A child of eleven years, when in an hotel, needed as much protection as a child of seven. The words "having charge" were too vague.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was no objection to the amendment, if it was not going too far.

Hon. J. T. GLOWREY: There was a danger that if a grown-up child was sent to bring its parent home and the parent was drunk, a mistake might be made and the parent might be liable to a month's imprisonment.

Amendment passed.

Subclause 2 amended consequentially: clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 17, 18, 19—agreed to.

Clause 20—Prohibition of sale of liquor to persons declared to be habitual drunkards:

Hon. J. W. HACKETT: Where was this provision taken from?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was a similar provision in the Licensing Act. This was a redrafting.

Hon. J. W. HACKETT: The provision in the Licensing Act would still exist?

The Colonial Secretary: Yes. It was not repealed.

Hon. J. W. HACKETT: In the Licensing Act it did not make the habitual drunkard subject to farther punishment, as this clause would do.

The Colonial Secretary: The latter part of the clause was the same as the law in England.

Clause passed.

Clauses 21 to 34—agreed to.

Clause 35—Male persons connected with prostitution:

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: This clause provided that any male person who persistently solicited should be liable to imprisonment. There was no need for the word "persistently"; the one offence should be sufficient to bring such persons within the four corners of the law.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was the existing law. It would be rather severe to inflict imprisonment for 12 months for the first offence.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE moved an amendment—

That the word "persistently" be struck out.

Hon. J. W. Hackett: It would be too dangerous.

Amendment withdrawn; clause passed.

Clauses 36 and 37—agreed to.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6.15 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 13th August, 1907.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock.

Prayers.

ELECTORAL—WEST PERTH, RESIGNATION.

Mr. SPEAKER intimated that he had received the resignation of *Mr. F. Illingworth*, member for West Perth.

On motion by *the Premier*, seat declared vacant.

QUESTION—CAMELS IMPORTATION, REGULATIONS.

Mr. MALE asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Has his attention been drawn to the fact that the newspapers in

the Eastern States have reported that the disease known as surra has been discovered in this State? 2, Also to the fact that the Eastern States have issued regulations prohibiting the importation of stock from this State into the Eastern States? 2, As it is not known that surra does exist here, and as these regulations will prohibit stock being taken from Kimberley and other pastoral districts into Queensland and the other States, what steps are being taken to counteract this report? 4, If the disease known as surra should be found in this State, what steps will be taken to stamp it out immediately?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied; 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, Dr. Cleland, the Government Pathologist, and Mr. Giles, an Entomologist, have been despatched to Port Hedland to make a full investigation. That work is now proceeding, and the progress reports to hand are of a very satisfactory nature as regards surra. The Eastern States officials have been advised of what is being done, and fuller information will be issued as soon as a final report comes to hand. The rumour that the tsetse fly had also been discovered near Port Hedland is absolutely without foundation. The fly submitted by Mr. Edgar is another biting fly known as the horse-tick fly, and has been identified to be similar to others caught at Fremantle and handed over to an inspector of this Department as far back as the 9th January last. 4, If the disease is found on animals in this State they will be immediately destroyed, and every precaution will be taken against its farther spread.

QUESTION—COMPANIES AND DIVIDEND DUTY.

Mr. DAGLISH asked the Colonial Treasurer: Is it true that some joint stock companies registered and trading as such outside this State are carrying on business in Western Australia without registration under the Companies Act, and thereby avoiding the payment of dividend duty?

The COLONIAL TREASURER replied: Whenever it has been ascertained that a Foreign Incorporated Company is not registered under the Local Companies Act, application has been immediately made for the Company's balance sheet and payment of duty as required by the Dividend Duties Act; and a printed circular has been forwarded to all known companies soliciting orders in this State, drawing attention to the provisions of the Act.

QUESTION—STATE BATTERY, BOILER TEST.

Mr. SCADDAN asked the Minister for Mines: Is it true that a Galloway tube was recently taken out of a boiler and replaced by the boiler-maker at the Mulwarrie State Battery, and again put into commission without either a test or other examination by the Inspection of Machinery Department?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, The then District Inspector of Machinery was aware of the repairs being effected. 2, After repairs were completed the boiler was satisfactorily tested to 105lbs. per square inch by two departmental officers in the absence of an inspector.

QUESTION — GOLDEN POLE BOILER TEST.

Mr. SCADDAN asked the Minister for Mines: Is he aware that a boiler on the Golden Pole G.M. Co. was worked during the present year after its certificate had expired, and farther that the furnace crown of this boiler was so seriously blistered as to cause repairs to be necessary, and was again put into commission without an examination by an Inspector of Machinery?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, There is no record of boiler having been worked without certificate at Golden Pole mine, but inquiries will be made. 2, No record of furnace crown being "seriously blistered," but inquiries will be made.

STANDING ORDERS REVISION.

Council's Requests when Insisted on.

Debate resumed from the 8th August, on the motion by Mr. Daglish, "That in

communications between the two Houses with respect to Bills in which amendments are requested by the Legislative Council, this House cannot agree to take into consideration any message in which a request is pressed or insisted upon."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. N. Keenan): Before entering on the subject matter of this motion I desire to commend the method in which the mover treated the subject. It is absolutely essential that we should be dispassionate in a matter of this kind, but at the same time we should be equally firm in protecting the interests of this House. I propose to put the matter before the House on somewhat different lines from those adopted by the member for Subiaco, while at the same time I arrive in my conclusion at the same result. I propose to ask the House to consider how it is that these Chambers have arisen in various parts of the British Empire in which Constitutional Government has been established, and to point out that it will be found on consideration that in every case they have been borrowed from those which existed in the home country. So far back as 1791, when the Queen Colony Government Bill was before the House of Commons in Great Britain, Mr. Fox laid down as a principle never to be departed from in granting a measure of local self-government to colonies founded by the British Empire, that they should reproduce in those colonies the constitution existing in the old country. It is true they did not create in those colonies a House or Chamber which has a right of succession such as the House of Peers; but, instead of that, they have created Second Chambers and endowed them with those powers and privileges, and only those powers and privileges, accorded to the House of Lords under the British Constitution. These Chambers are either nominative or elective. Even to-day in New Zealand, in Queensland and in other States enjoying local self-government, the Upper Chamber is still nominative, but whether such are nominative or elective, the principle still applies, as the duties assigned to them and the powers allotted to them are such, and such only, as, under the British Constitution, are enjoyed by and entrusted to the House of Lords. The argument has been addressed to this House by the member for Subiaco, not for the purpose of asking the House to endorse it but to ask members to differ from it—that the powers claimed by the Second Chamber under other British Constitutions are in advance, or are suggested to be in advance, of those which we have allowed in the past to our Second Chamber. I would point out the instance which I think shows in a perfectly clear light, what is the interpretation of those powers even on the most liberal grounds. That instance is the colony of New Zealand. In that colony there was a special Act passed by themselves and subsequently ratified by the Imperial authorities—and therefore having all the powers any Constitution Act amending the original Act can have conferred upon it—under which it purported to confer the like privileges, immunities and powers on both Houses in the New Zealand Constitution actually enjoyed and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament in the United Kingdom. I do not think any instance could be cited where the language is broader or more inclusive than that, the granting to each House in the New Zealand Constitution of the privileges and immunities and powers enjoyed and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom. Some time after the passing of that Act, in the year 1854, a difference arose between the two Houses of the New Zealand Legislature as to the statutory right of the Legislative Council to amend Bills of Supply. Although the original Constitution was silent on this point the Secretary of State for the Colonies was of opinion from the first that the Imperial practice by analogy should prevail. The original Constitution granted to the colony by the Imperial Parliament was silent on the point, but they had subsequently passed this Act conferring on them the rights and practice of the British House of Commons. The New Zealand Upper House argued from that that they had obtained the right to amend Supply Bills, and this difference

of opinion arose, as I said, in the year 1854. As the result of the collision of opinion between the two Houses it was agreed to send home a statement of the facts of the case for submission to the English Judges to obtain their opinion on the point raised. The New Zealand Legislature sent home to the Earl of Kimberley, who was then Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the portion of the reply which I propose to read and which is signed by Lord Coleridge, and the then Mr. Justice Jessel, is of great importance. They first of all point out that they were asked to express an opinion in consequence of a difference having arisen between the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly of New Zealand concerning certain points of law and privilege, and it was agreed that the questions in dispute should be referred for the opinion of the law officers of the Crown in England. They then say :—

> "We are of opinion that, independently of the Parliamentary Privileges Act 1865, the Legislative Council was not constitutionally justified in amending the Payments to Provinces Bill, 1871, by striking out the disputed Clause 28."

That was the matter in dispute, the right to amend a Bill of Supply. The learned counsel go on to say :—

> "We think the Bill was a money Bill, and such a Bill as the House of Commons in this country would not have allowed to be amended by the House of Lords."

It is impossible to get beyond the weight of those words. They point out that in spite of the local Act, which purported to confer large powers on the Upper Chamber, they were of opinion that a money Bill, particularly the Bill in question, was such a Bill which the House of Commons would not have allowed to be amended by the House of Lords, and therefore it was not one which would be allowed to be amended by any House in a position similar to the House of Lords in the Constitution of that colony. They go on to say :—

> "and that the limitation proposed to be placed by the Legislative Council on Bills of aid or supply is too narrow, and would not be recognised by the House of Commons in England. (2) We are of opinion that the Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865, does not confer on the Legislative Council any larger powers in this respect than it would otherwise have possessed. We think that this Act was not intended to affect, and did not affect, the legislative powers of either House of the Legislature in New Zealand."

And they pointed out in conclusion that their opinion goes to the extent that the practice of the House of the Commons is the practice to be followed in the Colonial Legislatures. In addition to that, there were two Constitution Acts, one in Victoria in 1855 and one in British North America in 1867, and by Section 56 of the former Act and by Section 53 of the latter it was declared that Bills appropriating any part of the public revenue or for imposing any tax or impost shall originate in the Assembly or House of Commons. But constitutional practice, it is pointed out in the book I am reading from (*Todd*), goes much farther, justifying the House of Commons in the general control over the revenue and expenditure, and the control is defined in the following words :—

> "All aids and supplies, and aid to His Majesty in Parliament, are the sole gift of the Commons, and it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants, which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords."

The latter portion of the quotation is taken from a resolution passed by the House of Commons, which will be found in the Parliamentary Papers of the House of Commons for the year 1678. The extract goes on—

> "This parliamentary principle, moreover, has been generally if not universally admitted in all self-governing British colonies, by the adoption in both legislative chambers of standing orders which refer to the rules, forms, usages, and practices of the Imperial

> Parliament as the guide to each House in cases unprovided for by local regulations."

I would direct the attention of members to this fact, that we have exactly the same in our Standing Rules and Orders of both Houses; we preserve this phraseology by words almost similar to those which I have quoted. Our Standing Order says:—

> "In all cases not provided for hereinafter, or by sessional or other orders, resort shall be had to the rules, forms, and practice of the House of Commons of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, which shall be followed so far as they can be applied to the proceedings of the Council."

It is therefore perfectly clear that the analogy from this case is absolute in our case; and I shall go farther in the latter part of my argument and point out how it was the Upper House in our Constitution came into existence. Before doing so there is one point in regard to which I differ very materially from the argument of the member for Subiaco, and it is this. He in some measure rested the weight of his argument on the fact that one House is elected by all the electors in the State, and that the other House is elected by only a certain number having a certain qualification, and he drew a distinction by reason of such fact; but we find this is not so, for in Cape Colony both Houses are elected on exactly the same franchise, yet in that colony they insisted just as strongly as we do in our Constitution, that the Lower House should be the one House with the right to vary Bills of Supply, and no amendment of money Bills should be allowed by another Chamber. The reason, when we examine it, is very apparent. The Government of the day cannot be responsible to two Chambers; whatever Government is in power must be responsible to one Chamber; and in our Constitution and in any Constitution of a similar character the responsibility of the Ministry of the day begins and ends with the Lower House.

Mr. Bath: What about the Minister in the Upper House?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: By a special feature of our Constitution, there must be one Minister at least in the other House.

Mr. Bath: That implies the responsibility of the Ministry.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member must fully recognise this fact, that no vote of the other House can force the Ministry to resign. True the Upper House may embarrass the Ministry of the day; they may even refuse to pass——

Mr. Taylor: The Land Tax Bill, for instance.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: They may refuse to pass any Bill for supply, they may reject the measure *in toto*, and they may farther create the *impasse* that happened in Victoria. Some members remember the friction between the two Houses which occurred in Victoria, and the relations became so strained that the Government had to pay the State servants without having authority to do so. That is not the argument I have just submitted; it is impossible that any Government could exist if it were responsible to two different Houses, and under the Constitution the responsibility remains with the Lower House. Whether members of the Upper House are elected on a restricted franchise or on a franchise the same as that of the Lower House is immaterial, and the example of that may be shown in the one I have furnished in regard to the Cape Colony Constitution, where exactly the same rights and privileges were asserted for the Lower House, although under their Constitution the Upper House was elected on exactly the same franchise. The member for Subiaco dealt with the position that arose under the Commonwealth Constitution Act, but that is not at all an argument in favour of the matter put forward by the member, for this reason: when it was determined to federate the whole of Australia there were two distinct methods of Federation, one Federation by which each State would have the same representation, and the other one was the Federation of the States on the basis of the numbers of the population, the representation of the

States being arranged according to quotas of the population. It is quite clear that each system could stand separately. We could have had Federation based entirely on the representation of the States, but we chose to weave the two together creating two Houses in which all the States were equally represented in the Senate, and in the House of Representatives the representation was based on the gross population of all the States; and therefore it is possible to assert and it has been asserted that the Ministry does owe some responsibility to the Senate in the Federal Constitution. It is not following the creation of a House originally contemplated in the Constitution, it is an entirely new idea to any British Constitution, and it was adopted for the purpose of arriving at a basis under which the States of Australia accordingly would be able to federate. In support of that, I would like to quote to the House from *The Commonwealth of Australia,* by Professor Moore. On page 122 he says :—

> "In the balance of power in the Commonwealth, it is a factor not to be neglected that, while the Senate has a recognised power over money Bills beyond that of any other Second Chamber in the British dominions, it can hardly exercise the extreme power of rejecting the Bill for the 'ordinary annual services of the Government' upon any other ground than that the Ministry owes responsibility to the Upper not less than to the Lower House. That is a position which in the future the Senate, as the House of the States, as well as the Second Chamber, may take up; but it is a position from which, even in the history of Parliamentary Government in the colonies, the strongest supporters of the Upper House have generally shrunk."

It is important to bear in mind the weight of the distinction, because we do find that the main argument for the insertion of certain rights and privileges by another place is the argument of the comparison of the Standing Orders of the Senate. I assert confidently that that comparison absolutely fails. It is not merely a second Chamber but the House of the States, and as such House it is in the position which no second Chamber is in any Constitution to be found elsewhere in the British dominions. The original Constitution Act of 1889 in this State under Section 6 gave the Governor power to summon to the Legislative Council such persons to the number of 15 as he thought fit, and thereafter from time to time, as vacancies occurred, in like manner summon to the Legislative Council such other persons as he thought fit, and every person so summoned thereby became a member of the Legislative Council. Therefore under the Constitution Act of 1889—the first Constitution Act of this State—the Upper Chamber here was nominative. It is true that in subsequent sections provision was made for the gradual conversion of the nominative into an elective Chamber. I shall deal with those sections in a moment; but it is important to bear in mind that the original Constitution Act created an elective Lower House and a nominative Upper Chamber, and provided that in certain conditions the nominative House should gradually merge into an elective House. But if we are to take the analogy which has been taken by some persons, to the Federal Senate, immediately we find there is the greatest possible distinction between this Constitution and the Commonwealth Constitution. Here we have a nominative House first provided for, a House that resembles in all respects as far as is possible the British House of Lords; and on the other hand we have a popular Chamber which resembles, as far as local conditions will allow, the British House of Commons. Under Section 42 it was provided that—

> "When six years shall have elapsed from the date of the first summoning, under Section 6 of this Act, of persons to the Legislative Council, or when the Registrar General of the Colony shall have certified by writing under his hand to be published in the *Government Gazette* that the population of this Colony has, to the best of his knowledge and belief, exclusive of aboriginal natives, attained to 60,000 souls,

whichever event shall first happen, this part shall come into operation; provided that the Governor-in-Council shall have power, by proclamation in the *Government Gazette*, to farther postpone the operation of this part for any period not exceeding six months."

Except for that postponing, the provision came into operation at the end of six years; and the result of such coming into operation is given in Section 44, which reads:—

"From and after the coming into operation of this part, the Legislative Council as constituted hereunder shall take the place under this Act and have all the powers and functions of the then subsisting Legislative Council, which shall then cease to exist."

Shall have all the powers and functions—it does not say the Council is to have any more powers, or other powers and functions, but only the same powers and functions as the nominative Chamber under this Constitution. The Act goes on to describe that in such circumstances the then Legislative Council shall cease to exist. I submit the argument is one that cannot be challenged, that the only rights and powers that are properly inherent in another place to-day are the rights and powers that were conferred upon the first Chamber, the nominative one; and that, therefore, if there be any weight at all in the argument that there should be some distinction made between a nominative one and an elective Chamber, that argument does not apply in the present instance. I have pointed out, I hope successfully, that it is really no criterion, that it does not matter whether a House is elected upon a broad franchise, a low franchise, or is nominated; but it is a matter to be borne in mind that the object of all these Constitutions was to reproduce the British Constitution, and to reproduce it under conditions which only allow to the second Chamber the enjoyment of the rights and privileges properly enjoyed by the House of Lords. I do not propose to go farther into this question. The matter that was traversed by the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish), dealing with a number of Conventions which were held for the forming of a Commonwealth Constitution, does not, in my humble opinion, apply; because I submit, the distinction I have made between that and the second Chamber under our Constitution is one that will be concurred in by this House. I agree with the hon. member that we should be absolutely firm in supporting the rights and privileges of this House, of which we are only trustees. The present rights and powers of the House have been enjoyed in the past by our predecessors, and it is our duty to secure the enjoyment of them in the future to our successors. I trust, therefore, that the House will unanimously support the motion moved by the hon. member, to the effect—"That in communications between the two Houses, with respect to Bills in which amendments are requested by the Legislative Council, this House cannot agree to take into consideration any message in which a request is pressed or insisted upon." The motion is intended to refer only to Bills of Supply. We have no intention of denying the right of the other Chamber to amend Bills which are not Bills of Supply; but as regards those matters which from time immemorial in the British House of Commons have been the peculiar privilege and right of the Lower House, we will not for one moment be wanting in our endeavour or capacity to defend them.

Mr. T. WALKER (Kanowna): After the lucid and exhaustive treatment of this subject by the member for Subiaco and the hon. the Attorney General, I feel that it is scarcely necessary for me to add even one farther word. But I regard this as an issue of such importance, and a matter which possibly may have some importance in the history of this State in the future, that I cannot forbear adding a few words, in support only of what has been said; more by way of emphasising than adding any farther light to what has already been said upon the subject. The concluding remarks of the Attorney General express my feelings. We are dealing with no new phase, no new question, but with one that has become embedded in the constitutional history of Great Britain. And although,

as has been pointed out by the Attorney General, there have been some slight departures from the old British Constitutional Law on this matter, those departures are exceedingly limited; they are new; they are still experiments, and there is nothing at all in them so far, in their operation, to justify a departure from our own foundation. How old that rule is may be gathered from a paragraph which I will inflict on the House from the *Constitutional History of England*, by Stubbs. It says:—

> "That the Commons should have a decisive share in the bestowal of money grants had become since the reign of Edward III. an admitted principle; and the observance of the rule is illustrated by the history of every Parliament. In the foregoing pages the regular votes of taxation have been noticed as they occurred; and the decision of Henry IV. in 1407 has been referred to as recognising the right of the Commons to originate, and, after it has received the assent of the Lords, to announce the grant, generally on the last day of the session. The ordinary form of the grant expresses this; it was made by the Commons with the assent of the Lords spiritual and temporal. This particular form curiously enough occurs first in the grants made to Richard II. in 1395, the previous votes of money having been made by the Lords and Commons conjointly. It was observed in 1401 and 1402, and henceforth became the constitutional form."

Now, I submit that a rule, or a law, that has had that antiquity in the British House of Commons itself, by that very antiquity, is its own vindication. In the multiplicity of changes that have taken place in the last two centuries, not only in the form of government, but in everything else connected with politics, is it not remarkable that this very principle is by the greatest statesmen held inviolable? And rightly so; because, as has been pointed out, the people must have some little responsibility; the people who pay the taxes must hold someone responsible. And who responsible but the Ministers? Who are they, but those responsible to the Lower Chamber, the representatives of the people? I quite agree that the mere method of electing a second Chamber has nothing to do with its functions, as altering the character of the first Chamber in holding the purse-strings. No matter whether the members of the second Chamber be nominees or be elected, they are still a revising and a class Chamber. The innovations being introduced into the Senate and into the State Constitution in Tasmania have been not in regard to the elective or the nominee character of those Chambers; but have really been because some of our new politicians on this side of the world—apart from the old English struggles for the freedom and powers of the House of Commons—have forgotten the lessons of history and have looked across the waters to the United States for an example. We have been clearly told this by the passage read by the Attorney General, that—

> "In certain British colonies—as for example in South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria, and the Cape of Good Hope—the Legislative Council is elective whilst generally the system of nomination prevails. The elective councils have plausibly urged that—in accordance with the practice in the United States where, in Congress and the different State Legislatures, while the Constitution requires that tax Bills shall originate in the lower branch, it is customary to provide that the Senate or the first branch may concur therein with amendments, as in other Bills—they ought to be at liberty to propose amendments to Bills of Supply."

That is fairly indicative that it is a departure from the well-established law in the British dominions, and an intimation of what, so far as the control of the public purse is concerned, has been an absolute failure in the Constitution of the United States, where the Senate has been made not only an equal branch of the Legislature with the House of Representatives, but has absolutely been made more powerful, a stronger House. It is the Senate that works the whole of the mischief at the present moment in the United States; and

it is the lack of power placed in the Lower House that has made it so difficult to prevent that corruption which is the source to-day in the United States of the enormous trusts and combines which are the curse of the American people. I say that this alteration in the rights and powers of the Senate was a departure sought to be followed by some of the framers of our Commonwealth Constitution. They did not seek strictly to follow the old lines of the British Constitution, because they had a difficulty to meet here that was met with in the American Constitution, where different States but one nation had to come into unison in order, as has been pointed out, to preserve what are called State rights —making therefore a distinction between the Senate and the other House. Strictly so to speak, the House of Lords and the Upper House here are revising Chambers; it is for them to revise and modify according to their class prejudices; but they have no power to control the administration through the public Treasury. In America it was sought to make an alteration so that the State, speaking as a State, might have the power, in the protection of their own interests, to control the expenditure, or to refuse the expenditure, of money. It is in that respect that the Constitution of the Commonwealth differs from our Constitution. Under the Federal Constitution the two Houses are not, strictly speaking, in the relationship of our Chamber to the Upper House in Western Australia. There the Senate, as the representative of the States, has State rights to preserve, it is created for that ostensible purpose. Therefore, it has given to it certain powers different from those granted under the British Constitution. But we have followed and are following the exact lines of the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and all our authorities lay down that we must have resort to the customs of the House of Commons and the House of Lords for our guidance in working out Australian Constitutions. These Constitutions are more or less copies of the British Constitution, and the reason for not giving the House of Lords or any Australian Upper House power over money Bills is not because those Houses are hereditary or nominee or elected, but simply because it is recognised fundamentally in our law that an Upper Chamber is a class Chamber. That is the reason; and I will take what I think is one of the best authorities on this point, because it was written for those studying the law. I speak of *Stephen's Commentaries*, and will read the following extract from page 359:—

> "Firstly, with regard to taxes.—It is the ancient indisputable privilege and right of the House of Commons that all grants or subsidies or parliamentary aids do begin in their House, and are first bestowed on them; (*a*) although their grants are not effectual to all intents and purposes, until they have the assent of the other branch of the Legislature. The general reason given for this exclusive privilege of the House of Commons is that the supplies are raised upon the body of the people; and therefore it is proper that they alone should tax themselves through their representatives in that House; a reason which would be unanswerable if the Commons taxed none but themselves, but it is notorious that a very large share of property in the possession of members of the House of Lords is equally taxable, and taxed with the property of the Commons; and the true reason seems rather to be this: The Lords being a hereditary body created by the Sovereign, are more liable to be influenced by the Crown than the Commons, who are an elective body freely elected by the people, and liable to be rejected at the next election. It would therefore be extremely dangerous to give the Lords any power of framing new taxes; it is sufficient that they have the power of rejecting any which a too lavish or an improvident House of Commons may grant. And so reasonably jealous are the Commons of this valuable privilege that they will not permit the least alteration or amendment to be made by the Lords in the mode of taxing the people by a money Bill."

We have there distinctly stated the reasons for denying the Upper House tha

power. The members of that House are so to speak of a different temper, a different class of people. They are the propertied class, those who in England constitute the aristocracy. In this country I scarcely know by what name to term them; but it is evident to all of us that they are of the moneyed class, the conservative class. [*Mr. Scaddan*: The plutocracy.] I do not like to be so disrespectful to another place as to give its members that designation; but they are a class body, and it is well, therefore, that from them should be taken, if they ever had it, the right to alter or to interfere with a money Bill which places impositions on the people. Nor can it be said that because the Upper House in the old country is hereditary, our Upper House cannot be considered as analogous to that House. The matter has been discussed, and very ably, in *The Government of England*, by Dr. W. E. Hearn, a Victorian writer whose work has been more than well spoken of by some of our ablest modern constitutional authorities; and Hearn defines the position of the Victorian Upper House, quoting in fact the "Memorandum on the Explosives Bill," as follows:—

> "It appears, then—and these views are founded upon a judgment of the Supreme Court—that Section 1 is the primary enabling authority; and that Sections 56 and 57 are substantially two independent provisos upon Section 1—and not the one upon the other—the former relating to the Legislative Council, the latter to the Legislative Assembly. In these circumstances, to the question how far Section 1 is limited by Section 56, the answer is plain.
>
> The Legislative Council may exercise all its powers, under Section 1, except that it may not either originate or alter any Bill,—(*a.*) for appropriating any part of the revenue of Victoria; or (*b.*) for imposing any duty, rate, tax, rent, return, or impost. In other words, the powers of the Council are restricted to the extent mentioned in the case of Bills for appropriating revenue and for providing Ways and Means, but no farther or other restriction is expressed. Thus, the Constitution Act [of which, of course, ours is a copy] enacts as rules of positive law for the regulation of the Council the rule as to origination, which is a rule of the English Common Law, and the rule as to amendments, which is a comparatively modern claim of the House of Commons, not indeed admitted, but habitually acquiesced in, by the House of Lords."

I think nothing farther need be said. There is on the part of the other branch of the Legislature an attempt to arrogate the powers to themselves, to usurp the powers and the functions which properly belong to the Legislative Assembly. If we are true to the traditions of history and to the laws of our land, the good example set us by the British Constitution, we shall resist to the utmost that attempt at encroachment. I feel it would be a waste of words to say more on the subject; I feel that every hon. member is prepared to stand by what has served Britain for the centuries that have passed since the year 1300; and I am convinced that what has been so complete a success and has led to so little friction and failure in Britain is quite good enough to stand by in this Legislative Assembly of Western Australia.

The PREMIER (Hon. N. J. Moore): After the very exhaustive manner in which the question has been treated by the three members who have given it their study, I feel sure the House would be wanting in its duty if it did not uphold the arguments advanced. The method hitherto adopted in our parliamentary practice is founded on precedent; and I can see no reason that has been advanced for any deviation from the usages and customs which have hitherto prevailed. It is our duty I take it to oppose rigorously any innovation on our branch of the Legislature, any innovation which would materially curtail our present privileges. It is set out in our Constitution that money Bills shall originate in the Lower House, and that is one point of distinction between the Assembly and the Council. In the Governor's Speech His Excellency addresses

the Legislative Assembly separately when he deals with money questions, though the two Houses are addressed jointly when he deals with ordinary legislative measures. As has been pointed out, our practice on this subject follows the practice which for so many years has prevailed in South Australia; and I agree with the contention of the member for Kanowna (Mr. Walker) that, irrespective of whether the Upper House be a nominee or an elective House, the fact remains that the Legislative Assembly must control the purse-strings of the country. I do not know of any necessity for dealing at greater length with this matter. Those who have already spoken have dealt with it thoroughly; the arguments they have advanced are in my opinion sound; and I feel it my duty to support the motion as it now stands, with the slight alteration mentioned by the Attorney General—that the words "of Supply" be inserted after "Bill." I take it the mover will make that alteration.

Mr. Daglish: It is not necessary.

Mr. Walker: The Council can make requests in respect of money Bills, and can make amendments in others.

Question put and passed.

BILL—PORT HEDLAND-MARBLE BAR RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 8th August.

Mr. W. J. BUTCHER (Gascoyne): It is not my intention to follow precisely the lines laid down by the member for Roebourne (Dr. Hicks), because I am one of those who believe thoroughly that the development of the great North-West depends entirely on the Government assisting it with a railway. But I am also one of those who, rightly or wrongly, think it their duty to see that all expenditure is made, first, in the best interests of the State, guarding at the same time the interests of the taxpayers who have to find the money. It is necessary, I take it, to consider the whole question and deal with its every phase as it appears to me. As to the sea ports, which of course play an important part in the question, we have first Port Sampson, a magnificent roadstead with deep water close to the jetty, which is approachable at any time in the year and at any tide. At this port the Government have already spent a large sum of money in erecting a jetty which compares more than favourably with any other jetty in Western Australia. Steamers of any draught can go alongside that jetty and discharge or take in cargo of any sort; nor is any tide likely to interfere with them. As stated by the Minister who dealt with the matter, it is as good a port or roadstead as was Fremantle many years ago, though Fremantle was then the principal shipping port of Western Australia, and served for that purpose during a great many years. I will admit that when a willy-willy is blowing it will be practically impossible for any vessel to lie alongside the jetty. Dangerous it would be for any vessel to be near the coast on those occasions, and I venture to say there is not a harbour on the North-West safe for any vessel or any large steamer when a willy-willy is blowing; the safest place then is out at sea. I have seen Fremantle Harbour on many occasions when a vessel could not lie alongside the jetty. When the wind blew from the north-west they had to leave the jetty and go out to sea, or some other anchorage. Point Sampson is a place which has yet to be connected with Roebourne by tramway. I understand that the work is at present under contemplation by the Government. As it is a work that has to be done, it will be to the advantage I take it of everybody concerned if it were made the starting point for a railway, or at any rate if a wider gauge were put down in anticipation that some day it might be wanted. The next port is Balla Balla, some distance to the eastward between Point Sampson and Port Hedland where the Government anticipate starting this railway. I have a plan which I should like hon. members to see if they desire it, showing conclusively that the port of Balla Balla is on the face of it one of the nicest little ports we have in the country, and one which might be made

positively safe from any sea or wind with a very small expenditure. I believe the Government at present have a survey party in that locality with the object of ascertaining if it is a suitable place from which to start a railway. Next we have Port Hedland. An hon. member reminded us the other day that Port Hedland was like heaven : it was a very good place when you got there, the trouble was to get there. It is well known that it is an exceedingly dangerous place to approach; steamers of a comparatively light draught only can get in there, and they can only get in at high tide. [*Mr. Underwood*: But what is the rise and fall of the tide ?] As I said in an interjection the other night, it will cost an enormous sum of money to make Port Hedland a harbour suitable for any purpose. It will probably cost half a million of money. I am not prepared to say what it will cost, but there is an enormous sand bar, the outer bar, that will have to be dredged, and there is a rocky bar, known as the inner bar, which will have to be taken away before steamers can approach the harbour at any time of the year and at any season. These are my dealings with the ports alone. When the Minister was speaking on this Bill he said, that speaking of No. 1 route from a mining point of view, the line did not touch auriferous country until the 74-mile peg was reached, but from there to Nullagine there was auriferous country all the way. I wish to emphasise the words "from a mining point of view." Now, from what point of view other than a mining point of view was there need for introducing this Bill ? What other object have we in dealing with this Bill ? Does the Minister for a moment hope that there is to be any agricultural development in that part of the world to justify a railway ? If the railway is not for mineral purposes I want to know for what purpose it is to be constructed. The member for North Fremantle seeems to think that because by an extraordinary fluke the Southern Cross line, which apparently was not justified, turned out to be a payable proposition, we are justified in taking on all sorts of gambles in every other part of the country ; but that was a piece of luck, let me remind the hon. member, that we are not justified in taking on in the present state of the finances. The Minister went on to say that none of the surveyed routes went sufficiently near Wodgina, and that, in the opinion of those qualified to judge, to serve that locality it would be necessary that it should be brought into touch with a sea port at Balla Balla. The Government apparently anticipate building two railways. First of all they will build a railway from Port Hedland to Marble Bar with the object of serving Marble Bar, and then it is proposed to build another railway to serve Wodgina from Balla Balla. It appears to me that originally Nullagine was the objective. There is no question about it that Nullagine was the gold centre, and that it was the objective. The present terminus, Marble Bar, stops short about 80 or 90 miles from Mosquito Creek or Nullagine. So it is not going to serve that locality. Also it is 65 miles from Wodgina, which is one of the principal tinfields in the district. It is producing and I believe is likely to produce a large quantity of tin. If we are to believe the Minister we must conclude it is a very important place indeed. Then the line is 60 miles from Cooglegong, another tin-producing district, and 14 miles from Moolyella. This is the line which is being built to develop the mineral resources of our great North-West. [*Mr. Taylor* : It does not touch them.] The Minister says it does not touch any auriferous country for the first 74 miles. It appears to me this line is simply going to serve the Port Hedland people and an idle and useless or worked-out centre at Marble Bar, where I believe there is a newspaper, a warden's court, and one or two other buildings necessary to make up a mining township such as that. This line will not touch one single mining centre that is likely to be worked for any considerable time, if ever, and I want the House to understand that there is a quarter of a million, perhaps more than that, at stake. Are we justified in simply going on with a gamble, in this condition of the finances of Western Australia, and dabbling in

such speculations as these with a quarter of a million of the taxpayers' money? The Government are aware—they must be—that they had a subsidised battery at Marble Bar some time ago. I think I am justified in saying there were absolutely no results from it. I have no doubt the Minister will correct me if my statement is not correct. There is not one single mine as far as I can see from the Government reports that has been reported on as showing gold and going down to any depth. The British Exploration Company had a considerable amount of dealing with the Marble Bar centre, but their mines were not deterred by the cost; they kept up while the capital lasted, and would not have shut down had not the gold cut out. It is not the worked-out fields of Marble Bar we have to take into consideration; it is the baser metals of the North-West we have to consider, not the gold deposits that are there; and let me remind hon. members that the baser metals of the North-West are not at Marble Bar. [*Mr. Underwood*: Where are they?] I am sorry the hon. member has been eight years in that part of the State and not found them. [*Mr. Underwood*: There is more tin around Marble Bar than anywhere else.] The proposed expenditure on this railway is not going to assist the baser metals in the slightest degree. It is going to serve no interests in the North-West except the interests of the merchants in Marble Bar, and those of a few landholders or speculators who probably have land in Marble Bar or Port Hedland. If the line is to be constructed from Port Hedland to Marble Bar it stops 90 miles short of any mines working at the present time. [*Mr. Underwood*: What about Lalla Rookh?] The asbestos discovery was visited by a Government inspector some time ago accompanied by the asbestos company's manager. I ask the Minister whether he has any reports. None have been laid on the table, and it would be interesting at any rate if the reports of that officer were made available to members. The Minister in speaking on the Bill made no reference to it at all. As far as I can see we have absolutely no proper information before the House, and so far as I can judge we are not justified in any shape or form in passing this Bill. As it is at present it appears as I remarked before, that the Government have been more mindful of the interests of the merchants of Port Hedland and Marble Bar, than they have been of the taxpayers' money. The railway is not going to benefit the State, nor is it going to open up any of our mineral resources in the North-West. To my mind the Government should have had an alternative scheme of surveys in order to allow the House to decide if other routes were not preferable to the one they have suggested. The Minister spoke of Station Peak, which I would like to remind the House is not touched by this route. There was a large body of ore the Minister said, and 12,000 tons had returned 11,000 ounces. However, valuable as this deposit seems to have been, the Government have not taken into consideration the interests of that district at all; they are not sending the line within an enormous distance of it. Then there is Wodgina. The Minister said that Wodgina might be made the terminus of a line from Balla Balla or Roebourne, serving a number of promising districts *en route*, which would be more generally served in this way than by a branch line from Port Hedland or Marble Bar. It is evident by this that the Minister considered Wodgina was a district well worth serving, and it was anticipated sending a branch line backwards from Marble Bar. It shows the Minister recognised the value of this particular centre, and that it was entitled to recognition by the Government in the way of railway facilities. The Minister said, "A railway right through from Roebourne to Nullagine through Croydon, Station Peak, Wodgina, and Cooglegong would be through mineral country the whole way, but it would be much longer—naturally—than the Port Hedland-Marble Bar route though it would not serve that particular centre." Granted; here again the Minister is aware of the value of these places *en route* from Roebourne to Marble Bar, but he apparently overlooks it in the interests of the Marble Bar and Port Hedland people.

Dealing with the potentialities of Wodgina, the Premier in introducing the Bill said they had tin and tantalite there, and that there was no doubt the tin lodes were marvellously rich. He added that, as mentioned in the Press, one block recently found weighed 150lbs., and he had personally seen blocks of close on 100lbs. ; also that the mines had been able to win sufficient loose tin to carry on development in their properties. Farther, he predicted that the fields would be very large, as from Wodgina 30 miles to the south and 20 miles to the east the country had been proved. The Minister used these words recognising the value of the deposits and the country, and yet he is not prepared to give the advantage of railway communication. My opinion of this proposal is that the line should go, if it is justified at all, from Point Sampson *via* Croydon, Station Peak, Wodgina and Cooglegong to Nullagine. [*Mr. Taylor* : What is the distance ?] A couple of hundred miles. If you take a line for 125 miles, which is the present proposal, you will stop a considerable distance short of some of the principle mining centres in that district. Some of these large properties will under the present proposal be 150 miles from the railway. It would be far better to start the line from the right point and let it run in the right direction, rather than having the line going nowhere and ending in the same place. [*Mr. Gordon* : Who mentioned Point Sampson as the original objective ?] The hon. member has not been listening or he would have heard me say that the line should start from Point Sampson and go *via* Croydon, Station Peak, Wodgina, and Cooglegong to Nullagine, the last-named being the objective. If there is not sufficient money to build the line along the whole of that route, a start should be made over the line indicated and have it constructed as far as the funds will permit. Subsequently, if it is found justifiable, the line should be completed. Within 12 miles of Point Sampson there is one of the richest copper mines to be found anywhere in the country. Along the whole of the route I propose there are rich working mines, and in addition, if we are going to recognise that the pastoral industry is to be of any value at all to the railway, it may be pointed out that the line I propose would pass through 22 pastoral properties, possessing no less than 275,000 head of stock. These would all be within reach of that railway. These are figures which the Government were not in possession of at the time the Bill for a railway to run from Port Hedland to Marble Bar was proposed. While pastoral country does not provide a very great inducement for railways freights there is always a certainty of a small amount of freight to and from pastoral properties. The Government are going to spend £250,000 in building a line from Port Hedland, whereas it would have been much better to spend that sum in starting a line from Point Sampson and continuing it as far as the money would enable the work to be carried. To confirm my remarks with reference to the mines at Marble Bar, I would like to read some extracts from a report of the Government Geologist who spent a considerable time in that country in examining the mines. Altogether he spent the cool portions of three years there. The State Mining Engineer, on the other hand, drove through that country with the Minister for Mines in a buggy, and accomplished the journey in a remarkably quick time. Of course he reports favourably, but the Government Geologist is somewhat pessimistic. Are we justified in believing an officer who spent the cool portions of three years in the district in thoroughly investigating the mines, or the State Mining Engineer who passed through the district rapidly and was only there for about a month? The reports of the Government Geologist have been published, and hon. members have had an opportunity of seeing them. In Bulletin No. 15 issued in 1904, the Government Geologist gives his views of the Marble Bar portion of the Pilbarra region, and in his summary on page 109 says :—

> "As, however, it cannot be said that, from anything yet seen, mining development has been carried out sufficiently far to warrant the State incurring any heavy outlay tending towards

> the development of the latent resources of the district, much might be done in the way of boring, with the view of testing the continuity of the deposits in depth, or other cognate points."

I want to know whether this has been done by the Government or by the mine owners? No, they have never made an attempt to ascertain whether the mines go to any depth; but they have simply taken advantage of the exemption clauses under the labour conditions and have sat down on one of the most prominent blocks and agitated for a railway to go to Marble Bar to assist them. Three years later, after going more fully over the whole region, the Government Geologist sums up the situation in Bulletin No. 23, page 81, thus:—

> "The auriferous reefs cannot be said to be long and are, as a rule, small, though they occasionally swell out into large lenticular masses. So far as may be judged, from the official returns from the various properties, it appears that the shoots of gold are rich, while the condition of the various workings implies that they are short."

On page 87 of the same volume he clinches the position thus:—

> "It seems, therefore, that the past history of gold mining in the district will be the future history, namely, the discovery of short rich chutes in veins and reefs of the type described in these three reports, the exploitation of which seems best suited to the operations of small companies."

That is the opinion of the Government Geologist who has been for three years in that locality. Are we to believe what he says. If he is worthy of the salary he is receiving and if he is a geologist capable of carrying out the duties he is supposed to undertake, we are justified in believing his opinion in preference to that of the State Mining Engineer who only went through the district with the Minister and occupied one month at the outside. The reports bear out what I say, and that is, if the line is justified at all, it should be sent from Point Sampson, for it would then pass through the whole mineral belt from start to finish. I have a small chart here which might be useful to members. It shows the line of auriferous country and the proposed railway line, and if anyone can say we are justified for one instant in passing this Bill in its present form, then I have no further remarks to make on the subject. The member for North Fremantle when speaking to the Bill said that as there was nothing at the time the Southern Cross line was started to justify it, and as it turned out a great success, we are now justified in doing a bit of a gamble. We are to do a bit of a gamble with £250,000 of the taxpayers' money. It is all right to be liberal with other people's money. [*Mr. Underwood*: How did you gamble on the Cue line?] Two wrongs do not make a right, and if we were mistaken in the past that should only make us more cautious in the future. The member for North Fremantle also spoke of the Whim Creek mine and said it was the biggest thing in Australia. That hon. member went through the country with a parliamentary party and thus speaks of the property, and yet he supports a line from Port Hedland to Marble Bar which will not assist this great mine at all. The hon. member also spoke of the Wodgina tinfield, and said it was one of the richest things to be seen anywhere. The position is that neither of these rich mines to which he has referred will be served at all by the line which the Government is proposing. The mines will not go anywhere near these rich propositions at Wodgina, and some 75 miles of the new line will be built across a country which is non-auriferous. This line is a useless proposition from beginning to end, yet the hon. member is going to support it. [*Mr. Taylor*: Have another parliamentary trip.] I think we must. The member for East Perth was another member of the party who went to the North-West to investigate matters and speaking of the Bill the other night he said that it was a justifiable plunge to make. He gained his experience in the same way as the State Mining Engineer, and that was by simply travelling through the district at a very fast rate. Mr. Male, the member for Kimberley, also went to the North-West, and he candidly admits

that the projected line does not seem to him to be the best scheme of opening up the region; but he says he accepts the decision of the Government because it is on the responsibility of very responsible officers. One of these responsible officers is the Government Geologist, and I have just read portions of the reports from that gentleman as regards the mineral value of the country. The other responsible officer is the State Mining Engineer who accompanied the Ministers. Are we to accept the opinion of the former or the latter gentleman? The member for North Fremantle spoke of the Whim Creek copper mine. I am perfectly aware that that property is freehold, but that does not mean that a railway passing that way would not be likely to get the benefit of the ore raised by the Company. [*Mr. Bolton*: I think so.] It is very likely to be a large contributor to the railway. While dealing with that I would like to ask the Government how it was, in the face of the fact that a railway to open up the mineral resources of the North-West had been in contemplation for some time, they thought themselves justified in giving to a company permission to build a tramway to the port of Balla Balla and at the same time to give that company a concession or a lease of the jetty and the tramway for a period. I say such a thing should not have been done while we were contemplating the building of a line in that country. I want to know the reason why this was done, and I hope the Government will make some satisfactory explanation of the position. With reference to the question of sleepers, from my experience in the district I am perfectly satisfied that jarrah sleepers, unless treated with some chemical, will not last. I think the first ones that are put in will be completely consumed before the last hundred miles of the line is laid. I strongly advocate the use of steel sleepers. The line will not be as good run on steel sleepers as on jarrah sleepers, and I impress on the Government that they should make themselves satisfied that by treating jarrah sleepers they will be made to last five or six years or it will mean an everlasting expense to continue sleepering the line from one end to the other. I hope the Government will consider the question of withdrawing the Bill and will introduce another which would mean the opening up of the great mineral belt from Roebourne *via* the places I have already mentioned, making Nullagine the objective; in that case I should be pleased to support the Bill.

On motion by *the Treasurer*, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—GOVERNOR GENERAL'S VISIT.

The PREMIER in moving the adjournment of the House said: No doubt members are aware that His Excellency the Governor General will arrive at about seven o'clock and there will be a welcome at the Railway Station by members of the Ministry, by Mr. Speaker, and the mayor and councillors of the city and members desired to have an opportunity of attending another function later on.

Mr. BATH: Although somewhat out of order I desire to make a few remarks in the nature of an explanation. This morning when I observed in the newspapers that the House was to adjourn at the tea hour this evening, I thought it was rather a breach of courtesy that such a statement should occur without any intimation being made to me by the Premier. I am glad to say that I have had a conversation with the Premier, and he informs me that it was not on information given by him that the statement appeared in the Press, but that he intended to speak to me on the matter this evening. Although Ministers are anxious, and it is their duty in their official capacity to be present at the welcome to the Governor General, I understand that members are not invited and I ask whether it is not possible for one Minister to remain so that members of the House can go on with the business. Then we should not waste the remainder of the evening; we shall only have to go to our homes if we adjourn now.

Mr. Johnson: The country wants our attention, too.

Mr. BATH: If we adjourn now there will be the usual rush towards the end of the session.

The PREMIER: As I pointed out I think the Speaker is desirous of attending the reception, and I understand a good many members have been invited.

Mr. Taylor: A few of the chosen.

The PREMIER: I hope the Leader of the Opposition will recognise that we are desirous of paying every respect to His Excellency the Governor General, and it certainly would not be possible to carry on the business with so many members absent.

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not know whether I am in order in debating the point.

The SPEAKER: I think the member is hardly in order.

Mr. TAYLOR: I will be brief. The Premier's reasons for adjourning are reasons why we should not accept the motion. It is the desire of Ministers to meet His Excellency the Governor General and it is also your desire, Mr. Speaker, in your official capacity, to do the same. From what I can gather very few members of the House will take part in either of the functions indicated by the Premier.

Mr. Heitmann: A good reason why.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am reminded there is a good reason why the invitations are not extended to members generally, but I ask the Premier to allow one of the Ministers to remain in charge of the House so that we may carry on the business of the country to-night until a reasonable hour, say 10 or 11 o'clock. You know as well as I do that towards the close of the session the business will be rushed. We shall be sitting five days a week, starting at two o'clock, and sometimes sitting all night. While there is work for the Parliament to do we should do it, and I hope the Premier will see his way, without taking a vote of the House, to withdraw the motion and allow one Minister to remain. I am sure one Minister will not be missed from the functions.

Question (adjournment) put, and a division (called for by Labour members) was taken with the following result:

Ayes	..	..	25
Noes	..	..	15
Majority for		..	10

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Barnett	Mr. Angwin
Mr. Brebber	Mr. Bath
Mr. H. Brown	Mr. Bolton
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Collier
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Davies	Mr. Holman
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Hudson
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Gull	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. Stuart
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Hicks	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Walker
Mr. Layman	Mr. Ware
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Troy (*Teller*).
Mr. Male	
Mr. Mitchell	
Mr. Monger	
Mr. N. J. Moore	
Mr. S. F. Moore	
Mr. Piesse	
Mr. Smith	
Mr. Veryard	
Mr. F. Wilson	
Mr. Gordon (*Teller*).	

Question thus passed.

The House adjourned accordingly at twelve minutes past 6 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 14th August, 1907.

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.