

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 13th November, 1906.

Question: Federation Cost, etc.	PAGE 2811
Bills: Agricultural Bank, Com., returned with suggested amendments	2811
Municipal Corporations, Com. resumed, progress	2823

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: 1, Half-yearly Report of of Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners. 2, Return of passengers booked on Eastern Railway to stations beyond Parker's Road, asked for by the Hon. T. F. O. Brimage.

QUESTION—FEDERATION COST, Etc.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What has been the total cost of Federation to this State up to the present date, including the loss incurred by the five-years sliding scale in the Customs duties? 2, In the event of the Federal Government constructing the Transcontinental Railway, will this State be required to bear the whole cost of a broad-gauge line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie? 3, What is the estimated cost of a broad-gauge line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie, including rails and sleepers of the required weight? 4, Is this State bound by the promise made by a late Premier that this State would indemnify the other States from all loss on the working of the Transcontinental Railway for the first ten years after its completion?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, A return is being prepared which will take some time. 2, No undertaking has been given to the Commonwealth authorities with regard to the construction of a broad-gauge line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie, but under the terms of the Trans-Australian Railway Enabling Act 1903, this State has undertaken to commence the construction of a railway from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle on the same conditions as to gauge and

rails as those laid down by the Commonwealth Parliament with regard to any such line authorised to be constructed by that Parliament. 3, The estimated cost of line is £1,750,000. This would provide for a gauge of 4ft. 8½in.; the rails would be 80lbs. and the sleepers 10in. by 5in. 4, No; a conditional undertaking was given, guaranteeing the State of South Australia against financial loss during the first ten years of the working of the railway referred to. This Government is prepared to endorse such guarantee.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK.**CONSOLIDATION AND AMENDMENT.****IN COMMITTEE.**

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Term of office:

HON. J. M. DREW: Why should the managing trustee hold office during the Governor's pleasure, while the other two trustees held office merely for three years?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In the case of any public officer, the appointment was terminable at the Governor's pleasure, should the officer misconduct himself. The managing trustee devoted the whole of his time to the work, but the other trustees were to act merely as advisory trustees, and would not devote the whole of their time to the work. Therefore it was not desirable to appoint them for all time. Naturally if they proved a success and were still available at the end of three years, they would be reappointed. It was unusual to give a member of an advisory board a permanent appointment.

HON. J. M. DREW: They were permanent in South Australia.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the trustees were not a success, they need not be reappointed at the end of their term, and no fuss would arise.

HON. G. RANDELL: The other trustees should not hold office more than two years. It was provided in Clause 11 that two trustees should form a quorum at the meeting of the trustees; thus the two trustees could meet without the managing trustee, and they might do something to which the managing trustee or the Government would object. The

only alternative was for the Governor to suspend them. It would be better to limit the term to two years. He moved an amendment—

That in Subclause 2 the word "three" be struck out, and "two" inserted in lieu.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amendment should not be pressed. Three years was not a long term. Some of the members of Parliament were elected for three years; in fact, three years was the usual period for similar appointments. However, if the Committee thought it desirable that the term should be reduced, he would not offer serious objection.

HON. W. T. LOTON: The view taken by Mr. Randell was the correct one. As these trustees would probably undertake duties to which they were unaccustomed, one or other might not give satisfaction; and if the appointment were only for two years, the Government would be in a better position to make a fresh appointment. The Government might find a man more suitable, or the trustees might not be able to get on together. The term should be limited to two years.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 8, 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Remuneration of trustees:

HON. J. M. DREW: To whom would be entrusted the settlement of the amount the trustees would receive?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Governor-in-Council.

Clause passed.

Clause 11—Quorum:

HON. G. RANDELL: There was the point to which he had already referred, that two trustees other than the chairman might transact business at a meeting.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was not likely there would be such a meeting without the chairman. But on the other hand it might be inconvenient to stipulate in the Bill that the chairman must be one of the two members present; because the manager might be temporarily absent, and the other two trustees would then be unable to transact business. If the hon. member would agree to the clause, he would have it

looked into, and if necessary have it recommitted to see if an amendment could be drafted.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 15—agreed to.

Clause 16—Treasurer may issue mortgage bonds.

HON. J. M. DREW: Where would the funds used by the Agricultural Bank come from, and would security be offered to the persons or institutions supplying the money?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: This Bill provided that money could be borrowed from other sources, but up to now, and very likely it would be the case in the future, it had been obtained from the Savings Bank. The Treasurer, as trustee of the Savings Bank, lent to himself as Treasurer on behalf of the Agricultural Bank certain moneys, and he as Treasurer signed the bond to himself really as trustee for the bank. The Savings Bank Act which we had passed this session provided that moneys borrowed for this purpose were a charge on the consolidated revenue, and if there should be a loss made in the Agricultural Bank the depositors in the Savings Bank would not be the sufferers, but the consolidated revenue of the State.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What was the amount raised at present?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Speaking from memory, something under £400,000 up to the time when those figures which he had adduced were compiled. But an amount of five hundred and odd thousand pounds had been authorised, and he supposed the amount was now very close to the £600,000. This Bill would increase the capital to £1,000,000. There had been paid back seventy odd thousand pounds, but that was not let out again.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Would that go back to the Savings Bank?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

HON. J. M. DREW: The only point to which he wished to direct attention was whether the Treasurer controlling the Savings Bank could issue mortgage bonds to himself.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member wished to know whether it was legal or not?

HON. J. M. DREW: Yes.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was perfectly legal. He had asked the Crown Law authorities to look into the matter.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 17—Bonds, how issued, when payable, and rate of interest:

HON. G. RANDELL suggested that words in the second line should be transposed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The mortgage bond had to be registered at the Treasury, and also by the Auditor General.

HON. G. RANDELL: At the end of the clause appeared the words, "but no interest shall become payable on any bond after the due date for the payment of the principal." He would suggest the addition of the words "unless otherwise arranged."

HON. W. T. LOTON: The Government should not be liable to pay interest after the date on which the principal was due.

HON. G. RANDELL: As he read the clause a person would be compelled to take the money when the bond became due, or it would lie in the hands of the Government or in the Savings Bank and would not bear interest.

HON. W. T. LOTON: The Treasurer would have to provide money for payment of the principal, and to keep it in hand so that he could pay it when it was demanded.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 18—agreed to.

Clause 19—Where bonds and interest payable:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: When speaking on the second reading Mr. Randell drew attention to Clauses 23 and 24, urging that they should come before Clause 20. He (the Colonial Secretary) had asked the Parliamentary Draftsman to go into the matter, and the Parliamentary Draftsman thought perhaps it would be better not to alter the clauses in the way the hon. member suggested, but to alter the sequence of Clauses 19 to 25 inclusive.

THE CHAIRMAN: The sequence of the clauses could be altered without a formal motion, when the Bill was under consideration in another place.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY wished to have certain clauses re-numbered, and of course this would not alter the wording.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 20 to 27—agreed to.

MONEY ADVANCES, HOW TO BE MADE.

Clause 28—Bank may make advances to farmers and cultivators:

HON. G. RANDELL: In regard to paragraph (b.) of Sub-clause 1, he thought the Committee would like to know whether the bank could pay off a mortgage already existing on land.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; the trustees could discharge an existing mortgage, though they would not necessarily take up any mortgage offered them. A mortgage, like an improvement, would be subject to valuation.

HON. E. M. CLARKE objected to the clause. To allow the trustees to take up any mortgage was dangerous. Why should the Government relieve the lender, who might possibly be glad to get out?

HON. W. T. LOTON opposed the clause. The Government should reconsider Subclause 3, to which he moved an amendment—

That the words "three-fourths of" be inserted after "to," in line 2.

This would allow of advances to three-fourths of the full value of the improvements, instead of to the full value as proposed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: As well strike out the subclause. The Bill already gave power to advance up to 75 per cent., the maximum advance being £1,000, for ringbarking, fencing, clearing, or water conservation. The amendment would defeat the purpose of the Bill. In this State we had little Crown land cleared of timber and ready for the plough. Clearing needed considerable capital, and survey before selection was advocated by some to bring land within the reach of almost everybody, a certain proportion to be cleared and the cost of clearing added to the price per acre. The present Minister for Agriculture considered Subclause 3 a better provision.

Not more than £300 could be advanced against improvements. If men were engaged to clear the land on contract, they must be paid far more than the selector would receive from the bank for the same work, his improvements being conservatively valued by the trustees. After clearing and ringbarking he would receive enough money for fencing, and so on. The advance would be not according to the actual cost of the improvements, but to the sum for which they could be effected in the cheapest possible manner.

HON. W. T. LOTON: The Bill contained no such provision.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That provision applied to any improvements. The settler's statement of what the improvements cost would not be considered. The improvements mentioned in the clause did not deteriorate. For instance, as time went on ringbarking increased in value. Undoubtedly such lands would fetch their purchase price *plus* the value of the improvements.

HON. M. L. MOSS: While the Government deserved credit for facilitating land settlement, he could not support the subclause unless amended as proposed. Mr. Drew said a selector would pay a deposit of £6 5s. on a conditional purchase of 500 acres. By the subclause the selector might possibly be provided with work and paid its full value, £300, and might then throw up the selection, having paid the State only £6 5s. This was a new method of providing work for the unemployed. Would any of us do likewise in our private business?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: This was entirely different from private business.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Mr. Loton's amendment was liberal enough, for no financial institution would advance to 75 per cent. By the subclause the bank could advance more than the value of the security; for while £300 might legitimately be spent on improvements, that sum could not be realised in the market. We might go too far in the endeavour to settle the waste lands of the Crown. We must not encumber the Government with unmarketable securities. Up to date the Agricultural Bank had been an unqualified success, and he had always said that success, to a large extent, was dependent on Mr. Paterson,

who had had so much to do with the institution since its inception. It was doubtful if another Mr. Paterson could be found when it came for this officer to resign or if he were removed for some other cause. The managing trustee would always have the most responsibility placed on his shoulders.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: This was a new feature in the Bill, by which the Government desired to give first-help, to suitable settlers. Without doubt the manager would use his discretion in all cases. A man would have to pay a good many rents before he had carried out improvements to the extent of £300. This proposal had passed in another place, without opposition. The Government wished to assist settlers in their earliest stages. It was a disgrace to this State that we were importing so much foodstuff, and this was due to the want of settlers. So long as a man made the improvements, the Government had the security. If the ground was not suitable for farming, the settler would not have the advance made to him. The manager of the bank had always in the past insisted on the ground being suitable before an advance was made, and had also insisted that the man was suitable. If the man was considered desirable, help was given to him. This Bill enabled the State to give assistance instead of private institutions or individuals doing so. Help had been given by private individuals, and in nine cases out of ten good had resulted. The larger the holding, the better the security the Government would have, in all probability. The idea was a good one. Speaking as a business man, he had adopted the same principle, so long as he found the man was suitable. The amount which a person could borrow had been reduced from £1,000 to £500, and £300 was allowed to carry out improvements. Members seemed to be under the impression that every person who went to the bank would require £300, but that was not so. The Government would have the security of the estate, and if the holding was not being conducted satisfactorily, the man would not be able to obtain a farther advance. As to clearing land, the regulations would provide that a man would not be paid for clearing green timber.

HON. E. M. CLARKE: The Minister might have advanced money privately up the full value of improvements, but he had made the advance on land which was partly paid for. Would the member care to lend a man money on a bit of his own land on which no improvements had been effected? That was the position, for the land was the property of the Crown until it was paid for. A condition that was absolutely necessary was that there should be a ring fence, either so far advanced that it was bound to be completed, or that the ring fence should be there. He had known men go on land and spend a good round sum of money, and after they had done so he (Mr. Clarke) would not give anything like the amount that it had cost to effect the improvements for that land. While he deeply sympathised with agriculture in all its branches, we must use some discretion in this matter.

HON. J. W. THOMSON: Would it not be better if the subclause read that advances might be made to an amount not exceeding £300 to the full value of the improvements made, not proposed to be made?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Advances had always been made in advance of the improvements.

HON. J. W. THOMSON: Many things might be proposed, and not carried out. The proposal seemed rather dangerous. It would allow the trustees to make advances on work not actually done, but proposed to be done.

HON. J. M. DREW: This feature of the Bill was eminently undesirable, and he agreed with every objection raised against it by Mr. Moss. After a man had done certain improvements he would get £300. Perhaps that man would get a dozen companions to club together to get the land cleared, and then receive the £300 and clear out, leaving the burden on the Agricultural Bank. After a couple of years the security in the shape of improvements would have disappeared to a large extent. Some two or three years ago when there were many unemployed at Kalgoorlie and Boulder an experiment in this direction was tried by a previous Minister for Lands. He brought a fair number down and settled them at Hamel and Nangeenan. In both places they were paid the full value of clearing the

land. After the land had been cleared they had not a penny to go on with. The Government came to the rescue and lent them £350, and did not receive a farthing back. The same position would arise if we passed this proposal and the trustees were foolish enough to take advantage of it, which he scarcely thought they would do.

HON. F. CONNOR: The proposal was one with which he was in accord. Although we took a certain amount of risk, it would have the effect of getting people to settle on the land, which was the most important thing we had to consider at the present day. It would give people confidence to know that the Government had power to support their efforts to get upon the land. Until we had population sufficient for the great areas and great potentialities of this country we should at all times and at all costs be prepared to take risk. In Mr. Paterson, the manager of the Agricultural Bank, we had a man whom it would be hard to replace; indeed one did not know that we could replace him, and it would be a calamity to Western Australia if Mr. Paterson were not in charge of this institution. Whilst he was in charge of the institution it would be of benefit to the country, and he would not make mistakes. We wanted people to export grain, lambs, mutton, wool, pearlshell, and beef. We should export live stock. The question was whether this country was capable of producing and reproducing. If not, all this legislation was wrong. But he held that it was capable of doing so. There was the dairying industry, which he was sure the Government would take into consideration and help to develop. While agreeing with the caution expressed by Mr. Moss and Mr. Loton, he believed that we could not do too much, even if we took risks, to get people on the land.

HON. W. MALEY: It was pleasing to find an attempt being made by the Government to assist settlement. It was desirable to advance to the full value of improvements if it could be done without accepting any risk. There would be no risk if the bank advanced on improvements of the prescribed character if there were other improvements on the land not of the prescribed character, such as a dwelling house. At present the prices

for wheat were not boom prices; so it behoved the Government to be exceedingly cautious. A depreciation in the price of wheat naturally meant a depreciation in the bank's security. Unless there was other security on the land, as he had suggested, he must vote against the Minister.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER supported the amendment. It would be unwise to advance to the full value of the improvements. We should not have in view merely giving work to the unemployed. After securing cash for the value of the improvements the man might clear out, and the ground would probably be again covered with a growth, so it could not be let to another settler. Consequently the land would be thrown on the hands of the bank, and would get worse year after year.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: Farming did not now return the same profit. That was the weakness in advancing money on proposed improvements. The object of this provision was to help the small man and to give him a start; but when those on the land must look to an oversea market for their produce, how could the small man compete with the large cultivator employing labour-saving appliances? With thousands of small settlers it would be unwise to advance anything on proposed improvements. The bank had been well managed in the past, but advances were only made on improvements already effected, and in the past there had been good markets and high prices for the produce grown. The time was coming, however, when the security would not be sufficient. The Government should be more conservative than they had been in the past, because the supply of produce was reaching the demand and would shortly exceed it. He thought 75 per cent. was too much; in fact it should be 25 per cent. In our desire to settle the land we did not want people to go on the land and starve, and we did not want a lot of land thrown on the hands of the Government because the small settler could not cultivate to export. Probably in a few years all the money spent on improving the land now would need to be spent again to prepare it for new occupants. We were dealing with the people's money, and we

should regard it as if we were spending our own money.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: We must deal with this matter on different lines from suburban and city securities, but the proposal made in the clause to advance to the full value was a new one and no experience of any other country was brought forward to justify the departure. It was not necessary for us to make the Agricultural Bank more attractive. All the money we could furnish from the bank would be applied for under the present 75 per cent. margin. In the circumstances it would be unwise to depart from the present system. It was provided in Subclause (4) of Clause 28 that extra advances could only be advanced to 50 per cent. He supported the amendment.

HON. W. T. LOTON: We should in no way deter people taking up land with a view to permanent settlement; but this, according to the Minister, was to be the first-aid to new settlers. Advances were to be made on improvements that were yet to be effected. Advances would be made on new selections immediately they were taken up. The Government were attempting to lead people to go on the land without any resources behind them except perhaps their own labour, and without any practical experience of settling on the soil. The people the Government should induce to settle on the land were those who were likely to settle on it, and not a class of adventurers who were likely to throw up their land after a little while. The main reason why the manager of the bank had been so successful in the past was that he was precluded from lending beyond a certain margin, and he always kept within that margin, generally 50 to 60 per cent. Thus the bank had held good security, but if the trustees were to lend to the full value of proposed improvements on virgin land there would be no security but the settlers' labour. The Government would be dealing very liberally with any person desiring to settle on the land if they advanced three-fourths on the first improvement made. It was not desirable to encourage people to settle on the land unless they had some little resources behind them in the first instance. We wanted permanent settlement.

HON. J. M. DREW: From 1894 up to about five years ago only a small amount was lent annually; probably in the first year not more than £10,000; whereas in recent years the amount lent had been something like £100,000 a year. Therefore the bulk of the money had been lent during the last five years, and the time for the repayment of more than half the principal had not yet arrived, so we were not yet able to judge whether the administration of the bank was sound, although we might believe it to be so. He believed all possible precaution had been taken. He would suggest that after the word "improvements" the words "already made, or to three-fourths of the value of improvements proposed to be made," should appear.

HON. W. T. LORON did not think that alteration necessary.

HON. J. M. DREW: Land might be already improved, yet a person might, in order to obtain a loan, have to agree to make farther improvements which might not be necessary.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY: This subclause was possibly dangerous, but taking into consideration the fact that the trustees themselves had the valuations entirely in their own hands, it was immaterial whether three-fourths of the value of the improvements was advanced or the full amount. The whole thing hinged on the valuations. The amount to be advanced in regard to clearing would be discretionary with the trustees. He had every confidence in the present manager of the bank, Mr. Paterson, and felt sure that no undue advantage could be taken of this clause by men approaching him as to amounts for clearing their properties. In many instances it would doubtless be dangerous to advance to the full extent to some people who would approach the trustees; but on the other hand there were many deserving men to whom the trustees could, with every confidence, advance the full amount. If we helped the latter class of men we would at the same time be helping the country in the direction pointed out by Mr. Connor.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: Provided sufficient securities were given, he would approve of the subclause. It would be all right for a selector who had been some time on the land and had these

securities; but it would be cruelty to attract, under the subclause, men who would probably be altogether unsuitable for agricultural work, as such men would give a bad name to the country. They might be quite honest and honourable, but quite incompetent, and failure would be the result.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The Agricultural Bank to-day had a great safeguard inasmuch as all the loans the manager recommended must have the approval of the Governor-in-Council before the money was advanced. The original Act stipulated that an amount not exceeding half the fair estimated value of the improvements proposed should be advanced. This was a very great advance on that.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amount was 75 per cent. now.

HON. M. L. MOSS: In this Bill the approval of the Executive Council on top of the Ministerial recommendation was altogether eliminated. Under Clause 6 we were creating a body corporate. When once Parliament had voted the money, this body would have uncontrolled power of spending it. The continual delegation of these powers of government to these bodies corporate was not altogether a good thing. Opinions were much divided whether it was a good thing in connection with the railways. In connection with this bank, if it was intended to put someone over the head of Mr. Paterson and make Mr. Paterson subservient to a managing trustee, a very serious blunder would be made. Under Subclause 3 it would apparently be competent for these trustees to advance the full value of improvements before the improvements were made.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member should read Clause 29.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Trustees could do what he had said, although he did not suppose any capable trustee would act in the way the powers of this Bill would enable him to do. These advances might possibly be made before any work was done on the holding. We should treat settlers liberally if we made the maximum advance 75 per cent.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: Much would depend on the inspectors, who might often have difficulty in judging of the value, say of a clearing.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The system would be the same as obtained now.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: An inexperienced inspector would be easily taken in.

HON. R. LAURIE opposed the subclause. Many years ago in South Australia numbers of men were induced to take up land under a village settlement scheme, though the conditions were far less liberal than we proposed. After remaining perhaps two or three years on the land the settlers left, sadder and wiser men.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was a drought-stricken district.

HON. R. LAURIE: Nowadays a farmer who would succeed must know his business. Even our best agriculturists did not find it easy to compete with Eastern wheat producers. If we advanced to the full amount of the improvements, we should attract a class of settler without the necessary knowledge.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY was surprised at the attitude of certain members, especially farming representatives, who showed no faith in their own country.

HON. W. T. LORON: They knew more about it than the Minister.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then it must be bad country. Some of them knew little about this subject. Surely Mr. Drew, a former Minister for Lands, must have known it would be impossible for a settler, by paying £6 5s. as a half-year's rent on a 500-acre block, to obtain £300 from the bank.

HON. J. M. DREW had said the settler would be able to secure an assurance from the bank that he would eventually obtain £300 if he effected improvements to that value. He could then employ labourers to assist him.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There would be no assurance of that sort. When the settler had effected improvements to the value of £300, he would get £300. But the work one man could do in a year would not entitle him to more than £100 under the subclause, and he must pay £11 10s. to begin with, inclusive of survey fees. As against the £11 10s. the most he could get would be £50. At first sight the risk seemed unnecessary; but by Clause 42 the Gover-

nor might by regulation prescribe the mode of advance. This was a matter of valuation. Though fully alive to the good work of the present manager, whom he wished in no way to disparage, it was nonsense to say that all depended on the manager personally. A hundred men as good as the present manager could be secured to manage the bank. So far the manager had incurred only nominal losses, but the repayments had scarcely commenced. Out of £400,000 advanced the repayments were only £71,000. Greater men than the present manager passed away, and their places were filled up without trouble. Did those members who were bank directors consider a manager who never made a loss better than one who took some risk and, though he made small losses, showed large profits? It was questionable whether a manager of the Agricultural Bank who showed a loss of £5,000 and a gain of £10,000 would not be better than the present manager; for there must then be a large indirect gain to the State through the enormous increase in land settlement.

HON. G. RANDELL: The success of the bank depended on a manager.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: True, but not on any particular manager. The British Empire did not stand still on the death of a Gladstone. Surely anti-federalists would agree we must do everything possible to develop agriculture, one of our main resources, now that we had lost power to develop our manufactures. Mr. Moss asked whether any private institution would take these risks. A private bank was not comparable to the State, which benefited all round from every man who settled on the land, whereas the private institution benefited by the interest merely.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Whether the State would benefit by scattering money broadcast, and incurring losses, was doubtful.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Money would not be scattered broadcast. Members said a settler might clear and secure an advance on useless country. Well, the amendment would permit an advance of 75 per cent. on that country. All depended on the inspectors. The character of the borrower would be considered, as well as the quality of the land.

At 6:30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.
At 7:30, Chair resumed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (continuing): Captain Laurie had said that similar advances made in South Australia had proved a failure; but the hon. member forgot that the other States were subject to droughts, while we were not. That fact would be taken into consideration by the valuers. If a settler thought it wise to go east of a certain line of latitude into dry country and ringbark land there, the ringbarking would not be valued at anything because it would not be worth anything in such a district. In a wheat-growing district the ringbarking would be worth the money it had cost. Although advances were to be made on a liberal scale, the conditions were such that there was practically no risk. Mr. Moss took exception to the Bill creating a body corporate. He objected to the Government delegating their powers to bodies, but he did not hold this view when discussing the Harbour Trust Bill. We should do something to encourage the small settler. He (the Colonial Secretary) differed from Mr. Sholl, who said that this country was only fit for large agriculturists. He (the Colonial Secretary) maintained it was eminently suited for the small wheat-grower.

HON. R. F. SHOLL objected to the remarks of the Minister. It was a question of supply and demand. When the time arrived for exporting wheat or grain, the margin of profit being small, the agriculturist would have to cultivate largely with labour-saving machinery, therefore the small farmer could not produce for export.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That should not prevent us assisting the small settler. Mr. Maley had said that the Government should not advance money on land that had not a house upon it. No advances would be made on a house, so that a man must have enough money to build his house with.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The present Act provided for 75 cent. Why not advance somewhat and make it 90 per cent., to meet the small settler?

HON. W. T. LOTON did not wish to make an alteration in the direction indicated by the Colonial Secretary. The

Committee had gone as far as was desirable. He was as anxious as the hon. member or his colleague for us to have *bona fide* settlement; and he believed if the Bill were passed on the lines he advocated it would have a sounder effect than if we went the whole distance asked for by the Government.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	5

Majority for ... 7

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. H. Briggs	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. C. E. Dempster	Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. R. Laurie	Hon. T. F. O. Brimnge
Hon. W. T. Loton	(Teller).
Hon. W. Maley	
Hon. G. Randell	
Hon. R. F. Sholl	
Hon. J. A. Thomson	
Hon. J. W. Wright	
Hon. J. W. Langsford	
(Teller).	

Amendment thus passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 29 to 39—agreed to.

Clause 40—Audit:

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: The clause referred to the possibility of the Governor's calling in the services of an auditor besides the Auditor General. He understood that the Auditor General was the watchdog of all our public accounts. In no Act could he find this provision made. He would like to hear why it was made in this clause.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY knew of no particular reason why it was inserted. It might be a matter of convenience sometimes. As members knew, the Auditor General was assisted by perhaps a dozen inspectors, who went out into the country auditing public accounts, and these words might be taken to mean that an audit need not necessarily be made by the Auditor General himself.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It was difficult to get his services now.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It would be really impossible.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The office was congested.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY was not aware of that.

HON. J. W. HACKETT could assure the hon. gentleman it was so.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: This would be going outside the Auditor General's office.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No. The provision was inserted so that one of the audit inspectors could make an audit, if the Auditor General himself did not.

HON. R. F. SHOLL did not agree with that view.

HON. J. M. DREW: Apparently the Governor could say to the Auditor General, if this clause was passed, "You are not to audit these accounts at all; we have decided that another auditor shall audit them." The Government might not be satisfied with the report of the Auditor General, and might wish to call in an outside auditor. He did not know the object of the clause unless it was that it was to be an extra check on the bank.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Apparently the object of the clause was to give the Government power to appoint an auditor outside the Auditor General's office.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It might be necessary to do so.

HON. W. T. LOTON: The office of the Auditor General should be responsible for a proper audit of all Government accounts.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Auditor General would be auditing his own work.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Not at all. He had a staff of officials, and was responsible.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY drew attention to Clause 17, and also to the second schedule. Clause 17 provided that every mortgage bond should be registered in the Treasury and by the Auditor General, and the second schedule showed that the bond had to be registered by the Auditor General.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: That was only registered.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Presumably the clause was inserted in its present shape chiefly to make it clear that the audit need not necessarily be made by the Auditor General in person, and secondly because it might be found necessary to have the audit checked in regard to certain particulars. In other Acts exactly the same clause would be found. Even if the Government were to get some outside auditor to do the work, that outside auditor would

have exactly the same powers as the Auditor General.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: The schedule and Clause 17 were wise provisions, because the Auditor General kept a record in his office of any leases on which money was advanced. It was a wise check on the Treasury.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: The Auditor General should have nothing to do with the business of the bank, even to the extent of registering bonds. The clause evidently involved the calling in of an outside auditor; because if the Auditor General should not do the work, no one in the Auditor General's office should do it. We should amend the Bill to provide that the registration should take place in some other office. If we once admitted the principle of going outside our Auditor General, we would hardly know where we would get. The Savings Bank Act provided that the Auditor General should conduct an audit of the Savings Bank accounts every month. The Auditor General would not do it personally; someone in his office would do it. We should have something similar in this Bill.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: If we stated in the clause that the Auditor General should conduct the audit, it would be necessary for the Auditor General to do it individually. Therefore it was necessary to have the additional words mentioned in the clause.

HON. J. M. DREW: There was a similar provision in the principal Act:—"Every such mortgage bond shall be signed by the Treasurer, and shall be registered by the Treasurer and by the Auditor General." The fact of the Auditor General registering these mortgage bonds did not make him an interested party. The Treasurer issued the bonds, and the Auditor General registered them to keep a check on the Treasurer. It was wrong in contending that the keeping of this register disqualified the Auditor General from auditing the bank accounts, but if the Government thought it advisable to bring in an outside auditor they should not be debarred from doing so. He moved an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subclause 1 the word "or" be struck out and the words "and if the Governor should deem fit by" inserted in lieu.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Then there would be two audits.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the amendment were passed it would be a direct expression of want of confidence in the Auditor General, which would be extremely unfair to the officer. The clause as it stood was no reflection on the Auditor General. It was for the double purpose of calling in an outside auditor to audit that particular part of the land transactions in which the Auditor General had taken part, and to provide that the Auditor General should not do the work in person. With the amendment it would be compulsory to have the work done by the Auditor General and by another auditor.

HON. J. M. DREW: It was contended that the Auditor General was an interested party, and that it was advisable to have another auditor to audit the accounts.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It might be deemed necessary on that account.

HON. J. M. DREW: If so, some provision should be made. The amendment would not make it compulsory to have two audits. There would be no double audit unless the Governor thought it necessary. If the amendment were passed it gave the Governor power to say that the Auditor General should not audit the accounts. First of all the Auditor General should audit the accounts; then if there was some special reason for securing a special audit, the Government should have the power to have it done.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: It would be better if all the words after "Auditor General" were struck out, because the clause as printed gave power to the Government to create another audit department.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: The clause as printed was correct. If there was congested work in the Auditor General's Department, power was given to appoint another auditor to examine these accounts. It seemed that if the Minister suspected that the Auditor General was not carrying out his duties, he must call upon someone else to audit the accounts. The clause was all right as it stood.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: If we were to omit the words after "Auditor General" it would mean legally that the Auditor General would have to do the work personally. The other words were inserted

so that he need not necessarily audit. The Auditor General might consider it necessary to audit the books of the Agricultural Bank, but if he did not feel disposed to do it he could nominate someone else.

HON. J. M. DREW: The term "Auditor General" covered the whole of the department.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: That might be, but he held that if the words after "Auditor General" were omitted the Auditor General would himself have to audit the accounts.

HON. W. T. LOTON: If the staff of the Auditor General was not sufficient, it should be supplemented. Clause 17 and the second schedule referred to the bonds and not to the accounts. The Auditor General would have to audit the general accounts of the bank. He was the responsible officer, and why remove the responsibility from him? One audit department ought to be sufficient. Though not prepared to move the striking out of the latter part of the clause, he considered it would be better if that portion were omitted. Mr. Drew's amendment would mean a double audit.

HON. J. M. DREW: If the Government were to have a check on the Auditor General, and wished to retain the clause, the only possible amendment was one providing for a check on that officer; otherwise it would be worthless. If his amendment were not carried, he would be in favour of having all the words after "Auditor General" struck out and of throwing the whole responsibility on the Auditor General. The first responsibility should be on the Auditor General. If the Government wished to have some check on the Auditor General afterwards, he would not be opposed to giving them that power, although he did not see much necessity for it.

HON. R. LAURIE: In connection with the Fremantle Harbour Trust, not only did the report of the Auditor General come in, but also the report of the responsible officer under him who examined the accounts; and presumably the same course would be adopted in relation to this particular work. The clause would not mean that the Auditor General should personally do the auditing. It meant that the work would be

done by the Auditor General's Department. It would be a mistake to allow the Government to call in another body of auditors. That would perhaps be the first step in the direction of causing work of this character to be done by outside auditors rather than by the Auditor General's Department.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD called attention to Mr. Brimage's suggestion.

THE CHAIRMAN suggested that the amendment at present before the Committee be withdrawn, and that there should be an amendment that all the words after "General" be struck out and the following inserted: "and if the Governor should deem fit, by such other auditor as the Governor may appoint for the purpose."

HON. J. M. DREW was willing to withdraw his amendment for the time being.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE moved an amendment—

That all the words in Subclause 1 after "General" be struck out.

Presumably the Auditor General had power to increase his staff if necessary.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: The Auditor General could not increase his staff.

HON. J. W. THOMSON was still of opinion that if the words after "General" were struck out the subclause would mean that the Auditor General himself would have to do the auditing. He would like to hear what Dr. Hackett had to say on the point.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What one did by another he did by himself.

HON. J. W. THOMSON: If the words remained in, the Auditor General himself would name the person to be sent from his office to make the audit, and the Government would approve of the nomination.

HON. J. M. DREW reminded Mr. Thomson that by an amendment recently made in the Bread Bill certain persons were exempted who delivered bread to the Commissioner of Railways for transmission up country. Did the hon. member think the bread should be delivered to Mr. George personally?

Amendment negatived; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 41—Report to be laid before Parliament:

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The clause was unusually brief. It did not state when the report should be presented, nor that it should be accompanied by a statement of accounts.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The objection would be noted, but we could hardly fix a time. Mr. Drew had said on the second reading he would provide for the auditor's report being presented. This was his opportunity.

HON. J. M. DREW: The report should be accompanied by an audited half-yearly balance-sheet like that of a public company. He moved an amendment—

That the words "balance-sheet and" be inserted in line 1.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Former annual reports contained balance-sheets, though the bank was not like a company with capital, but made advances as moneys were supplied from the Treasury.

HON. J. M. DREW: The reports did not contain balance-sheets. The officers published certain figures to suit themselves. An audited balance-sheet should be issued showing the assets and liabilities of the bank, the amount lent on mortgage bonds, the total due by sundry debtors, and a profit and loss account. This could easily be done if the books were kept by double entry.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: Certainly we should have a balance-sheet as well as the report, and the balance-sheet should be published in the *Government Gazette* also, so that people outside Parliament might know how the bank was progressing.

Amendment put and passed.

HON. J. M. DREW moved a farther amendment—

That the words "together with the report of the auditor" be inserted after "report," in line 3.

Amendment passed.

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved a farther amendment—

That the words "as soon as possible" be inserted after "laid," in line 3.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 42—agreed to.

Schedules—agreed to.

Ordered : That the Bill be returned to the Legislative Assembly with the suggested amendments, and that the Committee have leave to sit again on receipt of a message from the Assembly.

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from the 8th November, the COLONIAL SECRETARY in charge of the Bill.

Clause 167—Meetings, chairman etc. of committees :

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved an amendment—

That Subclause 3 be struck out.

He had a farther amendment in Subclause 5. The effect of these amendments would be to retain the present law, and to repeat the decision which to some extent the Committee on several occasions had endorsed. The clause provided that at the first meeting of a committee one member should be appointed chairman and hold office during the municipal year, which meant that if the member appointed chairman died, or resigned, or left the country, he still remained chairman for the whole of the municipal year. A mistake of that kind necessitated a special Bill being brought forward some years ago. In regard to Subclause 5, exception was taken by some members that the mayor should be *ex officio* chairman of all committees. It was pointed out that this would be very inconvenient, and that there should be some elasticity in the appointment of the chairman; for one member of the committee might be specially qualified to be appointed, or the mayor might find his time taken up too much to act as chairman of all committees. In this State as in South Australia the mayor was elected by the whole body of rate-payers, and was *ex officio* chairman of all committees. He was informed of all the business transacted by the committees, kept them in line, was the ground of communication, and was the central authority as far as the committees were concerned.

Amendment put and passed.

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved a farther amendment that the following be added to Subclause 5 :—

—and shall be *ex officio* chairman, provided that at the first meeting of every such committee the mayor may decline the chairmanship for the municipal year, in which case, and in all cases of absence, another member of the committee shall be appointed chairman.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD supported the amendment, as it should be optional whether the mayor was to be chairman of all committees.

HON. R. LAURIE : From a knowledge of municipal work, he was satisfied it was absolutely essential that the mayor should not be chairman of every committee; but the amendment would pay the mayor the compliment of declining to be chairman. A majority of mayors no doubt would decline in favour of a member of the council, for the mayor had not such a thorough knowledge of the work of the committees as some members had. He supported the amendment.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 168 to 175—agreed to.

Clause 176—Purposes for which by-laws may be made :

HON. R. F. SHOLL : Subclause 16 enabled a council to make by-laws regulating the construction, use, and management of furnaces and chimneys; to prevent as far as possible the emission of smoke and prescribing the carrying out of structural alterations. That was a proper power to be given to a municipality, but there did not appear to be any provision for appeal. To alter a chimney might cost a lot of money, and a council might put an individual to great expense for no reason.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY did not think the provision would be likely to work hardship. There were cases in which municipalities had compelled the owners of sawmills to have their chimneys higher so as to carry the smoke over the town. That was why the words "structural alterations" were inserted. Bylaws were made and had the approval of the Governor-in-Council and the force of law unless they were *ultra vires*. A bylaw to regulate the chimneys would not be *ultra vires*. These bylaws were first of all submitted to the Crown law

officers to see if they were in accordance with the Act, and if so they generally received the approval of the Governor-in-Council unless there was some protest.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: The objection raised might be frivolous, and the result of a bit of spite. There should be a right of appeal.

Subclause 23—Markets :

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved an amendment that the following be added to the subclause :—

(c) For regulating market places and the buildings, stalls, pens, and standings therein, and for preventing nuisances or obstructions therein, or in the approaches thereto; (d) For fixing the day and the hours during each day on which the market shall be held; (e) For preventing the sale or exposure for sale of unwholesome provisions in the market; (f) For regulating the use of the weighing machines, and for preventing the use of false or defective weights, scales, or measures.

The object was to give farther power to make by-laws for the better regulation and control of markets.

Amendment put and passed.

Subclause 29—Park lands and reserves:

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Perhaps the Colonial Secretary would look into Subclause 29. This clause empowered a municipal council to make by-laws for the management and conservation of park lands and public reserves. The words were most uncompromising. He wished to know whether park lands and public reserves in municipalities under the charge of boards appointed under the Parks and Reserves Act were subject to the control, in all the respects set out, of the municipalities.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: A council would not be likely to make by-laws relating to a park over which it had no control. He thought the provision related to lands vested in councils. That was the intention. He would make a note of the point, and recommit the clause and have a provision inserted if necessary.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: Paragraph (l) related to powers to prescribe the fees to be charged the public for admission to any park lands and public reserves, the occasions when such fees should be payable, and to prohibit admission therein on such occasions. These parks were

set apart for the public benefit, and the public should not be charged for admission. The Colonial Secretary might consider this point when considering that raised by Dr. Hackett.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Presumably this provision did not apply to the public parks as a whole, but only to the parks and reserves vested in municipal councils. If it was necessary to insert an amendment to protect park lands Dr. Hackett had referred to, he would do so, and that amendment would cover this clause also.

HON. R. F. SHOLL: Where land had been handed over to a municipality by the Government for the benefit of the public, fees should not be charged, but the provision might apply where the municipality had purchased land such as was done in the case of Loton's Park.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the land was handed over to a municipal council in order to beautify it and perhaps turn it into a recreation ground, and the council spent money on a grandstand and other improvements, the council could reasonably make a charge for admission. The provision was, he believed, the same as in the present Act. If the clause as it stood would apply to general park lands, he would have it amended.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: In Clause 6, the interpretation clause, "public reserve" was stated to include park lands, squares, reserves, and other lands included in or adjoining any municipal district, and set apart for the use and enjoyment of the inhabitants of such municipal district.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It would mean any lands contained within the boundaries of a municipality.

HON. E. M. CLARKE: Municipalities frequently spent large sums for the improvement of recreation grounds, and he failed to see why they should not have power to charge for entrance when there were any sports on. He moved an amendment—

That the words "park lands and," in paragraph (l), be struck out.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The interpretation clause ("public reserve") said "vested in or under the care, control, or management of the council." The

lands must be absolutely vested in the council.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The controlling word was "included."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If so, an amendment would be necessary in the interpretation.

HON. R. LAURIE: Many town councils had gone to considerable expense in making ovals for public amusement, open at all times except on occasions when hired for football or other sports. The council then received perhaps 20 or 25 per cent. of the takings, and it was only right they should have power to charge for admission not only on ovals but parks vested in the council, if at any time required for purposes of such a character. It gave an opportunity of spending the money so charged in beautifying the grounds or paying interest on the sum expended.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The clause should remain as printed. If the councillors of a municipality treated the ratepayers harshly the ratepayers need not re-elect them.

Amendment put and negatived.

Subclause 31 verbally amended.

Subclause 33—Public property:

HON. J. W. HACKETT: This covered the case mentioned by Mr. Clarke. It would be better to have added the words "the control or management of which is vested in the council" to the subclause mentioned by the hon. member.

Subclause 36 was verbally amended by inserting "license fees" in lieu of "licenses."

Subclause 37 was verbally amended by inserting "stall holders" in lieu of "stalls."

Subclause 42—Streets and footpaths:

HON. G. RANDELL: Paragraph (g) provided for the removal, at the expense of the owner, of any verandah or balcony, whether erected before or after the commencement of the Act. It would be harsh to inflict this provision where the footpath had been extended beyond the original alignment. It was not necessary to move an amendment, because councils would hardly carry out the provision.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was necessary to give the power to order the removal of these verandahs if it

would not cost too much. Sometimes they might be dangerous and unsightly. We should let the provision stand in the Bill and trust to the councils not to abuse it.

Subclause 43—Structures of iron, zinc, or tin:

HON. G. RANDELL: This provided for coating with some white paint or whitewash all buildings and erections composed of or roofed wholly or in part with iron, zinc, tin, or wood, and occupied or used as dwellings, or workshops, or workrooms, or offices. This would apply almost to all modern houses. It was not desirable where there were tanks used at dwelling-houses for catching rain that a coating of white zinc should be put on the roof.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was always done on the goldfields.

HON. G. RANDELL: Where houses were ceiled or where they were two or three storeys it was not necessary. It was wrong to compel the use of some of these paints, because there was poison in them. It would be well to insert the words "where the rooms were not ceiled."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The subclause should only apply where dwellings were not ceiled. It was necessary in other cases to whitewash roofs to reduce the temperature. On the goldfields the temperature was reduced 10 degrees by a coating of arabic. If zinc paint were used it might affect the water, but the ordinary arabic did not do so on the goldfields.

HON. E. M. CLARKE: If councils enforced this provision they would be going beyond their duties. The next thing they would tell one was what colour he should paint his gate.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Workshops should be made as cool as possible for employees, but householders should not be compelled to paint the roofs of their houses. He moved that the words "dwellings or," in line 4, be struck out.

Amendment put and negatived.

HON. G. RANDELL moved an amendment:—

That after the word "dwellings," in line 4, the words "which are not ceiled or lined with wood or lath and plaster" be inserted.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 177—agreed to.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9:32 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 13th November, 1906.

	PAGE
Question: Phillips River Railway Project ...	2826
Bills: Roads and Streets Closure, 1a. ...	2826
Loan (£2,467,000), 1a. ...	2826
Federation Referendum, leave to introduce (opposed), debated, granted, 1a. ...	2826
Land Tax Assessment, Council's suggested amendments, debate as to procedure, conference proposal ...	2829
Annual Estimates: Mines Votes resumed, State Batteries etc., votes completed in extended sitting ...	2847
All-night Sitting on Mines Estimates ...	2855

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the TREASURER: 1, Report of University Endowment Trustees. 2, Report of Acclimatisation Committee for half-year.

By the PREMIER: Report of Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners for half-year.

QUESTION—PHILLIPS RIVER RAILWAY PROJECT.

MR. HOLMAN, without notice, asked the Premier: Will he place on the table a copy of the letter sent to England, and other correspondence, with reference to Mr Kaufman's statement about the proposed railway to Phillips River?

THE PREMIER replied: Yes.

BILLS—FIRST READING.

Roads and Streets Closure, introduced by the PREMIER.

Loan (£2,467,000), introduced by the TREASURER.

BILL—FEDERATION REFERENDUM.

AS TO WITHDRAWAL.

MR. F. MONGER (York) moved—

That leave be given to introduce a Bill.

MR. T. H. BATH (Brown Hill): I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, whether the motion by the member for York is in order? Standing order No. 387 provides:—

It shall not be competent for a private member to move the House into a Committee of Supply or of Ways and Means, nor into a Committee of the whole House, for imposing any tax, indent, or impost, nor shall it be competent for a private member in any such Committee to propose increases on the amounts proposed therein.

The hon. member will have to move the House into Committee, in continuation of his motion. I should like to refer also to a ruling of a Speaker of this House, Sir James Lee Steere, on the 29th November, 1900, on a motion by Mr. Vosper that provision be made on the Estimates for a vote for the encouragement of prospecting:—

The SPEAKER regretted that he had overlooked the wording of this motion, or he would not have allowed it to be moved in its present form, because it proposed a direct sum to be placed on the Estimates; and it was not in the power of a private member to bring forward such a motion as that.

I submit that this motion will involve the placing of a sum on the Estimates in order to carry out its purpose, and is therefore out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The observations of *May*, under the heading "Bills creating a Charge," are as follow:—

When the main object of a Bill is the creation of a public charge, resort must be had to this procedure before the Bill is introduced; and upon the report of the resolution of the Committee of the whole House thereon, the Bill is ordered to be brought in. If the charge created by a Bill is a subsidiary feature therein, resulting from the provisions it contains, the royal recommendation and preliminary Committee are not needed in the first