

money in his hands remaining due to the contractor. There is also a provision giving the same rights to the workman in respect to a sub-contractor. That is to say, if a sub-contractor employs a workman, the workman can give notice to the contractor that the sub-contractor is owing him wages, and then the same liabilities will exist between the workman and the contractor as between the workman and the employer, where there is only a contract. The rest of the measure is pretty much that which was included in the previous Act; but, to avoid amending the Act, it is proposed to repeal it, and to make this a complete measure. I think it will give the desired protection, and it will save employers who undertake contracts from much of the harassing which I regret to say they have experienced during the last six or nine months. I have much pleasure in laying the Bill before the House.

MR. WILSON: I move that the debate be adjourned until to-morrow.

Put and passed, and the debate adjourned accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.59 p.m. until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 14th September, 1898.

Question: Potatoes and Discount on Imports—Question: Coolgardie Water Scheme and Acceptance of Tenders—Motion: Tick in East Kimberley, Quarantine and Inoculation; debate resumed on Amendment (negatived)—Police Act Amendment Bill, second reading; in Committee, reported—Petition against Dual Title, Gold-Mining Leases (debate)—Transfer of Land Act Amendment Bill, discharge of order—Prevention of Crimes Bill, in Committee, progress reported—Motion: Orchards and Vineyards, Tax to Suppress Pests—Motion for Papers: Northern Stock Route—Motion for Papers: Post and Telegraph Departments, Reports of Experts—Motion for Papers: Berthing of Steamer Nemesis (withdrawn)—Return ordered: Government Advertisements in Newspapers—Motion: Tax on Sheep for Destroying Wild Dogs; Division (negatived)—Motion: Official Receiver in Bankruptcy, Joint Committee appointed—Motion: Coolgardie Water Scheme, and Acceptance of Tenders; Division on motion to adjourn—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION: POTATOES AND DISCOUNT ON IMPORTS.

MR. LEAKE asked the Premier,—1, Whether it was correct that a discount of 10 per cent. was allowed in respect of duty upon potatoes imported into Fremantle. 2, Why a similar concession was not allowed to similar importations in Albany?

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied,—1, Yes. 2, Because potatoes imported at Albany, in consequence of the shorter journey, are landed in better condition than at Fremantle, and lose less weight.

QUESTION: COOLGARDIE WATER SCHEME, AND ACCEPTANCE OF TENDERS.

MR. HIGHAM, without notice, and by leave, asked the Premier,—Whether any tenders in connection with the Coolgardie water supply scheme have been accepted by the Government?

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied: I may say that tenders

for this great work would have been accepted to-day, had it not been for the notice of motion given by the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes), which is on the Notice Paper. I did not feel justified in accepting any tender, seeing there was a notice before the House in relation to this work. Of course, I am aware that this House has decided over and over again, in favour of this scheme being proceeded with; but, for all that, I did not feel that I was called upon to take an extra responsibility in regard to it.

MR. LEAKE: Certainly not. But is not the Premier going beyond a reply to the question by entering into argument?

THE SPEAKER: I think he is replying to the question.

THE PREMIER: What I should like the House to understand is that a delay has been caused through this notice of motion; and I do not think it is in the interests of this colony to delay this great work, unless the House desires to abandon the work. The sooner we get on with this work, the better. I do not know what hon. members' views are, but unless this House is of opinion that the scheme ought to be abandoned, I think the sooner we get to work with it, the better.

MR. LEAKE: Abandon it.

[Debate on motion ensued, at a later stage.]

MOTION: TICK IN EAST KIMBERLEY, QUARANTINE AND INOCULATION.

Amendment, Fourth Paragraph:

Debate resumed on Mr. Harper's proposed amendment, to add the following paragraph to the resolution (moved 31st August):—

4. That the quarantine now existing between East and West Kimberley be rigidly enforced, but that cattle from the unquarantined areas of the Northern Territory be admitted into East Kimberley.

HON. H. W. VENN (Wellington): I am not sure whether I have already spoken on this amendment, but I think not.

THE SPEAKER: I do not remember whether the hon. member has spoken on it. I think not.

HON. H. W. VENN: Hon. members will now see, having agreed to the motion moved by the member for Fremantle (Mr. Higham), the position they have landed

themselves in. If we once introduce tick into this portion of the colony deliberately by the voice of this Assembly, and if the tick is identical with tick over the border, where there are thousands of infested cattle, and the object is to cheapen the cost of living, I cannot see why we should exclude cattle that are across the border.

MR. A. FORREST: I rise to a point of order. I see from page 743 of the *Hansard* report that the member for Wellington has spoken on the motion.

THE SPEAKER: I see now, from a copy of the *Hansard* debates, that the hon. member has spoken on the motion; so of course he cannot speak on it again.

MR. MORAN: I am going to move an amendment, to enable the member for Wellington and others who have already spoken to do so again, because this is a very important question. I move that the following words be struck out:—

"That the quarantine now existing between East and West Kimberley be rigidly enforced." The motion will then read:—

"That cattle from the unquarantined areas of the Northern Territory be admitted into East Kimberley." I am not moving anything that will support the party wishing to keep cattle out. We have decided, in the interests of the population here and on the goldfields, to allow cattle under proper restrictions to be exported from East Kimberley district and imported here, also that clean cattle may be sent to the goldfields for slaughter, and the others killed here. It is admitted we have not a sufficient supply in the Kimberley district to last very long, and it is absurd to say that because cattle which have tick upon them are on the other side of an imaginary boundary line, such cattle should not be imported into Fremantle or Perth. We only allow those cattle from South Australia to come through the tick-infested part of Western Australia. They have to be examined the same as the West Australian animals before they are shipped, and if they are not in a passable condition, what will happen? They will simply be turned loose into the quarantine area at Kimberley, and they can do no harm, as the tick is already there. They will have to pass a rigid inspection at Wyndham, and also the same rigid quarantine inspection at Fremantle.

In reality there is no shred of argument to support the idea that because a beast happens to have been driven over an imaginary line it shall not come down here. It will be readily understood that I and others must have cattle down, and as we cannot get them from a totally clean district, it has been decided to allow them to come in under rigid inspection. The animals will go through the same channel, the same inspector being engaged and the same trucks going to the goldfields; everything, indeed, being identical except the fact that one bullock will be from South Australia and the other from Western Australia. We are not going to shut out a bullock from South Australia and allow one from Kimberley, for to do so would be most illogical. I would not support the introduction of cattle through any other channel than Wyndham, because that would involve having an inspector or a quarantine area and all the other paraphernalia. Restrictions would have to be multiplied, and if there were any possible chance of escape of the tick, it would be doubled, trebled, or quadrupled, as the case might be. The member who introduced this question (Mr. Harper) is very far-sighted, and he has a shrewd idea of what must happen in the future. His arguments are unassailable, and we who have been supporting him hitherto will not, I think, desert him on this occasion. He sees what will happen. If the stock at Kimberley decreases, bullocks over the imaginary boundary will have to come in. I move this amendment in order to, as I say, enable members who have already spoken to speak again. Antæus of old, having been thrown to the ground, rose with renewed vigour, and I hope members will return to the combat on this question with fresh energy.

MR. VOSPER: I beg to second the amendment.

HON. H. W. VENN: Hon. members cannot accuse me of failing to do all I possibly can to prevent the introduction of disease among cattle in the southern portions of the colony, for I have tried to obviate it on every possible occasion. Having been beaten, and having to recognise the superior wisdom of the House, I must bow to that superior wisdom; but I say again that if the desire of the House

is to have cheap meat, the arguments raised by the member who has just resumed his seat cannot be disputed in any way. It can make no difference to the stock-owners down here whether we have a West Australian breed of tick that will kill our cattle or a South Australian breed that will equally do so. Members in their wisdom have decided that we shall have tick, and not only so, but that they shall be carried all through the country and distributed all over the place. That being so, it will be as well to have them from Queensland through the same channel—Wyndham—I do not say through any other port; but as regards that channel there can be no logical reason for opposing the amendment now before the House, and those who say they will have tick-infested cattle introduced to enable us to have cheap meat should vote for it.

MR. A. FORREST: The amendment moved by the member for East Coolgardie appears to me to be the wrong way about. He asks this House to agree that there should be no quarantine between the two Kimberleys, but I think the House would say unanimously that as far as practicable there should be quarantine between those districts. The proposal by the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) contains the words "that the quarantine now existing between East and West Kimberley be rigidly enforced." The member for East Coolgardie wishes to strike that out altogether.

MR. MORAN: No.

THE PREMIER: It is to strike it out, is it not?

MR. MORAN: I do not propose to remove the quarantine. It is simply to reaffirm the quarantine that exists.

MR. A. FORREST: From the argument of the hon. member I should say he wishes no quarantine to exist, and desires the introduction of cattle from the Northern Territory. I hope the House will not agree to the amendment, and when an opportunity occurs, I hope some hon. member on this side of the House will move that the latter portion of the paragraph before us be struck out. I may say at once that the boundary between the Northern Territory of South Australia and East Kimberley is an imaginary line, and the South Australian Government, I am sure—their stock not being allowed to go

into their own markets—would declare the Northern Territory clean country as far as their cattle coming to Wyndham was concerned. The Legislature of South Australia would say, "The Government of Western Australia are allowing the stock from East Kimberley to go into their own country, and why should we deprive our squatters from sending their cattle to Western Australia?" If we are going to continually drain the Northern Territory, where the tick is bred, then we shall have tick here for the next 20 years, whereas we hope by means of inoculation to get rid of the disease in a few years. I hope hon. members will consider the question in a practical way, and not injure those engaged in rearing cattle. I appeal to the House, as it seems absurd that we should allow South Australian cattle to come into our country. We have gone as far as we reasonably can go, and we have allowed tick cattle to come into our own country from East Kimberley under certain restrictions. If the paragraph is passed, the Government of South Australia can declare their Northern Territory country clean, and cattle from that country can then be admitted into this country at once. This question has been threshed out so fully that it is hardly necessary to go further in the matter. I cannot understand the action of the hon. member for Wellington (Hon. H. W. Venn), who has turned completely round during the course of this discussion. He now says that, as we have made so many mistakes, we should continue to make more.

THE PREMIER (Rt. Hon. Sir John Forrest): I really think the hon. member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) need not press his motion. I asked him not to do so the other evening, but he seems to be persistent about it. There is very little in it, from his point of view. Unless he is of opinion that the South Australian Government are going to remove the quarantine from the northern portion of South Australia, this motion will be inoperative altogether; at any rate, until we meet again. The northern portion of South Australia abutting on this colony, and abutting on to the East Kimberley district, is in quarantine at the present time.

MR. MORAN: Cattle would not come from there under this motion.

THE PREMIER: Where would they come from then?

MR. MORAN: From clean districts.

THE PREMIER: There are no clean districts abutting on to the Kimberley district.

MR. MORAN: Then the motion will be inoperative.

THE PREMIER: I say it will be inoperative. The only chance of this motion being operative is that the Government of South Australia may remove the quarantine, and we remove the prohibition which now exists in regard to cattle from East Kimberley. I think there is not much in this motion; not sufficient for us to have a lengthy debate about it and to have great differences of opinion on it. There is a considerable section in this House and in the country, too, who are opposed to the introduction of cattle from East Kimberley, because they are afraid that the tick will come into the herds in the southern portion of the colony. Those hon. members, and those persons outside the House, have had to give way to the vote of the House in regard to the introduction of cattle from East Kimberley; at any rate between now and the next meeting of Parliament. I do not think we need go further than we have done. If members are constantly acting against the views expressed by those who do not want the tick cattle imported into the southern portion of the colony from East Kimberley, then we, having voted for the introduction of tick cattle, or cattle from the tick-infested districts under strict precautions, should be content with having our way to that extent; but we should not desire to open up our country to the whole of the Northern Territory of South Australia, even if the South Australian Government approved of that during the next twelve months. I think we may fairly wait until we meet again as to any extension of the area from which cattle from districts infested with tick shall come. I think there may be a great deal of force in the fact that by precautions, by inoculation, and by other means available we may be able to get rid of the tick in the East Kimberley district.

MR. LEAKE: What are the means available?

THE PREMIER: There are a good many means available: inoculation is the most important one. If we open up the whole country to the Northern Territory of South Australia and Queensland, we shall never have any chance whatever of getting rid of the disease. I believe the tick in the East Kimberley district is not nearly so virulent as in East Queensland. We have evidence before us which shows that we have not had mortality. We have certainly heard recently of deaths, but we have reports from our inspectors that the cattle remaining have now recovered. Therefore, we should have no desire to import cattle from Queensland to this part of the colony, and unless they are fat cattle, they would not pay for the freight. If you except the low-lying lands at the mouth of the Ord River, and perhaps some below eastward of the Territory to the coast, I believe on the southern slopes of the higher lands of East Kimberley it is not country suitable for tick, and that tick will be exterminated. But to open up the whole of the country to the east of the Northern Territory and to Queensland, if those countries like to withdraw the embargo—I do not know that they would; I am inclined to think they would not, but they might—I do not think there is any necessity. Those who are interested in this question, and who have brought forward this question as to introducing tick from our own territory to assist the consumers and producers, should rest content. I do not think they should press this matter too far. If I had thought they were going to move in this direction, and press it, that would have had some influence with me as to the course I should take. Our duty is to our own producers and consumers first. Let us wait for a year or so and see how what we have done acts, and see whether the precautions we take are effectual, and if they are not, and should the necessity arise, we can consider something wider. I have followed the member for Beverley right through last session and this one, because I thought that by precautions the ravages of the tick would be prevented in the southern portion of the colony, and I believe still

that tick will not flourish in these latitudes. We shall see by and by who is right. Mr. Pound says that he does not know; still we have had thousands of cattle from the North, and we know they must have had tick on them, yet no bad results followed. I go very largely upon that experience, and that being so, we have done all we should be asked to do during the present session to assist our own producers and meet the requirements of our consumers. I hope the motion will not be carried, and I hope the member for Beverley will withdraw it.

MR. LEAKE (Albany): I am not going to support the amendment or the motion proposed by the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper). We have done quite enough damage to the country as it is. We have decided now to let in cattle that are swarming with vermin, and may be rotten with disease. That is the position we are in, and we are asked to perpetuate this position by admitting diseased cattle from the Northern Territory of South Australia to East Kimberley, to enable that source of supply to be drawn upon by the parties whom this materially and practically affects. I do not think there ever has been before the House a motion which is more damaging to this Legislative Assembly than the one which has already unfortunately been passed. It is not impossible for us even now to retract that motion when it is put from the chair. It is no use going over the whole of the ground, but we cannot get away from the fact that the cattle in East Kimberley have been declared by an expert, whom we specially retained, to be swarming with this vermin: you cannot call them anything else. I do not care whether it is cattle or any other kind of animals, no agriculturists and no individual would care to be possessed of any animal that swarms with vermin, and we know that such a condition of things cannot but be harmful to the animal affected. Not only do we find that cattle are largely troubled by the insect, but the insect is the medium of a dread disease, that of tick fever. I am told on reliable authority that if these cattle are shipped from Kimberley—as no doubt they will be by the enterprising firms interested—in December next, if any trace of disease is on the cattle, that disease will develop

during the voyage. Nothing is more likely to develop the disease than the voyage by sea to Fremantle, and what is to be the result under the second paragraph we have passed? These diseased cattle can be brought from Kimberley to Fremantle and then held for slaughter, and the result will be that our markets in Perth and Fremantle will probably be flooded with diseased meat. That is the position we are in, and yet we are asked to regard this as a matter of slight concern. It astonishes me beyond measure to hear that hon. members can support this motion, and tell the House in the same breath that it is going to reduce the price of meat. Reduce the price of meat, forsooth, when we are going to be fed on diseased stuff! It is a monstrous thing. I emphatically declare against this motion, and against the whole of the paragraphs. The member for Beverley simply astonishes me when he, who has always posed as the friend of the pastoralist, supports a motion which has for its object the importation of cattle which are swarming with vermin and rotten with disease.

THE PREMIER: Pile it on!

MR. LEAKE: The Premier ought to be ashamed of himself to mislead and cajole the House into supporting this motion. It is idle for the Premier to say the disease is harmless, and that ticks would not flourish down here. I prefer the opinion of a gentleman like Mr. Hancock to that of the Premier, on a subject which the latter has never studied, and about which he admits he knows nothing. If it were possible to reject all the paragraphs, we should do so: but it is not possible, and I will content myself with expressing my intention to vote against this paragraph. I hope this is the last time this House will be the means of supporting private enterprise in the questionable direction proposed on this occasion.

HON. S. BURT (Ashburton): It makes me smile rather, when I consider the position in which the majority of the House have got. They have done distinctly the wrong thing—as wrong a thing as the House ever did. But we will pass that by. Having agreed to bring ticked cattle into the country, some members—out of pure devilment. I should

think—propose to bring cattle in from all round. Logically, these members are quite correct; for if ticked cattle come in from East Kimberley, why should they not come in from the country immediately adjoining East Kimberley and the Northern Territory? If ticked cattle are good they are as good from the Northern Territory as from East Kimberley; it is the same tick and no worse. I am not going to vote for the motion, but I would ask: On what ground are the majority of the other evening opposing this motion? Is it opposed on the ground that they want to protect the Kimberley cattle, or is it opposed on the ground that the tick outside Kimberley is more virulent than tick inside? What ground do the opponents of the motion take up? I am opposed to the motion on the ground that although we have, unfortunately, agreed to admit ticked cattle into this part of the country, yet there would be less chance of getting the tick, if we admitted them from only one portion of the colony, than if they were admitted also from the northern part of South Australia. There is really no reason, otherwise, why we should not admit ticked cattle from all parts of the world; and to give free trade in this way would be more likely to reduce the price of meat. The desire is to close the door against all cattle but those from Kimberley: but, if we consider the question from a free-trade point of view, I should say: admit all cattle from wherever they can be got. I think, however, such a course would do harm, and I hope the admission of cattle will be restricted to those from one spot. Unfortunately, however, we are restricted by the decision of the House, and therefore I shall vote against the proposition of the hon. member.

MR. QUINLAN (Toodyay): I cannot support the proposal of the member for Beverley. When this question was before us on a previous occasion I voted for cattle being brought to Fremantle, simply because such a course would encourage industry in our colony and help people who contributed to the revenue. So long as there were restrictions which would prevent the spread of the disease throughout the southern portions of the colony, I felt myself justified in supporting the proposal placed before the House on this previous occasion by the member for Fre-

mantle (Mr. Higham). I respect the opinion of the member for Beverley at all times, but I differ entirely from him on this subject. His motion would amount to the perpetuation of the pest, and continuation of a reflection on the colony; although we have so far met circumstances as to give the people interested every protection at the market at Fremantle. With the assurances we have had from the Government as to inspection before distribution we have a better guarantee for good meat than we have at present. Only within the last month have the health authorities discovered a diseased beast being made into sausages in Perth; but what better guarantee could we have for pure meat than supervision of cattle by the Stock Department? The disease, or pest, of tick is not of such a nature as should cause alarm to the consumer. In Melbourne only yesterday it was reported that the result of the Queensland experiment of inoculation for tick had been forwarded to the Government, and it stated that some cattle inoculated several months ago are now being sold as "fats." I feel sure the Government will see that inoculation is instituted, seeing that it can be carried out at a small cost. If we cannot insist on it being done in every instance, those who are careless, or who are not disposed to inoculate their cattle, will have to put up with the consequences.

MR. LEAKE: What about the stock-owners in East Kimberley? Why not apply the argument to them?

MR. QUINLAN: Let those stock-owners inoculate by all means, and I have no doubt they will do it shortly; otherwise they must take the risk. The sooner that district is emptied of cattle fit for consumption the better it will be for us all. It has been said that we will never get rid of the pest, and that East Kimberley will never be clean: but that is a mere matter of opinion. When the tick has nothing to feed on, it will disappear: but I entirely disagree with the proposal to open our doors to cattle from other districts, and I hope the House will set its face against both the motion and the amendment.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie): I quite agree with what the member for Wellington (Hon. H. W. Venn) said as to the logical position of those hon. mem-

bers who previously voted for the introduction of cattle from East Kimberley. But my principal object is to point out that this tick question has already occupied an undue amount of the time of the House. It has been before us for weeks past. Parliament met on the 16th June last, and from that time until now we have only passed one piece of legislation through all its stages—namely, the Health Bill. It seems to me that the time of the House might be more profitably occupied. I rise for the purpose of asking hon. members to moderate their transports as much as they can and get on to more important business, of which the Notice Paper is full. There are several small Bills to be put through, and the Government business takes precedence tomorrow. This tick motion shows symptoms of becoming interminable, and, whichever way it is carried, I ask hon. members for the sake of the country to cut the debate as short as possible.

MR. HIGHAM (Fremantle): I hope the member for Beverley will withdraw his motion, which would be absolutely inoperative. No cattle can possibly come through the East and West Kimberley districts without passing through infected country, notwithstanding the fact that they may be off quarantined ground. I hope the motion will be withdrawn; at any rate, I intend to vote against both motion and amendment.

MR. HARPER (in reply): When I tabled the motion, I gave my reasons for doing so. I said I hoped we should be able to draw from a wider area of country free from tick. Since that time I have made inquiries, and I have ascertained that it is impossible for tick to come from unquarantined country into East Kimberley without coming into collision with the infested cattle of South Australia and cattle of our own people. That is not what I desire, and not what I intended by the motion. A great many members have gone beyond my motion, and treated it as if it sought to introduce cattle from tick-infested country. That is not the intention of the motion. Seeing that it is impossible to bring stock from the Northern Territory without coming through tick-infested country, the object of the motion would not be attained, and for that reason it is my desire to withdraw it.

Motion and amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

New paragraph:

MR. HARPER (Beverley), in accordance with notice, moved, as a further amendment, that the following paragraph be added to the resolution:—

That the best interests of this country would be served were the Government to guarantee interest on the cost of the erection of chilling works at Wyndham by private enterprise; such guarantee to be for a limited number of years, at a moderate rate of interest.

He said: I need add very few words to that. I think it explains itself. My desire is, if this House is agreeable, that an inducement should be offered to do that for which so many people have expressed a desire—to establish chilling works at Wyndham. It is quite out of the question that the Government should find the funds to do this; but possibly, by this simple means, private people in the trade may be induced to do it; and, if it were done, it would obviate the risk of which so many people have expressed their dread in connection with the bringing of live stock to Fremantle. It might mean that in a short time live stock need no longer be brought through, and that the live stock trade would cease.

MR. HIGHAM (Fremantle): I second the motion.

MR. MORAN (East Coolgardie): I do not know what the Premier thinks of this motion.

THE PREMIER: We shall have to get a vote, to give effect to it.

MR. MORAN: I do not suppose he intends to go the length of supporting it. But I want to point out to the mover of it that it means nothing, after all. It proposes that the Government shall guarantee interest on the cost of the erection of chilling works at Wyndham by private enterprise; but it does not say that private enterprise will take advantage of the offer.

MR. HIGHAM: It would give them the opportunity, and would endorse the principle.

MR. MORAN: It only means that this House thinks it a good thing that chilling works should be erected at Wyndham; but what does private enterprise care for what you think about the matter? If I were a private capitalist

about to go into speculation, I do not want this Assembly to tell me that it would be a good thing if I did it. It seems to me that we are beating the air. I should have been almost prepared to support the hon. member if he had worded his motion to mean that the Government should make calculations, and consider the advisability of either subsidising or erecting, as a Government undertaking, chilling works at Wyndham. I do not want to say altogether that I shall oppose the motion, but simply to point out that it will be ineffective. We have the evidence of the local cattle-owners, who unanimously say they would never undertake the work of erecting such an establishment for the small supply they have there already. The chilling works would be absolutely empty for a certain period of the year, for the reason that the local supply could not keep them going, and that we will not allow ticked cattle from the Northern Territory to come in. If you throw down the restrictions between the Kimberleys, and the restriction on the Northern Territory preventing cattle coming to Fremantle, the demand for the erection of chilling works would be somewhat logical. If East Kimberley be already ticked up, what harm can it do to that district to allow ticked cattle to come in, and to be killed in East Kimberley and exported down here after being frozen in chilling works? But, if I correctly interpret the views of the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper), his intention is to allow cattle to come down alive till the chilling works have been erected.

MR. HARPER: Yes.

MR. MORAN: But the hon. member did not say so.

MR. HARPER: I did say so.

MR. MORAN: I am pleased to accept the assurance of the hon. member that he did say so. That being so, I say he is following a consistent course in this matter. Another objection I think is, as I have said, that people in my district do not want chilled meat if they can get the other sort. Chilled meat will not be eaten by a man who gets £3 10s. or £4 a week, even if he has to pay 2d. a lb. more for good fresh meat. That is the position: and, as this motion would probably lead to that result, I look upon it as

being inoperative to a large extent. But, if the hon. member intends, or would move, that the Government undertake this work, so as to assure its being done, I should feel inclined, perhaps, to support him. Possibly the motion will do no harm, but it cannot do any good. My object is as nearly as possible to get live meat down here clean; but what I want to point out is that this motion cannot have the effect of achieving that object. The upkeep of these chilling works would be very costly; and the interest guaranteed would not pay for the loss in respect of the seven or eight months per annum for which the works would be idle; and, when the eight or ten thousand cattle already in the Kimberleys had been frozen, where would your supply come from? You would not allow others to come in from the Northern Territory. I think it is idle to talk of this scheme. Further, I would point out that, before these chilling works could be erected, those ten or twelve thousand cattle would have already been exported to Fremantle. By the time the freezing works were complete, every exportable hoof would have left the district.

MR. HIGHAM: There is a growing supply.

MR. MORAN: Oh, do not argue like that. Will the hon. member tell me that, after you have exported every available hoof now in that district by the time those chilling works are erected, there is a growing supply sufficient to keep the works going? You would have about two yearlings every week to chill. If this scheme is to be successful, you must throw down the restrictions between the Kimberleys and the Northern Territory.

MR. HIGHAM: There are 60,000 cattle there now.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: There are 70,000 cattle there now.

MR. MORAN: What are you going to go on with in the meantime? When will these chilling works be erected? Let us say, in six months. Can a herd double in six months? I have already said that every available hoof will be sent down before the end of the six months; and, when your chilling works are erected, you are in such a position that you cannot import a hoof from the Northern Territory, and you have not got a hoof of your own old enough to chill. And can the cattle grow

fast enough to keep the chilling works going? We know perfectly well they cannot. There is no combination of cattle-growers which would undertake the work. They would rather boil them down. If you removed the restriction, and limited the duty to 30s. a head, and allowed cattle to come in, tick or no tick, through that one channel—through your chilling works at Wyndham—to Fremantle, you would be in a far more logical position than you are now. I do not say I am going to oppose the motion, because it means nothing under present restrictions; therefore, it can neither do good nor harm.

THE PREMIER: (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I think this motion must run pretty close to the Standing Order which prohibits resolutions asking for grants of public money. That is what the motion means, if it means anything. It means that the Government shall put a sum on the Estimates to guarantee interest on the cost of erecting chilling works at Wyndham. I really think it would be a good thing to have chilling works in the northern part of the colony—certainly the interest on them would not be large, and it would only be a guarantee. It would not absolve the owners of the works from their liability. It might amount to, say, 2 per cent. on £10,000; and perhaps £100 or £200 would be the amount of the guarantee for a year or two.

MR. MORAN: That would not pay for whiskies in hot weather.

THE PREMIER: I do not think it necessary for the House to pass this motion at the present time. If we can get the cattle down from the district by steamer, the necessity for the chilling works will not arise. If the district were shut up and not allowed to export cattle, there might be some reason for the motion; but, since we have agreed that, under certain strict precautions, the cattle may be moved by steamer, I think very few persons will be found willing to undertake the establishment of chilling works. It seems to me that, after having taken away all inducement for the erection of such works, to move now that some inducement should be given is rather an ineffective proceeding. I am inclined not to agree to it at the present time.

MR. HARPER (in reply): I do not wish to prolong the debate; but I must point

out that the Premier does not quite fully appreciate the position, when he says we have removed the necessity for these works, because he should know there is an enormous loss of weight in the carriage of live stock; and, furthermore, there is always an enormous number of stock which could never be transported by steamer, because they are too small to pay for freight.

THE PREMIER: Why erect the works at Wyndham? Why not at Derby or Broome?

MR. HARPER: Because their erection at Wyndham would remove the necessity of bringing tick-infested cattle to Fremantle. If it could be proved that chilled meat could be brought to the port of Fremantle and sold at a profit, that would be an immediate inducement to private residents in the Kimberley district to do the same. They might say that their supplies were not very large; but, if the Government would guarantee the interest for a few years, they would be prepared to erect the works, and by that means we should get a much larger supply in our market than by the live stock trade alone.

Further amendment (Mr. Harper's new paragraph) put and negatived.

This closed the debate.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

MR. LEAKE (Albany), in moving the second reading of the Bill, said: This Bill contains only two clauses. One gives the short title, and the other repeals section 2 of 58 Victoria, No. 26. The section proposed to be repealed is that section in the Police Act of 1892 which makes betting in public places punishable. It reads as follows:—

Every person betting or offering to bet by way of wagering or gaining on any racecourse or in any public place, or in any place to which the public are or shall be permitted to have access, whether on payment of money or otherwise, shall be liable, on conviction, to a penalty of not less than forty shillings nor more than one hundred pounds, and for a second offence shall be deemed a rogue and vagabond within the true intent and meaning of the Police Act, 1892, and as such may be convicted and punished under the provisions of that Act.

The objection to the law as it stands is, that for the second offence a man may be arrested and run in as a rogue and vagabond, straight away. There are 44 mem-

bers in this House, and I suppose 40 of them occasionally bet. The hon. member (Mr. Illingworth) shakes his head. Well, he has not done so perhaps for the last two or three years, but no doubt a great many people bet in a simple way; and if any person does so bet now, whether it be for a pair of gloves or £100, he is liable to be dragged before a magistrate and fined, and on a second occasion a party may be locked up by a police officer. It is a piece of drastic legislation which the circumstances do not justify, and as a matter of fact the present law is practically a dead letter. It was introduced, I believe, by some member a few years ago in a moment of pique, and he was one of the first to suffer from it. However, that is by the way. The Act may, and sometimes does, act harshly and unfairly upon individuals. We all know—and it is no use shutting our eyes to the fact—that betting does take place upon the racecourses. Most people, I suppose—not only men, but women—indulge in it; and nothing we can do in the way of legislation can prevent it. If that be so, had we not better recognise what some call an evil and others a pastime, and regulate it as well as we can. Before this statute was passed, the various turf clubs in the colony had it in their power to control what is known as the betting ring. They could prevent men from going on to a racecourse and betting, making themselves offensive, and swindling people, the result being that only men of substance and respectability were recognised; but now we find that men, respectable and otherwise, are betting on all the racecourses, notwithstanding the statute, which the police cannot enforce. I ask members to agree to the Bill, and leave it to the common sense of the general public to protect themselves and avoid those dangers which may possibly flow from the practice, if carried to an unnecessary extent. This Bill was before the House last session in another form, and it contained a clause authorising the working of the wheel totalisator. That clause is not in the present Bill, the object of which is simply to repeal the second section of the Police Act of 1892, and practically allow racing clubs to control affairs in the best way they possibly can. It is useless to allow the statute to remain on our

books when we know it is a dead letter, and that, if it is to be enforced at all, it must be with the greatest harshness and inconvenience to persons who never ought to be harassed in this way. The most innocent people might at any moment render themselves liable to imprisonment under the law, if it were enforced. I hope the Premier will agree with me, that in practice it is found impossible to enforce the law as it stands, and that the best plan will be to repeal it.

MR. HUBBLE (*Gascayne*): I intend to support the Bill because I think it far better to do openly what is now done in secret. If we go to any of the racecourses in the colony, more especially those of the W.A.T.C., we see agents with their books out and hear them saying "Two to one bar one" and so on. I have known cases where ladies and gentlemen, respectable people in this colony, have taken wagers, and it is, as I say, far better to do these things in a straightforward manner than to do them secretly, as at present. I have noticed the same thing in other colonies, where betting is carried on openly. For the reasons I have stated I intend to support the Bill.

MR. MORAN (*East Coolgardie*): Perhaps I am the only member of this Assembly who offered a very strong opposition to the passing of the section which the leader of the Opposition wishes to repeal. I then said, as I say now, that I thought it was over-legislation, and that it was striving to do what never would be done. The gentleman who introduced it did so, as he said, through personal spleen against certain gentlemen called bookmakers; but we know that the hon. member for York (*Mr. Monger*) has learned, perhaps to his regret, that it was ineffective, and that his object was not accomplished, whilst the legislation itself was a menace to innocent people who went to a racecourse and invested a few shillings with the idea of enjoying themselves and getting a little mental excitement. I am of opinion that members did not know what they were doing, but they have since seen how ineffective it is. I have always maintained that it is almost impossible in small matters of this kind to make a community moral by legislation. I am not a betting man, and certainly

not a racing man, yet I did not see that I was called upon to say my friends should not, for the sake of excitement, attend a race meeting, which is a British national amusement, and back their fancy. A man on a racecourse would back his judgment the same as a person would gamble in scrip in advance. Surely the chances against one in relation to the purchase of scrip in advance are very often greater than those against a person betting on a race, yet we do not say a person shall not invest in stock that has been brought out. We should think it very hard if the Legislature said that, if a person bought scrip in advance, or speculatively, he would be guilty of a crime. It is the same thing with regard to betting on a racecourse. The present legislation is unnecessary, and I welcome the step taken by the leader of the Opposition to repeal it. It has been useless to the police, who were hovering between feeling that they were not doing their duty and the idea that, if they did it, they would be accused of interfering with decent people. The legislation is ineffective, and when it was introduced I said it would be repealed in a short time.

THE PREMIER (*Rt. Hon. Sir John Forrest*): I am in accordance with the member for Albany regarding this Bill, and I really think it was a mistake to place the present law on the statute book. This law is not generally observed; and when it is there is trouble. Everyone knows that betting takes place on racecourses everywhere more or less; and the only thing we can do is to try to control it. I think it would do no good to prohibit it; and it is too drastic altogether to say that, if two persons in their right senses make a bet of a small amount, they shall be summoned before a magistrate and fined, and, if they repeat the act, be treated as rogues and vagabonds. Means are provided by which persons who have a little money can stake something upon their opinions, and although there are, no doubt, evils in betting, as in most things in this world, I do not know that we should go to extremes. I believe this law scarcely finds a place anywhere else—in fact, I have never been on a racecourse where the law is so drastic as in this colony—and I certainly see

no reason for such stringency. If you make a law which is contrary to what everyone does on a racecourse, it will be evaded, and, instead of betting openly, people will do it secretly. On a racecourse we see our friends betting, but it would be difficult to prove a case probably, though we know it is being done. For my own part, I would rather see betting done openly, and in that case it would be more under control. I do not know that the bookmaker is a man we desire to encourage in this colony; I do not think he does a great good, and if the present law were only to prevent him from plying his trade I should agree to it; but, as a matter of fact, that cannot be done. How many prosecutions have we had since this law has been enforced? We have had one or two—there being about one a year—and generally the accused gets off, or, if he does not, people think he has been hardly treated, because he makes his bet in an inoffensive way, which, perhaps, does not attract attention. I think we would be acting very wisely, and in the interests of morality, by striking this section from our statute book.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): When the Act was introduced years ago, I pointed out, I think, that it would probably be inoperative. I am going to support the member for Albany (Mr. Leake), but, I wish distinctly to say that I have no sympathy at all with gambling in any department whatever.

A MEMBER: What about land?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I have no sympathy with gambling in land. I want to call the attention of the Premier, as head of the Police Department, to the condition of things in Perth to-day. We have some scores of gambling houses in Perth that could not possibly have their doors open in any other colony, and the Postal Department is being used for the purpose of disseminating betting papers, communications being delivered every day.

THE PREMIER: I never get any.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I get them, and I know they are going through the post; but perhaps the senders are cautious not to send them to the head of the Police Department. We know this kind of

thing is going on to a ruinous extent, and I urge upon the Government to see that the law is carried out. To interfere in the particular to which this Bill refers is absurd. As we used to say at school, it is "straining at a gate to swallow a sawmill." That is not a Scripture quotation, I may tell hon. members. We should not allow all the places in the streets to be open, producing their ruinous effects upon society, and I hope the Government will take the necessary steps to stop the gambling mania in the city which is being carried on to its great damage. The Police Act should be enforced. I admit it is not possible to carry out the section which is now sought to be repealed, but it is possible to enforce the other provisions of the law. It is not a good thing to have a law on the statute book which is universally broken, and which the police make no effort to maintain. I give this as my reason for supporting the Bill. I opposed the introduction of the section referred to, and now I support its abolition.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and report adopted.

PETITION AGAINST DUAL TITLE, GOLD-MINING LEASES.

The petition of British investors, presented at a previous sitting, was now considered.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): I want the House distinctly to understand that I do not intend to enter into any debate on this question now, considering that we have the Mining Bill before us, but it is only in justice to the persons who have been pleased to send this petition that I now move: "That the House give due consideration to the prayer of the petitioners, when dealing with the Gold Mines Bill now before the House."

Question put and passed.

TRANSFER OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

DISCHARGE OF ORDER.

MR. A. FORREST: As it appears to me there is a great deal of objection to

this small Bill which I have brought before the House, dealing with questions of title to land, on the ground that it goes a little too far, I beg with permission to withdraw the Bill.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member had better move that the order of the day be discharged.

MR. A. FORREST: I move that the order of the day be discharged.

Question put and passed, and order discharged accordingly.

PREVENTION OF CRIMES BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

On the motion of **MR. LEAKE**, the House resolved into Committee to consider the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3, inclusive—agreed to.

New Clause:

MR. LEAKE moved that the following, to stand as clause 2, be added to the Bill:—

Where any person is convicted of any offence and sentenced to a term of imprisonment by any court of summary jurisdiction, such court may, in addition to such sentence of imprisonment, direct that such person is to be subject to the supervision of the police for a period of twelve months, or such less period as the court may direct, commencing immediately after the expiration of the sentence passed on him for the last of such offences.

As the Bill was drawn, it applied only to persons convicted before a judge and jury, or before a quarter sessions jury, and unless we passed the new clause and made the Bill apply to convictions under summary jurisdiction, the measure would be practically useless. The idea was to give power to a magistrate to place offenders, who had been convicted, under police supervision. The Bill aimed a blow at rogues and vagabonds, and those not sufficiently under the control of the police, who carried on nefarious practices. Inasmuch as a conviction before a magistrate preceded the application of the provisions of the Bill, no injury could be done to anyone. The new clause merely provided that an offender should report his residence to the police in the district where he happened for the time to reside. An offender was not restricted to going home at night at a certain time, and there was

no attempt to refer to the old system of convictionism.

MR. MORGANS: It amounted to that.

MR. LEAKE: There should not be so much sympathy with criminal classes.

MR. MORAN: We did not all belong to the old school.

MR. LEAKE: No; some belonged to the new and disordered state of things. There was nothing in the new clause that any criminal could object to. All the criminal was asked to do was to inform the police that he was in existence.

MR. MORAN: The curfew-bell.

MR. LEAKE: It was known perfectly well that "pothouse loafers" in Perth were mostly the cause of crime and trouble in our midst. If a man was brought up as a rogue and vagabond, he was a suspected character, and the magistrate would say "You will have to report yourself to the police in future," and the result would be that the police would have an eye on the man. We did not want undesirable people here, and this provision would have the effect of making these undesirable characters return to the place from whence they came, quickly.

MR. MORAN said he intended to offer strong opposition to this Bill. He had been accused of having a certain sympathy with the criminal classes, although he did not think it was within the province of a member to accuse other members of that. He had a distinct distaste for the old gyves and shackles of Western Australia being introduced again. It was distasteful to anybody from any of the other colonies.

MR. LEAKE: Which colony did the hon. member come from? From New South Wales?

MR. MORAN said he came from a colony that was peopled to a large extent by intelligent Britishers. The Bill would place in the hands of magistrates power to have a man "shadowed," as was the case under the police system in France.

MR. LEAKE: That was not so.

MR. MORAN: It was astonishing to find legislation of this kind introduced in to a British community. We all had the greatest confidence in the judges; but to hand this power over to magistrates would be to reduce our administration, as he had said, to the level of French espionage which was utterly distasteful to the Bri

tisher. It was to be hoped the Assembly would not lend itself to any legislation of the kind. He had no sympathy with criminals, but this was an undue interference with the rights of the subject. The Bill had passed through another place without much discussion, but he knew some hon. members of the Legislative Council regretted they had not observed the lengths to which this Bill went.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The Bill had to be looked upon with a certain amount of suspicion. It put too much power in the hands of magistrates, many of whom might not be altogether free from personal bias, and some of whom might determine to ruin a man's prospects for life.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: If not, he would be better pleased, but such had seemed to him to be the possible effects of the measure. The plan might be tried with the judges first. He did not object to the principle if he was sure it would be properly acted upon; but it placed too much power altogether in the hands of magistrates. If a man had served his sentence, every opportunity should be given to him to take a position in society, and start afresh. Our penal laws, if anything, ought to be reformatory; when a man had been punished for his crime, he ought to be afforded every assistance in commencing an honest career, and to place him under police surveillance in the way proposed was going too far.

MR. GEORGE: This measure illustrated the necessity for not pushing matters too quickly in legislation. It was to be expected that persons placed under police surveillance would be persons known by their antecedents as proper subjects for watching; and it was not likely that the honorary magistrates of the colony would be led away by the paltry motives which had been alluded to. During his career he had employed several men whose lives in other colonies had not been beyond question. He had employed two or three thieves, and one man who had been sentenced for manslaughter; the latter was a thoroughly good workman, and the knowledge that he was a convicted person did not come to him (Mr. George) through the police, but through some of those sanctimonious gentlemen who felt it their duty to utter

such warnings in the ears of employers. One unfortunate man, who had been for four years in this colony, had not been in employment six weeks before one sanctimonious hypocrite came and whispered a remark into the ears of the employer that the man had been convicted in Victoria. Now was that fair? It was not to be believed that magistrates would allow themselves to be biassed by private spleen. Western Australia had, during the last few years, been a collecting place for the scum of the colonies, America, and Europe, and in dealing with these the police had done their best. Magistrates should have power to act in such cases, and if a man of known antecedents was likely to become a menace to society there should be power to keep an eye on him. The Bill could not be construed to mean that a first offender had to be watched; the clauses were only intended to apply to known bad characters. In a place that had been a convict settlement, a number of settlers must have had to do with either gaolers or gaolod. Very frequently the gaolod had proved the better settlers, and, as had been pointed out, a person who had committed an offence should have the opportunity of redeeming himself.

At 6.30 p.m. the CHAIRMAN left the chair.

At 7.30 the CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

MR. LEAKE (in charge of the Bill): There seemed to be some misunderstanding about the provisions of the Bill. The members for East Coolgardie (Mr. Moran) and Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth) apparently failed to grasp its meaning. The only restriction under which it was proposed to place offenders was that of having to report their places of residence; so that in the case of a man residing in Perth, he might only have to report his residence once during the time he was under surveillance. He had not to go every week, but had simply to advise the police of his whereabouts. It was only after conviction that police supervision could be imposed. If a magistrate chose to say to a convicted

prisoner: "Although I may send you to prison for twelve months, I shall impose upon you the lesser penalty of police supervision," that was really a step in the direction of that reformation which many hon. members thought should obtain in the administration of our criminal law.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Would that be the effect of the law?

MR. LEAKE: Practically it would.

MR. MORAN: Could a magistrate inflict imprisonment and supervision?

MR. LEAKE: Yes.

MR. MORAN: That was what he objected to. These penalties should be alternative.

MR. LEAKE: A magistrate, exercising summary jurisdiction, could impose only a limited term of imprisonment. In the case of petty larceny a magistrate could only sentence a man to six months' imprisonment, whereas, upon an indictment, a sentence of three years' penal servitude or two years' hard labour could be inflicted. If a man were charged with petty larceny before a magistrate, and found guilty, he could be sentenced to six months' imprisonment and six months' police supervision. That was the extreme penalty, and would seldom be inflicted unless the case were a particularly gross one. If it were objected that twelve months was too long, he would agree to an amendment cutting it down to six; but he wanted the system to have a fair trial. Six months' imprisonment was often a very light sentence for offences like pocket-picking, and if six months' supervision were added, it would not be excessive. This clause was identical with one which had been struck out of the draft Bill by the Legislative Council, and was almost identical with clause 1, with the exception that it provided that the first conviction might carry with it police supervision.

THE PREMIER: The Bill might be lost again in another place.

MR. LEAKE: It was for that reason he suggested that the maximum term of imprisonment be kept down to six months. Hon. members would understand that this meant no particular hardship to the individual, but a great protection to the public. People who were

looked after seldom did wrong; and the argument of the member for East Coolgardie (Mr. Moran) about a person being in the power of a policeman—

MR. MORAN said he had not said that. It was the principle he objected to. After a man had suffered punishment and expiated his crime, he should not receive an additional punishment.

MR. LEAKE: That was not the position. The supervision was part and parcel of the one punishment. A magistrate had power to inflict twelve months' imprisonment. He could, if he chose, impose a sentence of six months' imprisonment and six months' supervision. The punishment was imposed at the time of conviction; a man not being brought up at the end of his imprisonment, and then, as it were, repunished. The argument of the member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth), that such a person as that referred to might be harassed by the police, did not apply. The police knew that they must not give away the character of a man unless it was in a court of justice, or they were called upon by the proper authorities. If any member of the community were to go to a police office and say he wanted to get the record of such and such a man, it would not be given him. If members were taken by surprise by the proposed new clause, let progress be reported, and the clause appear in print; but he could assure hon. members that there was no unnecessary hardship. No doubt it would be penal, but a man who committed crime must be punished. A person was not punished in this way merely because he was suspected, but after conviction. A man must be convicted of an offence, and then, in addition to having to undergo the limited term of imprisonment the magistrate could inflict, he might be under police supervision for a certain time.

MR. KINGSMILL: If this Bill were placed on the statute book, it would prove a deterrent to future crime. Had it been in existence, and especially this clause during the last few years, Western Australia would not have been such a happy hunting-ground for those gentry from other parts of the world who earned their living by petty larceny and other tricks. He would be sorry to pay the magistrates of the colony such a poor compliment as

to think they would not use with proper discretion the power given in the clause.

MR. MORAN: Would the member for Pilbarra give them power to hang?

MR. KINGSMILL: Certainly not. The hon. member was rushing to an extreme. The magistracy possessed a large amount of discretion in regard to the sentences they were allowed to inflict upon any person who committed a crime or misdemeanour; and if allowed such discretion in the matter of sentences, they should have discretionary power in relation to placing criminals under police supervision.

MR. KENNY: As one who had had considerable experience regarding criminology in the early days of the colony, he strongly supported the Bill, which was a re-enactment of a portion of our old law. That old law worked with a very great amount of good. If members who were opposed to this Bill were as intimately acquainted with the amount of benefit which would be derived from it as he was, they would at once see its utility. Supposing in the early days a man of the description in question left Perth to take up a position at the Canning. He simply went into the police station and reported that he was going to the Canning to work (or, say, Mr. Jones, farmer. He reached the Canning, and reported his arrival to the police, and stated that he was lodging with Mr. Jones. It might not be generally known to members, but it was a fact that invariably every expert in the art of house-breaking, safe-bursting, and many other industries strongly represented by recent arrivals from other colonies, left, as it were, his sign manual on his work. One man had a particular way of breaking into a house, whilst another would adopt another mode. One would pick a lock, and another would burst it with padded wedges. Now, to go back to this man who reported himself to the police at the Canning: if a house had been broken into, and a safe burst in, the police at once went to the scene, and they could tell almost in an instant what man was guilty, by the way the crime had been worked. Then finding that William Robertson, a certain expert house-breaker, arrived in the district, and was accredited to Mr. Jones, farmer,

a police-constable went to Mr. Jones and made inquiries, asking where William Robertson was at 10.30 the night before. If an account was not given, the police followed up the trace, and invariably ran the man to earth. That showed the great benefit that would be derived from the Bill. The Bill would be of wonderful assistance to the police, to whom it behoved us to afford every assistance in our power in their arduous duties, and the difficulties they had to contend with in tracing the criminals of the colony. The proposal made could not possibly affect honest men, and men who were conscientiously endeavouring to mend their ways. It could only press hardly on criminals; and he hoped no man in this House would attempt to lighten anything which weighed upon that particular class.

MR. WALLACE: It would be far better for a man to serve an extended term of imprisonment than to be hounded down as he would be under this Bill. Too much power was left in the hands of the constables, and he had known cases where police officers had been too officious. The continued hounding down of men drove them further towards destruction than an extended term of imprisonment would. It would be very dangerous to leave entirely in the hands of the constable the future of any man, whether a criminal or otherwise.

MR. A. FORREST moved, as an amendment, that the word "twelve" be struck out, and "six" inserted in lieu thereof. We were here to legislate for the protection of the people of the country, and not for those who broke the laws; and if we could in any way assist to put down the class of people referred to, we would be moving in the right direction. Moreover, an important point was that in cases not of a very grave nature, magistrates would have power, without sending persons to prison, to impose police supervision for six months. Many a young man might, if sentenced to three months' imprisonment, be demoralised for ever, whereas if he were told that he would be under the eye of the police for the next six months, he would perhaps become a useful citizen again.

MR. LEAKE: The amendment was one he would accept, because he thought that if the term were fixed at six months the

system would have a very fair trial. As he said just now, six months was the limit that a magistrate could summarily inflict for larceny. Members were not aware that in certain of our Acts a magistrate could give as much as "life" in the exercise of summary jurisdiction in the case of a convict under an unexpired sentence. All that was said about long sentences and powers of magistrates did not come to much, when we considered what a magistrate could actually do to persons who had already been convicted. It was the convicted man who was subject to this particular form of punishment. In many of our statutes provision was made for fine or imprisonment; whereas this was a case of police supervision or imprisonment.

MR. MORAN: Or both.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It was not "or" but "and."

MR. LEAKE: It was optional, though, and not compulsory.

MR. DOHERTY: Give them one or the other.

MR. LEAKE: The sympathy with crime was really sickening. Let prisoners have both imprisonment and police supervision, if they deserved it. What would six months' police supervision be for a common petty thief? Police supervision meant reporting to the police where a man lived. The word "supervision" was a mistaken term, and, had it not been for the peculiar phraseology of the clause, the objection which had been taken would not have been raised. It would have been better to have said that a person should report himself every time he changed his residence.

MR. CONNOR: Would the hon. member suggest a minimum penalty, after which supervision should come in, or would he suggest that upon any conviction the magistrate should have the power of fixing supervision as well?

MR. LEAKE: Supervision would be imposed only where a magistrate gave a sentence of less than six months.

MR. CONNOR: It would be necessary to state the offence. If a man broke a window, and it was proved that he did it maliciously, was he to be under police-surveillance at the will of a magistrate?

MR. LEAKE: If a man maliciously broke a window he could be sent to gaol by the magistrate for twelve months. This new clause would enable the magistrate to give twelve months' supervision instead of twelve months' imprisonment. He had never heard the faintest rumour or murmur as to the integrity or impartiality of the magistrates by any person.

MR. ILLINGWORTH asked the member for Albany to withdraw one expression; for to say that those members who were speaking from the opposite standpoint had a morbid sympathy with crime was a statement that should not be made. He (Mr. Illingworth) had no sympathy with crime, and no sympathy with criminals; but criminals, as well as other men in the community, ought to have justice meted out to them.

MR. LEAKE said his remarks had no personal application in regard to the hon. member, nor to anyone else. The hon. member was so well known as a philanthropist, that it must have been thoroughly understood he (Mr. Leake) was not referring to the hon. member.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It was for *Hansard* that he wished the correction made.

MR. LEAKE said he was addressing the Chairman, and not *Hansard*; but, if it was necessary, he would inform Mr. *Hansard* that he did not refer to the hon. member.

MR. CONOLLY, in supporting the clause, said it was an exceptionally good one in this country, considering the conditions prevailing. People coming to this colony were not, as a rule, well known to the police, owing to their recent arrival; and it would be a great benefit in a new town and in centres of population that offenders who had recently arrived should be under police supervision, so that the police would have an opportunity of following them up until they were well known.

MR. HIGHAM supported the clause. There were a large number of habitual criminals who committed offences, but who never reached the Supreme Court, because they accepted the summary jurisdiction of magistrates. A good deal had been said about the old practice which obtained in convict days, but there was no parallel between what was suggested

now, and the practice in those earlier days.

MR. MORAN: It was a ticket-of-leave.

MR. HIGHAM: To a certain extent it was; but an offender was not compelled to obtain a pass from one district to another. When he went to a new district he simply had to report himself. A man did not have to be indoors by 11 o'clock as in the old days. The clause was a good one.

MR. LYALL HALL: The clause was a step in the direction of prevention of crime, and prevention was better than cure. The clause would enable a magistrate to give a short term of imprisonment, instead of a long term. In a measure the magistrate bound the offender over to keep the peace for a certain length of time. The clause would be a help towards the discovery of crime.

MR. MORAN said he had listened to the further elucidation of the clause by Mr. Leake, but was still strongly opposed to the measure, mainly on the ground, which had not been attacked yet, that it was an innovation and un-British.

MR. LEAKE: It was taken from a British Act.

MR. MORAN said he challenged the hon. member to prove that this was the law in England, or that anyone but a judge had power to order police supervision in England. We had often heard the Premier say that we should go slow in this colony.

THE PREMIER: Follow the old country; that was what he said.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member did not follow the old country in everything.

MR. GEORGE: We were in front of the old country in some things.

MR. MORAN: The clause placed great power in the hands of the magistracy. He did not want it to be said that he distrusted the magistrates or that he had any sympathy with crime. He had no more sympathy with crime than a distinguished lawyer who took a fee to defend a murderer, or a man charged with any other heinous crime. But the clause would be irksome to an offender, who would sooner be given a double sentence than undergo police supervision. A Supreme Court judge, according to this Bill, only had the power on a second conviction to order police supervision, but a

magistrate was to have the power to inflict police supervision after one conviction.

MR. LEAKE: Different terms were awarded.

MR. MORAN: The term had nothing to do with the principle. The clause had been rejected in another place. Any member who was unwilling to defend those on whom an injustice was being inflicted was not worthy of his seat. This principle was un-British. The proposal would give to an inexperienced magistrate power to "shadow" a man for 12 months, probably for a crime which had been committed in a hasty moment. The class of man who would be sentenced under summary jurisdiction was the prospector or working man, who moved from place to place; and in each place to which such a man went he would have to report himself to the police inspector, and, practically, advertise himself as a criminal not fit to be at large. It was all very well to say that the people from the other colonies must be watched, but, as a rule, it would be found people inside the colony, and people outside, were just about on a par, and there was no reason to create a *furor* because there was a large influx of people whom the Government had asked to come here. The leader of the Opposition argued that in many cases, punishment inflicted by magistrates was not equal to the crime; but if the punishment fixed by statute was not enough, then the Legislature ought to set to work in a business-like way, and make "the punishment fit the crime." In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the magistrate would act with good common sense; but in the one case a mistake might be made, and a good man shadowed wrongly; and, of all things, the shadowing of a good man wrongly ought to be avoided. Looking at the House as constituted this evening, he could see the new clause would be carried in one form or another; and, if that were so, he would move as an amendment that the magistrate be given the choice of awarding imprisonment or police supervision, but should not have power to inflict both.

MR. LEAKE: The amendment was more stringent than the clause, and could be accepted.

MR. MORAN: The amendment took it out of the power of the magistrate to

award both imprisonment and police supervision.

MR. LEAKE: The new clause and the amendment were not much at variance. In reply to the member for East Coolgardie, who had asked whether there was an English law on the subject, he (Mr. Leake) could now refer the Committee to the 8th section of the 34th and 35th Victoria, chapter 112, known as the "Prevention of Crimes Act," from which the provisions of this Bill were taken. That Act was passed as far back as 1871, and enabled a judge and jury, on indictment, to sentence a prisoner who had been previously convicted to police supervision for a period of seven years or less. Although this supervision under the English Act was inflicted by a judge and jury, the principle was the same. If the member for East Coolgardie desired to move his amendment, it could be placed on the Notice Paper, and in the meantime progress could be reported.

MR. MORAN: In no case in England was this power given to magistrates, and it could not be said that the magistrates in Australia were on a par with those in England. He did not want to put this amendment, if he could defeat the clause, to the principle of which he was absolutely opposed. If, however, he could not defeat the new clause, he would make the punishment optional with the magistrates.

MR. SOLOMON: The amendment was desirable, because it only carried out the principle of the First Offenders Act. A great deal of difficulty was experienced, especially in such places as Fremantle, where ships were often deserted by men whose characters were not locally known; and when these men were once convicted, it was necessary their whereabouts should be known.

MR. MORAN: Seeing that no expression of opinion could be got from the Premier, he would submit an amendment to be put into shape by the leader of the Opposition, on the understanding that progress was now reported.

On the motion of Mr. LEAKE, progress was reported, and leave given to sit again.

MOTION: ORCHARDS AND VINEYARDS TAX TO SUPPRESS PESTS.

Debate resumed on the motion on MR. HARPER, moved on the 31st August "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that a tax be levied upon orchards and vineyards in the colony with the object of supplying funds for the administration of laws necessary for the suppression or extermination of pest injurious to the same."

MR. MITCHELL (Murchison): Hon members would recollect he had moved the adjournment of this debate for the purpose of communicating with orchardists and vigneron in his district. He had received several answers to his inquiries, asking him not to consent to the imposition of this tax. Two gentlemen wrote that they thought that the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) was not in earnest in proposing it. He asked that hon. member to except the Victoria district from the operation of the motion if carried. If the hon. member would agree that the Victoria district be not taxed, he (Mr. Mitchell) would have nothing more to say. Otherwise he would move an amendment. Would the hon. member agree to except the Victoria district?

MR. HARPER: No.

MR. MITCHELL moved, as an amendment, that the following words be added to the motion: "provided that no such tax shall be levied anywhere within the Victoria district." There were few pests in that district—the codlin moth was absent; and there was no reason why the Victoria district should be taxed. He could not speak of the southern gardens or vineyards, but he knew some thing of those in his own electorate. It was not apparent how the money would be spent. He doubted whether one farthing of the proceeds of the tax would find its way to the Victoria district.

MR. GEORGE (Murray) asked whether the hon. member's object would not be obtained by voting against the motion?

THE SPEAKER said he thought it would.

MR. LEAKE: The hon. member did not object to taxation, as long as his constituency was not asked to pay for it.

MR. GEORGE: Quite so. He (Mr. George) did not intend to vote for this

motion. The hon. member who introduced it (Mr. Harper) did not explain why this tax should be levied. The motion said it was to be imposed with the object of supplying funds for the administration of certain laws; but we were not told how the tax was to be levied or by whom, nor by whom it was to be expended. There was great diversity of opinion as to the benefits which some persons claimed had accrued from the establishment of the Bureau of Agriculture and its army of experts. There was an expert for almost everything in connection with the Bureau; and, if he was correctly informed, one principal duties performed by the experts consisted of attending to their own lands or those of their particular friends. At a considerable cost to the country, a sort of "Gazette" had been published weekly, which some people liked to receive, because they were not required to pay for it. If it cost them anything, they would not subscribe. From time to time, inspired paragraphs appeared in the press to the effect that an expert of the Bureau was visiting such a place; but it generally appeared that the expert either had property of his own in that neighbourhood, or he was visiting some of his friends for purposes of his experiments. We had quite enough of that sort of thing in this colony. He might be wrong; he did not wish to say anything offensive; but he was pretty safe in saying this motion would not have appeared, had it not been for the somewhat drastic measures taken, by instruction from the Premier, with regard to this Department of Agriculture.

THE PREMIER said he had done nothing in the matter.

MR. GEORGE: No. The right hon. gentleman had only cut away the "sinews of war;" and without such sinews of war, the expert shrunk into his shell, and was heard of no more; and this motion was simply another way of obtaining the same object which had already been obtained by the establishment of the Bureau. Those who recollected that event would remember the racy articles which appeared in a newspaper, the object of which, from start to finish, was to find a Government billet for one particular individual. Once the Bureau was established, it, of course, became necessary to have an expert in this branch and an expert in the other;

and he (Mr. George) would not be surprised if they had an expert on fleas, or for that other domestic animal which was, perhaps, a greater pest than the flea. It was unlikely that this motion would receive the support of owners of orchards or vineyards, except some few of them who were so highly educated that they looked to expert evidence far more than they did to the produce of their lands. The working orchardist would find any tax whatever objectionable; and it was hard to see how this tax could be logically proposed. After all the talk about settling and living on the land, and the fine living that might be made out of it, even with the inducement that the Government gave 160 acres practically free, and, under certain conditions, a loan of money to help people to cultivate it, there had been no startling result, nor had the people who had settled upon the land made rapid fortunes. This was an attempt, by a sort of side wind, to levy a tax which could be characterised in no other way than an attempt to continue an institution which the Government had practically rendered defunct. They had an army of experts—gentlemen, no doubt, very clever in their own way.

A MEMBER: They had done a great deal of good.

MR. GEORGE: Possibly they had; but probably the country would not have been very much worse had they never been appointed.

MR. WILSON (Canning): Whilst sympathising to a great extent with the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) and his motion for protecting our orchards and vineyards, he considered the motion premature. Fruit-growing was one of the industries which we had all been endeavouring to foster and build up in our midst. We had vineyards and orchards, and hoped in the near future to see not only this colony supplied therefrom, but also to see an export trade in fruit spring up; and why should we legislate so as to practically stifle this industry in its infancy? Probably the majority of vineyards and orchards in the country were from two to five years old; and he took it that a vineyard would not pay the fruit-grower under five years, that it would hardly commence to pay before that time; so that nine-tenths of our fruit-

growers to-day had as yet derived no benefit from the splendid market they had at their doors. Certainly the older orchards had the advantage of the magnificent market of our cities and gold-fields, and could well afford to pay taxation for the purpose of the motion; but when it was remembered that a great majority of fruit-growers had not realised any profit, and that when their fruit was marketable the price would fall, it would be seen we were going a little too far in proposing to tax them just now. The fruit-growers in his own district not only opposed any suggestion of taxation, but wished the Government to provide compensation for any trees or fruit destroyed in eradicating the insect pests. If, therefore, the Government could not spare the money to provide inspectors to go out and condemn the trees, it was not clear how they could find the funds to compensate the fruit-grower. He stated this frankly; at the same time the House should not add to the burden of the fruit-grower, who, if his trees were condemned, would lose his fruit. This was no time for putting a tax on the industry. It was not clear that this motion would be workable; for nearly every private garden in Perth and other towns contained a certain number of vines and fruit trees. He had one or two in his garden, and probably nearly every other hon. member was in the same position. How were such trees to be taxed? It would cost more to collect the tax than the amount collected, if inspectors had to be paid.

MR. GEORGE: People would pull up their trees rather than pay the fines.

MR. WILSON: No doubt they would.

MR. GEORGE: And that apparently was what was wanted.

MR. WILSON: At the present time the industry should be encouraged, and it was for the Government to provide sufficient inspection to keep the vineyards clean. We had spent thousands of pounds on the Agricultural Bureau in the past; and, although we were cutting down our expenses right and left—he granted it was perhaps more necessary in respect to that department than in any other—at the same time we could surely well afford to pay for one or two inspectors to carry out these duties. Members would see the necessity of not

adding to the burden of the fruit-growers, but of encouraging them in every way possible, because we wanted to build up an industry so that we should be able to export fruit.

MR. HARPER (in reply): It was a matter for regret that some members did not appreciate the position at all. The member who had just spoken had told us he thought two or three inspectors should be able to look after the orchards of the country, and that the country ought to be in a position to find the money for the purpose. He (Mr. Harper) did not think the hon. member could have the slightest idea of the labour required to inspect the thousands of orchards and vineyards existing in the colony, for gardens throughout the country would be included, and it was in the little gardens that the great danger arose. To inspect them would be a great task, which could not be accomplished without a considerable amount of time and labour. His object was to raise a fund in the administration of which the people who were interested would have a voice. At present the Government found the funds, and the inspection had been carried out through Government officers. If the inspection were carried out under local administrators who were interested in it, and who also supplied some of the funds, the work would be more likely to be done well than it would be if carried out altogether departmentally. Some members did not seem to realise the seriousness of the question. Last year South Australia lost 90 per cent of her apple crop. What would the member for the Murray say if 90 per cent. of his returns were taken away from him by some means he could not check at all? Here was a case in which our next-door neighbour had, as he had stated, lost 90 per cent. of a most important industry just through the lack of those preventatives which he (Mr. Harper) was seeking to provide. Because South Australia did not take the necessary precautions in time, and allowed this disease to get ahead and become established, the cost of recovering such a position as we were in would be ten thousand times as great as the expense of prevention would have been. By imposing a tax on people we

impelled them to see that the money they paid was properly laid out. At present people said that the matter belonged to the department, and the department should look after it. In all Government matters there was more or less a feeling of rebellion against the authority of the Government.

MR. WILSON: There would be the tax-collector.

MR. HARPER: The money would not be obtained by a tax collection. For instance, in regard to the Scab Act, every man had to make his report once a year and pay the tax in. It was not costly, and it produced a sum of money which enabled that disease to be eradicated from the stock. In his motion he did not specify any sum, but simply wished to see the principle established, and he did not say the whole amount should be raised. Unless some system of the kind was established we could not retain the state of cleanliness absolutely necessary, if these industries were to take that important place which they were destined to, provided they were properly looked after. If this proposal were carried, it would be necessary to bring in a Bill. It was rather unworthy of the member for the Murray to make the attack he did on the officials of the Bureau, because we all recognised that if that member was distinguished for anything it was for his honesty, and in his (Mr. Harper's) opinion other people might also be credited by him (Mr. George) with a feeling of honesty. He insinuated that the officers of the Bureau were employed in looking after their own private orchards, and that remark was unworthy of him. Whatever people might say about the necessity of officers of this kind, he (Mr. Harper) felt from his own knowledge of their work that they had done a great deal of good in this colony, and he was sure a very large proportion of those who had been affected by their services were of that opinion also. When a member wished to attack officers in this House, he should know a little more about the subject than the member for the Murray.

MR. WILSON: Did they not run private orchards?

MR. HARPER: One or two of them did, he believed.

MR. WILSON: Had not Messrs Cowen and Despeisses orchards?

MR. HARPER: He believed they had, but it did not follow that because that was so they neglected their public duties. Perhaps it was rather a good thing, because it gave them a personal interest in looking after the diseases throughout the country. Of course he could not do more than urge his belief that it would be in the interests of the country to have a Bill passed on the subject. He had been of that opinion for many years, and had often urged it. It appeared to him there was only the faintest hope of getting the matter considered; but, of course, if hon. members were not in favour of it, the existing state of things must continue, and we must hope for the best. He would again urge the House to bear in mind that our neighbour, South Australia, was reported to have lost 90 per cent. of her apple crop last year through neglect of the provisions which he advocated.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse): The motion deserved consideration, although it was perhaps premature. The principle was, he thought, the right one; and, although he was not inclined to support it at the present time, it was probable that in the future we would have to face the question, when the subject of taxation in regard to the orchards of the colony would have to be considered, with a view of arriving at a decision as to what portion of the cost of supervising the orchards and attending to them with the object of keeping down insect pests and carrying out other matters, should be borne by the Government. The subject would require to be fully dealt with, and the Government would have to pay some portion of the cost. At the present time most of the orchards were young, and the people who had been engaged in the industry were not now prepared to pay a tax, although possibly the impost would not be a heavy one. Considering the many burdens falling upon people who were engaged in the cultivation of the soil, and especially those engaged in the work of making orchards, it would be well, for a short time at least, to ask the State to assist these people by establishing, as we had done, a Bureau of Agri-

culture, and providing the officers necessary for carrying out this work a little while longer. The work done by the experts of the Bureau in this direction was most commendable, and it had a very good effect. Work had been carried out very faithfully, and everyone would agree that the country should be able to afford the small sum paid to the Bureau to provide men to act as experts and go through the country, either directing people what to do, or inspecting the orchards with a view of keeping down insect pests. The hon. member was to be commended for bringing this matter forward, because it was one by which he himself (Mr. Harper) would be considerably affected, as he was a large producer, and had a very large tract of country under vine and fruit cultivation; consequently the hon. member was not asking the House to agree to a principle which might affect others but would not affect himself. He (Mr. Harper) spoke from an unselfish point of view. He had come forward with a proposal which must certainly affect him more than it would many others in the country. Still, the period had not arrived when this principle should be introduced, and he (the Commissioner of Railways) hoped the House would defer it for some time longer. But as the hon. member had pointed out, it should not be deferred indefinitely. We should not lose sight of it, and there was an urgent necessity for doing everything possible to exclude the insect pest, which, if not kept out, must lead to disaster in connection with our fruit production, and consequent loss to those who were producers. Before sitting down he would like to make some comment about the remarks passed by the member for the Murray, who, speaking of the officers, would lead the House to believe that they probably neglected their duties in carrying out work in which they were engaged in relation to their own orchards. Any one who visited the orchards and vineyards of the gentlemen referred to would certainly give them every credit for the enterprise they had shown. They had done an excellent work. No one had watched the work of the officers more than he (the Commissioner of Railways) had done, and, although he had found fault with some

portion of their work from time to time, they had on the whole not neglected their task, in order to carry out work in their own interests, but had faithfully performed their duty. He did not see why a man who was engaged as an officer of the Bureau should be debarred from having an orchard, which would be one of the things to which he could probably devote a portion of his time to the advantage of the country and himself also.

Motion put and negatived.

MOTION FOR PAPERS: NORTHERN STOCK ROUTE.

MR. WALLACE (Yalgoo) moved—

That there be laid on the table of the House all papers and correspondence, including all claims made in connection therewith against the Government, in re that portion of the Northern stock route under the charge of Samuel Massingham.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse): What reason had the hon. member for moving for this return?

MR. WALLACE: Was it necessary to give reasons, in moving for certain papers?

THE SPEAKER: The reason why motions for returns were put in a particular form was to enable members to give reasons for asking for them, if any opposition was raised.

MR. WALLACE said if he had desired to give his reasons, he would have done so.

THE PREMIER: What claims were those referred to?

MR. WALLACE said he wanted all papers and correspondence, together with all claims connected with the Northern stock route.

THE PREMIER: Claims from whom?

MR. WALLACE: Anybody.

THE PREMIER: What claims could there be on a stock route?

MR. WALLACE said he wanted the claims in reference to that portion of the stock route under the charge of Samuel Massingham.

THE PREMIER: Were there some debts owing?

MR. WALLACE: There were some debts, he believed. This appeared to be a very unpleasant matter with the Government.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS : The Works Department was in entire ignorance of what the hon. member wanted.

MR. WALLACE : All the papers in reference to this stock route should be laid on the table. There would be no trouble in doing this. It was a new experience for him to be asked to give reasons why he wanted papers. He thought he had a right to demand papers.

MR. MORAN seconded the motion, out of sympathy with the hon. member. He (Mr. Moran) had been five years in the House, and had never before heard an objection by Ministers to the laying of papers on the table. There must be something wrong in the matter, or the Minister in charge of public works would not have given himself away in the manner he did by hastily rising as soon as the motion was moved. Somebody had lent some camels to the Government in connection with this stock route, and some of the camels had died. Now the person who lent the camels could not get payment for them. He (Mr. Moran) had moved dozens of motions similarly to this, and they had always been taken as formal motions. It was not an extraordinary thing for a member not to give an explanation; but it was an extraordinary thing for a Minister to rise before the motion had been submitted, and ask for reasons.

MR. GEORGE : There was something behind the scenes.

HON. H. W. VENN : The object of the rule of the House, that papers should be moved for, was to enable the member who moved to give an explanation why the papers were required. The hon. member for Yalgoo had not given any reason why the papers should be laid on the table.

MR. GEORGE : No one gave any explanation when moving for papers.

HON. H. W. VENN : The House was entitled to some reason why papers were being moved for. The member for East Coolgardie (Mr. Moran) said he had moved similar motions dozens of times. That was exaggeration, because the hon. member never moved a motion without explaining it very fully. The Government would have no objection, no

doubt, to the production of papers, if the member gave some explanation.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS : The reason why he had risen before the motion was stated was that the hon. member submitted his motion and took his seat, and it was to be expected that in ordinary course the motion would be put to the House; but as the hon. member had not given an explanation, he was asked to state reasons for moving in this way. The Government had nothing to withhold. He would be glad to give all information on the question of the northern stock route. The member for East Coolgardie (Mr. Moran) had mentioned that these papers were wanted concerning a claim about some camels which were lent to the Government, some of which died subsequently, and the claim was repudiated by the Government. He (the Commissioner) understood now what was wanted; and the Government had no objection to placing the papers on the table. If it were necessary to place all the papers concerning the northern stock route on the table, the papers would have to be conveyed in a dray to this House, the correspondence being very voluminous. The motion was most indefinite, and it was necessary, he thought, for the House to have some further information before the Government placed the papers on the table.

THE PREMIER : Was any law-suit pending in reference to this matter?

MR. GEORGE : The Minister in charge of the department, after trying to explain this matter, had given no explanation whatever; although he had risen in great haste as soon as the member for Yalgoo read his motion.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS said he had no idea of what was required.

MR. GEORGE : The hon. gentleman did not wait for any explanation.

THE PREMIER : Let the hon. member for Yalgoo ask for what he wanted. We could not know what was in his mind.

MR. GEORGE : Nor could hon. members know what was in the mind of the Premier. The Minister in charge of the department had endeavoured to take advantage of the forms of the House to prevent the member for Yalgoo obtaining what he desired. There could be no ob-

jection to the motion, even if the Government had to go to the expense of having a special dray or lorry to bring the papers to the House. It would be an advantage, in having these papers, to see what became of the money voted on the Estimates for salaries to public officers. It would be an object lesson to members of the House, and he hoped this would be the last time that a Minister of the Crown would endeavour to keep a private member out of his rights.

THE PREMIER: Let the hon. member make the point clear. No one could understand what was wanted.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The motion had been on the Notice Paper for several days, and its meaning could easily have been got from the hon. member himself.

THE PREMIER: It was thought the member for Yalgoo would explain what he wanted when he submitted the motion.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Parliament was not in the habit of resisting motions of this kind, and it was to be hoped such motion would not be resisted now.

THE PREMIER: The Government were entitled to know exactly what hon. members wanted. If papers were asked for, let it be said what these papers were. It was not fair to ask the Government to supply papers extending over a number of years, without giving some particulars. The Government never refused to produce papers—indeed, they were always anxious to do so; but the present motion was not in clear words, and the Government did not know what was meant. If the motion were confined to the dispute about the camels, the papers in connection with that dispute would be laid on the table.

MR. WALLACE: The Minister in charge of the Works Department and the Premier had, to a great extent, elicited from hon. members the object of the motion. His (Mr. Wallace's) actions in this House certainly deserved greater courtesy than had been shown him by the Ministers he had named. The particular claim to which allusion had been made certainly required looking into. He happened to know a little about this northern stock route, and could, perhaps, give the Government more particulars than they could give him; but he wanted to see the papers, and that was the reason of the

motion. He would accept the Premier suggestion, and confine the motion to the particular claim indicated, on the condition that he would not be debarred from the inspection of the other papers.

THE PREMIER: Any papers the hon. member named would be laid upon the table.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: If the hon. member called at the Works Department, he could see all the papers.

MR. WALLACE: That was very courteous, but the Minister had had sufficient time, since the motion was placed on the Notice Paper, to gather its purport.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The motion had not been observed by him.

MR. WALLACE: Then it appeared necessary for any hon. member, in a matter of this kind, to go to the Minister's office, and read over the Notice Paper to him!

THE PREMIER: Hon. members should explain what they wanted.

MR. WALLACE: The treatment he had received this evening at the hands of the Government was objectionable, and he asked the support of the House in protesting against that treatment. He would submit motions whenever he thought it necessary, in the interests of the colony; but in future he would be prepared to make statements on such occasions. The lesson he had received was a lesson for every member of the House. Members interested in the stock route were anxious he should not have the papers. The member for Wellington (Hon. H. W. Venn) championed the Works Department and opposed the motion.

HON. H. W. VENN: No, no; not at all. It was simply because the hon. member did not explain what he wanted.

MR. WALLACE: The discussion need not be carried on any longer, and he would be satisfied with the papers regarding the claims from beyond Roebourne.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The hon. member had better make some definite statement. If the information asked for was in connection with the camel claim, there could be no objection.

MR. WALLACE accepted the Minister's suggestion, and said he would go to the

Works Department, and inspect the papers, seeing the Government had some reason for not laying them on the table of the House.

THE PREMIER: No, no.

MR. A. FORREST said he was in a position to know something of the stock routes between Roebourne and Mullewa, and though drovers were the first to complain, he for a considerable time had heard no complaints. The member for Yalgoo blamed the Government for not producing these papers; but that hon. member ought to be reminded that there were instances in which papers had been refused, on the ground that the member who asked for them did not explain why they were wanted. The motion for papers was tabled in order that it might be discussed. As for the charge of discourtesy, it lay more with the member for Yalgoo than with the Government. When an hon. member asked for information of this sort, he should distinctly state why he required it, and not leave it to other members to explain.

THE SPEAKER: It was just as well that he should say a word or two on this point. The reason why hon. members, when they required information, should put their desire in the form of a notice of motion, was in order that they might explain their reasons for wanting the information, and also that the House might have an opportunity of saying whether the information ought to be given. That was a great advantage to an hon. member who wanted information. Members often made a formal motion for the purpose of making a speech on a question, and members would be very sorry to be deprived of the opportunity thus afforded. For instance, he believed such a motion would come on to-night; that being a motion by the member for Sussex (Mr. Locke), who wanted to make some explanation, and to found that explanation on a motion for the production of papers. There was nothing unusual in such a motion. Hon. members must not think that motions of this kind were merely formal, and that, as a matter of course, papers must be produced. Indeed, papers were sometimes refused, as the member for West Kimberley has said, not so much in this House as in other Parliaments, because it was not in the public interest

that they should be produced. That did not often happen, but it did happen occasionally; and that was the reason why all information had to be moved for in this particular way. In the first place, the member must explain why he wanted the information; and that explanation having been made, the House could say, if it thought fit, that the information should be given.

Question put and passed.

MOTION FOR PAPERS: POST AND TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENTS, REPORTS BY EXPERTS.

MR. WILSON (Canning) moved:—

That there be laid upon the table of the House the reports and appendices thereto furnished by Messrs. Caldwell and Jenvey, experts from Victoria, relating to the working of the Postal and Electric Telegraph Departments of the colony in all their branches, viz., postal, telegraphic, money order, and savings bank; etc.; also, reports made by departmental officers in connection therewith during the years 1896 and 1897.

THE PREMIER: Had this information not been published in the Postmaster General's reports?

MR. WILSON: The information had not been published, so far as he knew.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The publication of this information had been asked for several times.

THE PREMIER: Had it not been published in the Press?

MR. GEORGE: Not all of it. A portion was kept back.

THE PREMIER: It was two or three years ago.

MR. WILSON: It was in 1896; two years ago. Was any explanation necessary for the motion?

THE PREMIER: It was perfectly clear what the hon. member wanted.

Question put and passed.

MOTION FOR PAPERS: BERTHING OF STEAMER NEMESIS.

MR. LOCKE (Sussex) moved:—

That all correspondence in connection with the berthing of the *Nemesis* recently at Bunbury be laid on the table of this House.

The motion was submitted, he said, with the object of bringing before the House the reply given in relation to this matter by the Premier. That reply, he believed, came from the magistrate at Bunbury, and he (Mr. Locke) now wished to absolutely contradict it. He had telegrams

and other information which bore out the contradiction. He was certain his constituents would not mind vessels going to the Vasse for shelter, but would be only too glad to see them there: yet, considering the support Bunbury had from himself, not only now but always, it was unfair that the statement made by the Premier should go forth to the House as correct. The statement was as follows:—

The *Nemesis* was lying at the jetty astern of the barque *Amicitia*, and as it was blowing very hard the captain thought it possible that the barque might break from her moorings and come down on the vessel; so, as he had to go to the Vasse to discharge cargo, he hauled off and went to that port, but the weather was so bad that he could not get near the Busselton jetty. He, therefore, came straight back to Bunbury, and came alongside the jetty at once without any trouble.

The fact of the matter was, and he had it from the captain of the barque that was lying there, that the steamer herself was in difficulties, and not the barque. The steamer was dragging her anchors, and had to put to sea. It was a very wild night when this happened, and she ran down to Geographe Bay, to within eight miles southward of Busselton, under the lee of Cape Naturaliste, until daylight. In the morning the storm abated, and the vessel ran back to Bunbury, and, as a matter of course, came alongside the jetty, and there was nothing more about it. He did not mind her going to the Vasse for protection; but what his constituency objected to was that the vessel should have been reported to the House as having gone to the Vasse to discharge cargo, and having been unable to get alongside the jetty. That statement was absolutely incorrect. He was prepared to state, on unimpeachable authority, that there had never been an occasion on which the *Nemesis* or any other steamer could not have come alongside the Vasse jetty, if required; but this vessel never came within eight miles of it.

HON. H. W. VENN: Could she not get there?

MR. LOCKE: She never tried to get there.

MR. MORAN: She wanted to get anywhere from Bunbury harbour.

MR. LOCKE: She was dragging her anchors and had to go to sea;

and, when she got to sea, she ran down to Cape Naturaliste for shelter. He would read some of the telegrams he had received in connection with this matter. The first was signed by Mr. L. M. Hungerford, the resident magistrate at Busselton. The Premier, in replying to the question, had read a telegram received from the resident magistrate at Bunbury, and the resident magistrate at Busselton was just as good an authority. The wire read as follows:—

Premier misinformed, *Nemesis* to Vasse night of second for shelter; returning Bunbury morning third; discharging Cape Otway; over-carried cargo at Vasse on sixth.

THE PREMIER: How could he know that?

MR. LOCKE: He was there.

THE PREMIER: How did he know that she came for shelter?

MR. LOCKE: She never came within eight miles of the place. He would read the next telegram, which was signed by John Bovell, agent for the steamship company which owned the *Nemesis*, and who was also mayor of Busselton:—

Captain *Nemesis* consider dangerous remain Bunbury jetty owing rough weather. Came and anchored eight miles west of Vasse jetty. Could have landed Vasse cargo, but did not come within four miles of jetty. Returned Bunbury next morning.

Was it fair to say she could not go alongside, when she never tried to do so?

MR. GEORGE: Oh, very unfair.

MR. LOCKE: It was only fair to his district that he should read the third telegram. Mr. Tonkin was the head of the water police at the Vasse. The Mr. Cross referred to therein was a man who had been on that coast over 40 years:—

Tonkin Cross confirm Bovell's wire: *Nemesis* left Bunbury, went Quindalup for sheltering; could not work Vasse without difficulty, but never attempted. Get Hungerford's wire club: demand Premier withdraw or inquire.—H. J. Yelverton.

If the Premier were to inquire into this he would find that everything he (Mr. Locke) had stated was correct. None would be able to dispute it, for he had a great deal more information in addition to this. It was due to the Vasse that the House should know that the fact of a vessel getting into difficulties in Bun-

bury, and running down to the Vasse, should not be looked upon as a blot against the latter district because it sheltered her. From the telegram read by the Premier, it might be inferred that the steamer absolutely went to the Vasse and could not get shelter there. He wanted that inquired into, and would ask the Premier either to take back what was said or to make further inquiries.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he was glad the hon. member had brought this matter up; and, as he was aware, the question did not originate with him (the Premier).

MR. LOCKE said he knew that.

THE PREMIER: An hon. member representing a goldfields constituency recently appeared to be so much interested in the port of Bunbury that he asked in the House whether it was a fact that the steamer *Nemesis* had to leave Bunbury harbour on Friday, 2nd instant, and seek shelter in Geographe Bay. That hon. gentleman was not now in his place, and his object in asking the question was not apparent.

MR. LOCKE said he did not ask him to do it.

THE PREMIER: Nevertheless, he (the Premier) had to make enquiries. He telegraphed to the Chief Harbour Master and to the resident magistrate at Bunbury, in order to get the information required to answer the question. He received a reply from the resident magistrate, giving the information; and, although in the Votes and Proceedings of the House it said that he (the Premier) replied, nevertheless what he really did state was that he had a reply from the resident magistrate, who informed him as stated in the reply. Therefore, he (the Premier) was in no way responsible for reading out what the resident magistrate had said.

MR. LOCKE: It did not appear in that form in the newspapers.

THE PREMIER: In fact, the resident magistrate might have been misinformed; but he had noticed in the daily papers that the agents for the *Nemesis* published a letter, in which the very same statements were reiterated; and the only way to get at the true facts would be to see what the master of the *Nemesis* had

to say. Where the master was at present he (the Premier) did not know. He would be the last to say anything against the Vasse or its jetty accommodation. He believed the Vasse a good harbour, and that vessels could lie there with perfect safety in nearly all weathers. He knew that its harbour was far superior in every respect to the Bunbury harbour until the breakwater was built at Bunbury; and if, by reading the reply of the resident magistrate, he had done anything which reflected on the Busselton harbour, all he could say was that he was sorry for it. He merely gave the information he received. He did not believe the subject was worth pursuing further, though he might ask for information from the captain of the *Nemesis*, if he could find him.

MR. CONOLLY (Dundas) sympathised with the member for Sussex (Mr. Locke). It was certainly interesting to know that after £30,000 had been spent upon the Bunbury harbour, the first vessel that called there dragged her anchors, and preferred to face the whole gale of the Indian Ocean rather than lie in that harbour. He could quite understand that the member for Bunbury (the Premier) should have some difficulty in finding the master of the *Nemesis*. After that mariner's recent experience in Bunbury harbour, he (Mr. Conolly) felt keenly for the captain of the ship, as well as for the member for Bunbury. Such a question gave the House some insight into the benefits derived from this valuable work, upon which so much public money had been expended. It also bore out some observations he (Mr. Conolly) made last session, with regard to the capabilities of the Vasse harbour as compared with that of Bunbury. It was to be hoped that future expenditure in similar directions would have some beneficial results.

MR. LOCKE asked leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

RETURN: GOVERNMENT ADVERTISEMENTS IN NEWSPAPERS.

Ordered, on the motion of **MR. ILLINGWORTH** for Mr. Vosper, that there be laid on the table a return showing the amounts of money expended by the

various departments on advertising in the newspapers of the colony during the last financial year.

MOTION: TAX ON SHEEP FOR DESTROYING WILD DOGS.

MR. HARPER (Beverley) moved :—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that a tax be levied upon sheep in the South-West Division of the colony, with the object of offering special bonuses for the production of the carcasses of wild dogs within the South-West Division.

During the past year or so this question had cropped up on many occasions; and this year he had received several requests in writing, as well as verbal communications, asking him whether something could not be done to deal with the wild dog nuisance in certain parts of the colony. On the farms along the Great Southern railway, and thence all the way up to the eastern districts, very considerable losses had been sustained through wild dogs. The small farmers who only kept some 200 sheep were in a very different position from the station-owner who had perhaps 20,000. The latter could always look after himself; but a dog could do far more injury proportionately to a farmer with a small flock in one night than to the flocks of a squatter. He was informed of a good many instances within the last year or so where people who had been keepers of sheep had been obliged to give them up entirely on account of the losses incurred in this way. The present law provided a bonus of 10s. for every tail of a dog in the southern portion of the colony, and a like bonus of 5s. in the northern division; and it had been urged that the reward should be increased still further in the south. The difficulty was that the regulation led to abuses and frauds. Tails were collected from the far eastern portions of the colony, brought into the southern districts, and the 10s. claimed there. To attempt to increase the amount of the reward would only increase the number of frauds, and therefore any action taken must be independent of the Act as it stood. He introduced this motion as a possible way of meeting the difficulty, providing, as it did, that a fund should be raised by owners of sheep, and that it should be placed in the hands of local bodies for disbursement in the shape of rewards, on

their satisfying themselves that the dogs which had been killed had been destroyed within their own neighbourhoods. It would be impossible for them to do that if the bonus were on the tails, and therefore he suggested that it should be upon the carcasses. A man could not carry a carcass any great distance, but if a fee were paid, he would think it worth his while to bring the body to some magistrate, or other person, to certify to it. The great difficulty in dealing with the question was, that perhaps only one or two, or two or three dogs in a neighbourhood, might cause a vast amount of loss, the difficulty of poisoning these being enormous, as those who had anything to do with sheep knew. It was to enable people to deal with these specific cases that he brought forward this proposition. He knew many members would object to it for the reason that there were no dogs perhaps in their immediate districts, and sheep owners objected to it: but that was rather a one-sided way to look at it, because, if dogs were allowed to increase, those people who were not troubled with them this year might be next. When dogs were down to a narrow limit, it was very advisable to go a little further and try to exterminate them from the districts in which sheep were kept. He recommended the motion to the House as seeking a solution of a difficulty which had been before the country for a long time. He begged to move the motion.

MR. QUINLAN (Toodyay): In seconding the motion, he felt that a responsibility rested upon him as representing one of the eastern districts. He had received several communications with respect to this pest, and as the law in its present state would not permit of the amount being increased except by an address to the Governor, he felt that no course was open except that proposed by the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper). So far as his district was concerned, the people were entirely in accord with the object of the hon. member. The payment of 10s. each for the destruction of dogs was confined at present to the northern portion. He knew an instance where a sheep owner had given 30s., and several in which £1 had been paid, as well as the bonus given by the Government. That was a guarantee of willing-

ness to bear some taxation for the extermination of these destructive animals. The losses were considerable in the eastern districts, and 10s. to others than those immediately concerned in the industry of sheep rearing was not sufficient. The member who introduced the motion had given a good reason why carcases should be produced. He had very great pleasure in supporting the proposal, and, while he knew there was some difference of opinion, he hoped that at least those members who were not suffering at the present time from these destructive creatures would be good enough to support the motion.

MR. MORAN (East Coolgardie): The motion met with his sympathy, but he foresaw a difficulty. If it was necessary to produce the carcases of these dogs, and the local magistrate happened to be absent, a person would, if the carcases had to be kept two or three days, want to get away as quickly as possible.

MR. GEORGE (Murray): The objection of the member for Beverley with regard to a bonus being paid for tails was one which he quite understood. The statement made by him was correct, as most of those who had anything to do with a farming district could testify. He (Mr. George) did not like the idea of offering a special bonus. We might well debate the question whether payment should be by special bonus, or whether the funds gathered together should be utilised in the payment of men whose business it should be to hunt these wild dogs and kill them, leaving their carcases in the bush. In the Murray district, there were one or two men who made a very fair thing out of killing wild dogs.

THE PREMIER: How many did they kill a year?

MR. GEORGE: The number was not known to him, but he supposed they killed as many as they could. Ten shillings was a sum not to be sneered at. In the Murray district there were a very large number of wild dogs, and probably what applied to that part of the country would also apply to other districts. When a sheep owner knew of the presence of a wild dog—and he soon did so, owing to the way in which his flocks were ravaged—he sent for an expert dog catcher, if there happened to be one, and

that expert dog catcher obtained, not only the bonus, but payment by the sheep owner. That, in his opinion, was far more satisfactory than offering a bonus for the carcase or head. If the House were inclined to pass this motion, it might be sufficient if the head of the animal instead of the carcase were produced. To have a staff of dog catchers who could move about in different parts of the colony, going from one station to the other where the nuisance existed, would perhaps be a better remedy than offering special bonuses to amateurs, because he knew it was stated openly in Victoria with regard to rabbits, that men whose livelihood depended upon those animals were particularly careful to prevent that livelihood from being taken away through want of rabbits. Of course the same thing could be said in regard to wild dogs, but in this case the settlers would act as vigilant detective police among the dog catchers.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The proposition would seem to indicate, on the face of it, if one had no knowledge of the subject, that the carcases of wild dogs were very difficult to obtain, as he (the Premier) had no doubt they were in many cases; but it would also seem to indicate that wild dogs were not being destroyed in the colony to a large extent. Anyone who looked into the matter would, however, be simply astonished at the amount paid by the Government for the number of wild dogs killed in a year. He had not had time to go into the matter thoroughly, but he had investigated it to some extent, because it seemed to him almost incredible that so many wild dogs were destroyed in the colony. A doubt must arise in the mind of one who looked into the matter as to whether these dogs had been actually destroyed or not. Last year £2,043 8s. 9d. was paid by the Government for the destruction of wild dogs. We would take it that there were 3,000 dogs in the south-western division, which would mean the payment of £1,500, and we would put the number in the unsettled parts of the country in the north at 2,400, this making a total of 5,400. Of course the proportions were only guessed at by him, but he took it there were more dogs in the south-

western parts of the colony than in the other portions, because the climate was, he thought, better suited for the breeding of dogs. It seemed to him that it was an enormous number of dogs to be killed in one year, and it was, as he had said, almost impossible to believe that there had been so many destroyed; but we knew that, as a rule, a justice had to approve of these rewards being paid. He believed that in most cases the certificate of a justice was required.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: In all cases.

THE PREMIER: In some cases the police paid, he believed.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: No; a justice paid.

THE PREMIER: Where there was not a justice of the peace, a sergeant of police could act. However, there was the fact; and he would have thought we should have soon exterminated dogs at this rate. No doubt this expenditure had been going on for years, and how it came to pass that dogs were still such a great nuisance, in some districts, passed his comprehension. The offering of a special bonus could be done now, without further legislation; but if these dogs were such a great nuisance, one would have thought that sheep owners would have contributed something themselves.

MR. HARPER: Some of them did.

THE PREMIER: The Government contributed £2,043 last year. There should be no special tax for this purpose. To propose that the carcasses of dogs should be produced seemed to be impracticable. Just fancy the carcasses of these 5,000 dogs being carted in. He did not know whether the hon. member intended that no reward should be paid unless the carcasses were produced; but if these carcasses were produced, there might be typhoid fever.

MR. HARPER said he did not propose to deal with the present Act at all.

THE PREMIER: This was an extra, then?

MR. HARPER: Yes; an extra.

THE PREMIER: The whole matter required investigation, and he would see if he could not get some one to look into it. A majority of the tails must have been those of puppies, and not those of wild dogs at all. He did not suppose justices

of the peace could tell the difference between tails taken off puppies and those taken off wild dogs. The whole question really needed looking into. It seemed incredible that so many dogs should be paid for every year and still the nuisance continue. He did not think the hon. member should persevere with his motion. It would require a law to levy a tax, and he did not know that stock-owners would thank the hon. member for putting a tax on them, although he knew that a dog could do a very great deal of damage in a flock. One would have thought the agricultural societies would have offered rewards and thus make a raid against the pests.

MR. HARPER: How would they raise the funds?

THE PREMIER: Amongst themselves.

MR. HARPER: One man would have to do it all.

THE PREMIER: The Government would not mind paying the amount of money they did if value was received for it, but he feared the Government did not get value for the money. He feared that 5,000 dogs were not killed in the course of the year. Some one had been looking into this matter a little, but he would have it looked into more thoroughly. He was altogether opposed to the carcasses of wild dogs being produced. That would be perhaps injurious to the health of people. It was hardly necessary, if the fund was wisely administered, that further efforts should be made.

HON. H. W. VENN (Wellington): The amount paid by the Government every year had done a large amount of good. No doubt some fraud was practised, but he took it that on the whole a great deal of good was done. Those members who had been throughout the country during the last twenty years could hardly realise that the number of wild dogs had been lessened to the extent they had since the Government started offering a bonus for their destruction.

THE PREMIER: That was twenty years ago.

HON. H. W. VENN: The number of wild dogs were getting beautifully less, and that was due, to a large extent, to the amount of money paid by the Government every year; but the Government were not the only contributor towards the destruction

of wild dogs. The settlers themselves did a great deal in the destruction of these pests. Settlers desired to destroy the animals which did a considerable amount of damage to them. Some settlers had gone to the expense of several hundreds of pounds in fencing the dogs off from their holdings, and that was not all; they employed men all the year round poisoning the animals, and the settlers not only allowed their men to get what they could from the Government, but supplemented the reward themselves. As far as the settlers themselves were concerned, they were doing all they possibly could year by year to destroy the dogs, which were getting less.

THE PREMIER: £600 more was paid last year than in the year before.

HON. H. W. VENN: No doubt there were some seasons in which dogs increased more rapidly than in others. He did not see how the Government could have more careful supervision. The magistrates were alive to the fact that they might be imposed upon, but he did not know that there was a great deal of fraud carried on in respect to the tails of domestic dogs. Where there might be fraud was in sending the tails from one district to another. Tails might be sent from a district where a bonus of 5s. was offered, to another district where the bonus was 10s. This difficulty might be overcome by making the bonus uniform throughout the colony, either 7s. 6d. or 5s. The motion was premature. He, as a squatter, sympathised with the hon. member who desired to get the animals destroyed. He did not see how levying a tax on stock would secure the end the hon. member had in view any better than it was secured at the present moment. After hearing the discussion probably the hon. member would withdraw the motion. The Government might investigate this matter, and then the question could be brought forward next session when it would receive the consideration of the House. In the meantime very good work was being done by the people throughout the colony in destroying this great pest.

MR. MITCHELL (Murchison) opposed the motion on the ground that the farmers were already taxed as much as they possibly could pay. Settlers had to put up with bad seasons, the low price of wool, and many circumstances that had been un-

favourable to them, and it would not be fair to put another tax on them just now. The production of the carcasses of dogs was entirely out of the question, unless the dog killer carried a chilling machine around with him. He agreed with the member for Wellington that the price throughout the colony should be made uniform, and his experience had led him to believe this. On one occasion a man came to him with 13 tails. He (Mr. Mitchell) asked him where they had been obtained, and the man said in the central district. He asked the man whether he had come right from the north into the central district with the tails, and as the man could not satisfy him that the animals were destroyed in the central district he (Mr. Mitchell) told the man he would have to take the tails somewhere else. The bonus for dogs might be made 10s. throughout the whole of the colony. He believed a lot of the tails did not come from wild dogs at all. There was not much difference between the tail of a wild dog and the tail of a domestic dog.

MR. WILSON (Canning): We were reversing the policy which had been adopted by the Government in favour of settling people on the land; for we made liberal laws to encourage people to take up land, and the next thing done was to tax these people so that they might protect themselves. No doubt it was for a special purpose, but it was a tax all the same. He had a conversation with a practical farmer who told him (Mr. Wilson) that although there were a number of wild dogs about, farmers had to contend with more damage by domestic dogs than wild dogs. Where one sheep was killed by wild dogs, dozens were killed by neighbours' dogs. The House at present should set itself against any increase in taxation whatever. We did not want to increase the burdens on any section of the community.

MR. HARPER said he wanted to reduce the burdens.

MR. WILSON: Before we adopted a motion of this sort there ought to be some definite expression of opinion from those interested. If there were any wild dogs in his electorate, the farmers said nothing about them.

MR. HARPER: People did not keep sheep there.

Mr. WILSON: Some of the farmers did, in that district

Mr. HARPER: Very few.

Mr. WILSON: Even the member for Beverley did not say he had heard complaints from farmers in his own district.

Mr. HARPER: Oh, yes; there had been complaints.

Mr. WILSON: The hon. member was not understood to say so. In any case, where were the petitions or deputations asking for this tax to protect sheep against wild dogs? The House ought to be very cautious about increasing taxation, even of this sort; and there ought to be no hasty legislation on the subject. It was open to the farmers to bring pressure on the different members of the House to introduce a measure to meet this difficulty, if necessary. The Government were offering a fair bonus of 10s. per tail, and, if that were not sufficient, the farmers in any district, who were troubled with dogs, could combine to supplement that reward, even to the extent of 15s. per tail.

Mr. HARPER: How were the farmers to raise that?

Mr. WILSON: Out of their own pockets.

Mr. HARPER: By subscription?

Mr. WILSON: Yes. If 20 or 50 farmers were suffering from wild dogs, and the Government bonus of 10s. per tail were found not to be sufficient, let those farmers put their hands into their pockets and pay another 5s. or 10s. in order to exterminate the dogs. The same argument that he (Mr. Wilson) advanced in reference to the motion as to the fruit tax, held good in the present instance. What would the tax cost to collect?

Mr. HARPER: Nothing at all.

Mr. WILSON: To collect the tax would cost more than the tax was worth; and he would oppose the motion.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. H. B. Lefroy): The object of the motion seemed to be to make owners of large numbers of sheep, who had already had considerable trouble to exterminate wild dogs, pay for the protection of the flocks of those who only owned one or two hundred sheep. It was very hard on the large sheep owners of the colony to be now called upon to pay a tax for the

destruction of dogs which were interfering with the operations of farmers who possibly lived in isolated places. At the present time nearly all the sheep in the southern districts were in paddocks, and it was well known that sheep could not be kept in paddocks where there were wild dogs. In the old days when sheep were shepherded, they might be herded, in spite of the wild dogs, without serious loss; but, in these days when all sheep were paddocked, it was to the interest of the flock owner to do all he possibly could to destroy the wild dogs. Nothing had done more in the interest of flock owners than the bonus offered by the Government for the destruction of wild dogs. The only person that could certify to the production of tails was a J.P., and all the J.P.s in the country districts were practical men with a thorough knowledge of stock, and men whom it would be very difficult to deceive in a matter of this kind. In other colonies bonuses had been gradually increased until, he believed, they had reached as high as £5 per tail. If the bonus in this colony were raised gradually, all the wild dogs in the country would soon be destroyed. It was natural, in a tremendous territory like that of Western Australia, that there should be a large number of wild dogs, and the present system for their destruction was working extremely well. Large sheep owners went to a great deal of expense, going so far as to keep men on the watch, and lay poisoned drag trails; and nearly all the large sheep owners supplemented the bonus offered by the Government. He himself had always supplemented the Government bonus, and in the district he represented nearly all the wild dogs had disappeared, simply on account of the attention given to the subject. Since the present Act was passed in 1883, he, as the only justice of the peace for a very long distance, had been having dog tails brought to him, and it would have to be a very clever man to take him in, even with a wild dog's tail. Under all the circumstances it would be hard to tax the large sheep owners for the benefit of the few.

Mr. WALLACE (Yalgoo): After hearing the opinions of several hon. members, he was inclined to uphold the motion.

He had been requested by the pastoralists in his district to endeavour to get an increased bonus for the destruction of wild dogs amongst other pests. He noticed that in the southern districts the bonus was 10s. per tail, whereas, in the central and northern districts it was only 5s. per tail; and it had been suggested that, if the bonus were made equal, there would be no such fraud as bringing tails from one district to another. The bonus, he would point out, was only offered for the production of the tails of dingoes, whereas the destruction was, to a large extent, caused by tame dogs. At any rate, that was so in his own district, and there would always be trouble so long as the Government only offered a bonus for the production of the tails of dingoes. As a matter of fact, it was almost impossible to tell the difference between the tail of a young dingo and the tail of a young sheep dog. The desire in offering the bonus was to exterminate not only dingoes, but all dogs which killed sheep. Notwithstanding that he had been urged by the pastoralists of his district to ask for a further bonus for the destruction of dogs, it had occurred to him that, if every settler knew the responsibility of eradicating these dogs rested with himself, he would work harder to that end. As the law was now, he knew of one firm who supplemented the bonus by another 5s. But what advantage was gained by that? The firm were really endeavouring to exterminate dogs on their own run, while the adjoining runs were breeding grounds for the animals. The whole responsibility should be thrown upon sheep owners. Give them no rewards whatever, but allow them to suffer the loss of their flocks, or to exterminate the dogs—whichever they liked. This would go further towards extermination than would any system of giving bonuses. It was hard to see how the Government could do away with fraudulent impositions. It would not be fair to confine the bonus to dingoes' tails, inasmuch as the object was to do away with all dogs which were killing sheep, including the so-called tame dogs. The sooner the farmers and pastoralists were awakened to their own interests and compelled to see that, if they desired to exterminate these ver-

min, they must give the necessary assistance, the better; but, as long as the Government offered a bonus, the majority of people were willing to impose upon the good nature of the State, and allow the dogs to breed.

MR. HARPER (in reply): It was clear from the speeches of several members, that they had no sympathy with the small holder, for they had entirely spoken from the point of view of the squatter. The remarks of the Premier really proved his (Mr. Harper's) case; for the right hon. gentleman had said the amount paid in bonuses under the present Act was increasing; thus proving, if proof were wanted, that the maximum of good obtainable under the existing law had been achieved, and that instead of dogs decreasing, they were on the increase. He had received the following letter from a small sheep farmer in his own district:—

I myself commenced fencing about five years ago, thinking then that the wild dogs were completely extinct, and erected about 21 miles of wire fencing to enclose the sheep; and since that time have had about 700 sheep killed by the cursed dogs. This year I have had to shepherd all my sheep inside the paddock to keep them from being killed at night. As an instance, one of my shepherds killed by chance the other day a native slut with 10 puppies.

The cost of the last-mentioned incident to the State would be £5 10s.; and it showed how the dogs increased. That was in a district where there were numerous sheep-owners, and showed that the bonus of 10s. per tail had done its work in reducing the number of dogs to a certain point, but that there was a tendency to increase. To further decrease the number it was necessary to increase the bonus. Some hon. members would be prepared to support the Government in offering larger rewards. He (Mr. Harper) was not. The member for the Canning (Mr. Wilson) had asked, what evidence was there that the farmers desired this tax? The member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan) had answered that, and said his constituents were in favour of it. Moreover, this matter had been brought up at the annual meeting of the agriculturists of the country for several years past; and they had asked, over and over again, that this bonus should be increased, for they all recognised that the pest was

not decreasing, and that further action was necessary. True, they did not propose to tax themselves; but he maintained that it was wiser to tax sheep than to pay it out of general revenue. The member for the Canning (Mr. Wilson) said why could not the farmers club together and do this themselves? The hon. member ought to know, as a practical man, that one of the greatest difficulties of life was to get all men to pay their fair share towards any public necessity. A few would be allowed to pay, and the others would take advantage of that fact and do nothing; and the only solution of the difficulty was to make each of them pay equally, and then all would be fairly served. Probably the hon. member was not aware of past legislation levying a tax on sheep to eradicate the scab. That cost the State little or nothing. The sheepowner had to register the number of his stock once a year on a certain date, and was given a month or so to pay the rate which had been levied upon him in the district court, and there was no further trouble to the country. The owner was subject to heavy penalties for making a false declaration to the stock inspector. The member for the Moore (Hon. H. B. Lefroy), pointed out the hardship which would be suffered by those who, like himself, had worked for many years to eradicate this pest; and said that, even now he was paying very heavily for laying baits, and supplementing the Government vote, and for trying in every way to get rid of these vermin. That proved his (Mr. Harper's) case: that if the tax were levied all round the hon. member would not pay as much as he was now losing, because everyone in his neighbourhood would pay an equal share; so the hon. member's objection fell to the ground, and was rather in favour of the motion. The member for Wellington (Hon. H. W. Venn) took the position of a large stationholder, and pointed out how he and others had expended thousands of pounds in putting wire netting round their estates and in other directions. This only proved that small farmers could not incur such expenditure. If hon. members would look at it from the point of view of the settlement of the country, they would perceive that it was the small men who required protection,

which they were not capable of giving themselves. What was wanted was to increase settlement, to increase stock, to assist our meat supply; and one of the best ways of doing it was to foster the small man who owned a few sheep, and who, in his present position, could not protect himself from the depredations of these dogs like his wealthier neighbour and therefore was, in many instances forced to refrain from embarking in the industry. The objection of the Premier as to the carcass being produced could hardly be considered a sound one. There was a difficulty certainly, but, on the other hand, there was a danger of fraud if this were not done. If the claimants were too far away to produce the carcass he could always produce the tail and get the reward; while, if the carcass had to be produced, the bonus might be double or trebled with safety. If the rewards were payable on the production of the skin, it would only encourage imposition and therefore, although there were difficulties in the way of producing the carcass, it was the safest way of bringing about the desired result.

Motion put, and, a division being called for by Mr. HARPER, it was taken with the following result:—

Ayes	10
Noes	10
				—
A tie	0

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Conolly	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Hall	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Harper	Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Holmes	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Piessie
Mr. Kenny	Mr. Throssell
Mr. Locke	Hon. H. W. Venn
Mr. Quinlan	Mr. Wallace
Mr. Wood	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Moran	Mr. Lenke
(Teller)	(Teller)

THE SPEAKER gave his vote with the noes, the motion being thus negatived by the casting vote.

MOTION: OFFICIAL RECEIVER, JOINT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

MR. KENNY (North Murchison moved:

That, in view of the universal dissatisfaction existing throughout the commercial circles of the colony in regard to the administration of

the Bankruptcy Act by the Official Receiver in Bankruptcy, a joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament be appointed to inquire into the general administration and working of the department under the control of the said Official Receiver in Bankruptcy.

He said: I feel the responsibility of the position I have taken, inasmuch as there is nothing easier than to criticise heads of departments and men holding responsible positions; and the fact that members of this Chamber have that power makes me more tardy to exercise it than I should otherwise be. It is well known, not only to members of this House, but also, I may say, to the general public, and it is frequently seen in the columns of the press, both in the city and the country, that great dissatisfaction has existed in relation to the department referred to, which handles a very large amount of public funds, and moneys belonging to the commercial section of the community. Four weeks ago last Thursday I moved for a return, and whilst I at once acquit the responsible Minister of that department of any desire to keep back information asked for, I regret to say I am not in possession of that information yet, as it would to a certain extent have strengthened my position.

THE PREMIER: We have not been able to get it yet. That is the truth.

MR. KENNY: But, even in the absence of that information, knowing, as the members of this House do, the amount of smoke that has arisen around this particular department, I think we can only come to the conclusion that there certainly must be fire. I feel there is no necessity for me to delay the House any longer, and I formally move the motion standing in my name.

MR. CONOLLY (Dundas): I second the motion.

Question put and passed.

THE SPEAKER: I think the next thing will be to ballot for five members of this House for the Committee—four besides the mover.

MR. KENNY: The motion is for a committee consisting of members of both Houses.

THE SPEAKER: We shall have to inform the other House of what we have done, and ask them to appoint an equal number.

A ballot having been taken, the following members, in addition to the mover (Mr. Kenny), were elected:—Mr. Holmes, Mr. Kingsmill, Mr. Quinlan, Mr. Wilson.

Ordered, that the Committee report this day fortnight.

Resolution transmitted to the Legislative Council.

MOTION: COOLGARDIE WATER SCHEME, AND ACCEPTANCE OF TENDERS.

MR. HOLMES (North Fremantle) moved:—

That, in the opinion of this House, no tender for the supply of pipes for the Coolgardie water scheme should be accepted without the approval of this House.

He said: In moving this motion, I feel it my duty to apologise for having brought the matter forward at such a late stage. I may explain, in all seriousness, that I did not think the Government would undertake to accept a tender for this important work, involving such a large amount of money, at the present time, seeing the change that has taken place in the position of the colony since the matter was first introduced. A question was asked on Friday last, as to what information was available in regard to tenders for the Coolgardie water pipes, and the reply was practically that there was no information. However, on Saturday morning a notice appeared in the Press that tenders were about to be accepted, and I availed myself of the first opportunity of giving this notice of motion. I have no doubt that it will be argued that this is purely a departmental matter; and that I am almost prepared to admit. But the matter is of importance, involving a large expenditure of money; and seeing that Parliament is sitting at the time when the tenders are being considered, I think that, as the representatives of the people, this House should have some say in accepting or rejecting any tender. We know there are matters of importance connected with these tenders, and one I may mention is that it is proposed, according to information in the Press, which I take to be thoroughly reliable, that welded pipes are to be used instead of riveted pipes for the whole of this work. From the same source we have the information that pipes of uniform size are to be used; and we have also the

information that tenders are to be accepted subject to certain conditions. We are not in possession of the facts as to what these conditions are; and it would be interesting to know if the conditions are as stringent as originally intended, or if concessions have been made to secure the contracts to certain local firms.

MR. GEORGE: No local firms.

MR. HOLMES: It would be interesting to know, at all events, if conditions have been made giving preference to firms on the spot, while firms at a distance have not had an opportunity of having these conditions before them. I may stand alone in this matter or I may not, but my principal reason in bringing the motion before the House is that I consider it the duty of all hon. members to pause and consider well before they commit this country finally to the expenditure of two and a half millions of money. Once these tenders are accepted for the pipes, the country is undoubtedly committed to the expenditure of that vast amount. We have had a recent experience of financial institutions in London, in the attempt to float the late loan of a million, and that, to my mind, is only a foreshadow of what we may expect.

MR. WOOD: No, no.

MR. HOLMES: I am expressing my own opinion, and I say that is only a foreshadow of what we may expect. When these self-same institutions know we are committed to a scheme which is going to cost 2½ millions, they will know we must have the money at their price. We have it from the Premier himself that there was no necessity to put the recent loan on the market at the time, and that it was only placed because his financial advisers said it was an opportune time to float a loan.

THE PREMIER: I said we could do without it.

MR. HOLMES: The fiasco, as I can only call it, foreshadowed what we may expect. This treatment of the colony, when we really did not want the money, opens up rather a serious prospect, because when we are committed to this Coolgardie water scheme, we will have to have money at any price. I would like to know how many hon. members would feel justified in supporting the Coolgardie water scheme if that scheme were introduced to-day for

the first time. I doubt whether there would be very many hon. members prepared to support the scheme. I think, and I gather my information from conversations with hon. members, that the general opinion is that the scheme is too big for this country at the present time. That is the conclusion hon. members have come to; but they say that, having gone so far, there seems really nothing else to do but to go on with it. I take an altogether different view of the matter. I consider it is never too late to mend, on an important subject such as this. I consider that the argument used as to having gone on to a certain stage, and that it is too late to turn back, is one of the strongest arguments in favour of my motion, which simply means the delaying of this project for the time being, at all events. I cannot get away from this fact: that, once having accepted the tenders, we may find to our sorrow that we are committed to an expenditure of two and a half millions that we cannot possibly get away from. It is, to any hon. member who gives the matter serious consideration, an enormous undertaking; and I am convinced without doubt that, if we go on with it, it will end in disaster.

MR. GEORGE: You will be called a "croaker," directly, if you go on in this way.

MR. HOLMES: It does not matter; I cannot help it. It appears to me that now is the time to reconsider this question. Two years ago, when the subject was introduced, we had an overflowing treasury, an increasing revenue, and an increasing population; I admit that the House did approve of this scheme when the circumstances appeared to justify it; but we have to face an altogether different position to-day. We have to face a reversal of those circumstances. We have a decreasing revenue, a decreasing population, and, unfortunately—I am sorry to have to say it—an empty treasury instead of an overflowing one. All will admit that, in our own engagements and speculations during the last two or three years, we have found ourselves individually burdened with obligations that we have had to get out of as best we could, and to the best advantage. If hon. members are prepared to do that in their

own business, certainly they should do the same thing in representing the people of the country in the Parliament of Western Australia. If we have to face the inevitable, and do the best we can for ourselves in present conditions, when we find that our income is not coming up to what we expected, I certainly say we should run the country on similar lines. We were told two years ago that the mining industry could not be developed without this Coolgardie water scheme. Marvellous as are the developments of the eastern goldfields, I venture to suggest that still greater progress would have been made had it not been for this long promised supply, for the knowledge we acquired two years ago led us to the belief that the scheme would give an abundant supply of water by this time; consequently, mine managers have made no arrangements to provide themselves with an efficient supply, as they have ever since been depending upon the carrying out of this scheme, and the chances are they will have to wait three, four, or five years. The scheme, hung up as it is, has retarded progress and the output of gold.

THE PREMIER: You are giving us the "Lamentations of Jeremiah."

MR. HOLMES: That may be so.

MR. GEORGE: You give us the "Song of Solomon."

MR. HOLMES: *Hansard* shows that two years ago, when the right hon. gentleman introduced the scheme, he said the generation which came afterwards would say, this was surely a wise Government, for they made a way in the wilderness, and a river in the desert. At that time we were suffering from full pockets and swelled heads. But the present position does not justify us in acting recklessly. As I said at the outset, my object is to bring this matter before the Government and hon. members, and to ascertain whether it really is the intention of the Government to go on with this great work, which is a gigantic undertaking for a population of 170,000. For 170,000 to undertake an expenditure of £2,500,000 for one work alone is to my mind beyond conception. Well might the editor of the *West Australian*, who is supposed to have hatched this scheme, say that the people of West Australia are to be complimented upon their pluck in

undertaking such a scheme as this. I hope members will consider this question, not according to their ideas of two years ago, but according to their views of the present position of affairs, and I honestly believe that if they will regard it from that standpoint they will vote for my motion, the object of which is to delay this scheme until the prospects of the country are brighter. I have much pleasure in moving the motion standing in my name.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I hardly expected that I should have been called upon to argue this question over again. The motion submitted by the hon. member is that "no tender for the supply of pipes for the Coolgardie water scheme should be accepted without the approval of the House." If necessary, we could bring down the tenders, place them upon the table, and move a substantive motion; but that is scarcely a useful proceeding. The hon. member seems to have taken a good deal upon himself in this matter. It seems to me he has moved in this matter at the eleventh hour, when he has sat in this House two previous sessions and all this one, when he has known very well what has been going on. He has known that tenders were called for a certain date and were sent in, and he has been informed of everything that has taken place.

MR. HOLMES: I know also that there is a great doubt about the thing.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member knew thoroughly well what it was proposed to do. The hon. member has known too that a division has taken place this session on this point.

MR. HOLMES: We were not in possession of the facts then that we are now.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member has not told us of any of these facts. This scheme was approved of by the House; we called for tenders all over the world, and tenders were received. The lowest tender by a long way was a tender by two persons, Messrs. Hoskins and Mephan Ferguson, who have undertaken to construct the whole of the work in the colony, in their tenders. The tenders have been modified in some respects to the advantage of the country and the scheme. It has been decided to have 2ft. 6in. pipes all the way, and these pipes are to be made of $\frac{1}{4}$ inch

steel plates instead of three sixteenths, all the way, except a certain distance. The tenders are lower than the estimate by some £70,000. Notwithstanding all these alterations in favour of making the scheme better, it is a well-known matter that this scheme has been before the House and the country for two years, and the only question which was raised the other day was whether we should do it ourselves, or whether the work should be done by private enterprise. Hon. members opposite have been just as eager for this scheme as members on this side, the only difference of opinion being whether the work should be carried out as a Government scheme, or whether we should attempt to do it by private enterprise. Everyone has acknowledged the necessity for the scheme: no one now says it is not necessary. Our mines are progressing; we hope to turn out a million ounces of gold this year; the country is full of low-grade ores. I have never come across one man who says the scheme is not necessary—not one.

MR. HOLMES: Nine out of every ten I meet say so.

THE PREMIER: It seems to me if the hon. member had been in real earnest, he would have moved a motion that the Coolgardie water scheme be not proceeded with. If he had done that, we would have known what we were about; but to say we should lay the tenders on the table of the House is nothing, because I can tell hon. members to-night what is in the tenders, the amounts, and all the conditions that are in the specifications. They are very precise indeed: they have been very carefully prepared here and in London. Unless the House has come to the conclusion that the work has not to be carried out, I do not know what else could be done. I have no objections myself to placing the specifications and tenders on the table, if that will satisfy anyone. But that will not get us out of the difficulty, as to whether the tenders are to be accepted or not; and that is the point. If the members of the House do not wish this contract entered into and carried out, well, they should say so in no unmistakable language. The Government would then be able to meet the question and join issue on it.

MR. LEAKE: Threaten to resign.

THE PREMIER: There need be no threats; because the Government would resign, if the members of the Opposition could manage the affairs of the country. I see no necessity to go into this question of the Coolgardie water scheme all over again. I have talked about it until I have said everything that can be said in regard to it; and hon. members opposite have said all they can for and against the scheme. The motion is really a sort of half-hearted thing. "Without the approval of this House" means, I suppose, I have to move that the House approve of the tenders being settled. But I already have the authority of the House in every particular. There was an Act of Parliament; the estimates and plans have been laid on the table, together with a statement as to the conditions under which the accepted tender is to be carried out; and I do not know that any further authority is wanted. If hon. members do not wish the Government to go on with the scheme, they ought to say so.

MR. HOLMES: The money is the only thing we want.

THE PREMIER: We have borrowed £1,000,000 for the scheme.

MR. HOLMES: And spent it for other purposes.

THE PREMIER: We have sufficient money to carry on to the end of the financial year.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Micawber-like financing.

THE PREMIER: There only remain about one and a half millions to finance.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Two and a half millions.

THE PREMIER: Yes; but a great deal of the money has been raised.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: And how much expended?

MR. GEORGE: How much reappropiated?

THE PREMIER: We will have to get a loan of £470,000; and I have told you that before.

MR. GEORGE: Do not be so snappish.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You have to raise a loan for Treasury bills.

THE PREMIER: Not just yet.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: And you call this sound financing!

THE PREMIER: Everyone has had to do that. It does not add to the liabilities, but rather assists the colony, as the money is got cheaper. To raise a loan to repay Treasury bills is an advantage to the colony and not a loss. There is the advantage of a lower rate of interest.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Micawber-like financing!

THE PREMIER: That is the financing we are carrying out. It is the plan we have adopted, whether it be wise or unwise. If it is the best plan, and it has done good, well, the colony will benefit. I am not here to-night to defend the Government on all those questions. I am dealing with the one question before the House. If the House desires the Government should not go on with the work, that tenders should not be accepted, I have the right to ask for a substantive motion to be tabled, so that we may discuss it. I do not think I can say any more.

MR. LEAKE (Albany): It seems to me the motion before the House is sufficiently emphatic; and the hon. member who has moved it has framed it in such a way as clearly to express, not only his own views, but the views of many other members on this question. He merely asks that no tender for the supply of pipes for the Coolgardie water scheme be accepted without the approval of the House. Some time during the recess, tenders were called for; they were invited in the colonies, in London, and I believe in other countries—undoubtedly with the idea that, when the House did meet, it should have an opportunity of considering, or at all events of viewing, the whole of the tenders which had been submitted to the Government.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: That is not the course usually taken.

MR. LEAKE: It is not the course usually taken, perhaps, but it is the course which was taken in this particular instance. We have had certain tenders submitted to the Government here. Certain tenders were made in London; and, in reply to a question which was put by me the other evening, as to whether the Premier had any information to give us with regard to the London tenders, he said that at the moment he had none. Well, at that very moment when the Pre-

mier answered the question, he had in contemplation the acceptance of some tenders made here in Perth; and this House is entitled to know what those London tenders were, and we are entitled to compare them with the tenders that have been submitted locally. And we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that it is admitted by the Government that, since these tenders were called, there has been a modification of the tender. What is that modification?

THE PREMIER: I have told you.

MR. GEORGE: A special pipe made by a special man.

MR. LEAKE: You get up in the House here, at the last moment, and say: "We have made a modification, and we do not care what you say; we are going to accept the tenders." The House in fact is being flouted.

THE PREMIER: Oh, no.

HON. H. W. VENN: I do not think so. The Premier has been very fair in the matter.

THE PREMIER: I will give you any necessary information.

MR. LEAKE: It is not fair for the Premier to tell us in the same breath that he is going to accept a tender, and that the terms of the contract have been varied.

THE PREMIER: But the tender to be accepted is a great deal lower than any other. I will tell you anything you like to ask concerning it.

MR. LEAKE: Yes; you will lock the stable door after the steed is stolen.

THE PREMIER: What is it you want, and I will have the information placed on the table?

MR. LEAKE: Speaking for myself, I want to affirm the proposition of the hon. member (Mr. Holmes). There is no need for any unnecessary haste in this matter. We know perfectly well that this is a scheme involving a question of two and a half millions of money; and it is admitted also that we have not got the money. We have the authority for the loan, but not the money. The Government have actually reappropriated some of the very moneys required for this contract.

THE PREMIER: No, no—not those required for this contract.

MR. LEAKE: Certainly you have. Money has been reappropriated from the Coolgardie water scheme.

THE PREMIER: I thought you meant this contract—the contract for pipes.

MR. LEAKE: You cannot divide this Coolgardie water scheme up into five or six contracts, in order to suit the argument of the moment. That will never do. We have reappropriated from the Coolgardie water scheme over half a million of money. It is not business, and it is certainly not politic, for us to say we will take a step that will pledge us irretrievably to the carrying out of this work when we are bound to admit at the same moment we have not the means of carrying it out. Let us know everything. Let us know exactly where we are; and judging from the questions which have been asked, there is a very important phase to this question. More legislation will be required in regard to this work before it can be commenced, and we have, of course, to assume that this legislation will pass through both Houses of Parliament. The Government cannot go on with this scheme until they get statutory authority to construct the dam over the Helena River. But supposing, for the sake of argument—and we have no right to take anything for granted—this enabling Bill were rejected, if not by this House, by the Legislative Council, what would our position be? We should be pledged to the expenditure of £2,500,000 without seeing our way clear before us. The motion of the member for Fremantle is proper and reasonable, and I ask members, whatever their feelings may be, to at any rate be prompted by fairness, and support this motion. No doubt the Government in the long run will be able to force this through the House and down the throats of the people, in whatever form they will; but we have a right to know all the particulars.

THE PREMIER: We want to give them to you.

MR. LEAKE: What is the use of giving them? Supposing there is something in the information we disagree about? Supposing, for the sake of argument—and perhaps I am pushing it to an extreme—we find there has been some improper dealing in this matter, what is the use of find-

ing it out when the contract is entered into? No good at all. I do not say there has been anything of the kind, but I am applying the argument. Let us suppose there has been some little hanky-panky somewhere, and we want to get to the bottom of it, what will be the use of finding that out the day after to-morrow, if the tenders are accepted to-day? As to the necessity for the work being admitted on all hands, I dispute it. No doubt when we argued this question in the earlier days of the session, those of us who opposed the scheme were forced into the position of saying, for the sake of argument, that the principle having been affirmed, we must agree to it as a matter of necessity.

THE PREMIER: No one divided against it.

MR. LEAKE: What was the use of dividing against it? It is idle to say, at any rate, that members on this side of the House have approved of this scheme as a work of necessity, except for the sake of argument. We knew perfectly well we could not kill the scheme, and therefore we had to make the best of a bad bargain. I emphatically declare personally I have never admitted the necessity for this scheme.

THE PREMIER: You always said it was necessary.

MR. LEAKE: Nothing would give me greater delight than to see the thing smashed up. I do not care by what means. The financial question is one of no mean importance. It is true we have the authority for this loan, but we have reappropriated a considerable portion of that money, and when we go into the market those who have lent the money will, knowing our necessities, exact harsher and more stringent terms. We ought not to be in that position.

THE PREMIER: While you are borrowing you must be in that position.

MR. LEAKE: We are forced into that position by reason of the peculiar methods of finance adopted by the present Administration.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Hear, hear.

MR. LEAKE: Discounting their paper at long dates, and being forced into the market to borrow to pay their debts. That is the position, and we cannot get away from it. It is a complicated and scientific kind of "kite" flying

THE PREMIER: You know all about it.

MR. LEAKE: I have done a great deal of it in my small way, and perhaps it is our personal experience which enables us to preach caution. We know we have to pay more than if we were in an independent position. There is nothing unreasonable in the proposition of the hon. member. I commend him for what he has done, and I trust in a spirit of fairness, and in the interest of the country and the people, and considering the revulsion of popular feeling and opinion there has recently been against the work, we should pause and do what we can, not to take the smallest leap in the dark with regard to this important scheme. The hon. member for East Fremantle pointed out that, if the tender is accepted, the country is irretrievably pledged; and the country should have the fullest possible information and all the information the Government possess. There has been a modification in the terms of the contract, and there has been this very important modification, the alteration in the specifications for the pipes, the very essence of the contract itself.

MR. GEORGE: There may be good reasons for it.

MR. LEAKE: There may be, but why should we not know them. Certain specifications were published, and tenders were based on these specifications, and it was only practically one firm who, knowing of these modifications, was able to tender; and we have the right to assume that, had other persons a similar advantage and knowledge, we should have had, possibly, lower tenders.

MR. GEORGE: A contract made for one pipe.

MR. LEAKE: That is what it is, a contract put forward for one pipe and accepted for another, in a contract for a work of two millions and a half of money. I cannot assume any more glaring instance of deviation. Those who have tendered unsuccessfully for the work have the right to complain of not being fairly dealt with, and I say the House has not been fairly dealt with, nor the public interest. For that reason I shall support the motion.

MR. MORAN (East Coolgardie): I was going to propose that, as this motion is

really one of want of confidence in the administration—

MR. GEORGE: No.

MR. MORAN: It is a question of such importance that we might adjourn now.

THE SPEAKER: If the hon. member intends to speak now, he will not have an opportunity of speaking again.

MR. MORAN: I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion—that the debate be adjourned—put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	15
Noes	4

Majority for	11
--------------	-----	-----	----

Ayes.

Noes.

Mr. Conolly

Sir John Forrest

Mr. A. Forrest

Mr. George

Mr. Harper

Mr. Holmes

Mr. Hubble

Mr. Lefroy

Mr. Monger.

Mr. Moran

Mr. Piesse

Mr. Quinlan

Hon. H. W. Venn

Mr. Wood

Mr. Hall

Mr. Illingworth

Mr. Leake

Mr. Wilson

Mr. Wallace

(Teller)

(Teller)

Motion thus passed, and the debate adjourned until the next Tuesday.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11.45 p.m. until the next day.