

MR. BROWN said he had been disappointed in listening to the letter just read by the hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands. He had expected a recantation of the untruthful statements put forward in the *Aryus*, in which the Local Government was accused of a course of action directly contrary to that which it had pursued. When the Government deserved censure or blame, he was always prepared—possibly, too readily—to attach blame to them; but in the case referred to he felt bound to defend the course adopted by the authorities.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. H. H. Hocking) said it was never contemplated that the Government should appoint inspectors of stock in every part of the world; the intention was that persons desirous of importing stock to the Colony should apply for the nomination of a person authorised to act on behalf of the Government in granting the necessary certificate. Any such application would be entertained at once.

THE ACTING COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. A. O'Grady Lefroy) said he happened to be at Champion Bay with the Governor when the imported sheep per *Lucy S. Wills* arrived. His Excellency was most desirous that the stock should be landed without any unnecessary delay, but he naturally felt some hesitation in infringing the provisions of the law. The sheep in question came without a certificate from a veterinary surgeon, as required by the Imported Stock Act, and it was the duty of the "young Victorians" to have ascertained what the law was with respect to the introduction of stock, before bringing their sheep to the Colony. Every possible facility was afforded them on their arrival at Geraldton; the best place available for the sheep was placed at their disposal on landing; but owing to the extreme dryness of the season the country was parched up, and, owing to the lack of feed and water, it was impossible for the sheep to travel at once to their destination. When they came to anchor at Champion Bay, it was found that they had been so closely packed on board ship that many of them had died on the voyage. It was a bad time of the year to arrange for the landing of sheep in the Colony intended to travel overland to the interior, and he was sorry that the im-

porters had not exercised a wiser discretion, both as regards the season and making themselves acquainted with the provisions of the law bearing upon the importation of stock. Several letters had been received by the Government with reference to this matter, and care had been taken to reply to them, and to point out that more blame was attached to the importers than to the Government. He thought the strictures of the Victorian press on the action of the Government quite uncalled for. He had recently seen Mr. Butcher—one of the Victorians concerned—who had told him he was now quite satisfied it was not the Western Australian Government that ought to be blamed in the matter, but the importers themselves, who should have ascertained what the law of the Colony was in regard to the introduction of stock. The sheep introduced were now doing well, and Mr. Butcher had expressed himself exceedingly grateful to Mr. Burges for the great help which he had given the new comers in placing the sheep on as good pasture as the character of the season admitted, so as to strengthen them after their confinement on board ship, and enable them to travel to their destination.

Progress was then reported, and leave obtained to sit again on Monday.

The House adjourned at 11 o'clock, p.m.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Monday, 23rd July, 1877.

Yatheroo Road: clearing surveyed line—Geraldton and Northampton Railway: expenditure in connection therewith—Swan River: improvement of navigation of, at Fremantle—Polling places—Money Grants—Pensions Bill: second reading: in committee—Ballot Bill: in committee—Imported Stock Act, 1876, Amendment Bill, 1877: in committee—Industrial Schools Act, 1874, Amendment Bill, 1877: in committee—Extradition Bill: third reading.

The SPEAKER took the chair at seven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

YATHEROO ROAD.

MR. PADBURY moved, That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, praying him to place on the Estimates the sum of £50 towards clearing the surveyed line of road from Yatheroo to about five miles north of Dandaragan Spring.

Motion agreed to.

GERALDTON AND NORTHAMPTON RAILWAY.

MR. CROWTHER, pursuant to notice, asked the Acting Colonial Secretary what amount of money had already been expended, and paid, in the construction of the Geraldton and Northampton Railway; also, what amount (if any) of the supplementary loan of £26,000 had been expended, and upon which of the alterations suggested by the select committee appointed to report on the progress of the work, in December, 1875, the expenditure had been made. The hon. member said his reason for asking the question was to relieve the anxiety which to a certain extent existed among the public with regard to the completion of this the first railway ever undertaken by the Colony. The line had been in course of construction since December, 1874—close upon three years, and at the present moment only a distance of some chains short of fifteen miles had been completed. There was a feeling prevalent outside that the present Government was not particularly interested in carrying out the work to completion, and that there was a little carelessness and want of energy on their part in pushing forward the undertaking, otherwise the work would have progressed at a smarter pace than five miles a year. Before formally asking the question which stood in his name, the hon. member made an *amende honorable* to the Director of Public Works for having, in the course of debate on the Address in Reply, reflected upon the conduct of that official in neglecting to take steps to secure a suitable site for the railway station at Geraldton. He had since been given to understand that there had been no remissness on the part of the Director of Public Works in this matter, and he must express his surprise that when, in ignorance of the actual state of affairs, he (Mr. Crowther) had commented unfavorably on the action of the

Director of Public Works, the members of the Government in that House had not at once set him right and not allow a statement injuriously affecting a public officer to go unchallenged, when they knew it was undeserved. He hoped the Government, now they were alive to the importance of obtaining a suitable site for the railway terminus at Geraldton, would lose no opportunity in securing the only site available for the purpose.

THE ACTING COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. A. O'Grady Lefroy) said the Auditor General had been requested to prepare a return embodying the information sought by the hon. member, and, when completed, it would be laid on the table of the House. With regard to the charge of alleged carelessness and apathy and lack of energy on the part of the Government in connection with the progress of the railway, he felt it his duty to deny the allegation. So far as it lay in the power of the Government they had endeavored, in every possible way, to bring about the completion of the line. In this, as in other matters, the Government had been, necessarily, dependent upon the officers placed in positions to carry out the work; and the question of expediting the progress and completion of the line depended more upon the responsible officers entrusted with the execution of the work than upon the Government. He was sure the Director of Public Works had done everything within his power to bring the undertaking to a completion. Many difficulties had to be contended in carrying on the work, and harrassing complications had arisen, but the Government had exerted, and were exerting, all their energy to surmount these difficulties and to carry the work to a successful issue. He hoped the inhabitants of the district would, ere long, find the line completed to their entire satisfaction.

DESTRUCTION OF UNLICENSED DOGS.

MR. STEERE moved, That an address be presented to His Excellency, requesting that he will cause to be placed on the table of the House, a copy of the circular issued by the Superintendent of Police to the constables in the different districts with reference to the destruction of unlicensed dogs.

The motion was affirmed.

SWAN RIVER—IMPROVEMENT OF
NAVIGATION OF.

MR. RANDELL, in accordance with notice, moved, That an Humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, praying him to place the sum of £500 upon the Estimates, or such other sum as may be necessary, for the improvement of the navigation of the Swan River below the bridge at North Fremantle, and at the passage of the bar, as follows, viz.:—By completing the stone wall on the North foreshore up to Ferry Point; by removing a portion of the middle groyne, and by dredging, or blasting,—or by other means if necessary,—the flat rocks lying in the old channel over the bar, known as the Shepherds, and the Little Monkey; also to erect a mahogany beacon upon the Monkey Rock, of not less than one foot six inches diameter, and twenty feet in height above the ordinary summer level." The hon. member pointed out the advantages which the proposed improvements would be to the river navigation, as well as the protection which they would afford to the river itself in the neighborhood of Fremantle. He had already drawn the attention of the Governor and the Government to the desirability and the necessity of effecting these improvements, but he thought it would be as well that the subject should have the force and weight of a resolution of the House. The completion of the stone wall on the North shore up to Ferry Point would afford a good deal of protection to the river, and at the same time improve the navigation by deepening the channel. The rocks which he proposed should be removed were very dangerous, and the source of many accidents. Owing to their substructure being decayed they were easily removable, and the cost therefore would not be great. With reference to the beacon on the Monkey Rock, the present one was of little use, being too small and too low. The hon. member indulged in a hope that the House would acknowledge the necessity of effecting these improvements by affirming the motion which stood in his name. If so, he hoped the works would be executed with as little delay as possible.

MR. MARMION would not oppose the motion, but recommended caution in fur-

ther meddling with the river. No doubt something might be done to improve the navigation of the particular part of the river referred to, but care should be taken that no further mischief than had already been done would result from the attempt to improve the navigation.

THE ACTING COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. A. O'Grady Lefroy) could not help thinking that the motion was somewhat premature, pending the settlement of the question of harbor works, which, as the House was aware, was now under the consideration of the highest living authority on such matters.

MR. RANDELL contended that the improvements which he suggested had nothing whatever to do with the question of harbor works.

THE ACTING COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. A. O'Grady Lefroy) maintained that they had, inasmuch as Sir John Coode, before reporting on the question submitted for his consideration, had requested to be furnished with information relating to the condition of river, the amount of detritus brought down, the set and velocity of the currents, the effect of the groynes upon the maintenance of the North foreshore, and other matters connected with the navigation of the river. He therefore thought it would be unwise and premature to interfere with the river pending the decision of Sir John Coode upon the question of harbor improvements.

MR. RANDELL was surprised to find that the hon. member regarded the proposed improvement to the navigation of the river as premature. It would not have been premature twenty years ago, much less now, and it did not redound to the credit of the Government that the work had not been done long ago.

MR. BROWN thought the Government were perfectly justified in asking the House to pause before meddling with the navigation of the river, pending the settlement of the question of harbor works. He thought that the Director of Public Works should have been asked to report on the subject, before the House committed itself to support the motion under discussion.

MR. SHENTON pointed out that, in the event of Sir John Coode's scheme of harbor works not being affected by the river, or not carried out at all, there

would be a delay of another year before the improvements suggested by the hon. member for Perth could be effected. If the money necessary for carrying out the proposed improvements were now voted, and it was found that the question of harbor works was interfered with in any way by the river, of course the suggested improvements would not be carried out, and the money voted for them would remain unspent.

MR. RANDELL said that Mr. Wardell, C.E., had recommended all the improvements which he now proposed, with the exception of the beacon on Monkey Rock.

Motion agreed to.

VOTING UNDER THE BALLOT BILL.

MR. STEERE asked the Surveyor General, Whether he was of opinion that, by the map compiled in his office, showing the proposed situation of polling-places, nineteen-twentieths of the population, as stated in the Speech with which His Excellency opened the Session, would be brought within a radius of fifteen miles of a polling-place, taking into account that, under the proposed Ballot Bill, no person can vote at a polling-place other than within the electoral district in which he has a vote?

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL (Hon. M. Fraser) replied, that when the map was prepared, he had lost sight of the provision referred to (relating to electors being only permitted to exercise the franchise within the district for which they had a vote); but it was the intention of the Government to remedy this, by amending the provision in question when the Ballot Bill was committed.

ADDRESSES FOR GRANTS OF MONEY.

On the motion of Mr. RANDELL, it was resolved to ask the Governor to place the sum of £100 on the Estimates for the further improvement of the canal below and above Perth Bridge; also, another sum of £100, for the further improvement of the Canning River. On the motion of Mr. MONGER, it was resolved to ask His Excellency to place £100 on the Estimates for the purpose of sinking wells to the South-east of York.

PENSIONS BILL.

MR. STEERE, in moving the second reading of a Bill to regulate and abolish pensions in certain cases, said it was unnecessary for him to detain the House at any great length with a repetition of the arguments put forward in favor of a similar Bill last Session. At the same time he thought he should inform the House why he had re-introduced his measure. In August, 1873, a Select Committee appointed by the Legislature to consider the question of departmental expenditure, recommended that after that date no more pensions should be given any person entering the Civil Service. Mr. Weld, who was then administering the Government, gave effect to that resolution by issuing a proclamation in the *Government Gazette*, notifying that no person entering the Public Service after the 26th August, 1873, should be entitled to receive any pension, superannuation, or other allowance, upon leaving the service. Every officer who, after that date, entered the Civil Service, was notified in writing to the same effect. Under these circumstances he failed to see how the provisions of the first clause of the Bill before the House, which merely enacted the same provision, could be regarded as a breach of faith, or an act of injustice,—terms bandied about a good deal when the Bill was under discussion last Session—towards any public officer entering the service after the date referred to. The second clause of the Bill provided that, in computing the amount of superannuation or compensation allowance to which civil servants (who had entered the service before August, 1873) were entitled to, forage and house allowance shall not be considered as “emoluments.” He did not think there was any hardship in that. Neither in the Imperial Service, nor anywhere else that he was aware of, was forage allowance taken into consideration in the computation of superannuation allowances, and he failed to see why it should be here. House allowance, too, in his opinion, had no right to enter as a factor in such computation. Large sums of public money had been expended in erecting and improving the houses of Resident Magistrates and other public officers who were allowed official residences, but it was never contemplated that the value of

those improvements should be taken into calculation when computing the retiring allowance of those officers. When the Superannuation Act of 1871 was passed—and the measure was one to which the House had reluctantly given its consent—it was never intended that anything but salary and fees of office should count in computing the amount of pension to which a retiring officer was entitled: it did not enter into anyone's head that forage and house allowance should form an item in the computation. Nor had such allowances been granted except in one solitary instance—the case of the late Resident Magistrate at Newcastle. Even in that case, house allowance was not reckoned—a fact which he was somewhat surprised at, regard being had to the disposition on the part of the Government to render that officer's allowance as large as possible. The third clause of the Bill before the House provided that in the event of any person enjoying a superannuation allowance,—in consequence of retiring from the Colonial Service on account of bodily infirmity,—accepting employment elsewhere, his superannuation allowance should cease, in case his pay was equal to the salary he was receiving when he left the Colonial Service. This provision had been introduced into the Bill in consequence of several clergymen having left the service, and gone home (on the plea of ill health) in the enjoyment of a superannuation allowance from this Government, but who on reaching England had obtained and accepted other employment bringing them in as much salary as they were in receipt of here, in addition to the annuity which they received from Colonial Funds. It had been said, when the Bill was before the House last Session, that if it were passed, we should be held up as having acted in a most shameful manner towards our public servants. He did not think so. We had the example of several of the other Australian Colonies to guide us. No pensions were allowed in New South Wales; Tasmania had abolished her pension list years ago; and he thought he was correct in stating that Queensland had done the same. Victoria had not followed suit yet, but part of the programme of the Ministry now in office in that Colony was the abolition of state pensions. He therefore failed to see why

this Colony should be held up as a singular example of baseness or meanness if the House passed the Bill before it. For his own part, he would be sorry to be guilty of a breach of faith or an act of injustice towards any public servant, and he did not think that the measure which he had submitted to the House would, in its operation, act unfairly or unjustly towards any officer in the service. On the other hand, it would be an act of great injustice to the Colony, if the House did not agree to the second reading of the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. H. H. Hocking): I have much pleasure in rising to propose, as an amendment, that the Bill be read a second time this day six months. The principal section of the Bill—that embodying its vital principle—is the first clause, which provides for the entire abolition of pensions, superannuation, or other allowance, or gratuity, in the case of any officer who may have had the misfortune to enter the public service subsequent to August, 1873. No doubt, as the House has been informed by the hon. member in charge of the Bill, a resolution was adopted by a select committee, recommending that no person entering the civil service after that date should be entitled to a pension, and the resolution was confirmed by a proclamation promulgated in the *Government Gazette*; but the real question before us now is, virtually, the repeal of the Superannuation Act, and the abolition of pensions and gratuities to persons who, having served the Colony faithfully from youth to old age, find it necessary, in consequence of failing health or infirmity, to retire from the public service. I think this would be a most impolitic thing to do. In the first place I think that, in the event of this Bill becoming law, the benefit which its supporters anticipate would accrue to the Colony would not be reaped for many years to come. It is not likely that any person entering the public service subsequent to the year 1873 will become entitled to a pension for a long number of years yet. But the real question involved is not so much that of economy as of public policy. Does the House think it wise to withhold every inducement for public servants in their old age, and when incapable of

efficiently discharging their duties, to retire from the service? I think myself that it would be most impolitic. I was reading to-day, the debate which took place on the second reading of the Bill last session, and I find the hon. member for Greenough, and other gentlemen who supported the measure, preaching homilies on the duty of civil servants to put by a penny for a rainy day, and other equally admirable but impracticable texts. I say impracticable, because I should like to know, when you come to consider the amount of salary which your civil servants receive, the position they have to maintain, and the families they have to bring up, how it is possible for them to provide for their old age. It is all very fine for honorable and patriotic gentlemen who are engaged in profitable occupations and pursuits to talk about putting pennies away for a rainy day; but I should like to see them put it in practice on a pittance of £100 or £120 a year, with an annual increase of the small but acceptable sum of £10. What, then, are your civil servants to do when they attain an old age, and are overtaken by infirmity—with their faculties so impaired as to render them unfit for the efficient discharge of their public duties? Are they to stick to their office until they come utterly helpless to perform their work, and thus secure the full amount of the emoluments which appertain to an office the duties of which they have become incapable of discharging? Would that be a good thing for the public, or was it not, rather, a penny wise and pound foolish policy? Take the case of a Resident Magistrate, for instance, who, with the salary attaching to that office, could not be expected to bring up a family and save anything for old age. Would the House have such a man, with his bodily health destroyed and his mental faculties impaired, continue to discharge his judicial functions, and stick to his office to the hour of his death? Would it not be a wiser policy, by granting him a trifling pension, to induce him to retire into private life, in the enjoyment of his pittance? There is another thing to be considered in connection with this highly impolitic measure. If a public servant meets with an accident—possibly, in the discharge of his public duty—you take away from him all chances of compensa-

tion. The second section of the Bill refers to the question of “emoluments.” Now I should like to know, when the Superannuation Act was passed, what “emoluments” hon. members could have had in their minds, when providing that an officer’s superannuation allowance should be computed upon the amount of the salary and “emoluments” enjoyed by him at the time of his retirement? If this question of what should constitute “emoluments” were a new one, I should perfectly agree with the hon. member who has brought forward the Bill, that forage allowance should not be taken into consideration. I would do so for this reason—that horse allowance is given an officer not as a reward for his services, but in order to enable him to perform those services. But, under the circumstances,—regard being had to the provisions of the Superannuation Act, and the intention of the framers of that Act—to exclude forage allowance from consideration in computing a man’s pension would be an interference with vested rights, or, if not strictly-speaking a vested right, at any rate a claim which could not be fairly impugned. Were the provisions of the second clause prospective in their operation, I would not be so much opposed to them; but when it is proposed to render them retrospective, I think the House should pause before it commits itself to such an act of injustice. Not only is it proposed to strike out forage allowance, but also house allowance, and if you do that I should like to know what is to become of your precious “emoluments.” After all, as I have already said, it is a very small matter, this question of including forage and house allowance in computing the amount of an officer’s pension. There are very few gentlemen in the public service who are fortunate enough to get horse allowance—I do not—and it would not increase their pension to the extent of more than about £5. The third and final clause of the Bill provides that in case any officer becomes entitled to a superannuation allowance consequent upon ill-health, if he remains idle, well and good—he may go on enjoying the pension which a grateful country has bestowed upon him. But if he sets to work to supplement his income, his allowance is withdrawn, in the event of his earnings exceeding a

certain amount. The hon. member who introduced the Bill said he had been induced to insert this clause in consequence of "several" clergymen having retired from the Colonial service in the enjoyment of a pension, and gone home to England, where they obtained employment. Now, I think, in the first place, that if the hon. gentleman will but consider the real facts of the case the "several" clergymen to whom he alludes will be found to dwindle down into two, and one of them is now the chaplain of a workhouse. Hon. members may think that a very grand appointment, but for my own part, I cannot help thinking, if the health of the unfortunate gentleman alluded to as holding this envious position admitted of his returning to the Colony, he would be glad to come back, rather than be a workhouse chaplain in England. I cannot see what good is likely to result from this third clause; but the great principle of the Bill is involved in the first section, and as I have said before, I think it would be very detrimental to the public service of the Colony if you carry out the proposal to abolish pensions, and thereby cut off from men passed the working period of life every inducement to retire from the public service.

MR. HAMERSLEY was very pleased indeed that the Bill had been introduced again this session, and he trusted, if it did not become law, it would be re-introduced at every session and receive the same amount of support. It appeared to him that the present Act was very unfair indeed—it afforded no encouragement whatever to those holding office to entitle themselves to a pension. They could demand it as a matter of right, whether deserving of it or not. Was that fair or reasonable? Was it fair or reasonable that a man, whether deserving or not, should be able, after serving a few years, to retire on a pension?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. H. H. Hocking): May I ask under what section?

MR. HAMERSLEY: I don't know exactly what section, but I know it exists. After a few years' service a man becomes entitled to a pension. [The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, no, no]. The hon. gentleman may say, "No, no, no," if he chooses: my impression is this—when a

man is really entitled to a pension, a pension should be accorded him by this Council. But, unless some such provision as this be made, a person leaving the service, whether by reason of old age, or infirmity, or to receive a better appointment, may demand a certain amount of pension, in addition to the pay he may be receiving elsewhere. I supported the Bill of the hon. member for Wellington last year, and I shall continue to do so.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. M. Fraser) said the hon. member could certainly never have read the Superannuation Act. In the first place, under ordinary circumstances, no Government officer could retire under sixty years of age; and, in the second place, the Act provided that nothing therein contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, to give to any person an absolute right to compensation for past services, or to any superannuation or retiring allowance, or to deprive the Governor of the power and authority to dismiss any person from the public service without compensation. He had no intention of traversing all the arguments brought forward last year in connection with the Bill;—were they not written in the Book of Chronicles, on the Table. But he should be very sorry indeed to see a breach of faith committed with regard to public servants, as contemplated in the Bill before the House. Should it ever become law, all officers entering the civil service would know what they had to expect, and, if the efficiency of the service was to be maintained, the only alternative would be to increase salaries, so as to enable public servants to insure their lives, or otherwise to make some provision for old age. The hon. member who had introduced the Bill must be aware there was no more chance of its being assented to this session than there was last year. He would certainly support the amendment, that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

MR. BROWN did not wish to give a silent vote. He was not in the House last year when the Bill was discussed, but he rose to support the amendment for the reasons—most of them, at any rate—mentioned by the hon. the Attorney General. An additional reason why he supported the amendment was because

he believed the country was actually in favor of the existing order of things. Every hon. member must see that, if the efficiency of the public service is to be maintained, the result of abolishing pensions would be a corresponding increase in the salaries of public officers. An officer was content to enter the service at a lower salary than he otherwise would, knowing, as he did, that by good conduct and length of service he would become entitled to a superannuation allowance. But if they abolished this inducement, they might depend upon it the result would be they would have to augment the salaries of public servants. The effect of this would be that they would find public officers, like the rest of mankind, improvident—they had, in fact, plenty to do with their money; they would find deserving officers obliged to leave the service in their old age, unprovided for, and coming forward to solicit the State to support them. He did not think the House would allow such a man to starve; he did not think it would refuse to allow him a sufficient sum of money to keep him for the remainder of his days. Upon this principle he would support the amendment. He did not look upon the Bill as a breach of faith; he did not think it was right the hon. member for Wellington should be charged with any such thing. He considered that forage had no right to be considered as "allowance," and if the Bill were restricted to that provision he would certainly support it. He thought the Government had a very lame case when they maintained that forage should be regarded as an officer's "allowance," and, if they had done wrong in calculating it as such in one instance, that was no reason why the error should be perpetuated. If that were done, the House would find some other way for officers to travel about, without any forage allowance. The hon. member added he was not averse to house allowance entering as a factor in the computation of an officer's pension.

MR. CROWTHER, in supporting the Bill, said he had no intention whatever to travel over the ground already so well-trodden. At the same time, he would like to remind the Government that it had not acted up to the provisions of the Superannuation Act in their integrity,

except in one instance. If one officer was entitled to have forage allowance calculated in his pension, every other retiring officer ought to be entitled to it. They had no right to make fish of one public servant and flesh of another. If emoluments were computed in one case, they should be computed in every case. As he had said before, the Bill would have his support. He saw no hardship or injustice in telling a man, upon entering the service, "Your pay will be so much per annum, so long as you discharge the duties of your office efficiently; when you leave you must look after yourself." It would be better that public servants should know what they had to expect than that they should be dependent upon the whims of a Governor, or the temper of the House.

MR. RANDELL would vote with the hon. member for Wellington, as he had done last session, and if arguments were wanted in favor of the Bill they had been supplied by the hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands and by the hon. member for Geraldton, and they were the very grounds upon which he (Mr. Randell) supported the Bill, namely, that a proper salary should be given to every public servant. He was of opinion that by abolishing pensions, and paying civil servants such salaries as their services were worth, they would secure a better class of officials than under the present system. He had no wish to reflect upon the efficiency of the civil servants of the Colony, but he had no doubt, in his own mind, of the truth of what he had said. He thought every man should be paid what he was worth, and out of that pay make provision for his old age. He failed to see why the public service should be an exception, or why a man should be induced to enter the Government service who had neither the energy, the brain, nor the intelligence to make his way in the ordinary spheres of life. As to public officers leaving the service and turning farmers, in the event of the Bill becoming law, he would be very glad if it produced that result, for he thought the Colony could do very well with a smaller number of officials than it had at present. In no other department of life were pensions allowed: wages were paid according to what a man is worth, and he was expected to provide for him-

self and family out of those wages. The Bill, so far as he understood, simply enacted a regulation which now hung on a proclamation in the *Government Gazette*. Another argument which weighed with him in supporting the Bill, and in favor of the abolition of pensions, was the fact that these superannuation allowances, dependent in a great measure, if not wholly, as they were, upon the whim of the Governor for the time being, placed an engine in the hands of the Government which they ought not to have. Official life, generally speaking, was conducive of longevity; civil servants, as a rule, lived to a good old age—this had been observed particularly as regarded certain branches of the civil service—and ample opportunity was afforded them to make provision for their necessities when the time came for them to retire from the service. The hon. member for Geraldton said he believed the country was opposed to pensions being abolished; so far as his (Mr. Randell's) own constituency went he did not think that was the prevailing feeling. The hon. member for Wellington, some years ago, when advocating Representative Government described Perth as the "hot-bed of officialism"; but he (Mr. Randell) believed that a large number of the citizens were in favor of abolishing pensions. Stress had been laid upon the fact of public servants devoting their time and talent, and spending the energies of their life, in their country's service. But were they not paid for doing so? If they could secure a better outlet for their talents and their energies, they would soon leave the service. He considered the Bill a right and proper one; nor was he apprehensive it would be productive of any evil consequences, or inflict any hardship upon any officer in the service of the Government.

MR. BURGESS said he also would support the Bill, for he certainly was in favor of its provisions. He failed to see in it anything which could fairly be regarded as a breach of faith towards public servants. He considered the system of pensions a decided mistake. If they wanted to increase a man's salary let it be done during his life-time—what he meant was, during the time he was able to work for it. He would sooner see the salaries of public servants increased

than the existing system of pensions perpetuated. He hoped the Bill would meet with the same extent of support as it had done last session.

Question put, "That the Bill be now read a second time," upon which a division was called for, the result being as follows:—

Ayes	11
Noes	9
Majority for			2

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Randell	The Hon. A. O'G. Lefroy
Mr. Crowther	The Hon. M. Fraser
Mr. Shenton	Sir T. C. Campbell
Mr. Padbury	Mr. Brown
Mr. Gale	Mr. Parker
Mr. Monger	Mr. Burt
Mr. Hamersley	Mr. Marmion
Mr. Burgess	Mr. Pearse
Mr. Hardey	The Hon. H. H. Hocking
Mr. Glyde	(Teller.)
Mr. Steere (Teller.)	

The motion was therefore affirmed.

Bill read a second time.

MR. STEERE moved, That it be now considered in committee of the whole House.

Motion agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Bill reported.

BALLOT BILL, 1877.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—Short Title—agreed to.

Clause 2—Act to be incorporated with 33rd Vict., No. 13—agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. H. H. Hocking) moved as an amendment, That all the words after the word "any" in the seventh line be struck out, and the words "place other than the central polling place declared, fixed, and appointed by the Governor as a polling place for any electoral district," be inserted in lieu thereof.

MR. STEERE thought the committee had arrived at that stage of the Bill that rendered it impossible for them to proceed further with it that evening. He was now quite convinced it would have been a wiser course to have referred the Bill to a select committee; in fact, he thought they would have to do so yet. The amendment proposed by the Attorney General would remove some of the

difficulties; but there would still be a great number of people who would not be able to vote at all. The amendment before the committee would necessitate the introduction of a great number more, and he thought it would be unwise to proceed further with the Bill that evening. He would therefore move, That progress be reported, and leave asked to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported, and leave obtained to sit again on Friday.

IMPORTED STOCK ACT, 1876, AMENDMENT BILL, 1877.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—Short Title—agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of section 3 of Imported Stock Act, 1876—agreed to.

MR. STEERE, in moving a new clause, said that the Act passed during the previous year when first introduced into the House was never intended to apply to the neighboring colonies; but during the progress of the Bill through the House an amendment was introduced including those colonies within the operation of the Bill. When that amendment was agreed to, it had never crossed the minds of hon. members that the country at the North was likely to be largely stocked with sheep from one of the neighboring colonies. And, as he had said before, he did not think there was any necessity for applying the provisions of the Bill to those colonies. Therefore he would now move, as an additional clause, "The provisions of the 'Imported Stock Act, 1876,' shall not be taken or deemed to apply to stock imported from the Australasian Colonies, or New Zealand, nor to fodder or fittings imported therefrom."

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS ACT, 1874, AMENDMENT BILL, 1877.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—Short Title—agreed to.

Clause 2—No certified manager to acquire powers of a guardian, unless child is actually in the orphanage, or has been an inmate thereof for three years:

MR. STEERE thought this clause

would operate very injuriously indeed, in the case of orphanages. The funds of these institutions were very small, and if children had to be kept there for a period of three years before the managers could apprentice them out they would have to restrict their operations very considerably. He thought the third clause would be guarantee enough against any impropriety in the letting out of children by the managers.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. H. H. Hocking) said the hon. member was laboring under a misapprehension. It was not proposed that a child should remain an inmate of an orphanage for three years before the certified manager acquired the powers of a guardian over him. What was here proposed was that the manager should not exercise the powers or privileges of a father over a child until he became of age, unless such child had been an inmate of the institution for three years. In that case, the Bill empowered the manager to exercise parental control over the child until he became twenty-one years old.

MR. MARMION suggested that the period be reduced from three years to one.

MR. BROWN thought it would be detrimental to compel the authorities of these institutions to keep a child for any fixed period before they acquired parental control over him. If they did not assume this parental control over an orphan, who was to do so?

MR. RANDELL supported the clause as it stood, for he considered the provision it enacted a very wholesome one, and one which would prevent many a wrong being committed.

MR. PADBURY would reduce the period from three years to three months. He thought it would be a great mistake to interfere too much with the managers of such institutions as the orphanages, which were doing a great deal of good without any ostentation.

MR. BROWN moved, as an amendment, That all the words after the word "infant," in the eighth line, be struck out, and that the words "until after such infant shall have become an actual inmate of such certified school," be inserted in lieu thereof.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the

clause," upon which a division was called for with the following result:—

Ayes	12
Noes	8

Majority for	...	4
--------------	-----	---

AYES.	NOES.
The Hon. A. O'G. Lefroy	Sir L. S. Leake
The Hon. M. Fraser	Mr. Brown
Mr. Glyde	Mr. Hamersley
Mr. Parker	Mr. Burges
Mr. Randell	Mr. Padbury
Mr. Marmion	Mr. Hardey
Mr. Gale	Mr. Burt
Mr. Monger	Mr. Steere (Teller.)
Mr. Shenton	
Mr. Pearse	
Mr. Crowther	
The Hon. H. H. Hocking	
(Teller.)	

The amendment was therefore negatived.

Clause 2—agreed to.

Clause 3.—“No indenture of apprenticeship shall be of any force or validity, unless infant a party to the same, and Resident Magistrate approves.”

MR. STEERE said he failed to see the necessity of insisting upon an infant assenting to be apprenticed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. H. H. Hocking) said that according to the present state of the law no indenture of apprenticeship was valid unless the apprentice was a consenting party thereto.

MR. RANDELL deemed it desirable, in the interests of humanity, that such a provision should be retained in the Bill.

MR. STEERE moved, as an amendment, That all the words after “validity,” in the fourth line, and before the word “unless,” in the fifth line, be struck out. Amendment negatived.

Clause agreed to.

Bill reported.

THE EXTRADITION BILL, WESTERN AUSTRALIA, 1877.

THIRD READING.

The Extradition Bill, Western Australia, 1877, was read a third time and passed.

The House adjourned at a quarter to eleven o'clock.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Wednesday, 25th July, 1877.

Reply to addresses presented to His Excellency the Governor—Lockup at Geraldton—District Roads Audit Bill, 1877: in committee—Third Readings.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at seven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPLY TO ADDRESSES PRESENTED TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

THE ACTING COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. A. O'Grady Lefroy) notified to the House that His Excellency the Governor had been pleased to forward the following communication in reply to addresses embodying certain resolutions adopted by the Council:

“The Governor has received from Mr. Speaker the six resolutions adopted by your honorable House on the 18th, 20th, and 23rd inst. In compliance therewith the Governor will offer a bonus of £2000 for the construction of a Floating Dock at Fremantle, on the conditions suggested by the House. As regards the proposed bridge across the Margaret River, and the clearing of the road from Yatheroo to Dandaragan, provision will be made for these works from road funds at the disposal of the Government. The further improvement of the canal below and above Perth Bridge, and the sinking of wells to the East of York, will be provided for in the Estimates for 1878. On the subject of the improvement of the navigation of Swan River below the Bridge at North Fremantle, the Governor will take professional advice, and in the event of its being deemed advisable to proceed with the work, will be prepared, under the authority contained in the resolution of Your Honorable House, to expend such sum as may be necessary for the purpose.”

LOCK-UP AT GERALDTON.

MR. BROWN asked the Colonial Secretary “Whether the Government recognise the pressing necessity of taking steps to render the lock-up at Geraldton fit for the reception of prisoners; and whether it is intended to take such steps; and, if so, when.” The hon. member said his reason for bringing forward this