

official investigation—put, and negatived on the voices.

Amendment (Mr. Moran's) put and passed.

Question as amended agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10:41 o'clock until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 24th October, 1900.

Question: Helena Racecourse, Railway Fares—Motion: Railways, Control by Commissioners—Motion for Papers: Fourth Judge, Division (negatived)—Municipal Institutions Bill, third reading—Trustees Bill, in Committee, reported—Assent to Bill—Paper presented—Land Act Amendment Bill, in Committee, Divisions, progress—Call of the House—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—HELENA RACECOURSE, RAILWAY FARES.

HON. M. L. MOSS asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What return fare was charged on Saturday last to passengers from Perth and Fremantle, respectively, to Helena Vale Racecourse? 2, Why were passengers from Fremantle on the day named charged ninepence more for the whole journey than others who made the journey in two sections from Fremantle to Perth, and Perth to the racecourse? 3, Will instructions be given so that this inequality will not recur?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, From Perth, 2s. 6d., second class. From Fremantle, 5s., first class; 4s., second class. 2, The rates are the same as they have always been, but since the introduction of the cheap Wednesday, Saturday and Sunday excursion tickets, and the first race starting at 2:30 p.m.

instead of 2 p.m., it is now possible for passengers to leave Fremantle at 12:30 p.m., and take advantage of the excursion rates to Perth. This, of course, was not intended when these Wednesday and Saturday excursions were introduced. 3, Yes; the through fare is being so altered that it will not exceed the combined fares for the sections Fremantle-Perth and Perth-Racecourse.

MOTION—RAILWAYS, CONTROL BY COMMISSIONERS.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY (South): I beg to move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when the railways of the colony should be placed under the control of Commissioners, as far as possible removed from political control, and that the Government should introduce a Bill next session to deal with the question.

He said: I have no desire to take up the time of hon. members with any lengthy statement. The motion is one I feel sure will commend itself to every hon. member of the House, and it is one I hope will receive members' unanimous support. The object of the motion, if carried into effect, will be to remove our railways from the pale of political influence, so that they may be worked on business principles and in the financial interests of the colony. The Railway Department will be protected by giving independent and absolute control to a board of specially trained men. This will prevent the staff being interfered with politically by means of associations under political influence, and it will avoid the practice of employees approaching members of Parliament with their grievances. It will also minimise the construction of non-paying lines. Under a board of management statistics and other information will be collected, and recommendations made by the board accordingly. The construction of new lines would come under the board of commissioners, and the lines would be equipped only as the traffic required. A board of commissioners when removed from political control should not be unduly pressed to bring into existence a non-paying tariff: their powers should be to secure a fair and remunerative tariff for all work done, and this, I

think, would best serve the interests of the public. If past experience is to be any guide to us, and I may say it should be, we would no doubt be able to enjoy a more efficient train service than that we have at the present time. I have no desire to criticise the railway system of the colony at the present time: if I proposed to do so I do not suppose I should find it a difficult matter, but I do think we should endeavour to remove the evil which no doubt exists here and has existed in the other colonies, the evil of political influence. Hon. members, I am sure, will agree with me when I say this colony at the present time has a most valuable asset in its railways, and it is necessary that the railways should be well and carefully managed in the future. They are a commercial institution of great magnitude. It behoves us to see these railways are placed under the control of a highly qualified board of commissioners, who will carry out their work in a proper manner and on a commercial basis. The immense railway systems of Great Britain are not carried on by the State, but by boards of directors with administrators, and if the board of directors has any reason to be dissatisfied with any particular branch of the railways, they can remove their administrator and appoint someone who probably can give a better account of the service. Some years ago political influence brought to bear in Victoria with regard to railway administration became very acute, and a serious matter to the people of the colony; and, after some consideration, it was decided to place the railways under the charge of commissioners. This new departure was looked upon with a great deal of interest by the sister colonies, and I am pleased to say that after some three or four years most of them adopted that principle. Victoria has a railway commissioner; New South Wales has three railway commissioners.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think only one.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I think they all got rid of the commissioners. The system of commissioners broke down.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: That is my information. I believe that in New South Wales there are three commissioners; Victoria has a commissioner,

and South Australia has a commissioner, whilst Western Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand have railway managers. I am pleased to say, from inquiries I have made, that none of the colonies which have adopted the principle of placing the railways under the charge of a railway commissioner have ever had any occasion to alter that principle.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: New Zealand had.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: She has a general manager.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: She went in for commissioners first, and afterwards abolished them.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: I will read an extract from our last annual report, which speaks for itself.

Percentage of working expenses to gross earnings.—The percentage of working expenses to gross earnings on the Western Australian railways for 1899-1900, as compared with the same on the railways of the Australasian colonies for the latest years of which we have record, is as follows:—New South Wales (1898-9), 53·75; Queensland (1898-9), 57·14; South Australia (1898-9), 59·15; Victoria (1898-9), 59·73; New Zealand (1898-9), 63·26; Western Australia (1899-1900), 68·40; Tasmania (1899), 78·10.

So hon. members will see that the three colonies of Western Australia, New Zealand, and Tasmania, where the railways are under the charge of a manager, figure highest on the list.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That is only one point where we are at a disadvantage. In every other respect Western Australia stands above the colonies that have commissioners.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: I think that report may be criticised very easily. I admit that probably we have conditions in this colony which do not exist in New Zealand, Tasmania, or any of the other colonies. Still, I think we have advantages. We travel more per mile perhaps than those who travel over any one of the railways in either of the other colonies. That should make up for any disadvantages the railways suffer from on the goldfields from lack of water and long haulage for coal. That comparison is a good reason why this motion should receive at least some consideration, and I hope members will support it, and that the incoming Parliament will take the matter into serious consideration,

because although at the present time we may look at the railways as a very big asset, and are justified in doing so, I maintain that if we go on as we are going, our railways will probably become a burden on the State.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Why? In what way?

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: They will be controlled by political influence.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: They have done very well so far.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: They will not continue to do so much longer. That is my opinion. I now move the motion standing in my name.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell): Will the hon. member be willing to strike out the last sentence? We cannot control the incoming Parliament.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: All right. I will strike that out.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (to the Colonial Secretary): You accept it with that alteration, do you?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: No resolution of one session can bind the next session. As soon as Parliament is prorogued, all notices lapse.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not prepared to discuss the question at any length. The motion as it stands may possibly meet with the support of members, and I think I may answer for the Government that, if it is the will of Parliament that the railways shall be transferred to a commissioner or commissioners, as the case may be, the Government will have no objection to the transfer.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: But which case is it?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: One, two, or three commissioners: that is a detail.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: It is a pretty large detail.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That can be settled when the time comes. The hon. member (Mr. Glowrey) has been speaking to the general principle that it is desirable, in the interests of the railways themselves and their economical administration, that they shall be transferred from the direct control of the Minister to a commissioner

or commissioners. I am not disposed to argue the point as to whether it should be a commissioner or commissioners. I have my own opinion upon the matter, and perhaps it is as well that I do not express it just at the present moment. With the general principle I am personally in accord. It will be a great relief to the Minister who has the control of the railways to be freed from the political pressure which is very often brought to bear upon him, not only by members of Parliament, but others, and which may eventually lead to some difficulty, if not disaster, in the control of the railways of the colony. One may, without having any special acquaintance with the working of the Railway Department, or the cost of expenditure as compared with the revenue, very easily dispute the conclusion which the hon. member has arrived at, that there will be a more economical working of the railways under a commissioner than at present, under the working of a general manager responsible to the Minister, to the colony, and in fact to the country, for his administration. The hon. member read some statistics with regard to percentage of cost to revenue in the various colonies. I find that he was not exact in all his statements. If my memory serves me aright, in New South Wales one of the commissioners died, if not two. At any rate I think that at the present moment there is only one, he being Mr. Cooper or Cowper—I forget the name, but I think it is Cooper. As the hon. member (Mr. Whitcombe) interjected, the railways in New Zealand were originally under commissioners, but they returned to ministerial control. In deciding upon points of this description as to the economical working of railways, many questions have to be taken into consideration—the circumstances of the colony, the peculiar features of the grades, the amount of traffic, and many other things—in order to arrive at a right judgment upon the relative cost of the working of the railways in different countries. For instance, I believe that in New Zealand the country is exceedingly hilly, and that possibly may account for the considerable extra cost which appears; the cost, if the hon. member's figures are correct, being

nearly equal to the revenue. There may be other circumstances I am not prepared to speak on, not being well acquainted with the railway system there. With regard to South Australia, Victoria, and Queensland, and even New South Wales, I believe the conditions are considerably different from those which prevail in Western Australia; and when we are told, as we have been recently, that the railways are costing more here now than they did two or three years ago, we have to remember that railways are pushed out now into far distant parts, and the more that is done the greater is the expense. Then we have to contend with a deficient water supply, the water having to be conveyed long distances in some cases. Another thing is that rates have been cut down for the purpose of assisting enterprise. Whether that is done in the other colonies or not I am not prepared to say at the present moment, but doubtless that has had a serious effect upon the revenue in Western Australia. At the same time, we may be reaping advantage resulting from the encouragement of industries which may develop into useful enterprises and be for the benefit of the whole colony. I do not think I need labour this, in reply to the hon. member, but I would like to point out that in the great changes of the railway administration of this colony we cannot possibly get rid of the abnormal expenses which must be incurred in a country like Western Australia, where long distances have to be travelled and no passenger or goods traffic is available except at the remote ends of the railway system. These things have to be taken into consideration. I have not the slightest expectation that a commissioner will be able to reduce these expenses, and if the commissioner runs the railways on commercial lines, we must make up our minds for a considerable change in many directions.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: You mean he would raise the rates?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: He would raise the rates. If he is to conduct the enterprise on a commercial basis he will not run the railways at a loss. If Parliament says that a particular industry is to be assisted and

Parliament votes the money, a commissioner would say: "I shall lose by carrying at such rates: I will not lose; I must have my rates." Parliament is not in a position to say that now. I think there is a very important feature in the motion, the removal of the railways from political control, not as regards members of Parliament, but the administration of the railways as far as the labour that is employed in working the railways is concerned.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Do you believe it will prevent strikes or have any effect on them?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is a very serious question, and I think if the Bill which is now before the House becomes law there will be very few strikes. I believe in the good sense of both sides engaged in an industrial enterprise, and that they will obviate the necessity for strikes: that has been the result in New Zealand. The Government are not disposed to quarrel with the motion of the hon. member if he wishes that it should be carried. No doubt during the next session steps will be taken, whatever Ministry is in power, to go into the question thoroughly, and to give effect if it is found desirable to remove the railways from political control. I offer no opposition to the motion.

Question put and passed.

MOTION FOR PAPERS—FOURTH JUDGE.

Debate resumed from previous day on the motion by HON. A. JAMESON for production of correspondence in connection with the appointment of a fourth Judge of the Supreme Court.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell): It was with considerable diffidence that he addressed himself to the question raised by Dr. Jameson. It was a serious and important question that had been placed before the House by the hon. member, who seemed to have set forth clearly his reasons for considering this matter in the interests of the community at large. The hon. member associated his motion with the name of one hon. member of Parliament, which was undesirable and to be regretted. In introducing a motion of this nature into the House, personal

references should not be made. An abstract resolution might have been passed without referring to any individual; and if the hon. member had confined himself to stating that the importance of the occasion demanded the careful consideration of the House, with the view of setting before the Government of the day the importance of the question, he thought Dr. Jameson would have deserved the thanks of the Council and of the country; but the hon. member proceeded further than that, and referred in some rather scathing terms, one thought, to someone whose name had been mentioned outside the precincts of the House and to him (the Colonial Secretary) privately by some hon. members inside the House; therefore the case assumed a very different aspect. He thought it was desirable that members should set their faces against things of this description. A lasting injury might be done to an innocent individual by somewhat loose references to him in his public capacity. The hon. member stated in the course of his speech that he did not know the gentleman to whom he alluded, that he had no personal motive in bringing the motion forward. The House accepted that in all good faith, but at the same time the remarks of the hon. member were entirely personal in their application to the Attorney General, therefore they were to be deprecated. As far as he knew there was nothing in the public career of the gentleman named to invite or cause such terms to be used as to his ability or fitness for the high position, as those mentioned by Dr. Jameson. It was to be regretted the hon. member should have taken the step he had. One presumed, however, that the mover had given careful consideration to the matter, and he accepted the disclaimer that the hon. member had no personal motive, that he had spoken purely in the interest of the country, believing, he supposed—from what foundation of belief the hon. member did not state—that the gentleman alluded to was unfit to occupy the position of a Supreme Court Judge. He (the Colonial Secretary) had expressed his opinion about the Attorney General before in this House, and he did not then elicit from some hon. members any very cordial response

to his statement. He might repeat the statement again this afternoon, that as far as he was concerned, and as far as his own personal intercourse with the Attorney General was concerned as a member of the same Ministry for a short time, he had always valued the advice which the Attorney General had given, either to the Government or to himself, and he had reason to think that in almost every case his judgment has been sound and well founded. With regard to this particular matter, he was authorised to state that the Premier had not considered the question, and had not spoken to anyone on the subject, and had never mentioned the subject to anyone who might be considered an aspirant.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The subject of what?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The appointment of the Attorney General to the fourth Judgeship: that was the subject brought forward by the hon. member's motion. The motion necessitated a distinct statement from himself as the representative of the Government in this House, and he regretted the language that had been used, as he thought it was unjustifiable. If the member alluded to had been a member of this House it would have been a very different thing; but he was not here to defend himself, and of course it was very difficult for him (the Colonial Secretary) to defend the Attorney General against vague charges. The hon. member referred to something which occurred on the Penal Commission: he did not say what point of the evidence was referred to, but as far as one's memory served, he did not think there was anything in connection with the control of the establishment at Fremantle, or the detention or control of prisoners there, that reflected any discredit on the Attorney General as advisor of the Crown or grand jury of the country. He was not aware of anything that reflected discreditably on the Attorney General, who had high functions to discharge as the grand jury of the country. It was a question for members to consider whether it was advisable that a single officer of the Government should be the grand jury, or whether we should revert to the old system, which he thought had been

condemned by every newspaper in the country.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: That was a recommendation.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The consequence was the Attorney General for the time being was constituted the grand jury. Some of the decisions of the late Attorney General, Mr. Burt, had been questioned in the newspapers and by individuals.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Where did the hon. member see that?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had seen them and heard them, and he took it that in the natural course of things the Attorney General's judgment would be impugned from time to time by people who looked at a matter from a different standpoint. That was not a justifiable ground on which to impugn the fitness of the Attorney General for the position of fourth Judge. The hon. member had stated that twenty Queen's Counsellors could be found who would accept the position of fourth Judge of the Supreme Court at the salary of £1,400 a year. He (the Colonial Secretary) did not think any gentleman of position and education would come from England or the other colonies in whom the people here could place confidence, and who would be recommended by such authorities that we could place reliance in them, to take the position of Judge in this colony at £1,400 a year. There were a great many leading members of the bar here who would be very unwilling to sacrifice the emoluments of their position for the quiet and placid enjoyment of £1,400 a year as Judge of the Supreme Court. Be that as it might, when hon. gentlemen selected some persons as being understood by the general public as likely to be appointed in the ordinary course of things, the facts that should be placed before the House should be of a convincing character: he was not able to see anything convincing in the arguments of the hon. member. It was incumbent on him (the Colonial Secretary) to defend his colleague as far as he could, and to express his regret, as an old member of the Legislature and one who had served for a great number of years in one House or the other, that personal attacks should be made; because

really they were personal, though not from personal motives. He acquitted the hon. member of anything of that sort: the hon. member had disclaimed it and hon. members would accept that disclaimer; but questions of this sort should be dealt with on public grounds and not fancied unfitness for a position, for a motion such as this might prejudice any individual in his public career and as a member of the bar, which was exceedingly undesirable. He deprecated the position taken up by Dr. Jameson. The motion was one which the hon. member might have moved in simpler terms. Members were, he believed, acquainted with the facts of the case. A letter was received and had been acknowledged, that was all, by the Premier—what was generally termed a “round robin” of the bar, but three or four leading members of the bar had not signed it. With the exception of three or four leading men, members of the bar had signed that letter on various grounds.

HON. A. JAMESON: Could the Colonial Secretary give the names?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY said he believed Mr. Moorhead had not signed it, and that gentleman was considered a very leading member of the bar in Western Australia, having the attainments to which reference was made by the hon. member (Dr. Jameson) when making his speech. He believed Mr. Harney also had not signed the letter, and he thought that gentleman was considered one of the leading members of the bar in this country. Moreover, he believed Mr. Burt did not sign it, but he understood that was because of absence from the colony. He was not sure about that, however. He believed Mr. Parker had not signed it.

HON. A. JAMESON: Mr. Parker had signed it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then he (the Colonial Secretary) made a mistake. He had some information from the gentleman who interested himself in getting up this petition. The letter was received by the Premier, but it was considered to be of such a nature as at any rate not to require any particular action on his part. He might mention to hon. members that the Premier had never shown that letter to the Attorney General, and he believed it was only the

other day the fact of his having received it was mentioned. The Premier did not wish to hurt the feelings or insult the intelligence of the Attorney General by giving him the letter, and he had not done so. The Attorney General had never seen that letter to the present moment. These were the facts of the case. The letter at the present moment was not to be found, but search was being made for it. The Premier had no remembrance just for the moment, and no trace of the letter was discovered in his office. Possibly it was put into his private drawer or taken to his home, but hon. members might take it for granted that an effort would be made to discover the letter, if the House, by passing this motion, insisted upon its production. Apart from that, if members wished to be acquainted with the terms of the letter, doubtless a copy had been kept, and therefore some member might be willing or desirous, or might make a motion to that effect, to have that copy of the letter laid upon the table of the House. That letter was from the bar of this colony upon the subject of the appointment of the Attorney General to the office of fourth Judge. He believed it was the usual practice, unless there were very serious reasons against it, for the Attorney General for the time being to be appointed to the office of Judge, if such office became vacant.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: Oh, no. Not in the colonies.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Very largely. There were many cases.

A MEMBER: There was only one instance.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: All he need say upon the question had, he thought, been said. He must leave the matter in the hands of members, and he hoped that what he had said would be received in good faith, at any rate.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: Did the hon. gentleman oppose the motion?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; he opposed the motion.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE (Central): One was glad to find the Colonial Secretary opposed the motion, although the grounds the hon. gentleman had given were not altogether those that found favour with him. He had much rather

the Colonial Secretary had based his opposition on another ground, namely, that, if this motion were carried, it would be practically placing the appointment of the proposed fourth Judge in the hands of Parliament instead of in the hands of His Excellency.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not think the motion would do that. This was not a petition or a letter from the members of this House, but from the bar of the colony.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: The intention of the mover of the motion, as he understood it, was that the House should know whom it was proposed to appoint a fourth Judge, before they took upon themselves the responsibility of passing the vote for the payment of the fourth Judge. If they disagreed in regard to the person to be appointed, they would be able to refuse to pass the necessary money, and if by the adoption of such a course as that they would not be taking to themselves the decision as to who should be the Judge in this particular instance, and who should hold a future appointment to the judicial bench in the Supreme Court, he did not know the meaning of it.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Those were not the words of the motion.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: That was the meaning of the motion, taken from the words of the mover. And that being so, it would be a most improper thing for members to take that position upon themselves, because if appointments of the Supreme Court bench were to be political appointments pure and simple—that was to say appointments by Parliament—there would be a greater amount of dissatisfaction shown than where the Minister of the day took upon himself the responsibility of making the appointment. It was not, as had been here suggested, the universal practice in the colonies for the Attorney General to take a vacant seat upon the bench, although that practice had been followed in most of the colonies at times. He thought that if one searched the records of the whole of the colonies, not many instances would be found where that practice had been followed, and he did not for a moment imagine that the practice would be followed in this particular case. He did not think that

immediately before a dissolution, or the expiration of the representative House, the Government would take upon themselves to create an appointment the suggestion of which had been received with a great deal of disfavour some time ago. So far as this "round robin" was concerned, which had been referred to by the Colonial Secretary, that was got up some two years ago, if his memory served him aright.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: Supposing it was only twelve months ago, though he thought it was longer—

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had not seen the letter, and could not say how long ago it was received.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE said he was only speaking from memory, but he thought it was more than twelve months ago. During the time which had since elapsed persons might have changed their minds, and he did not think any good service would be rendered by placing the papers on the table of the House, open to publication, to do what harm they might; and certainly they could do no good. Supposing the motion were carried and the papers were laid on the table of the House, he did not suppose any motion of this House on the subject would make the slightest difference, if the Government intended to appoint the gentleman referred to. He did not suppose that the House, having passed a motion for the appointment of a fourth Judge, would refuse a salary to the person appointed. He hoped the hon. member would withdraw the motion, because one did not see that any good purpose could be served by it, and it would be pushing in the thin edge of the wedge towards a practice of giving parliamentary patronage in a particular direction not required.

HON. J. M. SPEED (Metropolitan-Suburban): As a solicitor, and not one of the leaders of the bar in this colony—nor could he ever expect to hold the proud position of being so—he felt that very often a leader of the bar in the colony meant a man who was an expert liar—he opposed the motion. A leader of the bar meant a man prepared to support the wrong just as often as he was prepared to support the right. Being behind the scenes in his profes-

sional capacity he was in a position to judge.

A MEMBER: The statement was very complimentary!

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It was to be hoped there were no leaders of the bar present.

HON. J. M. SPEED: When one found objection taken by a certain number of persons at the bar to, he believed, the Attorney General, he thought it would have been more manly of those gentlemen to have, instead of signing a "round robin" like a number of schoolboys, written their names one after the other on that paper that was sent in. He thought the Premier did a very proper thing when he sent that letter where one supposed he did send it—to the waste-paper basket. He (Mr. Speed) was asked to sign it, but if objections were going to be taken to a person they should be taken openly and straightforwardly, and not in a hole-and-corner sort of way. He trusted we should never see the bar in this colony put in a position which, he thought, would tend to lower its dignity, and he trusted they would consider the matter from a different point of view in the future. With regard to the motion as it stood, there was nothing to complain of at all, but the words used by Dr. Jameson in introducing it certainly raised trouble which there was no necessity to raise. He agreed with the Colonial Secretary it was much to be deprecated that personal matters should have been introduced in the manner they had been, so far as the Attorney General was concerned. He did not think it redounded to the credit of Parliament when we found an official who was a member of the Government spoken of by any member of Parliament in the way in which the Attorney General was actually spoken of by the mover of this motion. He should certainly oppose the motion.

HON. F. M. STONE: The 55 members of the bar who signed that "round robin" to the Premier would, he felt sure, be gratified to hear the remarks that had been passed.

HON. J. M. SPEED: The hon. member was one of the 55, he supposed.

HON. F. M. STONE: Yes; and he was prepared to say so. He was not afraid to do it either, as some hon.

gentlemen might have been. No doubt those members of the bar would be gratified to hear the advice that had been given to them by Mr. Speed, and would be prepared to follow his advice in the future, and be afraid to put their names on paper showing what they thought.

HON. J. M. SPEED: They were afraid.

HON. F. M. STONE: That was what the hon. member was afraid to do.

HON. J. M. SPEED: Oh, no. He was not afraid to do so, but those to whom he referred were, and they put it in the form of a "round robin."

HON. F. M. STONE: Apparently a red-herring had been drawn across this motion of Dr. Jameson. The second reading of a Bill was about to take place in this House for the appointment of a fourth Judge, and he (Mr. Stone) was not going to speak either against or for the gentleman whom Dr. Jameson perhaps mentioned in his speech. It was advisable for the House to be in possession of all correspondence that had passed with the Premier in reference to the appointment of a fourth Judge, and the House might think it advisable that the Bill should not be passed. Perhaps members from the goldfields might think this would work an injustice upon them, but such would not be the case. Commissioners could be appointed, and they should have been appointed long ago to conduct these Circuit Courts. There were learned gentlemen in the profession who were well able to carry out that work and were prepared to act as commissioners, should the Government appoint them. The Government should long ago have appointed commissioners under the Circuit Courts Act that was passed, and had that been done we should not have had the trouble that perhaps was arising at the present time. It might be advisable, if certain correspondence was placed on this table, for the House not to pass the Bill introduced unless we got some inducement, or some undertaking from the Government that certain gentlemen would not be appointed fourth Judge. If we did not get that undertaking, we could refuse to pass the Bill and leave the Government to do what they ought to

have done, appoint a commissioner to carry out the Circuit Court work. The Colonial Secretary appeared to think that there was likely to be a heated expression of opinion over this matter. He hoped members would look at the principle of the motion, that all correspondence should be placed on the table. He could not see that Dr. Jameson had brought forward any personal matter against the Attorney General. The hon. member had stated at the outset that he did not intend to do so. He could not remember what was said in connection with the Penal Commission or that the Attorney General had anything to do with it; but the hon. member had said that it was desirable, from the knowledge he obtained while a member of the Penal Commission, that Judges of the Supreme Court should be appointed who were able and who had the confidence of the bar and the colony. That was all Dr. Jameson had said: nothing at all personal to the Attorney General. He (Mr. Stone) certainly would not follow the hon. member if he had done so. We were not now inquiring whether the Attorney General should be appointed a Judge or not: there was no motion that he should be so appointed, therefore there was no reason to inquire into that matter at all, but he hoped members would insist that all papers be placed on the table so that when a fourth Judge was appointed members would be able to come before the House, if it was thought desirable, and get an undertaking from the Government that a certain person or persons should not be appointed to the judgeship: it seemed to be entirely within the province of the House to do so. Supposing the whole community was against the appointment of a certain person and the Government, in defiance of that, made the appointment, would hon. members tell him the House would not voice the opinions of the community and say they would not pass the Bill without receiving an undertaking from the Government? It seemed to him quite within the province of the House to object and compel the Government to give an undertaking before passing a measure of that kind. He hoped the House would deal with the motion in a quiet way, without getting heated and without abuse, although there seemed an

inclination on the part of one hon. member to go to that extent.

HON. A. G. JENKINS (North-East) : As a resident of the goldfields for years who had worked rather hard for the establishment of Circuit Courts, and had on every occasion fought for their introduction, he might say that the people of the goldfields would require the appointment of the most competent man as Judge to be obtained in the profession. In order that no undesirable appointment should be made, it was only right that the House should have all the papers before it in considering the Bill for the appointment of a fourth Judge, because personally, not as a member of the bar who had signed the "round robbin," he would go to an extreme course unless a desirable appointment was made. He was prepared to reject the Bill when it came before the House, if some undertaking were not given. We had waited three years already, and surely we could wait another three or four months, until perhaps a competent gentleman could be found to take the position. That was the aspect in which the matter was looked at on the goldfields. He was not then speaking as a lawyer, but as a member of the goldfields community. As to the remarks which had been made, that if the motion were passed it would bring the appointment of Judges under political patronage, from his experiences in Victoria he hardly recollected one instance of late years in which the Attorney General had appointed himself. In nearly every case the appointment was given to a prominent leader of the bar.

HON. M. L. MOSS : The only one in Victoria was Mr. Justice Kerford.

HON. A. G. JENKINS : The motion had his entire support. If a fourth Judge were appointed, we should get a gentleman who had, at any rate, the confidence of the bar and the country; and unless some assurance were given to the House that some such appointment would be made, he was prepared when the second reading of the Bill for the appointment of a fourth Judge came on to move its rejection.

HON. A. B. KIDSON (West) : It would be well if the mover of the motion could see his way to withdraw it.

Members were well aware of his views in respect to the appointment of a fourth Judge, therefore it was unnecessary to refer further to them; but if members considered for a moment what the effect of the motion might be, not only on the member of another place to whom it referred in his public capacity, but also in his private capacity, members would pause before they allowed the motion to pass. This House would not allow itself to do anything which might have the effect of interfering or affecting any member of Parliament or any person in his private capacity, which this motion would do if it was passed. Members must see the effect the motion had had already; even the Colonial Secretary had referred to the "round robin" more fully than there was any necessity to do, because a communication such as that was a private communication addressed to the Premier. One did not think the House had the moral right to call for communications such as these. It was not necessary to refer more fully to that aspect of the question, because he felt sure hon. members would not lend themselves to a course which would result in the manner he had pointed out. With respect to the speech of Mr. Speed, he could hardly say he was gratified to listen to the remarks of that member in regard to what, he thought, the hon. member looked upon as an honourable profession; but that hon. member seemed to think one of the first qualifications to become a leader of the profession was to become an expert liar.

HON. J. M. SPEED : Hear, hear.

HON. A. B. KIDSON : In thinking that, the hon. gentleman was hardly upholding the honour of the profession. One would think one of the first duties of the profession to which the hon. member and himself and other members belonged was to uphold the honour of the profession both in private and in public; but the hon. member had taken the trouble of holding up his profession to contempt and contumely not only in the House but outside of it.

HON. J. M. SPEED : One took things as they were, not as they ought to be.

HON. A. B. KIDSON : Then the best thing the hon. member could do, in his

own interest and that of the profession, was to retire from it, because the hon. member had referred to it in such scathing language.

HON. E. McLARTY (South West): As a lay member, he was entirely opposed to the motion. He was pleased indeed to hear the views of Mr. Kidson in regard to the motion, and he only wished to say he entirely indorsed what had fallen from that hon. gentleman, also from the Colonial Secretary.

HON. A. JAMESON (in reply) said he regretted the Colonial Secretary should for a moment have taken up the personal aspect of the question. The Colonial Secretary certainly exonerated him (Dr. Jameson) from any personal motive in the matter, but at the same time the Colonial Secretary had pointed out that an accusation had been made against one of the members of the Ministry which should not have been made. He looked on this as purely a question of public policy: there never had been a more important question than that of the appointment of a Judge of the colony at this particular time. We had vast industrial interests at stake, great social interests, and the colony was advancing rapidly, and if we were to become a new nation by ignoring the necessity of looking keenly into an appointment to the bench, he thought the colony would suffer indeed. As a member of the House and representing a large number of constituents, he felt it to be his duty to push this matter to its utmost: he hoped we should see exactly who supported and who did not. The motion simply asked for correspondence and for information. He disagreed entirely with Mr. Whitcombe in stating it was an attempt for Parliament to appoint Judges in the future: it was not so. We were asked to pass a certain Bill in connection with the appointment of a Judge, and we wanted to have every information in regard to the matter before we passed the Bill. Mr. Stone had pointed out that the matter could have been dealt with by the appointment of a commissioner who would have all the powers of a Judge of the Supreme Court. He (Dr. Jameson) would say more: we knew next year we would have a new Parliament, and why not appoint a commissioner for the time

being, and then bring in a Bill into the new Parliament which would really be representative of the country. That was the position of the House at the present time. As one of the new members he took it to be his duty to take up that position, as he with others more recently came from the country and had a public duty to perform. He was not likely to bring forward any personal reflections on the House or on any member of the community; but when so much public interest was at stake, when every member of the community had to be bound down to decisions possibly for a quarter of a century to come, and when the community had to pay a large emolument to a Judge not only during his term of service, but a pension during his lifetime, we should look very keenly to the question in the event of a member of the Ministry being appointed, which previously had been the ordinary custom. It was distinctly our duty to prevent the Bill being passed, at all events until the House received the correspondence on the subject. The Colonial Secretary had referred to his (Dr. Jameson's) remarks upon the Attorney General in regard to the grand jury. One could only refer to the report of the Penal Commission, and need say nothing more than that. That report was public property, and had already been on the table of the House, and could be referred to. Evidence was carefully taken before that commission, and was already public property, having been placed on the table of both Houses of Parliament; therefore he had brought forward nothing new in that matter. With regard to the petition from the lawyers, he regretted that it could not be found. He had, however, a copy of the petition, and if members of the House would wish that copy to be produced, it would be done. He would not read the names, and he did not think he should be at liberty to do so, but practically the whole of the bar had sent in a petition objecting to the name of the hon. member, R. W. Pennefather, as likely to be chosen. The petition said, "We deem it right to inform you that such appointment will not meet with the approval of the bar." That was signed, he might say, by all the leaders of the bar practically, except those absent from the colony. It really

bore 53 names of practitioners in this colony. Knowing that was actually the case, and having the knowledge of this, he thought that if he did not ask that information should be given to the House upon the matter, he would certainly be failing in his duty. He greatly regretted that any member of the House should have cast certain aspersions upon one as having taken a part in trying to defame the character of a man unjustly. He (Dr. Jameson) had done no such thing: he simply brought the matter forward as a public question. Every member must be aware that the gentleman mentioned had been alluded to time after time by various sections of the Press in a way we would not like any Judge to be referred to. These questions had all been made public. The Colonial Secretary said that he (Dr. Jameson) had no ground for doing this. This paper in itself was sufficient ground. Had there been in any colony of Australasia such a paper as that against any one individual member of a Ministry? No. There never had been a representation from the whole of the profession signed against any one man on the chance of his being appointed to a judgeship. If that were not sufficient evidence, where in the world could sufficient evidence be found for a man to do his duty and bring forward the names, or at all events the petition signed by those persons? He hoped the House would insist upon the papers being laid upon the table of the House, and that if members were satisfied the papers gave a true representation of the view of the legal profession upon the matter, they would not for a moment pass a Bill at the end of a session. He hoped that when a general election was about to take place this House would not for a moment pass a Bill of this kind, but be satisfied with a commissioner, as Mr. Stone had suggested. Perhaps it would be well for him to say no more upon the matter. He had been warned that we must not get hot upon this question; but it was purely, as he had said, a matter of public policy, and so long as he was in the House he should endeavour to bring forward these public questions upon every occasion. He believed that he would get some support, but whether he was supported or not he had only done his duty.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	12

Majority against ... 2

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. G. Bellingham	Hon. R. G. Burges
Hon. T. F. Brimage	Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. W. G. Brookman	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. J. T. Glowrey	Hon. A. B. Kidson
Hon. A. Jameson	Hon. D. McKay
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	Hon. C. A. Plesse
Hon. A. P. Matheson	Hon. G. Randell
Hon. M. L. Moss	Hon. J. E. Richardson
Hon. C. Sommers	Hon. H. J. Saunders
Hon. F. M. Stone (Teller).	Hon. J. M. Speed
	Hon. W. Spencer
	Hon. E. McLarty (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

HON. A. P. MATHESON rose to a point of order. He would like to know whether Mr. Saunders's vote was included.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: Was the hon. member in the House?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

[Hon. H. J. Saunders had been sitting a short distance from the President.]

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS BILL.

Read a third time, on motion by Hon. R. S. HAYNES, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

TRUSTEES BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 8, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 9—Enlargement of express power of investment:

HON. M. L. MOSS: This was one of the new clauses which he undertook to point out to the Committee. It was very undesirable that this power should be given to trustees. In the English Act leasehold property was made the subject of investment when the lease had 200 years to run, but even that was objectionable, because every lease might be defeated by a breach of the covenants. We could not be too careful in allowing trustees to invest in leasehold property, because the non-compliance with a covenant of the lease might render the lease absolutely void. He suggested that Sub-clause 1 be struck out.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In the administration of the Lands Department grants had been made to religious and other bodies at a peppercorn rental,

for a long number of years. Leases had been granted for 999 years, not only to religious bodies, but to friendly societies.

HON. M. L. MOSS: And charities.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the sub-clause were struck out, what position would trustees be in who had already executed mortgages by the consent of the Governor. It would be a very serious matter if it affected the security as far as the mortgagee was concerned.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The matter referred to by the Colonial Secretary, in a measure, escaped his attention. Up to a certain time the Government granted lands for religious and charitable purposes in fee simple, but it turned out that the land had not been used for the purpose for which the ground was originally granted, and the Government overcame the defect by granting leases for 999 years. There would be no objection to lending money on these grants. Sub-clause 1 did not aim at that, because it allowed trustees to invest money on a lease granted for 99 years. In the instances referred to by the Colonial Secretary no harm would be done, but if we passed the clause as it now stood, property which had been leased for 99 years on building leases could be utilised as investments, and the non-payment of rent might cause the lease to be forfeited. That was undesirable, and in order to meet the case referred to by the Colonial Secretary, the words "nine hundred and ninety-nine" might be inserted in the place of "ninety-nine."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The certificate of a lease for 99 years had been seen by him.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Grants by the Government had been issued for 999 years: if we carried the thing a step further there was a danger to trust moneys. He suggested that the words "nine hundred and" be inserted before "ninety-nine" in line four.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Would not 200 years be sufficient?

HON. A. P. MATHESON suggested that the words "for religious or charitable purposes" be inserted after the word "held." He would move that the words "ninety-nine" be struck out and "two hundred" inserted in lieu.

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

Clauses 10 to 15, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 16—Retirement of trustee:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that in line eight the words "by a deed" be struck out, and "upon passing" his accounts before the Master" be inserted in lieu. That was an extra safeguard to those persons beneficially interested in a trust. Before the trustee obtained his retirement by resignation he was bound to take his accounts to the Master of the Supreme Court and have them passed.

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

Clauses 17 to 52, inclusive—agreed to.

New Clause:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that the following be added as a new clause:—

Trustee's power of delegation.

(1.) A trustee who, for the time being, resides out of Western Australia, or is about to so reside temporarily or otherwise, may, if not expressly prohibited by the instrument creating the trust, by power of attorney, under seal, delegate to any person or persons residing in Western Australia all or any of the powers, authorities, and discretions vested in such trustee.

(2.) Every deed, act, matter, and thing executed, done, and performed by such attorney or attorneys shall be as valid and effectual as if executed, done, and performed by the trustee.

The clause enabled a trustee to delegate his power where the instrument creating the trust did not prohibit that from being done. As the bulk of the land in this colony was under the Transfer of Land Act, there was this anomaly with reference to the transfer of land. Under the Land Act power of delegation existed, but under the old system of titles that power did not exist. The object of this clause was that, if a person had sufficient confidence in another to create him trustee, it would enable that person to do with the trust as he would do with his own property. Speaking as one who had had some experience in this colony, he might inform the committee that very great inconvenience had resulted from the present position of affairs, and every person connected with trust property would agree with him that in every instance where property was under the old system of titles it had been found necessary to send outside the

colony to obtain signatures, which after all was a mere formal act after the transaction had been entered into on one's behalf. As far as he could see, this clause was amply safeguarded, because a person vesting property in trustees would have the right to prohibit by the instrument the delegation of this power, and inasmuch as pretty well the whole of the land of this colony was under the Transfer of Land Act, he thought we were simply bringing into line with it the rest of real property that might be settled on trust.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Even if a trustee resided altogether out of the colony?

HON. M. L. MOSS: Yes. Resided out of, or was about to reside out of, the colony, temporarily or otherwise.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Did "temporarily" refer to the first condition of the clause also?

HON. M. L. MOSS said he thought it referred to the whole clause.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: This meant that if the trustee resided out of the colony the delegation would last for ever.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Of course the committee must understand that the trustee would not escape any of his responsibilities. He would be liable for every act performed in the same way as if he performed it himself. This was one of the matters he had discussed with the gentleman who had charge of the Bill in another place.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the trustee was absent for twelve months, he could be removed.

HON. M. L. MOSS: Yes; that was a ground for the removal of the trustee.

Clause put and passed, and added to the Bill.

New Clause:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that the following be added as a new clause:

Trustee's Bank Account.

Trustees may, by written notice signed by them, authorise any bank to honour cheques, bills, and drafts drawn upon the banking account of the trust by any one or more of such trustees, and until such authority is cancelled by written notice to the bank the latter shall be entitled to pay all cheques, bills, and drafts so drawn.

He thought the new clause was perfectly unobjectionable. He believed many banks were at the present time

doing what was proposed, and the Committee would readily understand the inconvenience experienced where three or four trustees existed, and it was necessary to get every trustee to sign a cheque. This new clause would not lessen the trustee's responsibility.

Clause put and passed, and added to the Bill.

Schedule:

HON. M. L. MOSS moved that the schedule be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—

Act.	Extent of Repeal.
22 and 23 Victoria, Cap. 35 (Imperial). Adopted by 31 Victoria, No. 8	Sections 26, 30, 31, and 32.
23 and 24 Victoria, Cap. 38 (Imperial). Adopted by 31 Victoria, No. 8	The whole, except Sections 6, 7, and 8.
23 and 24 Victoria, Cap. 145 (Imperial). Adopted by 31 Victoria, No. 8	Sections 8 and 9.
53 Victoria, No. 14 ...	The whole.
59 Victoria, No. 28 ...	The whole.

The schedule now was what was originally intended. Had it been passed in the form in which it was sent down here, he was afraid we should have landed the colony in great difficulty. The amendment had been seen by the gentleman who introduced the Bill in another place, and that gentleman was now satisfied that it was in perfect order. In England they repealed the whole of this statute, because in 1881 they passed what was known as the Conveyancing Act, which contained a number of amended rules of conveyancing law. This Conveyancing Act was not adopted, and the gentleman who drafted the schedule originally, apparently forgot that Act had not been adopted.

Amendment put and passed.

Preamble and title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Administrator received and read, assenting to the Customs Duties (Meat) Repeal Bill.

At 6-26, the PRESIDENT left the Chair.

At 7-45, Chair resumed.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Amount of payment to members of Parliament in the Australasian colonies. Return.

Ordered to lie on the table.

LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3:

HON. C. A. PIESSE moved that progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	12
				—

Majority against ... 6

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. R. S. Haynes	Hon. G. Bellingham
Hon. A. P. Matheson	Hon. T. F. Brimage
Hon. D. McKay	Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. C. A. Piesse	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. J. E. Richardson	Hon. A. Jameson
Hon. R. G. Burgess	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
(Teller).	Hon. G. Randell
	Hon. C. Sommers
	Hon. J. M. Speed
	Hon. W. Spencer
	Hon. F. Whitcombe
	Hon. J. T. Glowrey
	(Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was not intended to force the Bill through improperly. If exception were taken to a clause, there would be an opportunity of amendment on recomittal. Members who had a knowledge of the subject could speak now for the information of those members who were not so well informed.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: So many amendments which it was proposed to move in this Bill were influenced by this clause that it was desirable, after discussion, to report progress. Clause 3 amended the original Act to this extent, that it struck out a certain condition which was embodied in Section 66. Members would notice that it struck out the words, "and a sum of at least four shillings an acre has been expended on it in statutory improvements." The object of this was to leave to the discretion of the Minister what sums should be expended upon that land. Those who were in touch with the Land Act would follow the conditions relating to the selection of homestead leases. They would find in

the first place that they had to pay a value of 6s. 9d. an acre. He was taking Clause 3, and Clause 4 made this apply to the homestead leases. The whole thing hinged on homestead leases. One had to pay 6s. 9d. an acre for the land, and 6s. 9d. an acre on improvements. As far as the actual price of the land was concerned the tenants were satisfied, but what they urged was that they could not expend 6s. 9d. an acre on improvements on second-class land, as such land would not pay for those improvements. The Minister had endeavoured to meet them in that respect by this amending Bill. As the Bill stood now, instead of paying 6s. 9d. for improvements upon the land, a tenant might have to pay 3s. 9d. or 2s. 9d. Taking the amount at 2s. 9d., that would leave 4s. an acre for improvements still to be done. It was not wise to spend that extra 4s. on that land. The Minister turned round and said the land was not worth spending 6s. 9d. an acre on, and he let one off on paying 2s. 9d., and instead of paying the remaining 4s. on improvements the Minister could require the tenant to pay 2s. in cash. That 2s. added to the 6s. 9d., the original price of the land, would make 8s. 9d., so that the amount a man would actually pay for the land would be 8s. 9d. instead of 6s. 9d. It had been discovered that the Government had been passing off third-class land as second-class land, and what was now proposed was regarded as the only way of meeting the difficulty. The price of land at present was 6s. 9d. an acre, and the Act said the tenant must spend 6s. 9d. as well on improvements, besides fencing.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Thirteen shillings and sixpence altogether.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Yes. The Minister agreed that after inspection by a responsible officer, the land would not carry that 6s. 9d., and if 2s. 9d. had been paid, leaving 4s. an acre still to be paid on improvements, he turned round and said "We will meet you half way; we will strike out half of that and you shall pay 2s.; 8s. 9d. instead of 6s. 9d."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Four shillings had been struck out.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: It was struck out only to leave a latitude. The provision was discretionary. The Minister had still power to make the charge 6s. 9d.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Minister had not the power. He made a recommendation to the Governor.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Did the hon. member want the 4s. to be remitted to the tenant?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: No; but people did not want tenants to pay 8s. 9d. for land which it was agreed was worth only 6s. 9d.

HON. J. M. DREW said he was unable entirely to follow Mr. Piesse in his arguments in connection with this matter. The amendment appeared to be a very simple one in the interests of the selector. It gave the Minister discretionary power to dispense with a portion of the improvements when it appeared to him that the carrying out of such improvements would be out of proportion to the probable returns to the selector.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: People did not object to that.

HON. J. M. DREW: Formerly the Minister could not use such discretion in regard to homestead leases, but by this Bill homestead leases would be included.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: There was not an objection to the striking out of 4s. in relation to improvements, and tenants were in favour of the discretionary power given to the Minister in relation to it. But what they did object to was that, while agreeing that the land could not bear the cost of carrying out any improvements, the Minister could make a man pay 2s. in hard cash, bringing the price of land up from 6s. 9d. to 8s. 9d.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: This was a very important matter, and he would like to look into the subject. All that was asked for was an adjournment of the debate until next Tuesday, for the purpose of considering the question. Certain clauses in the Bill would require careful discussion later on. He moved that progress be reported.

HON. C. A. PIESSE explained that he had said the cost might be 8s. 9d. It might be a shilling.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	5

Majority for	...	6
--------------	-----	---

AYES.
 Hon. T. F. Brimage
 Hon. E. G. Burgess
 Hon. J. T. Glowrey
 Hon. J. W. Hackett
 Hon. R. S. Haynes
 Hon. A. P. Matheson
 Hon. D. McKay
 Hon. C. A. Piesse
 Hon. J. E. Richardson
 Hon. C. Sommers
 Hon. A. Jameson (Teller)

NOES.
 Hon. J. M. Drew
 Hon. G. Randell
 Hon. W. Spencer
 Hon. F. Whitcombe
 Hon. J. M. Speed (Teller)

Motion thus passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

THE PRESIDENT ordered strangers to withdraw.

On resuming:

ADJOURNMENT.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY, in moving that the House at this rising do adjourn until Tuesday next, stated that he might have to ask hon. members to sit on Friday of next week, and to obtain permission to pass Bills through all stages on one day, as it was intended to get through the business and close the session as soon as possible.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at 8:53 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.