

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 6th September, 1893.

Erection of the Priestman Dredge—Tariff Bill: Message from the Governor—Tariff Bill: first reading—Grand Jury Abolition Act Amendment Bill: third reading—Real Estates Administration Bill: third reading—Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act Amendment Bill: recommitted—Kensington Lane Closure Bill: in committee—Grand Jury Abolition Act Amendment Bill: Legislative Council's amendments—Engine Sparks Fire Prevention Bill: in committee—Fremantle Water Supply Bill: second reading—Loan Bill, 1893: second reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4:30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

ERECTION OF THE PRIESTMAN DREDGE.

MR. MOLLOY, by leave, without notice, asked the Director of Public Works whether offers had been received for the work of erecting the Priestman dredge lately arrived in the colony; whether the amount it would cost by the method adopted would not greatly exceed such offer; whether local men were refused employment at this work; and whether a new arrival was taken off a steamer, he being about to leave the colony, and given this employment, and why this preference was given?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied that an offer was received, but it was not based on any specification, and did not cover the placing of the machinery on board or the fitting up, nor the painting of the hull, and the many larger and smaller details required to be effected before launching. One of the persons who made the offer referred to also tendered for the rivetting, but his price was the highest. It was estimated that the cost of the whole work, carried out under present method, would be proportionately cheaper. No local men were refused employment if they were qualified and required. No preference whatever was shown in selecting men for this work. Offers were received for rivetting, and the lowest tender was accepted; and the successful tenderer selected as his assistant the next lowest tenderer, who, it was understood, had only lately arrived in the colony.

TARIFF BILL: MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) presented the following Message to Mr. Speaker from His Excellency the Governor: "In accordance with the provisions of Clause 67 of 'The Constitution Act, 1889,' the Governor recommends to the Legislative Assembly a Bill intituled 'An Act to repeal the Tariff Act, 1888, and to make other provisions in lieu thereof,' for the purpose of raising the supply granted to Her Majesty.

"Government House, Perth, 6th September, 1893."

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that Mr. Speaker leave the chair, and that the House do now resolve itself into a committee of the whole to consider His Excellency's Message.

Question put and passed.

IN COMMITTEE.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved the following resolution: "That there shall, on and after the seventh day of September, 1893, be charged upon certain articles imported into the colony the various duties set forth in the Schedule of the Tariff Bill, 1893."

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported to the House, and the report adopted.

TARIFF BILL, 1893.

Introduced by Sir JOHN FORREST, and read a first time.

GRAND JURY ABOLITION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

REAL ESTATES ADMINISTRATION BILL.

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

WINES, BEER, AND SPIRIT SALE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

RECOMMITTED.

On the Order of the Day for the third reading of the above Bill,

MR. MONGER, in accordance with notice, moved that the Bill be recommitted, with a view of striking out Clause 20.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) hoped the House would not agree to recommit the Bill for this purpose. They had gone through the Bill very carefully, and dealt with its provisions in a deliberate manner, and carried it through committee by a large majority; and now the hon. member wished to recommit it, and have this question reopened. He did not know whether the hon. member thought that members were going to change their minds every five minutes. This particular clause was passed the other evening by a majority of members, and unless the hon. member thought he had a considerable amount of support, it was only delaying the business of the House to reopen the whole question.

MR. MONGER said he had no wish whatever to delay the business of the House, or to keep this Bill under the notice of members longer than was absolutely necessary; but he must contend that this particular clause which he wished to strike out had not received proper consideration the other evening; and, with all due respect to the Premier and his colleagues, he did not think it had received proper consideration at the hands of the Government. Of course, if it was the wish of the members of that House that the clause should remain in the Bill as it now stood, he supposed he should have to put up with it. He could only hope that members would see fit to allow the Bill to be recommitted, in order to reconsider the question at issue. He did not wish, himself, to see such a clause as this remaining on the statute book of the colony. He should certainly press for a division, if the Premier objected to the recommitment of the Bill.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Oh, I don't mind; recommit it if you like.

MR. SIMPSON said he was not aware whether, on the determination in the negative of the question that the Bill be recommitted, the new clause he had given notice of would go by the board with the resolution of the hon. member for York.

THE SPEAKER said the first question he should put was that the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of striking out Clause 20. If that was negatived, the hon. member for Geraldton would be in order in moving that the Bill be recom-

mitted for the purpose of adding the new clause he proposed to add to the Bill. No other points could then be discussed except that for which the Bill was recommitted.

Question put and passed.

IN COMMITTEE.

MR. MONGER moved that Clause 20 be struck out of the Bill. This clause, he said, dealt with colonial wine licenses, and provided that no such licenses should be issued outside the limits of a township. His reason for asking the House to strike out this clause was because he did not think it had received the consideration it was entitled to, and that people in the country had not had an opportunity of expressing any opinion upon such a sweeping provision. It had been alleged—and members by passing the clause the other evening agreed—that it was right and proper to establish these colonial wine shops in the towns, and yet it was not right but improper to allow people in the country the privileges extended to those in town. It was argued by that great temperance advocate, the hon. member for Northam, that if these colonial wine licenses were issued in country places, teamsters and others would congregate in that particular locality and make beasts of themselves. That was virtually what the hon. member's argument amounted to. But he contended that if we allowed these wine shops to exist in towns, the same thing would probably take place. If we were unable to trust the teamster and the farmer to call at a wine shop in the country without making beasts of themselves, he contended that we would be unable to trust the clerk and the mechanic to call at a wine shop in the town without doing the same. It appeared to him that if these wine licenses were necessary at all, they were more necessary in the country than in the town. There was nothing to prevent people who resided in the towns from going to any hotel and calling for colonial wine, and getting it. The only argument against that was, they would not get quite so much for their money as they would at a wine shop, the license for which only cost £2 per annum. The more wine shops, therefore, the greater quantity of wine would be consumed. This seemed to him to be offering a sub-

sidy for drinking. It appeared to him that the desire of members was to allow men to have an opportunity of going into wine shops in order to get a big drink for a small sum of money. On the other hand, they were told that men in the country were not to be allowed this privilege. To him, this clause seemed one of the most objectionable in the whole Bill. It allowed people in the town privileges which were refused to those who lived out of town; in other words, it recognised the larger drinking capacities of people in town as compared with the drinking capacities of people in the country. Undoubtedly, there were some people who wished to get as much for their money as possible, and if they could get more colonial wine in one of these wine shops than they could in a hotel, they would naturally go where they could get the biggest drink for their money, and these wine shops, instead of being the means of advertising a local product of the country, would be a curse upon that product. He contended—and he could speak from some little experience of this particular question—that if the quality of the colonial wine that was going to be sold at these wine shops was not an improvement upon the colonial wine that had been placed in the market in the past, it would do a great deal more harm to the man who drank it than if he went to a hotel and called for a glass of whisky. He really did not think this clause received the consideration it was entitled to when it was added to the Bill the other evening. If it should be decided that the clause was to remain in the Bill, he certainly hoped that the license fee payable for these colonial wine licenses should be increased. A paltry fee of £2 per annum would mean that, on every occasion when the licensing bench sat, it would be flooded with applications for licenses of this kind. He maintained it was an injustice to the man who paid £50 a year for his license for a man next door to him to be allowed to sell as much colonial wine as he liked upon payment of a paltry fee of £2 a year. He begged to move that the clause be struck out.

MR. MOLLOY said he must confess to having been in ignorance, when this clause was under discussion, that the license fee was so small, and he could quite see that it was likely to lead to the

licensing benches being flooded with applications for these licenses, from boarding-house keepers and others in our towns. He saw no reason why there should be any distinction made between wine which was the produce of the colony and beer which was the produce of the colony. He was afraid that if this clause became law we should find, from the wholesale manner that these wine licenses would be applied for, that the evil would be so great that it would be necessary very soon to check it by repealing the clause.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the reason adduced the other evening for inserting this clause in the Bill was to encourage the use of colonial wine, but, as the sale of intoxicating liquor had to be safeguarded and controlled, it was considered desirable to restrict these wine licenses to the towns, where they would be under police supervision. If they really looked forward to this colony becoming a wine-producing country, they must encourage the sale of the produce of the vine. He was not at all convinced that the multiplication of these wine licenses in our towns would tend to encourage drunkenness. It was not so in other parts of the world. France, where they drank wine with every meal, was not a country notorious for drunkenness.

MR. MONGER: Is the sale of it confined to the towns?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the object of restricting these licenses to the towns here was to have these wine shops under police supervision; and they might take it that the licensing bench would not issue these licenses to unworthy persons, or persons who were not of good fame and character. He held no very strong opinion on the subject himself; but he had heard nothing that afternoon to lead him to change his opinion, and therefore he should support the retention of the clause in the Bill.

MR. DEHAMEL said the argument of the hon. member for York appeared to be that because the clause excluded the country from its operation it ought also to exclude the town. He could not agree with that. He thought the system might just be tried in the towns, and, if it was found to work well in the towns, they might hope to see it extended to the country before long. He was not pre-

pared to say that any serious evil was likely to arise from the multiplication of these wine shops in towns, and he could not support the striking out of the clause.

MR. QUINLAN said if he were to consider his own interests, he would support the motion to strike this clause out. But it appeared to him that every facility should be given to encourage the sale of the products of the colony; and, as the licensing justices would have the power to restrict the number of these wine licenses, he did not think that they would lead to any evil result. He understood that some provision of this nature was in force in the other colonies, and that it had been attended with success. It had led to the fostering of a local industry; and this colonial wine industry being an industry that was likely to be very largely developed in this colony, he thought this clause was likely to have a good effect, and lead to the production of a better article. They might hope that competition would lead to that result, and they might hope that in a short time this colony would be able to produce an article equal to that now produced in South Australia. There was a large quantity of colonial wine now imported into this colony; but there was no reason why it should continue to be so, except that our local wines lacked age; for it was admitted that there was no colony better adapted for the growth of the vine than our own colony. As they had this session passed a Bill to encourage the cultivation of the soil and the planting of vineyards, he thought that every encouragement should be given to the sale of the products of the soil. Although the license fee was small, he did not see how they could increase it much, because a colonial wine and beer license only cost £5. He was unable to support the striking out of the clause.

MR. THROSSELL said he had strongly supported the introduction of this clause into the Bill, and he was not going to stultify himself by now supporting a motion to strike it out. He thought if we were to have wine shops at all, we should have them under such conditions as would protect the public, and produce the most beneficial results. He thought we could not do better than follow the example of South Australia, where colonial wine was sold under the most respectable

surroundings. The people of this colony had been largely stimulated of late to go in for vine culture, and he thought we should do all we could to encourage them, so long as the sale of wine was surrounded with proper restrictions, which could only be done in towns, where there was ample police supervision, and other restrictions of decency, which were not to be found in bush places.

Question put, and negatived on the voices.

MR. SIMPSON, in accordance with notice, moved that the following new Clause be added to the Bill: "The provisions of this Act shall come into force on the 1st January, 1894." He thought it was necessary that some time should elapse before the Act came into operation, in order to give clubs an opportunity of conforming with the provisions of the law. If the Act were to come into force to-morrow, no doubt it would simply obliterate every club in the land. Seeing that applications for licenses under the Act had to be made early next month (October) and they were now in the middle of September, he thought they might well delay the coming into operation of the Act.

MR. DEHAMEL thought there was a great deal in what the hon. member said; but he would suggest that he should make the date the 4th December, 1893, which was the first Monday in December, the usual licensing day.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) failed to see why they should delay the coming into operation of the Act at all. Everyone was aware of the provisions of the Bill by this time, and if they desired to conform with it, they could do so, he should say, in the course of a few days.

MR. SIMPSON said these clubs could not call their meetings, under their rules, without giving the members notice.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said they could call an extraordinary meeting. He did not think it would cause any hardship to *bonâ fide* clubs; on the other hand, if they postponed the operation of the Act until the beginning of next year they would be prolonging the days of those bogus clubs for the suppression of which the Bill was designed. If the hon. member for Geraldton would show him that any real hardship would be inflicted upon any *bonâ fide* club, if the

Bill came into operation at the end of the session—which was what the Government proposed—he should be glad to consider the point; but he did not think they should delay their legislation for the sake of only one club in the colony, even if that particular club were put to a little inconvenience. The evils which this Bill were intended to remedy were not evils of yesterday; they had existed for a long time, until they had become what some members called a disgrace and a scandal. If so, why should we delay the operation of a law intended to put down such abuses? He thought that even if the Geraldton Club did temporarily cease to exist, in the event of the Bill coming into operation at once, there would be some means found by which the club could be resuscitated, and reorganised, or “reconstructed.” In any case they would have until the 3rd October to comply with the provisions of the Act, as no license could be issued under the Act until that date. He should have much pleasure in forwarding copies of the Bill to all the recognised clubs of the colony, so that they would certainly have some time to arrange their affairs in conformity with the Bill. If the 3rd October was too close, he would have no objection to putting it off a week or two; but he saw no good grounds for putting it off for three months.

MR. MONGER thought it would be hardly fair to call upon these clubs to reorganise or reconstruct immediately, and if this Bill came into operation at once, many of the existing *bona fide* clubs would cease to exist. He might say here that there was a very big loophole in the Bill through which any club could get out of, if it wished, and which the legal profession had not been long in detecting.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): You had better amend it then.

MR. MONGER said it was not his Bill. He thought the motion of the hon. member for Geraldton was a very reasonable one, and he thought it was very unfair on the part of the Government to attempt to take advantage of any club which may have been constituted upon lines contrary to the provisions of this Bill, without giving them time to conform with those provisions.

MR. A. FORREST thought it would be a great hardship on some clubs if, in the course of a week or two, they should

have to close their premises, and sell off their furniture and effects. He thought they should have some time to reorganise themselves, so as to bring themselves within the provisions of the new Act; and he hoped the Government would agree to postpone the coming into operation of the Bill until next licensing day, which would be the 4th December.

MR. TRAYLEN said he was going to support the amendment for two reasons: one was that the Bill, as it stood, proposed to have a special licensing meeting in October; but since that clause was passed, the House had agreed to an annual registration fee, and it would therefore be necessary to have special licensing meetings every subsequent October. He thought there was very much more sense in having these club licenses to issue on the usual licensing day, the first Monday in December. He was going to support the amendment for another reason: he set himself against any dislocation of the ordinary course of business in the colony by having Acts of Parliament sprung upon the community, whether they were Tariff Acts or any other Acts. He would suggest that the Bill should come into operation on the 1st December, as the licensing benches would sit on the 4th of that month.

MR. MOLLOY could not assent to the statement that this Bill had been sprung upon members or upon the country. The necessity for it had been brought prominently before the country for months past. At the same time he thought the suggestion of the hon. member for Geraldton was a very reasonable one, for this reason: there were in existence at the present time what were called proprietary clubs, and this Bill proposed to do away with such clubs. If those clubs were willing to conform with the provisions of this Bill, it would be very harsh on the part of the Legislature to hinder them from doing so. It would ruin the proprietors of these institutions, who may have gone to considerable expense in fitting up their establishments, unless an opportunity was given them to prepare themselves for bringing themselves within the scope of the present Bill.

SIR J. G. LEE STEERE said he would just like to point out to the committee that, according to Clause 4 of the Bill, application for a club's certificate had to

be made fourteen days before the licensing meeting; therefore this Act must be brought into operation fourteen days before the Bench sat for granting licenses. If the Act did not come into operation until the usual licensing day, the first Monday in December, they would have to provide for the holding of a special licensing meeting not less than fourteen days after that date, otherwise it would be impossible for applicants to give the fourteen days' notice required by the Act.

MR. DEHAMEL said, although the Act might not be in actual operation, he saw no reason why the necessary notice should not be given beforehand.

MR. MOLLOY said that was a very funny notion, especially coming from a lawyer, that a notice required to be given under an Act should be given before the Act came into operation.

MR. SIMPSON said he would have much pleasure in altering the date he had originally proposed, to the first Monday in December, or any other day. He was absolutely indifferent about the date, so long as a reasonable opportunity was afforded existing clubs to bring themselves within the provisions of the Bill.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said it seemed to him they were getting into a fog, and that they had better report progress. He moved that progress be now reported, and leave given to sit again.

Agreed to.

Progress reported.

KENSINGTON LANE CLOSURE BILL. IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1.—Short title:

Put and passed.

Clause 2.—“All rights-of-way in and over the piece or parcel of land which lies between Hutt Street and Melbourne Street (commonly called Melbourne Road), in the City of Perth, known as Kensington Lane, and containing two roods twenty-nine perches more or less, shall henceforth cease and determine; and it shall be lawful for Her Majesty to deal with the said piece or parcel of land as if it had never been dedicated to the use of the public.”

MR. A. FORREST pointed out that this drain had been closed, by order of the Commissioner of Railways, for the

purpose of a railway station yard at Perth, with the result that there was an overflow of water in different parts of the city, which would entail considerable expense upon the City Council. He thought, as Mayor of the city, that some provision should be made whereby the City Council might call upon the Commissioner of Railways to make the necessary drains to carry off this overflow of water where it occurred. If the Commissioner would make a promise that he would do this, he would have no objection to the passage of the Bill.

MR. TRAYLEN said the point raised by the hon. member was certainly an important point. If they passed this Bill as it stood, the City Council would have no right to enter upon its own property. He believed the result of the action of the Railway Department, in covering up this drain, had been, in some instances, to cause serious inconvenience and injury to people, by the resultant overflow of water into the streets which was formerly carried off by this drain.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he could not make any promise until he had received the opinion of the Attorney General. The legal aspect of the question, and of the liability of the department, would have to be considered before he could give any definite promise to the hon. member.

MR. MOLLOY said if the Government closed up this lane, upon which the property of the City Council was situated, how could the Council enter upon their property to resume their rights? The Council had received repeated promises from the Railway Department to carry off the overflow of water, but, up to the present time, the excuse had been that the necessary pipes were not available for this purpose. In certain parts of Wellington Street, the premises of one or two proprietors were flooded with water, and the residents had to go another way round in order to get in and out. As the Railway Department had taken the control of this matter into their own hands, the least they could do was to make provision for the proper drainage of this overflow. The Department had attempted to (what they called) “improve” the main drain, running through this Kensington Lane, which they now proposed to close, but the result

of the "improvement," so far, had been what he had described,—people were flooded out. He thought the Department should give the City Council a pledge that they would see that this work was efficiently done and properly completed.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said that members must bear in mind that this was originally an open drain—and a very unsightly thing it was in the centre of the city—and there was no underground provision at all for carrying off the overflow of water. He felt satisfied that had it been suggested to the Department, at the time when they were boxing this drain, that some provision should be made, by means of egress holes, for carrying away the overflow, the Department would have done it. They might even do so now, but he could make no promise until he had an opportunity of consulting the Attorney General. He was willing and most anxious to meet the City Council in every possible way, if that was what they wanted—leaving egress holes in the cement with the view of carrying away the surplus water.

MR. A. FORREST did not think the Commissioner understood what the Council wanted. What he particularly complained of was that, from Hutt Street to Melbourne Road, there was formerly a natural drainage from the grants into the main drain, but now that drainage had been stopped up, with the result that people's premises were flooded; and what the Council wanted was a promise from the Commissioner that he would take proper steps to remedy this state of things. If the City Council applied to the department to lay down pipes for this purpose the least the department could do was to lay down those pipes into the main drain, so that the Council would not interfere with the railway goods yard.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he understood that what the City Council wished was that, when the Council in carrying out its work entered upon the railway property, the Railway Department should make the necessary drains at the department's expense, and put down pipes leading from all points to the main drain. That was rather a big order. The Government would do what they

could in the matter, but he was not in a position to give any pledge at present.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Power to lay lines of railway across Hutt Street:

Agreed to.

Preamble and title:

Agreed to.

Bill reported, and report adopted.

GRAND JURY ABOLITION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

The following Message was received from the Legislative Council:—"The Legislative Council acquaints the Legislative Assembly that it has agreed to a Bill intituled 'An Act to amend The Grand Jury Abolition Act Amendment Act, 1883,' subject to the amendment contained in the schedule annexed; in which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly.

"GEO. SHENTON,

"President.

"Legislative Council Chamber, Perth, September 6th, 1893."

Schedule showing the Amendment made by The Legislative Council in "The Grand Jury Abolition Act Amendment Bill."

No. 1, Clause 2.—Add the following words to the end of the clause: "and the warrant of the Governor, directing the Solicitor General or Crown Solicitor to exercise, perform, and discharge such duties and functions shall be conclusive evidence of the absence or inability (as the case may be) of the Attorney General to perform or discharge the same."

C. LEE STEERE,

Clerk of the Council.

6th September, 1893.

Ordered—That the consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's Message be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

ENGINE SPARKS FIRE PREVENTION BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—Short title and commencement:

Put and passed.

Clause 2—Interpretation:

Put and passed.

Clause 3.—“(1.) Every engine shall “be fitted with an efficient spark-arrester, and the owner of such engine “shall maintain such spark-arrester in “good order and fit for its purpose, “and every owner of an engine, which “passes through, along, or by land “whereon wheat, maize, oats, rye, barley, “flax, hay or other agricultural produce “liable to be injured or destroyed by “fire is growing, or is stored, shall cause “such engine to carry and use coal, “and shall also prevent the use or consumption of any fuel other than coal “upon or by such engine while passing “through, along, or by such land as aforesaid.”

“(2.) Any owner failing to comply “with any of the requirements of this “section shall, in addition to any civil “proceedings to which he may be liable, “be guilty of an offence cognisable before any two or more Justices of the Peace, and liable upon conviction to a “penalty of not less than Five nor more “than Twenty pounds for every such “offence.

“(3.) Any person convicted under “this section may appeal, and such appeal shall be made to the Court and “be subject to the procedure mentioned “in section 139 of ‘The Police Act, “1892’.”

MR. TRAYLEN said the select committee which had dealt with the Bill had recommended that nearly the whole of the first sub-section of this clause be struck out, with the view of inserting other provisions. He therefore moved that all the words of sub-clause (1), after the word “purpose” in the fifth line be omitted.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. TRAYLEN then moved, in accordance with the recommendation of the select committee, the following new sub-clauses be added, after sub-clause (1):

(2.) “Every engine shall be fitted with a steam jet connected with the engine, and carried into the ash-pan of such engine, for the purpose of extinguishing the live cinders in such ash-pan, and the owner of such engine shall maintain such steam jet in good order and fit for its purpose.”

(3.) “The owner of any line of railway shall be compelled to burn within such boundary of any line of railway all grass

and herbage at such time of the year as may be defined by the Governor-in-Council.”

(4.) “Before such burning, at least three days’ notice of the time at which it is intended to burn shall be given to the owner or occupier of the adjoining lands by the owner of any railway.”

The hon. member said, with reference to sub-clause (3), that the Bush Fires Act provided that country could not legally be burned except during certain months of the year, and the object of this sub-section was to allow this to be done for the purposes of this Act, at such time as the Governor-in-Council might define.

MR. PIESSE thought that a week’s notice of the time at which it was intended to burn should be given to owners or occupiers of adjoining land.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 4.—“Any member of the police force, or other person authorised by a Justice of the Peace, may enter upon any land and inspect any engine being thereon, for the purpose of ascertaining what fuel is being carried or used in such engine.”

MR. TRAYLEN said the select committee had recommended that this clause be struck out, and some other words substituted. Those words, in his opinion, were not quite complete. They were as follows:—“Inspectors shall be appointed to enter upon any land, and inspect any engine being thereon, for the purpose of ascertaining whether all engines in use, or being used, are fitted with an efficient spark arrester and steam jet as aforesaid.” Instead of that amendment, he begged to move some amendments of his own, in the original clause, namely, that the words “the Governor-in-Council or” be inserted after the word “by,” in the second line of the clause, and that all the words after the word “ascertaining” be struck out, and the following words be inserted in lieu thereof: “whether such engine is provided with an efficient spark arrester and steam jet fitted to the ash-pan as aforesaid.” The clause would then read: “Any member of the police force, or other person authorised by the Governor-in-Council or by a justice of the peace, may enter upon any land and inspect any engine being thereon, for the purpose of ascertaining whether such

engine is provided with an efficient spark arrester and steam jet fitted to the ashpan as aforesaid."

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) pointed out that the clause referred to "any engine," whereas the object of the Bill was to have these spark arresters and steam jets fitted on engines travelling over certain parts of the country. The clause as it stood would necessitate spark arresters and steam jets to be fitted on shunting engines used on a jetty, and any other engine. Surely they did not want steam jets on every engine. The object of the committee was no doubt a good one, but the thing had been tried, and though no doubt it afforded some additional security, it had been found that the steam jet did not put out the whole of the fire in the ashpan.

MR. TRAYLEN thought the answer to the Commissioner's objection was this: though they gave authority to inspect any engine, a sufficient reply to a charge would be that the engine which was not provided with a steam jet was not travelling where it could possibly cause a fire.

MR. PIESSE said he preferred the amendment of the select committee. The reason they proposed to strike out the provision that empowered "any member of the police force" to inspect an engine was that they thought it would be placing a power in the hands of an authority that would not be able to exercise it, in many instances. A policeman might know nothing about an engine, or whether a spark arrester or a steam jet was an efficient one or not; and the committee thought it would be better to have inspectors appointed who knew something about engines. They would not be wanted in many parts of the colony, only at such places as Beverley, Fremantle, Geraldton, and such centres. He therefore moved, as an amendment upon the amendment of the hon. member for Greenough, that Clause 4 be struck out, with the view of inserting the new clause recommended by the select committee.

MR. MOLLOY said he preferred the select committee's amendment. Although he had had considerable experience of the versatility of the police, it was new to him that a policeman must necessarily be a mechanical engineer.

MR. TRAYLEN said the reason why he had proposed his amendment, in lieu of that of the select committee, could be briefly stated. In the first place, if the Government were going to appoint inspectors for this purpose all over the country, they must find the money to pay them with, and when there was no necessity for it. Secondly, these inspectors must be very frequently about, doing their duties, if they were going to carry them out efficiently. What he had in his mind was this: suppose an engine passed by the mill of the hon. member for the Williams, and a spark from that engine set fire to a neighbouring crop, surely it was possible for a policeman on the spot to examine that engine and see whether it had a spark arrester or not. He would not require any large amount of scientific intelligence or technical knowledge to say whether it had a spark arrester or not. They must either have a staff of paid inspectors, or have the Act evaded, unless they got this work done by the police.

MR. PIESSE said it was not simply a question whether an engine had a spark arrester; but whether it was an efficient arrester; and he thought they would require a person with some technical or mechanical knowledge to decide that point. He should say they could have this work done by qualified inspectors at a nominal expense; they would not want many of them, and their duties would not be heavy. Even if they paid £50 a year to them, it would be money well spent, considering the large destruction of property that was now caused by sparks from passing engines.

SIR J. G. LEE STEERE thought it was worthy of the consideration of the committee whether this clause was required at all. Surely those who owned the engines would, for their own protection, and to save them from the penalties of the Act, see that their engines were provided with spark arresters. Any owner of an engine failing to comply with the requirements of the Act in this respect was liable to a penalty of £20, in addition to the value of any damage done to a man's property.

MR. PATERSON said his experience taught him that the owners of engines did not have them fitted with spark arresters, although they ought to be

compelled to do so; and he thought it was very necessary that somebody should be appointed to see that they did it.

MR. TRAYLEN said the kind of difficulty they wanted to get over was what occurred almost every day, at the Greenough and Dongarra, during the hottest part of the year. Take Mrs. Waldeck's case, for instance: she repeatedly discovered her stacks of wheat or barley on fire, just after an engine had passed by; and if there was any authority on the spot to inspect that engine, and see whether it had a spark arrester or not, the question could be settled there and then. Her only other course was to commence proceedings for damages, and then if it came out at the trial that the engine was not fitted with a spark arrester, the company or owner would be liable for the damage done. But he was anxious to avoid all this roundabout way of getting satisfaction. He wished to provide that, if there was ground to suppose that an engine travelling through the country had no spark arrester, someone should have authority to see whether it had one or not, and have the owner punished if the engine should have no arrester.

Amendment (Mr. Piesse's)—That the clause be struck out—put and passed.

Clause struck out accordingly.

Clause 5.—Onus of proof in proceedings to recover damages:

Put and passed.

Clause 6.—Sections of Shortening Ordinance:

Put and passed.

New clause:

MR. PIESSE then moved the following new clause in lieu of Clause 4, which had been struck out: "Inspectors shall be appointed to enter upon any land, and inspect any engine being thereon, for the purpose of ascertaining whether each engine in use or being used is fitted with an efficient spark arrester and steam jet as aforesaid."

Clause put and passed.

Preamble and title:

Agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments, and report adopted.

At 6:30 p.m. the House adjourned for an hour.

At 7:30 p.m. the House resumed.

FREMANTLE WATER SUPPLY BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): In moving the second reading of this Bill, I will, in a few words, explain its object. The Government have established, in the town of Fremantle, a water supply. The water is pumped up by prison labour into reservoirs, and thence distributed to the shipping and to the people of Fremantle. It is desired now to place the Director of Public Works, as representing the Government, in the same position for collecting a water rate as if the supply were under the control of the Municipal Council, and, in fact, to place him in the same position in regard to Fremantle as the Municipal Council of Perth is in regard to the supply from the Darling Range. Clause 2 of the Bill states that the Director of Public Works shall have all the rights, powers, benefits, and privileges which a municipality may exercise under Parts II. and III. of the Waterworks Act, 1889, except the power to take land permanently. Clause 4 provides that any act which may be done by any person acting with the authority of the council of a municipality may be done by any person acting with the authority of the Director of Public Works. Clause 7 provides that no pipes connected with the water service may be seized by process of law, or under distress for rent. Clause 8 gives power to the Director of Public Works to charge for the supply of water a sum not exceeding one shilling in the pound of the annual rateable value of any property supplied with water for domestic purposes. Hon. members will notice that the Director of Public Works has nothing to do with the rating of the property, this being done by the Municipal Council; and he may charge up to one shilling in the pound, the same as is chargeable in Perth. Clause 9 gives to the Director of Public Works the same power of recovering for water rate, by process of law, as is exercisable by the Municipality in respect of the general rate. This is an important provision, and very necessary, so that those persons who receive the water may be made to pay for it, if they will not pay willingly. Clause 10 directs that a copy of the rate-book shall be supplied, free of charge, to the Director of Public Works, so that he may be enabled to make a charge for

water supplied to those whose names and amounts of rateable value are entered in the rate-book. Clause 12 refers to damages and other things that may be recoverable summarily. These are the main provisions of the Bill, and it will be seen at once that the object is to place the Government in a position to deal with the water supply of Fremantle in a business-like manner, so long as it is in the charge of the Government. There have been representations made to the Government, at different times, on behalf of the Municipality, for the taking over of the water supply; and we have rather encouraged that desire, and would be glad if some arrangement could be made by which the Municipality should take it over and manage it. The water supply has been a considerable expense and much trouble to the Government, and there has been a difficulty, in the past, in recovering amounts due for the water supplied. The Director of Public Works is almost without legal power to enforce payment, at present; and the object of the Bill is to invest him with power to enforce the payment for water when supplied, and to put the system of supply on a satisfactory footing. The passing of this Bill will not interfere with the Municipality in taking over the water supply, if that can be arranged; and I shall be glad if the Government can get rid of it. I can see, however, that it may not suit the Municipality to take over the water supply at present, and that some time may elapse before that is done. Fremantle being a scattered town, the expense of laying down the mains is considerable for covering a large area. There is a requisition for an extension of the supply to North Fremantle, but the Government are not in a position at present to deal with that. You may depend upon it that those people will not let the Government rest until they get the water supply extended all over the town. That is a consummation very much to be wished; and if a moderate interest on the outlay can be depended on, there is no reason why the extension should not be made, if funds are available. For some reasons I regret having to bring forward this measure, because it is really a municipal measure, in which the Government should not have to take such an active part as they are now taking. I think the water supply

might be placed under the management of some board, or some means might be devised by which the Government should not be brought so much into contact with the ratepayers. But this Bill will meet the existing difficulty, and I do not think it will in any way prejudice any future action that may be necessary. I move that the Bill be read a second time.

MR. SOLOMON: I do not intend to oppose this Bill, because it is only reasonable that the Director of Public Works should have the same power as a Municipality or company would have for the recovery of amounts due for the supply of water. In reference to the application for extension of the water mains to North Fremantle, it was understood that the mains were to be extended to the North side for Government purposes; and, in order to anticipate that extension, overtures were made to the Government for getting the pipes laid at the same time to private and public properties on the North side, so that the people there might have the benefit of the supply. Clause 10 requires the clerk of the Municipality to supply a copy of the rate-book each year, to the Director of Public Works, free of charge. I think it should be sufficient if the Director of Public Works were to have a right of access to the rate-book, the same as in Perth, so that his servant might take a copy, or pay for a copy being made, if required. I would suggest that an amendment should be made to that effect, in committee. With regard to the collection of the water rate, I must say that I have frequently asked, at the office in Fremantle, for the water rate account, but the excuse has been made that the accounts are kept in Perth; and when, after much bother, I did obtain the account for the past two quarters, I had to make certain corrections in it myself. There are others who would rather pay their quarter's account than let it run on, and in that respect Fremantle has not had a fair chance. I assure the Government that if the accounts for water were issued at the proper time, and the collections made, there would be no difficulty in getting in the money.

MR. PEARSE: I am glad to find the Government are not opposed to the water supply being taken over by the Municipality, which would be the proper course to adopt. I must take exception to one

or two remarks made with regard to payment. I say the people of Fremantle are not opposed to paying this water rate, but there has been a difficulty in getting the accounts rendered. The accounts are kept in Perth, and the people in Fremantle cannot get them. No one expects the Government to supply the water for nothing. I shall be glad if the Government can see their way to extend the supply to North Fremantle. In a portion of the north side the water now used by the people is not at all good, and the extension of this supply would be a great benefit.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) : I stand to-night in a rather peculiar position, as a member of the Government which has brought forward this Bill, which is for imposing a certain amount of taxation on the people for the water supply, and also as a member for Fremantle, the residents of which will, I feel perfectly sure, resent the introduction of this Bill. I would like to draw the attention of hon. members, as I have already drawn the attention of my colleagues, to the fact that there is no comparison to be drawn between the water supply of Fremantle, and the cost of that supply to the city of Perth. [MR. A. FORREST: Why not?] I thought the hon. member knew already, as Mayor of Perth. He is well aware that he, on behalf of Perth, has been making a demand on the Government to assist the Municipality of Perth in paying a percentage on about £180,000 for the proposed purchase of the private waterworks of Perth. I would ask hon. members, what would be the cost of a private water supply for Fremantle? If Providence has blest Fremantle with a water supply, drawn from the sand at their very doors, by simply boring a hole in the earth, and either pumping up a supply by means of a steam engine or using the prison labour as at present, the supply being sufficient for the wants of the shipping and the railway terminus, besides serving the town, is that any reason why the people of Fremantle should be taxed to the same extent as the people of Perth are taxed now? I say there is no comparison. Hon. members must be ruled by common reason, in this matter. The rate of 1s. in the pound, in this Bill, is equal to the 5 per cent. interest

on capital cost which is charged to the people of Perth, as the rate payable for their water supply; but I say there should be a great reduction, as compared with Perth. I am sure hon. members will recognise the fairness of my argument, that because we are able to provide a water supply for the town of Fremantle, and the shipping, and the railway, and all other Government requirements, at an expenditure which would be perhaps one-tenth of the cost for a supply to the city of Perth, therefore we should not be rated to the same extent as the people of Perth are rated for their more expensive supply. It must also be borne in mind that the supply is not of a quality as good as that of the city of Perth, and there is not as much pressure, so that there are high parts of the town which the water cannot reach, and the bath-rooms and kitchens cannot be supplied to the same extent as in Perth. If I have departed, for a moment, from my position as a member of the Government, and have considered the interests of my constituents, I trust my hon. colleagues will pardon me.

MR. TRAYLEN : I think the Government are extremely wise in bringing forward this measure. At the same time I hope it may be possible to see their way to that larger scheme which has been referred to by the Premier. What was the purport of the speech we have just listened to? The object of this Bill is to provide the Director of Public Works with sufficient funds to pay the expenses of this water supply. These expenses are made up of two or three items: 1, the actual working expenses; 2, the cost of collection; 3, the interest of money laid out for the benefit of the town of Fremantle. If the interest on these sums together amounts to a total equal to 1s. in the pound on the rateable value of property in Fremantle, what good ground have the inhabitants of Fremantle for complaining that the rate will be excessive? But if, as one hon. member for Fremantle says, the actual cost is so much less than it is for the water supply in Perth, then the inhabitants of Fremantle will derive the benefit of the difference. I can well see there are considerable difficulties in working the supply in Fremantle, by the method now in use, and the lack of pressure cannot be overcome without considerable expense. The very

argument that has been used as to the want of water for gardens and bath-rooms, in the higher parts of the town, is also an argument against that supply being carried over to North Fremantle.

MR. SOLOMON: The North side is lower than the parts supplied on the South side.

MR. TRAYLEN: But you will have to convey the pipes over the bridge, and it must be high enough to allow steamers to go under. The railway bridge, if used for this purpose, may be much lower. Still, I hope the Government will see their way to agree to the appointment of some statutory board; and, I may say, the New South Wales Act for this purpose provides that the board shall consist of seven persons, the Government to appoint three, and the board to be a body corporate. Will it not cut a good many Gordian knots, if we have some such board in existence in this colony? All the interests of Perth and Fremantle, and intermediate places, in respect of a water supply, could be well looked after by such a board. I support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. A. FORREST: I congratulate the Government on bringing in this Bill. The revenue expected to be received by the Commissioner up to June, 1894, is £600, as stated in the annual Estimates; and the expenditure on the Fremantle Water Supply during the past half-year has been £1,000, for putting down new mains. The Government receive no interest whatever on this expenditure of public money in the town of Fremantle. I believe the hon. member for Fremantle will argue that Fremantle is nearly as large as Perth, and I believe there is not much difference. The people of Perth pay nearly equal to £4,000 per annum, on the actual rateable value of properties supplied with water, and nearly £2,000 per annum more for the supply through meters, as extras; and this total of nearly £6,000 paid for water in Perth may be compared with £600 a year paid in Fremantle. I think the time has arrived when the country should receive some benefit to the revenue from the water supplied by Government to the town of Fremantle.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): The country receives no benefit in revenue from the water supply in Perth.

MR. A. FORREST: The country has not expended any money for the water supply in Perth. I am also informed that the largest amount of rates paid by any one individual for water supply in Fremantle is the great sum of £2 per annum.

MR. PEARSE: £10 a year for hotels.

MR. A. FORREST: But there are a great number of persons in a hotel. I say the time has arrived, and I am glad the Director of Public Works has recognised the fact, when some return should be made to the country for this expenditure of public money in Fremantle. One hon. member said, just now, that the Municipal Council of Perth had appealed to the Government for an amount of money to purchase the Perth Waterworks. I deny that, *in toto*. The Municipal Council of Perth never asked the Government for one sixpence, but they proved conclusively to the Treasurer that what they did ask for could not possibly result in a loss. All we asked for was a guarantee of the City Council's bonds for purchasing the waterworks; and we showed that if the revenue was not found equal to the amount we would have to pay, the vendors would place in the bank a fixed deposit for that purpose, and it would be sufficient to cover any deficiency of interest. In the Premier's remarks to-night, he said he would be glad to encourage the Fremantle Council to purchase the waterworks. That is also the object of the Perth Council; and, having said that in reference to Fremantle, as being a step in the right direction, and if it would be easy for Fremantle to pay the interest on capital out of their rates, it should be easy for Perth to do the same. But, instead of receiving only £600 a year from water rates for Fremantle, he would receive, I should think, about £2,300 if the rate be levied at 1s. in the pound, or 5 per cent., and there should also be meters for those who can afford to take large quantities by measurement, so as to protect the supply. My friend, the member for North Fremantle, instead of having to pay £2 a year, will have to pay, perhaps, £20.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I rather sympathise with the people of Fremantle. I consider it is very cruel that the people of Fremantle should have to pay for the water they consume. I think the Government should lay mains all over Fremantle—east, west,

north, and south—and lay on a good supply, and charge nothing for it. In fact, the general public of the colony would willingly agree to be taxed for the purpose of supplying the people of Fremantle with a good service of water.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): That is the first liberal expression of views I have heard from the hon. member.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I can quite understand that the people of Fremantle cannot take over these works, because they would cost too much, and those people are not likely to do so if the Government will supply the water and charge nothing for it. But, after this Bill is passed, perhaps they will try to take over these works. The only difficulty will be the pumping, for they will then not be able to utilise the prison labour, and I do not think they will go to the expense of laying mains all over the town. With regard to handing over this water supply in the future, I think the Government should be careful and keep an account of all expenditure, so that when they are approached by the Municipal Council with regard to taking over the supply, the Government may be able to say something near what the works have cost. If you agree to the principle that the people in a town should pay for the water they consume, I do not think the rate proposed in this Bill is excessive; but it is just a question whether any rate ought to be charged at all. I suppose that the Director of Public Works will see that he does not overcharge the good people of Fremantle for the small supply of water; though I do hope he will see to the accounts being promptly rendered to the water consumers, after what has been said.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn): I feel sure the people of Fremantle do not object to pay for the water they consume. The Hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands, speaking as a member for Fremantle, seems to think that the maximum rate of 1s. in the pound will be levied straight off; but that is not the object the Government have in view. We shall ascertain accurately the annual cost of the upkeep, and a rate will be levied accordingly. It may not be equal to 1s. in the pound. The accounts will be kept, and it can always be seen what has been the

cost of the works and the amount required to be levied. There has lately been an application to the Government to extend the supply to North Fremantle. That extension may cost several thousands of pounds. If the Municipality desires, in the future, to take over the waterworks, the exact cost of the works from the start to the present time can be furnished, and I shall be only too pleased to have the waterworks handed over to the Municipality, in the absence of any other public body. The Government would like to get rid of the responsibility. The hon. member for the Greenough has suggested that the waterworks should be vested in a board, to be created by statute, something like the Metropolitan Board of Works in Sydney. I think that is an excellent idea, and the board would relieve the Government of a great deal of trouble and anxiety. The sewerage of Perth and Fremantle might also be managed by such a board.

MR. MOLLOY: This Bill is a reasonable one, because it is only asking that there should be powers for obtaining a return upon moneys expended in supplying water to the people of Fremantle. I do not know what the amount of rate is to be, but I trust the Government will not be put to any needless expenditure in this direction, but will be able to obtain a return equal to the capital expended as well as the working expenses. Then, other districts will not have much reason to complain. Some reference has been made to the Perth Waterworks. Seeing that the Government are so liberal in investing public money upon a water supply for Fremantle, no reasonable objection can be taken to the proposal which emanated from the Perth Council, when they recently approached the Government. The Perth Council did not ask the Government to expend any money, but only to guarantee the Council's bonds for the repayment of a certain interest; and in order to show that the Government would incur no risk by giving the guarantee, the vendors undertook to make up any deficiency in the revenue for paying the annual interest for a term of years, by offering to place a sum of money in a bank as a fixed deposit. The reason why the City Council approached the Government was that by purchasing the waterworks and giving the city's

bonds, guaranteed by the Government, the ratepayers would save 1 per cent. per annum in the interest on the loan, this being a material consideration to the citizens; and the boon which the purchase would secure to Perth and the immediate district will be apparent at once, on reflection. Now that the principle has been introduced in this Bill, there should not be much difficulty in having that principle re-affirmed in the case of the Perth Waterworks. I see that one hon. member for Fremantle readily acquiesces in the principle I am endeavouring to propound. I am not one who wishes to oppress Fremantle by having an extraordinary rate imposed for the water supply, and I agree with the Government that, as long as they obtain a return equal to paying interest on the capital expended, together with the working expenses, no reasonable objection can be taken to this Bill, which should meet with the approval of all hon. members.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

LOAN BILL, £540,000.

SECOND READING.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): In rising to move the second reading of this Bill, intituled "An Act to authorise the raising of a sum of Five hundred and forty thousand pounds by Loan, for the construction of certain public works, and other purposes," I feel that it is a very important matter, and one which requires that I should give some information to hon. members as to the reasons why the Government have introduced this Bill, and also as to its absolute necessity. Hon. members will, of course, recollect that during the session before last, and the last session, the Government proposed, and this House approved of, resolutions involving an expenditure of £50,000 in excess of the vote for the Mullewa Railway, as provided in the Loan Act of 1891, and also £230,000 for certain improvements in connection with the Eastern Railway, particularly the deviation up the Darling Range, and other improvements. I very much regret that to-night I have to ask the House not only to again approve of what you have already approved, namely, the expenditure of £280,000, but also to ap-

prove of a further proposed expenditure of £260,000, making in all a loan of £540,000. Later on I may explain, for the information of hon. members, the reasons for every item which appears in the schedule of this Bill, and I think I will be able to show there is an absolute necessity that the Government should be armed with power to the extent designated upon the schedule of the Bill. I may inform hon. members that the Government have no idea whatever of placing this loan on the market at the present time. The object I have in view, in asking hon. members to assent to this Bill, is to obtain legal authority for incurring the liability. We all know that we have, out of the loan of 1891, the sum of £426,000 yet to raise, and I have no doubt whatever that in a very short time we will be able to raise that sum in the London market, on favourable terms. I have no doubt that will be the result, unless some terrible catastrophe overtakes the financial world, but which there is no reason to anticipate. The latest advices I have from London, received by the last mail, go to show that some time before the end of the year there will be a probability of our being able to place this amount on the market; and when we have done that, and with the resources now in the hands of the Government, we will be able to carry on for a considerable time, without going to the London market for a further loan, notwithstanding that we shall have the power, if hon. members agree to this Bill, of going for a further sum of £540,000. The reason that has actuated the Government in asking the House to authorise this amount of loan is to place ourselves in a proper and legal position. As you are aware, we have incurred liabilities in excess of the amounts authorised in the Loan Act of 1891, in connection with the Mullewa Railway and in connection with the Yilgarn Railway. I do not look upon a resolution of the House as the proper course we should follow, although perhaps it may be a sufficient reason for the Government undertaking works; and I hope that in the future I shall not have occasion to ask this House to agree to resolutions for such a purpose, but that if we require authority we shall obtain it in the ordinary and proper way by an Act, because, as you may easily see,

all the arguments I used last year and the year before, to induce this House to agree to those two resolutions, I have again to use to-night for obtaining legal authority, and it would have been just as easy for me to obtain the legal authority at once, as to obtain authority by resolution and have to come again to the House for the legal authority afterwards. I could not help feeling, the other evening, when addressing this House, that when I mentioned the Government's intention to ask for authority to raise a further sum of £540,000, hon. members seemed to express, as far as I could judge, some surprise; yet I do not see that any surprise should have been experienced by hon. members, if they have followed closely the conduct of the business of the Government, because they must have seen that if we were to carry out those works which they are all looking forward to, and for which we had invited tenders but withdrew them afterwards, it is impossible for the Government to carry out those works and keep pace with the requirements of the times, unless more money is provided than was authorised to be raised under the Loan Act of 1891. I think I may say, speaking generally, that the members of the Government are just as anxious about expenditure, and just as adverse to incurring extra liability and to placing greater burdens on the colony, as any one in the colony or in this House can be. The members of the Government, either in their political capacity or in their private life, are not considered to be persons of reckless practices; we are not desirous of plunging the colony into debt and ruining ourselves at the same time; and I may say also of this House, that it is not composed of men who may be called adventurers who have nothing to lose, for this House and the other House are composed of men who are the backbone of this colony. The best, I say advisedly the best, that West Australia can produce are in the Legislature of the colony. Therefore, whatever the Government propose on this occasion, you may rest assured that we do not propose it as adventurers who have nothing to lose, or as reckless men, but because we believe it is in the interest of the colony, and will be productive of good to the whole of the community. As I have

often said before, the whole object of the members of the present Government—and I may speak also for the whole of the Parliament of this colony—is to improve the colony, to make it a place worth living in, and a place worth coming to; and unless we had taken some such means as the present Government have introduced, and are introducing now, to develop the resources of the colony, this generation—the men I see before me to-night—every one of us must pass away entirely, and a new generation must take their place, before any one could expect to see the improvements that are going on around us to-day, if we had been content to rely on our own resources and on our ordinary revenue. If we had altogether eschewed borrowing, I say that the generation of people now here must have altogether passed away before there could have been the great development and the great improvements we see around us to-day. If the people who are here now, and if hon. members of this Parliament, had been content to wear out their lives by going on in the old way, depending only on their own resources, living a life of obscurity and inactivity as far as the outer world is concerned, then we would not have required to borrow or go into the money market, but we might have continued on the even tenour of our way, as our fathers had done before us. But a new era has dawned on us. We felt an opportunity was given us by which we could raise this colony to a more prominent position—that in the new era our prospects were such that we might be able to borrow money with a certainty that we would be able to repay it, and that in a few years we might accomplish what our fathers had striven for during fifty years, and that we might place this colony in a position far better than that which she had ever occupied in the past. That is the motive the present Government have had. We felt that an opportunity had occurred, in the history of the colony, by which, with a judicious application of borrowed money, we could so improve the means of transit throughout the colony that we might throw open the lands to occupation and settlement, and thereby enable settlers to obtain a certain and sufficient reward for their enterprise. We have been in office two and a half years, and during the time

that hon. members have sat in this House we have had no reason whatever to be dissatisfied, under circumstances somewhat adverse, with the progress this colony has made during those two and a half years, or with our financial position at the present time. I think we have every reason to be satisfied with our present financial position and our future prospects. Parliament has authorised the Government, by resolutions, to undertake an expenditure of £280,000; but it is now found that, instead of £280,000, we will require, for completing the works already authorised and some other necessary works, a total amount of £540,000 to be raised by loan. This amount will complete our authorised railways, and put us in a position, I hope, to cease borrowing for some considerable time—I hope for a long time—because it has been no pleasure to me, or to anyone in this House, to think that we shall always be going on borrowing. Our desire is that we should not require to borrow; but it is quite impossible that we can obtain all we require for the development of our mineral resources, under our present circumstances, from our ordinary revenue. I will now deal with the items in the schedule. The first item is the completion of the Yilgarn Railway, £34,000. As hon. members will recollect, when the amount of £324,000 was placed in the schedule for constructing 162 miles of railway at £2,000 a mile, there had been no survey made of the line, and the amount was merely an estimate, and even the length of the railway had not been ascertained by detailed survey, but 162 miles was put down as the shortest length between Northam and Southern Cross. When the Loan Bill of 1891 was brought in, no survey had been made on the ground at all. The line has proved to be eight miles longer than was anticipated, and that length, at £2,000 a mile, means £16,000 out of the £34,000 additional which I am asking the House to sanction. Then there is the conservation of water along the railway line, which will cost a considerable sum; and there is also some expenditure on account of land resumed, which will not be much. There is also a small bonus to be given to the contractor in the event of his completing the line nearly six months sooner than the contract date. These several

amounts make up the £34,000 asked for in the schedule. The second item is the completion of the Mullewa Railway, £86,000. There was no survey made of that line at the time that it was placed in the loan schedule of 1891. The length was estimated at 150 miles, at a cost of £2,000 a mile, whereas it was found, after survey, to be 157 miles in length, and the difficult character of the country for the first 20 miles out of Geraldton has rendered the construction more expensive than I anticipated when I brought forward the Loan Bill of 1891. The contract price for construction was, I think, £1,735 a mile, without rails or fastenings, which are supplied by the Government. Hon. members will therefore see that the Mullewa Railway is a much more difficult line than the Yilgarn Railway, the contract price for which is only £871 per mile, without rails or fastenings. There is also an extraordinary expenditure of £21,000, on the Mullewa Railway, for land at the Geraldton terminus, and which we did not anticipate in 1891. There is also an expenditure of some £10,000 on the railway station at Geraldton; besides an outlay for workshops and engine running sheds, amounting to £9,000. [MR. R. F. SHOLL: What?] The hon. member for the Gascoyne has been making remarks about a small railway station in my own constituency, and if he is as active in regard to other portions of the colony as he is in regard to that portion, he will have something to do. For these reasons we have to ask for a further sum of £86,000 for the Mullewa Railway. These items alone will come to over £100,000 for the Mullewa Railway and the station at Geraldton; and the fact that we are asking for only £86,000 will show that some economy has been practised. Hon. members must understand that railway construction, although very convenient, costs a good deal in the first instance, and that must always be the case here and everywhere else in the world. To get railways and works and other facilities, and to purchase land for the purpose, must involve much expenditure; and the fact that only £86,000 is asked for, for completing the Mullewa Railway, and considering all the expenditure which the Government have been put to in this connection, must show there has been no extravagance. I may

add that we hope, by sales of land at Geraldton, to recoup the outlay to some extent, because the sites we have already for workshops in Geraldton will not be required, and it is hoped that the sale of that land will realise to the Government some £10,000, which will be so much towards reducing the expenditure we have had to incur. The next item in the schedule is the deviation on the Eastern Railway, to improve the grades between Fremantle and Beverley, and relaying the same with 60lb. rails. Hon. members will recollect that, last session, this was almost the same amount as was then approved of by the House. It was generally considered, at that time, that the improvement of the grades up the Darling Range must be undertaken very soon. Every preparation was then made, and but for the difficulties in the London money market the work would have been in hand by this time. The amount now scheduled is somewhat higher than was estimated last year, but considerable expense has been incurred in relaying the line with 60lb. rails, and a good many sleepers, which were found not to be good enough for relaying, have been replaced, so that about £8,000 more expenditure has had to be incurred than had been estimated on this account. The sleepers were jarrah. I think every hon. member will agree that, as soon as possible, we must improve the steep grades up Greenmount, and complete the relaying with 60lb. rails. I shall rejoice very much when we can get rid of those heavy grades, which are dangerous to traffic and most expensive in working. The fourth item is the purchase of land for the Perth railway station and yards, buildings, &c., including iron bridge and improvement to Barrack Street, £85,000. This item exceeds the amount stated in the resolution of 1893 by about £24,000, but the previous estimate was based on the assumption that £25,000 could be spared from the works of the South-Western Railway, but which it was hardly reasonable to expect could be saved, as the erection of a station at Bunbury had not been provided for in that estimate. The construction of the iron bridge over the railway at Barrack Street, Perth, will also involve an excess over the estimate, by reason of the compensation to be paid for the removal of the Working Men's

Institute, not originally provided for, and which will cost a considerable sum. Some other items also have cost more than they were originally estimated at. The fifth item, "Eastern Railway, miscellaneous, £20,000," is practically the same as in the resolution of 1893, the amount then estimated being £18,706. It was intended, in that resolution, that this sum should include the improvement of the Railway Workshops at Fremantle, but it is not now probable that much, if any, of that sum can be available for the purpose, if the growing requirements of the Eastern Railway, especially as regards wayside stations, have to be met. The sixth item is "Additional rolling stock for existing lines, £60,000." This includes the sum already provided for by the resolution of January last; and, of the total, about £40,000 has been expended in obtaining additional rolling stock, which was absolutely required; and about £10,000 is required for equipping the Northam and Bunbury lines. The seventh item is "Additional improvements to opened railways (exclusive of Eastern Railway), £10,000;" and this is a very necessary provision. The custom of railway construction in England has been to build up to the requirements of future years, but in the colonies the practice is to build up only to the present requirements, and to bring up the lines to the increasing demands from time to time. The eighth item is "Railway Workshops, £20,000;" and this must depend upon the report of the commission, as to whether the workshops at Fremantle can be made suitable for the increasing requirements, or whether the commission will recommend removal to a new site. So far as the Government are concerned at present, no absolute ultimatum is expressed. The ninth item is "Roads, and also roads to railway stations, £10,000." In regard to this item, the construction of railways throughout the colony has had this effect, that in many places the railway runs at some distance from the main road, and it is necessary to provide roads for connecting the main road with the railway. These roads will cost a considerable amount; and my friend the Commissioner of Railways tried to induce me to place a large sum on the annual Estimates for these connecting roads, but I regret I was unable to do so, therefore I have made

provision in this loan to the extent of about one-half of the amount of the item, for this purpose. It is an urgent work, and the country members especially will recognise that it is absolutely necessary to have connecting roads where the railways are some distance from the main roads, as it is impossible that the traffic can reach the railways without some considerable expenditure in making connecting roads. I regret that the ordinary revenue, as estimated for this year, would not stand the expenditure required for these roads. The tenth item is the "Development of goldfields and mineral resources, £40,000." When we have completed the construction of the Murchison telegraph line, and the line to Marble Bar, and fulfilled other engagements, there will be no funds left out of the loan of 1891 for these purposes, and we are bound to make more provision in this Loan Bill for works of this character. A telegraph line from Southern Cross to Coolgardie has become absolutely necessary, and in fact the Government have had to order the materials for this work at once. There is also water sinking and conserving on the Yilgarn goldfields and other goldfields in the colony, and it is absolutely necessary that the Government should have funds for keeping pace with the requirements of the country. The eleventh item is "Improvements to harbours and rivers, including jetties and dredging, £15,000." I was advised, this year, through the great demands on the public purse, to strike out from the annual Estimates all items connected with the jetties and harbour improvements along the vast coast-line of the colony, and you are all aware there are improvements going on all over the colony, from Wyndham in the North, to Eucla in the South, in the way of jetty improvements and dredging; therefore we ask for a sum of £15,000 to be included in this Loan Bill, though it is only a small amount, for the important works which are required. The twelfth item is "School Buildings, £15,000." I may say the demand for school buildings all over the colony has become very great; and this item, in the first instance, found a place in the annual Estimates, but had to be struck out because there was not money available for it out of ordinary revenue. I felt that this important requirement could not be overlooked, and I

have, therefore, placed it in this Loan Bill; for I consider that, amongst necessary public works, no one can reasonably object to money being raised to provide school accommodation, so as to train up and educate the youth of the colony. Personally, I would have much preferred to place this item in the annual Estimates, for expenditure out of ordinary revenue, but there being no money available for it, and the requirement being imperative, I decided to include it in the loan schedule. The last item is "Charges and expenses of raising loans, £25,000." We have not been able to realise the par value for our loans; and the Legislature having voted, say, £100,000 for a particular work, we have found there is a deficiency in the amount obtained for our bonds; for as our estimate of the cost of the work has been based on the £100,000, and there is not the full amount available from the subscriptions received, a deficiency has to be accounted for. It is much better, for the purpose of keeping the accounts of the colony, that the amounts voted by Parliament should appear as the actual sums available; and, for that reason, we propose, as is done elsewhere, to place this sum in the schedule, not only to cover the deficiency in the present loan, but also the deficiency in the Loan of 1891. Having now gone through each item in the loan schedule, hon. members will have to admit, whatever they may feel, that every one of the items is most urgent, and hon. members will have to admit also that these works are imperatively necessary. I am sure they will have to admit that it is impossible to do without them. This House is already committed to a liability of £280,000, and there is £260,000 more that we ask for. It will be seen, on analysing the schedule of the Bill, that £120,000 of the amount is intended for completing works already in hand, in connection with the Yilgarn and Mullewa Railways. These contracts are let, and the sums coming due will have to be paid, to the amount of £120,000—I should say the contracts for the greater portion are let, but the contract for the water supply on the Yilgarn Railway is not yet let, though it will have to be. Then £315,000 is for urgent works in connection with the deviations on the Eastern Railway, the Perth Railway station, and other railway requirements, in Perth; additional rolling

stock for existing lines, additional improvements to opened railways, and the railway workshops. If hon. members now consider that we can do without the deviations on the Eastern Railway, and can do without some other urgent works in the schedule, then we need not expend the money but may go on using the present steep grades. There is a considerable amount of money in hand, something like £100,000, which need not be spent at the present time; but I think it is absolutely necessary that the works should go on and the money be spent in completing them. We are continually losing money by working the excessively heavy grades up Greenmount, and if we do not spend the amount we propose in improving the grades at the present time, it is desirable that the Government should be authorised to improve those grades as soon as practicable. There are also £105,000 of the amount in the schedule for the development of goldfields and mineral resources and other important works, making up the total to £540,000. The main question we have to consider is the financial position of the colony, and whether we are in a position to incur these liabilities. If hon. members consider we are not able to bear this burden, and that it is not proper we should incur this responsibility, then I say, "Necessity knows no law," and although these requirements may be very urgent, still if we cannot afford to have them, we must do without them, except so far as we have legal obligations which we cannot get rid of. If the House comes to the conclusion that the colony should not incur this liability, we must remain as we are, and comply only with our legal obligations; but if, on the other hand, you come to the conclusion that it is in the best interests of the colony that these works should be undertaken and completed, then we must endeavour to bear the burden that this further loan will cast upon us. I told you, in my Financial Statement, that on the 30th of June last the debt of the colony amounted to £2,165,718, or about £34 per head of the population. I will suppose that during the next two years we borrow the £436,000 not yet raised under the authority of the Loan Act of 1891, and also the £540,000 which we ask authority to spend under this Loan

Bill, making together £976,000: our indebtedness will then be £3,141,718, less of course any amounts we pay on account of the sinking fund. Then, supposing we increase our population, during the next two years, at the same rate of increase as during the last two years, namely, about 500 a month, on the average, and this is assuming a very low rate in view of our improved circumstances; this rate of increase will make our population 75,000 at the end of two years, and the proportion of our indebtedness will then be about £41 per head. But if our population increases more quickly during the two years, it is probable that our indebtedness at the end of two years will not be greater per head than it is at present; because, if the population increases more quickly, the ratio of debt will be reduced from £41 per head to the lesser amount. What is the comparative indebtedness of other colonies at the present time? I do not wish to go into figures closely, because I have not got the exact state of all the colonies; but, speaking roughly, Queensland has a debt of over £70 per head of population; South Australia about £67 per head, and Tasmania nearly £50 per head; so that, if we look at what our position will be at the end of two years, and if our population increases only 500 a month, we shall be in a better position then, with a debit of £41 per head, than any of those colonies—a considerable deal better. Looking at these facts, and even supposing we do not increase in our population as quickly as we all believe and hope we shall, still there is no reason at all to be alarmed at what our indebtedness will be, at the end of two years, even if we borrow the whole of the amount we propose to borrow. I have shown that, with ordinary good fortune, the rate will not be much more than £40 per head—a burden which I do not hesitate to say we can well bear. If we look at our present position, we should not be afraid to incur this extra liability, for there never was a time in this colony when our prospects were half so good; indeed, I question whether any colony was at any time in a more sound position, or had better prospects. Fancy! our gold exports during the past twelve months amounted in declared value to £276,876; and during yesterday some 6,000 ounces of

gold have come into Perth, found within our own territory—between £20,000 and £30,000 worth coming into this city within the last day or two! Some hon. members may ask what good it does to us. It is doing us this great good, that it is attracting to our shores an increased population, and giving to this colony a popularity and attractiveness it never had before, and which we never expected it to acquire, throughout the whole world—attracting people from the great cities in England, and especially from the Eastern colonies of Australia. Western Australia is attracting more attention and consideration now than at any other period in our history. Our population is increasing rapidly, and even if we look at the prospects of our pastoralists and agriculturists, the season is unprecedentedly favourable. I do not think this is a time when we in the colony, who have borne the burden and heat of the day, during many years, should be faint-hearted or despairing of the country. If we should despair now, why have we not despaired long ago, when we had difficulties and trials, and bad seasons, and drought, and no gold found in the country, but living in isolation and almost unknown to the rest of the world? If we should now despair of the future, I say those who do despair now have no faith in the country. If the country will not prosper now, with all the improved circumstances, how has it held its own in the past? There is this great fact, that the money we are borrowing we are spending wisely and well. We are not spending it in wastefulness. We are building railways, for the most part, for giving better and cheaper means of transit throughout this vast territory, and opening up the lands and making them fit to be settled upon and improved. And we are introducing wise and liberal land laws into the colony, the result of which will, I believe, be of great benefit, and be most encouraging to those who are thinking of occupying and cultivating the land. In moving the second reading of this Bill, I do so with a light heart, though quite sensible of the responsibility that rests upon me. I feel more keenly, perhaps, than any other hon. member, the responsibility that rests upon me, but I have faith in the future of this colony, and I believe the only way we are to prosper and

progress is by striking out boldly, by trying to bring more closely together the outlying portions of the colony by connecting them by railways and giving facilities of transit, and by encouraging the occupation and cultivation of the land. I believe we are on the right track, and, so long as we spend our money wisely and carefully, I have no reason to fear, but I feel every confidence that, with wise administration and with care and economy, we will be able to make this country a better place to come to, and a better place to live in, than it is at present. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. DEHAMEL: The remarks that have fallen from the Premier render all the more necessary a very keen criticism of the proposals laid before us in this Bill. I do not intend to weary members with any discourse on the question of the amount of gold that is being raised—which, though raised, goes away and is of very little use to us. Neither do I intend to go into heroics about despair, or the reverse. I hope to deal with this Bill in a few words shortly, and I trust wisely—to deal with facts and nothing else. The first fact we have to take into consideration, in dealing with such a measure as this, is that when the Government took office in December, 1890, the public debt was one and a quarter millions. The first increase that was made upon the debt was one and three-quarter millions, which we sanctioned at the first meeting of Parliament under Responsible Government. Then we come to the second advance, recently made, which the Premier forgot this evening to remind hon. members of; for when he told us his figures, which made the total indebtedness £3,141,000, he forgot the £500,000 Midland Railway guarantee, which raises the indebtedness to £3,641,000. He says this is a new era. It will indeed be a new era, if we are to go on sanctioning moneys being borrowed and expended as they have been in the past two and a half years. Since the present Government came into office, the debt has been raised, or will have been raised, if we sanction this loan, from one and a quarter millions to three and three-quarter millions, or thereabouts. During the eighteen years, from 1872 until about 1890, the debt of this colony increased at

the rate of about £60,000 a year; but during the two and a half years that the present Government have held office, the debt has increased, on the initiative of the hon. gentleman himself, to the tune of something like one million a year.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): No, no; we have borrowed only about a million of it.

MR. DEHAMEL: But you have obtained authority to borrow at that rate.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Oh, oh!

MR. DEHAMEL: If the Premier does not intend to borrow this money, why does he come before this House and ask us to sanction it? The money will be borrowed, and if that £436,000 remaining from the previous loan could have been got on the London market, it would have been borrowed. What is the good of the Premier's trying to challenge the figures I have given, which are incontrovertible? The Premier laughs. I hope, before I have done — [MR. SIMPSON: He will cry]. What, I would ask, does the present application prove? It proves that the Government estimates, on which the first loan was based, were utterly untrustworthy and unreliable.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): You will prove that, I hope.

MR. DEHAMEL: Yes, I will prove it — and this in the face of the most extraordinary combination of fortuitous and advantageous circumstances that any Government have been blest with. And railway construction has never been done so cheaply as it has been done during the last two years — so cheaply, indeed, that even savings on the estimated cost were expected to be effected, or so we have been assured. But have these expectations proved in any way reliable? Now we want the proof that the Premier asks for. I will give it. We will first take the Bunbury Railway. We were assured, only last session, that out of the expenditure on that railway a sum of £25,000 would be saved, and that this would be placed, as its fair proportion, towards the cost of the Perth railway improvements and the new station, which were to answer for the Bunbury as well as the other Government railways. That was quite fair and right; but has it been carried out? What reliance can we place on assurances given such as this, when we

find that they really amount to nothing? Contrast that assurance with what we were told in this House, only the other night, when the Premier said it was found that the increased expenditure on the Bunbury Railway would not permit of any surplus being taken from that vote.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): That included the Busselton Railway, and not only Bunbury.

MR. DEHAMEL: And the Premier went on to say, the result is that the whole cost of the Perth Railway station is to be provided out of a special vote of £85,000, which is to be raised separately. Therefore, none of the promised £25,000 of saving from the Bunbury Railway vote will go towards that object. Where, I would ask, has this promised saving of £25,000 gone to? Where has this increased expenditure, which the Premier referred to, arisen? I think I can answer that question pretty shortly. It has arisen in building unnecessary stations, or unnecessary goods sheds, at Burswood, at Cannington, at the Serpentine, and the erection of ridiculous and extravagant outbuildings or sheddings at Pinjarrah, and last, not least, in the proposal to build an utterly unnecessary and extravagant railway station at Bunbury. I say that in the expenditure on the Bunbury Railway the Government have deliberately wasted the public funds of this colony, which have been entrusted to their care. I say they have "overrun the constable," and they now ask us to help them out of the difficulties caused by their want of forethought, if not by actual extravagance and mismanagement. They ask us to provide further funds. I ask, what for? Are these further funds to be provided to enable the Government to squander them, as I say they have squandered a portion of the funds we have already entrusted to their hands? I say they have not even done this wasting of the public funds with their eyes shut. They have been warned, time and again, in this House, and yet they have continued this reckless and extravagant policy all through, from one end to the other. The next item of proof I come upon is the Yilgarn Railway. There we are asked to provide £34,000 to complete that line. Why, it was but the other

day that the whole of the colony, almost, was ringing with the remark that the price at which this railway contract work had been let was wonderfully low—that the construction was to cost only £871 per mile, and I believe that such a low price as that was unprecedented in railway history, and far below the Government estimate.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Eight miles longer than the estimate in the Loan Act.

MR. DEHAMEL: It was then spoken of as another wonderful stroke of luck for the Government, and so it was; but how is it that we suddenly find ourselves called upon, after all this wonderful luck and after this cheap construction, to provide another £34,000 to build that line? The explanation is now given in this way, that this deficit is chiefly caused by the expenditure to obtain the necessary water, and a bonus of £2,500 to the contractor for finishing his contract by the 30th of June next.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): And the line being eight miles longer.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: It was surveyed when the contract was let.

MR. DEHAMEL: I take the two excuses that were offered to this House, the other night, when the Financial Statement was delivered. The first was that water for any railway is a necessity. That is an axiom. There was no new discovery in the fact that the railway could not be run without water. It was therefore known, from the first, that water would have to be provided; and I say the provision of water for that line ought to have been included in the estimates that were first submitted to this House. If the provision of water were included in those estimates, then it will not explain this deficit; but if it were not included, then I say the Government were at fault in putting estimates before us which did not include such a necessary thing as the supply of water.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We had not been in office more than three weeks when we brought that in.

MR. DEHAMEL: Then it proves the utter un wisdom of the Government in introducing a Loan Bill so soon after taking office. It is undoubtedly the duty of the Government to provide members of this House with the fullest information

in the estimates they place before the House. It is impossible for members to find out these things. The Government know them, and members are bound to accept the assurances of the Government on these matters, and in this instance I say the Government have failed in a manifest duty to the House. Now, I come to the next item of the excess, which is the bonus of £2,500 to the contractor. It is not the amount that astonishes me, but I have seldom been more astonished than I was when I heard the Premier state that he had promised to give this bonus to the contractor. I say the Premier and the Government have deliberately set the wishes of this House at defiance in this matter. On the 12th of January last a motion was made by the hon. member for Toodyay that a bonus should be given to the contractor if he would complete the Yilgarn railway six months sooner than the contract date, which was the 31st December, 1894. That motion was dealt with in this House in a way I have seldom seen a motion dealt with. It was hardly treated seriously, but was so ridiculed that it was laughed out. There is no motion I have seen thrown out with so much contumely as that motion was.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): There was no necessity, then.

MR. DEHAMEL: And what were the words of the Attorney General on that occasion? He said, in reply:—"Although the object may be a laudable one, to accelerate the completion of this railway, hon. members will know at once the Government could not think of supporting this motion, chiefly on the ground that, having accepted a tender and made a contract, to add another term to the contract would be unfair to the other tenderers. I question whether it would have helped forward the construction of the railway if we had put such a term in the contract, because, as has been pointed out, these works are completed as quickly as possible, otherwise nothing is made out of them." That was the statement of the Attorney General, in support of the throwing out of that motion. I say that no Government, trading on the blind support of a too loyal following, dare have ventured to take such a course as the present Government have done in this matter. It is not the amount,

but it is the principle, I object to. Have we returned indeed to the dark ages—have we returned to the time when we are to adopt the principle that “the king can do no wrong?” Surely not; and if some members of this House deem themselves honoured when the Government set at defiance their expressed wishes, I can tell those members I am not one who can feel honoured that my wishes are thus deliberately set aside, when those wishes form a part of the wishes of the House as a whole, and are not the wishes of an individual only. I trust that if hon. members do not take such a course as will support the honour of this House, their feelings will lead them to repel conduct which would not be attempted by Ministers in any other Assembly in the world. I come next to the Mullewa Railway, and here we are asked to provide a sum of £86,000 for its completion. What are the facts? That railway was included in the Loan schedule of 1891, and was passed solely on the assurance that the railway would cost only £100,000. It was carried only by a narrow squeak, and I am perfectly certain that if, on that occasion, it had been known that this railway would cost £150,000—much less £186,000—that railway would not have been sanctioned at all. The Government having got in the thin end of the wedge, by this sanction of £100,000, came again before this House in 1892 and said the £100,000 would not complete the railway, and they asked for £180,000; and this House deliberately and emphatically refused to grant it, and granted only £50,000 more.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The Government never asked for £180,000. They asked for a sufficient sum to finish the railway, and I limited the amount to £50,000, afterwards.

MR. DEHAMEL: It is distinctly in my recollection that the amount mentioned was £180,000, and that £150,000 only was the amount that was sanctioned by this House. Then we find that sum will not complete the railway, and the Government now come and say, “Will you advance us another £36,000, and then we will complete it?” Why, this work is to cost nearly double the amount of the estimate originally placed before us; and, really, in the face of things like this, I ask hon. members: what reliance can

we place on the assurances of the Government in regard to these estimates of the cost of public works which they place before us? And on what plea, I would ask, is such further amount sought? As to one moiety, we find that it is owing to the purchase of land at Geraldton, amounting to £21,000, instead of £5,000 as expected. In this instance, the Government estimates were about right, but the Government allowed themselves to be deliberately and distinctly “had,” on the question of the land at Geraldton. If, instead of taking that land, as soon as this heavy and unnecessary increase in the price was asked for, the Government had said, “No; we will just take the two allotments which will enable us to connect the line as it is at present, with a loop to the new jetty, but we will not take any of that other land for removing the railway from the main road into the land alongside.” It was to the interest of the people at Geraldton that the railway should be moved from the road on to the private land, and if the Government had put their foot down firmly and said, “Unless you agree to the price we offer, we will not take the land, and we will leave the railway where it is,” I say emphatically the people of Geraldton would have taken the offer, which was a fair and reasonable one. The Government have simply thrown away £15,000 or £16,000 at Geraldton, for want of a little firmness, when the hard-headed Northerners at Geraldton proved too strong for them. What was the excuse given to us by the Treasurer, the other night, as to the reason for paying this heavy increased cost? It was one, to my mind, rivalled in its audacity only by its extreme ingenuity. The reason given was this: “At the present time it must be admitted that the bold policy which the present Government have initiated is resulting in greatly increasing the value of land.” Now I deny this statement *in toto*. I say the value of land has distinctly fallen, and in many parts of the colony land is at the present moment actually unsaleable. This is proved by a little thing I saw in an evening paper yesterday, wherein a bankrupt under examination proved that the whole of his liabilities to secured and unsecured creditors amounted only to £2,100, whereas the total value of his property is £6,620. There is a big surplus in that,

and yet that man cannot sell this property, and has to go bankrupt.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): That man said that if he could get one of his deeds out of the bank he could pay all his debts.

MR. DEHAMEL: The conduct of the Premier, in all his holdings up to us, and through us to the people, of this bold policy of which he always speaks, reminds me very much of the ostrich. The ostrich has a way of trying to hide its head in the sand, and then thinking it hides itself so completely that no one can see it. The Premier possibly thinks that, by holding out continually that this policy has been such a bold one, he will persuade us and the people of the colony that the policy is really a bold one. I believe he has persuaded himself, and he hopes, like the ostrich, to carry that persuasion to others. In the same way he tells the people that the colony is so prosperous. Well, I am always being asked where this 'prosperity' is. People say their banking accounts are in anything but a prosperous condition; and I believe the Premier has really persuaded himself that, because he has a good salary and also a pension, and has no financial difficulties, the colony is in a prosperous position, so long as he is not troubled with such difficulties. But I say that telling the people this will not satisfy them. They say it is not so, and they will use their own sense and judgment, and when the right time comes their verdict will be that the policy of the Government, this bold policy that the Premier would wish them to believe it to be, has not made the colony so prosperous as he tells them it is. Other items are, "Eastern Railway, miscellaneous, £20,000," and "Additional rolling stock for existing lines, £60,000," making together £80,000. These railway stores have increased, during the time of the present Government, from only a few thousands in value until they are nearly a quarter of a million in value, and yet we are asked for all this additional money to buy more rolling stock. Is the money wisely and prudently expended for this purpose? Now we have in the colony half a dozen new railway saloon carriages. I have called for a return, which is not yet furnished, but I am told these carriages, delivered here, cost about £1,100 each. Taking them at that, I am told they will carry only 20 people each; and

yet the old carriages we used to run carried 54 people each, and cost about £800. If this be the case, it shows that even in the rolling stock the money is rolling sadly away. I think I have said enough to show a large amount of leakage in the first loan. But, in addition to the things I have mentioned, I will call attention to the post and telegraph stations, hospitals, and police stations in all parts of the colony which have been erected, perhaps not unnecessarily, but at an unnecessary cost; and this is the way in which the money has been squandered. The Government admit they have £436,000 of the Loan of 1891 still to raise, and I cannot see why we should at present authorise the raising of any more. It is quite open to them to raise and spend that. We gave them a Treasury Bills Bill to raise money in that way, so that the Government have every power to raise that amount. I say let them raise it, and if that money is spent by them more judiciously than the loan money has been spent in the past, I have no doubt we will authorise them to raise and spend more. But why, in a time like this, should we be asked to authorise a loan of over half a million of money? As to the £280,000 which the House has sanctioned, I am content to let that rest; but I do object to our giving any further amount than that at present. The Premier has referred—and I was pleased with the way in which he did refer to this one subject—to the deviations on the Eastern Railway for improving the grades up Greenmount. I am strongly of opinion that that deviation is necessary, but I am not of opinion that it is an absolute necessity at the present time. The very thing I was going to suggest has been practically held out by the Premier himself, and that is that the work might be withheld for a time. I should be sorry to see it withheld for any great length of time, but having regard to the circumstances of the colony, and the great amount we have added to the debt during the two and a half years, it would be wisdom to postpone this work for perhaps the next twelve months. I have said enough to show what are my main objections to the Loan Bill now before us. It is not that I want to throw the Bill out altogether, but I should like an expression of opinion from hon. members to the effect that a Loan Bill shall

be authorised, but that it shall be limited to £280,000, being the actual amount already authorised, with perhaps another £20,000 for any special pressing purpose.

MR. SIMPSON: After carefully thinking out the subject, the hon. member for Albany has favoured us to-night with his reasons for objecting to this Bill. There is no doubt he has, to his own satisfaction, furnished exact and careful reasons for the course he has taken, and he considers he is quite entitled to offer as much opposition as possible to this Bill. That is on the 6th September, 1893, but on the 6th of January, 1893, the hon. member had rather different views. I have before me some remarks he made then, on the resolution submitted by the Premier with regard to the vote of £230,000, and I dare say this House will remember that the hon. gentleman, in speaking on railway matters, referred to that great authority, Mr. "Satan" Brown, from whom he had gathered important information, and the hon. gentleman said, in concluding his address, "On this occasion I am thoroughly in accord with the Premier and the Government, in regard to this resolution, and it gives me great pleasure in supporting it."

MR. DEHAMEL: So I do now—the £280,000.

MR. SIMPSON: I am glad the hon. gentleman is supporting the Government, because he is giving us such a mournful tale, and such a pathetic warning to the Government, which may not have much effect on them, that one might conclude the whole position of the colony is hopeless. It was suggested by the Premier that we are not going to rush into the money market immediately for this £540,000. One would almost imagine, from what the hon. member for Albany says, and I suppose he speaks with a knowledge of the responsibility, the great responsibility, that attaches to the leader of "Her Majesty's Opposition," and knowing that his utterances will be carefully reported, and be read by gentlemen in the financial world, and if those gentlemen believe his conclusions—that this money is wastefully and extravagantly expended upon a railway connecting Bunbury with Perth, and on the Yilgarn Railway; instead of knowing, as we do, that the revenue from goods and passengers

already carried over the Bunbury line is very satisfactory, and I have no hesitation in saying, from what I know of the traffic to the goldfields, that an immense saving in the cost of transit to Yilgarn is already effected by the Yilgarn Railway being opened as far as the construction is completed. Reference was also made to the Mullewa Railway, and there is no doubt a great difference between the estimated cost and the item now before this House. But the first estimate was more of a conjecture than a calculated sum. Although we have grave public obligations, yet I have very little doubt that when these railways have been completed, and within five years from this time, we might easily get an offer from a company or syndicate to take over our national debt and pay it off, if we would give them our railways as an equivalent for the debt. This Bill is to complete and perfect, and make revenue-producing, a series of public works which have not been completed up to the present. The figures I have heard about extravagant railway stations, and matters of that kind, have appalled me, lately. I have heard one gentleman say that one country station has cost nearly £1,400, and he believed he was the only passenger who used it, and that the white ants had already almost eaten it away, the wood being karri, brought into a jarrah country. I think there has been extravagance with regard to the railway stations on the South-Western line, and, seeing alterations which are occurring so rapidly, I cannot understand why our Engineer-in-Chief has designed stations intended to suit the traffic so far into the future. The colony has not developed sufficiently in the country districts to require extravagant railway stations. Still, we do not want paltry station buildings, and I think it is our duty, if we believe in the public works policy of the present Government, to support them, while I also hope there will be care taken in not spending too much on ornamentation in the public buildings now going on. I saw a post-office going up, the other day, which has eight different places to get in at—you can get in at five different windows and three doors, and these openings cost money. The contractor told me he really considered, in the interest of that place, that £60 could have been saved instead of having so many unnecessary

openings. We should not go into highly ornamental buildings.

MR. A. FORREST: I intend to support the important Bill now before the House, because I consider it is absolutely necessary, in the interest of the colony, that further money should be brought into the colony in the present dearth of money. I do not altogether agree with the Premier's remark, that the colony is in a financially good position, because we hear on all sides, and in the city especially, that things are not what they are represented to be. Those who are engaged in commerce or finance are fully aware of the tightness of money. It is almost impossible, at present, to obtain the ordinary banking accommodation required in trade, and one of our great banking institutions is calling up the advances previously made to people in this colony. These are facts which cannot be disputed. Even those persons who are in a position to offer the largest possible amount of securities are not able to obtain money from banks or financial institutions at present, and, under these circumstances, the colony cannot be in the position the Premier has stated to-night. Only yesterday a large financial institution called upon a certain person to pay up an advance which he had obtained, and, although he offered to double the amount of securities which he had given for the accommodation, so that he might not be required to pay up the money immediately, the reply was: "We don't want more securities; we require the sovereigns we lent you." This incident does not show that the large financial institutions have confidence in this colony. On these grounds alone I say it is absolutely necessary that further money should be brought into the country. To show that this House and members of the Government have confidence in the colony, and that they are not afraid to borrow money, we ought to pass this Loan Bill. A few years ago, it was no more trouble to borrow money and give security, than it was to walk down to this House; but at the present time you may apply to any bank or financial institution, and you will find they cannot do anything for you. The hon. member for Albany has read out a paragraph from a newspaper, showing that a well-known citizen, for the sake of a small advance for which he had given

a large security, was obliged to meet his creditors, whereas a few years ago, in like circumstances, that citizen would no more have thought of calling his creditors together than flying to the moon. It is absolutely necessary that more money should be brought into the colony. Our goldfields are turning out a large amount of gold, and no doubt the gold costs nearly as much as it represents in value, but although it is sent out of the colony, there can be no doubt that it comes back in the form of goods, and must produce an immense deal of benefit to the colony. With regard to the Yilgarn and Mullewa Railways, I think the amounts asked for in the Bill are absolutely necessary. The amount required for the Yilgarn line is not to increase the contract price, but to provide for water, which was not included in the original estimate. The same applies to the Mullewa Railway, which has proved to be a heavier work than was roughly estimated in the first instance. I wish to have some information as to the item for developing the goldfields and other mineral resources. I think the Government have been a little lax in the development of those gold mines in which a large amount of private capital has been spent—I mean the mines at Southern Cross. To-night a telegram has been received stating that the leading mines have closed down, that the water supply has gone dry, and that the mine from which the water was got has now no more than sufficient for its own wants, and it has ceased to supply the other mines with the water on which they depended. I think the Government should have provided a sufficient supply for the whole of the mines at Southern Cross. The amount of money which has been paid to the Central Mine by the others, for water, would have been more than sufficient to pay for a large tank being sunk. Considering that nearly £100,000 has been spent by these mining companies, the Government should have taken some steps for carrying out the wishes of the population at Southern Cross, and of others having interests there. A bore was attempted to be put down, but has been since abandoned. They are now sinking in the old shaft, and hoping to get water there. The reason why the mining companies have not done it for themselves is the want of

funds. The Government have been supplying the town of Fremantle with water during many years, at an expense of £600 a year, and it will be found that £20,000 has been spent in providing that supply; but what have the Government done at Southern Cross? They have spent a large sum in buying boring machinery, which they have not worked.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We offered a bonus, last year, for the mining companies to sink deeper, and try to get water; and now you ask for a tank.

MR. A. FORREST: I shall support the second reading of this Bill.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: Though I expected the Government to bring down a Loan Bill, I hardly expected such a formidable schedule as this attached to it. Of course there have been resolutions passed authorising the Government to expend certain sums on particular works; and I thought that when the Government said they would introduce a Loan Bill, they were going to ask for legislative authority to construct those works. But there are many items in this schedule which, in committee, I shall try to reduce—I fear, however, with very little hope of success. There is a sum of £34,000 for the completion of the Yilgarn Railway, and I should like to have heard an explanation why that sum is required. The sum originally sanctioned in the first loan schedule was £324,000; the length of the line was 167 miles, at £871 per mile, giving a total of £145,457; there are the extra miles to add to the length at the same rate; and we have not heard what has become of the balance of £178,543. As the Government are removing all the rails from the Eastern Railway and relaying with heavier rails, and as the lighter rails may be used for the Yilgarn line, I cannot see how that line is going to cost, roughly, £170,000 for rails and other equipment. It appears to me that our professional advisers spend a great deal too much money on stations and ornamentations, instead of putting the money into useful works. I can point to several examples—one on the South-Western Railway, where £1,200 or £1,300 has been spent, while a couple of hundred would have been ample. If the Government would build platforms with shelter from the rain, and erected goods

sheds to keep off the weather, this would be all the people expect. If the Government economised in this direction, their action would meet with more approval than the expenditure of these large sums. I do not know that this is a time when the Government should raise another loan, except for works already sanctioned. Before this money can be raised, this House will be defunct, and probably there will be another House which may not approve of this schedule; there will also be another Government in office, or a shuffling of the cards; I do not think this is a time for raising a loan, except for the amounts already sanctioned. It would have been much better to leave this loan schedule until the next session, and if the present Government are then in office they can then bring forward their schedule. It does appear to me rather strange that a House nearly expired—

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Another year yet.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: The money will not be raised within another year, and it would have been better to leave this matter until after the elections. The Premier said we have been striking out a bold policy. There is no doubt he has, and it has been a very costly one, besides being bold. The loans have been raised at a rate not justified by the population we have; and as for comparing our indebtedness, per head, with that of other colonies, I think the other colonies regret they have borrowed so much. I do not think it is a happy comparison to compare the rate per head with that of the other colonies. When this Bill goes into committee, I shall certainly move to strike out some items from the schedule.

MR. MONGER: I shall not oppose the second reading, but I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without, perhaps for the last time, recalling to the minds of the Ministry the great mistake they made in the route of the Yilgarn Railway. For the first time we hear that this railway is eight miles longer than was at first anticipated. When the consideration of the route came before this House, about two years ago, we were given certain figures, which were acted upon by this House; and I think that even the Premier will now agree that if we had been told at that time that the line from Northam was

actually eight miles longer than was then stated, the line would never have started from Northam.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): The eight miles longer would have been common to both routes, whether from Northam or York.

MR. MONGER: It is all very well to tell us that, but we have got nothing to show that this would have been the case. We are asked now to vote £34,000 more to complete this line, which in the first instance was estimated to cost, as calculated by the Engineer-in-Chief for both lines, say £216,000 for construction. But instead of the line costing that amount, a tender was accepted for about £147,000, leaving the Government with something like £70,000 in hand, and not taken into consideration in their estimate. Notwithstanding this £70,000 which was saved to the country in the contract price, we are now asked to vote a sum of £34,000 for the completion of the line. Before I can agree to this item in the loan schedule, I shall certainly want explanations from the Government as to the way in which that money is going to be expended. Granted that the water difficulty is a very serious item of expense, I fail to see that the question of water is going to cost the country an amount of £100,000, as the difference between the estimated cost of the line and the amount we are now asked to vote, added to the £70,000 saved in the price of construction.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Where are the rails?

MR. MONGER: I am simply going on the figures of the Engineer-in-Chief. His estimate for the construction was £216,000, and, instead of the construction costing that amount, a tender was accepted for about £70,000 less; and, notwithstanding that large difference, we are now asked to vote a further sum of £34,000, the only reason given being the difficulty of providing water. As regards the Mullewa Railway, I agree with most of the previous speakers that the amount of £10,000 for a railway station at Geraldton is altogether out of proportion to the value of the work, and not in accordance with the requirements. I am pleased to see in the Bill an item for roads, but yet am sorry it embraces a further item of "roads to railway stations." If the latter

part had been left out, I should have said the item was worthy of support. While we are dealing with a loan, the best thing for the Government to do is to place a sufficient sum in the schedule for the requirements of the various road boards in the colony. At present the annual Estimates simply allow £15,000 for the requirements of all the road boards in the colony for the next twelve months, and that sum is altogether inadequate. The Government should have put, in this loan schedule, a sum sufficient for the maintenance of the various roads of the colony, and not merely for roads to connect with new railway stations. In committee I shall have some suggestions to make as regards certain items in the schedule. I cannot sit down without expressing my surprise at the Government asking members to support a Loan Bill for over half-a-million of money to be expended in Geraldton and districts South of Geraldton, without providing a single penny to be expended farther North than Geraldton. I am not at all surprised that the people in the North, at times, express dissatisfaction with the treatment they receive. Here we are represented by a Ministry whose interests should be as much in the North as in the South, whose members come from the South; and I can only attribute the wants of the North being overlooked in this Loan Bill to the fact that they have not more representatives in this House who are sent here from the Northern towns.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The Attorney General is a North member.

MR. MONGER: He is away from the House just now. I am sorry that greater consideration has not been shown to the North, in this Bill. I shall support the second reading.

MR. CONNOR: I am sorry that I cannot support the second reading of the Bill, for the reason which has just been advanced by the hon. member for York, and that is the entire absence from this Loan Bill of a single penny provided for expenditure to the northward of Geraldton. The hon. member for West Kimberley says £2,000 is to be expended there. Still, that is a very small percentage of the amount, in comparison with the revenue which is derived from the districts northward of Geraldton. In the

debate on the annual Estimates, last night, I am sorry the Premier had a sneer at the town which I have the honour to represent.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): No sneer was intended.

MR. CONNOR: I took it as such, but hope I was wrong in doing so. I shall ask the Premier to remember that, small as the place is at present, it was the cradle of the industry which has placed this colony in the position which it at present holds. I refer to the gold industry. I hope also it is the cradle of an industry which will, before long, astonish this colony. I refer to the pastoral industry.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn): What about the £40,000 in the loan schedule, for the development of goldfields and mineral resources?

MR. CONNOR: I must express my dissent from the Bill, believing that the Northern part of the colony is badly treated in it.

MR. PIESSE: I regret that the Government have found it necessary to ask for this further sum, in addition to the amounts previously sanctioned; yet, although this loan will burden the colony to some extent, I do not offer any direct opposition to it. I would like to record the same objection as was raised by the hon. member for York, with reference to the Yilgarn Railway. When the evidence was being taken before a select committee, with reference to the route of that railway, I particularly asked questions about the water supply, and although no direct answers were given at the time, yet I could anticipate there would be some expense which the Government did not clearly see at the time, with regard to providing water along the railway through a waterless country. No provision had evidently been made; and now we find an item of £34,000 for completing the railway, in which the water supply will have to be provided. It is one of the troubles which I knew at the time would crop up, and it ought to have influenced the Government in favour of starting the railway from York instead of Northam, because there would be better country to pass through and a better water supply. I am afraid this is one of the blots upon the career of the Government. If this railway had started from York, it would

have helped the districts further south, and there would have been a greater benefit to the colony; although a suggestion was thrown out, as a sop, about a loop line being carried from Beverley eventually. I think that even this £34,000 additional will be found insufficient, unless water is carried from some of the pools. Even now, taking all the central portion of the colony, the rainfall is less than half what it has been in the York district, and there will be an immense amount of trouble in providing water. It is to be hoped that, in the future, a water supply will be looked to more than anything else in the Eastern districts. The Premier referred to telegraph extension, and I hope that an extension of the Broomehill to Beverley telegraph line will be connected with Mount Barker, because now that we have such a large amount of telegraph business with the Eastern colonies, the breaking of the line connecting us with the Eastern colonies must mean a serious loss; and it will not cost much to connect the telegraph line from Broomehill to Mount Barker; and so provide a sufficient means of transmitting messages in case of breakage between the Williams and Bannister, or between Bannister and Perth, where breakage is frequently happening, and the whole communication being cut off for a time. I think it is not good form, on the part of the hon. member for Albany, to discourage the connection of the telegraph with other parts of the colony, and he ought to support the third line of communication which I suggest, by way of Mount Barker, as the falling of a tree across either of the other lines may at any time break the connection. If this is not proposed, I shall take an opportunity of moving an amendment that some other item be reduced to provide for this telegraph extension. I am glad to see that a sum is to be provided for school buildings. Many of the present school buildings are unsuitable. Some schools are held in tents, and in the summer the heat is unbearable. Other schools are held in small galvanised iron buildings, which are not suitable. Generally, I must agree that most of the items on the loan schedule seem to be quite necessary, although I regret that our liabilities are to be increased. The argument of the hon. member for West Kimberley, about

bringing in more money, is not sound. All who are connected with business must know that everything commercial is at a standstill, through the financial crisis; but the introduction of capital by borrowing it for public works will not help us now any more than it has done in the past. Unless we do what we know is necessary for developing the country, we may just as well let the money remain where it is. Bringing money into Perth, or Fremantle, or other centres, does not develop the country, unless we have people going on to the land and developing its agricultural and mineral resources, and unless this be done, we shall have nothing with which to pay the interest on the large debt we are incurring.

MR. CANNING: If the various items in the Bill represented entirely new projects, we might very fairly consider the wisdom of authorising them. But the main purpose to which the proposed loan is to be applied is the completion of works long since authorised, and which are much more necessary now than when first started; and unless these works are carried out, and done expeditiously, the promise of prosperity and of the amelioration of the present condition of things in the colony will certainly be disappointing. All hon. members must be satisfied in their minds of the necessity for obtaining the money required to complete these works. The only difficulty that presents itself, to my mind, is as to whether the money will be obtained. I think that if the proper means be taken to convince the British public as to the real character of our resources, the money will be obtained, and will be only an instalment of the money that will find its way, through other channels, into this colony, outside of our loans. Even if I were disposed to criticise closely the financial policy of the Government, no other course is open to me than to support the second reading of this Bill.

MR. MOLLOY: In common with the majority of hon. members, I deplore that the necessity exists for the introduction of another Loan Bill. However, the items in the schedule seem to demonstrate the necessity of completing the works which were originally set down for inadequate amounts, and bringing them to a successful issue. It is to be deplored that it should have been found necessary to ex-

pend such a large amount of money for the construction of the Mullewa Railway.

MR. CANNING: One of the most important works in the colony.

MR. MOLLOY: This railway may be, in the opinion of some hon. members, one of the most important works, but I venture to say that, on this subject, there will be a great difference of opinion, and in my opinion the expenditure in this direction will be a constant source of loss to the colony. The interest alone upon the cost of construction will be considerable; besides which the working expenses will create a tax or an annual loss of about £10,000. Considering the character of the country traversed by this railway, we will find that the land there will never sustain such a settled population as will justify the expenditure on this railway. The greater portion of it runs through a desert, which can never be populated, and to expect that settlement will follow the construction of such a railway is exceedingly unreasonable. The schedule proposes a further expenditure for improving the grades on the Eastern Railway, and relaying the line with 60lb. rails. This is a very necessary work, and the expenditure will lessen the cost of maintenance to such a degree that it will be found a very profitable investment. The amount set down for the purchase of land for the Perth railway station and yards seems a large sum; but, considering the development of the country, and the growing needs of the colony, the amount is only reasonable. The other items in the schedule are not unreasonable, but it is a question whether there is a necessity at the present time, before the expenditure of the last moiety of the previous loan, that we should saddle ourselves with the additional cost of the various works here set down. In view of the altered circumstances of the colony, it would perhaps have been wiser if some of the items had been deferred; but the completion of the Yilgarn Railway at an additional cost of £34,000, considering the low contract price per mile for the construction, does not say much for the accuracy of the estimate made for this work. The greatest objection I have is to the amount put down for the completion of the Mullewa Railway. We have had several discussions on the subject, and the last time this House was asked

to consider this work it was determined that the extra cost should not exceed £50,000, but now we find the item has increased to a further amount of £36,000. When we are also reminded that the cost of the railway station at Geraldton will be about £20,000, I think this should make us pause before we vote the sum here set down. It is well known that in the chief town of the colony, for the past twelve years, where the principal railway station accommodation is required, we have had a small station, which was built at a cost of £2,000 or £3,000; yet we see the large provision which is being made at Geraldton. This item in the schedule for the Mullewa Railway, which includes the large expenditure in Geraldton, will afford an opportunity for hon. members to express their opinion on it in committee, and to endeavour to effect a saving. Considering the depression in business which exists, we should apply ourselves to the consideration of economy, and we should be careful before committing ourselves to any sanguine views as to the future. Having been only two and a half years under our present system of Government, and having committed ourselves to such a large loan as that which was authorised in 1891, it is to be regretted that we should now find it necessary to increase our indebtedness to the extent of over half-a-million. We are reminded that our population is increasing considerably, and that our indebtedness per head is not now so much as it was anticipated it would be when the first Loan Bill was introduced. But there may be a check placed on us at any moment in this direction, and the sanguine views of the Premier may not be realised; and, having regard to this consideration, it would be well to consider, in committee, whether it would not be wiser to cut down the amounts in the schedule to as low a limit as possible, in view of the absolute necessity for it.

MR. COOKWORTHY: As one of the "too loyal majority who supported the Government," I should say a word or two. The Government have been accused of making very bad estimates of the railways they proposed to construct. Considering the time in which the estimates were made, and the absence of any professional knowledge to guide them, I think they are rather to be congratulated

on the result. The amount estimated for the construction of the South-Western Railway was above the actual contract price; and with regard to the Mullewa Railway, which the hon. member for Perth has just objected to, if he were in a responsible position would he bring in a motion that the Mullewa railway work be stopped? The time when the line was proposed was the proper time for objectors to stop it, if they could; but, now that the work has been sanctioned and commenced, this House should carry out the contract. With regard to the deviations on the Eastern Railway, would any sensible man attempt to stop that work while the working expenses on the heavy grades are eating up all the profits? The deviations will be a great benefit, to the Eastern districts particularly. As to the Perth railway station, I have noticed frequently that, when a great crowd are there, it is almost dangerous to be on the platform. The fault lay with a previous Administration in building a station on so small a scale, when they had no idea as to what the future population would be; whereas had they laid out the station properly, and not sold the adjoining land at a small price, but retained it for future extensions, the station requirements, which have now to be provided for, would not have cost anything like the sum put down in this schedule. I do not see any one item here that is not of great importance to the colony; but I still think that in some of the railway stations that are proposed to be built the Government are going too far ahead. Instead of building elaborate stations, the great object should be to extend the railways, and put up stations hereafter accordingly as the traffic develops. No man would borrow money from a bank to ornament his house, but he might do so for extending his business or improving his land. That is something like the case of borrowing money to build elaborate stations. Some of the stations which have been built along the South-Western Railway are not likely to be wanted; and I hope that the Government, while extending railways as much as possible, will put up stations only as they may be required for actual traffic.

MR. PATERSON: While supporting the second reading of this Bill, I must

express my regret that the Government are obliged to ask for another loan; but it appears necessary that we should fulfil our obligations, and carry these works to completion. With regard to the proportion of money expended in the North, there are several members representing Northern constituencies, and I do not know of one who has asked for money without obtaining it, if he showed that the particular work was necessary. I can hardly see where the complaint of the North is. The hon. member for East Kimberley has complained, but he has not suggested any particular work that is wanted in his district.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 7th September, 1893.

Removal of Dredge from Albany—Chattels Foreclosure Bill: third reading—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

REMOVAL OF DREDGE FROM ALBANY.

THE HON. E. T. HOOLEY: I have to ask the Colonial Secretary whether it is the intention of the Government to remove the dredge from Albany, and, if so, when; also, whether the dredge will be sent to Carnarvon?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I have to reply that the work the dredge is now engaged upon will take until about the end of the year, and then, in all probability, it will be sent to Champion Bay and Carnarvon. I may say that it is proposed to dredge a channel 600 feet wide at Albany. At present the deepening operations have

only extended to a width of 300 feet, and to do the other 300 feet will take about four months longer. After that the dredge will be free, and will be then employed wherever it is most urgently required; and I imagine Carnarvon and Geraldton will command her first service. My formal answer to the question is: When the work the dredge is now employed upon at Albany is finished, which will be about the end of this year, it will, in all probability, be sent to perform dredging at Champion Bay and Carnarvon; but nothing definite has yet been settled.

CHATELS FORECLOSURE BILL.

THIRD READING.

This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 4.40 o'clock p.m., adjourned until Monday, 11th September, at 8 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 7th September, 1893.

Proceedings connected with Magisterial Bench at Perth—Bills assented to—Proposed Abolition of the Aborigines Protection Board—Prevention of Prize Fights under guise of Boxing Contests—Chattels Foreclosure Bill received from Legislative Council—Proposals of Mr. J. S. Reid as to leasing 1,000 acres of Land at Greenbushes Tinfeld—Federal Council: Increased representation—Kensington Lane Closure Bill: third reading—Engine Sparks Fire Prevention Bill: committee's report—Grand Jury Abolition Act Amendment Bill: Consideration of Legislative Council's amendments—Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act Amendment Bill: further considered in committee: third reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

PROCEEDINGS CONNECTED WITH MAGISTERIAL BENCH AT PERTH.

MR. TRAYLEN, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier,—1. What occa-