that his services as electrician having been declined by the Post and Telegraph Department, he was made consulting engineer to the Works Department. It was unpleasant to say that any public servant was not suitable for the position which he held, but he was perfectly satisfied, from the information that had reached him, that the presence of Mr. Hancock in the Postal and Telegraphic Department had not conduced to the advantage of the public service, or to the satisfaction of the public. In consequence of representations

that were made to the Government concerning this officer, he was granted an extended leave of absence, the object being to get rid of him; but now he re-appeared as Government Electrician and Electrical Engineer. They had heard from the Premier that evening that Mr. Hancock was practically incompetent to inspect boilers.

THE PREMIER: I don't know about that.

MR. SIMPSON: Well, judging from what the Premier said, hon. members must take it for granted that the Electrical Engineer was not fitted to be inspector of boilers.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must be careful not to discuss boiler inspection.

MR. SIMPSON said he would be careful not to do so. Hon. members had heard that Mr. Hancock had not had anything to do with boiler inspecting, and probably they would be more satisfied to hear that he had had nothing to do with anything else connected with the public service. They had from the Post and Telegraph Department practically a discredited man who, it was proposed, should become an officer of the Works Department, and who, so far as he could gather from the statements made by the members of the Government, was to manage the electrical portion of the signalling facilities on the railways as well—a work which in itself required the services of a thoroughly competent and efficient electrician.

At 6.30 p.m., the Chairman left the chair.

At 7.30 p.m., the Chairman resumed the chair.

MR. SIMPSON, resuming his remarks, said the Premier had stated that he could not give the name of the officer who occupied the position before—that of Government Electrician and Electrical Engineer. He asked again, was it desirable that a position like this should be made for a man who had practically been discredited in another branch of the service? Considering that no reason had been shown for making this appointment, while there were serious reasons against it, the effect of persisting in this appointment would be to deter good men in the service from seeking promotion as the reward of competent and faithful service. The committee would act wisely in striking out the item.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the hon. member was not justified in stating this officer was discredited. This officer certainly did not give satisfaction as Superintendent of Telegraphs, though that

was not in regard to his professional knowledge, but to his management of the commercial part of the business. [MR. SIMPSON: He made a mess of it.] He (the Premier) had never heard any one question this officer's ability as an electrician, and there was every reason to believe he was a capable and qualified electrical engineer. He came to this country will recommended, to inaugurate the telephone service; and what ground had the hon. member for saying this officer was not a qualified electrician? When this officer was transferred from the Post and Telegraph Department, the Government did not think it well to dispense with his service, seeing that there was a growing necessity for an expert in electrical matters to advise the Government, especially in the ordering of electrical appliances. This item appeared also in the Estimates last year, and at that time electrical lighting was being introduced in Perth; large extensions of the telegraph system were also being undertaken; and there was an increasing necessity for such services, as a skilled electrician could render to the Government.

MR. GEORGE said there was no evidence to show this officer was an expert in telegraphy, while, on the contrary, it was known to some persons that this so-called expert did not even know how to use an electrical instrument, as an operator, for transmitting a message. If a first class expert in electrical work was required, had the Government got a first-class officer? That question should be answered. He usually put his questions to Ministers in as plain Saxon as he could, but the Ministerial heads did not seem able to answer them.

MR. SIMPSON asked whether it was not the fact that the expert who was imported for advising on the organisation and working of the Telegraph Department did question this officer's competency.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said this officer's competency as an electrical engineer was not questioned by the expert who came over to advise.

MR. SIMPSON said he had reason to believe the expert who came over did question this officer's competency as a professional electrician. As an example of his skill, there was the clock which recorded the time in this chamber, and which, after being under this officer's particular attention during three weeks, had to be sent to the plumber for repairs. This

officer might have been a long time in the service, but that did not prove his competency, for he was simply taken over by the present Government as a legacy from the old system; just as the Midland Railway trouble was taken over as a legacy. To place and keep this officer in a highly responsible position, for which he was not fitted, must have a bad effect on the service.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said an expert of this kind was necessary and the salary was not too much for a competent expert. What the committee desired was to be assured that this officer was really competent, and on that point he knew there was considerable doubt outside the House as well as in it. If this officer was not efficient, some other competent expert should be appointed, as an officer of this kind appeared to be necessary.

MR. A. FORREST said this officer entered the service in 1885, and had continued to draw about the same salary for nearly 10 years, while doing practically the same duties. Yet, after all these years, some hon. members suddenly discovered, as they believed, that this officer was incompetent. How could members of this House be judges of the competency of an electrical engineer? The head of the department was responsible for the efficiency of the officers employed, and any charge of incompetency should therefore be brought against the Minister, who would then know what he had to answer for, and might produce precise evidence to meet the charge.

MR. SIMPSON said this officer had not been in his present position of consulting electrical engineer to the Government until his salary came before the House in this year's Estimates. [The PREMIER: The salary was in the Estimates for last year also.] Well, this officer might have occupied this position fifteen months, and had been put into it after having been discredited in another department. If he (Mr. Simpson) had no right to say this officer was incompetent, then what right had the hon. member for West Kimberley to say this officer was competent?

MR. A. FORREST said he had not asserted this officer was competent. It was for the Minister to say that. Unless hon. members came into frequent contact with an officer in the discharge of official duties, how could members pretend to know whether that officer was efficient or not?

MR. MARMION said that, instead of first discussing the necessity for the office of

Government Electrician and Electrical Engineer, hon. members had been discussing the merits of the officer. If the office was necessary, then the immediate question was whether this officer had fulfilled the duties satisfactorily during the fifteen months he had held this position. The head of the department should give that information. It was possible for an hon. member to make a mistake as to the merits of an officer, in technical matters.

MR. MORAN said if this officer had been filling the position during the last fifteen months, he (Mr. Moran) must support the objections of the hon. member for Geraldton, because the fitting up of the mechanical appliances in connection with the Coolgardie goldfields had been most unsatisfactory.

THE CHAIRMAN said this officer was not responsible for the work in question, therefore the hon. member's remarks were not relevant to this item.

MR. CLARKSON said he had come to the conclusion, from what he had heard, that this appointment was not necessary. The argument that because this officer had been in the service ten years he ought to be retained was not a good one.

MR. MORAN said he also must vote for striking out the item, for, after all the explanations given, there appeared to be a screw loose somewhere. The Premier, in transferring this officer from one position to another, had probably allowed his tenderness of heart to get the better of his judgment. If this officer was not responsible for the proper fitting up of the telegraphic appliances on the goldfields, what was he responsible for?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he would again try to explain the duties of this officer. Firstly, since this officer had occupied his present position, he had fulfilled the duties satisfactorily; and, as to the future, the growing requirements of the colony, especially in the extension of telegraphs, would necessitate more and more the employment of such an officer. As a matter of fact he (the Director of Public Works) did not think it could be said, in this House or out of it, that this officer was not a qualified electrician. As this discussion had not been expected, the data which might otherwise have been ready to lay before the House was not at hand on this occasion. Satisfactory evidence of this officer's competency and qualifications could be pro-

duced. As a departmental officer, the Government had not said much about his fitness; but as to his professional ability they were quite satisfied; and hon. members would know that scientific ability as an electrician and commercial ability in managing the business details of a department did not often go together. Sir Charles Todd had spoken well of this officer's attainments. Probably this officer stood as well as most scientific men of his class in Australia.

MR. MORAN asked what were this officer's duties.

MR. MARMION also asked what were this officer's duties. As there were going to be great things in electricity in the future, it would appear that this officer was being kept in the service in expectation of future requirements.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the duties of this officer were to act as consulting engineer in advising the Government as to all matters relating to electrical appliances, and to advise as to the indenting of electrical materials and instruments.

MR. LEAKE said if he voted for this item, it would be on the understanding that this officer was relegated to his former position in the Telegraph Department. It did not seem right that merely because this officer and the Postmaster-General did not happen to "hit it off," therefore this officer had been foisted on the Public Works Department.

MR. MARMION said this unfortunate officer, in being shifted from one stool to the other, might fall to the ground. After this officer had fulfilled his duties satisfactorily during ten years, he should not be shunted and an injustice be done to him.

MR. RANDELL said the Government must be held responsible in the ordinary way, for the efficiency of this officer, and the committee could not take that matter out of the hands of the particular Minister. The Government had stated that the developments of electricity in this colony were expected to be great, and that an officer of this kind was required to advise them in electrical matters. There was, indeed, a belief among scientific men that electricity would be the motive power generally employed on railways before the nineteenth century closed, and he believed there would be great developments. This House should leave to the Government the responsibility of employing this or other

officers, and the Government would have to answer for any defects that might take place in connection with this department.

MR. SIMPSON said that, after having heard what might be called the defence of the Director of Public Works, together with the suggestion of the hon. member for Perth as to the great future of electricity in this colony, it appeared the Government persisted in foisting on the country this appointment of a discredited officer. [MR. A. FORREST: No.] The hon. member for West Kimberley would not think so of any action of the present Government. It had been stated that the electrical and telegraphic work of the Postal Department was in a better position, during this officer's absence from the colony on leave, than when he was in responsible charge of the work. The Government had transferred this officer to the Works Department, and wished to keep him there as consulting engineer because, as they said, the uses of electricity were going to develop very greatly in the immediate future. The Government had made a position for this officer, and wished to keep him in it, but such a precedent must have a bad effect on other officers in the service, by teaching them to depend on Ministerial favor rather than on efficient and faithful service.

MR. COOKWORTHY said the truth was that this officer had great scientific attainments, but was not a good manager in matters of business. The Government desired to retain him as a consulting engineer, for which he appeared to be well qualified; therefore the item should be allowed to pass.

Question—that the item be struck out—put, and division taken, with the following result:—

For	...	...	...	11
Against	...	...	...	17
Majority against				6

## AYES.

Mr. Clarkson  
Mr. Connor  
Mr. George  
Mr. Hooley  
Mr. Hingworth  
Mr. Leake  
Mr. Moran  
Mr. Moss  
Mr. Simpson  
Mr. Solomon  
Mr. James (Teller).

## NOES.

Mr. Burt  
Sir John Forrest  
Mr. A. Forrest  
Mr. Hassell  
Mr. Keep  
Mr. Lefroy  
Mr. Loton  
Mr. Marmion  
Mr. Piesse  
Mr. Randell  
Mr. Richardson  
Mr. H. W. Sholl  
Sir J. G. Lee-Steele  
Mr. Thrassell  
Mr. Venn  
Mr. Wood  
Mr. Cookworthy  
(Teller).

Motion negatived.

MR. JAMES, referring to Item 16 (Inspector of Works and Draftsman, £375; last year, £350), said that if the committee agreed to Item 20 (appointment of Architect, under direction of Engineer-in-Chief, £500), he hoped the present Inspector of Works, who had had practical experience as an architect before entering the service, and was, without exception, one of the best officers in the service, would have an opportunity of being appointed to the new position which was to be created under Item 20.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said this officer would most decidedly not be appointed to the new position of Architect, because he was too valuable an officer in the position of Inspector of Works, and was not a qualified professional architect such as was contemplated under Item 20. Indeed he (the Director of Public Works) could not speak too highly of the Inspector of Works in his present position.

MR. JAMES said what he desired was that this officer should have promotion or a better salary, being an exceptionally good officer.

MR. SOLOMON said this officer had been known to him as a practical builder who formerly carried on business in Fremantle many years; and, in his present position, this officer would be far more valuable than as an architect.

MR. MORAN said this officer was a native of the colony, a carpenter by trade, and had worked himself up to be a contracting builder before entering the Government service. Because he had practical knowledge of building and of timbers, especially jarrah, it would be preposterous to appoint him as an architect to design public buildings.

MR. LEAKE asked the Director of Public Works whether he would give the committee some information with regard to Item No 20.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied that it was a proposed new appointment altogether, but it was also one which the increasing work of the department and the growing importance of that work made absolutely necessary. The idea was that they should procure the services of a thoroughly efficient architect, who would not only be able to relieve the Assistant Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Poole), but who could also carry out portion, of the designing work of the department. What they desired to

obtain was a really competent architect, and this would be possible with the salary offered. He certainly had no one in his mind at the present time who was to get the appointment, and he intended to get the very best man possible. He trusted the vote would pass without opposition, for the reason that the addition of an assistant architect to the staff was both necessary and desirable, and one that would have to be made if the desire of the Government to see public works carried out with despatch was to be carried out.

MR. MORAN said this was a matter in which he took the greatest interest. He was positive that a most capable architect could be obtained for £500 a year. What he would suggest was that the appointment should be made as the result of advertising, if there was no one in the service at present who could be promoted. The department would then find that, owing to the stagnation in trade in the other colonies, they would be able to obtain the services of men who had occupied leading positions as architects. The Assistant Engineer-in-Chief (as he was called) could then have the assistance of a capable man. What was wanted was an architect with Australian experience; and he would oppose any suggestion that this architect should be imported from the old country. There could be no two opinions as to the necessity for an assistant architect, if it was proposed to introduce different designs in regard to public buildings from those at the present in vogue.

MR. SIMPSON disagreed entirely with the remarks of the hon. member for Yilgarn, so far as the emolument attached to this office was concerned. The person appointed would have to be one so competent and able to undertake such important work that the Department could not hope to secure the services of such a one for anything like £500. He did, however, agree with the suggestion that Australian experience was a requirement of the office; and no doubt hon. members could rest assured the Department would secure the best man it would be possible to obtain. At the same time the salary was not sufficient, and, if they wanted good work, they had to have the best men and pay them the best salaries. The right man would actually save his salary on one big contract. No one would be prepared to contend that the work of the Department now was satisfactory in any degree; and, although the Director of Public Works had

said the ratio of expense for supervision in the architectural branch was only 4·6 of the departmental expenditure, the statement was one the accuracy of which he was most sceptical about. He was informed that, in the erection of one public building, the contractors themselves had to draw the attention of the Department to a grave error. He was told, as a fact, that when the Beverley refreshment rooms were being erected, it was found that where the staircase met the ceiling there was only a space of eighteen inches between the top stair and the ceiling.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Who ever told you that must have been chaffing you.

**MR. SIMPSON** did not think so. They knew, of their own knowledge, what the experience had been concerning the public buildings erected close to the Chamber, and how a huge balcony was put in, in such a way that it was liable to fall into the street at any moment. No one could say it was proper to either borrow money or expend revenue in putting up buildings of that sort; and to pursue such a faulty system, was certainly not to act in the best interests of the colony. Even the Premier was aghast when he saw a certain public building at York, and had to admit that it was little better than a cross between a packing case and a railway tunnel. The time had really arrived when some competent man should be appointed to provide practicable designs, suitable to the requirements of the colony; and it would be better to pay him a larger salary in order to secure the erection of public buildings that could be properly utilised, and designed with a due regard to economy as well as to the public requirements.

**MR. JAMES** would like to see this item of assistant architect struck out altogether. He agreed with the suggestion that the amount provided would not be sufficient to secure the services of such a man as would be required for the position. A good deal has been said as to the necessity of obtaining the services of a "qualified architect." The term was one he could not understand, so far as Australia was concerned, for the simple reason that architects required little or no qualification to be called architects in these colonies. In England, however, he believed a man could not practise as an architect unless he held certain qualifications. If that was the case, then, if a properly qualified architect was

wanted, they would probably have to go to the old country for one. The necessity for the services of such an official was apparent just now, but the need was only temporary; and he was afraid that, when the rush of building work was over, the Department would experience some difficulty in putting an end to the extra employment. It would be difficult to obtain the services of a really first-class man, to be only temporarily engaged, and they would have to put up with a second-class architect. Even if the most competent person was obtained, they would not have the mistakes complained of in the past rectified; and so far as the future was concerned they could hardly hope for any alteration either in designs or system, while the assistant architect was subject to the control of the present Architect-in-Chief, for the simple reason that all plans would have to be submitted to this gentleman, and the architectural ideas now complained of would be perpetuated. The only possible remedy for errors of construction and design was to throw the designs open to public competition. This system had been adopted in several States of America, and was frequently availed of by the Federal Government. It was not advisable that all the buildings erected in the colony should be of one style; and it was evident that, if competitive designs were invited for the larger and more important buildings, they would obtain both beauty and variety of design and utility in construction. A system of competitive designs would encourage the best architects to come to the colony, and would lead to most beneficial results, from an architectural point of view. It would be by the adoption of such a system here that original designs could be secured. At any rate, the experiment should receive a fair trial at the hands of the Government. He was sure a trial of the system would be most profitable. Whatever the ruling rates for architects were, they should be paid; and, even if this was more expensive than the present method, there would, in the long run, be a very large saving. Surely there was no reason why the experiment should not be tried for, say, twelve months. There was already an Architect-in-Chief and an Inspector of works, who would be quite capable of deciding whether the plans submitted were practicable, and the estimates for the work correct. The Department could not want anything more than this. The present staff was sufficient to decide whether the competi-

tive designs could be carried out; and if the system was adopted, there would be no chance of repeating the mistakes such as that mentioned by the hon. member for Geraldton, as having occurred at York, or the one he (Mr. James) referred to some evenings before, where a schoolroom chimney was built with no means for the smoke getting out of it. Hon. members had also been told of a case in which the architect provided a chimney in a building, but left no hole in the roof for the chimney to be built through. The results of the present system were quite sufficient to justify them in making an alteration, and he quite agreed with the hon. member for Yilgarn when he said that the public buildings of this colony did not do the designer or the country any credit equivalent to the money expended on them.

MR. MORAN: I never used such an expression.

MR. JAMES thought the hon. member had said so. It was perfectly true that such was the case. The colony was not obtaining full value for its money at the present time, in this respect. There was no question of the fact that, in the erection of our most important public buildings, we wanted them of the very best designs, and these were only procurable by competitive designs being invited, instead of continuing the system whereby every building was erected on the same lines, and according to the same ideas as to architectural beauty.

MR. A. FORREST was very pleased to find that the Government proposed to appoint an assistant architect. When the services of such a gentleman were secured, the Architect-in-Chief would be able to travel about the country, and obtain a better knowledge as to its requirements in the way of public buildings. To throw the designs for public buildings open to competition would not only be expensive, but, in his opinion, impracticable. So far as the erection of these buildings in the past was concerned, he was sure they compared favorably with similar buildings in the other colonies. The General Post Office was a good example of this. This position of assistant architect was one for which the most competent man should be obtained; but he thought the Department could obtain such an official without (as had been suggested) advertising for him. If they advertised, all sorts of difficulties would be encountered. The City Council had advertised for a clerk at £100 a

year, and, in reply to the advertisement, they received no fewer than 90 applications, all with first-class testimonials. If the Government advertised for an assistant architect, at £500 a year, they would probably obtain replies by the thousand.

MR. MARMION pointed out that, so far as the remarks of the hon. member for Geraldton were concerned, the House was not in the position to increase the salary, unless hon. members were also willing to go back over the Estimates and increase other salaries. At present the Architect-in-Chief only received £600 a year, and it was proposed to give the Assistant Architect £500. The latter salary could not be altered without raising the other as well. He did not have any professional knowledge of architects, but it struck him pretty forcibly that they would have little trouble in getting a good man to take the position of assistant architect at £500 a year. Personally, he quite agreed with what had fallen from the hon. member for Yilgarn as to the necessity of the person appointed having Australian experience. No doubt the Government would use every effort to obtain the services of the best man they could possibly secure. So far as the suggestion to throw the designs open for competition by outside architects was concerned, it appeared to him that the suggestion would, if acted upon, disorganise the present system, and it would be a new departure which would alter the basis of working altogether. He thought there was no need to lose further time in the discussion of the item, because they were all agreed as to the necessity of assistance being given in the architect's branch of the department.

MR. RANDELL considered that the idea put forward by the hon. member for East Perth was a very good one, and he commended it to the careful consideration of the Government. It was very probable that, from every point of view, the Government would find that if the experiment was given a trial, it would be attended with the most satisfactory results. They had experience of the working of the system in the Central Board of Education, and it had worked well. They required a man who was a competent architect, as well as one in possession of the best credentials, and he did not believe the Government would find much difficulty in filling this position in the Works Department.



It had been pointed out that the salary given to the Chief Architect was only £600 a year; and, taking all the circumstances into consideration, he considered £500 a year would be a very fair salary indeed to offer an assistant.

MR. MORAN declared that the system of competitive designs did not rule in any other colony, and in no country was it adopted as a general thing. It was only on special occasions when the assistance of outside architects was called in. They were needed when it came to building structures demanding special skill, such as Houses of Parliament, Hospitals, etc.. Beyond that, it was quite unnecessary to go outside the Department. In the case of the Supreme Court Buildings or the Mint, competitive designs might be invited, but, to go beyond this class of work, would be to disorganise the Department when they had no precedent to show them that the proposed departure would be attended with success.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said there was ample room for the appointment of an assistant architect, and he hoped the Government would make a good selection. The architect's office had become stereotyped, or crystallised. He had every confidence in saying that the services of a competent assistant could be secured for the salary offered. At the same time the Government should give every consideration to the suggestion made by the hon. member for East Perth, and apply it to the more important buildings. If this were done it would mean that money would be saved to the country. It would be a great help to the colony if the large public buildings were erected on the design which were the result of competition. No doubt the Government would consider the suggestion, for, the want of some better design in the more important buildings was only too plainly seen. There was a proof of this in the recent additions made to the Colonial Hospital, at Perth, where some £8,000 or £9,000 had been expended without materially increasing the accommodation for patients.

THE PREMIER: We have doubled the accommodation.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I repeat that after the expenditure of all this money there is no material increase in the accommodation provided for patients.

THE PREMIER (HON. SIR J. FORREST): I

heard from Dr. Waylen only yesterday that the accommodation would be doubled.

MR. ILLINGWORTH was quite used to the Premier contradicting anything that the Government did not feel pleased to hear, but he thought it was pretty well known by this time that whenever he (Mr. Illingworth) made a statement it could be supported by facts. And it was a fact that, although all this money had been spent over the Perth Hospital, the accommodation had not been materially increased. This could not have happened if the designs had been the result of competition; and, in future, it was to be hoped that the Department would adopt this course. The person appointed should be one possessing such qualifications as would prevent the crystallisation of this Department going any further. A large amount of money was being expended on public works, and the works were increasing, so that it became absolutely necessary there should be some better system, where the money of the public should be spent to the very best advantage.

MR. CLARKSON thought that an assistant architect was necessary, and he agreed with the statement of the hon. member for Yilgarn that no difficulty would be experienced in getting an efficient officer at the salary proposed.

MR. R. F. SHOLL, referring to the item "Government House and Domain, Rottnest and Fremantle cottages, £1,000," asked the Director of Public Works whether he would explain what this expenditure contemplated.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (HON. H. W. VENN) replied that it was intended to thoroughly renovate Government House before the next Governor appointed went into occupation. Hon. members knew this to be necessary, and that nothing had been done to improve this building for some years.

MR. R. F. SHOLL, referring to the item, "Fremantle Lunatic Asylum, £2,600," said he noticed that in connection with this building £2,709 had been expended last year, and that it was proposed to spend £2,600 this year, when the original estimate was only £4,000. He understood the Government intended to remove the present lunatic asylum from Fremantle; therefore, it appeared strange that so much money should be expended on temporary premises.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (HON. H. W. VENN) said it was the intention

to remove the asylum, not necessarily from Fremantle, but to some spot more suitable than the present one. Several localities had been mentioned, including that at Point Walter; but the matter had not yet been decided. The Government were anxious to carry out the separate system (so long advocated by the Surgeon Superintendent) in connection with the unfortunate patients in this institution. The proposed expenditure was intended to meet the present necessities of the Asylum, but he looked forward to the time when—

MR. SIMPSON: We may go there ourselves.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) did not care to joke about such a subject. What he looked forward to was the time when they would be able to improve the position of these unfortunates by placing them where they would have more cheerful surroundings than were possible at present.

MR. R. F. SHOLL thought the amount proposed to be expended was a large sum of money to spend on the present buildings, when they were actually on the look out for another site. He was glad the Government were considering the question of removing the asylum to some more suitable position. They had taken a long time to realise how unsuitable the present site was.

MR. SIMPSON, referring to the item "Perth Bonded Stores, additions £1,500," inquired whether it was the intention of the Government to erect a bonded store at the river side. The subject had been discussed by the Chamber of Commerce, and, at the request of that body, he now brought the matter forward. It was necessary, in order to fairly meet the requirements of the mercantile community, that there should be a bonded store at the river side. He believed such a store was urgently required, and he would be glad to learn whether the Government proposed to meet the wishes of the mercantile community in this matter.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied that the sum on the Estimates was intended only for the extension of the present bonded stores at the railway station. He really did not think there was any urgent necessity for a bonded store near the river, just at present, whatever might be the case in the future. They could hardly erect a store at the river side until it was decided where the wharves should be put

When the business of the city increased, it might be convenient to have a bonded store at the river side, but it was not required at present. The extension to the present stores was being made at the request of the Collector of Customs, for the storage of beer, spirits, and similar goods. The Government had no immediate intention of erecting a bond at the water side, but intended to increase the accommodation at the railway station; and this should meet all the requirements.

MR. SIMPSON said that a great quantity of goods were now brought to Perth by water, and all this had now to be carted to the railway station. It was practically a toll-bar against the river. The matter had received the consideration of the Chamber of Commerce, and the erection of the bonded store near the river had been agitated for by the leading members of the mercantile community. It was hardly likely all this would have occurred if the erection of the store at the spot indicated was not considered a matter of urgent importance. He regretted very much that the Government did not feel inclined to make any attempt at meeting what the mercantile community had shown was urgently needed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) really did not think there was such a great necessity for a bonded store near the river at the present time, or that they would be justified in erecting two bonded stores in Perth, if they were not both required. Fremantle only had one bonded store, and Perth did not require more just at present. A great quantity of the goods brought into Perth were cleared before they came up the river, and these had not to go into bond at all. The Government was quite prepared to consider the question of erecting a second bond when it was found that such a building was necessary; but, so far, such a necessity had not been shown. So far as the quantity of goods which were not cleared, and which were brought up the river, was concerned, he was given to understand it was very small; but, at the proper time, the Government would be only too glad to meet the wishes of the mercantile community.

MR. GEORGE asked whether the amount (£1,845) in connection with the stores, which appeared lower down in the Estimates, was an additional expenditure.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): It is only a recoup. That amount has already been spent.

MR. GEORGE did not think there was room in the Perth railway yards for the additions proposed to the Customs store. The yard was already too small for the requirements of the station.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied that the money was proposed to be spent to provide a special Customs shed. There was plenty of room on the present site for the further extension of the existing stores, if such a thing became necessary. The Customs Department had taken over the bonded stores on the railway premises at Bunbury, Bussellton, Geraldton and Perth, and was about to refund to the Railway Department the cost of the buildings referred to, amounting to £9,870.

MR. R. F. SHOLL did not see why this item should appear on the Estimates, as it was to be presumed that, when the buildings in question were erected, the money was only voted conditionally. This being so, it did not concern the House as to which department of the public service owned the premises. It was a small instance of railway economy for the department to get a recoup of the money from the Customs Department.

MR. MARMION said he admired the keenness with which the Railway Department looked after such little items, in order to swell its own revenue.

MR. LOTON, referring to the request of the hon. member for Geraldton that a bonded store should be established at the waterside, at Perth, said there was no doubt that a store on such a site would in some cases save the extra handling and cartage of goods, for which, of course, extra charges were made upon the consumer. At the same time, now that duties had been remitted on such things as kerosene and tea, which no longer had to go into bond, there was no absolute necessity for a bond at the water side at the present time. If a bond was needed, it should be left to private enterprise to erect it. Why, when there was plenty of private money awaiting sound investment, should the Government be asked to borrow more money, in order to do everything for the community? On sound security thousands of pounds could be borrowed at five or six per cent.; but not on tin shanties on the goldfields.

MR. SOLOMON said the reason why the merchants would not provide their own bond was that they were not allowed to bond other people's goods as well as their own.

MR. RANDELL said it had always struck

him that the bonded stores at Perth had been placed in the wrong position; that was to say on the wrong side of the railway line, so that drays and waggons were sometimes blocked while waiting for the line to be cleared. Now that the traffic was increasing, it was incumbent on the authorities to take precautions for expediting the traffic to and from the bond, and for the prevention of accidents. And the reason why the stores should be at the water side, instead of where they were now, was that near the river the summer temperature was always four or five degrees cooler than in the centre of the city.

MR. LEAKE, referring to Item No. 126 (Beverley Court-house, £1,000), asked whether it was necessary to have a new Court-house at that place.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) replied that owing to the great increase of settlement in the Beverley district, there was great demand for a Court-house in the town named.

MR. WOOD, referring to Item No. 128 (Geraldton Court-house and Public Offices, £5,000), said that a miscarriage of justice had recently taken place at Geraldton. A man sentenced by the local magistrate to three years' imprisonment, had, on the advice of the Attorney-General, been released, after he had been in gaol only two or three months, which clearly showed that the magistrates were wrong in treating him so severely. It would be better to take serious cases out of the hands of magistrates.

MR. LEAKE, referring to Item No. 129 (Newcastle Court-house, £1,000), moved that the item should be struck out, as he did not think it was necessary to build a new Court-house at Newcastle.

MR. CLARKSON said the building that was now used as a Court-house had been built as a convict dépôt, and it was now in a dangerously dilapidated condition. The Resident Magistrate said he feared every time he took his seat on the Bench that the roof would fall upon his head, as the frail structure was only held together by an iron pin; and, if it gave way, the building would come down.

MR. ILLINGWORTH complained that while the Government was willing to spend £1,000 on a new court-house at Newcastle—which was making no progress—lock-up accommodation was so short at Nannine that a prisoner, who possibly may only have indulged in a glass too much, had to be chained to a log, in

order to hold him for his appearance before the magistrate in the morning.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Look at Item No. 164—"Temporary Police Stations at Goldfields, including Nannine, Cue, and Mount Magnet, £3,000":

MR. SIMPSON, referring to the item, Newcastle Court-house, said that the latest example of the progress Newcastle was making was the closing of a Bank in the township. He thought it would be a sound investment for the Government to buy up Newcastle, and wipe it off the face of the earth, instead of saddling the country with the interest upon the cost of new public buildings.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that Newcastle was the centre of a very large and fertile agricultural district. A deputation had recently made out a good case for the erection of a court-house there, and the building was much required. The objection of the item came with an ill grace from the hon. member for Geraldton, for the latter place had enjoyed a very large expenditure of public money within the last two years.

MR. CLARKSON said the agricultural returns showed that Newcastle was the centre of the largest agricultural district in the colony.

MR. THROSSELL thought that Newcastle was entitled to a new court-house, as the building now used for that purpose was a most wretched one, almost in the last stage of decay.

MR. JAMES understood, from a recent speech delivered by the Premier, that he was in favor of the policy that the spoils should go to the victors; and, as the hon. member for Newcastle was a consistent supporter of the Government, he (Mr. James) supposed that this £1,000 on the Estimates was to be spent on a court-house for the town in accordance with that principle of the Premier's to which he had just alluded. On the other hand, there was no attempt to show that the business for which a court-house was required was increasing at Newcastle.

THE PREMIER: The place is tumbling down.

MR. JAMES had always been under the impression that, if Newcastle was not declining, it certainly was stagnant; and, if the district was growing as rapidly as has been represented, it appeared to be feeding other outlets than Newcastle. He believed that the public money should be spent when it was most required; and, on this principle, Perth was

not nearly well enough provided for. Perth was going ahead more than twice as fast as Newcastle, and had more than ten times the population of that place, yet Perth, which was not represented by a Ministerialist supporter, only appeared on the Estimates for £2,000 for improved Court-house accommodation.

THE PREMIER: What about Geraldton?

MR. CLARKSON regretted that the hon. member for East Perth should displace so much animus against Newcastle, which had never had a court-house, and stood badly in need of one.

Motion, to strike out the item, put and negatived.

MR. JAMES, referring to Item 130 ("Northam Court-house and Police Quarters, £2,200") remarked that the country was asked to be very liberal towards Northam, which last year had £1,000 for a court-house.

THE PREMIER: The £1,000 was not enough.

MR. R. F. SHOLL recommended that a central station should be provided for York and Northam. Now that there was railway communication, he was also in favor of one Resident Magistrate doing duty in both of those towns.

MR. LEAKE, referring to Item No. 131, "Supreme Court, Perth, £4,000," asked whether the site for the Court had been selected, and expressed the hope that the building would be placed on some quiet spot, beyond the noise of traffic in the streets. It would be well to have, not only all the Inferior Courts, but also the Police Court under the one roof. At present, the Police Court stood upon a site that was not only noisy, but was also very valuable; and there would be a saving of expense, and great convenience in the administration of justice, if all the courts were to be found in the one building. It was absolutely necessary to remove the Police Court to a quieter place, as it was almost impossible to be heard in that Court where it was now.

MR. A. FORREST regretted that so much money as £25,000 (of which the present item of £4,000 was only an instalment) was to be spent upon Law Courts, which would not return a penny of interest to the country, but would only encourage litigation by domiciling the lawyers in comfortable quarters. While the member for East Perth complained that the City did not get a fair share of the expenditure of public money, it would be found that the total sum provided on the Estimates

for public buildings in Perth this year amounted to £64,000.

MR. WOOD expressed an opinion that the site for the new Supreme Court buildings should not be the site upon which the present buildings stood; because all that land should be utilized for the extension of the Government Gardens. He was of opinion that either the site of the old Gaol, in Beaufort street, or that upon which the present Legislative Council buildings now stood, would be a suitable location for these Law Courts.

MR. ILLINGWORTH suggested that competitive designs should be called for the new buildings, and said he agreed that the new structures should not be placed anywhere near the site of the present Supreme Court-house.

MR. RANDELL said he was extremely pleased that the Government had at last proposed to erect new Supreme Court buildings. This being a national undertaking, he was of opinion that £25,000 was not too large a sum to expend on the erection of such buildings, although he trusted that amount would not be exceeded. He quite agreed with the hon. member for Albany in regard to what he had said as to the inconvenience caused by the uproar of the traffic in Barrack-street, when the police court was sitting; and he ventured to say that no alterations to the present building would surmount the difficulties which arose at present, owing to that noise.

MR. R. F. SHOLL thought everyone was agreed that new Supreme Court buildings were urgently required, and that the work of erecting them should be proceeded with as soon as possible. He doubted whether the work could be expeditiously carried on with only £4,000 for this year. That amount he thought, could only be intended to cover the preliminary expenses. He favored the idea that all the Law Courts should be located under one roof, but he was not prepared to suggest a site. With regard to the plans of the proposed buildings, he wished that the Government could have seen their way clear to have presented them to Parliament this session; and he suggested that the Government should, in the future, lay on the table of the House, the plans of any large public buildings which it was proposed to erect, in order that hon. members should have all the information available regarding them.

MR. CLARKSON said a suggested site for the new Supreme Court buildings had been pointed out to him in St. George's Terrace,

and it occurred to him that it was a very suitable one. He quite agreed that the present Supreme Court-house was a disgrace to the City of Perth. He also concurred with those hon. members who had suggested that all the Law Courts should be placed under one roof.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said it was the intention of the Government to erect Law Court buildings which would embrace all these buildings under one roof, with the exception of the Police Court. With that object in view, the Government had asked the Queensland Government for the loan of the designs upon which the Law Courts of that colony had been erected, as it had been pointed out to them that those buildings were well appointed, and were erected at a very moderate cost. Those plans would be carefully examined when they arrived, as to their suitability for the Law Courts of the colony; and hon. members could rest assured that the Attorney-General, (who took great interest in the matter) as well as himself, would not adopt them if they were found to be unsuitable. With regard to the site for the new Law Courts, he would strongly recommend his colleagues to utilise the land opposite to the Court Hotel, and adjacent to the present Museum. It was centrally situated, and was in many ways eminently suited for the purpose. There was also another site which had been suggested, and that was in St. George's Terrace, where the Government boys' school stood. But the exact location of the buildings had not been definitely fixed upon. He hoped that whatever site was chosen, it would not be that upon which the present Supreme Court-house stood, because he agreed that that land should eventually be used in extending the present Government Gardens. He could not agree with those hon. members who said that the present Supreme Court-house was a disgrace to the colony. It had served its purpose well when the colony was not so advanced as it was at present. With regard to the proposed additions and alterations to the present Police Court buildings, he might say that the Attorney-General quite approved of them. It was just possible that hon. members had over estimated the amount of noise caused by the traffic in Barrack-street, and the consequent inconvenience it caused. Hon. members surely knew that in London a similar, if not inferior, class of buildings was

used, while the noise from the street traffic was much greater in the world's metropolis than in the City of Perth.

MR. JAMES hoped the Government would select the site upon which the present Legislative Council buildings stood, in St. George's Terrace, as the site for the new Supreme Court Buildings, because, in his opinion, the site was the best that could be found for the purpose.

THE PREMIER: It will never do.

MR. JAMES asked if there was any reason, why the Government Gardens should not be extended to the water's edge, and the new Supreme Court buildings erected in the centre of the gardens? He considered that the suggested site, near the Museum, was by no means a suitable one, and he favored the idea of having all the Law Courts, including the Police Court, under one roof. He hailed the proposal to erect new Supreme Court buildings with pleasure; and, with regard to the proposed alterations to the present Police Court building, he suggested that the Police Magistrate should be allowed to see the designs before they were finally decided upon, in order to afford him an opportunity of making any suggestions for their improvement, if he thought it necessary to do so.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said the proposed alterations to the Police Court buildings had been already arranged, and the plans would be submitted to the Police Magistrate, as the hon. member for East Perth had suggested. The designs for the new court had been drawn on a most complete scale, and he believed they would answer all the purposes required. Two separate court rooms would be provided on the upper floor, in order to place them out of the reach of the noise caused by the street traffic. In addition to the two court rooms, ample accommodation for the Police Magistrate, justices, suitors, witnesses and the clerks, would be provided, and the whole structure would be of a very commodious character indeed. With regard to the noise caused by the street traffic, he considered that too much had been made of it altogether. His own office (as Attorney-General) was situated very near to the Police Court, and overlooking on to Barrack-street; and he had never been troubled by the noise which hon. members alleged was caused by the traffic. In London, both the Mansion House and Guildhall were situated in busy thoroughfares, amidst a din of

street traffic. He was opposed to the idea of having the Police Court under the same roof as the Supreme Court, for the simple reason that it was undesirable that the business of the Superior Court should be daily interfered with by the presence of the usual habitués of a Police Court.

MR. LEAKE moved to report progress.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the Government had, so far, this session, not objected to report progress at the usual hour (half past 10), but he really thought the business had now arrived at that stage when they should get along with it as expeditiously as possible. There was yet a great deal of work to be done, and he thought hon. members desired that the session should come to an end towards the end of October. He suggested that the Opposition should allow the Government to get on with the Estimates a little faster than they had been doing; for he must say there had been a lot of unnecessary discussion on some of the items.

Motion (to report progress) put and negatived.

MR. LEAKE, referring to the item "York Court-house, £2,700" questioned the necessity for erecting a new Court-house at York. He considered the present building would answer every purpose, and, therefore he moved to strike out the item.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the present court-house at York was altogether unsuitable for the present requirements of the district, and he hoped the hon. member would not press his proposal to strike out the item, because the Government had—in view of the House having voted £1,000 last year for the erection of this building—accepted a tender for the work.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said he rose to protest strongly against the Public Works Department, or any other department of the Government, expending money without the authority of Parliament.

Motion, to strike out the item, put and negatived.

MR. JAMES, referring to item "Reformatory for Girls, £2,000," asked if the proposed building was to be used for girls only, or for small children of both sexes?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said the building would be used as a reformatory for girls, as distinguished from an Industrial School. The site for the building had not been fixed.

Mr. LEAKE, referring to the item, "Lunatic Asylum, £5,000" (probable cost of work when completed, £30,000), asked the Director of Public Works to explain what the intentions of the Government were in regard to the erection of the new lunatic asylum.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said it was intended to start the erection of the building for the new asylum as soon after the passing of the vote as possible. The site had not yet been chosen, but, some time ago, he had a sketch plan drawn of a proposed asylum to be erected at Greenmount. In his opinion, the elevation of the building would depend largely upon the site that would be chosen, but, with regard to the interior arrangements, he would shortly be able to give hon. members the fullest information.

Mr. ILLINGWORTH strongly recommended the Government to consider the question of not locating lunacy patients at one particular place for treatment, but to treat them in different parts of the colony, where the climatic conditions, and the surroundings were most conducive to their recovery. That system had been tried in Victoria, and elsewhere, and had proved to be efficacious. He also pressed upon the attention of the Government the desirability of making a lunatic asylum a curative institution, and not a prison; and, with that object, he recommended the adoption of what was known as the cottage system, in preference to the generally condemned barrack system. He therefore hoped the Director of Public Works would, before deciding upon any scheme for the erection and arrangement of the proposed new lunatic asylum, obtain advice from skilled men, either on the Continent, or in England, or in America—in all of which places the treatment of lunatics had excited a great amount of interest.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he agreed entirely with what the hon. member for Nannine had said as to the barrack system being an undesirable system to adopt in the treatment of lunatics, and, having read up the subject—in which he took a great amount of interest—his inclinations were in favor of adopting the cottage system of treatment. The Government would secure the fullest information on the subject before taking any definite action.

Mr. LOTON, in view of the importance of

the question under discussion, and also in view of the absence of several hon. members who were interested in the subject, moved to report progress.

Motion put, and negatived on the voices.

A division being called for,

THE CHAIRMAN said he understood the wish of the Government was not to report progress.

Mr. JAMES: What has that to do with the voices?

THE PREMIER: Order!

Mr. SIMPSON: Is it for the Chairman or the Government to decide what is a majority of the voices?

THE CHAIRMAN: The decision is given on what is supposed to be the wish of the majority.

Mr. R. F. SHOLL: Then the decision is really given according to the wishes of the Treasury Benches.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, if they represent the wish of the majority.

Mr. SIMPSON: Might I ask what is the rule by which the majority of the House, on the voices, is ascertained? There was only one "No" uttered on the Ministerial side of the House.

THE CHAIRMAN: If hon. members so desire it, I will put the motion again.

Motion put and declared carried, on the voices.

Progress reported and leave given to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.55 o'clock, p.m.