

member for Beverley will give us an opportunity of knowing the exact details, we shall be able to give him more support. I shall be happy to support the resolution, and hope it will accomplish some good. We have gentlemen on the Ministerial benches to whom we should look for exact oversight of the various Departments, and I think it is wrong to go beyond them. They are those who receive the emoluments of the country, and who are responsible to us and the people of the country for every member of the Civil Service. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion, so far as I understand it.

MR. HARPER: I have not very much to say in reply. I must, however, thank hon. members for the way in which they have accepted the motion. That reception has been mostly in the spirit in which the motion was prompted. I also thank the Government for the way they have received it. I cannot sit down without saying a word or two in reply to the hon. member for Perth. He said he was surprised I should bring such a resolution forward, and that it was very improper of me to do so. I thank that hon. member for the kind lecture he gave me, but I wish to say, that as long as I have a seat in this House, I shall exercise my rights, and seek to do my duty, by bringing before the attention of hon. members any subject upon which the public feel they have a grievance. I cannot understand how the hon. member who has filled the position of leader of the Opposition, should think that an extraordinary course. I do not think I need say much beyond what I said in my opening speech. I had no desire or intention of pointing to any particular individual. My sole desire was to bring before the public notice, and that of the Government, the desirability of doing all that was possible to secure an efficient Civil Service.

THE SPEAKER: I cannot put any amendment to this motion except with the full consent of the House. If any member objects, I cannot submit it.

MR. SIMPSON: I object.

Motion, as originally proposed, put, and division taken, with the following result:—

Ayes 19

Noes 4

Majority for 15

Ayes.

Mr. Burt
Mr. Clarkson
Mr. Cookworthy
Sir John Forrest
Mr. George
Mr. Hooley
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. James
Mr. Keep
Mr. Leake
Mr. Moran
Mr. Phillips
Mr. E. F. Sholl
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Throssell
Mr. Traylen
Mr. Venn
Mr. Wood
Mr. Harper (Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Loton
Mr. H. W. Sholl
Mr. Randell (Teller)

Resolution passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 8.35 o'clock p.m. the House adjourned.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 6th August, 1895.

Arbitration Bill; Select Committee's report—Partnership Bill; Select Committee's report—Criminal Evidence Bill; Select Committee's report—Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill; in committee—Railway and Refreshment Rooms Licensing Bill: second reading—Message from His Excellency the Administrator: Duties on Estates of Deceased Persons Bill—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

ARBITRATION BILL.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. JAMES brought up the report of the Select Committee, with amendments made in the Bill, and moved that the report be printed.

Agreed to.

MR. JAMES said a convenient mode of dealing with the Select Committee's amendments would be for the House to go into committee *pro forma*, with a view of considering the amendments at the next sitting, when the Bill as amended by the Select Committee would be before hon. members in printed form. He therefore moved that the House go into committee on the Bill, *pro forma*.

Question put and passed.

IN COMMITTEE.

The amendments made by the Select Committee were agreed to *pro forma*.

Bill reported with amendments.

Report adopted.

PARTNERSHIP BILL.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. JAMES brought up the report of the Select Committee, with amendments made in the Bill, and suggested that the same course as in the previous case be pursued.

IN COMMITTEE.

The amendments made by the Select Committee were agreed to *pro forma*.

Bill reported with amendments.

Report adopted.

CRIMINAL EVIDENCE BILL.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. JAMES brought up the report of the Select Committee, with amendments made in the Bill.

IN COMMITTEE.

The amendments made by the Select Committee were agreed to *pro forma*.

Bill reported with amendments.

Report adopted.

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—Warranty on sale of fertilisers:

MR. LEFROY said this provision appeared to be copied from the South Australian Act; but that colony had no natural deposits of guano, whereas this colony had such deposits; and as this clause did not contain the word "guano," he thought the word ought to be inserted, in order that agriculturists in this colony might obtain a proper warranty with the guano they purchased from dealers. He

moved, as an amendment, that the words "guano and" be inserted in the second line after the word "soil."

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) said the point was important, and it had also occurred to him. The guano sold in the colony was very liable to be mixed with sand, stones, and other rubbish. The object of the hon. member would be gained by inserting the words "or found," in the second line, after the word "manufactured," so as to read: "any article manufactured or found in the said colony or imported from abroad," &c.

MR. LEFROY accepted the suggestion, and asked leave to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) moved, as an amendment, that the words "or found" be inserted in the second line after the word "manufactured."

MR. RANDELL asked how the amendment would agree with the other provisions in the clause. Some alteration would be needed in the sub-clause.

MR. MARMION said this first amendment showed the danger of hastily dealing with a measure of this kind, because it was now proposed to insert a principle utterly different from the principle of the Bill as first brought in. The Bill was first intended to deal with articles manufactured in the colony, or imported into it, whereas this amendment would deal with a natural product of the colony. If the clause must be amended, the word "product" should be inserted instead of the word "found," which was indefinite. As to South Australia, he knew that guano was used there as a fertiliser to a larger extent than in this colony; and, as the word "guano" was not in the Act of South Australia, there must have been some reason for omitting it. He thought it would be dangerous to introduce the word into this Bill. Indeed, the Bill altogether was dangerous, and would have a bad effect in this colony. He repeated his previous warning that the Bill must have one of two effects—either it would be a dead letter, because unworkable, or it would prevent dealers from selling fertilisers because of the restrictive conditions, and thus prevent agriculturists from obtaining fertilisers through the dealers. Hon. members might smile at that statement, but, as one who had dealt largely in fertilisers, he claimed to

understand how the restrictions in this Bill would interfere with the course of trade in these articles. The agriculturists had been satisfied hitherto to accept fertilisers from the dealers without requiring a warranty in writing, whereas this Bill required that every time a dealer sold a few tons of guano a separate warranty must be given, and a separate analysis might be necessary. Bonedust varied in quality probably in every bagful, because the bones were gathered in small quantities from different sources, and, after grinding, the quality of different samples would vary according to whether the bones were fresh, or stale, or very old. He was sure the Bill was an absurdity, and would prove so in operation.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said the Minister's explanation that guano was liable to be adulterated with sand or stones did not affect the question, because, if the required proportion of phosphates was in the sample, the dealer could sell the sand and stones along with the stuff all the same. The Bill was bad enough as first produced—absolutely bad—but it would be made worse by applying these restrictions also to guano, as proposed in the amendment. Guano was a natural product of the colony, and yet it was not to be sold without a certificate in every instance. The dealer must give an invoice, an analysis, and a certificate to show the precise amount of phosphates and nitrogen in each and every sample or quantity sold. The buyer could protect himself if he found he was not getting a suitable article; but, on the other hand, the dealer who had taken the goods into his stock in good faith, would have no means of defending himself against the penalties under this Bill.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said that guano was an article that could easily be dealt with under the Bill. It was obtained at the Abrolhos Islands, and its ingredients could be easily ascertained. If a manure were discovered, say at the Lacepede Islands, those who obtained it would, in their own interests, have an analysis made.

MR. LEFROY said that the suggestion he made was in the interests of the producer. He knew as a fact that analyses of the products of the Abrolhos islands were made, and it was in the interests of the persons engaged in the trade that some protection should be afforded them against prosecution for ultimate manipulation of the products.

THE COMMISSIONER FOR CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) said the object in including guano in the Bill was to protect the local producer as well as the foreigner. Those who exported guano would have very little chance of selling it if the shipments were not accompanied by a certificate after analysis. As to the objection raised by the hon. member for Fremantle regarding bonedust, he did not think it held good, because it was known that the drier the bones were, the more phosphates they contained. Many of the objections to the Bill were of an ingenious character, because it was well known that exporters of guano generally gave a certificate for greater security.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said that exporters of guano always gave a certificate after analysis; but buyers sometimes found that the article did not contain the quantity of phosphates certified to. That could be explained by the fact that all substances, particularly guano, were mixed up with sea shells and other matter. In dealing with a case such as that, difficulties would probably arise, for it would be hard to determine which of the analysts, employed by the seller or the buyer, was correct.

MR. LEAKE said the argument of the Attorney-General only applied to large shippers of guano; but the small storekeepers would be put to very great expense if they were compelled to have every bag they bought for retail sale analysed. He would like to ask the Commissioner for Crown Lands what were the chemical properties of bonedust, and also what was the proper percentage of nitrogen, soluble and insoluble phosphates, and potash, that should be found in an ordinary fertiliser. The majority of the farmers were not chemists, and would like to have the information to guide them.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said it was not necessary to give the information. All the Bill required was that the article should contain a certain percentage of phosphates.

MR. LEAKE said he understood that, but he thought it was presupposing the farmers understood chemistry.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) said that there were books on the subject to which the farmers could refer. The Bill simply affirmed that the seller should state what was the least percentage of phosphates the product contained.

MR. LEAKE: I again ask the Hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands to state what are the chemical properties of bonedust or guano.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson): Time is too valuable to waste in explaining.

MR. LEAKE: You do not know them.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said that under the Bill every man who sold a bag of guano would have to give an invoice, on which would have to be stated the proportion of phosphates contained in that particular bag of the product. If he did not do that, and if it was found that its quality was not as certified, he was liable to a fine of £20, irrespective of the fact that he had been given a warranty by the manufacturer that the article was of the quality required by law. That was what he resisted on the second reading of the Bill, and he resisted it now. It was impossible to guarantee a uniform quality in 100 tons of bonedust, unless every bag was separately tested.

MR. HARPER said it seemed to be very ominous that those gentlemen who represented trading interests should be desirous of giving traders a free hand to adulterate manures to the fullest extent. They asked that the sellers should be allowed to dispose of bonedust or guano without responsibility for any adulteration. The difficulty they imagined was, that everybody in the country wanted to sell a bag of guano; but that difficulty could be easily disposed of by persons wishing to evade responsibility, and selling on commission. He had it on the authority of a gentleman who dealt in the native product very largely, that he preferred to sell at per unit than otherwise. If he could do that, he (Mr. Harper) could not see what there was in the Bill to object to.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. ILLINGWORTH moved to strike out the following words in the lines 5, 6, and 7—"and what is at least a percentage of the nitrogen, soluble and insoluble phosphates, and potash, if any, contained in the article," with a view to inserting the word "unadulterated" in lieu thereof.

THE COMMISSIONER FOR CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) said that if the amendment were agreed to, the Bill would be rendered useless. It was almost impossible to obtain guano that did not contain a certain percentage of sand.

MR. PIESSE said he would prefer to leave the clause as printed, in order to have some method of finding out how adulteration was effected. With regard to the small store-keepers, he thought some protection should be afforded them against responsibility for adulteration of the article before it reached them.

MR. RANDELL said he knew of an instance where a large quantity of imported bonedust was distributed in different bags through an agent, who could not possibly give a warranty, and should, therefore, not be made liable for adulteration. In all legislation of the kind proposed by the Bill, a person who had a grudge against another was afforded an opportunity to do him some harm; but that could not be avoided when restrictions were placed upon persons dealing with articles of the description in question.

MR. SOLOMON said he knew that gardeners bought single bags of guano and mixed it with other manures. To carry out the provisions of the Bill would cause great inconvenience and hardship.

MR. RANDELL said he intended to state that the *modus operandi* between seller and buyer would probably be that the seller, not being able to guarantee the article, would not do so, and the buyer would take it for what it was worth. If the buyer was willing to accept the seller's assurance that the article was of the same quality as when he bought it, there would be very little difficulty.

MR. PIESSE said he thought the Bill was intended to protect the producer, because it was likely that the manure in question would be purchased in large quantities. To those who had to purchase the article, the measure would give protection against fraud, and, with some amendments, it should be allowed to pass. Farmers could always get information as to the percentage of phosphates that should be contained in the manures from any book on agriculture, while they could always prove their quality by results.

MR. JAMES said he would support the clause as it stood. He had seen so much fraud carried on in connection with foodstuffs and fertilisers that he thought something should be done to make men honest by Act of Parliament. He understood the Bill was based on an English Act. In England a measure known as the Margarine Act was in force. It was not intended to affirm that margarine was injurious to health, but the Act was passed to

prevent it from being sold as butter. The same principle was aimed at by the Bill under debate, and persons should be prevented from obtaining money under false pretences. He did not believe any difficulty such as that suggested by the hon. member for Nannine would arise, because when merchants imported the article they would get a guarantee from the seller.

Amendment negatived.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2: Warranty on sale of feeding stuff.

MR. RANDELL said he had looked over the South Australian Act, and found it compared with the one they were considering nearly word for word, except that clause, and to test the feeling of the Committee he moved the clause be struck out.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is a copy of the English Act.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) said he did not see how the clause could do such a great injury if, as was said, there were only small quantities imported.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said he hoped the committee would accept the amendment of the hon. member for Perth and strike the clause out. If it were ever found desirable to deal with feeding stuffs, it could be done better in a Bill that dealt with ordinary food supplies. He wished the Government would legislate upon matters of importance affecting the whole country, and not only for a small section. He considered the Bill would only be an annoyance and a hindrance to trade.

MR. LEAKE said he wished to know if the Hon. the Commissioner had considered this clause, because it seemed to him it could be easily evaded by an ingenious vendor. Before the Hon. the Commissioner could get a conviction against a vendor, he would have to prove that he sold a given article as food for cattle. If he sold hay he could easily say he did not sell it as food for cattle, but for bedding, although he had charged £6 a ton for it. The Bill went to unwarrantable lengths, and he quite coincided with the views of the hon. members for Fremantle and Nannine—that it would be perfectly useless.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said he could quite understand the objection of the hon. member for Perth, but he could not understand that of the hon. member for Albany, because the Bill before them

was the exact wording of the English Act. He considered that what was good enough for the House of Commons was good enough for them. [HON. MEMBERS: No, no.] Those hon. members who did not think so, of course tried to find fault with the Bill. He contended that when any person sold an article as food for cattle, he ought to sell what he pretended to sell. If he did not do so, then he sold under false pretences, and ought to be liable to penalties. It might be true there were no large quantities being sold in the colony, but that did not make the clause objectionable. It was desirable that the committee should do all it could to ensure the importation of only good food stuffs.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	13

Majority for 1

AYES.		NOES.	
Mr. Burt		Mr. Connor	
Mr. Clarkson		Mr. Illingworth	
Mr. Cookworthy		Mr. Leake	
Sir John Forrest		Mr. Lefroy	
Mr. A. Forrest		Mr. Loton	
Mr. Hassell		Mr. Marmion	
Mr. Hooley		Mr. Monger	
Mr. James		Mr. Moran	
Mr. Phillips		Mr. Moss	
Mr. Piesse		Mr. R. F. Sholl	
Mr. Richardson		Mr. Simpson	
Mr. Venn		Mr. Solomon	
Mr. Wood		Mr. Randell (Teller.)	
Mr. Harper (Teller.)			

Amendment negatived.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 3, "Penalties for breach of duty by seller."

MR. RANDELL said he considered that clause would be a greater hardship to a person selling small quantities of food stuffs than to one selling small quantities of fertilisers. He moved that the words in line two "or as food for cattle" be struck out.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said the words could not be struck out without making the clause ridiculous.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said, in order to make a dangerous Bill as little dangerous as possible, he would move, as an amendment, to strike out of line sixteen, in Clause 3, the words "£10 and £50," with a view of inserting the words "£5 and £10" in lieu thereof.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) said if the amend-

ment were carried it would be to the advantage of people who were dealing in these things in a large way to pay a fine of £5 or £10, when, by adulteration, they could perhaps make £100 profit. They should leave the question to the good sense of the magistrate who dealt with the matter.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 4 and 5 : Agreed to.

Clause 6 : If buyer takes samples in a certain way, etc.

MR. LEAKE pointed out that no benefit under that clause could be obtained without adopting a rather cumbrous procedure. If any one bought a bag of chaff from a store, before he could take advantage of that clause, he would have to get a justice or an analyst, or a policeman, and have it tested. If he did not do so then his mouth was closed, and he would have to take whatever the vendor liked to give him, or else he would have to delay his purchase. If he were wrong in his conclusion he hoped the Hon. the Commissioner for Crown Lands would set him right.

THE ATTORNEY - GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said there was no necessity for any buyer, either small or large, to take any proceedings under that clause. If any action were taken it must be done before the bulk was broken, and then in the presence of a justice. If it were not so a man might easily say he had got a false invoice, and it would be difficult to prove, when fertilisers were on the premises up country, that they had been tampered with after they left the seller's premises. The seller might easily say it was quite correct when he sold it. Clause 6 therefore came in and gave the buyer the privilege, when taking delivery of these fertilisers, to call in a justice, or an analyst, and have them tested, and receive a certificate. Such a certificate would be accepted without question, unless any one preferred to call the analyst and prove by evidence that his analysis was wrong.

MR. LEAKE pointed out that sub-section b of the clause said "the costs of and incidental to the obtaining of any analysis shall be borne by the seller or the buyer in accordance with the results of the analyses, and shall be recoverable as a simple contract debt." Hon. members would easily see that for a person to challenge the quality of any goods bought by him would be to lay himself open to the risk of having to pay the costs of the

analysis. The onus was not thrown absolutely upon the vendor, but was shared by the purchaser. He asked who would question the component parts of any fertiliser or food stuff, if he thought it likely he would have to pay the cost of the analysis, and particularly when the cost might easily exceed the value of the article itself. He contended that fertilisers and food stuffs were not upon the same footing. Who was to know whether food stuffs were fit for cattle when there was no standard raised in the Bills.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	13
Majority for					3

AYES.

Mr. Burt
Mr. Clarkson
Mr. Cook worthy
Sir John Forrest
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Harper
Mr. Hassell
Mr. Hooley
Mr. James
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Loton
Mr. Phillips
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Richardson
Mr. Venn
Mr. Wood (Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Connor
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Keep
Mr. Marmion
Mr. Monger
Mr. Moran
Mr. Moss
Mr. Randell
Mr. H. W. Sholl
Mr. R. F. Sholl
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Solomon
Mr. Leake (Teller.)

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 7 and 8 :

Agreed to.

Clause 9—"Prosecutions."

MR. ILLINGWORTH said that any prosecution for an offence under this Act should be taken by the Government, in order that any importer might not be put to the trouble and expense of defending himself against proceedings of a malicious or vexatious character. The necessary amendment could easily be made by the Attorney-General.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said he saw no reason whatever why the ordinary procedure should be departed from. There was no reason why the Government should alone have the responsibility of initiating prosecutions, or why persons who might be defrauded by sellers of any of these articles should not take proceedings themselves. The proposal, if accepted, might have very dangerous results.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 10 :

Agreed to.

Clause 11—"Interpretation—Section 8, enlarged":

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) said his attention had been drawn to the fact that "soluble or insoluble in water," the tests under which the properties of manure were to be governed, would not be fair to the importer, inasmuch as some manures were not soluble in water to the same extent as they would be in citric acid, and consequently treatment by the test of water would not show the true character of the material. It would be possible, so he was informed by the expert attached to the Bureau, for manure tested by water with unsatisfactory results to have quite different results if tested with citric acid. The substitution of the words "citric acid" in sub-section 2, in place of the word "water," would be all the amendment required to secure absolute fairness.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said he had not had an opportunity of discussing the matter with the Commissioner of Crown Lands, but regarded the proposed amendment as one requiring some consideration. The test proposed in the Bill was the one in the English Act, and appeared to have been arrived at with the particular object of dealing with manures which were not soluble in water. It was very difficult to see what effect might not follow the insertion of the words "citric acid," and, moreover, there might be manures thoroughly unsatisfactory under the test provided in England which would be more satisfactory if treated with this acid, but that was no reason why the change should be made until it had been seen what the results from such a change would be.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) said that it would be best to report progress, in order that enquiries could be made as to the effect of such an alteration, and he moved accordingly.

Motion put and passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

RAILWAY AND THEATRE REFRESHMENT ROOMS LICENSING BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I rise to move the second reading of this Bill, and to ask the House that the second reading be agreed to. It is a short

Bill, and provides for the granting of licenses to the refreshment rooms at railway stations and also at theatres. I am informed that our present law is not quite as satisfactory as it might be. No provision has been made for the licensing of refreshment saloons at theatres, and at present, if it were desired to sell liquor in connection with such a place as a theatre, it could not be done without a general publican's license. There is no provision whatever for a saloon bar at theatres, unless it is that of a general license, for which a fee of £50 has to be paid. There are objections to granting general licenses for a building which is mainly used as a theatre. There is not the accommodation required, no meals are necessary, and a saloon bar in a theatre is merely a place where drinks can be procured during the progress of an entertainment. I am aware that in other parts of the world there are public-houses in theatres which are run as ordinary public houses in the day time, and in connection with the theatres at night. However, there is no necessity for us to have refreshment rooms at theatres competing with ordinary hotels during the daytime. We have quite enough hotels in Perth without increasing them. The Bill is divided into two parts. The first deals with refreshment rooms in theatres, and provides that the Licensing Bench may grant a license to the owner, occupier, or lessee of any theatre at an annual fee of £15. The holder of a license of this sort will enjoy the same rights and privileges as the holder of a publican's general license, excepting that liquor must not be sold at any time other than when there is a concert, theatrical, or public performance at the theatre, and the ordinary steps will have to be taken for an extension of time for keeping open after 11 o'clock. The same laws that apply to the general publican as to sale of liquor, and drunken people being on the premises, will also apply to any of these bars in a theatre. Section 4 of the principal Act will apply to this Act, and other sections of the principal Act governing the general conduct of such places will be read in conjunction with the provisions in the present Bill. The second part of the Bill applies to the refreshment rooms at railway stations. The present law in regard to these is most unsatisfactory. The only provision ever made for them is in the last section of one of the first, if not the first, Railway Acts passed in

this colony. That is 42 Vic., Section 37. That section provides that any person to whom the Railway Commissioner has let a refreshment room may apply to the licensing bench for a license, and the application cannot be refused. The license obtained is a general publican's license, and the holder of it sells to the public, while he ought only to be able to sell to travellers by rail. The Commissioner has granted as few of these licenses as possible, and he has done quite right. Under the present law it would be quite possible for the lessee of the refreshment rooms at Beverley, for instance, to compete with the outside hotels for the general custom. The Bill now before the House provides that the license may be granted by the Commissioner upon proper application being made, with proper notice. The conditions under which the licence is held will be found in subsection 2 of section 11, and it reads:—"The person so licensed may sell liquor at such refreshment room or stand, and shall for that purpose enjoy the same rights and privileges as the holder of a publican's general license; provided that liquor shall be sold at such room or stand only within a reasonable time before and after the arrival or departure of any passenger train at or from such station; but this proviso shall not render illegal a sale to any person who may be a bona fide lodger in any premises let at any such station by the Commissioner for the accommodation of travellers." When the Bill was first being discussed it was proposed to allow a fixed time after the departure of the last train. Half an hour was suggested, but I have adopted the words of the Queensland Act, and I think they will be more satisfactory.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Does the Commissioner decide what is a reasonable time?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): He has full power to make all the necessary regulations for carrying out the Act, and for the proper control of these places. Provision is made whereby he may cancel any license. It is necessary that he should have full power to do this, for a lessee might do a lot of things not at all permissible on a railway station, and the best way to prevent that is to give the Commissioner every power we can.

MR. BANDELL moved that the debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the House. Motion put and passed.

Debate adjourned.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE ADMINISTRATOR.

DUTIES ON ESTATES OF DECEASED PERSONS BILL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) presented a message from His Excellency the Administrator, which was read, as follows:—

ALEX. C. ONSLOW,
Administrator.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 67 of "The Constitution Act, 1895," the Administrator recommends to the Legislative Assembly a Bill for the purpose of imposing duties on the estates of deceased persons.

Government House, Perth,
6th August, 1895.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6.20 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 7th August, 1895.

Perth Hospital—Williams railway—Donnybrook land resumption—Justices Appointment Bill: third reading—Licensed Surveyors Bill; committee—Married Women's Property Act Amendment Bill; committee—Loan Act 1891, Reappropriation Bill: second reading; committee—Customs Duties Repeal Bill: second reading; committee; third reading—Municipal Bill; second reading—Mines Regulation Bill: second reading; referred to Joint Committee—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Sheuton) took the chair at 7.30 o'clock p.m.

PERTH HOSPITAL.

THE HON. A. B. KIDSON: I have to ask the Hon. the Minister for Mines—

(a.) The cost of the new Perth Hospital buildings.

(b.) Whether the whole of such buildings, when completed, will be set apart for the staff.

(c.) If not, how many additional wards and beds will be arranged for in the new building.