

"second schedule to this Act, in such amounts and manner as the Governor by any warrants under his hand may from time to time authorise and direct in conformity with the annual Estimates of the expenditure of loan moneys sanctioned by Parliament." By the summary at the end of the Bill it will be seen how it is proposed to expend the money. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House at 5-25 o'clock, p.m., adjourned until Thursday, 15th October, 1896, at 4-30 o'clock, p.m.

### Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 14th October, 1896.

Want of a Quorum—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4-30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

#### WANT OF A QUORUM—ADJOURNMENT.

At 4-48 p.m., there not being a quorum of members present, the SPEAKER declared the House adjourned until the next sitting day, Thursday.

### Legislative Council,

Thursday, 15th October, 1896.

Inadmissible questions—Treatment of Aborigines at the North—Cue-Nannine Railway Bill: first reading—Railways Act, 1879, Amendment Bill: second reading; committee; third reading—Australasian Federation Enabling Bill: committee—Loan Bill (£3,500,000), 1896: committee—Loans Consolidation Bill: committee—Statutory Declarations Bill: Legislative Assembly's amendments—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 4-30 o'clock, p.m.

#### INADMISSIBLE QUESTIONS.

THE HON. D. K. CONGDON: Yesterday I gave notice of a series of questions, including the following:—Will the Government supply the municipalities of Fremantle and North Fremantle with water for street watering, and also for the watering of public recreation grounds, free of charge, as is done in the eastern colonies? If not, will the Government consent to place upon the supplementary estimates the sum of £15,000, so that the Fremantle municipality may carry out a scheme for the watering of streets, park, and oval, which consume for these three purposes a total of 100,000 gallons daily? I notice that these have been left out of the Notice Paper.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton): The alteration was made by my instructions to the Clerk.

THE HON. D. K. CONGDON: Would you condescend to give me the reasons? Am I not at liberty to ask the questions?

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton): The questions relate to finance, and as I do not consider them admissible, I, under the powers which are given to me, instructed the Clerk to strike them out. I adopted the same course in regard to a motion which the Hon. Mr. Stone recently brought forward, and which dealt with the appropriation of money.

THE HON. D. K. CONGDON: But I only asked the question.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton): You asked for a specific sum, which no hon. member of this House has a right to do.

THE HON. D. K. CONGDON: I asked if the Government were willing to place a sum on the Estimates.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton): Under the powers delegated to me by the Standing Orders I altered the questions. I have nothing further to say in the matter.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I should be glad if the hon. member would postpone asking the questions until the next sitting of the House.

THE HON. D. K. CONGDON: I am quite prepared to accede to the hon. gentleman's request.

#### TREATMENT OF ABORIGINES AT THE NORTH.

THE HON. D. McKAY: I beg to move that, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to further consider the correspondence relating to the abolition of the Aborigines Protection Board. I, as a rule, make it a point, as far as I am able, never to be too pronounced in contradicting any one, especially such a high dignitary as his Lordship Bishop Riley, but I hope, sir, I shall always have the courage of my opinion when duty demands it. In this case I think I should speak with no uncertain voice. It is chiefly in reference to his Lordship Bishop Riley's communication to His Excellency the Governor that I beg to direct the attention of hon. members. Bishop Riley tells the Governor that the natives on some stations are treated in a cruel and inhuman manner. If the Bishop is able to prove this, why does he not name the stations? If he cannot do so, I look upon it as unjust, misleading, and calculated to create a wrong impression of native treatment in the North. Bishop Riley lays the root of the evil at natives being indentured to the settlers. He would lead the Governor to believe that the settlers force the natives to sign, and that the officers administering the law are corrupt in the execution of their duty, a base and unworthy implication, contrary to any facts that ever came in the scope of my observations, extending over 26 years' experience. His Lordship would also lead the Governor to believe that the natives are treated no better than the brute. This is a despicable perversion of the truth. I am sorry to be compelled to say it. His Lordship also insinuates to His Excellency that the

police in the North are not worthy of the power placed in their hands. This I consider, also, as a rule, a most unjust imputation. I speak from years of experience. Bishop Riley asserts, and, from a few days' hearsay experience, expects to be believed in Downing Street. Why, I say, does not Bishop Riley name the stations where it is the practice to turn the natives adrift when shearing or other work is done? My experience has been quite the reverse of this, and I think, as far as I know, it is the experience of other settlers also, who conclude that it is better to feed the natives, even if they can find nothing for them to do, than to let them go roaming about the bush feeding themselves on beef and mutton. We have sense enough to know which loss was the least, in more ways than one. On the whole, sir, I am inclined to the conclusion that Bishop Riley's communication to the Governor, relative to the natives at the North, has been very ill-considered. It is crude, misleading, and unreliable. This the Bishop's own concluding words would imply, so that all the effect it can have is to create a vile and erroneous impression. His Lordship went to the North biased, and he came back the same.

THE HON. J. E. RICHARDSON: I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton): What is the motion? The question given notice of is that the papers be taken into consideration.

THE HON. D. McKAY: I beg to move the adjournment of the House, then.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton): The Hon. member cannot do that; he has moved another motion.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: In order that the matter may be discussed, I beg to move the adjournment of the House. I think the thanks of this colony are due to the hon. gentleman for drawing attention to the letter which we now find has gone to Downing Street. Although I am sure we all hold the rev. gentleman who wrote it in the highest respect and esteem, we must agree that the letter was ill-advised. It was written at a stage when this colony was asking that the control of the aborigines should be taken away from the Board and placed in the

hands of the Government. Although in the first part of the letter his Lordship comes to the conclusion that the control, should, as we desire, be in the hands of the Government, at the same time he uses every argument that can be used against the Parliament of the mother country giving us that control. I do not propose to go into the details, because the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has had considerable experience on this subject, and has told us that the letter is incorrect. At the same time, I may say that it is a matter of regret that the letter should have been written at all. His Lordship does not tell us where he obtained his information from, so that we have no opportunity of judging of the value of it. This letter will be read in the House of Commons, and the members will come to the conclusion that we are not dealing rightly with the natives, and that we are continuing laws on the statute book which keep the natives in a state of slavery. We who are in this colony know that nothing of the kind has been done. This matter has been thrashed out time after time. Of course, there are exceptions and instances where natives have been treated badly, but are there not similar cases even among the whites? Do we not find white men ill-treating their wives, and Englishmen treating their own countrymen far worse than the blacks? I may say that if there are cases of natives being ill-treated then the Aborigines Board has failed to do its duty. If these cases are known why have not the offenders been prosecuted? The Board has been in existence for years, and apparently has not discovered any of these cases, and yet his Lordship goes to the North for a month and apparently finds out all about them. How is it that the inspectors of police know nothing of these cases? Surely this information has been given to his Lordship wrongly, and perhaps with some end in view. I regret that he should have accepted what he has been told seriously without further consideration and without going fully into the matter. I say the thanks of this House are due to the hon. gentleman for bringing this matter forward, and I hope that before the debate closes we shall have an assurance from the hon. the Minister for Mines, either that the Government have taken steps to con-

tradict the letter or that they will do so.

THE HON. J. E. RICHARDSON: I should like to say a few words to protest against this letter. It appears that the Bishop went to the North and visited some stations, where, no doubt, he was hospitably entertained, and now he has come down here and has turned round on the people. Probably the next time he goes there many of the settlers will tell him to move on. What he has written in the letter must be nearly all hearsay. He has not had the time to obtain the information. Why does he not particularise the districts? The North extends from Wyndham to the Ashburton. In any circumstances, I think it was ill-advised for his Lordship to write this letter at a time when Parliament was trying to get the control of the natives into the hands of the Government. In one part of the letter he says that the natives are compelled to sign. I know that in the matter of indentures the natives have to go before the Government Resident in Roebourne, and surely he is a fit and proper person to protect them. If the natives are ill-treated they have a remedy. They can refuse to sign with a master who is in the habit of ill-treating natives. They can also complain to the police, or to any respectable settler. I think his Lordship has cast a good deal of reflection on the officers who administer the law at the North, for in effect he says that they are not fit to look after the natives. I have known of many instances where the police have protected the natives against the settlers. Then the Bishop says the police should not be allowed to shoot the natives. This is as much as to say that the police must wait until they are speared before they are allowed to shoot.

THE HON. R. S. HAYNES: I was somewhat surprised on reading the letter of Bishop Riley, and a little more surprised at a paragraph in the letter of His Excellency, where he says that since the advent of Bishop Riley to Perth he has taken the warmest interest in the welfare of the aboriginal native population, and is in the best position for obtaining the most reliable information with reference to the treatment of the natives by the settlers. I do not know what better position his Lordship is in than any other

member of the community. I myself have had ample opportunity of judging of the treatment of the natives, and I must say that I have never known them to be badly used. It will be remembered that some years ago charges were made against the settlers by the late Mr. Gribble. I was counsel for him, and I am bound to admit, and I do so freely, that the rev. gentleman was grossly misled. The harrowing details given to me of acts of ill-treatment by the settlers were very many, but, after spending several months in investigating them, I found that nearly every case vanished into thin air. I found myself unable to put a witness into the box to substantiate any of the charges, with one exception, and the evidence of that witness did not go to show ill-treatment by the whites, but that the whites were little better than the blacks.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: Why did you not say that before? You might have saved us £1,000.

THE HON. R. S. HAYNES: I took up the position that the other side did not prove what they said. I may say now that there were isolated cases of cruelty, but those occurred long before the advent of Mr. Gribble. They were told over and over again; they were first ascribed to one district and then to another, and magnified to such an extent that the author of them could scarcely recognise them. I have travelled about the North from Roebourne to Cue, and in no single instance have I known a case of a native being ill-treated or any signs of it, nor have I heard of it from any authentic source. Had cases occurred I should have deemed it my duty to make them public, either through the newspapers or have reported them to the Aborigines Board, and I believe any right-thinking colonist would do the same. It is idle to suppose that cases of cruelty occur and that no one knows of them. White employés are often discharged on the stations, and it is not reasonable to think that if these cases occurred such men would, if only out of spite to their former employers, inform the police. Then, again, a settler cannot very well treat the natives badly, because they will run away. It seems to me a gross libel on the settlers to say that they are always treating the natives badly.

I say unhesitatingly that his Lordship has been misled. He says, "I think the police regulations should be altered, and that unless a policeman is really attacked he should not be allowed to shoot at natives. The expression 'dispersing the natives' should be clearly defined, so that we may know what it means." I know of no law which allows the police to shoot natives. If a policeman does shoot he has to take the same responsibility as he would have to take if he shot at a white. If any person is charged with felony, and attempts to escape, a constable is justified in shooting, but he must not shoot wantonly, and if he does so he must take the responsibility of his act. I know a number of policemen who have come from the North, and a finer or more upright body of men cannot be found. His Lordship says the expression "dispersing the natives" should be defined. I have heard it defined in Queensland. There, it has been said, people have gone out with revolvers to murder and slay any natives they might come across. This has never been done at the North of this colony with, I believe, perhaps one exception, and then they were Queenslanders, who set out for the purpose of dispersing the natives. These men were tried for the offence, and there was not sufficient evidence to convict them, it being stated that the man who did the shooting was dead. His Lordship says there should be hospitals on the reserve, but that seems to me a matter which is impossible to carry out. I might now ask from whom did the Bishop obtain his information. There are clergymen at the Gascoyne and Roebourne, and surely if they heard of ill-treatment of the natives it was their duty to complain publicly, either through the press or to the Board. If they have not done so they have been guilty of a gross dereliction of duty. It is to be supposed that these gentlemen have listened to tales of inhuman cruelty and have made no mention of them until his Lordship went up there? There is also a Trappist Mission at Beagle Bay. The clergymen belonging to the Mission travel a great deal about the districts, and if they had discovered any cases of cruelty I feel sure they would have denounced the settlers who were guilty of it. It seems to me that his Lordship's letter is

not levelled so much against the settlers at the North as against the clergymen of all denominations. Bishop Riley's statements are tantamount to saying that these clergymen have winked their eyes at cruelty. These reports have come to him and he has not taken the trouble to inquire into them, but has adopted them. Perhaps, even now, if he were to give the names of his informants the public would be able to judge of the value of the information. A great number of reports do come to Perth, and when they are inquired into (and I have myself inquired into many of them), it is found that there is not the slightest foundation for the statements in them. The settlers of the North are humane gentlemen, who would rather cut their right hands off than ill-treat a black or a white.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I join with those hon. gentlemen who have spoken in regretting that this letter should have been written or published, but I should not have risen had not the Hon. Mr. McKay stated that his Lordship Bishop Riley had gone to the North biased. If hon. members, however, will look at the letter, they will see that it was written at the request of the Governor. His Excellency wrote to the Bishop, and asked him if he would favour him with the result of his observations on the general treatment of the natives by the settlers. In replying, his Lordship did not condemn the whole of the settlers. In the first paragraph he says that the treatment of the natives by the settlers varies on different stations; on some of them they are well treated, but on a few stations, from all the reports and complaints which had been made to him, they have been treated in a cruel and inhuman manner. After this, however, he goes on to make particularly damaging statements, which may be very damaging outside of the colony where the true facts are not known. From a practical knowledge of the working of stations and the natives, I am glad to say that these statements are exaggerated. I have seen no slavery, and the state of the aborigines to-day is far preferable to what it was when I, among other pioneers of the North, first settled in the district. They are now well clothed, well fed, and healthy; but years ago, if there happened to be a bad season, the natives were in a

very bad state, and were almost starving. I think the whole of the statements made by the Bishop are discounted, to a great extent, by the concluding paragraph of his letter. His Lordship says:—"I am afraid my information is not very definite; but your Excellency knows how difficult it is to obtain evidence, as either, on the one hand, people are interested, or, on the other, they are prejudiced; and it is hard to find out the truth." After such a statement, it is surprising that his Lordship should have written the preceding paragraphs. I feel sure it was not his Lordship's intention to do any harm to the people, and that it was only at the request of the Governor that he gave his impressions as to what he believed to be true. I cannot say what steps have been taken by the Government in regard to the letter, but the Hon. Mr. Stone may feel assured that the matter will be carefully attended to. The Premier has conducted this correspondence, and I feel certain that the welfare of the squatters and station-owners will not suffer by being left in his hands.

**THE HON. D. MCKAY:** I should like to withdraw the last portion of my remarks, where I stated that the Bishop had gone to the North biased.

Question, that the House do now adjourn, put and negatived.

#### CUE-NANNINE RAILWAY BILL.

This Bill was received from the Legislative Assembly, and was read a first time.

#### RAILWAYS ACT, 1879, AMENDMENT BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

**THE HON. F. M. STONE:** I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. By the Railways Act of 1879, provision is made that when money is paid into Court by way of compensation for lands resumed it can only be applied for the purpose of the redemption of the quit rent, or the discharge of any debt or encumbrance affecting the land, or in the purchase of other lands, or if the money is paid in respect of buildings then in replacing them. There is no provision made by which the money may be invested on mortgage or in municipal

debentures in order that an income may be derived in cases where it is impossible or undesirable to purchase other lands or to erect fresh buildings. The Bill that I now propose gives this power, and I move that it be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Railways Act, 1879 :

THE HON. S. H. PARKER: I would ask the hon. member whether he thinks the clause as it appears in the Bill will have the retrospective effect he evidently desires. I think it is questionable, unless it is expressly stated, whether this Bill will have the effect of allowing the Court to deal with moneys which have paid in up to the present.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: This Bill is to be incorporated and read with the Railways Act, and I think the Court will have the power under it to make an order.

Clause agreed to.

Bill reported, and the report adopted.

The Standing Orders were suspended.

#### THIRD READING.

The Bill was then read a third time, and passed.

#### AUSTRALASIAN FEDERATION ENABLING BILL.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

Postponed Clause 25 :

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Sir G. Shenton): I may state for the information of hon. members that this is a Bill which comes under the provisions of Section 23 of the Amending Constitution Act. It appears that through an omission on the part of the Legislative Assembly it came here without the usual certificate. If, therefore, we desire any amendments, we can request the Legislative Assembly to make them.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I beg to move that the Legislative Assembly be requested to omit the words "£3 per day for every day the Convention is sitting," and to insert the words "such rate as the Governor may determine" in lieu thereof. I believe this proposal has the support of the Minister.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, and report adopted.

Ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Assembly requesting them to make the amendment.

#### LOAN BILL (£3,500,000), 1896.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 2—Power to raise money :

THE HON. S. H. PARKER: After perusing the Estimates which have been laid on the table, I intended to move that the Legislative Assembly be requested to reduce the amount mentioned in this clause by £500,000. I still intend to propose this, but I think the better course will be to make what amendments we desire in the schedule, and then re-commit the Bill so as to make this clause agree with the total. My reason for taking this course is that, in looking through the Estimates, I cannot but think that there are a great number of works provided which are not necessary at the present time, and which, if they were excised, would enable sufficient funds to be available for several of the items which are contained in this Bill. I notice that the Estimates provide an expenditure for roads and bridges of £168,700. This is an immense sum for one year to expend on roads and bridges, and as nearly three months have gone by, I do not think there is the slightest chance of the money being expended. Besides this, a great many of the works are unnecessary. If there is one district I know something about it is the Avon district. The river runs for only a few months in the year, and even when it is in flood people can cross it. Even if the bridges which are proposed to be built are erected the probability is they will only be necessary during one week of the year. From the earliest times the settlers have been in the habit of crossing the Avon at all periods of the year, and I feel sure that the bridges proposed to be constructed under these Estimates will not be required. As far as I can see, the items can only appear simply because there is a desire to have money spent in the district. Take the town of York, £11,000 is provided for a central bridge. Already there are two bridges in a small town like this, and I cannot see what is the utility of building another. Will any hon. member say

that this is a necessary work? Then as York is to have a central bridge, of course there must be a central bridge for Northam. Take the Dale River. This can be crossed at all times of the year, and we know that no bridge is required. I do not say that the bridge would not be a convenience, but I do think that when the Government find themselves compelled to borrow large sums of money they should obviously not construct works unless they are absolutely necessary. Then large amounts are provided for roads. I notice that the Meckering area, which has been constituted a roads board, and by reason of which it will obtain funds from the Government, is to have a special grant; and there are special votes provided for many other places. There is also to be a bridge over the Greenough. I am under the impression that the Greenough seldom runs. Of course, it is very nice to have these roads and bridges, but I do think that at the present time we should only undertake those works which are absolutely necessary. Is it absolutely necessary, for instance, to build a road from Subiaco to Claremont when we have a road already to Claremont? The only object of constructing it, I take it, is for the purpose of forming a drive for the inhabitants. But we are already constructing a drive through the park, and surely another road is not now necessary. I am not picking out any particular district where special favours have been shown, because under these Estimates favours have been showered all round. I find also that Fremantle is being liberally treated in the way of roads. £1,000 is provided for an approach to Preston Point, £1,000 for a bridge on the Canning River, and there is another vote for a road to Jandakot. I cannot see that these are necessary at the present time. Take again the works in my own district. There is a vote for the Canning River improvements. The dredge has been employed on this work for some years at a great cost. Notwithstanding all that has been done, I find from the boatmen that the river is now very little used, inasmuch as the produce and firewood are brought to Perth by the railway. £1,500 is provided for dredging the Canning. It may be very nice to have the river opened up, but is it an absolutely necessary work? Then again

we have £40,000 provided as the first instalment of the Bunbury harbour works. When we are about to borrow £7,000,000, is it necessary that we should undertake this work at the present time? It is said that we must have a harbour there to facilitate the export of coal and timber. Surely when we get the coal and a railway line to bring it to the Port it will be time to construct the harbour. We must remember, also, that we are not yet perfectly sure that we have coal that will pay to export. With regard to the timber at the present time, the local demand is so enormous that the mills cannot supply it, and immense quantities of pine have to be imported to keep the building trade going. How, then, can we expect to export. Surely the time to build these harbour works is when we have the timber to export.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: There is plenty of timber. It is want of trucks that it stopping the trade.

THE HON. S. H. PARKER: The want of trucks applies the same to the shipping as it does to the local market, and if we have not sufficient trucks to carry the timber to the local market, what is the use of building a harbour to ship timber when the timber cannot be had? There are two reasons why timber cannot be shipped; one is that the local markets can take the whole of it, and the second is that there are no trucks to send it to to port. In these circumstances are we justified in expending, during the present year, £40,000 for this work? It may be necessary in the future, but is it absolutely necessary now? Then we have reclamation at Fremantle. Is this absolutely necessary?

THE HON. D. K. CONGDON: The work is partially done.

THE HON. S. H. PARKER: Then I notice that the Government propose to build railways out of revenue. For my part, I am glad to see this being done, but I would ask hon. members whether at the present time they consider a line to Greenhills is a necessary work. I believe the inhabitants of the district possess splendid country, and they are only within 12 miles of a railway. Is it necessary for the success of agriculture that the farmers should have a railway nearer than this? I do not think so. I was talking to a gentleman who owns a

farm (and who is a distinguished member of the Lower House), half a mile from a railway and 10 miles from Guildford. He says that his horses and men have very little to do during the carting season, and that it pays him better to cart into Guildford than to cart half a mile and pay the railway freight, because if he did not cart his horses and men would be idle. Does not this apply also to Greenhills? Of course, if York is to have a railway to the Greenhills, Northam must also have a line to Quelquelling, and Bunbury must also have one to Marra-dong. Those of our farmers who are coming from the neighbouring colonies will be well aware that the more money we borrow the worse it will be for them when the time comes that the revenue is no longer inflated by the expenditure of borrowed moneys, for what has happened elsewhere must also occur here. It will be found that the land will be all that is available which can bear the additional taxation, and I cannot but help thinking that the borrowing policy of the Government will have the effect of inducing many of the farmers who have had experience elsewhere to pause before coming here to settle. In the interests of the farmers I think it would be well to forego these railways, to forego this large borrowing policy, and to adopt greater economy. Looking at the question as a whole, I think we can reduce the schedule of the Bill before us by a considerable amount, and then leave the Government to find the funds for the works we strike off by cutting out from the Estimates those items which are not absolutely necessary.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom):** I would remind the hon. member that two years ago he advocated a Loan Bill which at that time was considered to be one of magnitude, and to be beyond the means of the colony. Many hon. members opposed him, and on some items I opposed him myself. When, however, the hon. gentleman occupied the position that I do now he had facilities for obtaining the fullest information as to what was required. Having that information, he advocated the loan, and he was perfectly right. I claim to be somewhat in the position occupied by the hon. member, and I can see now how easy it is to oppose items

without having a full knowledge of them. The Government have considered every one of these works very carefully, and have not placed them on the schedule without being convinced that they are absolutely necessary. I am in accord with the hon. member that, if any of the works are not necessary, we should not incur any expenditure in respect to them. Take the hon. gentleman's remarks in regard to roads and bridges. Anyone who knows anything about the settlement of the country must be aware that good roads and bridges are absolutely necessary. Bridges are not always necessary for the purpose of enabling people to cross over water. We must remember that, although there may be no water, the banks may be precipitous or sandy, and are thus almost impassable for teams. The expenditure on roads and bridges, I feel sure, will not be objected to by anyone who has the settlement of the country at heart. The hon. member is not satisfied that the road from Subiaco to Claremont is necessary. If we wish to induce people to settle we must give them some facilities.

**THE HON. F. T. CROWDER:** They can use the train.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom):** Everyone cannot use the train, and it is only fair to provide at least one main road, especially in a country where there is so much sand. Then the hon. member said that some of the works in this Bill should be constructed out of revenue. It seems to me that there are certain works which should always be constructed out of loans. Why should the people who are here to-day pay the whole cost of works which will last for generations? The hon. member objected to the agricultural railways. The policy of the Government is to adopt every means to make Western Australia produce the necessities that are required for consumption. What is the object of keeping the taxation on articles of consumption. To tax articles of food for revenue purposes would be absolutely indefensible; we tax them with a view to inducing their production, and ultimately cheapening the cost. If the Government do not provide railways they must give the people roads, and even with railways there must be roads to feed them. I am surprised at the hon. member taking up



the position he has done at this stage of the colony's growth. I should have thought he would rather have supported the Government. The Government are in a position to get the best information, and I can assure hon. members that there is no desire to spend any money unless it is absolutely necessary.

**THE HON. A. B. KIDSON:** I have not been able to gather from the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Parker what items he suggests shall be struck out of the schedule before us. I might also point out that the Estimates of Expenditure have already been practically passed by the Legislative Assembly, and therefore the items to which the hon. member refers cannot now be interfered with. I am informed by the hon. the President that an Upper House has never been known to alter or amend the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure after they have been passed by the Lower House. In these circumstances many of the reasons given by the Hon. Mr. Parker for reducing the items in this schedule fall to the ground. With regard to the bridges over the Avon I am not qualified to speak, and I may take the hon. member's statement that they are not wanted; but when he says that the road to Jandakot is not required, he is speaking on a subject he knows nothing about. The Jandakot area has possibilities, and before long we shall see it one of our chief producing centres. The hon. gentleman also referred to the esplanade at Fremantle. This is a work which has already been commenced, and I take it that it is intended to complete it. He also referred to the road from Subiaco to Claremont. If we look at the road from Subiaco to Perth we shall see that immense results have accrued from its construction, and similar benefits will arrive from continuing it to Claremont. I am with the hon. gentleman in thinking that the agricultural railways are not required. In the other colonies agricultural railways have been laid down all over the country, and they have never paid for the grease on the axles of the carriages. I am sorry I cannot give my support to the hon. member, because he has not shown how he proposes that these works shall be constructed if we strike them off the schedule.

**THE HON. S. H. PARKER:** I am under the impression that we can deal

with the Estimates in the same way that we can deal with this Bill. When they come before us in the form of an Act, it will be quite competent for us to suggest amendments to the Legislative Assembly.

**THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Sir G. Shenton):** What I stated to the Hon. Mr. Kidson was that I did not think this House could amend the Estimates, but under Section 23 of the Amending Constitution Act, we could, of course, suggest to the Legislative Assembly the omission of any items we think proper.

Clause—agreed to.

The remaining clauses were agreed to.

Schedules:

**THE HON. S. H. PARKER:** I beg to propose that the Legislative Assembly be requested to reduce item 1, "Development of goldfields and mineral resources," by £90,000.

**THE HON. R. S. HAYNES:** Is the hon. member in order? We have passed Clause 2, which says that a specific amount shall be raised. Is it now competent to reduce the schedule?

**THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Sir G. Shenton):** If any alteration is made in the schedule it will be competent to recommit the Bill, so as to make Clause 2 agree with the schedule.

**THE HON. S. H. PARKER:** I propose to make this amendment under Section 23 of the Amending Constitution Act, and in doing so I may be allowed to say that I in no way waive what I consider is the undoubted right of this House to amend this Bill, but I do so in order that we may not come in collision with the other House on the question of privilege. I desire to reduce this item for this reason. In the Estimates, under the head of water supply, I find that large sums will be available. There is an item of £59,000 for goldfields water supply, £4,000 for tanks, wells, soaks, and bores. Then there is £30,000 for water supply, exclusive of upkeep, and various other items which will be found on page 68 of the Estimates. It is obvious that with all this money the amount placed in this schedule will not be necessary. Next year, bearing in mind the large revenue we shall obtain from the goldfields—from the sales of land and the letting of the mines—any moneys that may be required can be obtained from the general revenue. Already the money which has been

obtained from these sources must be enormous. Why, then, should we go to London to borrow £200,000 for a gold-fields water supply? I make this motion to test the feeling of the House, and if I succeed I shall afterwards propose to reduce other items.

**THE HON. J. E. RICHARDSON:** Before we proceed further, would it not be well for us to get from the Minister the details of how this amount is made up?

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom):** I was just about to give the particulars when the hon. member anticipated me. The information which I have received to-day does not quite accord with that which I placed before hon. members when I proposed the second reading of this Bill. I am pleased to hear from the Hon. Mr. Parker that he recognises that £100,000 should be left for the purpose of developing the mineral resources of the colony, but he does not agree to the whole amount which is put down. Unfortunately nearly the whole of the amount put down has been allocated for works already authorised.

**THE HON. S. H. PARKER:** By whom?

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom):** By the Government. It will be seen from the report of the Public Works Department that it was found necessary when water was scarce to construct tanks and dams to catch the rain water at various places, and then, for fear a drought should come on, it was considered advisable that bores should be put down so that salt water might be available for condensing purposes. It will be remembered that in December last the fields were in a terrible state for want of water. At Kalgoorlie if it had not been for the Government bore there would have been absolutely no water at all. If hon. members will look at page 37 of the Public Works Department report they will see the works which have been carried out. All of them were forced on the Government by circumstances of an extreme nature. The following are some of them:—Kanowna.—Bore, shaft, and fittings—Four bores have been put down, and a good supply of salt water has been obtained; but owing to there being no present scarcity of water at Kanowna the shaft has not been proceeded with until

the site of the tank is decided upon. 3,000,000-gallon tank—18 trial shafts, averaging 12ft. deep, have been sunk on two sites, but the holding ground is not at all suitable. The sinking of trial shafts is still proceeding, and will be followed by the survey. Broad Arrow.—Bore, shaft, and fittings—A good supply of salt water has been obtained at a depth of 160ft., and the shaft is now being sunk and timbered. 3,000,000-gallon tank. Bardoc.—Bore, shaft and fittings—The preliminary bore having been sunk to prove whether a supply of water existed, a shaft has since been completed and timbered to a depth of 200ft., giving a supply of 2,500 gallons of salt water per day. This water is good for condensing, and the shaft has been leased, the lessee to erect condensers. 3,000,000-gallon tank. Goongarrie.—3,000,000-gallon tank. Menzies.—3,000,000-gallon tank. Niagara.—30,000,000-gallon reservoir. Siberia.—Bore, shaft and fittings, 3,000,000-gallon tank. 42-Mile, Coolgardie-Menzies Road.—Bore, shaft, and fittings—Two bores have been put down to a depth of 150ft., and a fair supply of salt water struck. The sinking of the shaft has been commenced. 3,000,000-gallon tank. Black Flag.—3,000,000-gallon tank.

**THE HON. S. H. PARKER:** Has the money been paid?

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom):** No doubt portion of it has been. Hon. members will see that the Government were placed in a position of great difficulty, and in order to keep the fields open at all they were bound to anticipate the vote of Parliament.

**THE HON. S. H. PARKER:** I am very glad to hear the hon. the Minister make this statement, because it supports me in my motion. The money, it appears, has already been spent, and of course it has been found out of general revenue. In these circumstances I beg to withdraw my former amendment, and now move that the Legislative Assembly be requested to strike out the whole £190,000.

**THE HON. J. H. TAYLOR:** When the Hon. Mr. Parker suggested reducing the Loan Bill by £500,000 I thought it might be possible, if I only knew the items he desired to strike out, that I might be able to agree with him. If he had left the amount to the Government to reduce,

I should have been satisfied, because they would never have struck out such an item as the hon. member now proposes. The hon. gentleman says an enormous revenue is being deprived from the goldfields from the sale of land, and from the mines, and, I may add, from the Customs. I agree with him, and I may say that if all the money which is obtained were expended on the goldfields there would be no necessity for any loan moneys. The revenue, however, which is obtained from the goldfields is spent at such places as Jandakot, Boodleup, and Dandalup. In these circumstances it is not fair or generous to strike off this item of £190,000, especially as the money is absolutely necessary for the development of the fields. This item also bears a very small proportion to the whole Bill, and it would be absolutely iniquitous and wrong to strike it off. I shall not weary hon. members, for I am sure they all will acknowledge that the success of the colony depends upon the success of the goldfields, and therefore any legitimate expenditure upon them is justified. If this item is struck off, it will be a disgrace to this Parliament and to this colony.

THE PRESIDENT then left the chair for an hour.

On resuming,

Question, that the Legislative Assembly be requested to omit the item "Development of goldfields and mineral resources £190,000," put.

The committee divided with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	...	5
Noes	...	...	...	9

Majority against	...	4
------------------	-----	---

AYES.  
The Hon. W. Alexander  
The Hon. F. T. Crowder  
The Hon. S. H. Parker  
The Hon. F. M. Stone  
The Hon. S. J. Haynes  
(Teller).

NOES.  
The Hon. D. K. Congdon  
The Hon. R. S. Haynes  
The Hon. A. B. Kidson  
The Hon. D. McKay  
The Hon. J. E. Richardson  
The Hon. H. J. Saunders  
The Hon. W. Spencer  
The Hon. E. H. Wittenoom  
The Hon. J. H. Taylor  
(Teller).

Question put and negatived.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: On the item "Water supply for towns," I desire to know whether the hon. the Minister

can give us the particulars as to what towns are to be supplied.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): The towns that apply.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: If the hon. gentleman cannot give us any information, I cannot see what is the use of retaining the item. We have already thrown out the Waterworks Bill, and next year, if we pass it, the surplus revenue will be available with which to carry out the works. I move that it be a request to the Legislative Assembly to strike out item No. 2.

THE HON. R. S. HAYNES: Although I was one of the members who assisted in throwing out the Waterworks Bill, I hope this item will be retained. Next year we shall, no doubt, be able to pass the Bill, and then it will be necessary that the Government should have funds in hand with which to construct the works. It seems to me that this is particularly an item which should appear on a Loan Schedule. The Government will lend the money out at interest, and it cannot be expected that money for such a purpose can be found out of general revenue. It seems to me that the Hon. Mr. Stone is pursuing a sort of see-saw policy. First he says the Waterworks Bill should be thrown out, because there are no funds available, and now he says that no funds should be made available, because the Bill is thrown out.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I shall support the motion of the Hon. Mr. Stone. No funds for this purpose can be required this year, because the Bill has been thrown out, and next year if we pass it any money required can come out of general revenue. I wish to raise my voice against the reckless expenditure the Government are going in for, and I wish it to be placed on record that I am not in favour of it. In regard to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Taylor, I may point out to him that the goldfields will not have been injured by the striking out of the last item, because the money has already been spent. It strikes me that the Government are scattering money broadcast over the goldfields because they think that separation stares them in the face. For my part I think the sooner the goldfields separate the better.

**THE HON. J. H. TAYLOR:** What has this to do with the waterworks?

**THE HON. F. T. CROWDER:** I am working up to that. I say the Government are throwing money away broadcast, and there is no doubt a good reason for it. In six months' time there will be an election, and no doubt this is the reason for the action of the Government. The Hon. Mr. Parker has pointed out a number of items in the Estimates which are not necessary. He has shown that at York there are two bridges only 500 yards apart, and that now the Government propose to spend a large amount in erecting another one. I do not believe that 50 people pass over these bridges in a week. We are in the height of our prosperity. Our revenue is large, and instead of spending it judiciously we are wasting it on items which can be done without. The day will come, and is not far distant, when we shall regret this. I have yet to learn what is the life of a goldfield, but we may take it at 25 years. In 20 years' time our sinking fund will have only provided about one-fourth of the money we have borrowed, and we shall then be saddled with the remaining three-fourths, with little to meet it. Most of the present population will have gone away, and it will be the permanent settlers of the soil who will have to bear the burden. The Government are trying to settle the people on the ground, but I do not see how they can expect farmers from the other colonies to come here when they see such reckless expenditure going on, knowing as they do what disaster has resulted from a similar course elsewhere. This item can well come out of the schedule. No money will be required under it this year, and as the revenue is already about £200,000 a month more than the estimate—the very liberal estimate of the Premier—there will be ample funds available next year. Again, why should we put a paltry sum on a Loan Bill to build twelve miles of railway. It must be a very bad advertisement for the colony. Then, again, looking at the schedule, it is evident that in twelve months' time the Government must come forward with another Loan Bill to complete the works for which the first instalment only is provided.

**THE HON. A. B. KIDSON:** I have already given my views on the loan policy

of the Government, and to a large extent they coincide with the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Crowder. At the same time, I cannot see what good we shall do by striking off one or two paltry sums out of a total of £3,500,000. If we are to reduce the amount, let it be by a substantial sum. To talk of making a reduction of £95,000 is ridiculous. I feel myself in a difficult position in regard to this Bill, because a large amount of it is provided for Fremantle. If, however, any motion had been tabled to reduce the amount by a substantial sum I should have had to consider my position, but it is only tinkering with the Bill to reduce it by £100,000 or £200,000.

**THE HON. H. J. SAUNDERS:** It seems to me there is no reason why we should cut this item out because we have thrown out the Waterworks Bill. Some years ago the Government carried out waterworks at Fremantle without any special Act, and if we leave this amount no doubt they will be able to assist such towns as Albany, Geraldton, and others in obtaining a water supply, and pass the Bill afterwards. The Hon. Mr. Crowder says that it is a bad advertisement to put a small item in this Bill to construct twelve miles of railway. I think it is a good advertisement that the railway can be constructed so cheaply.

**THE HON. W. ALEXANDER:** Although not in favour of this large loan, I think it would be better to pass this item and enable the Government to provide water supplies in some of our towns. I know that Geraldton is badly in want of water, and the fact of having no funds is the only thing which prevents the Government assisting in the matter.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. WITTENOOM):** I hope hon. members will see their way to support this item. The Hon. Mr. Stone asked for information, but I feel sure he was only joking, because no amount of information would satisfy him. I can only say that such opposition is unreasonable. The position is this: Many of the towns are badly in want of a water supply. Hon. members think it a small matter to throw out a Bill, but let them go round to the towns and they will then see how urgent the matter is. If this item is passed the Government will be able to get all the preliminary work done, so that next

session when the Bill is passed the works can be gone on with.

**THE HON. F. M. STONE:** It seems to me strange that on the second reading of this Bill the hon. the Minister told us that £200,000 was required for the goldfields water supply, and now we find that he has to go back and tell us that the money is already spent.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom):** Allocated.

**THE HON. F. M. STONE:** If it had not been for the "unreasonable opposition" that information would never have been supplied. Now, when we wish for particulars of this item, the hon. member is unable to supply them. I might remind him of what he himself said when discussing the Loan Bill of 1894:—

"I rise to make a few remarks with regard to this Bill, and I do so because I consider it one of the most important measures that can be introduced into this House, not only now but during the next four years, and because on the result of it will greatly depend the future of the colony, whether it be ill or good. I must admit that I was surprised when I first heard that the Government intended to introduce a Bill of this magnitude, because I considered that the colony was not in a position to stand the further raising of money to so great an extent. Hon. members are aware that at the present moment our indebtedness amounts to three-and-a-quarter millions, and with this loan we shall owe nearly five millions, without taking into consideration the amount guaranteed to the Midland Railway Company. The interest on this will be somewhere about £200,000, and the people that will have to pay that, about 78,000. We should, perhaps, admit that, by the time this money is raised and spent we might have a population of 150,000, but even that will be a small number to bear so large a burden. We must also remember that very many of the people who come here are birds of passage. Many of them come owing to the reports as to finds of gold, and even if they are among the lucky ones, they will sell out their interest and take the money to spend in the lands whence they came. Then there is just the probability of the goldfields not turning out as we expect them, in which case there will be great disaster in the colony, especially as we are not able to settle population on the soil, as we would like, or to induce them to permanently remain amongst us. Should such a disaster as I have mentioned come upon us, the permanent settlers of the colony will have to bear the whole burden of the borrowed money. I ask hon. members, therefore, to proceed with this Bill with great caution, and to be careful that no money is spent unless it is upon necessary and reproductive works. We have the terrible experience of the other

colonies before us, and we should take a lesson from them."

In the face of this I am accused of unreasonable opposition because I asked for details.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom):** I never said anything of the sort. I accused you of unreasonable opposition because you said you regretted you were unable to throw the whole Bill out.

**THE HON. F. M. STONE:** And in 1894 the hon. member would have thrown that Bill out. Have we not the experience of the other colonies before us, and should we not profit by it? I have asked for details of this item and they cannot be supplied. If there is any necessity for the money it can come out of next year's revenue.

**THE HON. D. MCKAY:** I would like to ask whether this item has any reference to towns at the North.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom):** It has reference to any towns which may make application. It is to place the Government in a position to deal with any matter when it arises.

**THE HON. D. MCKAY:** In that case I shall vote for the item.

**THE HON. R. S. HAYNES:** I may point out that the Hon. Mr. Stone is now opposing this small sum which is to supply all the towns in the colony with water, when only a few days ago he willingly voted £220,000 to supply Perth alone. Such opposition is unreasonable.

**THE HON. F. M. STONE:** The money did not come out of loan.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom):** It was borrowed from the Savings Bank.

Question put and negatived.

**THE HON. S. J. HAYNES:** I hope the Hon. Mr. Kidson will be patriotic and support me in endeavouring to strike out the third item. "Fremantle dock and slip." In any case I think the construction of a slip is premature, and even if it is not it is certainly required more at Albany than Fremantle. I am here to protest against this enormous borrowing. I feel that we are going too far and are not profiting by the past history of the other colonies.

**THE HON. A. B. KIDSON:** I may say that the same thoughts occurred to me when a motion was made the other day

for the purchase of the Great Southern Railway. I think it is only waste of time to be continually moving to strike off these small items. We may all protest, but that is no reason why we should waste time by making these motions. What good would it do us if we reduced the total amount by £190,000. As regards this particular item, we shall shortly have the mail steamers calling at Fremantle instead of Albany, and we shall have the best harbour in the colony. The shipping is increasing daily, and often we shall have vessels putting in in distress for repairs.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I would ask the hon. the Minister whether the project has been reported on by the advisers of the Government. I do not know of any dock in the world, except one, that pays.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): It is not expected that a dock will pay directly, but there is no doubt it will pay indirectly, as it will provide facilities for the shipping trade.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: With reference to item 5, "Dredges and barges," are these for Fremantle or for other ports of the colony?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): The two new dredges are for the Fremantle harbour works, and there is also an amount for the dredge *Parmelia*. There are two more dredges which are to be used for reclaiming land along the river in Perth.

THE HON. W. ALEXANDER: Will not one of these dredges be available for Geraldton?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): No. Probably other dredges will be available. I know the matter has been under the consideration of the Government quite recently.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: It is proposed to use these dredges for clearing the sand out of the river which the Government have put into it? We were told some time ago that it was cheaper to put the sand in and then take it out again.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I am afraid I cannot answer the hon. member.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: Then I shall oppose the item.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: Is one of them a river dredge?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): They are for the Fremantle harbour works.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: With reference to item No. 7, "Menziess Railway £270,000," is that the estimate from Kalgoorlie?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I cannot quite tell whether from Kalgoorlie or Coolgardie. Two surveys have been made, but there is only three miles difference between them.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: What is the estimated cost from Southern Cross?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): About £400,000.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: Then directly we pass this we bind ourselves to the route. I think before we pass this item we should have an opportunity of discussing the route.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: Do you want to increase the amount of the loan then?

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I move that the Legislative Assembly be requested to omit item 8 from the schedule. This item relates to the Kanowna railway, a line which is  $11\frac{3}{4}$  miles and  $45\frac{1}{2}$  yds. long. I think it is a magnificent advertisement for the colony to go to England and borrow money for a paltry railway like this when we have from £70,000,000 to £90,000,000 of British capital invested here. If gold-mining will not pay where there is a railway within twelve miles, the sooner it is given up the better. The Government are going to spend £40,000 on harbour works at Bunbury, £20,000 or £30,000 on the Greenhills railway, and £20,000 or £30,000 on a railway towards the Williams, and I should like to know why they have not included this item. Probably the reason is that they thought they would never get these other railways through this House except they provided for them in a Bill which we are unable to touch. There is not an item which should be included in a Loan Bill. Although I may not live to pay the piper, what I say will be handed down to posterity through the medium of "Hansard." I assert that the Government have lost all control over the expenditure, and that immense sums are being wasted, and that now we are

going to borrow £7,000,000 more, most of which is to be lavishly spent. I do not believe there is a single member of the Government who knows the exact position of the colony to-day.

**THE HON. D. MCKAY:** I have been told that this will be a good paying line. How, then, can it be a bad advertisement for the colony.

**THE HON. J. H. TAYLOR:** It seems to me an extraordinary thing, seeing that the greater part of the revenue is derived from the goldfields, that the three items which more particularly affect the fields, and which involve less than one-tenth of the total amount of the Bill, should be singled out for all the attack. We must remember that no country ever built railways as cheaply as we have.

**THE HON. F. T. CROWDER:** They are the most expensive in the world.

**THE HON. J. H. TAYLOR:** They are the cheapest in the world so far as the money paid by the Government is concerned. No doubt the consumers on the fields had paid half the cost. This railway will pay, and it is the continuation of a line which runs through the various gold-mining districts. It will not only serve Kanowna, but other districts, and will help to connect the colony with other parts of Australia. It is also all in favour of the great harbour at Fremantle.

**THE HON. F. M. STONE:** The hon. gentleman, I think, misunderstands the point. We do not oppose the item; we say that it should not appear in a Loan Bill. We say there are items in the Estimates which should be struck out, and some of those which appear in this schedule inserted instead. I do not say that I am opposed to a railway to Kanowna, but that I do not think it wise that so small an amount should appear in a Loan Bill.

**THE HON. S. H. PARKER:** The hon. gentleman who hails from the goldfields informs us that there would be heaps of money for the goldfields if they could retain the moneys which they contribute, and which are now spent in other parts of the colony, and I may say that I am in perfect accord with him. I desire that the moneys raised from the goldfields shall be expended on necessary works for the fields, and that being so, I say they should not appear in this Bill.

Question put and negatived.

**THE HON. S. J. HAYNES:** I should like to have some explanation of item 9, "Improvements to open railways."

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. WITTENOOM):** I desire to once more assure hon. members that in no instance do the Government desire to spend money carelessly. I should just like to refer shortly to the position I took up two years ago. The Hon. Mr. Stone read my speech, and it sounded nice and cautious, and showed that I recognised our responsibility. The Hon. Mr. Parker at that time urged us to spend money, and he said it would be the means of developing the country. The hon. gentleman was right, and it has been proved that he was more than justified in asking us to agree to what was then a very large loan. Having taken up a cautious position I have maintained it, and I hope I shall continue to do so. The item referred to by the hon. member is made up as follows:—Duplication of line, Perth to Midland Junction, £64,000; Perth Station improvements, £28,850; Perth new station, purchase of land, &c., £250,000; Fremantle new station, including reclamation, £131,000; electric staff signals on all lines, £40,000; interlocking gear, £6,000; sanitary works, £6,000; Midland Junction workshops, £80,000; additional sidings Fremantle, £7,500; railway to Perth racecourse, £7,000; Northam station and Yilgarn railway improvements, £27,000; Cannington racecourse line, £7,400; northern railways, £17,500; new workshops Geraldton, £10,000, and other items.

**THE HON. S. H. PARKER:** What is the cost of the Northam station alone?

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. WITTENOOM):** I cannot tell.

**THE HON. F. T. CROWDER:** I should like some information on the item £1,200,000 for rolling-stock. How much of it is already spent?

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. WITTENOOM):** On the 30th June last there were liabilities for stock already indented for amounting to £500,000. Since then £300,000 worth has been indented for, or it will be. This leaves £400,000 for the requirements of the next two years.

**THE HON. F. T. CROWDER:** It is quite apparent that if we do not pass this

Bill the drafts on the Government will have to be dishonoured.

Schedules agreed to.

Bill reported, and report adopted.

# LOANS CONSOLIDATION BILL.

## IN COMMITTEE.

This Bill was considered in committee, agreed to without amendment, reported, and the report adopted.

# STATUTORY DECLARATIONS BILL.

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY'S AMENDMENTS.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Sheulton) reported the receipt of the following Message from the Legislative Assembly:—

“Message No. 46.

“Mr. President,

“With reference to Message No. 34 of ‘the Legislative Council, the Legislative Assembly acquaints the Legislative Council that it has agreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council in ‘The Statutory Declarations Bill,’ subject to the further amendments contained in the Schedule annexed; in which further amendments the Legislative Assembly desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

“JAS. G. LEE STEERE,

“Speaker.

“Legislative Assembly Chamber, Perth, 15th October, 1896.

“*Schedule of Amendments made by the Legislative Council in ‘The Statutory Declarations Bill.’*

“No. 1, Clause 1—Strike out the whole Clause and insert the following in lieu:—

“1. Every warden of a goldfield, whether appointed before or after the passing of this Act, shall, by virtue of such appointment and during his tenure of office, be a Justice of the Peace for the colony.

“No. 2, Clause 2—Strike out the whole clause and insert the following in lieu:—

“2. Every clerk of petty sessions, clerk of a local court, and mining registrar of a goldfield district shall have the same authority to administer oaths, and take affirmations in lieu thereof and statutory declarations in accordance with the Act

“of the eighteenth year of Her present Majesty, numbered 12, as a Justice of the Peace now has; and oaths administered and affirmations and statutory declarations made in pursuance of this section shall have the same force and effect as if administered or taken before a Justice of the Peace.

“No. 3, Clause 3—Strike out the whole Clause and insert the following in lieu:—3. Any clerk of petty sessions may receive and take informations, sign and issue summonses requiring the person summoned to attend before a court of petty sessions in answer to any information or complaint cognizable by such court in the exercise of its jurisdiction, and summonses to witnesses to attend and give evidence or produce documents before such court, and such summonses shall have the same force and effect as if signed and issued by a Justice of the Peace.

“*Schedule of Amendments made by the Legislative Assembly in the Legislative Council's Amendments in ‘The Statutory Declarations Bill.’*

“In No. 1.—In line 1, after the word ‘goldfield,’ insert the words ‘or goldfield district.’

“In No. 2.—In line 1, after the word ‘goldfield,’ insert the words ‘or goldfield.’

“In No. 3.—In line 1, strike out the words ‘receive and take informations.’”

## ADJOURNMENT.

The House at 9:30 o'clock, p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 20, at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.