

did not fill in the lower part of the ear. It was only shrivelled grain. I realised it would not prove a payable crop of wheat and, therefore, my only chance was to cut it for hay. While knowing that I had to make a loss on that part of my business, I had to make a further capital loss of 75 per cent by putting the commodity into this class of packing and, in selling, I lost £30 out of the £40 worth of jute. Thus I was penalised and could not help myself.

Mr. Smith: This Bill will not prevent that.

Mr. HARRISON: Certainly it will. If this Bill had been law, then I should not have sustained that loss on the jute. We have heard the opinion expressed here and in the trade that the supply would regulate the price. That is what I am after. I desire that the supply of the local article shall not have an influence on the higher priced article as the value of the packing is the same. It is the man who uses the commodity who needs the package afterwards. The farmer uses the jute package for a shorter period than the man who purchases the commodity. We ent the chaff on the farm and, when we have filled the bags, the general run of farmers immediately start to cart it to the railways for sale. On the average, those bags are not filled on the farm for more than three days, and it generally takes three days for the chaff to reach the market. The merchant stores the chaff for a longer period than does the farmer, and the retailer also needs the package just as much as the other trader. Then the consumer needs the package, and he makes use of it for a longer period than anyone else. Therefore, why should not all those parties run the risk of the loss on the jute in their true proportion. Why should the loss in the aggregate fall on the farmer as it does to-day? If the Bill becomes law, it will have the effect of adjusting this particularly high value in its proper proportions among those who benefit from it. Greater care will be taken of the jute and we shall thus save the State many thousands of pounds annually. I hope members will discuss the measure thoroughly so that the public may realise the value of the jute goods as compared with their contents. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and a division called for.

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare that the ayes have it. I might at this stage draw the attention of members to the fact that those voting "no" and "aye" should sit on opposite sides of the House when a division is called for. This is the second time to-night that there has been a strong chorus of "noes" and a division has been

called for, and where are the "noes" now? There is not a single "no."

Motion thus passed; the debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.39 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 30th October, 1919.

	Page
Commission to swear in members	1117
Question: Smoking in trains and trams	1117
Bills: Dog Act Amendment, 3R.	1118
Pure Seeds, 2R.	1118
Merchant Shipping Act Application Act Amend- ment, report	1118
Midland Railway, 2R., report	1118
Traffic, Com.	1119
Supply, £975,000, 1R.	1123
Resolution: Wheat production, price guarantee, Assembly's Message	1123
Sitting days and hours	1123

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

COMMISSION TO SWEAR IN MEMBERS.

The PRESIDENT: I have to announce that I have received from His Excellency the Governor a commission which I shall ask the Clerk to read.

Commission as follows read:

The Hon. Walter Kingsmill, M.L.C., President of the Legislative Council. Whereas by the 52 Victoria, cap. 23, sec. 22, no member of the Legislative Council is permitted to sit or vote therein until he shall have taken and subscribed the oath or shall have made and subscribed the affirmation as therein set forth before me or before some person authorised by me: Now I hereby duly authorise, commission, and appoint you, the said Walter Kingsmill, to administer to members of the said Legislative Council the prescribed oath or affirmation as aforesaid. Given at Perth this 28th day of October, One thousand nine hundred and nineteen. William Ellison-Macartney, Governor.

QUESTION—SMOKING IN TRAINS AND TRAMS.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (for Hon. J. Cornell) asked the Minister for Education: 1, Is it permissible under the railway regulations for females, who do not exhibit outward or tangible evidence of their being

smokers, to travel in smoking compartments; if so, will the Government instruct the Commissioner of Railways to provide a greater supply of smoking compartments on the metropolitan railways; if not, will the Government instruct the Commissioner to instruct his ticket inspection staff to rigorously enforce any regulations or by-laws bearing thereon? 2, Will the Government, in view of the accepted scientific opinion as to the disinfectant powers of tobacco, request the Commissioner of Railways to consider the advisability of abolishing the present antiquated system of smoking and non-smoking compartments, with a view to the inauguration of a uniform system of all smoking compartments on the suburban railways? 3, Will the Government request the officer responsible for the running or conduct of the Perth tramways to consider the advisability of discontinuing the present antiquated system of running occasional smoking tramcars carrying mixed passengers, mostly females, with a view to the inauguration of a system whereby it would be permissible for any passenger to enjoy a smoke whilst in transit on any tramcar, either throughout the whole car or in seats in rear of the centre?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, No. By-law No. 13 prohibits females from travelling in smoking compartments. The staff have instructions to enforce this by-law. If the presence of any female in a smoking compartment may have been overlooked by the staff, action would at once be taken if any passenger called attention thereto. 2, No alteration in the system is considered desirable at the present time. 3, The idea of making rear portion of tramcars available for smoking, and forward portion for non-smokers, is already under consideration.

BILL—DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

BILL—PURE SEEDS.

Second Reading.

Order of the Day read for the resumption from the 22nd October of the debate on the second reading.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East): I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and passed.

The Honorary Minister: I think the vote was against the adjournment.

The PRESIDENT: I have noticed a growing tendency not to give voices on either side, which is extremely wrong. The question was put and passed before I heard a voice from anyone. Voices which are given after I

have announced my decision cannot be taken notice of.

BILL—MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT APPLICATION ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 23rd October.

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

BILL—MIDLAND RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 23rd October.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [4.39]: I do not think it requires very many remarks to endorse what has been stated by the Minister in introducing the Bill. The Midland Railway Company have been amongst us for a good many years, and the original shareholders have certainly been one of the best sources for developing the northern portion of this State. It is well within my recollection, about 1892, probably before most members of this House were born, when the company first started to open this railway, and I can honestly say that the prospects at that time were not of such an encouraging nature as would lead many people to take shares in it. Still, the company, composed of English capitalists, were prepared to sink their money and open a railway through country which most of us know includes many sand plains as well as good land. Very few of us who knew the country would have been prepared to put our money into that railway, yet these English capitalists were prepared to do so. They started the railway at a time when it would have been impossible for the Government of Western Australia to have provided railway facilities and, under the circumstances, we are quite justified in extending to the company the provisions proposed in this Bill. It is unnecessary to indulge in a lot of superfluous language after what has already been said by the Minister, and therefore I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. J. F. Allen in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Vesting of land acquired for railway:

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: The company are to have the fee simple of land and there is a proviso, Subclause 3, to safeguard the interests of the Crown. I would like an assurance from the Minister that the interests of the State have been sufficiently safe-

guarded, and that no fancy price can be charged in respect of land resumed for roads for public purposes.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Provision is made earlier in the clause and the rights of the Crown are amply protected.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: Does the Bill confer on the company any rights they have not at present?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No, it simply gives them the title promised to them at the time.

Hon. J. EWING: The crossings over the railway are vested in the Crown. I think the hon. member may rest satisfied that the rights of the Crown are conserved.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It is simply a question of what machinery would apply in the case of any necessary resumption of lands for roads. I think we may accept the Minister's assurance.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 6—agreed to.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—TRAFFIC.

In Committee.

Hon. J. F. ALLEN in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Interpretation:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That there be added to the interpretation of "district" the words "the term includes sub-district."

At a later stage I will move to insert a definition of "sub-district."

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That there be added to the interpretation of "local authority" the words "and as licensing authority within the metropolitan area as defined by regulation."

When the first Bill was introduced provision was not made for the Minister to act as licensing authority in the metropolitan area; he was to act only in districts outside of municipalities or road boards, and consequently the definition of "local authority" which then appeared was sufficient. But an amendment to Clause 12 in the Assembly having made the Minister the licensing authority in the metropolitan area, it is necessary that he should be armed with authority in that area.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: This is a grave departure from the usual methods in respect of municipalities. Apparently the Minister is going to over-ride the local

authorities of the city. I hold that the people elected by the ratepayers of the city should control the city. I have no objection to the Minister being appointed as the recipient and distributor of license fees so that all the subordinate road boards may get their share, but I cannot approve of the Minister making rules and regulations to govern the city. I am quite in accord with the police controlling the traffic, but that traffic should be controlled under regulations made by the city council, which should have control of the city. The only power the Minister should be vested with is that for the collection and distribution of fees for various licenses. Beyond that I am not prepared to go.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The remarks of the last speaker serve to confirm the views I expressed on the second reading in regard to the attempt made by the Bill to usurp what are clearly the affairs of municipalities. The control of the traffic concerns the municipality, and it is clearly wrong for the Government to step in and seek to take away those powers which have been recognised from time immemorial. As further discussion is bound to take place in regard to the clauses which effect those changes in administration and control, I suggest that the Minister defer the consideration of the amendment until after consideration of the main clauses of the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have no objection to adopting the course which has been suggested and for the time being will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: If the definition clause remains as at present, some of the other clauses will be anomalous.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Perhaps the simpler course would be for the Committee to postpone the consideration of the interpretation clause until all the others have been disposed of. It has never been considered here that the interpretation clause is a good clause on which to discuss a principle. I therefore move—

That the consideration of the clause be postponed until after Clause 62.

Motion put and passed.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Passenger vehicle and carriers' licences:

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Does this clause mean that a vehicle carrying passengers must have a license and also a vehicle carrying goods must have a license? Some vehicles carry both goods and passengers.

The Minister for Education: They must have two licenses.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Is permission given to the local authority to issue two licenses and charge 5s. for each?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The passenger vehicle and carrier's license are

both in addition to the ordinary vehicle licenses. The local authority will have to administer that.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 7—The licensing authority:

Hon. J. DUFFELL: In the event of a person owning a motor car and more than one member of a family drives that car, will it be necessary for each member of the family to have a license?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The point raised by the hon. member does not come under Clause 7. It is dealt with in a later clause, but every member of the family driving the car will require to have a license.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Quite right too.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 8—Operation of license:

Hon. A. H. PANTON: I understand that this clause will mean that if a taxi driver who owns a car and obtains a license, that license will enable him to move all over the State. At present most of the taxi drivers have a stand in front of the Post Office, but some of them live in the suburbs which are controlled by a road board. Say a man lives in South Perth and he is issued his license in that suburb, I want to be sure now that a driver will not be compelled to pay more than one license fee.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 11—agreed to.

Clause 12—Minister to be licensing authority for metropolitan area:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: A big principle is involved in this clause. It seeks to confer upon the Minister authority for every district and sub-district comprised in the metropolitan area. We were informed by the leader of the House that the metropolitan area will take in what is known as the metropolitan-suburban area and the Minister will be able to exercise jurisdiction over a most important part of the State so far as population is concerned. I admit, of course, there are districts which rank in importance with the metropolitan area in certain points. The North-West is a district which is capable of doing great things, but the Minister will not concern himself about that particular area. The clause gives very big powers and they are of a nature which I described on the second reading as being altogether outside the scope of a Minister of the Crown. The Minister is descending from that high pedestal on which we have sought to place him. His duties are to administer affairs of State, not to descend to domestic matters such as these which are involved in the clause. Those functions are of a nature which can be more successfully carried out by local authorities than possibly by the Minister. If the clause is passed there are

certain other things which must necessarily be carried out by the local authority, and it will be necessary almost to extend the power which is given here so that the Minister may fully discharge his functions as a licensing authority under the measure. The main objection, and a very serious objection, to this clause relates to Subclause (2), which provides that all fees for licenses and for transfers and registrations of licenses in the metropolitan area shall be paid into the Treasury. That means the setting up of a new Government department, which course would be clearly opposed to the spirit of economy by which Ministers claim to be animated. The local authorities, with their existing staffs, can carry out the duty of collecting these fees. If it is decided that the fees shall be apportioned, an account can be taken of the fees collected by the various municipalities, and then a scheme of division can be decided upon by the Minister, whereupon certain municipalities in the metropolitan area would doubtless be required to pay various amounts to other municipalities. I am opposed to the contemplated division of fees; but if Parliament considers that the division should be made, the apportionment could be effected without any additional expense on the lines I have suggested. I hope the Minister will consider the advisableness of drafting the necessary clause.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not think the hon. member need fear the setting up of a new Government department. The Public Works Department have officers who are charged with the administration of local government affairs, and I fail to see why it should cost any more for that one department to collect the fees throughout the metropolitan area than it costs to have them collected by seven or eight municipalities. Moreover, the clause provides that the fees collected shall be chargeable with the cost of collection as certified by the Minister; so that there will be no cost to the State.

Hon. H. Millington: Could the Police Department be utilised to collect the fees?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The metropolitan-suburban area is a very large one, and the Government have not officers at every centre.

The Minister for Education: They have the police everywhere.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: An officer will be required for this purpose at every centre. Now, the local authorities are already established at every centre, and they can carry out this duty, and they should be charged with carrying it out.

Hon. J. EWING: There is a great deal of common sense in Mr. Nicholson's suggestion. It would be most unwise to create another Government department, which Government control would certainly involve. If the officers of the Public Works Department can do this work in addition to the work they are now doing, it follows that they have not enough work to do at

the present time. However, I do not think the Minister is so much concerned with having control of the issue of licenses as with getting the money. Mr. Nicholson's scheme for distribution of the fees would be a very roundabout way of doing the business. In my opinion the local authorities should be allowed to continue to collect the fees, and to deduct the cost of collection on an agreed scale, whereafter the whole of the money would be handed over to the Minister for distribution. Roads in outlying districts are being largely destroyed by motor cars licensed in the metropolitan district; and therefore, apart from Mr. Nicholson's first suggestion, I heartily support the clause.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Members representing the city of Perth should come here prepared with the amendments they want in this Bill. I would suggest that the Minister should be made the distributing authority, instead of the licensing authority, and this could be effected by striking out "licensing" in line 2 of Subclause (1) and inserting "distributing" in lieu. The council of the city of Perth should be the body to make laws for the city of Perth. The traffic should be controlled by the police, and there should be no interference from any Minister except as regards distribution of the license fees. It has been argued with considerable force that there are license fees collected by the city of Perth which should be distributed among other municipalities. Let us leave the distribution in the hands of the Minister, but he should have nothing to do with licensing or with making of by-laws and regulations. If the council of Perth are not fit to carry out those duties, they should not be permitted to exist. I take exception to the slipshod manner in which members representing the city of Perth have acted in regard to this Bill. They have failed to submit the proper amendments required. Why should I be discussing this Bill? I represent the North-West and not the city of Perth. I am not supposed to know anything about the city of Perth.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The point raised by Sir Edward Wittenoom is one which does not concern the clause. It strikes at one of the chief principles of the Bill, which contemplates that there shall be uniform regulations for traffic all over Western Australia. It sets out the idea that each municipality shall put up its own regulations, which is what we want to get away from.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The Minister can approve of the regulations.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: How are we to get uniform regulations under the existing Acts, when on every occasion the city of Perth has stood out? There was no power by which we could get uniform regulations. The purpose of the clause is to make the Minister the authority to issue licenses. The Minister is the licensing authority and the police are the sole authority

for administering the Act, and should be able to arrange for the collection of the fees at a smaller cost than the bodies now carrying out the work can do. Here are the three points: the collection of the fees and their distribution, the administration of the Act, which is vested in the Commissioner of Police, and the uniformity of the by-laws controlling the traffic all over the State.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The figures supplied in regard to licenses put the position in such a way that the city of Perth really has no leg to stand upon. The number of motor vehicles registered for 1918 was:—Perth 1,174, Belmont Park 12, West Guildford 2, Bayswater 4, Queen's Park 6, South Perth 23, and Guildford 27.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is according to the population.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Not at all. Because there are only two vehicles registered in West Guildford that bears no relation to the population of West Guildford as compared with the seven registrations for Fremantle. Is not Mr. Nicholson asking for the impossible?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The suggestion is still to allow the Minister to make the distribution.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I will do anything in reason to assist in the passage of this Bill. In regard to the collection of money, it is not an unreasonable suggestion, though I do not think it would suit all the parties concerned. We want to get the matter out of the control of the city of Perth and hand the money over to the Minister for distribution. I trust the clause will be agreed to.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: I am glad to say I do not represent the city of Perth. I am in accord with the remarks of Mr. Sanderson. Inasmuch as the Minister is eventually going to distribute this sum amongst the various participants, it would be as well if he had the collection of it. The city of Perth would be well advised to apply to themselves the words of Omar Khayyam, to take the cash, or that portion of it which they can get, and let the credit of collecting it go.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: The specious arguments put forward by the leader of the House do not convince me. The desire at present is to take out of the hands of the city council the right to make their own rules in connection with the city of Perth. It has been urged by several municipalities that they are not fairly treated, because the city of Perth absorbs the money from the license fees which they ought to get. There is a certain amount of justice in that contention. In the circumstances, it would be quite fair that the distribution of these fees should be in the hands of the Minister. So long as we have a city council and allow the people who live in the city to be governed by those who are elected by them, they have the right to make the rules under which they exist and carry on their avocations. I am not going to vote for the clause.

The CHAIRMAN: This has nothing to do with the regulation of traffic, but only with the fees.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I am opposed to the Minister being the licensing authority, but he should be the distributing authority and have nothing to do with licensing, although the municipality in each case should have everything to do with licensing. The Minister has no right to interfere with these local authorities. If they are not fit to control their own business they should be done away with.

Hon. J. EWING: This is a question of the distribution and the collection of money. If we agree to Sir Edward Wittenoom's suggestion it will overcome the difficulty. By voting for the amendment I am only voting that the Minister shall receive the money, but not interfere with its collection.

Hon. J. CORNELL: When a similar Bill to this was introduced in 1912-13 this clause, which was objectionable to the House, was not re-introduced in another place by the Minister in charge of the Bill. As far as the Government are concerned the clause now before us cannot be said to be a Government clause. The private members in another place have inserted this clause. If we throw this out again the Government will have to depend on the private members in another place to uphold it. Exactly the same position presented itself six or seven years ago. The Government then considered that this was a vital portion of the Bill, and when this Chamber struck it out they decided that the Bill should be dropped.

The CHAIRMAN: We are not discussing the Bill, but this particular clause.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The Government are not responsible for this clause and the Bill might be lost if we do not agree to it. There are in this Chamber now only 12 members who discussed it in 1913. Therefore we can consider that it is being dealt with by a new House. In 1912 and 1913, I voted for this clause; now I intend to vote against it. Previously it was pointed out that a preponderating number of motor cars was in Perth, and it was claimed that they cut up the roads of other local authorities which received no revenue from those cars. There are more motor cars in Kalgoorlie and Boulder than in the Kalgoorlie road board, and, for every mile they run over the roads under the jurisdiction of the Kalgoorlie and Boulder municipalities, they run five miles over the roads of the Kalgoorlie road board. The Government have not seen fit to apply this principle to them or generally throughout the State. I do not object to its non-application to the Goldfields because the local authorities there retain their full authority, they having negotiated and arrived at a workable and reasonable arrangement. I doubt whether like negotiations have been attempted in the metropolitan area. The proposal is that the Minister shall collect the whole of the

license fees for the metropolitan area, but the Bill does not even define the metropolitan area.

Hon. A. H. PANTON: The Minister said that will be done by regulation.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Quite so, but when the hon. member has been a little longer in the House, he may understand better what that means. The metropolitan area should be defined in the Bill. The Government, after collecting the license fees, will distribute them among the local authorities on a pro rata basis. What does that mean? Will they distribute the fees on the basis of the number of vehicles in each district, or on the mileage the vehicles run in the various districts? Whichever system is adopted, it will mean augmenting the staff of the Public Works Department to carry it out. I am not always in accord with bumble government, but I think councillors endeavour to do their best. It would be better if the local authorities in the metropolitan area evolved a scheme among themselves rather than change from their democratic control to the Czarism of the Works Department. I see no necessity to depart from the principles of municipal government which have operated so long in this State and which, under this Bill, will be perpetuated throughout the State, with the exception of the metropolitan area. Since 1913, the Leederville and North Perth municipalities have joined in the greater Perth scheme, so that there are two possible dissentients fewer now than in 1913. If there was no other reason for voting against the clause, I should do so on the personal ground that the hon. member who opposed it so strongly in 1913 is now President of the Council.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: This clause appears to have been introduced to settle a dispute between the city of Perth and the adjacent local authorities. A compromise has been suggested that the local authorities concerned should continue, with the staff they have, to collect the license fees and hand them to the Minister, who should distribute them. That seems an equitable proposal. The Minister said the licenses could be issued and the money could be collected by the present staff of the Public Works Department, but I am satisfied this would mean setting up a new Government department. When the department is created, as it will be, I presume portion of the license fees will be deducted, and the balance will then be distributed. If the local authorities continued to collect the fees, all the Minister would have to do would be to distribute them, and that could be done without expense.

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: This clause is designed to overcome the difficulty of divided control. The suggestion now made is to perpetuate divided control. The authority responsible for distributing the money should be the authority to collect it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Why?

Hon. H. MILLINGTON: I could understand members of the Metropolitan and West

provinces objecting to the Minister taking control. But apparently there must be some mutual understanding between the various municipalities concerned. Mr. Nicholson has not raised the same objection to the distribution, but he now suggests that it would be better if the local authorities collected the money. I am not convinced that a case has been made out for taking any of the control from the Minister. It is the divided control of the past which has been responsible for the clause. It appeals to me as a solution of the difficulty. I fail to see that any new department will be set up, for we have all the necessary machinery to-day. Since the Minister is to distribute the funds, he should be the one to collect them. The amendment affects the whole principle of the Bill. I will support the clause.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: None of the arguments advanced have influenced me in the least. I see no occasion for amending the clause, but I fully sympathise with the position of Mr. Nicholson, and I feel it has not been customary to take divisions on what might be regarded as vital points in a Bill on Thursday afternoon, when many of our members have left to go home. However, it will be necessary from this day forward to sit on Thursday evenings, and perhaps even to meet on Fridays. I am agreeable to reporting progress.

[The President resumed the Chair.]

Progress reported.

RESOLUTION—WHEAT PRODUCTION, PRICE GUARANTEE.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read requesting concurrence in the following resolution of that House:—"That in the opinion of this House it is in the best interests of Australia that the sum of 5s. per bushel at the sidings should be guaranteed by the Commonwealth Government to growers of wheat for a term of five years."

BILL—SUPPLY, £975,000.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

SITTING DAYS AND HOURS.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colbatch—East) [6.9]: Now that you are back in the Chair, Sir, I should like to intimate to hon. members, as I indicated in Committee just now, that for the remainder of the session it is my intention to sit on Thursday evenings as well as other evenings; and I may find it necessary to ask hon. members to meet on Fridays as well.

House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 30th October, 1919.

Questions :	Page
Hampton Plains, woodline extension ...	1123
Royal Commission, National Workers	1123
Firewood companies, concession and agreement	1123
Standing Orders Suspension ...	1123
Leave of Absence ...	1124
Bills: Supply, £975,000, all stages ...	1124
Bunbury Common ...	1124
Land and Income Tax, 2s. ...	1125
Perth Mint Act Amendment ...	1127
Annual Estimates: Votes and items discussed ...	1128

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

QUESTION — HAMPTON PLAINS, WOODLINE EXTENSION.

Mr. LUTEY asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Have the Lakeside Woodline Company, under their present concession, power to run a spur line to, or near, the new find at Hampton Plains without consulting the Government? 2, If not, will the Government consult Parliament before they grant the company permission to do so?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Mines) replied: 1, Yes, but the permit to construct the line is for the carrying of firewood and purposes incidental thereto. 2, No application to extend the powers granted under the permit has been made to the Government. Should this be done, and Parliament is in session, Parliament will be immediately informed of the fact.

QUESTION — ROYAL COMMISSION, NATIONAL WORKERS.

Mr. GREEN (for Mr. Jones) asked the Premier: 1, Does the amount of £140 0s. 5d., given as the cost of the Royal Commission on the National workers up to 23rd October, 1919, include the amount, if any, paid to witnesses? 2, Is it the Government's intention to make Mr. Lazarus (O.B.E.) a permanent Commissioner?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No payments are being made to witnesses. 2, No.

QUESTION—FIREWOOD COM- PANIES, CONCESSION AND AGREEMENT.

Mr. MUNSIE (without notice) asked the Premier: When will he make available the papers relative to the Kurrawang Firewood Company and the Lakeside Firewood Company which were ordered by the House on the 15th October to be laid on the Table?

The PREMIER replied: I do not know why the papers are not here. I will see that they are here on Tuesday. I am sorry the hon. member did not mention the matter to me, when I would have brought them along.