

anxious as the hon. member to have it disposed of.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: I would have been quite satisfied if the Minister had made a statement regarding the matter, and given the House some encouragement that there would be a reduction in the price of water at Bullfinch.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 11.9 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 2nd February, 1911.

	PAGE
Papers presented	3663, 3700
Questions: Education, Modern School	3663
Police district, Northern	3663
Bills: Health, Council's amendments	3663
Public Library: Museum, and Art Gallery of Western Australia, Council's amendments	3665
Transfer of Land Act Amendment, Council's amendments	3665
Loan, £2,100,000, 2s., Com., 3s.	3666
Appropriation, all stages	3679
Parliamentary Allowances, 2s., Com., 3s.	3679
Supply 1911-12, all stages	3686
Cemeteries Act Amendment, 2s., Com., 3s.	3687
Permanent Reserves Rededication, 2s., Com., 3s.	3688
Roman Catholic Church Property, 2s., Com., 3s.	3698
Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Amendment, 2s., Com., 3s.	3698
Fisheries Act Amendment, 2s., Com., 3s.	3698
Jury Act Amendment, 2s., Com., 3s.	3700
Fremantle Harbour Trust Act Amendment, 2s., Com., 3s.	3702
Game Act, Amendment, 2s., Com., 3s.	3706
Loan Estimates. General discussion concluded, votes discussed	3671
Coronation ceremonies, the Premier's invitation	3677
Supplementary Estimates	3679
Bills returned from the Council	3698

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Mines: Report on investigations into the composition of the gases caused by blasting in mines.

QUESTION—EDUCATION, MODERN SCHOOL.

Mr. PRICE asked the Minister for Education,—1, Is the construction of the Modern School sufficiently advanced to allow of intending scholars receiving proper tuition therein during the first term? 2, Is it a fact that Mr. Brown, when receiving scholars on the opening day, notified them that it will be fully three months before the school is in proper working order? 3, If so will steps be taken to provide that scholars shall receive further tuition in a subsequent term so as to compensate for any lost time?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Yes. 2, No. 3, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—POLICE DISTRICT, NORTHERN.

Mr. HEITMANN (without notice) asked the Premier: Has he yet received information concerning the postponed questions asked by myself in reference to the expenses of Sub-Inspector Sellenger?

The PREMIER replied: I furnished a reply to the two postponed questions two days ago.

Mr. Heitmann: I was not aware of that.

BILL—HEALTH.

Council's Amendments.

Consideration resumed from the previous day on postponed requested amendments.

Mr. Taylor in the Chair; the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

No. 52.—Clause 229.—Strike out this clause.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: When originally the Bill was before the Chamber the member for North Fremantle had succeeded in inserting a clause providing for exemptions from vaccination. This clause had been struck out in another place, and he proposed to ask the Chamber to agree to the striking out of the clause. He had discussed this matter with the member for North Fremantle and it had been agreed between them that the matter had been sufficiently debated

by members on both sides, and that in consequence there would be no occasion to go into a long discussion upon it. He would simply ask the Committee to accept the amendment. At some future date we might be in a position to give better consideration to this matter than we could just now. It would be unwise to insist upon retaining the clause. He moved—

That the amendment be made.

Mr. BOLTON: As the Minister had said, an understanding had been come to between them that it was unnecessary to go into this matter at any length. Briefly, the points which he wished to put before the Committee were that the clause had five times passed the Assembly in one or another form, and had been three times sent to another place. The Constitution provided for deadlocks, and seeing that this matter had been sent to another place three times he thought the members of the Assembly had a right to insist upon its acceptance. Three times the clause had been carried in the Assembly without division, and the greatest number that had voted against the clause was 13. He had reason to believe that if we now carried it for the sixth time it would be accepted in another place; in fact, he had an assurance to that effect.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	21

Majority against .. 7

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Monger
Mr. Daglish	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. George	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Harper	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Layman
Mr. Male	(Teller).
Mr. Mitchell	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Horan
Mr. Bath	Mr. Hudson
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Carson	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Collier	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Davies	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gourley	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Holman	(Teller).

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 54—Clause 248, insert a new subclause to stand as Subclause 3 as follows:—"If a local authority refuses or neglects to enter into an agreement with the board or managing authority of a hospital when required so to do by the Commissioner under Subsection one of this section, the Commissioner may in the name and on behalf of the local authority, enter into an agreement with the board or managing authority of such hospital, and the agreement when made shall, to all intents and purposes, be as binding upon the local authority as if it had been duly made by the local authority."

No. 55—Clause 250, Subclause 2, add at the end, "Or in the absence of agreement as may be determined by the Minister." Insert a new subclause to stand as Subclause 3:—"The amount of such contribution shall be a debt due from the local authorities to the Colonial Treasurer, and in default of payment may be recovered by action in any court of competent jurisdiction."

The MINISTER FOR MINES: These two amendments could be taken together; they provided machinery by which local authorities entered into agreements with hospitals, and for enforcing payments from one board to another. Ample power was given for making agreements and arrangements between local authorities and hospitals, but there was no power without this subclause to compel an outside local authority to recoup the board in whose district a hospital was situated. He moved—

That the amendment be made.

Mr. ANGWIN: The Committee should adhere to its former decision. The amendment was merely inserted in another place to relieve the Government of the cost of maintaining infectious cases. It was understood when the Assembly decided on this point previously that clauses would be drafted in accordance with the decision, but unfortunately words had crept in that did not have this effect. He did not object to this now, but he objected to giving power to enforce those words. The

Government should maintain these infectious cases.

The Minister for Mines: There must be some provision by which agreements could be arrived at. The amendment was necessary.

Mr. ANGWIN: When the Assembly dealt with the question of finance it was wrong for the Minister to force a clause into the Bill in another place contrary to the decision of the Assembly on a financial question.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	22

Majority against .. 3

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Monger
Mr. George	Sir N. J. Moore
Mr. Gregory	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Harper	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Jacoby	M. F. Wilson
Mr. Layman	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Male	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Hudson
Mr. Balf	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Carson	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Collier	Mr. Price
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Davies	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gill	Mr. Walker
Mr. Gourley	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Heltmann	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Holman	(Teller).
Mr. Horan	

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment not made.

No. 78 (consequential on No. 52) not made.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and the Bill accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

BILL—PUBLIC LIBRARY, MUSEUM, AND ART GALLERY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Council's Amendments.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with four amendments, which were now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Taylor in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

On motion by the PREMIER, Nos. 1 and 2 agreed to.

No. 3.—Clause 12, line 1, strike out "seven" and insert "six" in lieu.

The PREMIER: When this clause left the Legislative Assembly it provided that seven should constitute a quorum. The Legislative Council had reduced the number to six. He moved—

That the Council's amendment be agreed to.

Mr. BOLTON: When the Bill was previously before the Legislative Assembly he was responsible for increasing the quorum from five to seven. Since then he had had a conversation with Sir Winthrop Hackett and one or two others who were at present administering these institutions, and an assurance had been given him that while it would often be difficult to get seven members to attend a meeting it would be possible to get six. He intended to offer no opposition to the amendment.

Question passed: the Council's amendment agreed to.

On motion by the PREMIER the Council's No. 4 agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—TRANSFER OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's amendment.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment which was now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Taylor in the Chair; the Attorney General in Charge of the Bill.

Clause 2, after the word "holder" in line three insert "for the time being."

On motion by the ATTORNEY GENERAL the Council's amendment was agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—LOAN, £2,100,000.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. TROY (Mt. Magnet): The expenditure provided in the Loan Bill is generally allocated for the purpose of constructing railways, and more particularly for the construction of those railways passed in a previous session but which up to date have not been built, and railways which have been passed during the current session. It is to this expenditure and to these works that I want to apply the few remarks that I intend to make. I find that this session we have passed a larger number of agricultural railway Bills than we have ever done before, and as these Bills were not introduced until the very end of the session members were not given sufficient time to make the fullest inquiry regarding the justification for the expenditure on these works. We know perfectly well that the statements made by the Premier and the Minister for Works and others, if submitted to an investigation would have been found to have been not entirely correct. In fact I am satisfied that the Premier's speech on the Wongan Hills-Mullewa Railway was not altogether correct, and that many of his statements were not justified. Moreover I am satisfied that if the select committee which I asked for had been appointed it would be found that the Premier was wide of the mark in regard to many of his statements.

The Premier: You do not want it, then?

Mr. TROY: I ask the Premier not to put into my mouth words I do not want to utter, and words which do not convey my opinions or intentions. I gave my views in regard to this railway when it was before the House, and those views stand. Whilst the Premier would have this House believe that the railway would be proceeded with at once, and whilst he opposed the appointment of a select committee on the score that it would retard the construction of the railway, I find to-day that only £15,000 is provided on these Loan Estimates for the construction of that line, whereas the railway itself is to cost not less than £325,000. After all, what justification

did the Premier have for opposing the appointment of a select committee, particularly on the ground that he was anxious to get on with the construction of this line at once, when only a paltry £15,000 out of a total of £325,000 is allocated?

The Premier: Well, what do you want?

Mr. TROY: If the Premier was sincere in regard to the urgency of constructing this railway he would have put not £15,000 but £200,000 on the Estimates, and then he would have been £100,000 below the sum requisite to build the line. As I pointed out previously, many of these railways are merely an electioneering device so that the Premier and his colleagues may go into the country and claim to have brought forward all these new lines. If £15,000 only was to be provided annually for this Wongan Hills-Mullewa line it would take 20 years to build the railway. Bearing in mind that the Government are not sincere in regard to the urgency of building this railway, the interests of the people would have been better served if the Premier had agreed to a select committee. The committee could have made the fullest inquiries and the construction would not have been retarded any more than with this paltry £15,000 on the Loan Bill.

Mr. Scaddan: That is for 1912.

Mr. TROY: I find that I have been giving the Government credit for more than they deserve. The £15,000 is for next year, and not a solitary penny is for this year; yet we have the Premier going about the country boasting of the intentions of the Government regarding public works expenditure. Then, in regard to the Wickepin railway I find that £241,000 is the total amount required, and only £138,000 is allocated; for the Wagin-Dumbleyung line £36,000 is required and £14,000 allocated; Dwellingup-Hotham, £43,000 is required and £16,000 allocated; and Katanning-Nampup, £62,000 is required and only £18,000 allocated. Anyone looking at those figures must recognise that the Government have passed these Bills in order to mislead the country in regard to their intentions, and

so that they may go before the country and pose as a vigorous Ministry. These figures will give the lie direct to any assertion of that kind. I find that there is an amount of £5,000 on these Estimates for the Lawlers railway, but there is not the slightest explanation as to how this money is to be expended. Seeing that the construction of that line is an urgent matter, and one in which many people are interested, I hope that the Premier will tell us something about the expenditure of this £5,000. The line itself will cost not less than £130,000, and although no Bill has been introduced £5,000 is down on the Estimates to be expended in some way or other. Are the Government sincere in regard to the construction of this railway?

The Premier: There is nothing in the Estimates or in the Loan Bill.

Mr. TROY: There is a sum of £5,000.

The Premier: That is only an unexpended balance from last year's Loan Bill, I think.

Mr. TROY: What are the intentions of the Government in regard to this railway? Is it to be constructed from Sandstone or from Leonora?

The Premier: It is being inquired into.

Mr. TROY: It has been inquired into for the last three years. During all that time the member for Leonora has been receiving replies that the project is being inquired into. Report after report was to have been received, but still nothing is done, and the Premier says that the matter is being further inquired into. Unless the Government are imbued with a spirit of "mark time" it is time that something definite was done in regard to this line. Have the Government not the courage of their convictions one way or another? Recently a report was received from the Government Geologist in regard to the auriferous possibilities of the country between Sandstone and Lawlers, and I want to know from the Premier if that report has influenced the Government in regard to the routes. A great many people in this country are extremely doubtful regarding the sincerity of the Government on this question, and it is a

fair thing that they should receive some enlightenment. I have already pointed out that the railway should only have one possible point of connection with the main system, and that is at Sandstone, because then it will give Geraldton and the northern districts direct communication with that country, and the trade will go to the port which is geographically entitled to it. We ought to build a railway for all time and not to serve for only a few years, and the best interests of the country would be served by determining now to continue the railway from Sandstone to Leonora, and so link up the Eastern Goldfields with the Murchison. I hope that before the debate concludes the Attorney General and the member for Geraldton, both of whom represent portions of the northern districts, will say something in regard to this line and demand from the Government a pledge for its construction. No man taking a broad-minded view of the matter will dispute the right of Geraldton to the trade of the Murchison fields. There may be some members who, for one reason or another, have to consider parochial interests, but even they will realise that if there is one way to develop a country better than another it is the policy of giving to each port the trade which geographically belongs to it. The Premier made a few remarks in regard to the preparations which the Government are making in view of the probable early construction of the Transcontinental railway. The preparation they are making is the purchase of some property in the vicinity of the Perth railway station, so that the station may be enlarged and other facilities provided for a larger service. But there is one other matter in regard to this work which might receive the early attention of the Government, and that is the matter of a uniform gauge. It is surprising that the Government have not given some hint of their intention to the Federal Government long ago. The Minister for Home Affairs and the Prime Minister have referred to the fact that there must be a standard

gauge for all railways throughout Australia, and that we cannot link up the various States effectively unless we have one gauge. At the present time every State has a distinct gauge, and that is to be an obstacle to any railway propositions such as the two Transcontinental lines. The Prime Minister has frequently stated that he would like to hear the views of the States in regard to the widening of the gauge, particularly in Western Australia. What do the Government intend to do? Do they intend to widen the gauge between Perth and Kalgoorlie in order to allow the Transcontinental train to come right through from Adelaide to Perth? The system is not going to give satisfaction if we are to have a changing station at Kalgoorlie; the trains must come right through. I know that that will mean a considerable expenditure, but it is expenditure that will be justified and endorsed by the people of this State. As regards this railway the Premier need have no doubts. Yesterday in speaking on the Loan Bill he said that he had his doubts regarding the sincerity of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Foulkes: I do not think he said that.

The Premier: I certainly stated nothing of the sort.

Mr. TROY: The Premier said something that was almost akin to that expression, but we on this side of the House have no doubt regarding the intentions of the Federal Government. We know that for 10 years certain politicians who were supposed to be the sole representatives of Western Australia, have talked about this railway, but beyond talking about it, they have done absolutely nothing to bring about its early construction. It has remained for the Federal Labour Government, who have the largest following that any Government possesses in Australia, to bring this construction within immediate possibility, and I have no doubt that within the next few years the construction of the Transcontinental railway will be well under way. I have not the slightest doubt about that. Mr. Fowler, the member for Perth, said that all parties in the Federal Parliament are

opposed to it. It is very kind of Mr. Fowler to remind us of that, but it was not until the Federal Government came into power that any party was bound to it. To-day there is a two-thirds majority in the Federal Parliament composed of men sufficiently broad-minded, and who are sufficiently sound nationalists, to vote for the construction of the railway. The Government do not want the help of Mr. Fowler, or Sir John Forrest, or Mr. Hedges, but the Federal Government will build the railway because they are the only party in the Federal Parliament who have ever been sincere in regard to it. The Federal Government have an absolute majority, and they will build the railway to Western Australia. Sir John Forrest was 10 years in the Federal Parliament doing nothing, and Mr. Fowler has been there for a number of years, and for 10 or 12 years the result has been nil. Everything done in connection with the Transcontinental railway, the survey, the security of the assent of the South Australian Government, has been carried out by the Federal Labour party. The Watson Government carried out the survey, and it was the Federal Labour party that stumped South Australia and gained the assent of the South Australian Government to the railway, and it is the Federal Labour party to-day who will build the railway to Western Australia. The Premier in talking the other day said the Government had been active. During the time the Premier was acting head of the Government, he said it was the intention of the Government to build the railway themselves. The Premier had no intention, not the slightest, in regard to the construction of the line. It was merely a bit of bravado, a bit of advertising. A strong man was going to build the railway all by himself! I told the Premier myself, "You are not sincere," and the Premier was not sincere, and he will admit that to-day? We have not sufficient money to build railways urgently needed in farming and in mining districts. I am glad to say that this great work will be left to the Federal Government because they are sincere in regard to it.

Mr. Monger: Since when?

Mr. TROY: Since the last election, because the majority in power until the last election were composed of men like Sir John Forrest, and he was never sincere in regard to it.

Mr. Monger: That is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. TROY: While on the question of railways, I want to ask the Government what is their proposal in regard to the building of the new station at Geraldton. I have seen no reference to it, neither to the construction of the locomotive sheds at Geraldton. I believe it has been recommended by the engineers to change the railway station site at Geraldton to a new site occupied by the loco. sheds. I believe that will commit the Government to a large expenditure of money. I have not heard any reference to it, but I read in the Geraldton newspapers that the Geraldton people are very anxious in regard to it. I would like to know what the intentions of the Government are. The port of Geraldton is growing; the trade is growing every year, and, if the Government are sincere in their intention, they will get to work as soon as possible and build a new railway station and new loco. sheds for the district. It is the intention of the Government likewise to spend a large amount of money on the completion of this (Parliamentary) building. Before any money can be expended on the completion of the building, I would recommend the Minister for Works to instruct his engineers to investigate the work already carried out in the building. Wherever one goes about the building, and I believe it was a contract job, one can find the building falling to pieces. Huge crevices are to be found in the library; in fact the whole building is falling to pieces; one would imagine that it had been erected 50 years ago so badly has it been constructed. I am inclined to think, before any money is expended on the completion of this building, our first purpose should be to repair the building we have erected, for I say the building is a disgrace and reflects no credit on the Government, or the Ministry who were responsible for it. If members go into the library they will find some of the

pillars falling down. There is a gap in the ceiling, and it is very dangerous in many portions of the library. It is time the attention of the Minister was called to it. I think the Minister's attention should be called to it; every member knows about it. Before any money is expended on the completion of the building, a large amount should be spent in repairs. I am opposed to the allocation of money which it is suggested should be spent on this building. The building, such as it is, serves all the purposes.

Mr. Scaddan: If we are going to meet in summer, we shall need to do something to the rooms occupied by *Hansard*.

Mr. TROY: I know; but to fulfil the intentions of the designer is something that is not required at the present time. The money is more urgently required to build up the industries of the State—the farming and the mining industries. We should build railways and provide roads for the farmers of the State, for there are many who are 15 and 20 miles from a railway, and will be for years, and the sooner we see the money expended in giving them further accommodation the better. The Premier states that this building is a bad advertisement. I do not consider it an advertisement to make a fine front door and leave the back premises in a bad state. It is not a good advertisement; it is not sound. The country cannot be judged by the Parliament House, or by the fine buildings in the towns, but by the prosperity of the country generally, and we shall ensure that prosperity by building up the industries. When we have built up the industries and the country is prosperous, we can spend our surplus money on the Parliament House. It is a bad policy to borrow money for the completion of this building. It cannot be called a reproductive work in any sense of the term, therefore I oppose the expenditure. That is all I wish to say about the Loan Bill. Generally I endorse the policy of building railways, but I condemn the policy of introducing a large sheaf of railways when there is no evidence of the Government's determination to build those railways for many years to come.

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill): The only matter to which I desire to address myself in regard to the Loan Bill is in reference to an item which has already been dealt with by hon. members discussing this measure, and that is in reference to the attitude of the Government in regard to the Transcontinental railway. Some time ago, I think during the tenure of Sir Walter James as Premier of the State, a promise was given that if the Transcontinental railway was constructed the West Australian people would be responsible for the widening of the gauge between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie, and in view of the fact that provision has already been made for the survey, and the preparation of the necessary plans, and we have the distinct assurance of the Federal members, and the Federal Cabinet, that a measure providing for the construction of the railway would be amongst the first Bills dealt with in the next session of the Federal Parliament, it is time that we had some intimation and information from the Government as to their intentions in regard to the section between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie. This is a problem that is not going to be dealt with within a week or two, or a month or two, and this House is entitled to some detailed statement by the Premier in regard to the proposals of the Government for the widening of the gauge. There is something to be considered in addition to the mere question of making it into a 4ft. 8½in. railway between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie, because we have to consider there are spur lines running out from that system, and in Western Australia we are going to be in a very big mess indeed if the gauge is widened to 4ft. 8½in. with the spur lines running out with a gauge of 3ft. 6in. It will mean that all these railways will be dead ends, and it will be only possible for them to run to the junction of the spur railways with the Transcontinental railway, and unless time is taken by the forelock and those responsible for the administration of the railways and the construction of them give the Parliament and the people some idea of their intention, it will be impossible for us to evade a deadlock and big difficulties when the occasion arises, to extend our

system between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie in order to link up with the Commonwealth project. It seems to me we ought to receive the information as to the probable cost, the expense that will be involved in regard to the spur railways of Western Australia, and the people ought to be given an opportunity of forming some idea as to whether it is desirable to widen the gauge of the present railway between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie, or whether it would not be a better policy to lay down the Transcontinental section between these two places independent of the existing railway. That would mean, although the expense of construction would be higher as far as that railway is concerned we would undoubtedly avoid the difficulty in regard to the spur railways which join the line between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie. I did not hear the Premier's remarks in reply to the question of the leader of the Opposition, but I hope he will take the House into his confidence and give members more information on the matter than he has vouchsafed up to the present time. It is essentially a matter of urgency. It cannot be prepared for just at the time when the Bill is introduced in the Federal Parliament, or when the construction is commenced. It is a matter we ought to have information on now, a matter in regard to which Parliament and the people should be made acquainted with the Government's intentions.

The PREMIER (in reply): I think the hon. member who has just spoken might have given me some reasonable notice of a question of so important a nature as that dealing with the Transcontinental railway.

Mr. Bath: The notice ought not to be necessary.

The PREMIER: It ought to be necessary. The hon. member expects me to get up at a moment's notice and give him full details as to how the Government propose to carry a broad-gauge railway from Fremantle to the border of South Australia. He is asking too much on the spur of the moment.

Mr. Bath: The information ought to be in hand.

The PREMIER: It is not in hand. I told the House we were making provision to carry a broad-gauge line into the Perth central station in connection with certain land resumption; beyond that I am not prepared to go. When the Federal Government are ready to construct the broad-gauge railway to Kalgoorlie, which I presume they have accepted—I do not know that they have accepted it; South Australia, I am told, wanted a 3ft. 6in. gauge—but when the Federal Government are prepared to carry their railway to Kalgoorlie we shall be, if necessary, prepared to couple-up with a 4ft. 8½in. gauge from Fremantle.

Mr. Bath: Is it going to be an independent line?

The PREMIER: I could not tell the hon. member. That is a matter for the engineers to determine. We are now having a report obtained, at least, we shall have a report in a few months, as to the whole system of the proposed South Swan railway. That will also have to include arrangements for the carrying of the Transcontinental railway to Fremantle, and when that is under consideration the other question also will have to be considered. The engineers will advise as to whether an independent line is best in the event of the Transcontinental railway coming into Kalgoorlie on a broad gauge. I can assure the hon. member we shall not be backward when the Federal Government is forward with the work.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

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

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

LOAN ESTIMATES, 1910-11.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the previous day; Mr. Taylor in the Chair.

Vote—Departmental, £88,224:

Mr. PRICE: It was not his intention to deal with any particular items, because he thought the business could be

better be expedited by dealing generally with the Estimates, and allowing the items to pass without comment. There was a large increase proposed to be made in connection with certain expenditure in these Estimates. When dealing with the Revenue Estimates he had pointed to the expenditure from Loan on agricultural surveys. Whilst there might be a certain amount of justification for the expenditure of a small sum in this way, he thought the Government were inclined to go too far. A large area of land was being surveyed at the present time which it was well known would never be taken up, for the reason that it was useless. There might be no reasonable objection to surveying first and second class land from Loan.

The Premier: The money is collected and refunded, you know.

Mr. PRICE: That was the point. Provided the land was taken up there could be no objection; but when we found surveyors surveying a huge block of country without regard to its varying qualities, it was clear that many of the surveyed blocks would never be taken up.

The Premier: Very few of them are not taken up.

Mr. PRICE: Did the Premier suggest the whole of the land in the South and South-Western divisions could be profitably cultivated?

The Premier: Ninety per cent. of the surveyed lands will be taken up.

Mr. PRICE: That left 10 per cent. which should never have been surveyed. There should be some check upon the present system. Contract surveyors were sent out, and, of course, it was to their interest to continue running the line without a break, irrespective of the quality of the land passed over. And there was another phase of the question: much of the surveying was being done in country where the survey line would be absolutely lost within two years' time, owing to the prolific scrub and undergrowth. The object of the Government was certainly a commendable one if they protected the funds of the State by preventing the survey of land which undoubtedly was of such a character that it would not

be taken up. He had always supported the Government in their immigration policy, but there came a time when it was well to consider whether that policy was being carried out as it should be carried out, and in the best interests of the State. While he desired to see as many white settlers as we could possibly get brought into the country, he objected to paying the passage money to those not likely to make good settlers. The Government recently sent 120 immigrants to Denmark from Albany by special train, among them being a number of single men, to work on new railway buildings and the construction of a railway bridge over the Denmark River. Food was provided for these men and buildings were placed at their disposal, and the foreman in charge of the railway works was instructed that the immigrants were to be given work, and preference of employment, on these works. He must protest against the conduct of immigration affairs in such a manner as that, because there were a large number of settlers at Denmark many of whom desired to get employment on these particular railway works. Four of them interviewed Mr. Morrish, the officer in charge of the works, and asked if there was any chance of receiving employment, and the reply Mr. Morrish gave was that instruction had been issued that preference of employment was to be given to the immigrants.

The Minister for Mines: Preference?

Mr. PRICE: Yes, Mr. Morrish was told he must find employment for these immigrants who were sent out there by special train, and who were placed in Government buildings at Denmark.

The Minister for Lands: The buildings were empty, and these people were received with open arms when they arrived.

Mr. PRICE: The settlers protested against the immigrants being there. They were only too anxious to secure the opportunity of earning a few pounds to assist them in developing their holdings, but when they went to seek employment they were told the employment must be given to the immigrants, and there was

no chance for the settlers. These immigrants were taken there by special train and were supplied with food ready-cooked when they landed. That might be desirable in exceptional circumstances, but no exceptional circumstances existed at Denmark that would permit the Government to give this preference. No attempt was made to discover whether local labour was available.

The Minister for Mines: No such instructions were ever given by the Commissioner of Railways.

Mr. PRICE: At any rate, it was Mr. Morrish's statement to the men who asked for work, and the Minister privately could be informed of the names of those who asked for work. The Minister for Lands knew that the buildings were placed at the disposal of the immigrants. In a letter the Minister said the immigrants were being sent out there to carry out certain works, and that the buildings were placed at their disposal.

The Minister for Lands: I did not mention any works. So far as I am concerned we simply placed the buildings at their disposal.

Mr. PRICE: Then why were the immigrants sent there? The Denmark settlers required no labour. As a matter of fact they themselves sought employment to earn money to assist the development of their holdings. It showed, however, that the immigration policy was not being carried out in the most desirable manner. If we were to import immigrants to place them in competition with those already in the State seeking employment, it must be condemned. If the immigrants were sent to Denmark to go on the land one could agree with the project, but there was no suggestion that they were sent there to go on the land. They were sent there to work on the bridge and on the railway buildings. Such was the statement from the immigrants themselves, and there was also the statement from the settlers, whose names he was prepared to give, who received the reply from Mr. Morrish. Further, a road was being built between Denmark and Nornalup Inlet and a number of the single immigrants who were sent

out there to work on the railway works were sent on to work on the construction of this road. They were sent out to do work for which there was ample labour available.

The Minister for Lands: Oh!

Mr. PRICE: Did Mr. Ross, the officer in charge of that work, complain at any time that he was not able to secure labour?

The Minister for Lands: Could he secure all his labour at Denmark?

Mr. PRICE: Was there any complaint that labour was not available, and that there was need to send 10 or 12 immigrants out there to the job?

The Minister for Lands: Mr. Ross drew his men from Perth, and if we wanted men to-morrow he would need to do it.

Mr. PRICE: Not for all. The result of sending out these immigrants was that the settlers in the district could not get employment if they desired it. What became of the allegations of the Government that they were only importing agricultural labourers? If these men were imported as agricultural labourers why were they sent to carry out railway work and the construction of a road? It was a direct instance of men being imported expressly for the purpose of entering into competition with wage-earners. When the last batch of immigrants arrived there were 30 or 40 residents of the State, and many of them old residents, at the labour bureau seeking employment when the immigrants came to the bureau in a batch, evidently pre-arranged. The immigrants were taken inside and the doors shut, and the citizens of the State waiting for work were told they would have to stand down until work was found for the batch of immigrants who had just arrived. That kind of thing would not inspire confidence in the immigration policy of the Government.

The Minister for Lands: Are there men out of work in Perth?

Mr. PRICE: I am telling the Minister what I saw.

The Minister for Lands: They ought not to be out of work.

Mr. PRICE: Not if they were prepared to take a sweating wage or if they were

prepared to take work and risk receiving payment, probably getting nothing for their work.

The Minister for Lands: Probably?

Mr. PRICE: Was not the Minister aware that even members of the Opposition took contracts during last recess and were not paid for their labour? If men conversant with the State, with better information at their disposal than the average seeker for work, could not secure payment for their labour, what would be the result in the case of men sent from the labour bureau to work for men unknown and carry out contracts for them?

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. PRICE: It was due to the Government to do all they could to secure agricultural labourers for the farmers and those who were already settled on the land. The question of the rate of wages to be paid to the immigrants was one which must be governed by the recognised law of supply and demand. If the supply was not equal to the demand, then it would rest with the labourers themselves to claim a higher rate. If they failed to claim it they had no right to seek sympathy. The trouble lay in the fact that a large number of immigrants who came to the State were not agricultural labourers, and the need for stricter supervision in connection with the immigrants before they left the old land should be impressed upon the Government. Last year he advocated the institution of some system whereby undesirable immigrants could be deported: it would be well if the Government were to bring in a short Bill, which would give them power to send back to the place whence they came those immigrants who had secured passages under false pretences. If intending immigrants signed a declaration setting forth that they were agricultural labourers, and it was found that on their arrival that they were not what they professed to be, and they were likely to become a drag on the labour market, or an expense on the State, we should have the power to return them to the country from which we imported

them. It was surprising that the Government had not long before this taken steps in the direction indicated. He desired to refer to the physical character of many of the workers who came to the State. Of the sixty who arrived a week ago, and whom he saw at the bureau, only three were men bigger than himself and he was an ordinary sized man. A large number of them were youths not over five feet in height and weedy built, and judging by their build they were not the class of men who would be likely to impress the farmer or a settler as being capable of doing that kind of work, which the pioneer settler or the farmer desired when he employed labour. He hoped the Government would endeavour to place some check upon this class of immigrant coming to the State. There was a matter he desired to refer to in connection with the expenditure of loan moneys by the Agricultural and Lands Departments. He had already referred to the fact that a large sum of money had been spent on grass seeds, which the department had intended to sow in the Denmark district. These seeds were still down there, and seeing that the object which the department had in view when they purchased them had not been achieved, it would be well if the Minister were to take into consideration the desirability of selling the seeds for a nominal sum to the settlers who were now on the land at Denmark in order that they might sow them on their holdings. Of the little seed which was sown broadcast very little had taken root on account of the scrub and undergrowth which was so prolific in the Denmark district. There were a number of settlers who desired to purchase the seed, but the department had refused to sell.

The Minister for Lands: The seed is for sale.

Mr. PRICE: But they cannot purchase it in small lots.

The Minister for Lands: It will be sold to them in small lots.

Mr. PRICE: It was satisfactory to hear the remarks of the Minister, because the department a little while ago refused to sell the seed in small lots, except at a figure which was almost prohibitive. He

congratulated the Government on their desire to provide for the construction of roads to act as feeders to the railways in the agricultural districts. For some years past the tendency had been to reduce the roads vote. Whether it was altogether justifiable to spend a huge sum of money from loan on the construction of roads was one of those economic problems which it was hardly desirable should be discussed at that stage. In voting a sum of money for the construction of roads to help to open the Southern and South-Western portion of the State, the Government were taking a step in the right direction and it should commend itself to members who desired to see this portion of the State opened up. He did not intend to refer to the Loan Estimates. In connection with the large increase provided for immigration he was not prepared to oppose it, but he would express the hope that the Government in expending this huge sum of money in bringing out while settlers would do all they possibly could to ensure that only the right class of immigrants came to the country. Despite the plea of those who imagined that the importation of a large number of immigrants might tend to a reduction of wages, he could not strive to that idea, because he had already pointed out that there was undoubtedly a big demand for labour at the present time. He sincerely hoped that the Government would do all they possibly could to secure those immigrants who would prove beneficial to the State and who would be capable of aiding in the development of the vast resources of the State.

Mr. ANGWIN: It was not his intention to take up much time in discussing the Loan Estimates. It was his intention to again support the Government in their policy, an action he had always done, realising that it was the policy which the Labour party had initiated, and to be consistent the Labour party were bound to follow that up. He regretted very much the delay which had taken place in the carrying out of the drainage system in the district of Fremantle. The delay in the carrying out of these works would add considerably to their cost and the result ultimately would be a higher charge on

the ratepayers of the district. During the past twelve months scarcely anything had been done with regard to those works, and he hoped this year that the Government would be more active than they had been in the past. He also wanted to express regret that although he brought before the House on several occasions the possibility of a block in our railway system—a block which had now occurred to a very severe extent from Midland Junction to Fremantle—the Government had not put an amount on the Estimates this year for the construction of a line on the South side of the Swan river. There was no doubt in his mind that this line would do a good deal more to relieve traffic on the principal section of the railways than any alterations which might be brought about in the City of Perth. The removal of the yards there would not assist traffic to any large extent. It had been said that it would be a means of facilitating the passenger traffic, but if the Government were to move the heavy goods traffic to the South side of the river they would be better able to deal with the passenger traffic than by any large expenditure on the present lines. The Premier had stated to-day that he was getting a report on that line, and it was to be hoped that the report would be so satisfactory that next session the Government would bring down a proposal for the construction of the line. In regard to immigration he must express his regret that some hon. members attacked those who have come to the State for the express purpose of making it their home. No one could expect any farm labourer from England to be up to the standard of the Australian in regard to clearing work in the country. They had never had the experience, but, after they had been here for a few months, and had gained experience, and understood the system, he believed that they would hold their own with any other persons.

Mr. HEITMANN: I do not think so.

Mr. ANGWIN: Many of those who had come to this State from the old country were at first strangers in a strange land, and had had to adapt themselves to the

conditions of the country; but when they had done that they must have been able to give satisfaction or they would have been thrown out years ago. The forefathers of those who complained to-day had been put in exactly the same position; they had had the same difficulties to contend with, and until they had become adapted to the conditions of the country were not to be compared with those who had preceded them. The new arrivals must be allowed a little latitude, especially when they came here to make this country their home. He had seen a large number of immigrants; in fact he had made it a practice to go to the Fremantle wharf in order to see the class of immigrant that was being brought in, and although occasionally there were a few who would rather had not come, he certainly thought that we had very little indeed to complain about so far as the general character of the immigrants was concerned. We had got a very good class of men, and they were settlers who intended if possible to make this their home for the future, and to assist in the development of the State. Of course, he realised that it was necessary to exercise the closest supervision over immigrants, and if we looked at those who had been coming to the State we could only come to the conclusion that good supervision had been exercised; but, when we were bringing in thousands of people we could not expect that everyone would be a success. One or two might turn out bad—and it must be remembered that the Press did not cover up such cases—but because of these few failures we should be careful not to condemn the whole of them, particularly as throughout Australia it was necessary that we should get population. So long as the Government would make provision that the people whom they brought here had proper homes, and proper conditions of life, and did not interfere with those who had been here for many years in the way of lowering the economic conditions, he believed that these means adopted for increasing the population would be of benefit to those who were already here, instead of being a disadvantage as some seemed to think. He would support the Estimates,

and he hoped that the Premier in his reply would admit that the Government had neglected the drainage works at Fremantle.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): It was his desire only to make a few remarks in reference to immigration, and first of all to thank the member for East Fremantle for the words he had used in regard to the Government's immigration policy. He had been brought into contact with a fair number of those who had been sent to the State, and we must congratulate ourselves on the type of men who had been sent here recently. We had always had some black sheep in the crowd, but we should not condemn the lot because of them. He desired particularly to deal with the statement made this evening by the member for Albany that Mr. Morrish, who was in charge of the railway work at Denmark, had advised the people of that district that he had received instructions to give employment to immigrants in preference to our own people. First of all, he would like to disabuse members' minds of the idea that the Government were not going to give employment to suitable immigrants, but, while doing that, they would at all times be prepared to give preference to our own people.

Mr. Price: No such suggestion was made.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Questions had been asked in the House from time to time which would suggest that the Government should not give employment to these people. He wanted to say that no instructions had been issued by the Commissioner, or by any member of the Ministry to the Commissioner, that preference was to be given to these immigrants, and if any such thing had occurred it had been an error entirely on the part of the officer in charge of the work. That he could not credit. He believed that the hon. member had received incorrect information.

Mr. Price: That Morrish did not refuse to employ local men?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That he had been instructed to give preference

to these immigrants. No such instructions had been issued.

Mr. George: He may have been told to give them employment if possible; that would be only reasonable.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Not even that had occurred so far as he knew, because if the Government were to show preference at all they would sooner show it to our own people. During the dinner hour he had rung up the Commissioner and asked him if it was possible that any such instructions had been given; the Commissioner had replied in the negative and said that the policy adopted in the past was still being adhered to. He only wanted to assure the Committee that the Government had no desire to give preference to the immigrants, but at the same time they would not hesitate to give employment to good men, especially in cases where the local men were not equally suitable. Members must disabuse their minds of any idea that there was an effort being made to import these immigrants to give them preference in connection with railway works, and thereby reduce the standard of wages.

Mr. Price: That is deliberately misleading.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: So far as the authorities in the Railway Department were concerned, no instructions had been given to give preference to any of these people.

Mr. PRICE (in explanation): Neither by suggestion, indication, nor implication had he said that the Railway Department, or any other department had entered on a policy of providing work for immigrants in direct opposition to people already in the State. The Minister had distorted and misrepresented his statement to the House in a manner which he could not allow to go unchallenged. What he had said was that Mr. Morrish had told certain men, the names of whom he had given to the Minister, that his instructions were that he must find work for these immigrants, and he had refused work to one man whose name he had given to the Minister. The statement of the Minister that he (Mr. Price) had suggested that the Railway Department had entered on

a policy of finding work for immigrants in preference to local men was not warranted by any statement he had made; nor did he suggest that the department should refuse to employ immigrants.

Mr. FOULKES: A good deal of discussion had taken place on this matter of immigration, and he had with him an extract from the Melbourne *Argus* of January 24th which contained reference to the immigration policy being pursued by the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria. It was reported in this paper that Mr. Neilson, the Minister for Lands in New South Wales, had stated that the cry in New South Wales was for more people, evidently showing that the Labour Government of New South Wales had at last realised that it was necessary to get more people into that country. And the Minister for Lands brought his programme forward and stated he was going to reserve several millions of acres. That was so far as New South Wales was concerned. In Victoria it was stated in the newspaper to which he had referred that in two days 668 people arrived from the old country for the State of Victoria, and it went on to say that there were thirty-two agents with written instructions as to what to tell inquirers in the old country. That showed that other States had embarked on a large immigration scheme. In the past we had no competition from the other States for immigrants, now we must realise that we must take more active steps than had been taken in the past on account of the competition. It would be necessary to employ a greater number of agents in Great Britain and spend more money in advertising, and if we wanted to protect Western Australia it would be necessary to take more active steps. In the months of December and January last there arrived a considerable number of immigrants in this State, and we were glad to see them. He hoped the Government would continue the work which Sir Newton Moore, when in England, started. It was useless to advertise for a month or two, we should have to go on for the next two or three years, and no money would be better spent than

that in encouraging immigrants to come here. There were people in Great Britain with capital who were prepared to come out if information was given them as to our resources. We only employed two agents in Great Britain, and no one would admit that these two were sufficient. Victoria had thirty-two agents employed in this work, which proved we were not giving sufficient attention to this important subject.

Vote put and passed.

Votes—*Railways*, £814,518; *Harbours and Rivers*, £187,300; *Water Supply and Sewerage*, £77,000; *Development of Gold-fields and Mineral Resources*, £92,600; *Development of Agriculture*, £250,783; *Roads and Bridges*, £83,000; *Sundries*, £117,500; *Mines*, £4,037; *Colonial Secretary*, £2,070—agreed to.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

CORONATION CEREMONIES. THE PREMIER'S INVITATION.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson): Before submitting the Appropriation Bill for the consideration of the House I have to ask members to indicate to me their pleasure in regard to the representation of the State at the coronation of His Majesty the King in June next. Members know, I presume, that a special invitation has been received through His Excellency the Governor from the King inviting me, as Premier of the State, and my wife to be present on that occasion.

Mr. Angwin: You should take the leader of the Opposition with you.

The PREMIER: I am sorry I cannot. I cannot include anyone in the invitation, although statesmen would all be welcomed there, although I should be only too glad to do so. The question has to be considered whether benefit will accrue to the State by being represented on that special occasion. I am inclined to think that it is the proper course to follow, not because I have a personal desire to be present: I certainly should like to be present if convenient. Some ten years ago I had the misfortune to miss the coronation ceremony of the late King

by forty-eight hours. I went home and arrived forty-eight hours late. On this occasion if it is the desire of the House that the State should be represented then I propose to leave in ample time to be there and to take my part as the representative of the biggest and greatest State of the Commonwealth. I understand that every State of the Commonwealth, I believe with the exception of South Australia, will be represented by the Premiers for the time being. I have not definite information but I believe that is the intention. I think it is an occasion when very good service can be done in keeping Western Australia before the eyes and in the minds of our countrymen in the old country, and if members will express their feelings in the direction that I should, with my wife, proceed Home and accept the invitation, I shall ask the House to grant the necessary supplies for that purpose.

Mr. Bolton: We can express that by granting or refusing the supply.

The PREMIER: I should not like to submit it if it is to be refused.

Mr. Heitmann: I believe all members of the Federal Parliament are going, why should not we go.

Mr. SCADDAN: I may say briefly that the members on this side of the House have not conferred together with regard to the question of the Premier representing the State at our King's coronation. Therefore in speaking on this occasion I do so on my behalf. Probably there is a difference of opinion, but as far as I am personally concerned, in view of the fact that the States to-day represent thirty per cent. of the functions of Government it is due they should be represented in London at the great festivities. Moreover, I hold that Western Australia, in view of the fact that we are attempting to advertise our country in every direction and induce people to conform to our ideas and come to the State, it devolves upon us that we should be properly represented as a State. We have to recognise that the proper individual on such an occasion is the Premier, because he is not only the leader of the Government and the House, but he is the leader of public opinion in the State

for the time being. As far as I am concerned there is no reason why the Premier should not represent the State on the occasion. I cannot enthuse over the matter because of the limitation of the invitation, but as far as I am personally concerned I think the State should be represented and that it will reap an advantage. Anyhow, if it does not reap a distinct advantage we should belittle the State if the Premier was not there.

Mr. FOULKES: I am glad to hear what the leader of the Opposition has said for I deem it is only right, in my opinion, that the Premier should go as the representative of the State. The Federal Parliament has received an invitation to send. I think, twenty-two members, and as far as I am concerned I should like to have seen the leader of the Opposition go, not of course as the representative of the State, because the Premier would be the representative of the State, but I should like to have seen the leader of the Opposition go to testify by his presence that the loyalty towards the Crown at Home is participated in not only by members on this side but by the full Parliament.

Mr. ANGWIN: I also endorse the remarks of the leader of the Opposition, and I agree with the member for Claremont that the leader of the Opposition, as well as the Premier, ought to be present at the Coronation. The Premier said he could not extend the invitation. We realise that, but I notice in the Press that the Premier of New South Wales is to attend the Coronation, taking with him one of his colleagues.

Mr. Gill: No: his private secretary.

Mr. ANGWIN: I may be mistaken. Anyhow, I would be very pleased to see the leader of the Opposition accompany the Premier on this occasion. I feel confident that if the leader of the Opposition were to go he would be the means of removing a good deal of the feeling which exists in the old country in regard to the Labour party in Australia and Western Australia in particular. He would be the means also of inducing to come out here even a larger number of immigrants than we are getting to-day, because he would

be able to make it clear that so far as the Labour party are concerned they welcome those prepared to make their homes in Western Australia.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1910-11.

Message from the Governor received and read transmitting the Supplementary Estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1911, and recommending appropriation accordingly.

In Committee of Supply.

Mr. Taylor in the Chair.

Vote—*Miscellaneous*, £1,500—agreed to.

This was the only vote on the Supplementary Estimates.

The usual resolutions as passed in Committee of Supply and Ways and Means were adopted.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

All Stages.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation in connection with the Bill.

The PREMIER, in accordance with resolutions adopted in Committee obtained leave to introduce the Appropriation Bill, which passed through all its stages without debate and was transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—PARLIAMENTARY ALLOWANCES.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson) in moving the second reading said: I have much pleasure in rising to move the second reading of this Bill which I forecasted several months ago would be introduced this session. I do not disguise for one moment that I have for many many years looked with disapproval on the principle of payment of members in the Parliaments of the British Empire. On the other hand I do not attempt to disguise for one moment that payment of members right throughout the British Empire has come to stay for all

time: and that being so, everyone has to be reasonable and recognise that, especially in new countries where we are totally unable to get a body of men of the leisured class who can afford to spend five or six months in looking after the State's affairs every year, we must accept the position and agree that payment to those members who serve their country is a principle that has been accepted and must hold good. We are strengthened more, I think, in accepting that position, no matter what our feelings may be, by the fact that even in the mother country itself there is a strong movement in this direction; and I fully anticipate the time is not far distant when payment of members will be an accomplished fact in the British House of Commons. Admitting that position, I often have to ask myself as to whether we are paying members a reasonable salary for their services; and I feel that we command work from members in this House at any rate of our Legislature which is strenuous in the extreme. At any rate during the last three or four months it has been strenuous so far as members on the Government side are concerned, and I believe that members on the Opposition side have made it very strenuous for themselves. However, the fact remains that there is a great amount of work demanded from hon. members, and I must conclude that the sum that has been paid as honorarium, or salary, if we like to term it such, both to members and Ministers, is totally inadequate for the time they give. A salary of £200 a year is not sufficient for hon. members to live on reasonably decently; in fact it is not sufficient for them to live on at all; and, although I approve myself of hon. members utilising their abilities, their undoubted abilities, in earning additional income for themselves, yet we have to recognise that some hon. members cannot do that, that their time is fully occupied and they have not the facilities for taking on temporary work during recess. Under these circumstances I have provided in this measure that for the new Parliament at any rate, because I do not approve of voting ourselves an addition to our sala-

ries, and seeing we are to have a general election within a few months' time, ordinary members in the Legislative Assembly shall receive £300 per annum. In addition to that I have considered very carefully the position of the leader of the Opposition; and, recognising the strenuous work he has undoubtedly to perform and the continuous attention he has to give to public business—because through his hands pass all the measures that emanate from half a dozen Ministers—of course I do not for a moment suggest that he, or any other leader of the Opposition could go into the whole details of the Acts as Ministers have to do that are put through this Chamber and another place, still at any rate he needs to have a fairly accurate knowledge of what is going on in order that he may fill the role of critic, and in order that he may make suggestions and generally lead his party in a wholesome criticism of the measures that are put before the House for their approval—recognising this, as I say, I must admit that the leader of the Opposition is not adequately remunerated at the ordinary salary of a member of Parliament; and I have provided in this Bill that, in addition to the ordinary salary of £300 per year, he shall receive extra remuneration to the extent of £200 a year, giving him a salary of £500 a year. Then we have put in a clause in which we have looked after Ministers of the Crown also, and we provide that Ministers shall in addition to their salaries be able to draw their salaries as members. This will increase their salaries by the amount of £300 per annum which they will draw after this Bill passes. It is provided in Clause 3 that the Chairman of Committees in the Assembly and the Council shall each receive an allowance of £500 per annum. This is to include of course the allowance they would receive as members of Parliament. It is provided that the Speaker of the Assembly, and the President of the Council, shall receive an advance bringing the remuneration for their offices up to £700 per annum. These briefly are the clauses of the measure, a Bill which I think will receive the approval of the majority of

members of this Chamber, and also I hope of another place. I have no party concern in it. My colleagues agree with me that it is a reasonable proposition to put before the Assembly, and I leave the measure in the hands of the House to deal with as they may deem best according to their consciences. There is no party vote to be taken on it. I hope hon. members will vote as they deem right and fit, and the result I trust will be that hon. members will receive extra remuneration such as I have outlined for the services they render. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): It is needless for me to say I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading, not because I am more interested than most members, but because I have always held that the remuneration members have received in the past is not adequate for the services they render to the people. I would like to say to that, so far as the position I occupy is concerned, I regret very much I cannot make the extra salary for the leader of the Opposition retrospective for the past five years. The Premier will recognise it will not apply to me. Every member will agree that there has been no person, irrespective of who has held the position of leader of the Opposition, who has applied himself more closely to his duties as leader of the Opposition, while not actually obtaining a majority of the electors but yet representing a party almost equal to that occupying the Treasury benches, than did the ex-leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bath). I admit I have not been able to apply myself as closely to the work as Mr. Bath did, but even with the little experience I have had of the position I find it is a most strenuous one and presents a task that one individual finds very difficult to fulfil especially during such a long session. It really does not require the House to agree to the Bill, because on the 19th October we decided on an increase of payment to members; and while I am prepared to accept the Bill so far as it provides £300 for members, still I hold the opinion that £400

would be adequate remuneration for the services members render to the country. But I do not desire to delay the passage of the Bill on this account. I am not in agreement with the Premier as to the time when the increase should take effect. I realise we took the responsibility on the 19th October of saying that we, and not a future Parliament, were entitled to greater remuneration than £200 a year; and, having taken up that position, the responsibility rests with the members of this Parliament, and not with the members of the next Parliament; and although we are faced with a general election, those who are returned will not be called upon to decide the question as to whether the salary shall be £200 or £300, because merely by virtue of their position they will obtain the £100 increase we provide in this Bill. The responsibility for making the increase will rest with members of this Parliament, and having accepted the responsibility I contend we are justified in asking that the increase should apply to members of this Parliament as well as to members of the next Parliament. Therefore in Committee I shall propose, if the Premier will permit me, and the majority will support me, to strike out words in order to make the increase apply from the 1st January of this year; and even then I am not asking all one could ask in the circumstances. We have already decided, on the 19th October last, that we are not adequately paid for the services we render, and it is not asking too much to say that the increase should apply three months later than this decision, namely from the 1st January. Of course, as to the time when it should apply, that was left to the Government, and they have placed their opinions in the Bill, as they were entitled to do, because we did not set out in the resolution when the increase should have effect; but I believe the attitude I take up will receive concurrence from the people of the country who are satisfied that members should be paid for their services and also that they should be adequately paid. In fact, the only people who would oppose the increased payment being made from the 1st January would be those who are op-

posed to payment of members in any form. I hold with the Premier that payment of members has come into the British Empire to stay, and I believe it will be put into operation in the British House of Commons shortly. If members are to be paid they should be paid adequately. I will read an authority—Bastable—on this point. It is some time since his book was written, and he takes up the attitude that members should not be paid, but he goes on to say—

Thus the English colonies that possess responsible government are perhaps justified in departing from the English method of unpaid legislators. At the same time, there is an unquestionable advantage in the development of public spirit produced by the English system. One point is certain, viz., that the least satisfactory method of all is the granting of small payments which do not attract the best men, while they discourage those who would serve without any salary. The danger of corruption is brought to its highest in the case of ill-paid legislators, who are inclined to supplement their official incomes by less honourable means.

When an authority such as Bastable asserts that the probability exists that such might be the case with regard to ill-paid legislators, I am satisfied it would be better to pay legislators an adequate salary when we would get better services from them than under existing conditions. The question of the salary of the members of the Legislative Council should be dealt with by themselves. If they are of the opinion that they should receive the same salary as members of the Legislative Assembly I shall offer no objection to it. While I do object to the continuance of the second chamber, while it does exist I consider members of that Chamber should be adequately paid for the services they render to the country. I recognise that members of the other Chamber have not been called upon to do that work which they are entitled to do, but very frequently we get a better expression of opinion from them directly affecting the administration because they

represent a wider area than members of this House. While we often view questions of administration as to how they will affect our particular portion of the State, the members of the Legislative Council, who represent provinces, take a wider view, and on that account I consider that their services should be more largely availed of by the people to place their wants before the Government. It is the duty of the Legislative Council to express an opinion on the question as it affects them. If they express the opinion that they are inadequately paid I shall not interfere with the matter.

Mr. George: Suppose they consider they ought to receive £400?

Mr. SCADDAN: Then they will have to take the responsibility of saying that they are entitled to £400.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray): If I had the power I would oppose this altogether. I have always held that opinion at the risk of being called archaic. I think it is a poor State which cannot find sufficient men of ability and means to represent all classes without payment. I agree with the Premier and also the leader of the Opposition that the principle I have laid down has been relegated to the past. I believe also that payment of members has come to stay, and I have to bow to that. Having taken that position I say let the payment be adequate. If we come to the question of payment for the time which is taken up, neither £200 nor £300 will be found to be adequate for the services rendered. If the State desires that members should be paid, my view of the matter goes on one side, and then as a business matter can any hon. member say that £200 or even £400 is adequate remuneration for the amount of time which is taken up by Parliamentary duties? We have been sitting in this Chamber for nearly six months.

Mr. A. A. Wilson: And keeping two homes.

Mr. GEORGE: That is a matter which the hon. member can deal with himself. We have been sitting here for six months,

and the time at the disposal of private members of this Chamber has been very little indeed. I am not going into the question of whether that time might have been shortened or not. I do say, however, if the principle is to be accepted that the State should pay its members of Parliament, the State should pay them adequately for the time taken up in rendering the services which are required from them. As far as the Federal Parliament is concerned, members were elected in the first instance on a payment of £400 per annum. Hon. members there found that seeing that they were called from all parts of Australia their remuneration was insufficient. I am one of those persons who think that those who are working in the State and looking after the affairs of the country are at any rate more in touch with the State than those who go to the Federal Parliament. I mention this without in any degree detracting from the value of the services of those hon. members who receive £600 a year. This House can without impropriety consider whether the sum even now proposed will be a fair remuneration for services rendered. Seeing that the principle has been accepted and even an increase will be accepted without demur by the people, I might say that if hon. members were more adequately remunerated for the time which is taken up in Parliament they probably would be able to take their duties more seriously than they do at present.

Mr. Walker: No one could take them more seriously than you do.

Mr. GEORGE: The hon. member, whose recovery we are all pleased to witness, seems to have a high opinion of the seriousness with which I take my duties. I am glad at any rate there is one righteous man in Gath who can recognise that. We may as well deal with the thing properly and thoroughly and effectively if we are going to deal with it at all, but I do not think this Bill deals with it effectively, thoroughly, or satisfactorily.

Mr. JACOBY (Swan): I expressed an opinion in regard to this mat-

ter earlier in the session, and since then an event has happened in South Australia with regard to the proposal to increase the salaries of members of Parliament of that State which supports the view I have taken. The question of the amount to be paid is of less concern to me than the method of approving of the payment. I have stated that I think it should be referred to the electors of the State. The South Australian Parliament, I presume at the instance of the Labour Government, have passed a measure raising the salaries to be paid to members of Parliament of that State, but a provision is contained in it that the Bill must first be assented to by the electors of the State by referendum. The position is that in all States where the representatives are paid it is left to the people who provide the funds to decide whether there shall be any payment, and if there is to be payment what that payment shall be. We are practically in the same position as the directors of any joint stock company. In cases of that sort the directors are not permitted to vote fees for themselves or for those who are to succeed them. That is done at the annual general meeting of shareholders, who decide what amounts shall be paid, and it appears to me that is the proper course to take. It is argued that because this Bill will not come into force before the next Parliament hon. members are not voting money into their own pockets. There will, however, be a large percentage of those sitting in this Chamber who will be returned to the next Parliament.

Mr. Walker: On this side.

Mr. JACOBY: On both sides. Under the circumstances I propose when the Bill is in Committee to move an amendment to provide that a referendum be taken, and I trust that as South Australia is to refer its measure to the electors, there will be a sufficient number of members in the Chamber who will agree to support me in a similar proposal.

Mr. Murphy: You have no hope of carrying it.

Question put and passed.
Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Foulkes in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title and commencement:

Mr. SCADDAN: Would the Premier permit him to delete certain words, and if they were deleted the clause would of course require other words added. The clause read—"This Act may be cited as the *Parliamentary Allowances Act, 1911*, and shall come into force on a day to be fixed by Proclamation, after the expiry by effluxion of time or the sooner dissolution of the existing Legislative Assembly." He desired to move an amendment—

That in line 2 all the words after "1911" be struck out.

The object of the amendment would be to make the clause apply as from the first of January. The Premier might agree to take the feeling of the Committee on the matter and to give an assurance that if the Committee adopted the amendment the necessary provision for the payments would be made.

The PREMIER: As had been stated when the measure was introduced, hon. members could vote as they thought fit in connection with this measure, and he would not stand in the way of any amendment which the majority of members might deem desirable. If, therefore, the leader of the Opposition carried his amendment that the Act should come into existence at some time after or before the dissolution of the present Parliament, instead of the date mentioned in the Bill, and as Mr. Scaddan had intimated his desire that the measure should come into force on first January of this year, he would certainly accept it as an intimation that a new clause was to be added bringing the Bill into effect from that date: at the same time, he could not support the amendment. He believed that members would do well to pass the measure to increase the salaries as for a new Parliament and he had expressed that opinion on more than one occasion; but if

the majority of the Committee decided that payment should start from first January, he would deem it his duty to move a clause which would give effect to that wish.

Mr. MURPHY: From a public platform at Fremantle he had most definitely stated his intention to endeavour to increase the salary not of the next Parliament but of this Parliament. He was asked whether he was in favour of increasing the salaries of members of Parliament, and he replied, "Yes." The questioner asked "How much?" he replied "to £400 per annum." The questioner asked, "When?" and he had replied "from the moment I am elected." To that plain statement no objection had been raised either by the two Ministers of the Crown sitting on the platform supporting him, or by the electors, and if the Government would permit him he would move an amendment that that increased payment should commence from the beginning of the financial year, namely, first July last. There were some members on the Government side who were mock-modest on this question, and he thought that some were opposing the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition because the result of the voting was known beforehand. But if those hon. members did not care to take up the retrospective payment, they could band the difference between £200 and £300 over to him; let them not handle any payment for which they had not had the endorsement of their electors. He would not hand his over to the hospital; he had been waiting for this day from the moment he had been elected and his only fear had been that it would not come until after Parliament had been dissolved, because no member knew what his fate would be in the elections, and he wanted to enjoy some of the good which the gods sent while he was here.

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

Ayes	24
Noes	12

Majority for 12

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Bath	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Price
Mr. Carson	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gill	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Walker
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Ware
Mr. Holman	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Horan	Mr. Heilmann
Mr. Hudson	(Teller).
Mr. McDowall	

NOES.

Mr. Daglish	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. George	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Hayward	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Male	(Teller).
Mr. Mitchell	

Amendment thus passed.

Mr. JACOBY moved a further amendment—

That the following words be added to the clause:—"and shall come into operation when the electors of the State have agreed by referendum to the provisions of this Act."

If members were satisfied that the electors were with them in increasing their salaries there should be no hesitation in adopting the course usually taken prior to members of the Federal Parliament voting money into their own pockets a few years ago. If the amendment were carried and the electors by referendum agreed that the increased amount should be paid, the payment would then operate from the date which it had been proposed to insert. There was no objection to the amount being inserted in the Bill, and the date when the payment should commence, provided that first of all the consent of the electors to the payment was obtained.

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

Ayes	7
Noes	30

Majority against.. 23

AYES.

Mr. Davies	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. George	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Jacoby	(Teller).

NOMS.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Bath	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Carson	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Collier	Mr. Price
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Walker
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Ware
Mr. Holman	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Horan	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Heilmann
Mr. Male	(Teller).
Mr. McDowall	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Clause 2—Repeal:

The PREMIER: It was intended later on to move a new clause to fix the date on which the Bill would come into operation. Therefore the proviso was not necessary. He moved—

That the proviso be struck out.

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

Clauses 3, 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Reckoning of allowance to members of the Assembly:

Mr. OSBORN: This clause provided that payment should take place from the day of election. If that was so, payment would be from the date of the last general election.

The PREMIER: The member was under a misapprehension. This clause was inserted so that members might draw their salaries until they were re-elected, or successors were elected, notwithstanding that the House was dissolved.

Mr. JACOBY: Was it proposed to pay members of Parliament who were really not members of Parliament, because if the House was dissolved there were no members of Parliament?

The Premier: That was the intention.

Mr. JACOBY: Then he opposed the clause. Where did a provision of this nature come from? When the House was dissolved there were no members of the Assembly. A member had a free pass over the railways, and now in addition he was to be paid when he was not a member of Parliament.

The PREMIER: A member held a railway pass until his re-election, or until his successor was appointed, because he was tantamount to being member for the electorate. It would be a gross injustice if a member was not allowed to continue to draw his salary because after the House was dissolved it might be two months before a member was re-elected, and in that case the member would be two months without a salary. This was a common sense and just provision.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6—agreed to.

New clause:

The PREMIER moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 7:—"In relation to the allowance to members holding their seats at the commencement of this Act the provisions of this Act shall apply as from the first day of January, 1911, and any person elected to supply a vacancy in the seat of any member holding such seat at the commencement of this Act shall receive such salary as such member would have received had no vacancy occurred in his seat."

That was to meet the case of any by-election which might take place.

Mr. HAYWARD: For his part he intended to oppose the amendment. If it were carried he for one would refuse to receive one penny of the increase.

Mr. BROWN: Like the member for Wellington he would oppose the amendment. He regretted not having been in his place during the second reading to oppose the principle of the Bill. In his opinion it was wrong to vote ourselves money without first going before the electors. He was totally opposed to the payment of members. Without payment of members we would in two months get through the work which under the existing conditions was taking us six or seven months.

Mr. PIESSE: In the belief that this matter should be referred to the electors he would oppose the amendment. For his part he would prefer to have a mandate from the electors before agreeing to support the increase as from the first

January. Notwithstanding this he felt justified in supporting the Bill as at first introduced, in which form it had provided for the payment of the increase from the beginning of the new Parliament which would have given the electors an opportunity of expressing a voice on the matter.

Mr. MURPHY: If the Bill had been left in its original form providing for the increase to start from the beginning of the new Parliament every member returned at the next election would claim that the increase had been endorsed by the electors. We knew as a matter of fact that the question of increase of salaries would be the least to be considered at the next general election.

New clause put, and division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	30
Noes	6

Majority for 24

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Bath	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Carson	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Collier	Mr. Price
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Walker
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Ware
Mr. Holman	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Horan	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Heltmann
Mr. McDowall	(Teller).
Mr. Male	

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Hayward	(Teller).
Mr. Jacoby	
Mr. S. F. Moore	
Mr. Osborn	

New clause thus passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

Bill read a third time.

The PREMIER moved—

That the Bill be transmitted to the Legislative Council.

Question put, and a division called for.

Mr. SPEAKER: Owing to this being a formal motion a division was not necessary. The Ayes have it.

BILL—SUPPLY 1911-12.

All stages.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purpose of a Supply Bill for the services of the year 1911-12.

The House having resolved into Committee of Supply. Mr. Taylor in the Chair,

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson) moved—

That there be granted to His Majesty on account of services of the year 1911-12 a sum not exceeding £1,653,700.

A new Parliament could not be called together until after the expiry of the present financial year, and it was necessary to ask this Parliament to grant supply to carry on until after the general election. The passage of the Redistribution of Seats Bill and the Electoral Act Amendment Bill would throw a great deal of work on the Electoral Department. Transfers had to be made to new divisions, and all the paraphernalia of printing rolls, and new forms would have to be done, and it would be necessary to have an electoral census. It would take at least six months to get all things into order. In any case, members did not wish to be called together again until after the general election, which would take place in the first week of October or at the end of September. At least, that was what he was aiming at. If supply was not granted now it would be necessary for Parliament to meet before the end of the financial year, somewhere in June, in order to pass a Supply Bill, and it would be absurd to put the same members to the trouble of coming together in June for the purpose when it could be done now before proroguing this Parliament. In view of the fact that the Treasurer could not touch the money except for the services of the year 1911-12 there was no danger. The matter was mentioned to the leader of the Opposition, and it was agreed it would con-

sult the convenience of members of both Houses if we followed the precedent established by the Federal Parliament and took supply for the new year in this way. It was a step about to be taken in New South Wales also. On the recommendation of the late Premier, Mr. Wade, now the leader of the Opposition in that State, the Premier proposed to take supply for the first few months of the financial year. It was convenient to do this. It would not hamper members by calling them together at an inconvenient time. The requirements of the Bill before members were based on the Estimates just passed. He was asking for four-twelfths of the Revenue Estimates and four-ninths of the column representing the loan expenditure for the first nine months of the new financial year in the summary at the back of the Loan Estimates.

Mr. SCADDAN had previously protested against this method of dealing with our finances, continually granting supply without Parliament having the opportunity of considering the Estimates. Circumstances, however, were different in this case. Members having agreed that the Premier should be absent over a certain portion of the new financial year we could do nothing else but grant supplies to carry on the affairs of the State until October, during his temporary absence. He trusted the Premier would see the new Parliament assembled early so that they could carefully consider the granting of further supplies. It was essential after a general election, in order that Parliament should have an opportunity of considering the expenditure of the Government. The Premier was taking the right attitude in regard to obtaining the consent of Parliament for his visit to London and in passing Supplementary Estimates covering the expenditure of his visit, and in asking Parliament to grant supply in this manner. It was hoped we would not have in future Parliaments, whether he was there or not, the spectacle of seven months supply being granted without Parliament itself having the opportunity of controlling the finances of the State. Not many altera-

tions were made to the Estimates which were introduced, but that was due to the fact that the bulk of the money was already expended, and the works undertaken, and it would be a serious matter to stop these works. He proposed to raise no objection to the passing of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported; and the report adopted.

A resolution in Committee of Ways and Means having been passed and adopted, a Supply Bill in accordance therewith providing for the expenditure of £1,683,000 was brought in, carried through all its stages, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—CEMETERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. J. L. Nanson) in moving the second reading said: By the sections of the Cemeteries Act mentioned in the Bill, the appropriation of the surplus funds in the hands of cemetery trustees has to be made not by the trustees themselves but by the Governor. There can be no objection to this procedure so far as regards those cemeteries which receive Government subsidies, but it is considered right that in the case of unsubsidised cemeteries the trustees should have the power, subject to necessary restrictions, of disposing of all the funds in their hands. The purposes for which it is proposed that the trustees shall be empowered to appropriate their surplus funds are set forth in Clause 3 of the Bill. It will be observed that power is given to the trustees to make a contribution to the cost of maintaining roads in the neighbourhood of cemeteries, and provision is also made for the execution of a reserve fund. The intention is that this fund shall not be applied to the ordinary upkeep of the cemetery but shall be utilised for such special purposes as may be approved by the Governor. I may further add that it is proposed to make portions of this Bill retrospective, the reason being that in the case of one cemetery at any rate—Karrakatta—an unsubsi-

dised cemetery, the trustees have in the past exercised the powers that this measure proposes to affirm. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. HUDSON (Dundas): I take it that the object of the Bill is not to deprive the cemetery trustees of money which may happen to be to their credit; it is only to allow them to use it for specific purposes.

The Attorney General: That is so.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Mr. Foulkes in the Chair; the Attorney General in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Act retrospective:

Mr. Hudson: An explanation of the intention of this clause was desirable.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The clause referred to the Karrakatta cemetery. This was an unsubsidised cemetery and the trustees without the power conferred by the Bill had carried out certain works of the class which the Bill proposed to authorise. The clause was to validate their past expenditure.

Clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL — PERMANENT RESERVES REDEDICATION (No. 3).

Second Reading

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. J. Mitchell) in moving the second reading said: This Bill, as the name indicates, is for the purpose of rededicating certain permanent reserves. Clause 2 refers to a proposal for the extension of the school-site at Claremont. The Education Department desires to erect a manual training and cookery school, which will necessitate an extension of the present school grounds to take in a portion of class "A" reserve 883 for recreation. The area required is 1 rood 15 perches, and it will be necessary to exclude this area from Reserve A883 before it can be set apart for a school-site. The municipal council have agreed

to this Act on the understanding that a pathway thirty-three feet wide, which is now used by the people who make use of the recreation reserve, shall still remain in part of the park reserve. The council have, I believe, no objection to this being done, and it is desired by the Education Department that this addition should be made to the school-site at Claremont. The Bill also refers to the rededication of portion of reserve 7686 on the Busselton-Karridale road. This reserve contains about 4,500 acres, and was set apart as a State forest because it contained valuable timber; it was also used as a camping ground because it was one of the beauty spots of the district. The people of the district now desire to erect an agricultural Hall, and it is proposed also to mark out a townsite and cut up a few acres suitable for cultivation. We ask the House to agree to 1,000 acres being taken from the reserve for these purposes.

Mr. Bath: What size blocks are you going to cut up?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Very small blocks, about twenty acres each. The river runs through portion of the area to be taken out, and of course the blocks fronting the river will be more valuable than others.

Mr. Bath: What was the original purpose of the reserve?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was originally set apart as a camping ground for travellers and stock, but when the larger reserve was set apart to preserve good timber, the former one was included as a natural beauty spot. The area is no longer required, and the remaining 3,500 acres will be ample. Clause 4 deals with the lease of a permanent reserve at Coatesloe to the golf club. I have here an agreement which is to be entered into in connection with the proposal, and it is signed by the councillors of the municipality and Mr. Drummond, of Peppermint Grove, representing the trustees of the golf club. I understand the club have used these grounds as links for the past two years. I will just mention the provisions of the agreement in order to show hon. members that the rights of the public are well looked after. It is

proposed to lease to the golf club reserve 6613, containing 23 acres, and part of reserve A1664, containing 16 acres, for 15 years at a rental of £40 for the first five years and £20 for the balance of the term. The lessees are to water all trees and shrubs, pay water and sanitary rates, protect all trees and shrubs, remove any trees they may deem necessary for the purpose of improving the land, repair and maintain all fences, buildings, etc., and appoint a caretaker who shall devote his whole time to the maintenance of the land and buildings. They are to cause no harm or nuisance to persons resorting to the land, and provision is made for free entrance at all times to the ground by rate-payers, residents, or visitors.

Mr. Hudson: Are the general public to be excluded from the grounds?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No, all persons may enter the grounds during play and at all times, and a notice to that effect is to be posted. The lessors have the right to enter the ground and remove stone and effect improvements as they think fit, and may grant a special lease or license for any period not exceeding one month to any person to enter the property and use it for lawful sport or recreation so long as it does not interfere with golf. It goes without saying that in a place like Cottesloe the rights of the people have to be protected and in this agreement that has been done. The golf club has spent a good deal of money in improving these grounds, and where so many reserves are provided as is the case at Cottesloe it is necessary to relieve the council where possible of some of the expense, especially as the grounds will be beautified by the club. The Bill further provides that a portion of the recreation ground at Bunbury, which has been included within Mr. Biegel's fence for a number of years, shall be set aside in order that it may be sold. I am assured by Sir Newton Moore that the sale of this ground to Mr. Biegel will not interfere with the recreation reserve and it is stated by the council that if he puts his fence back it would really cause a disfigurement of the area rather than an improvement. The ground will be sold at auction in the usual way and

the proceeds will be devoted to the improvement of the reserve from which this area is to be taken. The council desire that this land shall be granted together with a portion of Russell esplanade, which will be contained in a roads closure Bill which I hope to submit to the House tomorrow. In Committee I hope to move an amendment to enable the Government to grant to the Cottesloe Municipal Council about one and a half acres of a public reserve.

Mr. Angwin: Is this to enlarge the golf links?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No, this is to enable the municipality to erect tea rooms and other buildings for the convenience of the public. I understand that the council desire to have these buildings for the purpose of getting revenue to improve the other reserves which are fairly numerous in the district. The member for Claremont will no doubt describe further what are the intentions of the council in regard to this block of land. I am informed that they propose to spend a considerable sum of money in providing public conveniences, and as the land will still remain a public reserve I hope there will be no objection to the proposal. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. FOULKES (Claremont): With regard to clause 2, I will give an explanation later on when the Bill is in Committee. I am glad to see that the Government propose to increase the size of the school ground. It is a very large school and the area of ground is so small that the children attending it have been greatly inconvenienced. In regard to clause 4, under which power is given to the council to lease this reserve to the golf club, I may state that the club have already spent a considerable sum of money in improving this land. They have made footpaths, have planted the ground with trees, and have had a water supply laid on, and altogether have spent at least £1,000 there. They also propose spending another £2,000 or £3,000 in further improving the grounds in order to remove any possible objection to the leasing of the grounds. I

have the authority of the mayor and the councillors to state that they are willing to take a referendum of the electors of the district. I have impressed on them the necessity of seeing that full and free access is given to visitors to the grounds, and they have recognised that and that is one of the clauses in the agreement. I am sure of this, the money spent in planting the place with couch will be of advantage to the people and also to those persons living outside the district. The member for Fremantle may be assured that everybody will be protected and the opportunity given to the ratepayers to decide whether they wish the mayor and councillors to grant this lease. The mayor and councillors are quite willing, in order to remove any possible objection to the lease—and they do not anticipate any objection—to take a referendum.

Mr. BATH (Brown Hill) : Apart from Clause 2 of the measure, I certainly shall oppose the passage of this particular Bill. I think we are altogether too ready to pass measures through the House—this is the third this session—practically dispossessing the people of the reserves of the State which have been set apart for various purposes. The object in setting apart a Class A reserve is to make it impossible to utilise it for any other purpose or to alienate it without the consent of Parliament, but we are coming to regard it as a formal thing—although Class A reserves—to dispossess the public of them by Bills of this kind without adequate inquiry, and consulting those for whom the reserves have been dedicated. Let us take Clause 3. As far as the Margaret River is concerned where we have caves reserves, and have endeavoured as far as possible to build up reserves for the benefit of the State and visitors, one naturally thinks it is eminently desirable that we should take care of reserves of this kind; but here we propose to take away a considerable portion, one quarter, and remove it from the category of Class A reserves. Then again, as to Clause 4—I have heard this story before as to the honourable intentions of semi-private clubs if they are permitted to use reserves—I know in a suburb of Perth where there

are two desirable blocks of land belonging to the Government of considerable value for various purposes, and of great value for park purposes, and these have practically been alienated in this fashion. There were all sorts of assurances from the people concerned that although these were to be set apart for sporting clubs they were going to do everything for the safeguarding of the public, that although they would improve them there would be no restrictions placed on the right of the public to enter the grounds. And assurances of this nature are absolutely essential or we should never consent to parting with areas of land set apart for the public. But only the other day I was going through that very area and I found a notice that “children are not permitted to enter.” What was the primary object of the reserve but to give children free access to these playgrounds and breathing spaces. In this Bill where we had the assurance that no restrictions would be placed on the right of the public to enter we find the notice “children not permitted.” And in other places people have no right of entry unless they pay admission. I resent the alienation of these reserves in order that clubs may exercise a semi-proprietary right over areas which in the wisdom of the administrative authority have been set apart essentially for the public use.

Mr. Foulkes: A notice will be put up that the public have access.

Mr. BATH: This is the process which goes on, and it has resulted in the alienation of large areas of commonage reserves in the old country. People go along without any particular legal right or any right whatever and are assisted by agreement. They carry out certain improvements, and that appears to have been done by this golf club, and the very fact of having carried out improvements is regarded as a basis on which they have a right and a claim to negotiate with the legal authority to get some kind of legal right over the area. They do it first of their own volition and then they say we have spent £100 or so, and think they are entitled to a legal right or lease, and they secure it. Before we know where we are

these reserves are enclosed, and in spite of the agreement restrictions are imposed. It is not desirable in matters of this kind that Bills should be passed without the closest inquiry and the residents being consulted in regard to the reserves. We have a statement by the member for Claremont that they are going to take a referendum. I believe this matter should not be dealt with until the people have been consulted. If the people are consulted we could enter into the agreement with a better spirit, and we should then be more calculated to agree when we are asked for this process to alienate reserves that we should do without proper authority and without the knowledge of how the alienation is viewed by people in the particular locality.

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle): I trust members will not agree to the Bill. This is the only reserve that is near the beach where a large number of people who visit the district have an opportunity of picnicing. It has been stated that there are other reserves in the neighbourhood. I admit there is another reserve adjoining this one which was granted to a friendly society, but that society has got power to sell, and will sell when they get a price that suits them. I do not object to retaining a reserve for the right of the people as a whole, but I object to transferring these reserves to private people. The council has no right to any portion of this reserve, and we must remember that the council only lasts for three years. It is all very well to say that these reserves are open to the public. No doubt they are. Because the areas are fairly large the public can go through them contrary to the wishes of those to whom the reserves have been granted. I have seen letters in the Press complaining of the actions of this golf club in cutting the trees down, which was the only shelter for people visiting Cottesloe Beach at holiday times. I think this reserve, situated as it is, should not be offered to one club but should be reserved for the whole of the people. As to the other reserves to be dealt with by this Bill, one or two may be necessary, and we should approve of them. If it were not for that I should

move that the Bill be read a second time this day six months. I think we should bear in mind that when a reserve is made a Class A reserve it is done for the express purpose of retaining it for the use of the public and prohibiting anybody being granted that reserve for private purposes or for the use of a club. The object of making a reserve a Class A reserve is to protect it for future generations. Seeing that is so why should we remove this reserve from the purpose for which it was granted? I trust members will not agree to the transfer of one or two of the reserves mentioned in the Bill. There is one referred to that is necessary for the use of school children, and there can be no objection to it being included in the Bill, but as the fence is adjoining the school ground it could be removed and the children would have the use of the whole of that reserve, because no one would step in and say the children have no right there. The Bill could very well be postponed; I hope members will not agree to passing it.

Mr. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): I think members are under somewhat of a misapprehension as to changing the purpose of these reserves. Through the courtesy of the Minister I was able to see the draft agreement between the council and the golf club. I know this reserve fairly well. At the present time it is absolutely neglected. It is regrettable that it should be so, in such a convenient spot, but the fact remains that it is neglected and is likely to remain so as long as it is under the control of the local authority.

Mr. Murphy: Give it away to somebody else, and prevent the public from using it.

Mr. SCADDAN: There is no proposal to prevent the public from using it. The only rights granted to the golf club are to make any improvements necessary for the purpose of playing golf. At the same time the lease provides that the public may at any time without restriction, even when golf is being played, go on the reserve, and that notices shall be exhibited in conspicuous places to the effect that the reserve is open to the public at all times. It is provided also that the golf

club have to maintain a permanent gardener. This the municipality have never done, and are never likely to do. Generally speaking I think it will make a vast improvement in the reserve. After all there is no comparison in the lease being granted to the golf club at Cottesloe and the title given to the race clubs on the goldfields; yet no hon. member would contend that it was not wise to have given these reserves over to the race clubs, for they have been transformed into real beauty spots. If the golf club carry out the conditions of the lease, which they will have to do, it will be to the advantage of the residents of Cottesloe. At the present time the grounds are really an eyesore. I do not think there is any danger in this at all. I am a strong believer in the preservation of our Class A reserves, but having read the lease I am satisfied we are not endangering the rights of the people in regard to this ground. It will mean a great improvement to the ground, which after a period will revert to the people if they so desire. With regard to the other reserves, I know nothing about that at the Upper Margaret River, except as shown on the plan. As to the Bunbury town lot 122, when I was in Bunbury I saw the gentleman most interested in this matter and he showed me over the ground, in regard to which no satisfactory arrangement has been arrived at. This gentleman himself paid the municipal council for a portion of the ground which was useless to the council, and after he had improved it he found he could get no title because the council had no right to sell it. I am satisfied we are not robbing the State, the municipality, or anybody else by making the alteration in connection with these particular grounds. I do not think there is anything objectionable in any of these, so far as I can gather.

Mr. HUDSON (Dundas): I intend to oppose the Bill on the general grounds that the proposals are for inroads on our reserves which have been set aside for the benefit of the people. The first provision does not appear at first sight to contain any special ground for objection inasmuch as it is only the use of the reserve which is altered; but when

we come to either of the others providing for the disposal of a Class A reserve by sale I take strong objection to it. With regard to the proposal to lease certain lands at Cottesloe it seems to me to be somewhat of an anomalous position to find the reasons urged for the breaking up of this reserve are that the people are to be allowed in, while the golf club are going to spend the money. Everything is to be done for the people. The people can go in, and there will be a notice that they can go in, yet the club are to have a lease. What is the lease for? What right is conferred on the club by that lease? if the public are to have free access to the ground as they have to-day? Where is the necessity for the lease, and for breaking into this reserve? I intend to oppose the Bill.

Mr. MURPHY (Fremantle): I am not so much concerned over the details as over the general principle contained in the Bill. The leader of the Opposition said the place is absolutely a desert, that it is neglected, that it is of no use, and consequently the lease should be granted to the golf club. May I tell the leader of the Opposition this is a favourite reserve of the people he is supposed to represent.

Mr. Scaddan: What is?

Mr. MURPHY: The very reserve you are handing over to a golf club. In the town of Fremantle we can furnish an excellent reason why we in this House should not be so ready to part with public reserves for the purpose of golf clubs. No one who knows me will accuse me of not being a sport, and of not being fond of all classes of sport. If there is one class of sport the devotees to which should be prepared to put their hands in their pockets and buy their own sporting ground, it is golf. Years ago the Government of Western Australia granted to the municipality of Fremantle a certain reserve for the recreation of the people for all time. Years went by and 50 acres of this reserve were granted to a golf club. To-day the reserve of the golf club is just in that portion of Fremantle eminently suited for the establishment of a public park for the recreation of our people.

The Minister for Lands: This is not an absolute lease.

Mr. MURPHY: But you get in the thin end of the wedge, and the next municipal council drive it home. No municipal council has a right to grant a lease beyond three years. Some years ago the golf club at Fremantle borrowed from the municipal authorities £800 upon which they were paying 8 per cent. Since I have been re-elected to the office of mayor of the town I find that the last council wiped off the whole of the debt of £800 and granted the club a lease for 20 years at a pepper-corn rental in return for the club planting 20 trees every year. There is no stipulation that the trees shall be cared for. All they have to do is to put 20 trees in the ground every year, and that constitutes the return for the lease. The leader of the Opposition is prepared to hand over to a small section who desire to use it for golf a large area at present used for the recreation of the people of the metropolis who go to Cottesloe Beach. The leader of the Opposition said the public could enter whether golf was being played or not. We know how much consideration the general public get. The same condition exists in regard to every bowling green granted in Western Australia. The bowling clubs have to put up a notice to the effect that the public are admitted, that the public have the right to go in on the bowling ground and play bowls.

Mr. Scaddan: Subject to their rules.

Mr. MURPHY: Who is going to do that? The very fact that tacitly you have given the ground over to a section of the community will stop any man from exercising his rightful privileges. It comes with bad grace from the leader of the Opposition to support a proposal to hand over a public reserve to the control of a certain select section of the community.

The Minister for Lands: You will have an ill-kept ground transformed into one well kept.

Mr. MURPHY: It is a ground the general public can go in on and enjoy.

Mr. Scaddan: You would not like to spend a day there.

Mr. MURPHY: I have spent many a day there, and have enjoyed myself with my wife and family on the very ground you are handing over. After our experience at Fremantle I protest against any further giving away to a particular section Crown lands originally granted for the benefit of all.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray): I endorse all I have heard from the member for Fremantle. My reason is a remembrance I have that 14 or 15 years ago portion of the Perth esplanade was granted by the City council to a bowling club. It will be remembered that there was some opposition to this, and many discussions took place in the City council. Mr. Speaker would remember the various discussions that took place in the Perth City council on the fact that permission was granted to the bowling club to use this land on condition that the citizens of Perth were to be entitled at any time to go on and use it and so forth, but it was not very long before certain councillors of the city of Perth had to force their entrance into that ground because the gates were padlocked and chained against them. The present mayor of Perth, Mr. Molloy, and myself went down there once, and we kicked up a row until we got the padlock and chain taken away from the gate. What happens in regard to these particular reserves? It is not a question of protecting sport. I am pleased that opportunities should be granted to people to enjoy themselves after they have finished their work, but I strenuously object to any of these reserves granted to the whole public being granted to one section to the exclusion of the general community, and the instance I have given is one I shall never forget, nor any of the members of the City council in those days, nor any of those who interested themselves in the battle we had to preserve the rights of the people to that piece of ground. Now, in regard to the golf reserve at Cottesloe. It is all right to say that it is open for the public to go on it; but from what little I know of golf, I understand there are putting greens that have to be prepared, and I presume the reason for wanting the reserve is that the club may have

the power to stop people playing on these putting greens and injuring them. Now, if this cannot be done by any other means than by taking away from the whole of the people the right to this ground, I say let the golf people go elsewhere and provide their own ground over which they can have their own control, but to the request that this House should put its imprimatur on a matter of this sort, handing over to one section only a reserve granted for all the people, I hope we will not agree. Even assuming the reserve is not used very much now by the people, we must remember these reserves are not only for to-day but they are for all time. They are not for our children but for our children's children, and if we are giving away the rights and our control over these reserves now what are our children's children to do when they require places for recreation? I have no desire to hinder the enjoyment of any class of person, but I protest strongly against any attempt to hand over to a few that which belongs to the many. I can hardly understand any member of Parliament supporting such a thing. Some people may say we are not democratic, but I believe we are all democratic at the base, and the whole principle of our Government is that the people as a whole should control these matters. This reserve was granted years ago, and we are going backward by handing over public reserves to private people. I strongly protest against it. It is all very well for some members to say we are such a small community, and that there is all this, that, and the other. We must remember we will become a larger community as time goes on. In Birmingham it has become necessary for the municipality, because the parks and reserves have become so small, to provide large sums of money, hundreds of thousands of pounds, in order to purchase places where the children can play; and I have sufficient belief in this State of ours to realise that even the reserves which have been wisely granted will not be too much for what the population of the State will be in the course of time. We might as well ask that a large portion of King's Park should be made use of for golf purposes

only. I know there are croquet lawns and tennis lawns at King's Park, which practically mean private possession, but I hold they are wrong, and I say distinctly we would be doing a great wrong and going back if we permitted any more of this sort of thing. My vote will go against it, whether it is popular or unpopular. I say it is not right.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (in reply): May I suggest that the second reading be allowed to pass and that the Bill be dealt with in Committee? It would be a pity to lose the whole Bill because of this reserve at Cottesloe. I would remind the hon. member, however, that golf links and bowling greens are different things. A bowling green is a close preserve that has to be cared for, watered, and rolled, and the public could not possibly be allowed on a bowling green, or the green would be entirely destroyed. On the other hand, golf is played in open paddocks, and all that is asked for and granted in this Bill is the right to preserve greens and to keep the grounds in order, and only to play golf so that it will never be to the detriment of other people.

Mr. George: There must be a ranger, and he would order the people off.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: No; he would not order the people off; there would merely be a gardener to keep the grounds in order. Golf is played over a long stretch of country, and there will be no chance of putting a padlock and chain on a gate. As a matter of fact the public will be much better provided for if the golf club are allowed to spend their hundreds on beautifying the grounds. The ranger will have the right to preserve the green just as cricket clubs have the right to preserve their pitches. What would be the use of a cricket pitch if the public had the right to sit down on it when games are being played? All the golf club ask is that they can keep the grounds in order and not to the detriment of the people. I believe there is a lease already in existence at South Perth, where golf is played and where no annoyance is caused to the public. The mayor of Cottesloe and the member for the district warmly support this proposition, and it seems to

me extraordinary it should have been received with so much opposition. It seems to me a sort of dog-in-the-manger policy, when it is said that these greens must be kept for the people. I daresay a clause can be inserted that will give the right to cancel the lease on compensation being paid, but I do not think it will be necessary to consider that. I hope the Bill will pass the second reading and that the Bill will be dealt with in Committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Taylor in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Changing of purpose of portion of Reserve A883:

Mr. GEORGE: Seeing the insidious nature of this Bill what was the reason for this clause?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was to enlarge the school area at Claremont so that manual training and cookery school rooms could be erected. It was necessary to pass the clause to give the Education Department control over the ground.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—Changing of purpose of portion of reserve A7686:

Mr. BATH: The time would come when all the reserves now declared would be found necessary. If the policy of passing Bills for the alienation of reserves was continued we would have to pay exorbitant sums to buy that back with which we now parted so foolishly. We should not alienate this first-class reserve in the Margaret district.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There was a large area of land already reserved for the Caves Board in the Margaret district, and with the excision of this area dealt with in this clause there would still be 3,500 acres in the locality, which should be sufficient for all purposes. It was proposed to erect an agricultural hall and the desire also was to set aside an area for a small township, and to cut up the few blocks along the river frontage, which could be sold.

Mr. Bath: You do not want a thousand acres for an agricultural hall.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: But for the township we did, and it was desired to sell a few blocks.

Mr. Bath: You are looking for revenue.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: All of course were looking for revenue and the timber was wanted on this land and the land could be put to better use than was done at present.

Clause put and a division taken with the following result.

Ayes	18
Noes	15

Majority for .. 3

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Carson	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Davies	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gordon	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Layman
Mr. Male	(Teller).
Mr. Mitchell	

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bath	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Price
Mr. Collier	Mr. Swan
Mr. George	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gourley	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Hudson
Mr. Horan	(Teller).

Clause thus passed.

Clause 4—Power to lease portions of reserve:

Mr. GEORGE: It was his intention to vote against this clause.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	16

Majority against .. 3

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Gordon	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Layman
Mr. Male	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bath	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Bolton	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Collier	Mr. Price
Mr. Davies	Mr. Swan
Mr. George	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Hudson
Mr. Holman	(Teller).
Mr. Horan	

Clause thus negatived.

Clause 5—agreed to.

New clause:

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 6:—"All that piece of land containing about one and a half acres being a portion of Permanent Reserve numbered A Reserve 6613, situate at the north-west corner of the said reserve, and having a frontage of 317 feet to Forrest-street and of 208 feet to Swanbourne-terrace, and opposite boundaries parallel and equal, is hereby excised from the said reserve to the extent that the said piece of land so excised may be vested in the Municipality of Cottesloe."

The desire was that this land might be vested in the Municipality of Cottesloe. It was in order that tea-rooms might be caused to be erected for the convenience and service of the public.

Mr. Bath: What is the total area reserved?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: About 40 acres.

Mr. FOULKES: We were vesting in the council about an acre and a half of the 40 acres. He proposed to move an amendment to the new clause to the effect that the proceeds derived from the land should be applied to the improvement of the land.

Mr. Murphy: Will the municipality run the tearooms?

Mr. FOULKES: No; the municipality would construct the tearooms and let them. He moved an amendment to the proposed new clause—

*That the following words be added:—
"Provided that all rent derived from*

the said land shall be applied by the said municipality to the improvement of the recreation grounds in the municipality."

Mr. MURPHY moved—

That the question be now put.

The CHAIRMAN: Seeing that he had scarcely finished reading the new clause and the amendment upon it when this fresh motion was made, he did not think he would be justified in accepting the motion. Hon. members should have time to at least realise what was the question before the Chair.

Mr. MURPHY: Would the Chairman give hon. members his reasons for refusing to accept the motion that the question be now put?

The CHAIRMAN: The new clause and the amendment thereupon had scarcely been stated from the Chair when the hon. member had risen and moved that the question be now put. It would not be fair to the Committee to accept the hon. member's motion. He ruled the hon. member out of order.

Mr. MURPHY: Having moved that the question be now put, and having a perfect right to move that question, he demanded to know under what Standing Order the Chairman declined to take it.

The CHAIRMAN: It was not a question of Standing Orders at all, but rather one of equity and fair play to the Committee. He would not be justified in accepting the hon. member's motion, which, indeed, he had ruled out of order.

Mr. MURPHY: In the circumstances he would move that the ruling of the Chairman be dissented from.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No good purpose would be served by proceeding with the motion, which would serve merely to take up the time of the Committee. Moreover, the Standing Orders did not provide for any such motion as that the question be now put.

The CHAIRMAN: Technically that was so, but when the hon. member moved that the question be now put he (the Chairman) had realised that what was meant was that the Committee do now divide. He had no desire to fall back upon technicalities. But he had declined to accept

the motion on the grounds of equity and fair play.

Mr. MURPHY: As it seemed to be the desire of the Committee that the motion should not be pressed, he would withdraw it.

Dissent by leave withdrawn.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was to be hoped the Committee would not accept the amendment. No good reason for it had been forthcoming.

Mr. ANGWIN: While it remained a Class A reserve it would be impossible to sell this area without a special Act of Parliament, but if it were taken out of the Class A reserve then it could be sold at any time with the consent of the Governor. To-day this was an A reserve for recreation, but the municipality wanted to hand over the power that they possessed at the present time to a private club. The Committee had rightly objected to that. Now the municipality wanted $1\frac{1}{4}$ acres for the purpose of erecting tea rooms, and it was desirable that this $1\frac{1}{4}$ acres should continue as an A reserve so that it would be impossible for the municipality to dispose of it. If the clause were agreed to the council could erect tea rooms, and then sell buildings, land, and everything else to any private person who came along and made an offer for it. So long as the area was kept part of an A reserve that could not be done.

Mr. FOULKES: The municipality of Cottesloe, unlike other municipalities, had not an acre of freehold. They had been to great expense in catering for the holiday public, and he was surprised at the Fremantle members opposing this grant considering that a few years ago 14 acres of land, situated at Cottesloe, had been granted to the Fremantle friendly societies in freehold.

Mr. Collier: Fremantle has made arrangements to cater for the holiday public, but Cottesloe is a disgrace.

Mr. FOULKES: Cottesloe has only a total revenue of about £1,200, and every spare penny had been expended in catering for the holiday public. This area being an A reserve the council has no power to enter on the grounds and build the proposed tea-rooms. There was no desire to

sell the land, and he would be willing to insert any provision prohibiting a sale by the municipality.

Mr. PRICE: There was no reason why the municipality should not build tea rooms on a class A reserve in the same way as the Perth council had built tea rooms on the Esplanade, which was also an A reserve. Apparently the Cottesloe council wanted the land in fee simple, purely in order that they might dispose of it. There was no need for this clause.

Amendment (Mr. Foulkes's) put and negatived.

Mr. ANGWIN: The members for Fremantle had nothing whatever to do with the reserve granted to the friendly societies, because the grant had been made previous to any of the present Fremantle members entering Parliament. He was not objecting to Cottesloe building tea rooms on this reserve, but he was objecting to the area being taken out of an A reserve, thus giving the council power to sell the land.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	15

Majority against .. 4

AYES.

Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Davies	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Grogory	Mr. Layman
Mr. Male	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Price
Mr. Brown	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Heilmann	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Horan	Mr. Collier
Mr. McDowall	(Teller).

New clause thus negatived.

Schedule 2—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

12 o'clock, midnight.

BILLS (2) RETURNED FROM THE COUNCIL.

1. Appropriation (without amendment).
2. Supply 1911-12 (without amendment).

BILL—ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH PROPERTY.

Second Reading, etc.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. J. L. Nanson) in moving the second reading said: The object of this Bill is to make some necessary provision for dealing with Roman Catholic church properties in the diocese of Perth. There are a number of titles of land belonging to the diocese which remain under trustees appointed many years ago. These titles have never been registered in the name of the Roman Catholic Bishop as they should have been according to Act No. 4 of 1858. Furthermore, there are numerous titles in the name of the former Bishop of the Diocese, the Right Rev. Dr. Gibney. The existing Act does not do away with the necessity for having these titles registered in the name of the new Bishop. The titles to which I refer are very numerous, and the expense of getting the new Bishop's name registered would be considerable. It is chiefly in order to avoid this expense that this Bill is asked for. There is also a further difficulty which it is desired to overcome in the present instance and for the future. It is not desirable that the titles of these lands be in the private name of the Bishop, because, if this is done, there is nothing to show on the title whether the land is the private property of the Bishop or belongs to the church. By making the Bishop, as is done in this Bill, for the time being a corporation sole and having all titles registered in his official name, not only will this difficulty be overcome but no change whatever would have to be made to the titles on the appointment of a new Bishop in the future. It will be found on reference to the Bill that the Bishop is to have no power to dispose of property except with the concurrence of two advisers. This restriction is a new one, as hitherto the sole power of disposing has belonged to the

Bishop of the diocese, subject to the provisions contained in the Roman Catholic Church Lands Act, 1895. The provisions of this Act, which deal largely with the power of mortgaging and selling church lands, will continue to apply, notwithstanding the passing of this Bill, as there is no desire to abrogate these provisions, the more important of which I may mention are those requiring the consent of the Governor in regard to the mortgaging or sale of church lands which are given to the church by the Crown without consideration. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

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

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS AMENDMENT.

Second Reading, etc.

Order of the Day for resumption of debate on second reading read.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment; the report adopted.

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading, etc.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory) in moving the second reading said: This measure has been before the Chamber on a previous occasion and members generally have a full knowledge of its object. Under the present Fisheries Act provision is made for granting leases, but owing to some unfortunate interpretation of the term fish, it has been impossible to grant leases for the purpose of utilising the turtle. At the present

time there are two companies which are prepared to start work, providing an agreement can be signed giving them the exclusive rights for the purpose of using these turtles. We have not that power under our present legislation. I have here a draft of the agreement which the Government are prepared to enter into with these people, and I think those members who have seen it are satisfied that the conditions are such as will provide for all that is necessary for the preservation of the turtles, as well as assisting a new industry in Western Australia. A stipulation is made in the agreement for ample capital to be provided, and ample expenditure during the first year. The granting of these exclusive rights should do much to protect the life of the turtle, because it would naturally follow that after the expenditure of a fair amount of capital in the building up of the industry, those who would possess the rights would endeavour to preserve the life, as far as possible, of the female turtle, while successfully establishing factories upon our coast. If these works can be successfully established, it will mean that they will provide employment for a large number of people, and thus introduce an important enterprise into Western Australia. I have much pleasure in moving—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. TROY (Mount Magnet): If the draft of this agreement has been shown to members, I think the number of members is very limited indeed. This is a matter which affects all hon. members, and not one or two members only. I speak in this strain because a similar Bill came in for a considerable amount of criticism on a previous occasion, and it left this Chamber with an amendment providing that no concession should be given unless it was stipulated in the agreement that white labour exclusively was to be employed. I do not know whether the agreement the Minister has contains such a provision.

The Minister for Mines: I will let the hon. member have the agreement.

Mr. TROY: I do not know who has signed this agreement. It has not been laid on the Table of the House. The Minister might adjourn the debate until the following day in order to give members an opportunity of perusing the agreement.

Mr. GILL (Balkatta): It seems to me that there only objection there is to the passage of the Bill is with regard to the question of the employment of white labour. I had no idea that there was an agreement in existence. I understand that some members are satisfied with the Bill, but those members only speak for themselves. I would have no objection to the Bill if I were assured that the agreement provided for the employment of white labour.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray): I would draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that it has been impossible for me during the past two years to obtain any satisfaction with regard to the question of the destruction of fish at Rockingham and Mandurah. Perhaps this is not the time for referring to these matters, but as the Bill proposes to amend the Fisheries Act, I might be permitted to say a few words on the subject. At Rockingham there have been tons of immature fish destroyed by those people who are commonly called "Dago" fishermen. I have made representations to the department requesting that adequate inspection should be undertaken, but I have not been able to get it done. I have been put off by letter after letter, and I know that if a white man were to have anything to do with a matter of this description he would be prosecuted. Down at Mandurah the same thing is occurring; a large quantity of edible fish has been destroyed owing to the parsimony of the department in not appointing a sufficient number of inspectors. I have in my pocket now a letter from Rockingham in which the roads board say that it is absurd to suppose that honorary inspectors can go out and watch during the night in order to prevent the destruction of fish. It is a crying shame to find that this can be done, and that the department are supine and can pass the matter over. It is a very serious mat-

ter, seeing that our own fishermen are held responsible if they commit an infraction of the Act, yet we have foreigners allowed to destroy young fish, and the department is either too poor or too supine to do anything in the matter. If it were earlier in the session I would deal with the subject at very great length, because I feel that during the past two years the representations I have made and which have been proved to be correct, have not been dealt with in the spirit that should have been displayed. The principle of putting off and bluff has existed from start to finish. As far as this Bill is concerned, I understand it means that the objections of this time last year have been removed, and that being so, I do not propose to say anything more about it. I hope the Minister will let those who are in control of the department know of my outspoken criticism with regard to the destruction of young fish.

Mr. COWCHER (Williams): I quite endorse the remarks of the member for Murray. Some friends have told me the destruction of young fish down there is something dreadful, and that thousands and thousands are thrown away and destroyed.

Mr. TROY (in explanation): I have now gone through this agreement handed to me by the Minister. Last year it was intended to give persons who secured the concession the right to all the fish. I find now, however, that the agreement provides for the exclusive right to turtle only.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (in reply): I will be only too pleased to convey to the Minister controlling this department the sentiments expressed by the members for Murray and for Williams in regard to the destruction of fish. Undoubtedly one great want in Western Australia is a plentiful supply of fresh fish, which would be of immense advantage to the people. If that great destruction is going on it must mean considerable loss to our people, and I can assure those hon. members the criticisms they have passed to-night will be sent to the proper quarter and an endeavour

made to prevent a recurrence of what has taken place. I wish it to be distinctly understood this is the draft of any agreement which will be entered into. It has been devised to protect the interests of the country and the desires of hon. members, and I think it will do so.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

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

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Mines: Form of agreement—exclusive licenses.

BILL—JURY ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Mr. BROWN (Perth) in moving the second reading said: This Bill applies only to civil cases. Its chief object is to provide that when a jury shall have deliberated for three hours a two-thirds majority of that jury shall rule; while if they have deliberated for six hours they shall be discharged. It is further provided that in either of these events the action can be reinstated and commenced without the loss of even a day. I hope hon. members will pass the Bill, which, as I have said, applies only to civil actions. We all believe in majority rule, and this Bill is based on majority rule.

Question passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Mr. Taylor in the Chair; Mr. Brown in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—In civil cases a two-thirds majority to be accepted:

Mr. TROY: It would be interesting to hear from the Attorney General the opinion of the Crown Law Department on this clause.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The clause was a desirable one. Litigants could be put to very great expense through juries in civil cases failing to

agree. At present unless both parties agreed to accept a majority verdict such verdict could not be taken. The Bill provided for a majority vote being taken in certain cases. Whether it would be good from the point of view of the lawyer he could not say, but from the point of view of the community it was, in many ways, advisable.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 and 5—agreed to.

New Clause—At what name empanelment from juror's book to commence:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 6:—"The first empanelment under section nineteen of the principal Act of names from a Jurors' Book shall commence, so far as practicable, with the first name arranged therein under the letter next in alphabetical succession after that under which the last name empanelled from the preceding book was arranged, and the beginning of the book shall be resorted to only when no names arranged in a subsequent portion of the book are available for empanelment in accordance with the provisions of this and the principal Act."

In the past when a jury was summoned the department commenced by taking the names in alphabetical order, but each year the list of jurymen called did not get beyond B or C. Then at the beginning of the next year a commencement had to be made at A again, with the result that only persons whose names commenced with the letters A, B, or C were liable to be summoned. The effect of the clause was to enable the department to go right through the jurors' book, and then commence again, so that everybody, who was liable to serve as a juror, would have an equal chance of enjoying that inestimable privilege.

New clause put and passed.

New Clause—Name may be omitted from panel and person summoned excused:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 7:—"The summoning officer may, of his own motion, in the district comprising the Perth-Fremantle and

Swan Magisterial Districts, and in any other district by the direction of a police or resident magistrate, omit from a panel any name in the Jurors' Book and excuse from attendance any person who has been summoned as a juror."

At the present time it was not possible for the summoning officer to excuse any person from serving on a jury, although the officer might know that that person had the best of excuses; neither was it possible for the judge to excuse an individual. This clause gave a certain amount of discretion to the summoning officer, who was the sheriff, and would prove in practice a very desirable innovation.

Mr. ANGWIN: The clause gave too much power to the summoning officer, who might be able to excuse his personal friends from serving on a jury. Every person should take his position on a jury when called upon, and it was undesirable to give any officer of the department the power to excuse persons who might be able to bring influence to bear to avoid their duty. It was quite sufficient to give that power to a judge.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The sheriff was a responsible officer, and there was no reason to suppose that he would be less careful in the discharge of his duties than a judge of the Supreme Court. It would be a singular thing if the Committee refused to pass this clause because the sheriff could not be trusted. If that were the position, the remedy would be to remove the officer.

Mr. ANGWIN: Influence could be used on an officer of a department which could not be used on a judge. At the present time everybody was served alike, but under the proposed clause, whilst a working man would have no chance of being relieved by the present sheriff from serving on a jury, persons of influence might have no difficulty in being excused. If the matter was left to a judge, the working man would have the same chance as anybody else.

Mr. MURPHY: Members could not overlook the fact that the jury list which might be compiled by the present sheriff would not be in the best interests of

justice. It would be much better to leave this matter in the hands of the judge.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Committee should not agree to the new clause, which gave far too much power to a single individual. It would permit the sheriff to pack the jury, and whilst the present arrangement in regard to the empanelling of juries was not altogether satisfactory, the proposed alteration would be considerably worse. To give the judge or the court power to excuse jurymen would be quite sufficient.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was not the sheriff who chose a jury; the sheriff merely got the panel together and from the panel the jury were selected. It would be impossible for the sheriff to pack a jury, and even after the jury were empanelled there was the right to challenge any jurymen. All that was desired was that when an individual could rightly claim that he was not able to attend, a certain amount of discretion should be vested in the summoning officer to excuse the man. This simply enabled the sheriff, where good cause was shown, to excuse a person from service on the jury. That could be done at present by the judge, but the jurymen was placed in the uncomfortable position that if he did not send somebody to court to explain his absence, he was liable to be fined. This clause and the next one were sought to be inserted in the interests of the general public liable to be summoned as jurors. At this late stage he would let the clauses go did he not feel convinced such was the case.

1 o'clock a.m.

Mr. BROWN: Having been asked to take charge of the Bill by the Hon. Mr. Kingsmill, who introduced the measure in another place, he accepted these clauses. There were repeated occasions when the allowances paid jurymen were not sufficient for the time certain people lost, and there were many occasions when the most urgent necessity arose for a man to be relieved from attendance on juries. As for the matter of bias, was it not a frequent practice with solicitors by

arrangement to challenge jurors and so relieve them from attendance?

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

Ayes	15
Noes	11

Majority for 4

AYES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Horan
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Male
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Gregory	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Harper	

(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Murphy
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Collier	Mr. Troy
Mr. Gregory	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Heilmann	Mr. Underwood
Mr. McDowall	

(Teller).

New clause thus passed.

New clause:

The ATTORNEY GENERAL moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 8:—"The Court or Judge, before which or whom a jurors' panel is returnable, may excuse from attendance any person whose name is included in such panel."

This gave judges the powers given to the sheriff in the preceding clause.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments; and the report adopted.

Read a third time and returned to the Legislative Council with amendments.

BILL — FREMANTLE HARBOUR TRUST ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. J. Mitchell) in moving the second reading said: The object of this Bill is to provide power for the appointment of special constables to protect the goods entrusted to the care of the Fremantle Harbour Trust Commissioners, and within the limits of the harbour. The Commissioners have a detective now, but he has such

limited powers that his usefulness is greatly hampered. Another object is that the Commissioners may have power to order the removal of goods likely to injuriously affect other goods stored in the sheds. This power is asked for because last year in several of the sheds the Commissioners found that, owing to certain wheat becoming infested with weevil, it was necessary to secure power to order the removal of wheat which became so infested. This power will be advantageous to our settlers, who should have their wheat protected to the fullest possible extent. The Commissioners desire to have the power to order the removal of any goods liable to do injury to other goods. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle): I do not think the powers go far enough. I suggest that power be given to prohibit wheat such as that in the sheds at Fremantle last season being sent out of the State. There was some wheat sent away at the beginning of this season that will be detrimental to the best interests of Western Australia. In fact, it was a disgrace. I obtained a sample of that wheat, and even the Minister had to admit it was in such a condition that it was a disgrace to send it out of the State. This wheat had not been properly stored, and the neglect was the cause of the condition in which it was found. The time has also arrived when people who send things out of the State which have deteriorated should be prosecuted and made to suffer imprisonment. That is the only penalty which I consider should be imposed. People who are guilty of this kind of thing are committing a robbery equally with a man who is taking money out of the pocket of another. Every person must feel the effect of the damage which is done by action such as this. I hope that a Bill will be introduced as early as possible to punish offenders such as those to whom I have referred, whose actions are detrimental to the well-being of the State.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

New clause:

Mr. ANGWIN moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 6:—"Section 4 of the principal Act is amended by the addition of the following proviso: Provided that after the vacation of office by the Commissioners as a whole, which shall take place next after the second day of February, 1911, one position among the Commissioners shall always be held by a person who has been appointed on the nomination of the majority of the members of the duly registered industrial unions formed to protect the interests of workers engaged in or about the handling, shipping, or unshipping of cargo at the port of Fremantle."

The practice had been followed of having certain interests represented on the Trust. Representations had been repeatedly made to the various Governments that there should also be a representative of those who were employed in connection with the work that was done on the wharves. The Government in the past had not seen fit to grant representation to the workers, while they granted representation to the other associations. At Fremantle we had a body of men acting as Commissioners of the Trust who knew nothing whatever with regard to the handling of cargo, and by having a representative of the workers who thoroughly understood the whole business much assistance would be given to the other Commissioners in carrying out their duties. There were many men engaged on the wharves to-day who held master mariners' certificates, and many of them had traded to various ports of the world, and had seen the working and handling of cargo in many ports of the world. These were the men who would be of valuable assistance to the Trust.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member should have given notice of his intention to move such clause, and he hoped that its inclusion in the Bill would not be pressed.

Mr. BOLTON: The Committee should agree to this amendment. If he remembered rightly, half a promise was made by the former Premier that if a workers' re-

presentative was appointed on the Bunbury Harbour Board a similar representative would be appointed on the Fremantle Trust. The Government admitted that for practical experience there could not be found the equal to the waterside workers, who had had experience all over the world. Such a clause as the member for East Fremantle proposed to move should be included in the measure; then it would not rest with the Government to make the appointment. It would be only a generous act for the Government to appoint a workers' representative. No doubt the hon. member who moved the amendment would be prepared to withdraw if he were given an assurance that such representative would be appointed.

Mr. MURPHY: The amendment opened up a very big question indeed. When first the trust was constituted certain public bodies were permitted to suggest nominees to the Government, and these nominees, with the chairman, formed the Fremantle Harbour Trust. The Fremantle Chamber of Commerce, the Perth Chamber of Commerce, and the shipping companies of Fremantle each suggested to the Government a nominee and now, during the last two terms of office, we had gone to the Chamber of Mines, Kalgoorlie, for another nominee. In his opinion the first chairman of the harbour trust should never have been appointed, for the reason that he was a member of another place and was carrying on the principal stevedoring business in Fremantle. Yet that gentleman had special qualifications in that he was a seaman, and that his business kept him on the wharf where he was in close touch with everything going on. Although holding that such appointment should not have been made, he (Mr. Murphy) could not but admit that the Fremantle Harbour Trust had never been so efficient as during the term of the first chairman. To-day we had on the Trust as chairman, Mr. Leeds, managing director of Dalgety & Co., and a director also of the Swan Brewery. All the time that gentleman could give to the Fremantle Harbour Trust was once a week, when he attended the meeting. Another member

of the Trust was Mr. Allnutt, managing director of D. & J. Fowler, Ltd. There was nothing to be urged against these two gentlemen except that in their private capacity they had all the work they could attend to and knew nothing whatever about the affairs of the trust. Then we had Mr. Hudson, who was also connected in private business, which left him no time to do anything for the Trust. Then came Mr. Eyres, a very ancient and estimable gentleman representing the Perth Chamber of Commerce. In matters of shipping administration and harbours this gentleman was no more qualified to perform the duties than he (Mr. Murphy) would be to occupy the position of Commissioner of Railways. Then we had the representative of the Chamber of Mines, Kalgoorlie, Mr. Barker. While the Government had appointed five gentlemen to administer the Fremantle Harbour Trust, it mostly resolved into the hands of the secretary of the trust. For 11 years he (Mr. Murphy) had been closely in touch with the shipping trade of Fremantle and, consequently, he knew something of what he was speaking about. In Melbourne, after twelve years' of experience, they had abolished honorary commissioners and appointed five salaried men, who devoted their whole time to the administration of the Melbourne Harbour Trust. In Sydney this mistake had never been made, because from the outset they had paid Government servants to form a harbour trust, responsible to Parliament for the administration of the harbour. In Fremantle anybody was able to get on to the trust, and they attended to their private business first, and when they had five minutes to spare attended to the business of the trust. This work demanded maritime experience, but instead of having at the head of affairs a man who knew something about ships, shipping, and wharves, we placed this responsible work in the hands of anybody who had influence enough to get on the trust. If interests were to be represented, if the Fremantle Chamber of Commerce, the shipping companies, the Perth Chamber of Commerce, and the Kalgoorlie Cham-

ber of Mines, were all entitled to representation, then surely the 700 men who worked on the wharves day by day were also entitled to be represented. Unless the Government were prepared to alter the whole constitution of the trust, and by Act of Parliament appoint a body of commissioners, whose whole time would be devoted to the interests of the harbour, he demanded that the workers on the wharves should have representation on the trust.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The harbour was well managed and the commissioners were doing good work. When the time came to reappoint the commissioners, the suggestion put forward by the member for East Fremantle would have consideration, and he hoped that the member would accept that assurance and withdraw his amendment.

Mr. Angwin: Will you give it favourable consideration?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The matter would be given earnest consideration.

Mr. MURPHY: The member for East Fremantle should not be satisfied with the promise of earnest consideration. When the harbour trust was first created by the James Government that promise to give consideration to the question of representation for the workers had been made, but it had never been carried out. He was opposed to representation of any interest, but if interests were to be represented, then the promise given many years ago in regard to the representation of the workers should be redeemed. No matter how well the Fremantle harbour had paid in the past that result had been due, not to administration, but to force of circumstances arising out of the growth and prosperity of the State. With proper administration the harbour would have paid better. The commissioners knew nothing about ships and shipping, and yet they were supposed to administer a shipping concern. It was strange that the chairman appointed by the Government was a gentleman representing the company that controlled more of the shipping that entered the harbour than any other company in the State. He hoped that the

Minister's promise would give better results than the previous promises of Ministers in regard to representation of the men.

Mr. ANGWIN: The Minister controlling the Harbour Trust had been approached many times in the past in regard to this matter, but the request had never been favourably considered. He hoped that the Minister for Lands would now promise to give the matter favourable consideration.

The Minister for Lands: I do not think the matter has been considered by Cabinet.

Mr. ANGWIN: The matter had been considered by Cabinet before the Minister for Lands was a member of the Cabinet.

The Minister for Lands: I can promise that Cabinet will consider this matter.

Mr. ANGWIN: If the Minister would promise that the matter would be given favourable consideration he would withdraw the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: To promise favourable consideration would be as much as promising that a representative of the men would be appointed; he had promised earnest consideration, and if the hon. member thought that favourable consideration stopped short of an actual appointment—

Mr. Angwin: I do think so.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Then the promise of earnest consideration should be quite satisfactory. He could promise favourable consideration if the hon. member would understand that it did not necessarily mean the appointment of a representative of the men. The Government had already appointed a representative of the workers on the Bunbury Harbour Board, and the matter of extending the same representation to the labourers at Fremantle would be considered by Cabinet.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

2 o'clock a.m.

BILL—GAME ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading, etc.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. J. Mitchell) in moving the second reading said: This is a small amendment made necessary by the desire of the Colonial Secretary to protect opossums. It remedies restrictions set up by the First Schedule. Under the Game Act a close season is provided which we find very difficult to enforce, because under the amending Act of 1907 the season is limited to the game mentioned in the schedule. We desire to protect opossums to the fullest possible extent, and we wish to take power to make it an offence for any person to have in his possession the body of any game so protected, or any part of the body, which of course will include the skin. It would be simple enough to add opossums to the schedule, but it was thought advisable to move the amendment in the form now presented to the House, because we shall not only be setting up this restriction, but also we shall give the Railway Commissioner authority to refuse to carry any game over the railways during the close season. I hope the amendment will be accepted. It is necessary. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment; and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

House adjourned at 2.7 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Council,

Friday, 3rd February, 1911.

	PAGE
Paper presented	3706
Bills: Criminal Code Act Amendment, 3a.,	3706
Roads, 3a.	3706
Loan, £2,100,000, 2a., Com., 3a.	3706
Constitution Act Amendment, Recom., 3a.	3712
Licensing, Assembly's Message	3717, 3726, 3735
Parliamentary Allowance, 2a. (amendment six months), Com.	3722
Health, Assembly's Message, 3a.	3727
Jury Act Amendment, Assembly's amendments	3728
Roman Catholic Church Property, all stages	3729
Roads, Assembly's Message, Com., 3a.	3729
University Assembly's Message, Com. 3a.	3730
Mines and Machinery Inspection, all stages	3730
Permanent Reserves Rededication, all stages	3731
Roads Closure, all stages	3731
Cottesloe Beach Rates Validation, all stages	3735
Bills returned from Assembly	3717
Motion: Water Supply, Bullfinch, price	3732
Adjournment, Complimentary remarks	3735

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 10.30 a.m., and read prayers.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: Annual report of the board of Governors of the High School for the year ended 30th June, 1910.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1. Criminal Code Act Amendment.

2. Roads.

Returned to the Legislative Assembly with amendments.

BILL—LOAN, £2,100,000.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly) in moving the second reading, said: This Bill, as the title indicates, is for the purpose of authorising the raising of a sum of £2,100,000 by loan for the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes and the reappropriation of certain loan moneys. The works include a number of railways which have already been authorised during the present session. It also includes an amount of £200,000 for rolling stock. I specially mention this item because hon. members in speaking on the Estimates last night drew attention to the shortage of rolling stock, and naturally