

It is confidently hoped that by means of the organisation provided under the new Act which you have passed amending the law regulating Parliamentary Elections, the electoral rolls will be put in proper order, and the right of franchise not only secured to our people, but that a healthy interest in political subjects will be stimulated.

I note with especial pleasure that you have adopted a Bill having for its object better provision for the protection, control, maintenance, and reformation of neglected and destitute children, and I venture to predict that this Act will prove to be one of the most desirable and humane measures passed by Parliament.

By the passage also of the Railways Act Amendment Bill and the other important measures which have engaged your attention, my advisers are of opinion that the best interests of the State will be served.

I now declare this Fourth Session of the Sixth Parliament of Western Australia prorogued until Thursday, the 25th day of June, 1908.

The Session then closed.

Legislative Assembly,

Friday, 20th December, 1907.

	PAGE
Question—Lands Forfeiture	2024
Factories Inspection, Principal Medical Officer	2024
Leederville Population	2024
Elections next Year	2025
Railway Entrance, Beaufort Street	2025
Bills: Metropolitan Water and Sewerage, 3a.	2025
Workers' Compensation Amendment, 3a.	2025
Marine Insurance, 2a. etc.	2025
Government Railways Amendment, as to an Amendment	2029
Discharge of Orders	2030
Complimentary Remarks	2030
Prorogation	2034

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 11 o'clock forenoon.

Prayers.

QUESTION—LANDS FORFEITURE.

Mr. C. H. LAYMAN (for Mr. H. Brown) asked the Premier: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to insist on the forfeiture of all C.P., S.O.L., and other leased lands on which the improvement conditions have not been complied with? 2, If so, when?

The PREMIER replied: Each case is dealt with on its merits. Blocks are being forfeited daily for non-fulfilment of conditions. One of the reasons that provision has been made for the date of approval to be placed on all survey posts and lithographs is that persons may have an opportunity of drawing the attention of the department to any block where the conditions are not being fulfilled.

QUESTION—FACTORIES INSPECTION, PRINCIPAL MEDICAL OFFICER.

Mr. DAGLISH asked the Premier several questions relating to the case of the Chief Inspector of Factories.

The PREMIER replied: I have not had an opportunity of ascertaining the views of the department in connection with these matters, and I much regret that at the present time I cannot give an answer.

Mr. BATH asked the Premier: Does he intend to institute inquiries into the charges made by the Chief Inspector of Factories against the Principal Medical Officer, during the recent inquiry before the Public Service Commissioner?

The PREMIER replied: Any charges made against a public servant can be fully dealt with by the Public Service Commissioner, under Section 47 of the Public Service Act.

QUESTION—LEEDERVILLE POPULATION.

Mr. BATH asked the Premier: 1, Has the attention of the Colonial Secretary been drawn to the allegations in the Press, that His Excellency the Governor was misled in regard to the population of Leederville as disclosed by the census recently taken by the Electoral

Department? 2, Is he aware that at the present date the population is below the necessary 5,000? 3, Is it the intention of the Government to carry out the provisions of the Municipal Corporations Act 1906, by revoking the proclamation gazetted four wards? 4, If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: I have not had an opportunity of going into this question, but I have noticed a statement in the Press that at present Leederville has not the required population provided for in the Act. The question will be carefully considered, and the hon. member will be advised as to the action the Government intend to take as soon as the matter has received consideration.

QUESTION—ELECTIONS NEXT YEAR.

Mr. BATH (without notice) asked the Premier: Can he give any idea as to the intentions of the Government next year in regard to calling Parliament together, and fixing the date of the general election?

The PREMIER replied: The date to which Parliament is to be prorogued will be set out in His Excellency's Speech this afternoon. I may say, incidentally, that the Speech has not yet been framed.

QUESTION—RAILWAY ENTRANCE, BEAUFORT STREET.

Mr. T. L. BROWN (without notice) asked the Minister for Railways: Will the entrance to the Perth railway station at Beaufort street be open during Christmas week?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The hon. member representing the constituency has already asked the question, and I have replied to it.

Mr. T. L. BROWN: That is no answer to my question. Surely I can get an answer as well as the member for the district. A number of people in North Perth have asked me to seek this information. I suggested to the hon. member that he should ask the question, but in his absence I am asking it,

BILL—METROPOLITAN WATER AND SEWERAGE AMENDMENT.

Third Reading.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. TAYLOR: This Bill was carried to its present stage at the last sitting, but there were several points to be considered.

The PREMIER: It was not likely the Bill would be agreed to by another place. There was an understanding that nothing new would be introduced in another place to-day. The third reading was merely a formal matter in this House.

Mr. TAYLOR had no idea what the understanding was that had been arrived at with another place. The Minister for Works had conveyed the idea that there were certain provisions which would make it possible for the Government to appoint a board, and give adequate power to the board to decide upon a standard for the sewerage system of the metropolitan area. Since the Bill had gone through the Committee stage a member for the metropolitan district had pointed out to him that he was very sorry the measure had been advanced so far because it only brought Perth under its provisions.

The Minister for Works: It brought the whole of the metropolitan area under its provisions.

Mr. TAYLOR was glad to hear that.

Question put and passed.

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

BILL—WORKERS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENT.

Read a third time, and returned to the Legislative Council with amendments.

BILL—MARINE INSURANCE.

Second Reading.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. N. Keenan) in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill which passed its second reading in this House in August last, and members are therefore seized

of its provisions. It is a measure dealing with a most important branch of our commercial life, and it is very necessary it should be brought into law. I hope members will help to facilitate its passage. Members will remember that when I spoke in August last I traced the history of marine insurance legislation in the State, and pointed out that we were working on old antiquated legislation of the time of the Georges. I also said that the Board of Trade in England had undertaken an inquiry with regard to the legislation and that the Imperial Parliament had passed a Bill in accordance with the requirements of commercial life as they existed to-day. The present measure is a copy of the Bill which was passed through the Imperial Parliament, and it is the most recent legislation on the question. I have no hesitation in asking members to accept it. I do not think the House desires me to cover the ground which I dealt with last session. The Bill sets out very clearly what an insurable interest is and prevents that conflict which happens now where parties have an insurable interest of an indefinite character. It also defines insurable value, which also is a matter of great importance. It refers to defeasible or contingent interests and points out clearly the position when more than one insurer is covering the same risk. There has been considerable trouble on matters of this kind owing to there being no provision as to the relative liabilities of the parties. The result of this trouble has been litigation. This is purely a non-contentious Bill, and I hope it will be put through.

Mr. T. WALKER (Kanowna): Although the Attorney General says the Bill is non-contentious, I submit it is a very important measure. This House is entitled to farther explanation as to the reason for introducing it at this juncture, when we are almost in hearing of the guns declaring Parliament prorogued. The Attorney General tells us this Bill is a copy of the one passed recently in England. What new principles are there in this Bill which do not exist in the present Act? I have looked through

the existing measure, and cannot find that this Bill does more than systematise and codify the existing law. I cannot ascertain a new feature, any addition to the law already existing. On the initiation of Responsible Government we took over the law as it existed in England, and therein are contained all the elements of the present measure. We are now setting an exceedingly bad example, for we are asked to pass a measure which may be, as the Attorney General claims, a valuable Bill as codifying the existing law, but we are asked to accept it merely on his assurance. It is quite impossible for us to go through this Bill. [*The Attorney General:* It was before the House last session.] Yes; and it was passed through the House on the authority of the Attorney General, but that is not the way Bills should be passed through this Chamber. We should not be guided simply by a mere assertion, however great the authority might be, that the measure should be brought into law. We should not consider a question in bulk, but should go into the minutest details. Possibly the Bill could be greatly improved by certain amendments, and the mere fact that the Board of Trade in England and the Legislature of the old country have adopted this measure, is not the guarantee this House requires. Our local companies and marine matters generally are not on all fours with those existing in Great Britain. We have local conditions which may require specialising in the Bill. There appears to have been no attempt at an adaptation of the English measure, but the Bill before us is an exact copy of the Act existing in the mother country. It is necessary for us to deal closely with this subject because at the present time we are anxious not only to get our own mercantile fleets but also to obtain ships of war, and to pass a measure of this kind hastily and without consideration, and without bearing in mind the new conditions which will shortly arise, would be most unwise. The measure has no urgency and I am not aware of the Chamber of Commerce, or any other body more immediately interested in shipping matters, having clamoured for it, nor am I aware that the local marine

insurance bodies have asked for it. It is hard to understand who promoted this Bill unless it is merely a desire to take over bodily legislation as it comes along from Great Britain. We may be doing some considerable injury by passing the measure, as the conditions here are very different from what they are in the great shipping centres of Europe. I do not want to disparage the law because it was made in Great Britain, but we should have our own legislation dealing with the particular circumstances and conditions in which we find ourselves. I do not think this Bill anticipates anything of the kind. We get too much of that merely taking over *holus bolus* the laws of Great Britain. With regard to the necessities of the case, I do not think there is a single insurance company that will suffer or a single insurer who will suffer because the Bill is postponed until another period, when it can be more closely adapted to the requirements of our time and place. Nobody will suffer; there is no privilege or command given to the insurers or the insurance societies, or shipping insurers generally, that we cannot already obtain by the existing law, dating as the member tells us, back to the days of the Georges. We not only have the general laws, but we have had such decisions in the old country, such explanations and interpretations of the law by the marine courts, that we are not one whit behind what they are in Great Britain at the present time. The best that the Attorney General can say for the Bill is that it is declaratory law, it tells us what is already the law, and it does not in any sense amend or re-enact.

Mr. Daglish: It is harmless.

Mr. WALKER: Harmless as far as Great Britain is concerned. I have not much objection to it generally speaking, but I object when we have one hour or two only to consider a Bill of this enormous dimensions.

Mr. Daglish: Do not take more than your share then.

Mr. WALKER: I am taking the Bill's share. It is a Bill of no less than 93 clauses and two schedules.

Mr. Bath: One for each member, and 43 over,

Mr. WALKER: Two for each member. I want to suggest most seriously that we have no right to deal with Bills of this kind at this late hour. To my mind, if I may be allowed to use the expression, it is scandalous to be introducing Bills of such dimensions now. We are in this position perhaps, that with the exception of the Attorney General there are only one or two capable of dealing with a matter of this kind at all, and we are to that extent not qualified to debate the measure; therefore if we accept the Bill at this moment we accept it purely on the authority of the Attorney General. I can conceive, if time permitted to deal with the matter, certain modifications and conditions, and the possibility of improvement, so as to fit this measure in with the circumstances of the Commonwealth. I would like to ask the Attorney General what other States of the Commonwealth have adopted this Bill, and I would also ask has the Commonwealth itself, which will ultimately have to deal with shipping, taken this measure particularly under its management? Has the Federal Parliament taken over this Bill; has it dealt with it; have Victoria and New South Wales dealt with it? I forget for the moment the Federal list that the Constitution confers on that governing body to the exclusion of the local governing bodies, but I am rather under the impression that shipping is one of the exclusive prerogatives of the Federal House, and if that is so, we are anticipating them.

Mr. Foulkes: The inter-State conference passed some resolutions as to this legislation.

Mr. WALKER: These resolutions passed by the inter-State conference doubtless will ultimately formulate themselves into an Act or a Bill by-and-by, and the various States no doubt will be asked simultaneously to pass a measure, or it will be done by the Federal body itself; but to jump this Bill and rush it through as a matter of absolute urgency is not right; could it not wait for another session? Must it pass, or the greatest calamities happen? It seems to me the height of absurdity. I can understand it of an impulsive character like the

Attorney General, who likes to do a lot of work in a short time. These things are commendable under ordinary circumstances, but at this stage, when we are all nervous from the effects of last night's long debate and consequently are not qualified to discuss a Bill, we are not justified, that is my strongest point, however good the measure may be, in rushing it through when it cannot be debated. The Attorney General himself had to apologise for the short speech he gave on the subject. Is the subject worth dealing with? If so, the speech of the Attorney General this morning was absolutely unworthy of the subject. He will I am sure admit he would have given a fuller explanation of the measure, and taken members more into his confidence, if it were not that he wants to get this Bill through at the very last hour without discussion and without consideration. In other words, if we were not on the very threshold of the prorogation he would have treated the measure with more dignity and consideration, and he would have treated the House with more courtesy in respect to the information we have a right to demand under the Constitution. I personally prefer to enter my strong protest against the introduction of this Bill at this late hour, and in the next instance for anticipating Federal legislation that must deal with the subject, and for the next reason the fact that we are taking out of the hands of the Federal Parliament the right to instruct the Federal nation generally as to what is the best course to take in regard to this legislation. There has been a conference on shipping matters generally, and the Attorney General cannot assure us when the recommendations and modifications of insurance may be considered. I want to tell the Attorney General that there is nothing new in the Bill that is not already existing, and again I repeat that we should not pass the Bill when it really is a Federal matter.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (in reply): I would not have submitted the Bill at this hour in the last stage of the session, had it not received the seal of this House and of another House last session,

It was dropped last session in consequence of the sudden close of the session, or it would certainly have then become law. We passed it and another place passed it, and by accident it did not become law. Insurance covers the risk which everyone takes if he has anything brought to this country even from the other States or from any other part of the world to any of our ports. Anyone who gets freights sent to him always gets an insurance on them, and the present insurance companies draw up various conditions; one company issue one set of conditions and another company another; and we are passing this Bill so that there can be a set of conditions and a fixed policy such as members will find in the schedule of the Bill. It will form a standard insurance, and there will be no trouble as there is nowadays of perusing a document to know the insurance one is going to get for the premium one pays. We are not entrenching one iota on the Commonwealth grounds; we are providing a means of our own for the purpose of covering freights imported to this State; and under the circumstances, seeing that the seal of this House has been given to the measure, it is not too much to ask that the measure be considered now.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair, *the Attorney General* in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Marine insurance defined:

Mr. TAYLOR: Why make clear what was clear enough already?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The clause set out, in terms subsequently defined in Clause 4, what constituted the contract of marine insurance.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 17—agreed to.

Clause 18—Insurance is *uberrimae fidei*:

Mr. TAYLOR: The insurance contract might be avoided by either party if the utmost good faith were not observed by the other party. Who should determine what constituted the utmost good faith?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : The expression meant that all matters pertaining to the insurance contract must be fully disclosed by the parties. Otherwise the court could make the contract void.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 19 to 22—agreed to.

Clause 23—Contract must be embodied in policy :

Mr. TAYLOR : The policy might be executed and issued either at the time when the contract was concluded, or afterwards ?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL : The parties to the insurance agreed orally or by correspondence to the terms ; and the acceptance of the risk sometimes preceded the execution and issue of the policy.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 24 to end—agreed to.

Schedules (two), Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, the report adopted.

Read a third time, and *passed*.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier : Woods and Forests Department Annual Report.

By the Honorary Minister : Department of Agriculture Annual Report.

BILL—GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS AMENDMENT.

Legislative Council's Amendment.

One amendment made by the Council now considered in Committee.

Mr. Daglish in the Chair, the Minister for Railways in charge of the Bill.

Clause 16—Strike out Subclause 1 :

The MINISTER: The amendment was an unimportant one. The subclause relieved the Commissioner from any liability as to fencing district railways, but the Commissioner was not under any liability to fence railways at all; the subclause was inserted to make it more emphatic. It would not entail any obligation on the Commissioner to fence railways. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. T. L. BROWN opposed the motion on the grounds that members had spent a considerable amount of time in dealing with this Bill, and now, because the Council thought fit to amend it we had to give way to them. The Assembly should not be dictated to by the Council on any occasions, and if the Minister had shown anything like the spirit he had displayed this morning when replying to him (Mr. Brown), he would have resented the Council's interference, and the Minister would have stood higher in the estimation of members. The Minister had said this was a simple matter; everything that had come before the House during the last few days had been simple, because Ministers wished to rush the measures through. The Minister should stand on his dignity and insist that the measure as passed by the Assembly should become law.

Mr. H. E. BOLTON: This amendment was one of the sensible things that had come from another place. We should not differentiate between district railways and existing railways. Under the parent Act it was not provided that the Commissioner of Railways should not be liable to fence. Why should the Commissioner be relieved of the expense of fencing a district railway and not relieved of that expense in connection with the existing system? Members should not oppose this amendment. It would not be well to lose the Bill for the sake of opposing this paltry suggestion from another place.

Mr. DRAPER : The only effect of enforcing the fencing of railways was that supposing stock were killed and the Commissioner had not fenced the railways he would be liable. If we left the Bill in the same position as the principal Act the Commissioner's liability to carry passengers safely was unaffected. The Commissioner was liable under common law to carry passengers safely, and if it came to the knowledge of the Commissioner that it would be dangerous in certain places for the safety of the passengers to leave the railway unfenced, and if passengers were injured, the Commissioner would be responsible. That was a position we should not interfere with, namely, the safety of human life. The amend-

ment from another place put the district railways in exactly the same position as the existing railways and it was certainly an advisable proposition.

Mr. TAYLOR: We could accept this amendment. We should place these district railways on a similar footing to other portions of our railway system. Wise amendments from another place were very scarce, and when they came along we should hail them with delight.

Mr. UNDERWOOD opposed the Council's amendment. We had decided dozens of times that we could not afford to build these agricultural railways and fence them. If we had decided that, where was the harm in putting it in the Bill? It appeared to him that the amendment was a mere straining on the part of the Council to get in an amendment to justify their existence. The clause as it left this House made the matter absolutely clear, and that should be our object.

Mr. HOLMAN: We had built these agricultural lines on the ground that they were not to be too costly. Were the people in the districts now asking to have every facility that was given on other lines? By striking out this subclause we practically admitted that we were liable for fencing.

The Minister for Railways: No. It simply put the district railways in the same position as existing railways.

Mr. HOLMAN: When a case came before the court it would be quoted that the Legislature intentionally threw out this provision prohibiting claims in connection with fencing.

Mr. DRAPER: If a man's cattle strayed on to a railway line and the cattle were killed by a train, the Government were under no responsibility for the cattle killed, because every man was supposed to keep his cattle on his own property. The only liability arising was in connection with the carriage of passengers safely. An accident occurred between Claackline and Newcastle. It had been brought to the notice of the Commissioner that a horse had derailed a train, and that cattle had been constantly, for 12 months, straying on the railway line. It was held that there was evidence of neglect on the part of the Commis-

sioner, as it was his duty to protect the passengers and to use every precaution to prevent cattle from straying on the line. The only liability that arose was as to the carriage of passengers.

Mr. HOLMAN: Did the Minister consider that undue influence would be brought to bear on the Government to have certain district railways fenced, so as to save land owners in various parts considerable expense?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS
There was not the slightest possibility of undue influence being brought to bear on the Government. The Commissioner was fencing in most of the sidings, for the reason that when a farmer brought in his produce it should be protected from a neighbour's straying cattle. This was being done for the protection of the produce, but it would be impossible to fence in all lines. It was not the intention of the Government to incur this responsibility; the cost was more than the Government could bear. The striking out of the provision placed the Commissioner in the same position as he stood in regard to all lines of the State.

Question passed, the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, a message accordingly returned to the Council.

DISCHARGE OF ORDERS.

The PREMIER moved—

That the remaining Orders of the Day be discharged.

Question passed.

At 12.55 noon, sitting suspended until 2.30 afternoon.

COMPLIMENTARY REMARKS.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore) Before the House is prorogued, I would like to extend to you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of hon. members, our best wishes for a merry Christmas and a happy New Year. The present session has undoubtedly been one of the most strenuous I suppose in the Parliamentary history of Western Australia; at the same time it is pleasing to note, notwithstanding the fact that we have had some very con-

tentious measures—the Land and Income Tax Bill and the Electoral Bill, I suppose two of the most contentious measures we could consider—that the best of good feeling has prevailed here during the discussions, with the exception of one or two occasions when, if I may make use of the term, we were a little bit over the odds. No doubt the good feeling that has existed during some of the all-night sittings when this House has been in Committee, is largely due to the tactful way in which the Committee has been handled by the Chairman of Committees and his deputies; and without wishing to be invidious, may I allude to the good work done by Mr. Hudson and Mr. Ewing in their capacity as deputy chairmen. I can only hope that members one and all will enjoy the recess, and I have no doubt they will return with renewed vigour, to oppose measures or support their principles in the same manner as they have done during the present session. At the same time I would like to convey to the Clerks of the House through you our appreciation of the courtesy which they have extended to members on all occasions, as well as to the officers of the House generally. Personally, I have been indebted to them on many occasions for advice and assistance, and I would like also to thank members generally for the courteous manner in which they have assisted me during the session.

Mr. T. H. BATH (Brown Hill): On behalf of the Opposition, I would like also to convey to you, Mr. Speaker, our best wishes for a merry Christmas and a happy time in the forthcoming New Year, and a good rest from the strenuous duties that have characterised this session. I also wish to convey the same compliments to the Chairman of Committees, and to the Deputy Chairmen and officers of the House. I agree with the Premier that this has been a strenuous session: I do not suppose anyone has realised that more than I have done, and I thoroughly appreciate the rest that now looms very closely. At the same time I wish also to say that undoubtedly, although we have had a very strenuous session, probably more all-night sittings and longer sittings than have characterised

any previous Parliament, it has been remarkable for the orderly way members have conducted themselves, with the exception of one or two lapses. We are all human, and when members are kept up all night it is not to be expected that their tempers will be of the smoothest. Probably this result has been largely due to the excellent good temper of members of the Opposition, and while I would also say that while I do not think much of some of the Premier's brand of politics, I may say as Leader of the House he has always shown the very best of temper, and his tact and his good temper have smoothed over many difficulties.

Mr. SPEAKER (in response): Mr. Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and hon. members, I desire in the first place to thank you very heartily for the kind manner in which you have wished me the compliments of the season, and also to reciprocate the same feeling to every member of the House. In doing so I feel I am only echoing your sentiments in saying that considering the long hours we have sat during this session, longer than I have ever known during my experience in this House, on all occasions we may say that members have fairly well conducted themselves under the unusual strain on them. If there have been exceptions, as I suppose there always will be in any deliberative Assembly, I can assure those with whom I found fault that I acted in obedience to the Standing Orders. Perhaps I am to blame for being in the early part of the session a little too indulgent to hon. members; but subsequently I decided that it would not do to allow disorder to continue, and I then became more strict, and will continue to be strict in future. I have, at one time or other, been present in all the State Parliaments of the Commonwealth, and during the past few years have been several times in the House of Commons when I visited the old country; and I can say that I never noticed in any of those Parliaments the frequent interjections which are a feature of the debates in this Chamber. I, therefore, felt it incumbent on me to be more strict and more severe than I had been previously. However, I ask the House to accept the assurance

that when I have occasion to call an hon. member to order I have no regard whatever to his personality. I have merely to control the House in accordance with the Standing Orders; and I hope it will never be imagined that I am actuated by personal feelings. I should be sorry to think that any member was of that opinion—far be it from me to entertain a personal animus against any member, or against any other human being. I return my warmest thanks to you all for your expressions of good will, and I hope we shall all meet again next session, actuated by the same spirit of good fellowship which has been exhibited to-day. I may add that my thanks are due also to the chief and the subordinate officers of the House for the kind assistance they have rendered to me at all times; and particularly am I indebted to the chief officers, the value of whose assistance is recognised by every member of the Chamber.

Mr. H. DAGLISH (Chairman of Committees): I should like to acknowledge the Premier's kindly reference to me as Chairman of Committees, and to take this opportunity of thanking you, Mr. Speaker, for the advice and assistance you have always willingly afforded me; and likewise I particularly desire to thank the Deputy Chairmen (Mr. Hudson and Mr. Ewing) who have so frequently relieved me, especially at a time, a week or two ago, when I was unable fully to discharge my duties. I wish also to convey my thanks to the officers of the House for their ready assistance. I join with you, Mr. Speaker, in wishing all members a merry Christmas and a happy and prosperous New Year; and while admitting that this has been a strenuous session, I can strongly emphasise the fact

that it has been one of the most peaceful sessions of Parliament in which I have had the pleasure of taking part. Good feeling has been more pronounced, and the absence of offensive personalities has been more marked than during any preceding session of which I have had experience. I trust that during next session we shall not have to face the same long hours and the same arduous work; for I feel satisfied that shorter sittings will conduce to the health of members and to the advantage of the State.

Mr. J. EWING (Deputy Chairman): I desire to thank the Premier and the Chairman of Committees for their kind remarks regarding my colleague the member for Dundas (Mr. Hudson) and myself. I can but say it has given us great pleasure to occupy the Chair, and that we are highly sensible of the honour that was conferred upon us when we were appointed Deputy Chairmen.

PROROGATION.

Black Rod appeared at the Bar at 3 o'clock, and in the name of His Excellency the Governor commanded the attendance of members of the Legislative Council Chamber, to hear His Excellency's reasons for proroguing Parliament.

Mr. Speaker and hon. members proceeded accordingly to the Council Chamber, where His Excellency was pleased to give assent to the Appropriation Bill, and to other Bills of the session which had been completed and passed. His Excellency then delivered an Address, proroguing Parliament to Thursday, 25th June, 1908. [*Vide Council proceedings, ante.*]

The Session then closed.