

day is much different from that obtaining during the last three or four years. A better spirit prevails throughout the State; and it is our duty to maintain that buoyant feeling, and I believe we shall maintain it. The voice of the people throughout the late election was so pronounced that caucus government has received its death-blow.

MR. BOLTON: Your seat is still uncertain.

MR. EDDY: If I remember rightly what I read in the Press, the hon. member interjecting was one of the men who said on the platform that no pledge will keep a crooked man straight. I say that the reaction predicted by wise heads has taken place; the liberty which has been Britain's and Australia's boast was only tied up for a time; and now, men with hands and minds unfettered can again secure the common-sense vote of the people. I believe that this feeling which has extended throughout Western Australia will extend also throughout the Commonwealth, and that the people of Australasia will at the next Federal election condemn government by caucus. His Excellency's Speech concludes with the hope that this Parliament will materially advance the well-being of the State; and I believe it will, by means of honest debate, by good, common-sense arguments, and by allowing work to supersede talk; though there is plenty of room for honest and healthy opposition. As each member expects to give to his electors a fair account of his stewardship, so do the Ministry hope to give general satisfaction to the State they represent. I have pleasure in seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. (General applause.)

On motion by Mr. T. H. BATH (Leader of the Opposition), debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

On motion by the PREMIER, the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m. on the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 28th November, 1905.

	PAGE
Members Sworn, additional	17
Question: Metropolitan Water Supply, Reductions	17
Messages (3), Appropriation	18
Sitting Days and Hours, Precedence	18
Committees of the Session	20
Bills, first reading (7) without debate	20
Metropolitan Waterworks Act Amendment, Mount Lawley Agreement, first reading	20
Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act Amendment (No. 2 Bill), first reading, Points of Order	20
Ditto No. 1 Bill (Mr. Foulkes), first reading	22
Roads and Streets Closure, second reading	32
Address-in-Reply, debate resumed (Mr. Bath)	22
Debate not continued, question passed	32

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

MEMBERS SWORN, ADDITIONAL.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received a Commission from the Governor authorising him to administer the oath to members not already sworn.

Hon. H. Gregory (Menzies), Mr. C. H. Layman (Nelson), and Mr. P. Stone (Greenough) took the oath and subscribed the roll.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR WORKS: 1, Special by-laws of Bayswater Roads Board. 2, Exemptions from rating under Lawlers Roads Board. 3, By-laws of Nelson Roads Board.

By the MINISTER FOR MINES: Annual Report of Mines Department for 1904.

QUESTION—METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, REDUCTIONS.

MR. HORAN (for Mr. Daglish) asked the Minister for Works; 1, Is it correct that the price of water to the city of Perth has been reduced to 6d. per 1,000 gallons? 2, If so, will the same reduction apply to the municipalities of Subiaco and Leederville? 3, If not, why not?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. Frank Wilson) replied: 1, Yes, for road watering purposes, from Causeway and Wellington Street bores, where pumping is unnecessary, and from points on the new 21in. pumping main in Havelock Street prior to bore water being treated. Also for the same purpose during period from 1st June to 30th September, in-

clusive, at any part of the reticulation in the city. 2 and 3, All municipalities within the board's area will be supplied under same conditions as above.

MESSAGES (3), APPROPRIATION.

Messages from the Governor received and read, recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Stamp Act Amendment Bill, Totalisator Duty Bill, and Perth Mint Act Amendment Bill.

SITTING DAYS AND HOURS.

THE PREMIER (Hon. C. H. Rason) moved: .

That the House, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays at 2:30 p.m., and shall sit until 6:30 p.m. if necessary, and if requisite from 7:30 p.m. onwards.

He said: This motion should commend itself to hon. members generally. It must be apparent that, unless the sittings of the Assembly were to be prolonged into objectionable weather, it was necessary that the ordinary sitting days should be increased. Being anxious to study the wishes of members as far as possible, it seemed to him that by including Friday the wishes of a majority of members would be met to a far greater extent than by including Monday, because members residing in country districts would have the opportunity of returning to their homes at the end of the week and being back on the ordinary business day of Tuesday. He hoped members would agree to the extra day and the extra hour, so that if possible—and it seemed to him quite possible—the business of the session might be got through before Christmas.

MR. T. H. BATH (Brown Hill): In previous meetings of Parliament the Labour party, of which he had the honour to be leader, moved in the direction of extending the sitting hours by meeting at 2:30 o'clock and by sitting four days a week. While having no intention of opposing the present motion, he was surprised that the Premier desired these extended sitting hours, seeing that such a small amount of business had been brought down for Parliament to deal with during the present session. There was just one matter he

desired to speak on, and with extreme regret. When giving notice of motion, the Premier stated that he had not had an opportunity of meeting the Leader of the Opposition, but would do so before moving the motion. However, not only in this connection but in other matters, the Premier had not extended that courtesy to the Leader of the Opposition which he (Mr. Bath) thought was due. In the first place, the Premier had needlessly imparted to the election of Speaker a party aspect, when such an aspect was absolutely unnecessary, seeing that the nomination was acceptable to the Opposition. The same objection applied to the appointment of the various Committees for the session. It was to be hoped that in the course of the proceedings of this Parliament the Premier's display of gentlemanly conduct and courtesy would not be in inverse ratio to the majority behind the Government. In the past, the traditions of the Parliament had been upheld by the courteous conduct that had ruled between the leaders of both parties; and it was to be hoped that in the future the same conduct would obtain as far as this Assembly was concerned.

THE PREMIER (in reply): Whatever sins he had been accused of in the course of his political career, he did not think he had ever been before accused of want of courtesy, but generally thought that his error was in the direction of extreme courtesy. However, if the Leader of the Opposition thought he could give him lessons in what was due from the Leader of the Government to the Leader of the Opposition, he (the Premier) would always be glad to receive any suggestions; but the proper procedure, as he always understood it, was for the Leader of the Opposition to wait upon the Leader of the Government, rather than that the Leader of the Government should wait on the Leader of the Opposition. Had the Leader of the Opposition adopted that procedure, he would have been received with the greatest courtesy and the greatest respect, and would have been given that consideration for the dignity of his office which he (Mr. Bath) thought was justly due to it. He (the Premier) hoped to be at all times ready, willing, and anxious to uphold the dignity of the proceedings of the House. The Leader of the Opposition had no ground of complaint in this

instance and he hoped the hon. member never would have.

Question put and passed.

PRECEDENCE.

THE PREMIER (Hon. C. H. Rason) moved—

That on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays (and also on every second Wednesday) Government business shall take precedence of all motions and orders of the day.

It was not necessary to enlarge on the motion, as it was apparent to everyone, and indeed it was the usual procedure, that one day in a fortnight should be set aside for private members' business. That had been done in past sessions, and he proposed to adopt the same procedure this session.

MR. J. C. G. FOULKES (Claremont): Notice had been given to introduce a Bill to amend the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act, the only Bill (apart from Government measures) given notice of. It was true the member for Forrest (Mr. A. J. Wilson) had given notice to ask leave to introduce a Bill to establish a legal eight hours day; but one hardly believed the hon. member was serious in his intention. The Bill which he (Mr. Foulkes) had given notice to introduce dealt with an urgent matter, the intention being to obtain power from Parliament so that no more public-house licenses should be granted. The licensing bench would be sitting next week, and all were agreed as to the urgency of the matter, and all were in favour of a system of local option. If more licenses were granted there would be greater difficulty in dealing with the question; hence he had thought it his duty to give notice of the introduction of a Bill as soon as possible, and he now asked the Government to give every opportunity to pass the Bill this week, and that it be treated practically as a Government measure.

MR. A. J. WILSON (Forrest): In view of the general desire on the part of members sitting on the Government side of the House to rise from their labours as shortly after Christmas as possible, it was only fair, seeing that members had generously conceded to work an hour longer per day and to put in an extra day per week, that private members should be entitled to some consideration in matters of urgent business. He (Mr.

A. J. Wilson) had a very important measure, notwithstanding the charge of insincerity thrown out by the member for Claremont: it was a Bill of very material importance not only to members on the Opposition side, but to members on the Government side. If the present motion were carried, it would mean that there would be only one Wednesday to attend to private members' business. The Leader of the Government might generously afford members an opportunity of having every Wednesday for private members' business. Holding that view, he moved an amendment—

That the words "and also on every second Wednesday" be struck out.

There would then be three days out of the time before Christmas for members to attend to private business.

THE PREMIER (in reply): Although anxious to fall in with the views of members as far as possible, it was to be hoped the House would not agree to the amendment.

MR. A. J. WILSON: Sit earlier, at 10 o'clock in the morning if need be. We were anxious for work, anyhow.

THE PREMIER appreciated the hon. member's desire for work; and as at all times the hon. member was most anxious to work 16 hours a day, therefore he was consistent in bringing down a Bill for a legal eight hours day.

MR. A. J. WILSON: Eight hours' pay for eight hours' work.

THE PREMIER: At all times the Government would be ready to offer facilities to private members who had urgent business to transact; but to say that every Wednesday should be set apart for private members' business would be to do away with the good sought to be attained by an extra sitting day. If every Wednesday in every week were set apart for private members' business—and every member who had a Bill thought it was extremely urgent and that the fate of the nation depended on it—there would be not much chance of finishing the session within the time mentioned. In regard to the measure referred to by the member for Claremont, the Government also had an amendment of the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act to bring forward, notice of which would be given to-morrow. The Bill which the Government would bring forward would

give an opportunity to the member for Claremont to introduce the amendment he desired. The Government would be ready to offer the hon. member every facility, should that not suit him, to bring along his measure; and he (the Premier) would give the same assurance to the member for Forrest. The House should not be asked to depart from the usual practice, which was to allow private members' business to be brought forward once a fortnight.

Amendment negatived, and the question passed.

COMMITTEES OF THE SESSION.

On motions by the PREMIER, sessional committees were appointed as follow:—

PRINTING COMMITTEE—Mr. Speaker, Mr. H. Brown, and Mr. Bath; to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the printing executed by order of the House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for printing returns and papers presented in pursuance of motions made by members, and all papers laid upon the table, whether in answer to addresses or otherwise.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Foulkes, and Mr. Daglish; with leave to sit during any adjournment, and with authority to confer upon subjects of mutual concernment with any committee appointed for similar purposes by the Legislative Council.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Price, and Mr. T. Walker; with leave to sit during any adjournment and during the recess, and with authority to act jointly with the Library Committee of the Legislative Council.

HOUSE COMMITTEE—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Gordon, Mr. A. J. Wilson, and Mr. Taylor; with leave to sit during any adjournment and during the recess, and with authority to act jointly with the House Committee of the Legislative Council.

BILLS, FIRST READING.

Statutory Fees, introduced by the Premier.

Stamp Act Amendment, introduced by the Premier.

Perth Mint Act Amendment, introduced by the Premier.

Totalisator Duty, introduced by the Premier.

Racecourses Licensing, introduced by the Premier.

Permanent Reserve Rededication, introduced by the Minister for Lands.

Secret Commissions, introduced by the Minister for Commerce and Labour.

BILL—METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

MOUNT LAWLEY AGREEMENT.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. Frank Wilson) moved

For leave to introduce a Bill for "An Act to confirm an agreement between the Metropolitan Waterworks Board and the proprietors of the Mount Lawley Estate, and to amend the Waterworks Act 1889, and the Metropolitan Waterworks Act 1896, and for other purposes."

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): Was this the same Bill about which a select committee was appointed last session?

THE MINISTER: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: No report was furnished by that committee.

THE MINISTER: No.

MR. DAGLISH: Was this Bill the same as that introduced by Mr. Johnson when Minister for Works in the last Government.

THE MINISTER: The same Bill.

MR. DAGLISH: If it were not, he would object to it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a first time.

BILL—WINES, BEER, AND SPIRIT SALE ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

THE PREMIER (Hon. C. H. Rason) presented a Message from the Governor, recommending appropriation out of Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purpose of a Bill to amend the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act. Motion made (without notice) for leave to introduce such Bill.

POINTS OF ORDER.

MR. J. C. G. FOULKES rose to a point of order. Amongst the Orders of the Day stood motion No. 16, for leave to introduce a Bill for "An Act to amend the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act." Did not that motion take precedence of all motions of which notice had not been given?

MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with the Governor's Message, the Premier had a prior right, notwithstanding the notice which appeared in the name of the member for Claremont on the Notice Paper.

MR. FOULKES: Of course the Governor's Message took precedence of all business in the House, but any action consequent on that Message taken by the Government should not take precedence of any notices of motion given by members which appeared on the Orders of the Day for to-day's sitting. The two things were quite apart. Any action the Government proposed taking might be taken only after motion No. 16 had been dealt with. He would like to have Mr. Speaker's decision.

THE PREMIER hoped the hon. member did not construe his action as being in any way opposed to that of the hon. member himself. [MR. FOULKES: Not at all.] He intended only to move the first reading of the Government Bill, as he understood the hon. member himself intended to ask for leave to introduce a measure. He thought the hon. member would find that the action he wished to take, and the action the Government intended to take, could receive simultaneous attention.

MR. FOULKES was unaware at present what amendment the Premier proposed to make in the duties under the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act. He (Mr. Foulkes) could not shut his eyes to the risk he might be taking; for supposing there were some financial amendment made in the Act, he might be running some risk of not being able to have farther amendments made to the Bill introduced by the Premier. Such amendments might be contrary to the Standing Orders, or quite foreign to the Bill as introduced by the Government. He suggested that the hon. gentleman should allow the first Bill to stand until he (Mr. Foulkes) had an opportunity of seeing what amendments the Premier proposed to make in the existing law. [MR. GORDON: Wasting the time of the House.] Doubtless when he had an opportunity of seeing that, there would not be the slightest trouble. He hoped he would not have any opposition from the Premier to his Bill. All he wished to be satisfied about was that he

(Mr. Foulkes) would have leave to introduce his Bill.

MR. BATH: Whatever might be the position in regard to the Premier in asking leave without notice to introduce the Bill, he thought the member for Claremont was perfectly right in his contention that there could be no such haste for the measure the Premier proposed to introduce as to make it needful to cut in ahead of the motion of which the member for Claremont had given notice. He hoped the Premier would see the desirability of giving notice in the usual way, and leaving the motion of the member for Claremont to take its proper place.

MR. DAGLISH: The member for Claremont having given notice, the mere fact that the hon. member sat on the Government side did not debar the courtesy, at all events, of his being told what the intentions of the Government were. Even though some members might occupy seats on the Government side and might perhaps happen to do something not altogether palatable to the Premier, the hon. gentleman should still allow them the privilege of discussing with him their intentions, and of knowing a little when the Government intended to supersede those intentions. If these two Bills were running concurrently there was no reason why the Bill of the member for Claremont should not have been read a first time before his Excellency's Message was brought under the notice of the House. He hoped the hon. member would be afforded a chance of going on with his motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Already he had ruled and had adopted the precedent of the past that, following the receipt of a Message from His Excellency, the Premier or any other member in a similar position had the right to introduce a Message of that nature; consequently the Premier had a prior claim. That did not affect the right of the member for Claremont in any degree whatever with regard to his motion.

MR. DAGLISH asked that the motion by the Premier be read again.

THE PREMIER moved "That the Bill be now read a first time."

MR. BATH submitted that the Premier had not secured the leave of the House to introduce the Bill.

Mr. FOULKES again rose to a point of order. He asked for the Speaker's decision as to whether he would be in order in introducing a Bill bearing the same title word for word as that introduced by the Premier. All he was anxious for was that he should not be shut out and prevented from introducing his Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member had a perfect right to introduce the Bill of which he had given notice. In his opinion, the title did not affect the Bill.

Question (that leave be given) put, and a division called for by Mr. Horan, who afterwards withdrew the call, saying the member for Claremont was satisfied with the decision given.

Question passed, leave given.

Bill introduced and read a first time. -

BILL—WINES, BEER, AND SPIRIT SALE ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Introduced by Mr. FOULKES, and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

SECOND DAY OF DEBATE.

Resumed from the previous Thursday.

Mr. T. H. BATH (Brown Hill): In rising to address myself to the motion, I do so as leader of a party (Labour) which, as a result of the recent general election, was considerably diminished in numbers. But I wish to say at the outset, I hope and believe that the party has not entered this House with any diminished belief in the fact that its principles stand for everything that is opposed to class domination and class prejudice, but with renewed confidence that its principles approach nearest to the ideal of responsible and representative government—a thing about which members on the Government side of the House prate considerably, but understand very little. In the first place, members now in Opposition had to endure much contumely during the recent electoral campaign, because of the procedure which they adopt in their party organisation, and especially because of the party meetings which are designated by the name of "caucus." I would call attention to the fact that members on the Government side had a meeting on the day prior to the as-

sembling of Parliament, and in the course of the meeting had to consider the rival claims of several gentlemen who were very desirous of securing the coveted position of Speaker. Some of those gentlemen had pursued with considerable vigour their candidature for that position, with the result that the party was called on to decide their rival claims; and I understand that Government supporters had even to adopt the expedient of the exhaustive ballot, in order to decide who should be the nominee of the united party. I do not know whether they called that a caucus meeting, or called it an afternoon tea party, or by what name it was designated; but it was essentially a party meeting, similar to those meetings held by the Labour party, in which the Labour party discusses matters of concern to the organisation. We know at least that whatever decision Government supporters arrived at, and by whatever means, they presented a united front on the assembling of Parliament; and I compliment them on the fact that while they may not have seen fit to adopt a particular designation for meetings of their party, they have at least seen the wisdom of holding such meetings, of adopting precisely the same methods as the Labour party, and of securing precisely similar results. It was rather amusing to hear both the member who moved (Mr. Price) and the member who seconded (Mr. Eddy) the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply grow indignant over the evils of caucus government. I should like to point out that the member for Fremantle (Mr. Price) was once very desirous of being connected with the Labour party; was once very desirous of securing the nomination of the Labour party. [Mr. PRICE: Never.] And I have reason also to believe that the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Eddy) has wooed the Labour party.

Mr. EDDY: Never, under your leadership.

Mr. BATH: And because the members of the Labour party have not appreciated those gentleman at their own high estimate of their abilities, those gentlemen have seen fit to go back on their previous protestations of their desire to farther the Labour cause; and now they attempt to kick the party which would have nothing to do with them.

MR. PRICE: Why do you not stick to facts?

MR. BATH: The hon. member says, "Why do you not tell the truth?"

MR. PRICE: No; I say, why do you not stick to facts?

MR. BATH: That is a distinction without a difference. If the hon. member desires, I will explain the precise circumstances in which he sought the support of the Labour party. At the time Mr. Doherty resigned his seat as representative of North Fremantle, the Labour party had a selection ballot in which Mr. T. Cartwright was chosen as the Labour nominee. Some of those opposing Mr. Cartwright said it would be advisable to submit that nomination to a public meeting in order to have it indorsed. The nomination was submitted to a public meeting, which meeting was called by the Political Labour Party, advertised by the Political Labour Party, and organised by the Political Labour Party, to select a candidate who would run for the North Fremantle seat as the duly selected Labour candidate. The present member for Fremantle (Mr. Price), in common with Mr. Cartwright and Mr. Ives, submitted his name for selection; and unfortunately for Mr. Price he was not selected: Mr. Ives was the chosen man. If, however, Mr. Price had been selected by that meeting, he would have stood forth in the North Fremantle electoral campaign as the duly selected Labour candidate.

MR. PRICE: Did I or did I not refuse at that meeting to sign the Labour pledge?

MR. BATH: No.

MR. PRICE: Certainly I did.

MR. BATH: If at that meeting the hon. member had refused to sign the pledge, he would not have been allowed to be a candidate.

MR. PRICE: It was not a Labour meeting.

MR. BATH: So much for the opposition to and the abuse of the Labour party, the caucus, and the pledge, which we hear from such members as the representative for Fremantle.

MR. PRICE: It was not a Labour meeting.

MR. BATH: Whatever may have been the result of the general election, and however that result may have been

secured, I believe it was secured by methods which will not bear the light of investigation. In the first instance, the issue of the writs with such indecent haste was the means by which the member for Menzies (Hon. H. Gregory) found himself elected. The hon. member happens to have some excellent friends in the electoral office at Menzies; and he was well aware of the fact that since the by-election at which he submitted himself as a Minister of the Crown, about 400 or 500 claim forms had been filed by men desirous of getting their names on the roll.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): I say the hon. member's statement is quite untrue; and I demand its withdrawal.

MR. BATH: Which statement does the hon. member desire me to withdraw?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The statement that I was aware that a large number of claims had been filed, and that the names of the claimants had not been placed on the roll.

MR. TAYLOR: You told me so, and you showed me telegrams to that effect.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw.

MR. BATH: If the hon. member denies that he was aware of that fact, I will withdraw the statement.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Now I should like to ask the hon. member where he voted.

MR. BATH: The hon. member voted in the electorate in which he was entitled to vote. Had the issue of the writs been delayed, or had a decent interval been allowed to elapse, as was allowed in all previous elections, those men who had filed their claims in the electoral office would have been eligible to vote, and the member for Menzies would not be present in this Chamber to-day; therefore, as regards that member, the issuing of the writs with such haste can be characterised only as indecent; and I say that experience is not confined to the member for Menzies, but was the experience of other members who sit in this Chamber. I wish to say also that though the Premier has characterised the result of the general election as a glorious victory, nevertheless the methods employed to win that victory can be characterised only by the South African adjective "slim." There

is no glory about a victory which depends, not on giving an opportunity of voting to every man and every woman entitled to vote, but rather on depriving of the right to vote those who do not happen to be of the same shade of opinion as the National Political League. As to my own personal vote, I was on the roll for Kalgoorlie, and was not on the roll for any other electorate. I am constantly visiting Kalgoorlie, and I reside there. My interests are more closely identified with Kalgoorlie, more fully wrapped up in that district, than they are in any other electorate; and I exercised my vote where my interests lie. The Labour party recognise that it is useless to indulge in any recriminations because of the manner in which the present result was brought about. We have to accept the position of parties as they stand to-day; and I suppose we have to subscribe to the pious wish embodied in the Governor's Speech, that the position of parties to-day may lead to stable government, and to those great advantages which some people imagine will follow stable government. We have seen it stated in the Press, and by members who have recently been before the electors, that there cannot be a restoration of confidence in the future of this State, in its resources and its industries, without a restoration of the old conditions of parliamentary government, conditions under which there were but two parties. Electors were informed that if they returned to power three parties, the unsatisfactory state of affairs complained of last session must continue. I am not buoyed up by the same hope, nor inspired by the same confidence, that the result of the general election and the state of parties in this Parliament will bring about such renewed confidence or such renewed prosperity. And when I see the quarters in which such hope is expressed, I am strongly reminded of an incident chronicled by Shakespeare. Members will probably recollect the scene: How the portly Sir John Falstaff, the swaggering Pistol, and the light-fingered Poins waited with the same confidence and hope for the translation of their quondam boon companion, King Hal, to the throne of England. Possibly the advent of the present Administration may result in securing the desired objects.

Ministers may do as well as that great figure in English history. But I fear some members of the Ministerial bench have been too long on the other tack to take any other course or to make a start at well-doing in their present time of life. Again, while we hear the hope expressed that we shall have stable government and the joys that it is to bring, we have on that Ministerial bench three gentlemen who, but four short years ago, occupied altogether different positions. It was about the month of November four years ago that the present Minister for Mines (Hon. H. Gregory) toured the country, stating that if the present Minister for Works (Hon. F. Wilson) was then allowed to continue in office or to occupy that position, the interests of the State would suffer. At the same time we had the present Premier on one side and then on the other—at one time an enthusiastic supporter of Mr. Morgans, who was then the chief of the present Minister for Works—[THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. N. J. Moore): Are we to have all this ancient history again?]—and later on a colleague of the present Minister for Mines. I would like to point out to the Minister for Lands that this is not ancient history. The history of four years ago cannot by any means be characterised as ancient; and I would infinitely prefer the opinion of the present Minister for Mines at that time in regard to the possibilities, or the capabilities, or the probabilities of success on the part of the present Minister for Works than I would accept his present opinion; because we all know the truth of the proverb: "Evil communication corrupts good manners." However, I suppose there is no one in this House who would not re-echo the wish that in the course of our political warfare of the future, we may have a clear-cut issue in this House, that is a clear-cut issue not as we sit in this House at present, but according to the political opinions expressed by members when consulting the electors of the State. I have taken the trouble to go through the speeches that hon. members made when wooing the suffrages of their constituents; and I could without difficulty point to a dozen members on the Government side who, in the course of their addresses, declared themselves out-and-out sup-

porters of the taxation of unimproved land values, in fact they made it the first plank in their programmes; while on the other hand, I can point to a dozen members on the Government side of the House who are just as emphatically opposed to it. I want to know how the Government supporters can reconcile themselves to the conflicting opinions. This is not only true of the question of the unimproved land values taxation, but it is also true in regard to such questions as the reduction of the franchise for the Upper House and other important legislative proposals. Of course, there are some hon. members on the Government side of the House whose opinions I could not find. For instance, I quote the two hon. gentlemen who sit for Balkatta (Mr. Veryard) and North Perth (Mr. Brebber). They either had no views to express, or were unequal to the task of expressing them; and the result was they were compelled to requisition the services of Ministers to go and express their political views for them; and whatever may have been the predilections of the electors of those constituencies, we know that the Ministers placed in the mouths of those hon. members their own particular views on political issues.

THE PREMIER: With very good results.

MR. BATH: Apart from that, I wish to say that, whatever may be the opinion of people in this House or outside as to the desirability of having more than two parties in the House, there is infinitely more room in this Chamber for honest difference of opinion, even if it involves three or half-a-dozen parties, than there is for the political apostacy and prostitution of principle which have brought hon. members, with their election pledges still warm on their lips, to sit behind the reactionary Cabinet that occupies the Government bench. Now we come to that which is being dignified by the name of the Governor's Speech. This miserable production, which is something on the lines of a glorified soap advertisement, absolutely destitute of matter or of literary grace, has been brought before us as the embodiment of the proposals of this progressive and liberal Government. And right here I wish to congratulate the hon. members who moved and seconded the adoption of the Address-in-Reply on the fact that they were able to

make such excellent speeches on such poor material. They emulated some character in Shakespeare, and made "an infinite deal out of nothing"; and with the stock of platitudes and inanity which they were compelled to fall back upon they made most excellent speeches. While we had very little in the way of legislative proposals put forward by the Premier, we have the Governor's Speech padded out with the usual tale of the wonderful way in which the industries of the State are progressing, and with details of the agricultural, pastoral, and mining industries. We are told, for instance, about the export of gold, and about the dividends that have been paid for the first ten months of the year. It seems to me they have credited the mining industry with some occult power of foreseeing that the Rason Administration was going to benefit us with its glorious presence, and that therefore during the first ten months of the year that they were not in office the mining industry exerted itself to put out dividends simply in the hope that this Administration was going to arrive. Of course I am very pleased to hear of the dividends. We all like to know that the mining industry, in fact any industry, is progressing; but I may point out that there is another side to the picture, and I am going to supply this most palpable omission from the Governor's Speech. While we have this export of gold, this stream of dividends, there is another side to the picture which is infinitely darker and infinitely blacker. I refer to the tragedy of toil which daily occurs on the mining fields in this State; and in all the deification of our golden harvest, I want to know why some humane consideration is not paid or given to the lives and health of those engaged in the mining industry. I have a lively recollection during the recent campaign of a pink-tinged pamphlet issued by the Minister for Mines in which, in tones almost beseeching, he professed sympathy with the working miner, and an intention of working on his behalf when returned to Parliament. In fact he had published the Mines Regulation Amendment Bill submitted by the recent Administration, and side by side in comparison were his own revolutionary proposals. Now I want to know why, when he had the

opportunity, and when as Minister for Mines he is called upon to administer the Mines Department, there is no mention in this Governor's Speech of such an important matter as a Mines Regulation Amendment Bill. While we can find room for trifling measures, and while the hon. member professes sympathy for the working miner and states that the scandalous condition of things which obtains on many of the mines shall not continue, why, when he has the opportunity, does not the Minister introduce this measure? It shows that, now that the elections are over, his professions of sympathy for the working miner and his health and welfare were nothing but a hollow sham. Of course, we have hon. members declaring that what we want is legislative rest. Every political prattler, when he has nothing sensible to say, uses this dreary drivel about wanting legislative rest. In a growing community such as Western Australia, which is young and progressive, there is more danger in administering the affairs of the country with out-of-date and obsolete legislation than there is in introducing amending measures, or new measures which are necessary to a growing community. We have heard too much altogether of this dreary drivel about legislative rest. Even hon. members on the Government benches have not decided to give us complete rest, for they have brought down legislative proposals; and it is a crying shame that amongst them there is no mention of a Mines Regulation Amendment Bill.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: You want to get those Italian friends of yours a job.

MR. BATH: Again we have the usual platitudes about assistance to prospectors. Ministers have been spending considerable time lately in trotting around the agricultural shows, posing to the people and professing about what they are going to do for the great mining industry, while they have not embodied much in the way of assistance to that industry so far as the Governor's Speech is concerned. I suppose they have salved the conscience of the Minister for Mines by some delightfully vague statements in one paragraph of the Governor's Speech. So far as assistance to prospectors is concerned, no doubt every member is desirous that such assistance should be given; but if we are to assist the right

man and give it in the right direction, it must be on some well formulated plan, and not on the methods pursued by the Minister for Mines, giving a few sops here and there to electors and by the reduction of charges here and there, which certainly do not benefit the right man, the *bona fide* prospector, but more often give crushing at rates that are unremunerative to the man who merely goes to some show where he happens to know that stone exists, and gouges it out, and then leaves the show unworked and undeveloped. I believe there is room in the department for a business man who will grapple with the question of assistance to prospectors. Perhaps he would not be popular with a section of the people, or with a lot of men who very often call themselves prospectors, but have absolutely no right or title to the term. Very often the prospector is a man who makes the least outcry, while the man who is not a prospector, but who merely gouges out a bit of stone, joins a prospectors' association, invites the Minister along, gets him to give a concession here and there, and then declares what a great deal the Minister has done for the industry. We want a business man who will place the administration on a business footing. For instance, we had during the prior term the Minister for Mines occupied that position the statement that the State batteries, while they had been of great assistance to people out back, had always shown a small profit; but when things were investigated and the financial position was put in a clear light, we found that a considerable loss had taken place which had not been compensated for by any equivalent advantage in the development of the industry. I believe that the administration of the State batteries should be placed on a business footing, and that if we are to give encouragement, it should be by a lump vote of this House and as the result of the deliberations of this House, and that it should be spent by some competent authority in the right direction, so that the real genuine prospector should receive the benefit of it, and not the one who merely gets the ear of the Minister. But this is not the worst feature of the proposals which have been put forward by the Minister as the

remedy for what he is pleased to term the stagnation of the mining industry. We have insidious proposals for the removal of many of the conditions which have been inserted in the mining legislation of this State; and these appear, while they are carefully veiled, side by side with the Press interviews with Mr. Hoover, who is the representative of Bewick, Moreing, and Co. in this State. Mr. Hoover's remedy for all the ills to which the mining industry is heir is that the mine-owners should be granted the fee simple of their holdings. I have made a study of the conditions of mining in America; and although they grant the fee simple there, I deny that mining in America is in a better position than it is in Western Australia. For the size of the population in America they do not make the same progress in prospecting and mining development that we do in Western Australia; and I can point to a mining field in New South Wales where I have had experience and where the mining companies hold the fee simple of a very large area of land. I refer to the Wentworth properties at Lucknow. The owners have enjoyed the fee simple there, yet stagnation in mining is the rule. It is not because of any conditions to which they have to submit, for they have to submit to none, but because those mines have been made the means of market manipulations, because those mines have been submitted to practically the same kind of scandal as has existed in Western Australia, that the mining is in a stagnant condition. It is because we have precisely the same conditions in market manipulations amongst our speculators, that stagnation continues here. We had a Commission on the Deep Levels Mine, and certain recommendations were put forward by that Commission; and I say those recommendations were desirable, and in pursuance of them the previous Administration submitted an amendment of the Companies Act to get over some of the difficulties. The Premier in his first policy speech after assuming office, at Midland Junction, was pleased to express approval of the proposals: then why not embody them in the Governor's Speech to-day? Why has the Minister for Mines, who is so solicitous for the welfare of the mining industry, not submitted these proposals in his programme? If he is

desirous of improving affairs here, if he is desirous of doing away with the fraudulent methods of the past, why has he not submitted these proposals as well as such a proposal as the Fire Brigades Bill? As far as the mining industry is concerned, it apparently is going to receive short shrift at the hands of the present Administration. It is rather significant that side by side with the demand for an alteration of conditions as to mining and the movement for the fee simple of the land, we have the Minister for Lands declaring at Subiaco that although we have over six million acres of land alienated and in process of alienation in this country, we have but a miserable 678,000 acres of land, or 3 per cent. of the total, under cultivation. He proposes an opposite method to that adopted by the Minister for Mines. He proposes to insist on the conditions under which the lands are held being carried out in order that the land may be brought under cultivation. I point this out as a significant contrast between the two remedies for the evil. It is not the proposed amendment of the Mining Act which will restore confidence on the part of investors. We have a proposal for the construction of light agricultural railways. This has been a good old gag in the hands of the Ministers opposite for a long time, but they have been careful not to give details as to where the lines should start from because these would have set people by the ears. Hon. members would then have been battling for their respective routes, and we should have had the happy birds in the Ministerial nest quarrelling right away. So far as the construction of these lines is concerned, until we have people settled on the areas and cultivating the areas which have been taken up along the existing lines of railway, it is not time to talk of building spur railways which must be unprofitable for some years to come. We have a large area of alienated land along the lines and such a small percentage cultivated, and if we are to encourage land settlement and introduce a different state of affairs we must devote our attention to these areas, and not to the building of lines which will be unprofitable.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Why did you not put it in the Governor's Speech?

MR. BATH : The hon. member knows I have not had an opportunity of drafting a Governor's Speech yet: the hon. member will have to wait three years. I want to know what is the use of loading the expenditure of this State with the necessary amount for interest and sinking fund in building branch lines, when we have areas of land that could be utilised along the existing lines of railway? If there had been any statesman-like qualities in the Premier he would have submitted to us proposals for the institution of a tax on the unimproved value of land, for compulsory purchase of some of these areas, and for the insistence in carrying out the conditions upon which much of the land is now held, in order that the railways might be made paying propositions. There is room for hundreds of settlers along the railway routes if the right policy is pursued, and I hope those members who have declared their belief in a tax on the unimproved value of land will insist that the Ministry shall carry out that proposal, or that they will take their places on that side of the House on which they ought to have occupied seats when they first entered the Chamber. There is another significant omission—and it seems to me the sins of omission on the part of the Government are infinitely greater than the sins of commission. The Premier secured considerable support by his advocacy of Upper House reform. While he was not in favour of the Labour party's proposal for a referendum he was pleased to be in favour of a reduction of the franchise to £15, and the Ministry were to stand or fall by this proposal; yet there is no mention made of this proposal in the Governor's Speech. We shall have Legislative Council elections coming on next year, and if the Premier was desirous of Legislative Council reform being introduced, he should have brought forward the proposal this session. That is of infinitely greater importance than some of the proposals submitted in the Governor's Speech, and it shows how sincere the hon. gentleman was four years ago when he signed the Labour platform and was then prepared to swallow all the proposals, but now he has gone back even on the small modicum of the proposals in Upper House reform.

MR. G. TAYLOR : Did the Premier sign it?

MR. BATH : The hon. member knows I gave the fullest information during the course of a speech last session. The hon. gentleman was then in favour of the taxation of unimproved land, he was in favour of old age pensions, the non-alienation of Crown lands and of Upper House reform; but he has even gone back on that small instalment which he was prepared to grant after becoming Premier, that of Upper House reform. While we have an entire lack of matter in the Governor's Speech, and while we are going to be treated to that much-needed Legislative rest, the Government intend to do a great deal in the matter of administration—that is where they are going to shine. Yet they have been three months in office and what have they done? Their greatest thing seems to have been telling the people what they are going to do, when they have been attending agricultural shows. In the time they have occupied in going round the country speaking of what they intend to do and saying how they intend to carry out administration, they might have accomplished something. Then I remember the smaller the amount of time these members spend in their administrative offices, may be the greater advantage to the community. The Minister for Works at Busselton gave an eloquent speech, one of the most eloquent he has ever delivered: of course it was after partaking of a show dinner. He treated us to an eloquent speech on the amount of good the Government were going to do in the administrative work of the State.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS : I am glad you enjoyed it.

MR. BATH : It seems they are more capable of talking about it than doing the work.

MR. A. J. WILSON : He told me it was a good job it came after the dinner.

MR. BATH : I may remind the Minister for Works that the road to a certain place where the temperature is reported to be very great is paved with good intentions, and the Government appear to have not much confidence in the future world or they would not be erecting such a good pavement as they are doing. We are going to have close

attention paid to the finances. When the September return appeared, and it was inflated to such an extent by the receipt of land rents, the Premier, although he did not want to claim credit for the surplus, made the remark that if there had been a deficit people would have blamed him. It seems to remind me of the Minister for Works saying, "I do not want to say I am a beautiful man; but if people do not say I am ugly, it shows conclusively that I am the other thing." After the September return appeared, the October return came with a deficit, the surplus being on the other side. Then the burst of confidence which the Press and the public said the State had received from the advent of the Rason Government, went bung, and straight away the Premier lost his halo. I am afraid this state of the finances is not to be gauged by the method displayed by the Premier in dealing with the prospects for the coming year 1905-6. He stated that he arrived at his decision by a simple method, multiplying the quarterly returns by four.

THE PREMIER: Nothing of the kind.

MR. BATH: The Premier stated that he received so much during the first quarter, that he simply multiplied it by four, and it gave so much.

THE PREMIER: He did nothing of the kind.

MR. BATH: The papers recorded it as having been stated by the Premier, and if he has any grievance, then it is not against me.

THE PREMIER: The papers did nothing of the kind.

MR. BATH: It is against the gentlemen who reported him in the newspapers of the State. I do not know which to admire most, the simplicity of the method, of the Premier, or of the audience. If the Premier is to build up his Budget Speech on methods such as that, I am sorry to say that he will be a long way out of his calculations at the end of the financial year. We come to the whole secret of the support of the 34 members which the Premier received at the recent election, when we come to the paragraph that deals with loan expenditure. The hon. member placed these words in the mouth of His Excellency the Governor:—

Expenditure from Loan Funds will be necessary upon the railways previously re-

ferred to, on Harbour Improvements, Increased Water Supplies to the Goldfields Improvements of existing and creating new Stock Routes, Boring for Artesian Water in the North and North-West, and in other important directions. Improving the Water Supply and the initiation of a comprehensive Scheme of Sewerage for the Metropolitan Area will be shortly commenced. You will be asked to grant a farther Loan Authorisation. My Advisers, having every confidence in the future of our State, feel that development in every possible direction should be encouraged by judicious expenditure.

"My Advisers having every confidence in the future of the State" are going to borrow money in order to expend it on these works. It is the same old story. Instead of asking the people of the State to square up the finances and show confidence in the State by honest financial methods, that of building many of the works which cannot be of a reproductive nature out of revenue, they are going to show confidence in the State of Western Australia by going to the money-lender in the old country. That reminds me precisely of the method of the impoverished spendthrift, who takes his dress-suit to his "uncle" and asks for a loan, telling him it is a magnificent suit, made of the best material, that it cost him £12, and he is quite satisfied it will wear for a great many years to come. So he pawns the garment with his "uncle." That is precisely the method adopted by the hon. gentlemen when they want to restore confidence in the resources of Western Australia. I wish to say that, as far as this State is concerned, if we need legislative rest, we need rest infinitely more from the borrowing policy pursued in the past. If members were desirous of squaring the finances, if they were desirous of providing or building many of these works as they should do from revenue instead of from loan funds, they would go to the people of the State with confidence in its resources and say, "We want increased taxation; we want you to provide money in order that these works can be built without going to the foreign money-lender, to place the country in pawn in order to secure that money." [MEMBER: How much did you borrow?] The hon. member asks, how much did I borrow? I have not had an opportunity yet: that will come three years hence, when a change of condition takes place. Then finally we have it declared in all

seriousness by the hon. gentlemen who fill those benches that they are going to amend the Electoral Act and to re-organise the electoral system. I would just as soon accuse a burglar of introducing a society for the suppression of burglary. When we know by what methods many of the elections in this State were won in the recent campaign, when we know for instance how the postal voting system was abused in the electorate of the member for Menzies (the Minister for Mines), how can we possibly believe that these hon. gentlemen are sincere in their desire to amend the electoral system, unless it be that, having secured their advantage by abuse of provisions of the Act, they are quite satisfied with the result, and wish to assume a virtue and use the besom of reform. If the hon. members are really sincere and desirous of remedying the abuses which we know have cropped up in the administration, they will find members on this (Opposition) side of the House willing and anxious to assist them in that task, because it is members on this side of the House who have suffered by those abuses. We have, for instance, the abuse of postal voting. I wish to say I was a member of the Labour party of seven which assisted the Administration to insert that provision for postal votes in the Electoral Act, because the Labour party has always been desirous of extending the franchise to as wide a circle as possible, to give every adult in the community the right and title to vote; and we thought by inserting that provision we should be giving the franchise to persons otherwise deprived of the right to exercise it. But we did not know how that provision was going to be abused. We did not know it would be used in the way it has been by those who have gone to people and have taken their votes, for instance when they were drunk; who have taken some votes and absolutely refused to take others, and in many other directions have made the Act a by-word in the mouths of those who criticise our electoral system.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Why do you not cite an instance?

MR. BATH: If the hon. member wishes me to cite one, I can cite one in the district of Waverley, which is in the

hon. member's electorate, where a gentleman refused to take the vote of some, and took the vote of another who was drunk, and who when he wished to exercise his vote in a proper manner was told that he had given the vote for a certain gentleman.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not think you would dare to say that outside.

MR. BATH: Then in another case we have postal votes of ladies behind bars which were taken over the bar counter. These people were able to go and record their votes, and that was a distinct breach of the postal voting provision. Then again in regard to the limitation of expenses, it is absolutely a farce and a by-word. How many persons on that (Government) side of the House can say their expenses were limited to £100?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Every one.

MR. BATH: That is the most absurd statement I have ever heard the Minister for Works make in this House. I assert that when they sign those declarations before a justice of the peace, a great many of them must commit absolute perjury.

THE PREMIER: They have no union funds to use.

MR. A. J. WILSON: What about the National League funds?

MR. BATH: Then again we have in the Electoral Act provision against treating electors, and yet we all know how prominent a part beer played in many campaigns throughout the State of Western Australia. These provisions should either be made operative or else wiped out of the Electoral Act as being absolutely useless and cumbersome. Now we come to the question as to what is likely to be the fairness or impartiality of the administration of those gentlemen who occupy those benches at the present time. The member for Fremantle (Mr. Price), for instance, stated he would not be on that side of the House if he did not expect the present Government to give a fair and impartial administration. It seems to me that if the hon. member knew what he ought to know, he ought not be occupying that seat on that side of the House. I wish to ask members on that side of the House, for instance, why, when the previous Administration had

taken steps to prevent the monopoly of large areas of timber without those areas being utilised, those steps were stopped as soon as the present Ministers assumed office, and the action was prevented. I want to know, for instance, why, before any authoritative statement could have been procured in regard to the matter, while the election campaign was on, the Premier declared his intention of carrying on a flying survey between Bridgetown and Albany with a view to building the Bridgetown-to-Albany railway. I want to know why during this last week and whilst the seat of the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Eddy) is challenged with a petition which is very likely to be successful, the Minister for Mines (Hon. H. Gregory) has declared publicly his intention of bringing the Coolgardie battery up to date, when there are a dozen other places in other parts of the State which have prior claims to that of Coolgardie to have their batteries equipped and brought into proper working order. Then we have sinister hints about amending the legislation and about the removal of restrictions in regard to private enterprise. Then we also have in this connection the despatch from the Home Office, and the stated intention of the Government to move for an amendment of the Factories Act. As far as the members on this side of the House are concerned, if members opposite believe that the interests of the State can be furthered and the resources of the State developed by giving to the syndicator the right to plunder this State without any legislative interference, by giving to the sweater the right to sweat labour without any legislative interference, then I say they will receive the strongest and most bitter opposition from those who happen to constitute His Majesty's Opposition in this Parliament. As far as we are concerned we are desirous, and have always been desirous, of giving the utmost assistance and the utmost encouragement to every industry and to every class in the community. But we say there are those against whom those legislative enactments are required. They are required just as much for the protection of the fair employer as they are for the protection of the worker, and we will give the most strenuous opposition to any proposals which may be submitted

at the instigation of the Minister for Works (Hon. Frank Wilson) in order to do away with those legislative safeguards which have been introduced for the protection of the worker and the fair employer alike. It is absurd. And I say there is a complete change in the politics of the Minister for Mines which will allow him to take part in a Cabinet that puts forward such proposals, there is a complete change from that time when he used to claim that, although he would not sign the pledge, he was desirous of allying himself with the Labour party—

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Do not say that: it is going too far.

MR. BATH: The hon. member stated in a speech at Kookynie that while he could not sign the pledge of the Labour party, he was desirous of working in with them and making a sort of alliance with them, if many of them were returned. That was at the election of 1901. I recollect that it was in response to an invitation by the members of the Labour party at Kookynie to the hon. gentleman to join the Labour party at that time and sign the platform.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: It is untrue that I was asked to sign the platform at the meeting.

MR. BATH: If the hon. member says it is untrue, I withdraw the statement.

MR. TAYLOR: It is generally believed there.

MR. BATH: At the same time the hon. member has always declared himself to be in sympathy with the Labour party and with their proposals, and it comes ill from him at the present time to be allied in the manner he is. As far as members of the Opposition are concerned, although they may be few in numbers, they will present the most strenuous opposition to the influence which undoubtedly the Minister for Works is exercising on the present Cabinet.

MR. J. PRICE (in explanation): I desire to make a personal explanation. The leader of the Opposition has done me the honour of referring to an incident which happened at North Fremantle some three years ago with which I was connected. I desire to inform him that the meeting was open to the public. It was not confined to the members of any

Labour organisation at all. The vote taken at the meeting was also open to any person who attended that meeting, and many men attended who were absolutely unconnected with any Labour organisation. I believe it is customary when a ballot is taken for it to be taken amongst trades unionists or members of the Labour party.

MR. BATH: When I was first chosen as candidate it was by electors on the roll.

MR. PRICE: At this very meeting I was unexpectedly proposed at the ballot. I distinctly informed the assemblage that under no circumstances would I sign the Labour platform. It seems to me that courtesy and fair play must be dead, when a gentleman who is Leader of the Opposition gives such a travesty of facts to this House.

MR. BATH: We have hon. gentlemen who were present there who can give the absolute facts of the case.

[Pause ensued, each side suggesting members who should speak.]

MR. A. J. WILSON (Forrest): I move that the debate be adjourned.

MR. H. E. BOLTON (North Fremantle): I second the motion for adjournment.

Motion put and negatived.

[Pause ensued; suggestions made for continuing the debate.]

MR. SPEAKER rose at length, and put the question "That the Address-in-Reply be adopted."

No remarks. Question passed.

BILL—ROADS AND STREETS CLOSURE.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS AND AGRICULTURE (Hon. N. J. Moore): I have the honour to move the second reading of this Bill. As members are aware, it is practically a perennial measure; and, from a perusal of the schedule, members will see that it contains nothing very novel. In accordance with the usual procedure, all the proposed closures have received the approval of the municipalities and roads boards interested. Plans showing the necessary details will now be laid on the table, so that members may study them before the Committee

stage. When in Committee, I will beg leave to add to the street closures already notified in the schedule three others in the towns of Broome, Chidlow's Well, and Gnumballa respectively.

On motion by MR. BATH, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER (Hon. C. H. Rason) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

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

Ayes	27
Noes	14

Majority for ... 13

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Barnett	Mr. Bath
Mr. Brebber	Mr. Bolton
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Collier
Mr. Carson	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Holman
Mr. Eddy	Mr. Horau
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Hudson
Mr. Gull	Mr. Lynch
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Hicks	Mr. Walker
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Ware
Mr. Isdell	Mr. A. J. Wilson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Troy (Teller).
Mr. Layman	
Mr. McLarty	
Mr. Mitchell	
Mr. N. J. Moore	
Mr. S. F. Moore	
Mr. Piesse	
Mr. Price	
Mr. Rason	
Mr. Smith	
Mr. Stone	
Mr. Varyard	
Mr. F. Wilson	
Mr. Gordon (Teller).	

Question thus passed.

The House adjourned accordingly at 23 minutes past 4 o'clock, until the next afternoon.