

**QUESTION—CYANIDE PLANTS FOR PUBLIC BATTERIES.**

HON. J. M. DREW asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Whether the need of small cyanide plants in conjunction with the public batteries on the Murchison and Peak Hill goldfields had been represented to the Government. 2, Whether the Government contemplated the erection of such plants at an early date.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied:—1, In some instances representations have been made to the Mines Department. 2, The erection of cyanide plants at Government public batteries has been under consideration for some time, and it is intended to erect such where it can be justified.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE.**

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, leave of absence for a fortnight was granted to the Hon. C. A. Piesse, on the ground of his wife's sickness.

**FEDERATION ENABLING BILL.**

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, read a first time.

**ADJOURNMENT.**

The House adjourned at three minutes to 5 o'clock until the next day.

**Legislative Assembly,**

*Wednesday, 6th June, 1900.*

Question: Millar's Jarrah Co., Railway Restrictions—  
Question: Denominational Schools, as to Further Grant—  
Question: Railway Servants as Members of Public Bodies—  
Question: Railways, alleged Frauds (Kalgoorlie)—  
Question: Wharf Extension for Fremantle—  
Privilege: Committee of Inquiry Geraldton Case—  
Federation Enabling Bill, third reading—  
Motion: Beaufort-street Bridge, Perth (to widen)—  
Motion: Electoral Rolls, Publication—  
Adjournment.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

**PRAYERS.****QUESTION—MILLAR'S JARRAH CO., RAILWAY RESTRICTIONS.**

MR. WILSON, for Mr. Ewing, asked the Commissioner of Railways, Whether the Government intended to compel Millar's Jarrah Company to carry goods and passengers from Wokalup Siding to their Mornington Saw Mills?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS replied: The matter was under consideration.

**QUESTION—DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS, AS TO FURTHER GRANT.**

MR. WILSON, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier, Whether it was true that the Government had been approached with the view of obtaining a further grant to denominational schools? If so, by whom; and what amount was asked for?

THE PREMIER replied: No; it is not true.

**QUESTION—RAILWAY SERVANTS AND MEMBERS OF PUBLIC BODIES.**

MR. SOLOMON, without notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways: Is it a fact that in the new set of regulations about to be introduced in the Railway Department, provision is made to prevent employees in the department from holding any office on roads boards, municipal councils, or political bodies.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS replied: Notice of the question should be given.

**QUESTION—RAILWAYS, ALLEGED FRAUDS.**

MR. GREGORY, without notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways: Does he

intend to make any statement to the House in reference to the serious allegations made in the *Sun* and other newspapers, in regard to the Perth Ice Company and the Railway Department.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS replied: I have already replied to the question, which has been put in both Houses of Parliament, stating that the matter is under consideration. I may add that every step is being taken by the department to make inquiry, and the directors of the Ice Company have placed at the disposal of the officers of the Railway Department all their books, which are being examined with a view to ascertaining whether some understanding has existed, or whether any false declaration has been made, with a view to defrauding the department. I shall be able to give a full statement very shortly.

MR. GREGORY: I give notice that I intend to move that all papers in reference to the alleged frauds in connection with the Perth Ice Company and the Railway Department be laid on the table of the House.

#### QUESTION—WHARF EXTENSION FOR FREMANTLE.

MR. HIGHAM, without notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways what measures have been taken for the construction of three wharf sheds on the South Quay, Fremantle, and when will the buildings be commenced, and tenders called for them?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS replied: I may say the plans are in course of preparation, and the intention is to call for tenders for the erection of the sheds.

MR. HIGHAM: They have been "in course of preparation" for two years past.

#### PRIVILEGE—COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY, GERALDTON CASE.

MR. HARPER, in the absence of the Chairman of the Select Committee, moved for one week's extension of time for bringing up the report of the committee.

Question put and passed.

#### FEDERATION ENABLING BILL.

##### THIRD READING.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

#### MOTION—BEAUFORT STREET BRIDGE, PERTH (To Widen).

MR. HALL moved:

That in the opinion of this House, in consequence of the inconvenience and loss to the public living in the northern portions of the city, occasioned by the long delay in the construction of a tramway to the northern and western portions of Perth, the Commissioner of Railways should ratify his promise to have the widening of the Beaufort street bridge completed without further delay.

Since giving notice of the motion, he was pleased to see that tenders had been accepted for the construction of a tram line along Beaufort street; but the action of the Minister or of the department in delaying the very necessary widening of the Beaufort street bridge, and the action of Mr. C. Y. O'Connor in compelling the Tramway Company to lay down a single line over the present bridge, thereby necessitating switches being placed on the approaches to the bridge, was detrimental to the interests of Perth and North Perth, and would prove a serious obstruction to the traffic. There was no doubt that with the advent of trams, property along the tram routes increased in value, and property became more lettable according to the facilities offered to the travelling public. He had only to instance properties along the Mount Eliza road and at Subiaco, as showing that increased facilities to the public travelling by the trams did increase the value of property.

THE PREMIER: Land in West Perth had not increased in value as a result of the trams.

MR. HALL: Last year, before the advent of the trams, property had gone down in value, and with the advent of the trams along the Hay street route he knew, as one engaged in the business, that properties had become more valuable and houses more lettable. Therefore the delay that had taken place in the construction of the tram line to the northern portion of the city had been detrimental to the welfare of the citizens of Perth who were living in the northern and western portions of the city. If the dictum of Mr. C. Y. O'Connor was to be supreme, the traffic would be impeded, as a single line would be an absolute source of danger. It was at one time the opinion of a great number of people that a single line should be constructed along the busier portions of Hay street, and switches placed at Pier

street on the one side and at William street on the other, on account of the narrowness of the street. But no man would now maintain that a single line would have been better than a double one. Some two years ago he (Mr. Hall) asked the Commissioner of Railways whether it was intended to widen the Beaufort Street bridge on the western side, so as to bring the bridge into as direct a line as possible with Beaufort Street. All knew of the very dangerous curve which existed there at the present time. The Commissioner of Railways stated that it was the intention of the department to widen the bridge on the eastern side.

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS:** That was if the necessity arose for the widening. The Government were not desirous of widening the bridge.

**MR. HALL:** Anyone who knew the traffic going over the bridge must be convinced of the necessity for widening the bridge. Action was then taken by the Perth City Council, with the proper persons to be consulted in the matter, so that their wishes, if possible, might be acceded to. It was moved in the Perth City Council and carried that the proposal of the railway authorities to widen the bridge on the eastern side only was detrimental to the best interests of the people of North Perth, and that the Council was of opinion that the bridge should be widened on the western side so as to bring the bridge in as direct a line as possible with Beaufort Street. The Commissioner of Railways was communicated with by the City Council, by deputation or letter. A reply was received by the town clerk as follows:

Referring to your letter of the 12th October last, re widening of Beaufort street bridge, I have the honour, by direction, to inform you that this matter has had the consideration of the Hon. Commissioner for Railways, but in view of the fact that there are no funds available at present for the carrying out of the work, the widening of the bridge will have to be deferred until such a time as funds have been provided. In the meantime, it would be of advantage that the City Engineer should confer with the Chief Engineer of Existing Lines, with the view of plans for the work being prepared, which would meet the requirements of the public and be satisfactory to your Council.

In accordance with the letter the City Council, as a body, met the Government

Engineer on the bridge, and a plan was then and there agreed upon by the City Council on the one side, and the Engineer for Existing Lines on the other side, and it was signed by the Government Engineer, the City Engineer, the Chairman of the Works Committee, and the Mayor; but since then nothing had been done, and he understood that the Government had delayed the matter because of some idea they had that the Tramway Company should contribute the sum of £2,000 towards the cost of widening the bridge. He contended it was the intention of the Government to widen that bridge before the tramways were even suggested; and it was absolutely necessary the work should be gone on with, as at present the bridge was a source of danger, and when the trams went over the bridge it would be a still greater source of danger. Mr. O'Connor said he would insist on there being a single line of rails across the middle of the bridge. That, he maintained, would be detrimental to the traffic; the trams would not be able to run so frequently to the north of the city, and therefore the travelling facilities to the public living in the northern portion of the city would not be so good as they ought to be. He understood that the company were in favour of running a double line of rails across the bridge even as it existed now, and they were prepared to give an undertaking that two cars would never be on the bridge at one time. The advantage of a double line of rails must be apparent to hon. members, because a car going over the bridge would always be on the left side and would leave room for vehicular traffic going in an opposite direction; whereas if a single line were put down it would mean that a single track would block all the traffic going in the opposite direction. Whilst the cars were being switched at the Wellington street side on to the single line, all the vehicular traffic on the opposite side of the bridge would have to wait until the car got over the bridge, and there would be a stoppage of traffic nearly as bad as the stoppage of traffic at the William Street railway crossing, which was quite sufficient without having another block at the Beaufort Street bridge. If a double line were permitted, there would be no switches at the approaches to the bridge, which would

overcome the difficulty of having to switch the cars from one track to another. He wanted to impress on the Commissioner of Railways the necessity of going on with the work at once. Independently altogether of the trams, the widening of the bridge was a necessity. The bridge was built by the Railway Department, without looking sufficiently far ahead. A narrow bridge had been erected there which was not at all suitable for the present traffic, and with the advent of the trams that bridge would become a very great source of danger; therefore he asked the Commissioner, in the interests of Central Perth and North and West Perth, which would be affected very considerably, whether it was not advisable to proceed with the work of widening the bridge at once. The work would have to be done in the very near future; and taking into consideration the difficulty we already had at the William Street railway crossing, he did not think the Commissioner of Railways should cause another block at the Beaufort Street bridge, which would surely happen if the bridge was not widened, or in case Mr. O'Connor's idea of permitting only a single line of rails across the bridge was acquiesced in by the Commissioner.

MR. ILLINGWORTH seconded the motion.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piessé): In regard to this bridge, about two years ago the matter was brought up by the City Council. That was principally, he thought, in anticipation of the tramway being carried to the northern portion of the city of Perth. He then said that he thought the matter was connected more with the City Council than with the Railway Department. The only object he had was to endeavour to improve the bridge and so to help the municipality, if he could do so.

MR. HALL: It was a railway bridge.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The Railway Department constructed a bridge which was sufficient for the traffic of the city. Pathways were provided for foot passengers, and a roadway for vehicular traffic. There had been no complaint as to the congestion of the traffic there, and the bridge, so far, had met the requirements of the Railway Department, also the requirements of the

travelling public. When it was proposed to extend the tramways to North Perth, the necessity of widening the bridge was brought under notice, and he had some communication with the City Council; afterwards some negotiations were entered into by the City Council with the Engineer of the Railway Department. An arrangement was arrived at which was submitted and approved of. Subsequently the matter was again revived by the City Council in connection with the extension of the tramways, and he (the Commissioner) then saw the manager of the tramway system, who asked for an estimate of the cost of widening the bridge, and this was prepared. It was found that the initial expenditure would be £6,000 for the alterations to the bridge. The Tramway Company expressed their willingness to pay £2,000, one-third of the amount, if the Government would carry out the work. He (the Commissioner) expected the Municipal Council would provide another £2,000, and the Government would then find the remaining £2,000. That was one of the arrangements the department was willing to enter into at the time. Subsequently the manager of the Tramway Company said his directors were not agreeable to pay any portion of the cost of widening the bridge, and that he considered the City Council should take such steps as were necessary to provide a proper means for the tram lines to cross the railway at that point. The matter dropped at the time, and nothing had been done since until the City Council revived it a few weeks ago. The Railway Department had provided a bridge suitable for all requirements of railway traffic at that point, and if the Tramway Company required the bridge widening for the convenience of running a double line of tramways across it, the company and the City Council should arrange to pay their proportions of the cost. The proposed widening was, after all, required really to provide a means for the Tramway Company to carry their lines over the railway at that point. The cost of widening the bridge was estimated at about £6,000, and if the Government were required to provide all the money for this work, that would be a matter for the consideration of this House. For himself as Commissioner of Railways, he was willing to put the work in hand on

receiving authority from this House to do so. As the widening of the bridge was rendered necessary by the extension of the tramway system, something should be done by the Tramway Company or by the Municipal Council, or by both, to pay their portion of the cost, or, if not prepared to pay their portion, they should put their case before the Government. In regard to the advice given by the Engineer-in-Chief, it should be observed that under the Act 49 Victoria, No. 23, grave responsibility was put on the Commissioner of Railways as the Minister responsible for the working of the tramway system; and therefore it was necessary for himself, as Commissioner, to obtain the advice of those who were, after all, better able to judge as to matters of this kind than he could be. The Engineer-in-Chief had advised him that it would be unsafe to lay two lines of tramway over the Beaufort street bridge; therefore he could not see his way to disagree with that recommendation by allowing two lines to be laid across the bridge, because he, as Minister, had to protect the lives of the people using the bridge, and to see they had a safe means of transit over a thoroughfare which was used daily. If he, as Minister, were to agree to the construction of two lines over the bridge, and if an accident did occur to any of the public, he would be held blamable; therefore he could not see his way to agree to any other course than that already suggested by the Engineer-in-Chief, for one line of rails to be laid over the bridge, and if that were done the tramway system could be worked properly and with the least risk to the public safety.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That would block the bridge.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: What was now suggested was that if one line of tramway were put over the bridge, that would block the bridge; but in fact the bridge was now too narrow for two lines of rails to be laid across it, because one or other of these lines would run so close to the side of the bridge that there would be considerable risk to the public using the bridge. Having the advice of the Engineer-in-Chief, as the officer specially responsible for carrying out Government works of this character, and as the

Engineer-in-Chief had stated his reasons for advising the Government against carrying out the work in the way the Tramway Company proposed, he (the Commissioner) was not going to take the responsibility of ignoring the advice of a responsible officer. It was his duty, as Commissioner, to provide the necessary means of crossing the railway at that point; and he had been desirous of protecting the public funds, as far as possible, by requiring those persons who were going to reap a reward from the tramway system, to contribute a proportion of the cost of this bridge. It was said the tramway system was making good progress; and if the company were going to derive such benefit from the widening of the bridge, as it was stated they expected to do, they should pay some portion of the cost of that work. The manager of the company did say, at one time, that the company would pay a share of the cost; but subsequently the manager withdrew that offer, and said his directors were not agreeable to pay any portion.

MR. HALL: The Commissioner appeared to say he would not do anything to the bridge, whether the company agreed to pay a share of the cost or not.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: If the company paid their proportion, was the Commissioner prepared to go on with the work?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: Yes.

MR. HALL (in reply as mover): When this question was first raised in the House, no concession had been given for running tramways through the city; and the question of widening the bridge was not then in connection with a tramway system at all, but was owing to the necessities of public traffic at the time. Anyone going over that bridge and seeing the dangerous curve existing there from the bridge into Beaufort Street, must consider the bridge ought to be widened on the western side, to bring it into more direct line with Beaufort street; therefore the question of the tramway should not come into this matter at all. If, however, the Government could get the Tramway Company to contribute some portion of the cost of widening the bridge, so much the better. He wanted the Government to promise

that this work should be gone on with as quickly as possible. With regard to the municipality of Perth, if the City Council, which meant the citizens, had to contribute £2,000 towards the cost of widening the bridge, it should be remembered that the bridge was built for the convenience of the railways, that the construction of the railway cutting had necessitated the building of a bridge across the railway; therefore it was a railway project, and had nothing to do with the City Council. The Commissioner of Railways might as well expect the City Council to contribute towards the cost of erecting the railway gate at William Street crossing. He felt satisfied that the Commissioner of Railways, if he could make an arrangement with the Tramway Company, would be willing to go on with the work at once. He did not know how the Tramway Company felt in regard to the question, but the widening of the bridge would be a great convenience to them, and in saying this he was speaking entirely in the public interest.

**THE PREMIER** (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): No complaint had reached him from the citizens or the City Council as to the present bridge being inadequate for the public traffic, nor did he believe it to be inadequate at present. He had crossed the bridge frequently and observed that the traffic was not inconvenienced; therefore he did not think the bridge was too narrow for the traffic at present.

**MR. HALL:** The City Council said it was too narrow.

**THE PREMIER:** When did they say so? Had they passed any resolution.

**MR. HALL:** There was a motion here on the subject.

**THE PREMIER:** It was not necessary to go to the City Council or to the member for Perth (Mr. Hall) to ascertain whether that bridge served the present requirements of public traffic. He did not think there was any obligation on the Railway Department to widen the railway bridge as the overhead traffic increased; and he did not see why the City Council should come to the Government, as it were with a pistol to their head, saying "You must make this bridge wider." If the City Council made a request to the Government, that request would be considered; but the Tramway Company had undertaken to build tram-

ways for the city, and in order to do that it was said this bridge should be widened. It appeared to him there were three parties to this question: the Tramway Company, the City Council, and the Railway Department. It also appeared that the Tramway Company now wanted to get out of their obligation, and throw the whole cost of widening this bridge on the City Council and the Government, instead of the Tramway Company paying their third share of the cost. If the request affected only the traffic of the city, that might be considered; but if the hon. member, in moving this motion, was advocating that the Tramway Company should be relieved of their obligation—

**MR. HALL:** That was not a fair way to put it. He had not consulted the company in the matter before moving.

**THE PREMIER:** Accepting that assurance, yet if the hon. member's arguments went to show that the Government should do this work and that the Tramway Company should be relieved, he must ask the hon. member to show why the company should be relieved in the matter. Indeed, why should not the Tramway Company bear the whole cost necessary to carry out their tramway extensions? No good reason had been shown why the company should not contribute one-third of the cost of widening this bridge. The hon. member (Mr. Hall) had referred to a resolution passed by the City Council, but that resolution was passed two years ago, and the Council had been silent on the subject ever since. If it were a matter of vital importance that this work should be carried out, the Mayor of the city, being a member of this House, would probably have moved in the matter; but he had not done so. He (the Premier) did not think there was any present necessity for widening the bridge, leaving out the question of the tramway extension.

**MR. WILSON** (Canning): According to the Premier's argument, the Government were not bound to widen the bridge at all. As a fact, however, the Government were in the position of a private railway company which, if it owned the railways, could be forced to provide accommodation for traffic over the bridge.

**THE PREMIER:** Two years had elapsed since the City Council had asked for more accommodation.

MR. HALL: They had been agitating ever since.

THE PREMIER said he had never heard of it.

MR. WILSON: Motions had been passed when he was in the City Council, and the Government had acknowledged that the bridge should be widened.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The department agreed to enter into negotiations regarding the estimate and design, which was done.

MR. WILSON: For railway purposes this bridge had to be built. Was it adequate for the traffic? It was useless to differentiate trams from ordinary vehicles.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member would, of course, relieve the tramway company from responsibility.

MR. WILSON: As usual, the Premier made insinuations.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The department maintained the accommodation was sufficient.

MR. WILSON: It was not sufficient. The traffic was congested. Vehicles had to wait their turn, and had to cross the bridge at a walking pace.

THE PREMIER: Quite right.

MR. WILSON: The bridge should be wide enough to drive across as in a street. If not, why had the old wooden bridge been replaced? The action of the Government had delayed the extension of the trams to North Perth.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: No, no.

MR. WILSON: Yes; simply because they could not cross the present bridge, and because of the impracticable stipulations of the Engineer-in-Chief. A single line across the centre of the structure would be dangerous to traffic and to life, for the narrower the street or bridge the more reason for a double line, which divided the traffic. Two trams could be prohibited from crossing the bridge simultaneously.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: While personally of opinion that matters might be better, a serious responsibility must be assumed if he disregarded the advice obtained. Pass an Act to relieve him of the responsibility.

MR. WILSON: The Commissioner admitted the advisableness of a double line. Then widen the bridge immediately,

no matter who paid the cost. There was no objection to getting a portion or the whole of the cost out of the Tramway Company; but do not delay the extension of the tram line, for by so doing the whole of Perth was injured.

Question put, and passed on the voices.

#### MOTION—ELECTORAL ROLLS, PUBLICATION.

MR. HALL (Perth) moved:

That the electoral roll for each and every district and province shall be printed as soon as possible after each revision court, and that a copy of each district or province roll shall be forwarded to each mechanics' institute, post office, police station, and public institution in that district or province, to enable residents to ascertain whether they are on the electoral roll or not.

He said: Hitherto it had been the practice not to print the rolls until they were actually required, but to keep them in manuscript, with the result that people not living in towns where electoral registrars resided could not ascertain whether their names were or were not on the rolls. To find this out, a man living, say, at Tuckanarra must go to Cue; whereas, were the rolls printed immediately after the sitting of the revision court, and a copy exhibited at each public or semi-public institution, this inconvenience would be obviated. No doubt the Government were sincere in their wish to facilitate the registration of voters, and there should therefore be no opposition to the motion.

MR. GREGORY (North Coolgardie) supported the motion. The fact that the rolls were not printed had affected no district more than his own. At Menzies the Registrar kept the rolls in manuscript, and for the last three years there was in that place only one copy. Under the old Act it was extremely difficult to get one's name on the roll, very hard to keep it there, and quite as hard to find out whether it was there or not. The proposal would entail no undue cost, and if a copy of the rolls were sent to each post office, one of the greatest disabilities under the old Act would be removed.

THE PREMIER: What was meant by "public institutions"?

MR. GREGORY: Leave that to the discretion of the Government.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir John Forrest): The motion was indefinite as

to the institutions named. Who knew how many mechanics' institutes there were in the colony.

MR. HALL: If one or two were missed, what matter?

THE PREMIER: Wardens' courts, post offices and police stations could easily be reached. In the past, the revision court sat quarterly, and it was almost impossible to have the rolls made up and distributed after each sitting.

MR. GREGORY: But they had not been printed for three years.

THE PREMIER: Surely that was not so in all cases; but now the revision court sat only once a year, and it would be easy to circulate copies of the roll after each sitting. If the motion were altered to read "every electoral registry, post office, police station, and warden's court," it would be more definite.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): It was hardly desired that every public building should be filled with rolls, but merely that rolls should be inspected at ordinary public places.

THE PREMIER: The motion had better be definitely worded.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Nothing was wanted save an assurance from the Government that they would take steps to have the rolls properly distributed.

MR. HALL said he would be satisfied if a copy were exhibited in each post office.

MR. OATS (Yilgarn): In October last, when at Mount Malcolm, he had searched at the Local Court for a roll, but unsuccessfully; and no one in that district could tell who was or was not on the roll. In the old country, rolls were to be seen in all public institutions, and were also posted on church doors.

MR. WOOD (West Perth): Everyone who had anything to do with elections would support the motion, knowing how difficult it was to find a copy of the rolls. Sometimes it happened one could not get a copy till about three days before the election. The motion was in the right direction, and its adoption would prove of inestimable benefit, not only to the country but to town residents.

MR. GEORGE: They were all the same.

MR. WOOD: Certainly the places which had been noticed were not the only places where this state of things could be found, and the city of Perth required just

as much consideration as any other constituency.

MR. WALLACE (Yalgoo): Within the last two hours there had been brought under his notice an instance which showed the desirability of the motion being passed. He had been shown some fifty or more electoral claims which had been returned as invalid because the plural "qualifications" appeared there, and in filling the papers up the Registrar considered it necessary to give more than one qualification, with the result that the claims had to be made out afresh, and the alterations initialled. In this instance the majority of the claims were those of female voters.

THE PREMIER: What had this to do with the question of the places at which the rolls should be exhibited?

MR. WALLACE: In one instance the words "in the district" had been omitted, and on that ground the claim was rendered void.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) moved, as an amendment, that all the words after "each" in the fourth line be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu: "Electoral Registrar's office, Resident Magistrate's office, Warden's Court, post office, and police station in each district or province."

MR. HALL accepted the amendment, which practically attained the object of his motion, which was that every facility should be given to electors to see whether they were on the roll or not; and if the motion as amended were carried it would be their own fault if they did not ascertain the fact.

MR. OATS (Yilgarn) instanced Mount Jackson, where there was no Warden's Court, police station, or post office, but only a miners' institute, and he desired the institute included in the motion.

THE PREMIER: The member for a district would see that electors were put on the roll.

MR. GREGORY (North Coolgardie) supported the amendment, but urged that it should be distinctly understood as a sort of instruction to the electoral registrar that places where mails were sent and given into the custody of some store-keeper or private person, and where there was no building which could strictly be called a post office, should be considered a "post office" within the terms of the

motion. At Mulline and a number of similar places, there was only a mail custodian, and he (Mr. Gregory) would like an assurance that "post office" should mean any place to which mails were sent and distributed.

MR. KINGSMILL (Pilbarra): Instances could be given of places which had no miners' institute, post office, or any institution of the kind. At one place in his own constituency they were going to have a miners' institute, but had to "swap" it away for a lock-up; and there were many centres of population, certainly not large centres, but still large enough to entitle the residents to the same rights as the other people of the colony, where there was no building whatever answering the description in the motion as amended.

THE PREMIER: There was a post and telegraph office at every place in the hon. member's district.

MR. KINGSMILL: That was not so. At the 40-Mile, where there was a population of fully 200 people, there was no post office, though it was true a mail was carried there and distributed by some local storekeeper or butcher.

THE PREMIER: These places were generally deserted after a post office had been provided.

MR. KINGSMILL said he had no intention of being captious, fractious, or anything of the sort, but really the statements of the Premier were derogatory to his (Mr. Kingsmill's) electorate. Outside of his own electorate he knew of a place on the new line to Phillips River, where a population of 150 men had no post office, and would not have for some time to come. These men ought to have every opportunity of getting on the roll, and of finding out whether they had been placed there.

THE PREMIER: We were not at present engaged in passing a law, but in discussing a motion, in the spirit of which members should act, and not go into particulars, as was being done. One of the reasons he objected to the motion as originally proposed was that "public institutions" was so wide a term, that it would include a gaol, and his desire had been to make the proposal more definite.

MR. LOCKE (Sussex) suggested that copies of the rolls should be handed to hon. members, who could then distribute

them in outlying districts in their electorates.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT.

On motion by the PREMIER, the House adjourned at 5:44 o'clock until the next evening at 7:30.

### Legislative Council.

Thursday, 7th June, 1900.

Elections for the Council, Additional Municipal Institutions Act, an Amendment—Agent General Knighthood Question: Lead Ore, Export, etc.—Federation Enabling Bill, Standing Orders suspended, second reading, in Committee (amendments), third reading—Chairman of Committee: Election—Paper presented—Adjournment.

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### ELECTIONS FOR THE COUNCIL, ADDITIONAL.

HON. A. P. MATHESON asked for an intimation from the President as to what steps were contemplated in regard to electing four additional members to the Council, the amended Constitution Act providing for an increase from 26 to 30 members. Writs would have to be issued for the vacant seats, and the electors in his district were anxious to know when the writs would be issued.

THE PRESIDENT: Formal notice had better be given of a question of this kind, to the leader of the House.

#### MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT, AN AMENDMENT.

HON. R. S. HAYNES, in giving notice of his intention to introduce a Bill to amend the Municipal Institutions Act