

to the spirit of the Bill. The appointment of public notary might be held on somewhat the same terms and conditions as the appointment of commissioner for taking affidavits for the sister States. He himself held an appointment as commissioner of the Supreme Court of New South Wales for taking affidavits. That appointment was conferred on him on the ground that there was scope for a commissioner in Perth, where he was practising at the time he made application for appointment. If he discontinued practising in Perth, he would send back his commission, which would then be of no avail.

HON. W. MALEY: Hon. members might fairly regard the amendment as an attempt to limit the number of notaries. The principles of extreme conservatism with which legal members were imbued led them on all occasions to seek to impose restrictions of this nature.

HON. G. RANDELL: There was no necessity for the sub-clause. A notary once appointed ought to be able to practise anywhere; and it should be left to the Chief Justice to see the reasons given for his appointment. That was quite sufficient safeguard. The Chief Justice would take into consideration all the circumstances connected with the case, and make the appointment accordingly. The provision was illiberal, for it limited the appointment very much, and took it out of the power of the Chief Justice to exercise his good judgment upon the applications made. Therefore he moved as an amendment that paragraph *b* be struck out.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The alteration advocated by Mr. Haynes was very illiberal. The hon. member wanted to make these poor men pay £5 to go into some goldfields place, and it was well known that some two or three months afterwards the place might be wiped out altogether. There was a desire to stop a man from going anywhere else to practise; and was not that an injustice?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The paragraph would not carry the matter very far, and it would be much better to leave the clause as it stood, because it fitted in with a later clause which gave power to the Chief Justice to make regulations for satisfying himself. It would be a pity to strike out that sub-clause. He was somewhat astonished at his friend Mr. Burgess

designating this clause as an illiberal one.

Amendment (Mr. Randell's) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	10
Noes	3

Majority for ... 7

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. G. Bellingham	Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. A. Jameson
Hon. F. T. Crowder	Hon. R. S. Haynes
Hon. C. E. Dempster	(Teller).
Hon. J. T. Glowrey	
Hon. R. Laurie	
Hon. W. Mahey	
Hon. B. C. O'Brien	
Hon. G. Randell	
Hon. R. G. Burgess	(Teller).

Amendment thus passed, and the sub-clause struck out.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Bill reported with a farther amendment, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 18 minutes past 9 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 23rd January, 1902.

Election Return, Pilbarra—Papers presented—Brands Bill, Select Committee's Report—Mineral Lease Inquiry (J. H. Walker), Select Committee's Report—Question: Tariff Act, how enforced—Question: Trades Hall Site, Fremantle—Question: Sheep-stealing, to Prevent—Question: Railway Duty, Inquiry as to Breach—Question: Sunday Labour on Mines Act—Select Committee, Change of a Member—Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill, Recommittal, reported—Friendly Societies Act Amendment Bill, first reading—Light and Air Bill (Buildings), first reading—Annual Estimates, in Committee of Supply, Public Works Votes resumed and completed, progress—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

ELECTION RETURN, PILBARRA.

THE SPEAKER reported the return of election writ for Pilbarra [vacancy caused by the member having been

appointed Commissioner of Railways], from which it appeared that Mr. Walter Kingsmill had been re-elected.

MR. KINGSMILL took the oath and subscribed the members' roll.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. F. Illingworth): Municipal By-laws, Guildford and Paddington.

By the PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake): 1, Remission of tonnage dues to Karri Davies Company, papers ordered on motion by Mr. Jacoby. 2, List of licensed plumbers, ordered on motion by Mr. Daglish.

By the MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. Kingsmill): 1, Claims made for damages caused by fires from locomotives: Return ordered on motion by Mr. Harper. 2, Comparative Statement of Value of Locomotives imported from South Australia, Great Britain, and America: Return ordered on motion by Mr. Higham.

Ordered to lie on the table.

BRANDS BILL.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. W. H. JAMES brought up the report of the select committee.

Report received and ordered to be printed.

MINERAL LEASE INQUIRY (J. H. WALKER).

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. R. HASTIE brought up the report of the select committee.

Report received and ordered to be printed.

QUESTION—TARIFF ACT, HOW ENFORCED.

MR. F. McDONALD asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Whether the Tariff Act has been re-enacted. 2, If so, whether the Collector has power to administer the same. 3, Why the Collector refuses to allow manufacturers to manufacture essences in bond at the old rate of 5s. per proof gallon.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. F. Illingworth) replied: A copy of the above questions has been referred to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, with a request for

the necessary information to enable a reply to be given.

QUESTION—TRADES HALL SITE, FREMANTLE.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND asked the Premier: Why the title of the Trades Hall site in Fremantle, granted to the Labour bodies by the Forrest Government, has not been handed over.

THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake) replied: The question is now before the House in the form of a notice of motion (*see* Notice Paper).

QUESTION—SHEEP-STEALING, TO PREVENT.

MR. C. HARPER asked the Premier: Whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the manner in which the railway service has been utilised for the purpose of aiding in a wholesale robbery of sheep at Northam, and whether steps will be taken to, as far as possible, prevent a recurrence of this by requiring station-masters to ascertain the names, addresses, and *bona fides* of shippers of live stock.

THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake) replied: No. The names and addresses of senders of stock are obtained, but it is not considered advisable to take any farther steps to ascertain their *bona fides*.

QUESTION—RAILWAY DUTY, INQUIRY AS TO BREACH.

MR. G. TAYLOR asked the Premier: 1, Whether it is the intention of the Commissioner of Railways to call for a report regarding the alleged breach of the railway rules by an official or officials in connection with the passage of the Governor General's special train between Armadale and Burswood, on the 5th inst. 2, Under what authority, if any, is any railway officer authorised to make special arrangements for continuing a journey in a case of this kind. 3, Whether it is the intention of the Government to hold an inquiry into the whole of the circumstances surrounding this case.

THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake) replied: 1, No; the Commissioner of Railways already has particulars of the special arrangements made in connection with the special train referred to. 2, No general special authority is given to

railway officers to make special arrangements. The train referred to was run under the authority of the Acting Head of the Traffic Branch. 3, No; farther inquiry is not considered necessary.

QUESTION—SUNDAY LABOUR ON MINES ACT.

MR. J. B. HOLMAN asked the Attorney General: 1, Whether he is aware that Sunday labour on mines is on the increase. 2, Whether he has issued instructions to have the Sunday Labour on Mines Act strictly enforced. 3, If not, whether he will take action at once to have all unnecessary Sunday work on mines stopped.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. G. Leake) replied: 1, No. 2, No. 3, Inquiry will be made at once, and instructions given to enforce the law.

SELECT COMMITTEE, CHANGE OF A MEMBER.

MR. R. HASTIE (Kanowna) moved :

That the hon. member for Gascoyne be discharged from service on the select committee appointed to inquire into the surrender of G.M. Leases on the Eastern Goldfields, and that the hon. member for Greenough be appointed to act in his place.

Put and passed.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION BILL.

RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by Mr. W. H. JAMES (in charge of the measure), Bill recommitted for farther considering Clauses 36, 62, 98, 119, and the Schedule.

Clause 36—Existing boards not to continue in office :

MR. W. H. JAMES: Notification of discontinuance must be published in the *Government Gazette*; and it was desirable the time mentioned (30 days) should be shortened to seven, so that the board should cease to exist within seven days after notice had been gazetted. He moved that the word "thirty" be struck out, and "seven" inserted in lieu.

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

Clause 62: Existing court not to continue in office :

MR. JAMES moved that the word "thirty" be struck out, and "seven" inserted in lieu.

Put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 98—Special provisions in case of an industrial dispute (penalty):

On motions by Mr. JAMES, the word "Whoever," in line 1, struck out, and "Any person who" inserted in lieu; in line 11, the words, "against this Act" struck out; also in the same line "conviction" struck out and "on summary conviction on the information or complaint of the registrar or of an industrial union" inserted in lieu; also all words after "fifty pounds" struck out.

MR. JAMES: It seemed desirable to provide an alternative penalty to meet an aggravated case. He moved that there be added to the clause the words "or to imprisonment with or without hard labour for a term not exceeding 12 months."

MR. A. J. DIAMOND: Would this penalty apply to both sides?

MR. JAMES: To everybody.

MR. DIAMOND: Supposing an employer or an agent of an employer advocated a lockout and did not try to avail himself of the provisions of the Bill, would he be liable to this penalty?

MR. JAMES: This provision did not deal with unions. Every person guilty of an offence, whether an employer or employee, whether an individual or a corporation, would be liable to the penalty provided in this clause.

MR. H. DAGLISH: If a worker did advocate anything in the nature of a strike, he must necessarily do it by speaking at public gatherings, because the numbers of the workers necessitated the holding of some kind of meeting. Employers were often a mere handful by comparison, and a lockout might be advocated among a small number of employers without any information going beyond their little circle. As this Bill would establish a new order of things, it was unreasonable to imagine that either employers or employees were going to be disloyal to the principles of the measure. They had not been disloyal in New Zealand, where this legislation had been tried for years. The proposed penalty of imprisonment was an unnecessary slur, as it implied beforehand that there was going to be disloyalty on the part of employers or employees. His general objection to the amendment was that it

would not tend to friendliness between the two parties.

MR. G. TAYLOR, in protesting against the amendment, regarded the clause as objectionable because it assumed that neither party would abide by the decision of the tribunal provided in the Bill, or that neither party would be likely to avail themselves of the privileges of the Bill or would not register under it. He did not think the penalty would apply to two bodies in conflict if neither party were registered.

MR. JAMES: Yes; it would.

MR. TAYLOR: It would be time enough to make laws for punishing people for offences of this kind when it was seen by the experience of the new legislation that one or other party was likely to violate the principles of the measure. It would be unwise to insert an imprisonment penalty until experience showed a necessity for it.

MR. W. F. SAYER: In the Act just passed in New South Wales for dealing with industrial disputes, the similar clause in that measure was even more stringent; for it provided that whoever took part in a lockout or strike should be guilty of a misdemeanour, and be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding £1,000, or imprisonment as for a misdemeanour. This amendment did not go so far as that.

MR. TAYLOR: The Act in New South Wales had been passed only recently, and there was no experience to show the effect of its working.

MR. R. HASTIE: We had been following as far as possible the New Zealand Act; and according to the experience in that colony, it had not been found desirable to impose a penalty of imprisonment for offences of this kind. In nearly every case the decision of the court had been carried out. As to the New South Wales Act, there was no experience of its working; therefore it would be unwise for us to follow that legislation in the way proposed in the amendment. The member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner) had on a previous evening advocated the penalty of imprisonment for striking; but in this State there was not yet any indication that such a penalty would be necessary under the new legislation. If it became necessary in future to enact a special

penalty against persons who encouraged strikes or lockouts and who would not submit to the arbitration court, he was sure this House would try to get the decisions of the court carried out. He urged the mover to withdraw the amendment.

MR. JAMES: This was one of the most essential provisions in the Bill. The effect of it would be that persons going about talking "strike" or encouraging a strike, when they had a tribunal for settling trade disputes and did not avail themselves of it, ought to be punished. Feeling was worked up and passion played on before the parties submitted their dispute to a tribunal, and that had been the main cause of trouble in industrial disputes. The Act of New South Wales recognised the need of punishment in such a case as was contemplated in this clause. It was true that in the New Zealand Act there was only a money penalty, but the objection he felt in regard to a money penalty was that while an employer might easily pay, it was not so easy for an offending workman to pay a money penalty. As in New South Wales the provision was more drastic, and as in New Zealand there was a money penalty provided, we should try in this State to make the Bill as effective as possible, especially in those large disputes which the Act was mainly intended to settle.

MR. TAYLOR: It was almost impossible to have a large assembly of men without passions being aroused, whereas the employers would be few and not so likely to get heated. The enthusiasm of a large crowd was sometimes so great that it would almost "lift the roof off." Having regard to the difference in condition as between employers and workers, the effect of this amendment would be that employers would be practically exempt from the penalty, and it would operate only on offending workers. He knew from experience how easy it was to get a case against a workman when he stood up to advocate his own rights or those of his fellow workmen. This Bill would operate more smoothly if the penalty of imprisonment were not provided in it. He hoped that in future labour troubles there would not be the same hostile feeling on the part of capitalists as he had known in past disputes.

This arbitration legislation was really the outcome of bitter conflicts in the past, although some persons might attribute it to a desire on the part of individual members to pass democratic legislation. The Bill should be framed so as to induce a better spirit between employer and employee. It was impossible to work up the feeling of a few employers so as to get evidence against them for inciting each other, while it would be easy to get evidence against individual workers for advocating a strike. The true spirit of conciliation and arbitration would not be shown by carrying the amendment. He was speaking from a workman's point of view. No one more than himself would have liked to have seen a Conciliation and Arbitration Act in existence a few years ago : it would have been of benefit to himself.

MR. DAGLISH : In the event of a breach of this provision being committed, would it be dealt with by the Arbitration Court or a magistrate ?

MR. W. H. JAMES : By the ordinary court.

MR. DAGLISH : Then it was not a reasonable provision. Very often from an ordinary court of petty sessions one could not get justice, when on one side there was a body of wealthy men and on the other a body of working men. In a number of cases, to his knowledge, there had been a leaning on the part of the justices to one side. He was not referring to cases in this State, but cases which had been heard elsewhere. He would support the amendment if the penalty of £50 were struck out, so that there should only be a penalty of imprisonment, because opportunity should not be given to impose a monetary penalty on those who would not feel it, and consigning to prison men who were in a poor position. If the mover was not satisfied with the £50 fine, he might provide a penalty of six months' imprisonment without the option.

MR. JAMES : The object in adding the alternative penalty was to make it operative on both sides. In regard to what had been said by Labour members, the amendment was assisting them. The penalty would affect the employer more than it would the other side. There must be discretion given to the court.

MR. J. L. NANSON : If it were necessary to put this clause into operation it would be at a time of strong popular feeling, and the best thing that could happen to the leaders of any movement was to go to gaol, because then they were made martyrs. Throughout the Bill the fullest facilities were given to allow persons to avail themselves of the measure. It was left open to the day workers in the Government service. If the amendment were carried the clause might be made a little more perfect, and he suggested two additional provisions as follow :—

Nothing in the section shall prohibit the suspension or discontinuance of any industry or the working of any person therein for any good cause. No prosecution under the section shall be permitted, except by leave of the president of the court.

The strength of the Bill did not lie in the power to send persons to gaol, but in having public opinion behind it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake) said he could not say he favoured altogether the idea of imprisonment. If the penalty was to be enforced at any time, it would probably be at a time when feeling was running very high, and when matters had got too far for the terror of imprisonment to have a wholesome check on those who were regarded as wrong-doers, and it would be more likely to throw oil on the flames than water. Throughout arbitration and conciliation laws the difficulty always had been the method of enforcing the awards, and this principle was closely allied to that. The governing principle in disputes between labour and capital was public opinion, and the only way to arrive at any expression of that opinion was by quiet and reasonable means. The clause, even if passed, would seldom if ever be put into effect. It must not be understood that he was opposed to penalties. There should be some sort of penalty, and if persons were guilty of a breach of the Act, or violated the underlying principles of the Act, they should be liable to a fine. If the fine were increased, that might meet the case. After all it was not the maximum penalty which was inflicted, but it was left to the discretion of those who had to adjudicate ; and offences differed so much in degree that a fine of 1s. met the case one day, while the next day a somewhat similar case required a penalty

of something like £500. Depriving men of their liberty at a moment of great excitement and tension would not do any good either. It would be more likely to fan the flames and create trouble. We must appeal to reason and judgment, and above all to public opinion. He could not help reminding himself of the difficulties that faced him six or seven months ago when we had the railway strike on. Then, in an appeal to the men, he pointed out that they could do no good at all unless they had public opinion on their side. The men declared that they had public opinion on their side, whilst he (the Premier) claimed that public opinion was with him. The men claimed that Parliament was on their side, but the result of a division in the House showed he had the right to claim that public opinion was with the authorities and not the men. That division did more to bring about a settlement of the strike than any degree of threat or anything else could possibly have done. He did not like opposing any proposition brought forward by the member for East Perth, who had given great attention to the subject, but this amendment did not affect the vital interests of the Bill.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND: This was experimental legislation, and if it were found that the law could not be properly carried out without extreme penalties being enforced, the measure could be improved later on. At present he was strongly against the imprisonment clause. It would be a great mistake: it was like holding up a red rag to a bull. He was glad to hear from the Premier that the division on the late strike did so much good in settling the dispute, and he was glad to remember the part he took in the matter.

MR. J. GARDINER: We were supposed to have given to the country an Arbitration Bill broad enough and wide enough to embrace every section of the community: we were giving them a fair Bill. Some had thought that we had gone farther in this direction than the law in force in the other States. During the last railway strike, an offer of arbitration had been rejected by the men; and it had been apparent to this House that to stop the traffic meant stopping the supply of food for the goldfields. Another

railway strike would have the same effect. True, to add a penal clause to any Act of Parliament might prove an irritant, but it might have a deterrent effect also. Many men were kept honest by the fact that crime brought punishment; and many who would pay a fine would hesitate to incur twelve months' imprisonment. Parliament had a right to enact that those who refused to accede to such a just measure as this, should not be allowed to flout it, or to do anything which would stop the food supply of a section of the people. If men availed themselves of the Act, the penalty would not affect them.

MR. TAYLOR: Then why have the penalty?

MR. GARDINER: Because some men might not accept arbitration, and might decline to register. For such, a penalty was required. Probably any large body of men would always be in favour of arbitration, but there were exceptional cases.

MR. TAYLOR: When the Bill was last in Committee, the member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner) had not spoken so mildly. On that occasion, one would have thought the hon. member had been living in France during the 18th century, and been familiar with the Bastille. He (Mr. Taylor) contradicted the statement the hon. member had then made, to the effect that he (Mr. Taylor) had said that men who would not accept arbitration should be taken out and shot. He (Mr. Taylor) had then risen to a point of order; but the hon. member sheltered himself by saying he had heard him saying it somewhere else. Against private conversations being used in the Chamber it was impossible to protest too strongly. Such conduct was beneath contempt, and had the hon. member's misrepresentations been made outside the Chamber, they must have been resented with a blow. In all the labour disputes in which he (Mr. Taylor) had been engaged, he had not heard any man advocate imprisonment with such warmth as the hon. member had exhibited on that occasion, backed up by misstatements. Judging by the hon. member's statements to-night and by the process of change in his opinions, probably in another fortnight he would be willing to strike out the penalty altogether. All the hon. member's bitterness resulted from the

railway strike a few months ago. That strike was about the most innocent he (Mr. Taylor) had ever seen. The hon. member might speak strongly if he had seen a strike in which the military force of the whole of Australia had been called out to suppress the strikers. Whatever might be said against those strikers, they were incapable of making improper use of private conversations. The amendment should be withdrawn.

MR. GARDINER: If such a statement as that referred to had been made by him, the fact remained that the hon. member had not denied using the words alleged.

MR. TAYLOR: No. He did not remember using the words.

MR. GARDINER: The statement did not come to him as a piece of private conversation, unless private conversations were utterances in the loudest possible voice, which could be heard all over the House. To the opinions of the hon. member he was quite indifferent, being willing to be judged by the House and by the country. It would be wise, as far as possible, to prevent a recurrence of such a strike as was lately experienced in this State; and if this could be done by means of a clause providing for imprisonment, he was justified in thinking that it would not be unreasonable to support such a provision. Without being moved by the mock heroics of the hon. member, he would say that if he had thought the quotation he had made from that member's remarks were part of a private conversation, he would certainly not have quoted those remarks in this House. As to his own conduct in regard to the amendment he had previously proposed in this Bill, he must be judged by the people who sent him to this House.

MR. NANSON: It would be well to withdraw the amendment which provided imprisonment as a penalty for inciting to a strike, because if we looked back to the history of industrial disputes we must recognise that the penalty of imprisonment had proved a futile form of punishment, and had rather intensified the evil instead of removing it. He did not think the provision of penalties in the Bill would do any good—even a pecuniary penalty—but if that was deemed necessary, then let us stop at that, and not

pass a provision by which men might be sent to prison, thereby making martyrs of them.

MR. JAMES: This clause, providing a penalty for inciting to a strike or lock-out, was not introduced for dealing with an ordinary strike or lockout, but was for the purpose of seeing that the principle of a strike or lockout should not be urged at a time when the bulk of men concerned might not be inclined to go on strike. It appeared to him that all arguments about making a martyr of a man were beside the question, for it should be remembered that any penalty which might be provided would be inadequate for inciting to a strike at a time when feeling was greatly excited or very rampant. When dealing previously with the Bill in Committee, he had left the penalty at £50, and that only, as provided in the New Zealand Act; but it was afterwards pointed out to him that if the punishment was to be only of a pecuniary kind it would fall more heavily on the man who had £50 than on him who had not. Therefore to make it more effective, and as a complement to the pecuniary penalty, this amendment, providing an alternative of imprisonment, should be inserted in the clause. However, after hearing the opinions of members, he would not press the amendment to a division.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: A penalty of £50 or penalty of imprisonment would be of no use in industrial disputes; for if men were going in for a strike, the question of penalty would make no difference whatever.

Amendment put, and negatived on the voices.

MR. GEORGE asked if he could move now to strike out the whole clause?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not now.

MR. NANSON moved that the following words be added to the clause:—

Provided that nothing in this section shall prohibit the suspension or discontinuance of any industry or the working of any persons therein, for any other good cause.

These words were in the New Zealand Act, and as there was some vagueness in the wording of the clause as it stood, he thought the meaning would be made more clear by adding this proviso.

MR. JAMES accepted the amendment.

MR. TAYLOR: It was desirable to hear the opinion of legal members on the

effect of this amendment. He did not see that the amendment would do much good. The Bill provided that no person should advocate a strike or lockout, and by adding this proviso, the effect would be that if an employer could find a good reason for closing his works he would be enabled to do so without incurring any penalty under the Bill.

MR. GEORGE: Why should he not, if he could not make the works pay?

MR. TAYLOR: But it was odd that an employer should find out only when a dispute was on, or when a case was before the court, that his works did not pay. The weapon of the employer in a case of dispute was to lock out the employees. If workers were not allowed to strike, then employers should not be able to shut down their works pending the decision of the particular case before the conciliation board or the arbitration court.

MR. GEORGE: But if the employer could show he was losing money by it, why should he not shut down?

MR. TAYLOR: The employer would discover only at the last moment, while a dispute was pending, that it would not pay to carry on his works.

MR. GEORGE: An employer might have just cause for suspending his works. Suppose there was a demand for increased wages in a particular industry, and the employer had to meet competition from the other side; then the demand for increased wages might mean an absolute disappearance of profit; and if the employer could show that he would lose money by continuing the work, he ought to be allowed the ordinary liberty of ceasing to carry on an unprofitable business. If the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) could devise some expedient by which articles manufactured in the State could be sold at a price that would assure a profit to the manufacturer, we might agree to that.

MR. TAYLOR: If workers demanded a higher rate of wages, and the employer said he would not give it, the difference between them ought to be decided by the board or the court. The men had to work on till the tribunal gave a decision, and it was possible for a decision to be given within a week or so. He did not think there was any desire in this House to compel employers to carry on industries which were not paying. This clause would

affect the employer only when there was a case referred to the board or the court, and the clause was intended to prevent his stopping the works, pending a decision; but if that employer had previously carried on the work successfully, surely he should continue it pending the decision of the board or the court to which the dispute had been referred. The amendment for adding certain words would really leave a loophole for a lock-out, and the workers would lose confidence in the Bill if this proviso were inserted.

MR. J. EWING asked the member in charge of the Bill to explain the effect of the amendment.

MR. JAMES: If work were suspended by a strike or lockout, the person or persons causing that result were guilty of an offence. The offence aimed at in paragraph 2 of the clause was that of suspending work or discontinuing employment, arising from a reference to the court; and the amendment was to make it clear that if the suspension was not for that purpose, but was for other good cause, then there was not an offence.

MR. DOHERTY: It was really an interpretation clause.

MR. JAMES: It was, to that extent. The onus would rest on those who suspended their work or employment to show they had done so not because of the existence of the case before the court.

MR. F. W. SAYER supported the amendment, because the object of the clause was to make it an offence against the Bill to indulge in the industrial warfare of a strike or a lockout. It was never intended that it should be compulsory on any man to work, or compulsory on an employer to find employment for others to work for him; therefore, if occasion arose for employers to cease carrying on business for a good cause, it was a lawful thing for him to do, and he should not be fined or imprisoned because of the discontinuance of that employment. Cases might arise of machinery breaking down, or of a fire occurring by which it became necessary to suspend employment; and, forsooth, because of either of these contingencies occurring, the employer was to be charged with a misdemeanour under the Bill for discontinuing employment! It was to prevent such absurdity that this proviso had been

proposed. If, seeing a dispute in the distance, and having in his mind this dispute, an employer suspended his work, that was the sort of misdemeanour which the clause was intended to provide against. It was to guard against the innocent suspension that the proviso was proposed.

MR. GEORGE: Supposing a person discontinued working for an employer, he could go and get work where he liked, or he could stay away from work altogether; but if an employer was threatened with an increase of wages, and that increase meant that he might be the loser of money, still if he discontinued to employ he was liable to a penalty; yet the employer was willing to risk the loss of his connection, and the stoppage of his works, because he could not carry on his employment at a profit. As far as tradesmen were concerned, they could get their wages, and employers were only too willing to give them work at a fair wage. Fully 90 per cent. of the employers of the State were men who knew how to deal fairly with their employees, and that was proved by the fact that when there was a strike it came from a small section of the employers or workers. The employers of Australia were not nigger-drivers and tyrants, but fair men. For 20 years he (Mr. George) had never had a dispute with his men, and he was only one instance in a thousand. Big strikes had never repaid the workers. Australasia had never recovered from the great maritime strike which occurred some years ago. There were men to-day who had hardly done any work since that strike took place. It should not be stated in the Committee that employers were unfair, and legislation should not be passed to make out they were tyrants and required shooting. Were we living in the nineteenth century or in the days of William the Conqueror?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Before a penalty could be enforced, the matter had to be referred to the court. It seemed that the amendment was wholly unnecessary, and the only use possible that might be made of it would be to become an excuse for a lockout. An employer might say he did not stop his works because of a difficulty with the men, but there were other reasons which caused him to cease giving employment.

When we came to the question of a penalty, then the court had to decide the matter, and if there was a fire, as had been pointed out by the member for Claremont (Mr. Sayer), and the works were stopped in consequence, then the court would not enforce a penalty.

MR. SAYER: The court would have to convict, but the fact of there being a fire would have something to do with reducing the penalty. The suspension or discontinuance of employment was in any event an offence; therefore if the Committee desired to allow suspension for a good cause, the proviso should be inserted.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There would be no offence until the matter was brought before the court and declared to be an offence. The amendment was not necessary, as it would only give an excuse to an employer to discontinue work.

MR. R. HASTIE: This was an interpretation clause, and as far as he understood it did not increase or restrict the powers of the court or the individual. It was not likely to do harm. No member wished to pass an absurd clause which said in one case that under all circumstances an employer should be compelled to employ, and that in the other case men should be compelled to continue their work. The amendment left it for the court to say whether good reason had been given on either side; therefore it could not hurt anyone. He strongly advised the Committee to pass the amendment, as it had been adopted in the New South Wales Act and had not been objected to in that State.

MR. TAYLOR: Did the hon. member approve of the amendment?

MR. HASTIE: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: The member for the Murray (Mr. George) said the amendment was fair, and that it applied to both parties. None could show where any employers had been imprisoned in respect of striking, though during every strike workers were imprisoned.

MR. GEORGE: What for?

MR. TAYLOR: For opposing tyrannical capitalists. Men as good as the hon. member had for that reason been imprisoned. Because of a strike, the employer did not suffer except financially, while the workers suffered financially, physically, and mentally. The amendment

would give the employer opportunity to cease work at will. Some hon. members asked, how about a fire? Let that exception be clearly stipulated, but do not put in ambiguous exceptions. The Bill should provide that neither party could suspend operations. How the leader of the Labour party (Mr. Hastie) could advocate such an amendment was incomprehensible, though if the majority of the party favoured the amendment, he (Mr. Taylor) would vote with them, but under protest.

MR. GEORGE: The hon. member ranted about working men going to prison. Strikers had not been imprisoned on account of any Conciliation and Arbitration Bill, but because they had offended a law for the breaking of which an employer also would have been imprisoned.

MR. TAYLOR: George the Fourth!

MR. GEORGE: George the Fourth was dead, but the spirit of fair-play was alive, as proved by the attitude of the majority of the Labour party. He defied the hon. member to show that any man had been imprisoned for striking merely. All such penalties had been inflicted for inciting men to break the law; and for the same offence an employer would have been sent to gaol.

MR. TAYLOR: No.

MR. GEORGE: It would be unfortunate if all working men held the views of the hon. member.

MR. NANSON: The amendment was equally fair to both parties. If a few men innocently failed to come to work, technically they would be guilty of an offence, but the proviso would prevent their punishment.

MR. DAGLISH: The amendment was unobjectionable, though apparently unnecessary. It was wrong to rake up old differences between capital and labour, causing ill-feeling on all sides. The clause provided that the penalty could not be recovered save on the information or complaint of the registrar or the industrial union; and neither was likely to make a frivolous complaint. Still, as the amendment was a mere definition, it ought to be accepted.

Amendment (Mr. Nanson's) put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 119—Act not to apply to Crown or Government Departments:

MR. JAMES moved that all the words after "Crown," in line 3, be struck out. This was necessary in view of the alterations in Clause 107.

Put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Schedule—Regulations for elections of members of a board of conciliation:

MR. TAYLOR: Paragraph 18 of the Schedule provided that a union of 300 members or of any larger number should have only three votes. Representation should be more equitable. He moved that there be added after "three votes" the words, "and one vote for each additional 500."

MR. JAMES: This was not a wise amendment.

At 6-30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.

At 7-30, Chair resumed.

MR. JAMES: The amendment was not a good one, as it tended to give a controlling power to the larger unions. We should bear in mind that in this State there were only two unions which had a membership running into thousands, whereas the smaller unions were very numerous. If the amendment were adopted, the larger unions might swamp the smaller ones by the increased power proposed in the amendment. The schedule defined the voting power of unions when called on to elect members to a board of conciliation; and it was important that as far as possible we should give an effective vote to every separate union of workers. Under this Bill, each union would have one vote, and that also was the provision in the New Zealand Act. We should bear in mind that the Bill would allow a comparatively small number of members to form a union; consequently the average number of members in a union in this State would be very small. Outside of the two large unions, there was hardly one union which would be entitled to three votes by reason of having three hundred members. If increased voting power were given to unions by allowing an additional vote for each 500 members above 300, then one or two unions might have six votes; whereas among smaller unions there would be very few having two votes. The voting unit was not the

individual member, but it was the union. In paragraph 18 of the schedule he had endeavoured, as far as possible, to give increased voting power to large unions, but not so as to practically swamp the smaller unions; and the scale there was not fixed by him on his own motion, but by consultation with labour bodies in Perth. He thought the voting provided in the scale was a fairly representative one, and we should not put the smaller unions in a position to be swamped.

MR. J. B. HOLMAN: According to the scale in the Bill, a union having one hundred members would have one vote; from 100 to 300 members, two votes; over three hundred members, three votes. So that if a union had 299 members it would be entitled to two votes, while if it had 301 members it would have three votes. That was not a good scale to work on. If the scale provided that a union of 100 members or less should have one vote, from 200 to 300 members two votes, from 400 to 500 members three votes, and one vote additional for every 300 members over and above 500, that would be a workable scale.

MR. TAYLOR assented to the amendment suggested by the member for North Murchison.

Amendment (Mr. Taylor's) by leave withdrawn.

MR. HOLMAN moved that the voting scale in paragraph 18 be amended to read as follows:

If the members (other than honorary) residing in the district are 100 or less	... One vote,
From 200 to 300	... Two votes,
From 400 to 500	... Three votes.
And one vote for every additional 300.	

MR. HASTIE: It had been pointed out by representatives of labour unions who assembled at the Trades and Labour Congress that it would be unfair for each union, however small, to have equal voting power with the larger unions; and a proposal similar to that contained in the Bill was made, except that it was suggested to give one extra vote for all unions having over 500 members, four votes to be the limit of any union. A committee was appointed by the Labour Congress to consider this matter, and it adopted the suggestion made. If the larger unions got an additional vote in

proportion to their membership, the smaller unions would soon have no power at all. After discussing the matter, the member for East Perth (Mr. James) made the limit three votes, so that the proposal in the Bill was the result of an amicable compromise. Unless there was give-and-take in these matters, we should never come to an amicable arrangement. Although he did not think the member for East Perth was wise in limiting the number of votes to three, still he (Mr. Hastie) would support the proposal and vote against the amendment.

MR. W. D. JOHNSON opposed the amendment, for, if it were carried, certain large organizations would have the whole of the representatives on the conciliation board, and the small unions would not be represented. There were hundreds of tradesmen in West Australia who had their organisations, but no controlling power. Large organisations like the Australian Workers' Association had branches throughout West Australia, and an executive, which body could select men for certain districts and support them; consequently, those men would be returned. This would practically prevent any tradesman being elected to the board, whereas it was only fair that tradesmen should be represented. The proposal in the Bill was absolutely fair to all parties.

MR. TAYLOR: While the small unions would have one vote for each hundred members up to 300 votes, the larger unions, having a membership of over 300, would only have three votes; therefore if a union consisted of 2,000 persons, 1,700 would be disfranchised. It was not fair that there should be equal representation all round: the majority should rule. If the voting power was one vote for every hundred members, then a union with 1,000 members would have 10 votes. But the large unions did not wish to take such advantage, although they did not wish to give everything and take nothing. He belonged to a union which protected every branch of labour, and it was not necessary that tradesmen should be on the board. If a man were a carpenter, that did not qualify him to understand the true principle underlying unionism. A man with a vast experience of the labour movement was the person to represent the organisations on

the Conciliation Board. He would support the amendment, and would divide the Committee on it. None could show why a large number of people should not have fair proportional representation.

MR. JAMES hoped the paragraph in the schedule would pass unaltered. This question was one in which there must be a compromise. Many small unions felt strongly that, though small, they were vigorous and active; and they did not wish to be under the domination of larger bodies. Where was the analogy between representation in this House and representation on a conciliation board? The board would judge questions affecting various interests, therefore the members should represent different interests, and not one only. The clause would give the small unions a chance, instead of allowing one association to put three men on the board while the small bodies remained unrepresented. The compromise as shown by the clause as it stood was most equitable. In New South Wales, the rule was "one union, one vote."

MR. D. J. DOHERTY: For years past the Labour party had advocated representation on a population basis, twitting certain members with the fact that they represented only a few electors. For that reason he would support the amendment; because if the Labour members were correct, the larger body should have the greater representation, though in this matter most Labour members inconsistently maintained that it should not.

MR. HASTIE: No.

MR. DOHERTY: The hon. member would limit the maximum number of votes to three per union, 5,000 members having no more votes than 300.

MR. DAGLISH: The amendment would not make the representation proportional.

MR. DOHERTY: That was not being attempted.

MR. DAGLISH: Then the hon. member's argument was valueless.

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

Ayes	5
Noes	28
				—
Majority against	23

AYES.
Mr. Doherty
Mr. Holman
Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Stone
Mr. Taylor (Teller).

NOES.
Mr. Daglish
Mr. Diamond
Mr. Ewing
Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Gordon
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hassell
Mr. Hastie
Mr. Hayward
Mr. Hicks
Mr. Holmes
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Jacoby
Mr. James
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Leake
Mr. Nanson
Mr. Oats
Mr. Pigott
Mr. Purkiss
Mr. Rason
Mr. Beside
Mr. Sayer
Mr. Wallace
Mr. Yelverton
Mr. McDonald (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Schedule put and passed.

Bill reported with farther amendments.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council, and, on motion by the PREMIER, read a first time.

LIGHT AND AIR BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council, and, on motion by the PREMIER, read a first time.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES.

IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Resumed from the previous day, at page 109 (partly discussed).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (Hon. C. H. Rason, Minister).

Roads and Bridges, £89,029 :

Item—Mundaring, road from Weir to Station, £150 :

MR. M. H. JACOBY: Was it intended to make provision for an approach to the large reservoir which was just completed for the Coolgardie Water Scheme? The only way of getting down to the reservoir at present was by going along the tramway or by trespassing over private land, and although no objection had been raised as to trespassing, there might be objection at any moment now that the work was practically finished. As soon as the

temporary tramway stopped running a few months hence, there would be no means of getting down to the weir. The first and second pumping stations were within a short distance of each other, but there was no connection between the pumping stations except by the railway. The Mundaring Reservoir appeared to be the most popular place for visitors to see, whether from the goldfields or from outside the State, as the work had attained a world-wide celebrity, and people from many places came to see it. The £150 provided in the item would be quite inadequate for making a road, which would cost probably £800. He trusted the Minister would be able to assure the Committee that the desired facility would be provided.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No provision had been made on last year's Estimates for the construction of a road to the reservoir, but the Government recognised that a road from the railway station to the weir was absolutely necessary, and a report on the work was being obtained. The amount of £150 in this item would be sufficient for the work during the present financial year. He believed it would be necessary to resume a portion of private property to make a road, but a full report on the matter would be in his hands shortly.

MR. JACOBY: There was no necessity for purchasing private property to make a road, as he had himself offered to give the small portion of freehold ground which would serve the purpose; and as there was material for making a road on the spot, there would not be much expense involved in the work.

Item—North Perth, Wanneroo Road through North Perth and Perth Roads Board Districts, £500:

MR. JACOBY: The descriptive words in this item were an error. The intention was to make an extension of the Wanneroo Road. He moved that all words after "road" in the first line be struck out, and "extension" inserted in lieu.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. Kingsmill) said he had pleasure in corroborating what the hon. member had stated. The idea was that this should be one of the main front roads into the country from the metropolis, and

it would add materially to the settlement and convenience of the Wanneroo District, the road running northward from Perth.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: Would it not be well to ascertain, before altering the item, whether the roads board interested in the work were agreeable to the alteration? If the hon. member was voicing the views of the roads board, he would not object.

MR. JACOBY: The deputation which asked for the extension of this road comprised members of the roads board and members representing the district; and it was only through an error that the work was thus described in the item.

Amendment put and passed.

Item—Perth-Fremantle Road Maintenance, £1,000:

MR. F. McDONALD: Instead of paying this money to the local authorities for maintaining the road, it would be more satisfactory if the Minister would put men on the road to keep it in repair, and not entrust the work to the local bodies which had hitherto been looking after the road. The condition of the road was simply disgraceful; and if two or three maintenance men were placed on the road, with sections of two or three miles for each to look after, the work would be more satisfactory.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The maintenance of this road had hitherto been entrusted to the local authorities, who now stated that £1,000 was insufficient to keep the road in proper repair, and had requested the Works Department to take over the maintenance. The Government had agreed to do so, and he believed some parts of the road were undergoing reconstruction.

MR. GEORGE hoped the department would also take over the liabilities, because there were several bad places on the road, notably about Crawley.

Item—Perth Park, May Drive, £350:

MR. R. HASTIE: Last year the Committee voted £1,500 for this work, but £5,375 was spent. Now there was an item of £350. It was within the recollection of members that the Committee voted £3,000 the other day to the Perth park trustees. When was this expenditure going to stop? Next year he was

satisfied that this board would want a large amount of money to spend, and the Committee should tell them to stop the expenditure. He moved that the item be struck out.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: When in charge of the Works Department, these votes caused him a great deal of annoyance. The vote went through the department, although they had no voice in spending the money. The item had been put on the Estimates after the money was spent. If members struck the amount out, nothing would be gained.

MR. GEORGE: This was another phase of what the Committee were discussing the other evening. There were certain boards to whom previous Governments had given almost unlimited power, and almost unlimited money. It was a farce for the Committee to vote money, if when £1,500 was voted, £5,500 was expended. Could not this work be done by the Government so that the Minister would have some control over the expenditure, and not hand the money to an irresponsible body?

MR. McDONALD: Would the Minister give an undertaking that he would notify these boards that they must not spend money in this manner?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: This was an instance of shutting the door after the steed was stolen. The money was spent before the Government, in its former phase, came into office. The liability was incurred, and the Government had to meet it. He had expressed his opinion pretty forcibly in departmental minutes as to what he thought of the arrangement, and had not altered his opinion. If the items were to appear on the Estimates, the head of the department should be responsible for them, and have the control and the spending of the money.

MR. GEORGE: Had anything been done to prevent such an expenditure in future?

MR. HASTIE: Would anything happen if the amount were struck out? Unless the Committee divided on the question and said that this should stop, there appeared to be no means of preventing the spending of the money; and the same thing would be repeated.

MR. GEORGE: A sum of £3,000 was voted to the Perth park trustees the

other day, which apparently had not been expended. Here was an instance of what the board was willing to do, and could do. The Committee should stop a similar expenditure in future.

THE PREMIER: It had been stopped.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS said he was authorised to give the House an assurance that nothing of the kind would occur again while the present Government were in office.

MR. DOHERTY: But £3,000 had already been voted for the Perth park.

THE PREMIER: That grant was not for roads, but was handed over to a special board for the general improvement of the park.

MR. GEORGE: The member for Subiaco the other evening got an amendment passed that £500 of the £3,000 voted was to be used for making a road to join Rokeby Road. The item of £3,000 was not under the Works Department; but the £500 to be spent on the road would come under the Works Department. The Committee were justified in asking whether the £500 would grow to £3,000 by handing it over to an irresponsible body.

MR. HOPKINS: Abolish the board.

MR. GEORGE: It would be well if all irresponsible boards were abolished, and these items were brought under the Government.

MR. HASTIE: If the Committee struck the item out it would be equivalent to a vote of want-of-confidence in the board, and perhaps the board would resign. It had been said that the money had already been spent; if so, it must have been expended during the financial year, because only the other day we passed an Excess Bill, and this amount was not contained in that measure. We had practically no control over money to be spent by this board. Could not the £350 be taken from the £3,000 which was voted the other night?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amount of £3,000 was under the control of the Perth Park board, who had authorised fixed arrangements. The board had been in existence some years, and if Parliament desired to make any alteration, the way to do that was by specific motion. The member for Subiaco got £500 of the £3,000 earmarked for a special road, and since then he (the

Colonial Secretary) had received a protest from the board, stating that it was impossible to do the work to be carried out this year if £500 was taken out of the £3,000. There was also another statement that £500 would not do the work required to be done. When on the Opposition side of the House he had protested against this for years, and he did not want to take any responsibility in regard to this kind of expenditure. The Committee was asked to vote £1,500 for the purpose of a road, and by some means the board spent £5,600. As far as it was possible for the Government to do so, they intended to stop this kind of expenditure, but this amount of £350 had actually been expended.

MR. DOHERTY: Under Form J?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No; the money was passed to the board under last year's estimates, under form "I", which was a form by which the Government increased a vote in existence, while Form J created a vote altogether.

MR. HOPKINS: Did the Government increase it?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Government did; not the present Government, nor the last Government, nor the Government preceding that.

MR. GEORGE: Which Government was it?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The money was expended by the Government that preceded the first Leake Government. This was one instance of what the Government had to do in dozens of cases, and altogether £300,000 had been expended in this way.

MR. HOPKINS: The fault lay with the previous Government; so there was no alternative but to pass the item.

Amendment put and negatived.

Item—Perth, Wood-blocking Wellington street and Barrack street (half cost), £2,000:

MR. HOPKINS: This year Perth would draw the maximum subsidy, £15,000. Last year £2,000 was provided for wood-blocking; this year another £2,000 appeared on the Estimates. Was similar provision made for wood-blocking in other municipalities?

MR. JACOBY: Against such special grants he had previously protested. There was extreme difficulty in getting country

roads made, and it was ridiculous that a non-producing city should receive an enormous subsidy and such large grants as this. No doubt there would be found farther on other grants for Fremantle.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Last year £2,000 had been provided, and apparently spent. Why was £2,000 provided now? No wood-blocking had been done at the intersection of Wellington and William streets, which were the streets really referred to. The reason for the Government paying half the cost was that the railway property abutted on Wellington street. What became of the £2,000 granted last year?

MR. QUINLAN: The total sum agreed on between the City Council and Sir John Forrest's Government was £4,000, of which £2,000 had been paid.

MR. HASTIE: And spent?

MR. QUINLAN: Yes; in the purchase of blocks, which were now stacked and in process of seasoning. The council also pointed out that all Government property was exempt from rating; hence the necessity for such grants.

MR. JACOBY: Perth received a Government subsidy.

MR. QUINLAN: So did other towns.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND: No further grants of this sort should be given. The only wood-blocking done in any Fremantle street had been paid for by the citizens, without Government aid. This £2,000 was simply an increase of the subsidy to the Perth Corporation, which was constantly spoon-fed by the Government.

Item—Port Hedland, Causeway Repairs, £2,000:

MR. D. J. DOHERTY: Originally £1,000 was voted for this work, £1,788 was spent, and there was still a liability of £1,637. The work had cost £3,300, according to the Estimates, yet four years ago £8,000 had been spent on the same quagmire, and the work was as yet a failure. This item was simply a bonus to the constituents of the Minister for Railways.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member should not make statements which he would have to withdraw.

MR. PURKISS: Look at the dates in the Estimates. Who was it that left the liability of £1,637?

MR. DOHERTY: When a liability existed, there was nothing left. The facts showed the Minister could look after his own constituents.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. Kingsmill): If the hon. member had read the dates at the head of the columns, he would have found this work was initiated when Port Hedland was not in his (the Minister's) electorate, but in that of the former member for the De Grey, the lamented Mr. F. Darlôt, a supporter of the Forrest Ministry. When the £1,000 was granted, and the liability of £1,637 incurred, the present Government were not in office. He would not ask the hon. member to withdraw the nasty remarks made, but the House was now in possession of the facts.

MR. DOHERTY accepted the explanation. Within the last few months there had been so many different Governments that one lost count. But the Government of the day should be responsible for all liabilities. As to the remarks of the member for Perth (Mr. Purkiss), the hon. member evidently did not understand what a liability was. As to the work itself, he was sorry it was the Forrest Government which spent the money.

MR. F. CONNOR: Was the amount of £2,000 intended to cover the liability, or was it an additional sum for repairs?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: This was the amount of liability existing on the 30th June last, and a small amount of additional work required to complete the undertaking would be covered by the balance of the item. The work was for the better protection of the causeway which had been constructed across Port Hedland marsh, and the additional work consisted in placing along the batter of the causeway a stone facing to resist incursions of the sea. That work had been absolutely satisfactory.

MR. W. B. GORDON: If the amount spent on this work was to improve the facilities for shipping stock at Port Hedland, any money spent in that direction would be supported by him, as the effect would be to cheapen the cost of meat in Perth.

MR. F. CONNOR: This amount was too small for the work to be done in that important place, which deserved more consideration than it had received hither-

to; and he presumed a larger provision would be made as soon as the hon. member (Hon. W. Kingsmill) took over the position which it was rumoured he was about to take in a short time. Lower down the Estimates were two or three items for roads round about Port Hedland; and why not put them all in one item, as they were all for the same thing, so that members might see the total.

MR. DOHERTY: There were different voters interested in different bridges and creeks.

MR. CONNOR: Was the money expended to be under the control of the Works Department?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The balance was to repair a road that was partly washed away during a cyclone, and the money was being spent by the Works Department under the supervision of its own officer.

MR. S. C. PIGOTT (West Kimberley): There had been a gross display of ignorance made by members of the Committee this evening in regard to Port Hedland and the district. He knew the work on which this money had been spent. He hoped that before long it would not be a question of voting £2,000 for Port Hedland, but a question of voting something like a million for constructing a railway to open up the district. Proof had been given in this House year after year that there was good gold in the district, and that there were as good mines there as existed in Coolgardie or Kalgoorlie; and knowing the district as he did, he would support every item of proposed expenditure in connection with Port Hedland and the district.

MR. CONNOR: Any person who saw the traffic at Port Hedland, and saw teams hauling through sand up to the axles for miles, would be convinced that the money expended at Port Hedland was not sufficient for the requirements, or the money had been badly spent, because there should have been a road across that sandpatch which would be trafficable to the wharf. Very soon it would not be a question of spending a few pounds in that district, as the member for West Kimberley had said, but it would be necessary to build a railway from Port Hedland or Cossack to tap the country in the North-West. If the present Government could not start the construction

of that railway in place of a paltry vote for a road like this, then the railway should be built by private enterprise if necessary, though this was the first time he had advocated such an idea; because that district should be opened up by a railway, and if the Government would not provide the money, the work should be done by private enterprise.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS thanked the member for West Kimberley and the member for East Kimberley for the encomiums they had passed on the district which he had the honour to represent, and assured them that all they had said in favour of it was well deserved. The place where the money was spent was two or three miles from Port Hedland, and he doubted whether the hon. member (Mr. Connor) had seen the place.

Item—Woodman's Point, Roads in Quarantine Area connecting with main road, £1,000:

DR. O'CONNOR asked for information as to this item.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It was considered necessary by the medical authorities to make a road for the patients. The sum of £250 was put on the Estimates last year, but it was found insufficient even to make an economical commencement, and the money was not spent.

MR. MACDONALD: The Quarantine Station was about two miles from the main road, and it was necessary to make a road there for conveying patients.

MR. DOHERTY: Although this work was necessary for Fremantle, he must say the Government ought rather to consider the advisability of spending this money for continuing the railway from Owen's Anchorage to Woodman's Point.

DR. O'CONNOR: The proposed road was not necessary, and he moved that the item be struck out. The road was hardly ever used. Occasionally a patient might be sent there, and we might or might not have an outbreak of disease in Perth for a long time to come. The distance was only about half-a-mile of sand, and it would not hurt patients to carry them over sand, which would be rather easy travelling for patients.

MR. DIAMOND: The distance was more than half-a-mile from the main

road, and the roadway to the Quarantine Station was in a fearfully bad state. It was like going over a sand-heap all the way; and if the Quarantine Station was to remain there, a good road should be made. During the plague outbreak, patients were carried over that road, and in some cases their death was hastened.

MR. GEORGE: There was no necessity to make an expensive road in this case; and if the traffic to the Quarantine Station was not likely to be much used, why not use this £1,000 to continue the railway, which would eventually join with a branch line that was coming from the South-Western railway? Could the member who represented the district tell the Committee if there was any local traffic along this road?

MR. McDONALD: This amount of money was not asked for by him. It was placed on the Estimates at the request of the Medical Department, as it was impossible to carry patients to the Quarantine Station along the sandy track.

Amendment put and negatived.

Vote put and passed.

Harbour and River Works, £6,911:

Item—Hauling up privately-owned Vessels on Fremantle Slip, £350:

MR. GEORGE: Would the Minister give some explanation about this amount?

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Like a great number of other items that appeared on the Estimates which represented expenditure, there was no means of showing the revenue from this source, but the revenue derived was far more than the expenditure.

MR. GEORGE: A note might be made at the foot of the page, showing that there was a revenue from this source.

Item—Murchison and Peak Hill Gold-fields, Wages of caretaker, yardsmen, drovers, etc., £900:

MR. J. B. HOLMAN: It was advisable to do something to provide water along the road to Chesterfield. There was a distance of 40 miles without any water at all. A caretaker might be appointed to look after the wells along this road. A battery had been erected at Chesterfield, and people had to go a stage of 40 miles without water. On

the Lake Way road there was a distance of 40 miles without water, and teamsters had to carry 200 gallons to water horses.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: A note would be made of this matter.

Vote put and passed.

General Water Supply, £22,670 :

Item—Stock Routes, Improvement and Maintenance, £1,500 :

MR. HOPKINS: Had attention been paid to the recommendation of the select committee on the Food Supply as to opening up stock routes? The item was increased in amount this year, but it should be farther increased.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The Estimates were framed long before the report of the select committee was received. In framing the Estimates for next year, due regard would be paid to that report.

MR. F. CONNOR: How could this Committee take notice of a report that had not yet been adopted? A very material amendment would be moved when the adoption of the report of the committee on Food Supply was moved.

SIR JAMES G. LEE STEERE: Several complaints had been made to him lately by gentlemen interested in the stock route, who said it was almost entirely useless. A considerable sum of money had been spent in putting the stock route in order, sinking wells at moderate intervals, but all the wells had become useless. The timber had been taken out of these wells and burnt by drovers; buckets and troughs also removed, rendering the stock route useless. He suggested there should be one or two men constantly travelling up and down this route, to see that the wells were kept in order and the buckets and troughs were not carried away. One inspector could not do the work—two at least would be required; and if that were done and the wells put in order, the stock route would be of use. Friends of his were not able to travel stock along the route because no water was available.

MR. S. J. PHILLIPS: A great deal of money from time to time had been spent on this route, but lately no money had been expended, and all the wells were in a bad state. The member for Boulder wished to reduce the price of meat. One

of the best means of doing that would be to improve the stock routes, which were in a disgraceful state.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: With regard to the stock route, when the item was put on the Estimates he felt proud of it.

MR. F. CONNOR: It was not sufficient; that was all.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It was as much as could be found. He had been glad to increase the item, and he could inform the Committee that a survey party had gone out and were engaged in fixing sites for new wells, to replace those that were practically useless, also to make a deviation in the stock route, which was badly laid out in the first instance. It would save a good distance, would take stock through better country, and bring them into Peak Hill. That the late stock route had been of assistance was seen from the fact that along the route since it had been established, three cattle stations had already started, and he had heard lately that more country had been taken up, which was entirely due to the stock route in the vicinity. It was only recently that the stock route fell into disrepair owing to the good seasons in that part of the State. Natural water was found sufficient without going to the wells, and everything on the stock route went to "rack and ruin" for the want of use and looking after. He was sorry the drovers did such things as taking timber from the wells to light their fires with. It was a very exceptional man who would do such a thing. In the back blocks people had too much appreciation of the value of water to depreciate their chance of getting it. They generally were more willing to effect repairs about wells than to cause damage. A progress report was expected in a few days from the party who had gone along the route. The work was being done in two sections, the first from Peak Hill to Nullagine, and the second thence on to Kimberley. The second section was not very much used.

MR. CONNOR: It ought to be.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: There was no reason why it should not be. Even now there was a water supply, but it was very shallow; still it could be used. It was possible to travel store stock over it.

MR. DOHERTY: The store stock on the Kimberley stations were increasing

rapidly, but one of the Kimberleys was under peculiar regulations at present which prevented the moving of stock. If Parliament would take into consideration such measures as dipping and quarantining, valuable cattle could be brought overland at a cost of £1 to 25s. per head. A mob of cattle was taken from Wave Hill to the Murchison in a bad season at a cost of 19s. per head, as against the cost of shipping, £5 per head. If the Minister would push the survey of the stock route farther on to Kimberley it would benefit the country.

MR. F. WALLACE: When the report of the select committee on Food Supply was being discussed, this matter could be brought up. He would have something to say on the question.

Item—Agricultural Areas, Boring for Water, £200:

HON. F. H. PIESSE: It was to be regretted this amount was so small. He had hoped that something could have been done this year to farther prospect in this direction. There was a little difficulty when pioneering to obtain a water supply, but subsequently the water was found in plentiful quantities. The money for boring and providing water was well spent, as the districts afterwards became settled. More money should be provided for this purpose in order to promote settlement.

Item—Water Supply and Boring generally, £1,500:

MR. GARDINER: There was need for a better water supply for shipping at Albany. Many vessels at the port had to leave with a half or a quarter supply. The revenue from sales of water amounted to £110 to £115 per month, and if a better supply were provided by the department there would be ample interest and a substantial sinking fund realised. The water was now drawn from springs, and with proper attachments the outflow would be increased. He acknowledged the courtesy of the Works Department in the past. The large scheme formerly proposed by the town council was not considered practicable, but a smaller scheme should be taken in hand.

MR. HOLMAN: When new goldfields were opened up it would be better to put down bores before sinking wells. The

first point to ascertain was whether the water was fit for consumption. This should be immediately tried at Megarthella.

MR. CONNOR: What was to be done regarding water supply at Wyndham? This was a serious question for the inhabitants, and for the cattle export trade, which would be one of the most important State industries. This year he anticipated 10,000 head of stock would be shipped from Wyndham; but in the environs of the town there was, in a dry season, absolutely no water. The former Leake Government had acknowledged the necessity for action.

MR. GARDINER: Would boring be required?

MR. CONNOR: The department had sent an officer, who alleged that he had put down a bore 600 feet; but the local residents maintained that he had not gone farther than 200 feet. Mr. Jull, the Under Secretary, had suggested inquiry, but apparently nothing had been done to elicit the facts; and the cattle trade, which kept £150,000 to £200,000 in the State, instead of its being spent in the sister States, was placed in jeopardy.

MR. GEORGE: The £15,000 on this year's estimates had already been spent, and there was actually a liability of £36 on the 30th June last. How was such liability to be paid off if only £1,500 were passed? Lower down appeared a liability of £99 for Wyndham water supply, for which there was no provision on this year's Estimates.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The question of water supply at Albany had been noted. The member for the district admitted the Government had hitherto been under the impression that the municipal authorities would undertake this work. As they could not do so, inquiries must be made with a view to a scheme. It was intended to bore at Megarthella. Regarding the Wyndham water supply, provision was made on the Loan Estimates. In reply to the last speaker, although £1,250 had been voted last year, only £641 5s. 9d. had been spent; therefore the £1,536 liability on 30th June last did not absorb the balance of the amount voted.

MR. GEORGE: Was there a £2,000 liability?

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. member had stated the whole of this year's estimate, £1,500, plus £36, had been absorbed, and that there was a debt of £36; but he had forgotten the balance unexpended from the original vote of £1,250.

MR. GEORGE: If there was £600 in hand, why ask for £1,500? He moved that the item be reduced by £600.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: If only £900 had been asked for that would have covered liabilities merely, and there would have been no money for work this year.

MR. GEORGE: Why the unauthorised expenditure involved in the £1,536 liability? In what way were the unexpended balances treated? Were they earmarked and kept in reserve, or what became of them?

MR. DOHERTY objected to the item, because there was a great discrepancy in the figures stated by the Minister for Works.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Hitherto there had been too little information on the Estimates: this year, with the altered form, there appeared to be too much. The amount of this item was not confined to clearing off the liability of last year, but to do a little work in addition.

MR. CONNOR: Where did the surplus come from?

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: In farther explanation of this vote, there was a vote of £1,250 last year, and out of that amount £641 was paid up to the end of June, leaving a balance of £609 unexpended, and there was £1,536 owing at that date. Deduct the £609 from the £1,536, and the balance left would be £927 still owing. Therefore, in asking for £1,500 this year, the department had to pay £927 out of that sum, and the balance of the amount would be available for expenditure this year.

MR. DOHERTY: The Government were asking for £1,500, and out of that sum they had spent £927. The Government were breaking faith with the House in regard to their assurance that no money would be spent without a vote by Parliament first obtained.

THE TREASURER: Items in the Estimates were dated from the 30th June

last, and of course some money had been spent since.

Item — Yardarino (West Dougarr), Boring, £500:

MR. PHILLIPS: Why were the contractors allowed to abandon their boring contract before it was completed? They were within 25ft. of bringing water to the top of the bore.

MR. WALLACE: Last year this vote was questioned, and he was given to understand by the member for the Irwin (Mr. Phillips) that this bore was being put down to find coal: to-night, the member explained that it was being put down for artesian water. There was never any necessity for this bore. Were the Government going to continue to put down bores like this, especially when they had such an experience before them as the Dardanup bore, which the member for the Williams recommended? Before the Government decided to put down bores, they should ascertain the necessity for water, and the likelihood of obtaining it.

MR. GEORGE: The vote last year in connection with this item was £1,500. The expenditure was £1,973 19s. 9d. There was a liability of £327, and now the Committee were asked to vote £500; yet we were told that the bore was no good, and that it was stopped before the 30th June last year.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The sum of £1,973 19s. 9d. was paid during the last financial year, and on the 30th June there was a farther liability of £327, but it was not paid. To cover that liability, and he presumed to pay off any outstanding accounts incurred since the 30th June—as there was no reason to suppose the bore was stopped before the 30th June—a sum of £500 was provided on the Estimates. As far as he remembered, the contractors for the bore got into some difficulties in regard to their plant, and the Government thought it better to stop the bore. He understood the bore was put down to prove the existence of a coal seam. The depth attained was 1,800 odd feet, but it failed to prove the existence of a coal seam, and the contractors being in a difficult position and within a few feet of completing their contract, the bore was discontinued.

MR. DOHERTY: The liability incurred last year was £1,973 19s. 9d; there was still a liability of £327, making a total amount of £2,300. Fifteen hundred pounds was voted for this work, and now £500 was asked for. Who was to pay the balance of £300?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: With regard to the £1,973 19s. 9d. he could give no information. It was paid before the Government came into office. He presumed that £473 19s. 9d. would be found on the last Excess Bill.

MR. DOHERTY: It was misleading to the Committee.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It was impossible, of course, to pay £1,973 19s. 9d. with £1,500, but the money had been paid, and £473 19s. 9d. was evidently paid by Form J.

MR. DOHERTY: If any account of a private firm showed a difference of £300 that firm would not be satisfied.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: A sum of £473 19s. 9d. would be found on last year's Excess Bill, he presumed.

MR. DOHERTY: The Minister should be in a position to give all the information to the Committee. The information which had been supplied in every case was misleading.

MR. PHILLIPS: If the contractors for the bore had gone down another few feet, water would have come to the top of the bore. The money expended had been practically thrown away.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The papers would be laid on the table of the House.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: On page 12 of the second Excess Bill, item 240, was an amount of £473 19s. 9d. It would have been as well if the hon. member had taken his word.

MR. DOHERTY: This had been brought forward for the purpose of educating the Government in their business.

Item—Wyndham Water Supply:

MR. DOHERTY: A sum of £1,000 was voted for this work, £451 19s. 4d. was spent, and what became of the balance?

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

Fremantle Water Supply, £4,060:

Item—Superintendent, £300:

MR. HASTIE: Was water supplied to Fremantle at the expense of the State? Did the consumer pay anything for it; and if so, how much? How long was Government expected to provide water?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Government made a profit by the business.

MR. CONNOR: There should not be a profit.

MR. McDONALD: There was a profit of some £2,000.

Item—Materials, upkeep, services to houses, etc., £1,100:

MR. McDONALD: In East and South Fremantle, application had been made to have certain pipes laid down. Such pipes were in stock, and should be utilised.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

Engineering Surveys and Railway Construction, £16,510:

Item—Menzies-Leonora Railway: Traffic Expenses during construction, £16,000:

MR. DAGLISH: For what was this expenditure?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The expenditure on the line during construction would be more than covered by the receipts. It was not expected that the expenditure would reach £16,000.

MR. HASTIE: When would the line be completed?

THE CHAIRMAN: That could be discussed on the Loan Estimates.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

Public Buildings (Architectural division), £135,831:

Item—Superintendent of public buildings, £700:

MR. JACOBY: Was it necessary to have a superintendent as well as a chief architect?

DR. O'CONNOR: The expenditure of the architectural branch was enormous. It was said outside that whereas private architects received five per cent. on cost of construction, the work of Government architects cost 16 per cent. The Government astronomer, whose income was £500

a year, had a house built by the department costing £7,000, whereas a £1,200 or a £1,500 building would have sufficed. Why were the two heads of the department certificated engineers? The vote could be considerably reduced.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: This department did much work for the Federal Government, which was not shown on the Estimates. There might be room for retrenchment, but such retrenchment should not be made haphazard, but part of a general scheme.

Item—Chief Architect, £650:

MR. DAGLISH: How long had the Chief Architect been absent from the State during the past two years, and was he now in the Eastern States?

THE TREASURER: The officer was in Perth, and had been here for a long time.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The Chief Architect was today in his office, attending to his duties.

Item—Assistant Architect, £300:

MR. TAYLOR: Was this assistant architect identical with the person who was drawing a pension in addition to his salary, concerning whom the Premier had promised information?

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No.

THE PREMIER: This was not the same person.

Item—Cadets, £100:

MR. HOPKINS: Why the increase from £15 3s. 4d. to £100.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The smaller amount was for a portion only of last year, and the larger for the whole of this year.

Buildings, etc. (continued)—Colonial Secretary's division:

Item—Whitby Lunatic Asylum, £1,000:

MR. GARDINER: Why the liability of £50,000?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: That was the estimated total cost of the buildings.

MR. QUINLAN moved that "Whitby" be struck out. That site was too remote for an asylum.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Government would not object to the amendment, as they had no intention of

erecting the asylum either at Whitby or elsewhere until after the fullest inquiry. So far, the information obtained showed the Whitby site was not altogether suitable.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Then better let the item remain until inquiries were completed.

MR. T. F. QUINLAN: If this item were passed for Whitby, the country would be committed to Whitby. There were more suitable places, and one which he had highly recommended before was Bassendean, a portion of which was now available. He would like to see the unfortunate inmates of the Asylum in the best locality they could be placed in.

MR. GEORGE: This item had been on the Estimates for a number of years. Why the work had not been proceeded with he could not say, but he did not think the House would be wise in striking out the name which had been on the Estimates for some time. We had heard a good deal about vested interests, and there were a few in connection with Whitby. A great number of people had been looking on this district as a place where, if the asylum were properly established, they could sell their produce and other things. As the Minister for Works had said it was not intended to spend money on this asylum or any other until more information was obtained, what harm could be done by allowing the amount to remain on the Estimates?

MR. HOPKINS: Presumably if the item were passed as it stood, £1,000 would be spent on the asylum; if not, the item would be misleading. If the amount was not required, why not strike it out?

THE PREMIER: Something must be done with regard to the construction of a new asylum, and the House should not tie the hands of the Government in this matter. There was a conflict of medical testimony with regard to the suitability of Whitby. Some doctors recommended it and a great many condemned it. The Government would have to consider the matter. They did not desire a vote which would oblige them to construct it. They were anxious to commence an asylum somewhere on a site selected by those best able to decide.

Amendment put and passed, and the word "Whitby" struck out.

Item—Derby Gaol, £500 :

MR. S. C. PIGOTT: The money on the Estimates for this work was of no use. The reason the money had not been spent during the last two years was that the gaol authorities considered it would be an absolute waste of time to deal with the matter with this amount. The gaol was getting into a worse state year by year, and was becoming a standing disgrace. £500 might appear a heavy sum, but in the Estimates already passed provision had been made for wages in connection with the gaol to the extent of £583 15s. An amount should be spent at once, or the sum should be struck off the Estimates. He asked for an assurance from the Government that the matter would be settled one way or the other. What was requisite had to be done, or we should hear about it from different places. For a small sum in addition to the £500 a good substantial building could be erected. Gaols were a failure in the North-West. Would the Minister give an assurance that the matter would be dealt with without farther delay?

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The Works Department did not initiate this work; it was really in the position of architect towards many of these items. The department was asked to give an estimate of certain work, and according to that estimate provision was made. In regard to this particular item the department was awaiting instructions. He understood a new gaol was necessary, and it was almost useless to attempt to restore the existing gaol. If anything could be done with £500 as a start, the Government were willing to begin.

MR. PIGOTT: What the Commissioner said was unquestionable. He could throw the responsibility on other shoulders, but one did not suppose the Colonial Secretary could do the same. This matter would have to be looked after at once. We had had the native question brought up strongly lately; if what was required could not be done without advice from the Gaols Department, that department would have to move pretty quickly.

THE PREMIER: The question of gaols came under his notice in a rather forcible way the other day with regard to the escape of native prisoners. He had instructed the Sheriff to, at the earliest

possible moment, make a personal trip, specially inspect these prisons, and report on the localities as to their being fit and proper places for the security of the native prisoners. He believed most of the native prisoners came from the tropics, and we should keep them there.

Item — Perth Supreme Court, £25,000 :

DR. O'CONNOR: Was it a fact that it was necessary to arrange for the construction of coffer dams to keep water out of the foundation of the site? If so, was the site considered healthy for courts?

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS said he was not aware of any such difficulty. He was informed that the work of erection was proceeding in a satisfactory way. It was proposed to lay the foundation stone shortly.

DR. O'CONNOR: Would the hon. gentleman inquire?

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS said he would make a note.

Item -- New Parliament Houses, £5,000:

MR. WALLACE said he would like to draw attention to a notice of motion on the Notice Paper (adjourned debate).

THE PREMIER: This item really anticipated the motion on the Notice Paper. The Government intended, if the item were passed, to proceed at once with the construction of the new Parliament Houses on the hill behind the Barracks.

MR. HOPKINS: Would the Barracks be pulled down?

THE PREMIER: The Barracks would have to come down some day. Hon. members knew there was very little room in the public offices at the present time. If the site on the hill were secured for Parliament Houses, the Legislative Assembly rooms and the Legislative Council rooms would be available for the accommodation of civil servants. A large sum of money was now paid annually in renting private buildings to be used as public offices. The interest on the money needed to provide sufficient accommodation for legislative purposes was less than the expense involved in the renting of private offices; so that really the scheme of new Parliament Houses was one of economy, and should commend itself to hon. members on that score. The plans of the proposed buildings had been laid

on the table. The structure, when completed, would be of considerable size; nevertheless, about £20,000 would suffice to provide the accommodation required for both Houses of Parliament and for the Parliamentary staff. It was unnecessary to remind hon. members that the premises now used as Legislative Chambers really afforded no accommodation at all. There was no Ministerial room; the Speaker had only a little bit of a den, or kennel it might be called; the Chairman of Committees had no room; and hon. members on both sides knew what the Opposition room was like. (Laughter.) There was no room for the Premier. If he wanted to discuss matters or write a letter, there was no place where he could do so in private. Of course the members of the Legislative Council had far better accommodation than we had. The Committee knew how wretched was the accommodation for the reporting staff—[SEVERAL MEMBERS: Hear hear]—not only the *Hansard* staff, but also those of the daily journals. The reporters had no proper retiring rooms, and it was really wonderful that under such adverse circumstances our Parliamentary business was reported so ably and so well. The *Hansard* staff and the staffs of the newspapers laboured under enormous disadvantages. He understood, indeed, that members of the *Hansard* staff worked in the draughty passages of the adjoining buildings. It behoved the Committee to take some steps to remedy these very serious defects. A careful consideration of the whole question led to the conclusion that, as a matter of annual expenditure, we should save money by undertaking the building of new Parliament Houses. The work was one, therefore, which might fairly be allowed to start without unnecessary delay. The only difficulty arose in connection with the question of a site, which question, however, should be regarded as having been settled during last session. Certain hon. members advocated the construction of new Parliamentary buildings on the site of the present Legislative Council buildings; others advocated the top of the hill at the end of St. George's Terrace as a site. He was one of those who supported the adoption of the report of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the building of new Houses of Parliament; and

that committee recommended the hill site, which was now readily accessible through the tramway system. The Committee should pass this item on the score of both convenience and economy.

MR. NANSON: While opposed to spending a large sum of money on building new Parliament Houses, he would not oppose the item, seeing that the proposal of the Government was a sound, business-like one, and would result in a considerable saving of money. Moreover, there was the consideration that if new Houses of Parliament were built, the public officers now scattered all over Perth might be accommodated in a Government building. He understood that £20,000 represented the limit of expenditure, at any rate for the present.

THE PREMIER: From twenty to twenty-five thousand pounds would provide sufficient accommodation for both Houses of Parliament. The Government did not propose to indulge in much embellishment, at any rate for the present, and certainly not at all without the authority of Parliament.

DR. O'CONNOR: So small a Committee as this should not authorise so large an expenditure.

MR. JACOBY: Members present were not to blame for the thinness of the attendance.

MR. HOPKINS: The members who had been kicking up rows all the evening were now absent.

DR. O'CONNOR: No matter what the Premier might say, the expenditure was unnecessary. The temporary Supreme Court buildings would shortly be available. If the accommodation in that building was good enough for the Judges, it was good enough for other Government officials. The Premier had promised retrenchment in the public service, and therefore so much office accommodation would not be required in the future. Moreover, the Perth City Council had a claim on the Legislative Assembly premises. [Several interjections.] If necessary, he would divide the Committee on this item.

MR. HOPKINS: The items should be passed. No hon. member who had taken the trouble to read and consider the report of the Joint Committee on the building of new Parliament Houses could arrive at any other conclusion than that

the proposal of the Government was, as the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) said, a sound business proposal, or, as the Premier put it, good business economy. We certainly required more accommodation for our public officers. It was now next to impossible to discover where the Agricultural Bank was housed. The quarters which that important institution occupied were a disgrace to the State. The Crown Law Department was hidden away in rooms at the top of the Commercial Bank building. The Inspector of Parliamentary Rolls had a retreat somewhere else. If all these departments and officers were housed in one building, where they would be accessible to the public, it would be of considerable advantage. Hon. members well knew the inconvenience of the Legislative Assembly building. There was no room where a member of Parliament interviewed by his constituents could see them in privacy, unless it was in the Opposition room, which was private by reason of its inaccessibility. Every other room connected with the Legislative Assembly was almost invariably crowded. The apology for accommodation offered to the *Hansard* staff and the Press was a discredit to the country. These unsatisfactory conditions had been tolerated long enough. Adverting to the first observation made by the member for the Moore (Dr. O'Connor), he wished to say that he, for one, was willing to be in his place when the House assembled at 4.30, and to sit till 11.30. There were, however, certain members who came in prim and rosy after dinner, some of them perhaps with an over-supply of wine. [Several interjections.] Such a thing had happened more than once.

HON. F. H. PIESSE rose to a point of order. The hon. member should withdraw that remark.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member had no right to make that statement.

MR. HOPKINS: Subject to the Chairman's ruling, he would withdraw the remark. Certainly, the hostility displayed to all sorts of proposals by various members after dinner did not by any means always spring from patriotic motives.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was out of order.

MR. HOPKINS: These remarks had reference to the suggestion that the Committee should report progress. He was pleased to support the item, and hoped the Government would see that the building of new Parliament Houses was pushed on with all possible despatch.

DR. O'CONNOR moved that the item be struck out.

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

Ayes	5
Noes	23

Majority against ... 18

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Stone	Mr. Hassell
Mr. O'Connor (Teller).	Mr. Hayward
	Mr. Holman
	Mr. Hopkins
	Mr. Hutchinson
	Mr. Illingworth
	Mr. Jacoby
	Mr. Kingsmill
	Mr. Leake
	Mr. McWilliams
	Mr. Nanson
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Rason
	Sir J. G. Lee Steere
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Quinlan (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Item — Grants-in-aid (in accordance with regulations) for Construction of and Additions to Mechanics' Institutes, Miners' Institutes, and Agricultural Halls, £1,500:

MR. QUINLAN: In future he understood that grants-in-aid to agricultural halls were to be given on a subsidy system, which no doubt would prove very good; but he wished to ask the Government to carry out a promise which had been made by two successive Governments of a grant of £250 for the purpose of erecting an agricultural hall at Nunyle.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The system of granting money for agricultural halls all over the country was becoming "rotten"; agricultural halls were becoming a disease, they were being asked for within three miles of one another, and a large amount of money was being spent, so that he came to the conclusion that the money would be better spent on works of utility. With that object he prepared a scheme by which

agricultural halls in future were to be erected on a subsidy system, and regulations were prepared, exceedingly liberal, which provided that in districts similar to that in which the Nunyle agricultural hall was required, £2 was to be provided by the Government for every £1 contributed by the local people. The only reason the request of the member for Toodyay was refused was that once the Government granted money for an agricultural hall under a condition different from that laid down, the scheme fell to the ground. He had to refuse the request, although he acknowledged the hall was promised by two former Governments. If it were put to the people of this district that the sum which they would be required to make up to build this hall was only one third of £250, he thought they would admit that he was not asking too much of them to put their hands in their pockets to that extent. The country was well off for agricultural halls.

MR. QUINLAN: Not in this district.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: If the request was granted, the subsidy system, which he wished to initiate and which he believed to be the best system, must fall to the ground.

MR. HOPKINS: In the list of grants previously made there were institutions other than those comprised under the heading of mechanics' institutes and agricultural halls. There were fire brigades, trades halls, and workers' associations. These were institutions which in the past had been receiving Government grants, but in the future they were not to receive them.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It was not an improbability that if people wished to put up a workers' hall in the future they would call it a mechanics' institute.

MR. HOPKINS: Mechanics' institutes were the property of the people, whereas a workers' hall was the property of an association, therefore it could not come under such a vote. Many applications for grants for institutions such as a workers' hall, a chamber of commerce hall, or a friendly society's building would be obviated if the Minister had a fund from which he could advance loans at a reasonable rate of interest. The Boulder chamber of commerce had a considerable sum of money, but not

enough to complete the building. The chamber would be glad to borrow the balance of the money from the Government, at about five per cent. The Caledonian Hall at Boulder was similarly situated. In the past, grants had been made indiscriminately, but in future they would be given only to mechanics' and miners' institutes and agricultural halls, which were vested in trustees for the benefit of the people. The Treasurer might consider the suggestion to have a special fund from which loans could be advanced on the security of buildings to be erected.

MR. QUINLAN: As the former Government had promised the amount for the hall he had mentioned, and as the land had been granted for the purpose, the money should be forthcoming out of this £1,500.

MR. J. EWING: The suggestion of the member for Boulder was excellent.

THE PREMIER: If the member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan) would hand him the correspondence referred to, something might be done provided this were a case in which the condition laid down ought to be waived.

Item — Furniture for Government House, £300:

MR. NANSON: In the return of expenditure connected with the Royal visit, there were some heavy items for furniture.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: This was the usual annual provision for new furniture which might be required at Government House. If the money were not required, it would not be spent.

Item — Firewood and Collie coal for Government offices, etc., £2,750:

MR. JACOBY: Wishing to buy some soot the other day, he made inquiries of a sweep, who told him that the only place where Newcastle coal was burnt was the Perth Hospital. Why not burn Collie coal there?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hospital was not under the control of the Works Department, but under a board.

MR. EWING: It was to be hoped that the Government would continue to use the local article exclusively.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

This concluded the votes for the Works Department.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER: Monday next being a public holiday, of which he had been informed the majority of members desired to take advantage, he moved that the House at its rising do adjourn till Tuesday next.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned accordingly at at 11-19 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 28th January, 1902.

Papers presented—Question: Coronation, State Representation—Question: Moojebing Townsite—Leave of Absence—Early Closing Bill, second reading—Workers Compensation Bill, first reading—Midland Railway Inquiry, Joint Committee's Report, debate—Fourth Judge Bill, in Committee, reported—Gaols Act Amendment Bill, second reading—Pawnbrokers Bill, in Committee, reported—Trading Stamps Abolition Bill, in Committee, reported—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: 1, The Goldfields Acts, 1895-1900, Amendment of Regulation 106, *re* Forfeiture of Share or Interest in Claims. 2, By-laws of Albany Park. 3, By-laws Boulder General Cemetery. 4, By-laws of Cue and Day Dawn General Cemetery. 5, By-laws of Katanning General Cemetery. 6, Canning Roads Board—Amendment of By-law No. 5. 7, By-laws of Katanning Roads Board. 8, By-laws for Management of Reserve 7628. 9, New Regulations under Land Act.

QUESTION—CORONATION, STATE REPRESENTATION.

HON. F. T. CROWDER asked the Minister for Lands: 1, If it is the intention of the Government to send a representative of this State to the Coronation of King Edward. 2, If the Government will give an assurance that they will not send such a representative without the consent of Parliament.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, No invitation had been received nor any intimation that a representative is expected to attend the Coronation. 2, Parliament will be consulted if during the session it is decided to send a representative.

QUESTION—MOOJEBING TOWNSITE.

HON. W. MALEY asked the Minister for Lands: 1, The date of the original survey of the Townsite of Moojebing, and the cost of same; 2, The number of allotments sold; 3, The date of the recent re-survey, and the cost thereof; 4, The reason for such re-survey.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied:—1, October and November, 1891, £83. 2, None. 3, November, 1900, to February, 1901, £153 5s. 4, Because it was deemed advisable to provide additional streets and rights-of-way to improve subdivisional design.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by the MINISTER FOR LANDS (for Hon. A. G. Jenkins), leave of absence for one fortnight was granted to Hon. C. Sommers, on the ground of urgent private business.

EARLY CLOSING BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. A. Jameson), in moving the second reading, said: I invite the attention of hon. members to a brief statement of the relation which the present Early Closing Bill bears to similar measures now in force in the Eastern States. To begin with, there is no Early Closing Act in Victoria or in Queensland. The only States of Eastern Australia in which an Early Closing Act exists are South Australia and New South Wales. Ours has been the first State in Australia to pass early closing legislation. Shortly