

Progress was then reported, and leave obtained for the further consideration of the Estimates next day.

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

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Friday, 12th July, 1878.

Constitution Bill—Jury Act, 1871. Amendment Bill, 1878: first reading—Medical Officer at Northampton—Boat Licensing Bill, 1878: re-committed—Estimates: further considered in committee—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

CONSTITUTION BILL—RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.

MR. S. H. PARKER, in accordance with notice, moved for leave to introduce a Bill to establish a constitution for Western Australia, and to grant a civil list to Her Majesty.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL: I rise to move the Previous Question. I find that the course pursued by the Legislatures of the other Australian Colonies on the adoption of a change in the constitution was, in the first place, to pass a resolution affirming the necessity for the proposed change, and,—the country having expressed its desire to that effect,—then to bring in a Bill embodying the details of the constitutional reform contemplated. I have not the slightest objection to the Bill now proposed to be introduced by the hon. member being brought forward, and I would not do anything whatever to hinder him in bringing in his Bill; but before we agree to the introduction of a measure to decide the details of the new constitution, I think we ought first of all to affirm the principle whether a constitutional change is desirable or not. I think it is most unreasonable, and that it has the appearance of being ludicrous, that the

House should be asked to agree to the introduction of this Bill, before we affirm the resolutions to be submitted for our consideration on Monday next. This is no ordinary Bill, but a measure dealing with a question of vital importance to the whole Colony, and I think that question should be dealt with in the proper form and manner. It does appear to me that, until we affirm the principle of the desirability of introducing a change in the form of Government, we should be acting in a most extraordinary manner if we agreed to the motion of the hon. member for Perth for leave to introduce this Bill. For this reason, and for other reasons which are well known to every hon. member, but which (being contrary to the rules of the House) I cannot refer to at the present time, I beg to move the Previous Question.

MR. CROWTHER, agreeing with what had fallen from the hon. member for Plantagenet, seconded the movement of the Previous Question.

MR. S. H. PARKER: As the hon. member for Plantagenet has adopted the unusual course of moving the Previous Question on the motion for introducing this Bill, it behoves me to give my reasons for bringing the measure forward. It is well known to the hon. baronet and to the House generally, that I have not taken upon myself to introduce this Bill without consulting nearly every member of this Council with reference to its provisions. I had no desire whatever to introduce the measure—as seems to have been supposed by some people—with a view of my being appointed the first Premier under the constitution which it proposes to establish, and at one time I was laboring under the belief that I should have induced the hon. member for Geraldton to bring it in. As I said before, nothing is further from my mind in introducing this measure than that I should be the first Minister entrusted to carry out its provisions; but I gave a pledge to my constituents that I would, in the course of the present Session, bring in such a Bill, and it is in fulfilment of that pledge that I have done so. It is solely in deference to the views of hon. members of this House that I have deferred its introduction until the present time. To postpone it any longer would endanger its being brought in at all

during the present Session, for it is well known to hon. members that we cannot sit here much longer. Therefore, had I waited any longer for some other hon. member to introduce the Bill, the opportunity of doing so this Session would probably be lost; and for that reason, and after consulting every member of the House with regard to its main provisions, I now come forward to do what I conceive to be my duty—my duty to myself, to my constituents, and to the country at large. The hon. baronet in moving the Previous Question said that, in assenting to the introduction of this Bill, hon. members would be affirming certain principles. Now it is well known to the House and to the hon. baronet himself, that they affirm no principle whatever in agreeing to the motion for the introduction of this or any other measure. It is only on the second reading of a Bill that its principles are affirmed, and it would be quite time for the hon. baronet, if he is opposed to the principle of Responsible Government, to move, on the motion for the second reading of the Bill being put to the House, that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, or—if the hon. gentleman preferred that course—to move the Previous Question. The hon. baronet tells us that we are asked (in assenting to the introduction of the Bill this evening) to affirm the details of the measure; but he must know that no member of this House is to be taken in by that. [Sir T. Cockburn-Campbell: I never said it.] I have taken down the hon. gentleman's words—the House is asked to affirm the details of a measure they have not yet seen. The hon. gentleman must know that we never see the details of any Bill on the occasion of its first reading, and that it is only when the Bill is read a second time that the House commits itself to any expression of opinion as to the principle of the measure. Were it otherwise, the hon. gentleman would be justified in moving the previous question on the occasion of the introduction of every Bill brought before the House. But the hon. gentleman has already affirmed the principle and details of this measure. As far back as 1874, the principle of the Bill was affirmed by a large majority of this House, and, to a certain extent, its

details, for, in its fundamental provisions, the Bill is identical with that which received the support of the majority of hon. members four years ago, and, among them the hon. baronet himself. Not only in 1874 did the House affirm the principles of this Bill: the whole question was again brought forward in the Session which was held early in the following year, when Governor Robinson submitted for the deliberate and impartial consideration of the House a despatch received from the Secretary of State relative to the introduction of Responsible Government. On the 25th January, 1875, the hon. member for Wellington submitted a series of resolutions on the subject for the affirmation of the House, and those resolutions were adopted by an overwhelming majority, including the hon. baronet himself. For the information of the hon. gentleman, who thinks that the House should again affirm the principle embodied in this Bill before assenting to its introduction, I will read one of the series of resolutions referred to, which was as follows: "They (the members of this Council) would ill fulfil the pledges they have made, and the votes they have recorded, and they would, moreover, feel how little worthy they would be to occupy their respective positions, if they, specially elected after a dissolution on the question of Responsible Government, did not fully and emphatically bring under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government their adherence to the views they have advocated, their reasons for arriving at those views, and, at the same time—representing, as they fully believe they do, the opinions of a large majority of the people—urge upon the Secretary of State to recommend Her Majesty to sanction the amended constitution they have sought." Again, I would point out to the hon. gentleman that another of the series of resolutions which he, with the majority of other hon. members, affirmed, was as follows: "In requesting the Governor to transmit for the consideration of Lord Carnarvon the foregoing remarks that have with all due respect been made on His Lordship's despatch, this Council desires to point out that, in their opinion, delay in the inauguration of the form of Govern-

"ment sought, is simply delay in the progress of the Colony." I would ask the hon. gentleman whether anything has tended to change his views on that point? Having already affirmed that, in his opinion (and in the opinion of this House), delay in the inauguration of the very form of Government which this Bill proposes to establish is "simply delay in the progress of the Colony," the hon. gentleman would yet lead hon. members to believe to-night that they have not affirmed the principle of this Bill. I am not going into the question of Responsible Government—its desirability, or otherwise—this evening: I know every hon. member has made up his mind on that subject, and I do not for a moment think that anything I may say would alter the opinion of one hon. member. But what I do say is this: if they have made up their mind on the subject, let them not take this mode of expressing it, and imagine that in agreeing to the hon. baronet's amendment they will get out of a direct vote on the question. Every member must be aware that whoever votes for that amendment will, virtually, be voting against their pledges, and against what they have advocated for the past four or five years,—in other words, against Responsible Government. I would point out to hon. members that whether they support the amendment or not, if they negative my motion they will, in doing so, negative their own pledges, and negative what they have already deliberately affirmed—that delay in the inauguration of self-government simply means delay in the progress of the Colony. Why does not the hon. member for Plantagenet adopt what I cannot help regarding as the fairest and most honest course, and propose at once that the Bill be introduced this day six months? The outside public would then understand what the hon. gentleman meant. But when hon. members support the movement of the Previous Question, they say, in effect, they would like to vote for Responsible Government and yet they don't. Those who support the hon. baronet's amendment simply support the existing order of things, and in voting for it they will in reality be voting against the introduction of Responsible Government.

THE SPEAKER said it would not be so: they would not be expressing an

opinion one way or the other. The adoption of the Previous Question would not prevent the motion of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Parker) being brought forward on any other occasion.

MR. PARKER continuing, said: I could not possibly give notice of my intention to move for leave to introduce the Bill again until Monday evening, and the motion itself could not be made until Tuesday. If the Previous Question were then moved, and the same tactics adopted continuously, I would never be able to introduce the Bill; therefore I maintain that those who vote in favor of the hon. baronet's amendment this evening, vote, in reality, against the introduction of Responsible Government, and shirk the whole thing, because they do not really wish to vote for it at all. The hon. member for Plantagenet, in moving the Previous Question, pointed out that in the other Australian Colonies the course pursued, when the question of constitutional change was first brought forward there, was for the Legislature to affirm a resolution expressive of the desirability of a change, and then appoint a Committee to bring in a Bill to give effect to that expression of opinion. Now, so far as a resolution in favor of Responsible Government is concerned, this House, as I have already pointed out, has over and over again affirmed such a resolution, and even in the resolutions which the hon. member for Geraldton has this evening given notice of his intention to move, it is set forth that the feeling in favor of a change in the constitution has during the past few years strengthened, throughout the length and breadth of the Colony. This being admitted, and the House having already adopted a resolution affirming the desirability of the change which it is the object of this Bill to bring about, why should we be asked to affirm another resolution? When are we going to be done with affirming resolutions? If the details of this Bill are not such as to commend them to the approval of hon. members, every opportunity of amending them will be afforded in Committee. I shall have no objection to a modification of its details: all I care for is the broad principle of self-government with ministerial responsibility. That principle has been over and over again affirmed by

this House, and why we should be asked to do so again before leave is given to introduce this Bill I cannot imagine, unless, indeed, it be, as I said before, with a view to shirk the whole question, which hon. members will undoubtedly be doing in supporting the amendment of the hon. member for Plantagenet.

MR. MARMION: I was under the impression when the hon. baronet moved the Previous Question that it was a pre-concerted arrangement with a view to postpone discussion until another occasion, and I certainly intend to vote for the amendment. But I am not prepared to say what course I shall adopt when the resolutions on the notice paper are under discussion. I think, myself, in view of the fact that the House at present comprises several members who were not in it when the principle of Responsible Government was affirmed, that it is desirable the principle should be re-affirmed on the present occasion. Nor is it improbable that some hon. gentlemen who were members of the House when the resolutions affirming the necessity for a change in the constitution may since then have changed their own opinions on the subject. We all know that the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Parker) is himself liable to change his views, and that he has done so completely with respect to this very question. Other hon. members, without rendering themselves fairly open to a charge of inconsistency, may also have altered their views on this most important subject, and for very good and sufficient reasons. Although it is not my own intention to-night to enter upon the question of Responsible Government—I shall defer any expression of opinion on that point until the resolutions of which notice has been given are before the House, on Monday evening, I presume—yet I must say I was rather surprised to hear the hon. member for Perth stating that he had no intention of dealing with the question either to-night or on Monday evening—

MR. PARKER: I did not say that.

MR. MARMION: I think you did.

MR. PARKER: I deny it.

MR. MARMION: The hon. member said the subject had been dealt with before, and that he did not intend to bring forward any further arguments with reference to it. I think the House will

agree with me that if an hon. member, a representative of the people, comes into this Council to propose the introduction of an important measure of this character he ought to be prepared to furnish good and valid reasons for doing so, and for asking the House to assent to his motion.

MR. PARKER: I am quite prepared to do so, when the proper times arrives, namely, on the second reading of the Bill.

MR. CAREY could not but feel that the course adopted by the hon. member for Plantagenet, of moving the Previous Question, was a very unusual course, on the occasion of a motion for the first reading of a Bill, and, in this case, was scarcely fair. Hon. members were yet in the dark as to the provisions of the Bill. Seeing that the present Session was drawing to a close, and that the result of voting the Previous Question would be to defer the introduction of the Bill, it appeared to him that to support the amendment before the House was, in reality, to oppose the introduction of the Bill altogether, and virtually shelving the whole question for this Session. He hoped hon. members would bear this in mind, and that, whatever they themselves might think in voting for the amendment, the outside public could view their action in no other light than that they were virtually voting against Responsible Government. The hon. member for Fremantle (Mr. Marmion) had said that the hon. gentleman who brought forward the Bill ought to be prepared to give reasons for the adoption of the change which it is contemplated to bring about. He (Mr. Carey) had sat in that House in 1874, and heard the hon. member himself Mr. Marmion) make use of very strong arguments for, and not against, Responsible Government.

MR. MARMION: I beg your pardon.

MR. CAREY: You voted for it, at any rate.

MR. MARMION: I know that.

MR. CAREY considered that the strongest argument any hon. member could bring forward in support of a measure was to vote for it.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. H. H. Hocking): The hon. gentleman who has brought forward this question is one who, I know, has had very considerable experience in riding; but although he may be a very skilful rider,

he is evidently not much of a driver. In the present instance, at any rate, he is putting the cart before the horse. When he gave notice of his intention to bring in this Bill, he prefaced that notice with another one, expressive of his intention to move a series of resolutions affirmative of the desirability and expediency of adopting the change which he proposes to effect by means of this Bill. And that seemed to me to be an intelligible way of doing it—it being understood that if he failed to carry his resolutions affirming the principle embodied in the Bill, the motion for the introduction of the Bill would lapse. And I was surprised this evening, when the motion for postponing the consideration of the resolutions until Monday evening was carried, that the hon. gentleman did not move that his motion for leave to introduce the Bill should also be postponed until after the consideration of those resolutions. It appears to me that we are now in this position—we are asked this evening to grant leave to bring in the Bill, and to consider the reasons for doing so on Monday night, which seems to me an extraordinary course of procedure, and one which is most unusual, and, I cannot help thinking, most inadvisable.

MR. PARKER: In explanation, I may say, that I have no intention to move the resolutions standing in my name. I have abandoned them.

MR. BROWN regarded the first reading of a Bill as a mere formal matter, in no way pledging the House or any hon. member to the principle of the Bill; but, in the present case, and under existing circumstances—seeing that the resolutions on the subject would not be discussed until Monday evening—he thought it was as well that the Previous Question should be moved. In supporting that motion, as His Honor the Speaker had pointed out, they did not take away from the hon. member for Perth the opportunity of again asking the House for leave to bring in the Bill, after the resolutions were discussed and disposed of. Although he (Mr. Brown) was opposed now, as he had always been, to the proposed change in the constitution, he would nevertheless—when the proper time arrived for doing so—support the hon. member in his motion to

bring in the Bill, so as to enable him to fulfil his pledge to his constituents, and to afford the country an opportunity of ascertaining what the details of the Bill are. In agreeing to that course, neither he nor the House would be pledged to the principle of the Bill, and might, without being charged with inconsistency, throw it out on the motion for the second reading.

MR. BROCKMAN expressed his intention of supporting the motion for the introduction of the Bill, as it was not yet clear to his mind how far the amendment might affect the future fate of the measure, and he would be sorry to see it endangered or delayed.

MR. MONGER did not exactly remember whether he had pledged himself on the subject or not, but he certainly did not intend to support the amendment of the hon. member for Plantagenet, which he regarded as a polite way of shelving the whole question indefinitely. The more he saw of the present form of Government, the more convinced he was of the necessity of a change, and he would have the greatest pleasure in voting with the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Parker) on this occasion.

MR. BURT did not think that, possibly, there was any member in that House who felt more strongly on this question than himself. He maintained, and always had maintained, that the Colony could not be advantageously governed by persons residing sixteen thousand miles away: but the only question was whether we could get anything better? Those who were in favor of a change might well rejoice that the subject had been brought forward before the Session closed; but was it really expected that their desire for constitutional reform would be gratified, even if the Bill were passed? A good deal had been said about hon. members redeeming their pledges to their constituents; but, in doing so, regard should be had that the interests of the country were not sacrificed, merely for the sake of fulfilling a pledge, given possibly amid the excitement of a contested election, but which, on maturer consideration, might in the interests of the country be regarded as better left unredeemed. He could not say that he had any particular constituency—the whole Colony was his constitu-

ency—and he had given them no pledge for or against Responsible Government; but it did appear to him that the matter would be better met by disposing of the resolutions before asking for leave to bring in the Bill. That course, he noticed, was adopted in the Cape Colony, where Responsible Government had recently been adopted. As to the course pursued by the hon. member for Perth, what had that hon. gentleman in view? Simply to redeem a pledge given at his election. Did he really suppose that anything would come out of it? If anybody could show him (Mr. Burt) that there was anything to be gained by the adoption of the course pursued by the hon. member with reference to this Bill,—if, for instance, it were shown that if the Bill passed there was the slightest chance of its becoming law—there might be some excuse for adopting the mode of procedure which he asked the House to commit itself to. But, under the present constitution, it was utterly absurd that a Bill of this important character, passed at the tail end of a Session immediately preceding a dissolution, should receive the assent of Her Majesty. If he thought otherwise he would be prepared to support the motion of the hon. member for Perth, but, being convinced that there was nothing to be gained by adopting the unusual course which that hon. gentleman proposed, he would support the amendment.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. R. T. Goldsworthy): I think the members of this House who would derive most benefit from the proposed constitutional change would be those who occupy the Treasury benches—judging from the provisions of the Bill introduced at a former Session. At the same time, I must say that my honest conviction is that it would not be to the interest of the Colony that Responsible Government should be introduced. However advisable such a change may be in the distant future, in my opinion the time has not yet arrived for its adoption.

MR. PEARSE said he was one of those members who had supported the adoption of Responsible Government when it was before the House before, and, for the sake of consistency, he would support it again this Session. He looked upon the amendment of the hon. baronet as an

attempt simply made to shelve the question altogether.

Question—That that question be now put—put, and a division being called upon, the result was as follows:

Ayes	5
Noes	13

Majority against 8

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Brockman	The Hon. R. T. Goldsworthy
Mr. Carey	The Hon. H. H. Hocking
Mr. Monger	Mr. Brown
Mr. Pearse	Mr. Burt
Mr. S. H. Parker (<i>Teller.</i>)	Mr. Crowther
	Mr. Glyde
	Mr. Hamersley
	Mr. Hardey
	Mr. Harper
	Mr. Marmion
	Mr. S. S. Parker
	Mr. Shenton
	Sir T. C. Campbell (<i>Teller.</i>)

The question for leave to bring in the Bill was therefore not put.

JURY ACT, 1871, AMENDMENT BILL, 1878.

Read a first time.

MEDICAL OFFICER AT NORTHAMPTON.

IN COMMITTEE.

MR. BROWN, in accordance with notice, moved "That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, praying that he will be pleased to place upon the Estimates the sum of £100 to provide the services of a Medical Officer at Northampton, for the year 1879." The House had for years recognized the principle of making provision for the appointment of medical officers in the various settled districts of the Colony, and he hoped no opposition would be manifested to the proposal to extend the principle to Northampton, a district which was rapidly growing in importance as well as in the number of its inhabitants. The population of the district was far more numerous than the population of many localities which were provided with a medical officer.

MR. SHENTON proposed that the question be considered when the House went into Committee for the further consideration of the Estimates.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES said the question could not be considered when the House was in Committee on the

Estimates. It was irregular, in Committee of supply, to propose any motion not relating to a grant under consideration. The Committee might grant or refuse a supply, or might reduce the amount proposed, but it had no other function. He saw no reason why the question should not be dealt with at present, and the resolution affirmed or negatived, before the re-committal of the Estimates.

Progress reported, and leave obtained to sit again.

BOAT LICENSING BILL, 1878.

This Bill was re-committed, and several verbal amendments made, which, however, elicited no discussion. [*Vide* "Votes and Proceedings," p. 130.]

ESTIMATES:

FURTHER CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Works and Buildings, Item £9,570 read:

MR. MARMION, referring to the item "Converting Commissariat building, Fremantle, into Police Court, £100," said he considered it a great waste of space and accommodation to devote the whole of this building for the purpose of a Police Court, and suggested that a portion of it be converted into a post and telegraph office. He would move a resolution, affirming the desirability of this being done, were he not under the belief that the matter would receive the consideration of the Government.

MR. PEARSE expressed a hope that such would be the case, for the building was altogether too large for a Police Court, and the necessity for improved and enlarged accommodation for the post office and telegraph department at Fremantle was a long-acknowledged want.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. R. T. Goldsworthy) quite agreed as to the inadequacy of the accommodation afforded in the building at present used as a post and telegraph office at the port of Fremantle; but the question of the conversion of the Commissariat building had already engaged the attention of His Excellency the Governor and of the Director of Public Works, and the conclusion arrived at, after an inspection of the build-

ing, was that the building could not be conveniently converted into a post office and Police Court.

MR. MARMION—referring to the item "Towards improving Perth Gaol (half-estimate) £1,000"—said he regarded this proposal as an altogether needless expenditure, when he came to consider that they had within a few miles from Perth a massive building, affording a great extent of accommodation, where all the local prisoners of the Colony might be conveniently incarcerated. He was aware that the suggestion to improve the Gaol accommodation at Perth had emanated from His Excellency the Governor, and of course he (Mr. Marmion) treated the suggestion with all due respect; but, some time ago, a commission was appointed to inquire into this and other departments, and he was not aware that the commission had made any recommendation for improving the present building, nor indeed was the subject brought under their notice. He regarded the proposed expenditure as unnecessary and uncalled for.

The vote for "Works and Buildings" was then agreed to.

Roads and Bridges, Item £11,000 read:

MR. SHENTON asked if his motion for clearing a road from Newcastle to the Eastward Station, and between Dandaragan and Yatheroo, and to sink wells on the former line of road, would be met out of this vote?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. R. T. Goldsworthy) said that personally he had no objection to that being done, if such was the wish of the House.

The vote for "Roads and Bridges" was then agreed to.

Aborigines, Item £1,210 read:

MR. MONGER called attention to the practice adopted in distributing blankets to aborigines. These blankets were sent from Perth to York to the Resident Magistrates, who—no doubt with the best intention—issued them to the settlers for distribution to the natives; but as a rule the blankets were given to their own native shepherds, who traded with the bush natives, obtaining opossum skins in barter for the blankets given away by the Government. He would suggest that the blankets should be issued by the Resident Magistrate at York to the police-constables stationed

to the Eastward (and not to the settlers) for distribution among the natives.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. R. T. Goldsworthy) said he would be very glad at all times to learn the views of hon. members on such matters, and to give them every consideration, as he would with regard to the present suggestion.

MR. CAREY thought it would be a very good plan to leave the distribution of the blankets in the hands of the police, rather than in the hands of the settlers. He would also suggest that they be distributed in the early part of the year; at present, the natives did not receive them until the winter was half over.

The vote for "Aborigines" was then put and passed.

Lacepede Islands, Item £888 read and agreed to.

Government Gardens and Reserves, Item £358 read:

MR. MARMION expressed the gratification he felt at the appropriation of a sum of money for the improvement of public parks. He thought it would be well if the Government were to grant a sum to all the principal towns in the Colony for reserves for public recreation.

Vote agreed to.

Miscellaneous Services, Item £8,840 read:

MR. CAREY thought the vote for acclimatisation purposes might be increased from £50 to £100, which was the amount of the grant last year.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. R. T. Goldsworthy) said he would be glad to meet the views of the hon. member, concurring as he did in the desirability of encouraging acclimatisation. He would, therefore, move, That the sum "£50" be struck out, and "£100" inserted in lieu thereof.

This was agreed to.

MR. SHENTON advocated the claims of the Bushman's Home at Northam to a share of the vote for "Mechanics' Institutes and Working Men's Associations." The institution referred to at Northam, he thought, had strong claims upon the consideration of the Government, and he would be very glad to see the voluntary efforts of the promoters and supporters of the Home supplemented by State aid.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. R. T. Goldsworthy) said if that were done in the case of the institution at Northam, the same assistance would have to be given to other kindred institutions.

MR. SHENTON—when the item "Admiralty and Colonial Survey, £1,500" was read—suggested that some steps should be taken, by means of a steamer, to ascertain the true position of two reefs reported to be right in the passage of vessels in the vicinity of Rottneest.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. R. T. Goldsworthy) said he would bear the hon. member's suggestion in mind. He might add that the question of this marine survey was still a subject of correspondence between the Local Government and the Imperial authorities.

MR. MARMION thought the House was entitled to some account of the progress made with these surveys. Year after year, a sum of £1,500 was voted for the service, but no information was afforded to the Council as to what was done. He thought the officer in charge of the survey might fairly be asked to furnish a report of the progress made every year, and that the report should be presented to the House at the opening of the Session with the official reports of other heads of departments.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. R. T. Goldsworthy) said there would be no objection on the part of the Government to lay the report periodically furnished by Capt. Archdeacon on the Table of the House, and, in future, this would be done.

The vote for "Miscellaneous Services" was then put and passed.

Progress reported, and leave obtained to sit again.

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