

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 10th October, 1900.

Petition: Hampton Plains Railway—Question: Wyndham Public Works—Trustees Bill, third reading—Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages Bill, on report—Motion: Perth Public Hospital, a Commission of Inquiry (Amendment passed)—Papers Presented—Motion: Dry Dock for Fremantle (Amendment passed)—Motion: Prospecting, Vote to encourage (adjourned)—Motion: Federation Referendum, improper Issue of Certificates—Papers: Wyndham Aborigine Child and Mrs. Durack—Motion: Payment of Members, to Legislate, Division—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PETITION—HAMPTON PLAINS RAILWAY.

MR. MOORHEAD presented a petition praying for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise the Hampton Plains Estate Limited to construct and maintain a railway from Lakeside to Hampton Plains.

Petition received and read.

QUESTION—WYNDHAM PUBLIC WORKS.

MR. VOSPER asked the Premier: Why public moneys were spent in the Wyndham district without being submitted to the competition of public tender.

THE PREMIER replied: Because in that remote district, where competition is very limited, it has been found to be more advantageous to carry out works departmentally.

TRUSTEES BILL.

Bill read a third time, on motion by MR. ILLINGWORTH (for Mr. James) and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES AMENDMENT BILL.

ON REPORT.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved that the report from Committee be adopted.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Attention had been called to Sub-clause (b) of Clause 3, having reference to dates. That sub-clause provided that a person could be registered after twelve months. It would be possible for some persons who desired to establish

an heir to property of some kind to come in and register a child, or to declare a child his own, whether it were his own or not. One would like to know whether the Attorney General had considered the point sufficiently, because we were taking a new departure entirely at variance with what existed in the Eastern colonies and New Zealand. It was a question whether, if a child could be registered after seven years, people would not say there was plenty of time, and put off registration until the last minute, as was done now.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Bill was based on the Act in Victoria, the section in that Act bearing on the question being 98. The object of this Bill was to enable people who had been neglectful in registering the birth of their children to get such children registered, but after seven years from birth children could not be registered except with the consent of a Judge.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: On evidence satisfactory to the Judge?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes.

Question put and passed, and the report adopted.

MOTION—PERTH PUBLIC HOSPITAL, A COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

MR. HALL (Perth) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the condition of the Perth Hospital; such Commission to consist of gentlemen wholly unconnected with the hospital.

He said: I think most members are in accord with the wish that there shall be a thorough examination into the management of the Perth Public Hospital. I understand that the member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan) is a member of the hospital committee; and whilst he is of opinion that the management is perfect, he is quite with me in thinking that an inquiry would do good. I hope the motion will be carried, because the Perth Hospital is a public institution, and, as such, is open to criticism. Certainly, as far as the Perth public are concerned, it has been freely criticised in the Press and otherwise for some time past, and criticised very unfavourably—whether deservedly or not I am not prepared to say; but there have been numerous cases lately before the public in relation to which it certainly seems the management are to

blame. We recently had a case of a man named Rogers, residing at Wanneroo, who was refused admission to the hospital; and an independent inquiry was held, consisting of a jury, with Mr. Roe as chairman, which jury brought in a verdict to this effect:

In our opinion the system of examination of fresh patients at present in vogue in the Perth Public Hospital is totally inadequate to the requirements, and increased medical assistants should be secured; and we further consider that if the deceased had been more carefully examined he would have been admitted to the hospital.

The Acting Coroner said he could not receive that verdict, for it amounted to a verdict of manslaughter against Dr. Horrocks. The foreman of the jury said there was no intention to reflect on Dr. Horrocks in any way, but the jury felt called upon to make some remark on the method of management by the hospital authorities. That is severe condemnation, and I think that alone warrants this House in appointing a Royal Commission to inquire into the management. As far as I can see, the management seems to be a close borough, and apparently there are only a favoured few who seem to get the run of the hospital. There is a very bad system here, I think, of having the hospital partially controlled by some members of the medical profession. I know that in the hospital at Melbourne the medical profession are totally excluded from the management. The management of the Melbourne hospital is composed entirely of laymen, and professional gentlemen are only called in when it is necessary to get professional advice on any matter. Whilst on the subject of complaint I may mention that one of the members or would-be members of one of the Contingents told me recently he contracted some trouble through the hard work which the Contingent underwent in camp, and he could not go to the war. He was sent into the Perth hospital, and he himself informed me that the food given to the patients was such that he would have felt ashamed to give it to his dog. Even since I gave notice of this motion fully half-a-dozen people have come to me and stated their willingness to give evidence. They have made very great complaints of want of proper management. Then there has been a continued agitation by the

friendly societies. It seems that the hospital authorities refuse to admit any member of a friendly society. When a person is taken to the hospital or goes there, the question asked is, "Are you a member of any friendly society"? and if the reply be in the affirmative, he is refused admittance. The friendly societies in this colony very justly complain that this puts a tax on industry, a tax on those who desire to help themselves. Then, again, an inquiry will do good, perhaps, in the way of getting this hospital partly maintained by the public, as is the case with hospitals in Melbourne and elsewhere. Here the hospital is almost entirely supported by the Government, and as a proof that this hospital is not fully appreciated by the public I have only to instance that an attempt was made some time ago to initiate a Sunday hospital movement, the same as in the other colonies, and as exists at Fremantle, and the attempt totally failed, showing that the public have no confidence whatever in the management of the hospital. How much better would it be for the Government of this colony if they could get the public to subscribe, and then only have to add £ for £ as is done in the other colonies. I can assure you, sir, that there are very grave complaints in Perth as regards the management of the hospital, and if on inquiry these complaints are found to be groundless, I shall be exceedingly pleased, as will this House; but I think in the interests of the hospital, in the interests of the public, and in justice to those who have the management of this hospital, an inquiry should be held. I do not propose to make a long speech, and therefore I will simply move the motion.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie): I second this motion, because I think there is a general consensus of opinion that the condition of the hospital should be inquired into. I know that as far as I am concerned I have received a very large number of complaints from indoor and outdoor patients about the various details connected with the management, and my only reason for not having taken action in the matter before is that I hoped the subject would be dealt with by the hospital authorities themselves. This last affair—the death of this man Rogers—appears to me to sug-

gest the existence of a very scandalous state of affairs. I do not want to fix the blame on one or any number of persons, but it does seem to me to be an outrage that a man should be brought in a dying condition to the doors of an institution which is largely supported by the people, and still more largely supported by the Government—

MR. MONGER: Very slightly supported by the public.

MR. VOSPER: I cannot help thinking that it is scandalous that a man should be turned away from the doors of this hospital on account of red-tapeism or some other formality, and should be allowed to die for want of assistance. That such was the case is shown by the coroner's jury. The member for York (Mr. Monger) has remarked that the hospital is supported to a very small extent by the public. As a matter of fact, although the hospital gets Government grants, it is wholly supported by the public, because the public are made to pay the amount of the Government grant. Still there is value in what the hon. member says, because the amount of voluntary subscriptions given towards this hospital is very small indeed. And why should that be the case? In other countries and in other towns of this colony we find that the public, as a whole, are very liberal in supporting hospitals. It appears that in Perth they are not willing to contribute, the real reason being that they have no confidence in these institutions as they are conducted in this colony.

THE PREMIER: That is not so. The people on the goldfields have control of the hospitals there, and how do they subscribe? How do they subscribe in your own district? Take Kanowna.

MR. VOSPER: They have not the whole control.

THE PREMIER: They have the whole control.

MR. VOSPER: In Kanowna itself two hospitals were maintained by the public for a very long time, one being the miners' hospital and the other the Government hospital; and in Bulong the hospital is very largely supported by the people, the amount derived from the Government in the shape of a grant being, I think, only a small sum.

THE PREMIER: They get more than they contribute, all of them.

MR. VOSPER: I do not think so. The public, as a general rule, do not appear to have confidence in the hospitals of this colony, for a feeling exists that there is a scandalous waste, and in almost every case there is a general complaint of mismanagement. To my mind it is necessary that a Hospitals Bill should be passed here for the proper control and management of public hospitals throughout the colony, at as early a date as possible; and I hope the effect of this inquiry into the Perth Hospital will be to illustrate more forcibly the necessity for this legislation.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I am always disinclined to oppose the appointment of select committees for inquiring into the working of public institutions, and I do not intend to oppose this one. At the same time, it seems to me there is a desire in this House to have select committees on public institutions to a larger extent than is reasonable. Hon. members will find that no public institution gives absolute satisfaction to everyone; and if members will examine the *personnel* of the committee who manage the Perth Hospital, they will find that all those persons are men of known respectability and position in the place, and this fact in itself should be some guarantee that these gentlemen are not likely to do anything that is not consistent with their public duty. We must remember, too, that these positions are honorary, that they are undertaken only from a sense of public duty, and that there is nothing to be gained, so far as I know, not even a little kudos, which seems to be the incentive to some persons who undertake public duties. All that these gentlemen can get is a lot of work. If we unduly harass these persons and do not show we have confidence in them, I know what will happen. They will have nothing to do with the institution, and will leave it to others. Is it likely that better men can be got than those who now form the committee of this institution? In my opinion, it is not likely. I know we had a great deal of trouble in getting persons of known position, who would be satisfactory to the public, to act on this committee; and it would not

be an easy matter to induce other good men to take that position; therefore we ought to have really good grounds before we appoint a select committee to inquire into the working of a public institution controlled altogether by persons outside the influence of the Government. The Government have very little influence, and in reality have no control over the management of this hospital. We have to provide nearly all the funds, but in regard to the management, it was the desire of this House and of people outside that the management of the Perth Hospital should be removed from the control of the Government, and placed in the hands of an independent public board. That has been done. The Act provides also that the board should be elective so soon as a certain proportion of the funds was contributed by the public. Unfortunately that has not been the case. The public for some reason—probably because they have not been asked—have not contributed in any material degree to the maintenance of the Perth Public Hospital; the largest contributor, and almost the only one, being a firm of Chinese in Perth, who contribute £25 a year. We have this institution managed with care, as we well know; and though there may be some alterations necessary in the appointment of medical officers, in regard to the term they should continue to occupy the position, yet I know this has already been dealt with by the Colonial Secretary, who has sent a communication to the hospital committee, suggesting that an alteration should be made by shortening the term of the appointment. There may be some other little alterations desirable; but if this House expects that a better committee of management can be got by having a public inquiry through a select committee, I think hon. members will not get a better board, and will be disappointed with the result. I know the result of an inquiry will be to show that the hospital is thoroughly well managed. I think there is no doubt that this institution will be found to be well and carefully managed; and notwithstanding one case which the member for North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper) has referred to, I know the opinion he has expressed is not indorsed by persons who appear to have looked into the case. I

am not conversant with the case myself, except by hearsay; but I say that case is not a sufficient reason for appointing a select committee to inquire into the working of this independent public board. The result, as I have said, will be that hon. members will not get suitable persons of good position to perform these honorary duties, if they are not treated with respect and consideration by this House. We may be sure that persons who occupy these positions will not consent to be insulted by this House or by any one else, by having their actions inquired into when there is no real reason for it. I am informed that the president of the board does not object to an inquiry, in fact no one objects to it so far as I know; but hon. members will find, if an inquiry be made, that the hospital is well and carefully managed, and the result will be a justification of the actions of the board. I do not object on personal or any other grounds to an inquiry. In regard to one or two patients not having been well treated in the hospital, I do not think that a patient is a good judge as to whether the food supplied to him in the hospital is of the right sort or not. When a person feels ill, probably he would like to have chops and rich food, when he ought not to have them. In many cases of illness we know the best cure is to take little or no food for a time. That is my experience, anyway, and that is the treatment I always receive when I have the misfortune to get ill—I am put on low diet. No doubt that has been the case with the patient mentioned by the hon. member. If patients paid for the food they received in a public hospital, and had to pay a good round sum for it, they might appreciate it and be perfectly satisfied; but when they get it for nothing, they are dissatisfied and grumble, and say they have not been well treated. We know that is often the case with persons who get good things for nothing. I consider this motion will do no good; and in forming that opinion I go by the position and character of the men who are on the hospital board. They are fifteen in number, and all good men, well known and respected in the colony; and it will take a good deal of evidence to make me believe those gentlemen have not acted properly and worthily in carry-

ing out the public duties they have undertaken.

MR. MONGER (York): While disposed to support the motion, I hope this Royal Commission, if appointed, will not be on the same lines as other royal commissions I have been associated with in recent years. That is, I hope the commission will not be one whose members are to receive remuneration for their services, but that any duties they undertake to perform will be honorary. I do not think there are many persons in Perth who are desirous of sitting upon these Royal Commissions in ordinary circumstances; but if it is the wish of the House to appoint such a commission, let it be understood that this is not to be a Royal Commission appointed under the same terms and conditions as the Royal Commission on Mining, in respect of which the colony was mulcted in an expense of some thousands of pounds. Let it be understood that this is to be a commission the members of which voluntarily tender their services. If the commission is to be appointed upon that basis, I shall support the motion.

MR. QUINLAN (Toodyay): I regret I was out of the House when this motion was moved. It was once before on the Notice Paper, and was removed, I do not know why; but I was given to understand it was not necessary after the report from the hospital committee, which was recently placed on the table of the House. However, the mover has thought fit again to introduce the subject; and, so far as the Hospital Board is concerned, of which I am a member, I and my fellow members court the fullest inquiry. I may further add that, while courting inquiry, I am so confident of the result of that inquiry that I think the House will be wasting the money of the taxpayers if they appoint a Royal Commission. Let a select committee be appointed from amongst those members who are desirous of sitting on select committees. If hon. members want such work, they are welcome to it. For my own part, I hope I shall not again be offered an appointment on a select committee or on a commission. For some time past I have been acting on a committee, and have had enough of it for the next few years. However, the members of the board, so far as I am able to speak for them—and I think most hon.

members know them—are, I venture to say, men of the strictest integrity; they give their time without fee or reward; and every care is exercised in the management of that hospital. Suffice it to say that the rate per head of cost is considerably less than that of the Fremantle Hospital, which has been boasted of as a well-managed institution. I believe the Fremantle board deserve credit likewise for giving their time in the same manner as do the board of the Perth Hospital; but the rate per head in Perth is lower; and this fact, I think, proves that our hospital is managed as economically as possible. It appears that the case which, I understand, has been referred to, and in which the name of Dr. Horrocks was mentioned, may necessitate some slight inquiry, if any at all; but the board have laid down from time to time the strictest rules that every consideration be given to both inside and outside patients; and I may here remark that the verdict of the jury, if it had been admitted by the acting coroner at the time, would have been, in other words, a verdict of manslaughter against Dr. Horrocks; but the acting coroner very properly disagreed with the jury's verdict. In addition to that, I am informed on good authority that one of the jurymen, at least, did not act up to his oath. In other words, he had a prejudice against the hospital, because a relative of his had not been treated in the manner he wished. That is no new thing. I have known of other juries and witnesses in this colony who did not adhere to their oaths; and for my own part I should like to see the oath abolished, because it is totally disregarded, and simply amounts to asking people to commit crime. The Hospital Board is composed of ten lay members and five doctors. I am not only on the board, but am also on the house committee, and am, with others, most anxious that every care should be bestowed on the patients, and all possible economy studied in the interests of the taxpayers; and if there is any reasonable complaint whatever, the board, which is composed of reasonable men, give to every case submitted to them the best consideration it is possible to bestow. I have just been handed a note from my friend the Commissioner of Railways (Hon. B. C. Wood), to the effect that Chinamen are the only subscribers.

Well, that is almost the case. It is true that Chinamen are the principal subscribers; but there would be plenty of others who would subscribe, if the hospital were not established under the present system; that is, maintained out of the funds of the taxpayers of the country. I am perfectly willing, and I know of some others who are also willing, to subscribe to the funds of the hospital; but we are not willing to put our hands in our pockets till the onus of the upkeep of this establishment can be more fairly divided. Most of us, I think, have had some experience in such matters; and we know it is the custom for the few to find the means, and for the many to go free; and it is a question of whether the present method of running the hospital is not the best, because all the taxpayers at present contribute equally to the hospital revenue provided by the Government. That is why the subscriptions are not given in a manner that might be expected, for it is generally held that all the public are subscribers indirectly. With regard to the friendly societies, which I understand have also been referred to this evening, they have been dealt with in the manner they wished; in fact, only recently we had a letter from the friendly societies withdrawing some charges they had previously made. I think that fact is sufficient to show that the statements made with regard to friendly societies are not warranted. The hospital now receives members of friendly societies upon their merits. If it is known that a member of a friendly society is able to pay a doctor, or if he has some other means of keeping his family, of course he is not admitted to the hospital to become a burden upon the taxpayers; but if, on the other hand, he is unable to contribute to the support of his family, he is received in the hospital at the moderate charge of £1 ls. per week, which sum certainly does not pay for his upkeep, including medical attendance and nursing. Those cases are dealt with on their merits; and, if hon. members were only aware of the attempts at times to impose upon the hospital—that is, upon the pockets of the taxpayers of this country—by people well able to pay a doctor, they would be astonished. Well-dressed people have the effrontery to come to that hospital and ask for both inside and outside attendance, who have

plenty of means at their disposal to keep themselves and to pay doctors. This shows hon. members what care is exercised, and how at times when we have to deal with people of that kind, we have to do unpleasant things, as happens to other people at various times in their lives. We have at times to say “no” to a demand for some help; and, when it is the opinion of the board and the secretary, formed upon certain information received, that people soliciting help are not warranted in so doing by lack of means, then arise cases of this kind, and some extravagant paragraph appears in a paper demanding an inquiry into the Perth Hospital. The member for Perth (Mr. Hall) has moved this motion; but he gave the notice on a former occasion, and after the report of the hospital committee it was dropped, and is now brought up again, when it appears that something new has arisen. Well, I do not know of any new case which warrants a commission of inquiry; but as regards a select committee, which will not involve any tax on the people of this country, I am quite in favour of it, and am confident of the result.

MR. MONGER: I have had the pleasure of sitting on some Royal Commissions, of which the members have not been paid. Let the members of this commission, if they wish to sit on it, be treated in the same way.

MR. QUINLAN: As far as the board are concerned, I am prepared for an inquiry; but I do not want to see a waste of money for no good purpose; and therefore I beg to move an amendment to the motion: that the words “Royal Commission,” in line 1, be struck out, and “Select Committee” inserted in lieu thereof; and that the words in lines 2 and 3, “such committee should consist of gentlemen wholly unconnected with the hospital” be also struck out.

MR. HALL (in reply): The last speaker is slightly wrong when he tells us that the motion was dropped on one occasion on account of the hospital committee's report having appeared.

MR. QUINLAN: You told us so. That is why I said it.

MR. HALL: The hospital committee's report had nothing whatever to do with the dropping of the motion. It was understood by me that certain alterations

were being made by the hospital committee, and therefore I allowed the motion to drop. As these alterations were not carried out, I renewed the motion. I may say the Premier has mentioned that I have only one or two cases. One of the cases, as has been observed, was fatal; and in reference to that case the evidence went to show that Rogers went to the hospital at 8 o'clock in the morning, and was told he could not see a doctor till 11 a.m., so he had to wait three hours; and Dr. Horrocks said, in his evidence, that he had so many patients to see that he could not examine Rogers; so Rogers was passed on and not allowed to enter the hospital, but was sent away with a dose of Epsom salts. Now there are plenty of cases to quote. My reason for not quoting them was because I did not wish to take up the time of the House; but here is a case of typhoid fever reported, where a man was turned out of the hospital one or two days after he got out of bed for the first time. The man had no money, no relatives, no home; and he had to sleep in the scrub at night. Another was a case of rupture, where the patient's doctor wrote a special letter describing the case and its urgency. Apparently the letter was not read till the next day; anyway, the man was not examined, nor was anything done for him for 24 hours. Meanwhile, an extravasation of urine had spread all over his body; abscesses ensued, and the man nearly lost his life in consequence. There are cases innumerable. It was certainly not my intention, in moving for a Royal Commission, that the country should be put to any expense such as has been indicated by the member for York (Mr. Monger). I believe that, as usual, witnesses will have to be paid; but my object was to have an inquiry held by gentlemen totally unconnected with the hospital; and so long as there is an inquiry, I do not very much object to the manner of it, whether it be by Select Committee or by Royal Commission. I should prefer a Royal Commission, because then we might have more time to devote to the subject. We know very well that, ordinarily, members appointed on select committees of this House are so occupied with their private business and with their public duties

in this Chamber that they have little time to pay proper attention to the work of the committee, the result being that very often the findings of select committees are valueless. Therefore I think that if a Royal Commission were appointed so as to allow of persons outside this House being on that Commission, it would be much better than a Select Committee. At the same time, if this House thinks that a Select Committee is all that is required, I am perfectly willing to fall in with that view, but I urge that a Royal Commission be appointed. I have been on Royal Commissions of this House, the members of which received no payment. Indeed, I have never known members receive payment except in the case of the Mining Commission, and the members of that were paid under special circumstances, because they were men who had to be hunted for, hundreds of miles away, and to be dragged down to Perth. I feel sure there are plenty of business men in and around Perth who would be willing to act on this commission without fee or reward; therefore I hope the House will agree to a Royal Commission on the understanding that such commission be not paid.

Amendment put and passed, and the motion as amended agreed to.

MR. HALL: I trust that no one on the committee governing the Perth Public Hospital will be elected a member of the Select Committee.

A ballot for the Select Committee having been taken, the following members were elected: Mr. D. Forrest, Mr. J. F. T. Hassell, Mr. Oats, and Mr. Solomon, in addition to the mover (Mr. Hall).

Ordered, that the Committee have power to send for persons and papers, and to sit during any adjournment of the House; also to report on the 24th October.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: 1, Death of Catharine Clifford in Fremantle Lunatic Asylum, Correspondence; 2, Telephone Regulation No. 4, Amendment; 3, Eight-hours Day, Telegrams between Premiers of Australian Colonies as to observance of holiday on public railways; 4, Mini-

imum Wage in Government Contracts, Telegrams between Premiers.

Ordered to be on the table.

MOTION—DRY DOCK FOR FREMANTLE.

MR. SOLOMON (South Fremantle) moved :

That, in the opinion of this House, it is in the best interest of the colony that the construction of a dry dock at Fremantle should be taken in hand immediately.

He said: It will be remembered that so far back as 1896 it was decided by this House that a dry dock should be commenced at Fremantle, and a sum of £140,000 was voted for that purpose. Since then there has been a reappropriation of over £105,000 of the amount for other works. Now that we have the mail steamers calling at Fremantle, and no doubt other vessels of large tonnage will make use of the port to a greater extent than hitherto, it becomes absolutely necessary for the proper working of the harbour that some facility should be provided for the repair of ships at Fremantle. At the present time there is a vessel of large tonnage, the "Euphrates," considerably damaged, and the best that can be done for her is to patch her up in order that she may be sent to a port in some other colony for proper repair. In all the principal harbours of other colonies, a dry dock is provided in which vessels can be placed for repair or for cleaning. This House recognised, years ago, that similar facilities should be provided at Fremantle, and a vote for the purpose was passed; consequently it does not need much from me on this occasion to place the matter before the House in order to induce hon. members to support this motion for the immediate construction of a dry dock at Fremantle. So far as the money is concerned, no doubt there will be a Loan Bill before the House during the present session; and it is only fair to Fremantle to place in that Bill, at any rate, the amount that has been reappropriated from the Fremantle dock vote and applied to other purposes. I do not think there will be two opinions in this House as to the necessity for this work. It is a work which may take a little time to complete, but when it is done it will be useful; and it seems hard that, if we have vessels coming to Fremantle which are unfortunately disabled, we are obliged to send

them to some other colony to be repaired because we have not the appliances at Fremantle which ought to have been provided. Some little time ago a slight accident occurred to one of the mail steamers while in the harbour. Fortunately the damage was only slight, and the railway workshops being at Fremantle, they were the only means available for repairing the damage. We all know the mail steamers remain in harbour only a short time; consequently there was not time to send to any private firm for making the necessary repairs, and the railway workshops had to be used for the purpose. That was only a minor accident; but accidents do occur, and often it is necessary that a vessel should be put on the slip to overhaul her and see whether any material damage has been done. I feel sure the House will agree with this motion, so that it is not necessary for me to labour it. The Premier, I feel sure, will see the justice of the course I suggest in providing the money which the House voted four years ago, the greater part of which was afterwards reappropriated for other works; and this having been done, Fremantle is entitled to some consideration; more especially taking into account the circumstances of the colony, and that we shall have vessels coming from all parts of the world before long, and vessels are actually coming now from many distant places. If it were known that Fremantle had facilities for docking a vessel for repair, there is no doubt many vessels which now pass the port would call in for repair at Fremantle, this port being on the high road of trade and commerce with the Eastern colonies, and such vessels would not, as they do now, go past to some other port for repair. I leave the motion in the hands of the House, feeling sure that hon. members will do justice to Fremantle in this matter.

MR. HIGHAM (Fremantle): I do not think it requires many words from me to commend this motion to hon. members. The desirability of building a dry dock at Fremantle has been affirmed by this House years ago; and although there has been some hesitation as to the selection of a site, I think the time has come when the site should be finally decided and the dock be commenced at once. There can be no question that quite

half a dozen, if not a dozen, vessels are compelled to leave Fremantle for repairs under the present conditions; and there are at present in the harbour at Fremantle four vessels which would probably go into dock for repair, if that convenience were available which this House provided for four years ago by passing an item in the Loan Bill. There are in the harbour at present the "Socotra," the "Canada," the "Euphrates," and the "Luna," all of which have come into harbour disabled after suffering a great deal, except the "Euphrates," which was unfortunately disabled in the harbour. These vessels require the facilities of a dry dock, and under the present conditions the only thing that can be done for them is to patch them up and send them elsewhere to be properly repaired. In addition we have had vessel after vessel during the last two or three years for which we ought to have provided these facilities; and were it known that a dry dock at Fremantle would be available, other vessels requiring repairing or cleaning, which now labour past the port to reach some other port for repair, would come into Fremantle. I hope the House will carry the motion unanimously, for the work is absolutely necessary for the shipping interests of the colony, and a dry dock should be constructed at once. One hon. member has interjected that we ought to strike out the word "immediately"; but there can be no question that this dock should be constructed immediately. The necessity for it has been admitted times out of number, and a vote was passed for it four years ago. Any one acquainted with the necessities of shipping at Fremantle must admit that this dock should be constructed immediately. We have enough cases at Fremantle at the present time to prove the necessity for the immediate construction of this dock.

MR. MONGER (York): I want to call the attention of the members representing the various electorates in the Fremantle district to the fact that, only a few evenings ago, they expressed their opinion that it would be desirable to obstruct a certain line of railway, which the Government then proposed; yet, soon after taking that action, the same members come forward now and propose a work which is to benefit Fremantle. To be

consistent, those members who were so opposed to the construction of the Coolgardie-Norseman railway — [MR. HIGHAM: That is a new work] — should show their sincerity by holding back until the finances of the colony are in a stronger position. The hon. member (Mr. Higham) says that railway would be a new work; but I say, with all respect to the hon. member, that this dry dock which is proposed is also a new work; that it will mean that the Government will have to ask for further moneys to carry out the work during the present year.

MR. SOLOMON: No; the money has been reappropriated.

MR. MONGER: I say with all due respect to the members for Fremantle, let them show that their feelings are absolutely sincere, not only in this direction but in the direction in which they voted the other evening. If they were sincere the other evening, they should be sincere on this occasion, and should never ask that this motion be passed. I move as an amendment that the word "immediately," at the end of the motion, be struck out.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): We are all justly proud of the Fremantle Harbour. I have no doubt every member of this House feels a very great amount of satisfaction at the harbour having reached its present progressive condition. But a harbour without a dry dock is scarcely complete, and I want particularly, in reply to the member for York (Mr. Monger), to emphasise the point that this is by no means a new work.

MR. MONGER: Nor was the Coolgardie-Norseman railway a new work. It was voted for during last session.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That may be so, but it was a new work all the same. But with regard to this dry dock, not only was it a part of the original scheme, but the money has been actually voted and actually borrowed for the purpose of constructing this particular work.

THE PREMIER: It has not been borrowed.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Now with reference to this work, I am very much opposed to arrangements made by this House and decisions come to by this House being upset.

MR. MOORHEAD: Such as with regard to the Cue-Nannine railway.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: And for that reason I opposed very strongly the reappropriation of this money at the time it was reappropriated, and I pointed out that the reappropriation, amounting to £980,000, would involve this House in a future loan; and now we have nearly arrived at the stage when that will be necessary. Now that loan will have to be raised, because the works for which the money was taken must be completed. Some of them are in hand, some of them are laid aside for a time, and amongst these works is this dry dock for Fremantle. A decision was arrived at by this House to do a certain thing; the money was voted, the money was borrowed, the money was reappropriated and spent upon other works; and all that we can do is to recoup that money at the earliest possible date, and to proceed with the work.

MR. MORGANS: When?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: At once. The time has come to do it now. I think it was a mistake to reappropriate that money. I think the works should have been proceeded with, and that the dry dock should have been commenced about the same time as large vessels were enabled to come into the port.

MR. CONNOR: At the same time as the railway workshops should have been commenced.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: In 1895 this House decided that these workshops were to be removed.

MR. MITCHELL: Is the hon. member (Mr. Illingworth) in order in trying to put himself right with the Fremantle people?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I am not trying to put myself right with anybody, or with anything except my own conscience. In this House I am not influenced by outside public opinion.

MR. CONNOR: You merely made a mistake; that was all.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: If I have made a mistake, I am prepared to take the consequences of that mistake, both in this House and in the country. To resume: the question of recouping is an urgent one, and not for this work only, because considerable sums will be required for the continuance of the Coolgardie

Water Scheme. Hon. members know I opposed that work very determinedly for years, and I did so because I believed I was right; but this House having voted certain moneys for that work, and having borrowed a portion of those moneys temporarily, there must be a recoup in respect of that scheme, as there must be in respect of this Fremantle dock. What is the use of our inviting large vessels to the port of Fremantle, which come across the sea after from eight to eleven days' sail from Colombo, when at the first port those vessels touch, namely Fremantle, we have no means of repairing any damages they may have sustained? Why, we shall soon discredit the port and ourselves; and what for? For the sake of a dock, a work which has already been voted for by this House, and the money voted for which has been temporarily borrowed. This money should be recouped from some source, and this work should proceed as quickly as possible. For that reason, I hope the member for York (Mr. Monger) will not press his amendment, but that he will allow this motion to go through.

MR. CONNOR (East Kimberley): I have not much to say on this subject, except that an absolute necessity exists for the construction of this dock as soon as possible. I do not say it should be built immediately, because there are certain items of the Government programme which have been put before this particular work, though in my opinion this work should have had precedence. However, the other works are first, and consequently we cannot ask the Government of this colony to excise all those works and start on this particular work immediately. Time after time we have steamers and sailing ships coming here disabled; and what is the result? They have to be towed round to Melbourne, Sydney, or Adelaide. We find that in Adelaide a work such as is suggested in the motion is being carried out. I think this particular suggestion comes second to nothing in connection with public works. It means that we shall be able to keep employed an immense amount of labour, and of course we all understand that the employment of skilled labour here means that the colony must be advancing, that these men who come here as skilled labourers must bring

their families with them, that the work done will increase and be the means of increasing the population of this country. It is only within the last twelve months that I have had some personal experience in this connection. A steamer in which I had some interest had to go twice to Melbourne to be docked within a period of eighteen months. On each occasion, I think, there was about £2,000 spent on her. If we had a dock here it would be the means of keeping such steamers in our own ports. Another thing: every vessel which comes here after a long passage would probably go into dock to have the barnacles cleaned off. We want to clean all the vessels it is possible to accommodate; we want to keep the vessels here. If it is not possible, as this motion desires, to construct this dock immediately, then I say, let it be done as soon as possible. It is one of the first, if not the first, public works which should be carried out in this colony.

MR. MORRIS: Amend the motion.

MR. CONNOR: We have now this great harbour at Fremantle; we have the finest ships in the world coming here; and if we had facilities here for docking, a very large increase in the population and in the earning power of the people of the principal port of this colony would result. It would also follow that vessels, in place of taking the greater risks of going further on, would, when it was necessary to dock, come here rather than go to Melbourne or Sydney. It has occurred many times that a ship ordered by the insurance agents to go into dock has actually had to be towed from Fremantle round to Melbourne. The expenditure involved would not, I think, be very great. I should say that half a dozen ships being treated in the dock would almost pay this colony for the construction of the work. The formation of the river, or the harbour as it is now called, is most favourable for the building of such docks. All that is necessary is a little excavation. I am not an engineer, but I know something practical in connection with this subject, because I have seen these docks built before. A little excavation would be required, then the sides would have to be built up, and there would also be necessary a pumping-engine. I suppose £50,000 would build a dock sufficient to accommodate any ship that will come here.

MR. J. F. T. HASSELL: Get a donkey-engine to pump it out.

MR. CONNOR: That is all you want, a donkey-engine to pump it out. I am afraid some hon. members here have been talking on the hospital question, and that has got them rather off the track. Although I am opposed to any unnecessary expenditure at the present time, still I say, if there be anything necessary, it is above all things necessary that we should have a dry dock at Fremantle for the purpose of treating ships which require repairs, and of increasing the population and inducing people to settle in the colony.

MR. MORAN: The motion will not increase the population.

MR. CONNOR: It will increase the number of artisans now at work, and if the Fremantle people are not so good at increasing the population as are those in some other parts of the world, that is their misfortune. I would ask the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Solomon) to amend his motion to read as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is to the best interests of the colony that the construction of a dry dock at Fremantle should be taken in hand as soon as possible.

MR. MONGER: I agree to that as regards my amendment.

MR. CONNOR: I shall ask the hon. member so to alter his motion. I would support the motion as it stands on the paper, but I merely suggest this alteration to him as being probably more practicable.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member (Mr. Solomon) cannot amend his own motion.

MR. CONNOR: I propose my suggestion as an amendment.

MR. MONGER: And I withdraw my amendment.

MR. MITCHELL (Murchison): It seems to me this matter resolves itself into a question of ways and means. I do not think there is a member who does not deem it absolutely necessary that there should be a dry dock at Fremantle. Ships have to be towed all the way round from Fremantle to Melbourne at a fabulous cost; and I think any scheme initiated in this House, whereby men may be employed and retained in the colony, we are bound to support. I certainly support the motion for the construction of a dry dock at Fremantle, the principal port of the colony. We have now the royal mail steamers

calling three or four times a month, and we should do everything to show the outside world that we are prepared not only to give these steamers every facility, but to sacrifice ourselves to find money to give them proper accommodation.

MR. HOLMES (East Fremantle): I regret the necessity for this motion at the present stage, because I think the records of the House show it was the intention of the House, when they undertook the construction of the Harbour Works at Fremantle to construct a dock at the same time. Further they made provision to that extent, because I notice that the Loan Act of 1895 contained an item of, I think, £142,000 for the construction of a dry dock at that place. The Loan Estimates for 1896-7 showed an item of proposed expenditure of £20,000 for that year. It will thus be seen that the original intention was to construct a dock at the same time as the harbour works were being constructed, and in my opinion that was the correct policy to pursue, so that the dock and the harbour would be completed about one and the same time. However, it was thought fit to reappropriate the money to other work, and the majority of the members in this House were in favour of that reappropriation. Personally I opposed it, as I have always opposed reappropriations at every stage during the time I have occupied a seat in this House. The harbour works are now practically completed, and it is a matter of very great urgency that this dry dock should be proceeded with at once. The money was voted in 1895, and as the member for York (Mr. Monger) has pointed out, the intention of the hon. member for South Fremantle (Mr. Solomon) is to ask for nothing new and nothing Fremantle is not entitled to. All that is asked is that the work which should have been started in 1895 shall be commenced immediately. I would like to point out there is no doubt whatever that the dock, if it were constructed, would be revenue-producing and would undoubtedly pay a handsome interest on the expenditure. There is no doubt about the demand for the dock. As the hon. member has pointed out, there are no less than four vessels in the Fremantle Harbour at the present time requiring repairs, and they are being patched up. The Adelaide Steamship Company's boats

engaged in the North-West trade have to go to the Eastern colonies to be docked. Steamers engaged between Fremantle and Singapore have to make periodical stays at Singapore in order to be repaired. If there were a dock at Fremantle, undoubtedly they would avail themselves of that dock. The member for East Kimberley (Mr. Connor) has pointed out that one of their vessels had to go to the Eastern colonies twice in 12 months. The coast on the North-West of this colony is a dangerous one to those steamers. It is not properly surveyed, and unless a man of very great experience is in command, one of those steamers may at any time run against a rock. I understand that the site of the dock has something to do with the delay. There is some difficulty as to deciding upon a correct and proper site suitable for the dock, and that I believe is the true difficulty at the present time. The Engineer-in-Chief has had four or five years to consider the position, and if he cannot come to a definite conclusion as to what is the right place, I think an expert should be obtained in order that the dock may be put in the best possible and most suitable place. As I said at the outset, I regret that there is any necessity for this motion at the present time. It was certainly intended to carry on the dry dock at the same time as the harbour works; and now the harbour is practically completed, I do not think it is too much to ask that the construction of the dock shall be taken in hand immediately.

A MEMBER: Nothing is too much for the Fremantle people.

MR. MORGANS (Coolgardie): I quite agree with the hon. member who proposed this motion, that a dry dock is necessary for Fremantle. We know we have had many exhibitions in this House of the modesty of Fremantle generally in regard to the expenditure of money upon that port, and I think it was not at all unexpected that they would bring forward this motion at the present time. As far as I am concerned, I shall not strongly oppose the motion. In principle I would not at all oppose the construction of a dry dock there, because I look upon it as necessary; but I should like to point out to this House the inconsistency of the position occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to the expenditure of

public money at this juncture. I am bound to say, after listening to the speech of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Illingworth), that it is one of the most astounding examples of political inconsistency I have ever heard. The hon. member several times during this session has called attention to the fact that this is a moribund Parliament, and that no money must be spent under any circumstances.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: On new works: be fair.

MR. MORGANS: The hon. member urged that no money must be spent during the very short period of this moribund House, and the other night we found the hon. member placing himself in a difficult position with certain members on that (Opposition) side of the House, on the important question of the workshops for Midland Junction. We found him voting against two of his very strongest supporters on that side of the House. We admire him for having the courage—[MR. HIGHAM: Very much]—for having the courage to oppose two of the strong members on that side of the House. But it will appear to us on this (Government) side of the House, and I am sure it will also appear to the country, that the members for Fremantle have been "putting the screw" on the leader of the Opposition. They evidently have been driving a bargain with him.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You are all wrong.

MR. MORGANS: No doubt some meeting has taken place. We know what strong supporters the members for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes) and South Fremantle (Mr. Solomon) have been to the hon. member, and no doubt in the meantime some pressure has been brought to bear upon the leader of the Opposition, for the purpose of making him, as far as possible, retrace the steps he took the other night. Of course I must commend the members for East Fremantle and South Fremantle for putting the screw on. It is quite fair and just. They want to get this dry dock. The leader of the Opposition having gone back on them so seriously as he did the other night, having in fact, through his vote, lost to Fremantle the advantage of the railway workshops, it is easy to understand that those hon. members and the electors of Fremantle feel very strongly against him.

We know this is the case, because I saw the account of a meeting at Fremantle the other day.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You are running your train on the wrong line.

MR. MORGANS: I am running it on a very good line, I think.

THE PREMIER: A wheelbarrow.

MR. CONNOR: A wheelbarrow; yes.

MR. MORGANS: I think I am running this train on the main track. There was a meeting the other day at Fremantle at which certain members opposite (and I suppose some members on this side of the House) were present, and a very strong grievance was vented against the leader of the Opposition on that occasion for having had the effrontery to vote in favour of the establishment of the railway workshops at Midland Junction. All kinds of threats were hurled at the head of the hon. member. The support of members opposite was to be withdrawn from him; in fact, so far as we who are outside the secrets of the Opposition side of the House could understand, there was every probability that the organisation on that side of the House would be broken up. That was the appearance.

MR. HIGHAM: What about the dock?

MR. MORGANS: Looking at the frightful and astonishing inconsistency of the leader of the Opposition with regard to this question, I can only conclude that members opposite have brought this pressure to bear upon him, and that he is giving his vote in favour of this dock as a sop to them in order to secure their support in the future. That is the construction I put upon it, and I am perfectly certain that is the construction that will be put upon it by the public.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You are wrong, all the same.

MR. MORGANS: The hon. member has always been a pessimist in regard to expenditure, but this year he has exceeded himself. He has opposed everything in the way of expenditure, and the other night, when the important work of the Norseman railway was before this House—a work far more important than a dry dock at Fremantle—[Several MEMBERS: No!]—a work, I assert, that would be to this country of far greater benefit than a dozen dry docks at Fremantle [Several MEMBERS: No!]
—when that motion was brought before this House, strenuous

opposition was placed in the way of that Bill, and it was defeated simply on the ground that the Government were not justified at the present time in spending money on that enterprise. If we follow the arguments of the leader of the Opposition, and also the arguments that have been used in this House by other gentlemen on the Opposition side, that this is a moribund Parliament and that we have no right to incur expenditure on any account during the short period which remains of the life of this Parliament, then I say this proposal to spend a large sum of money upon the dry dock at Fremantle is absolutely inconsistent with the principle that they have laid down.

MR. DOHERTY: You might as well have a house without a kitchen as a harbour without a dry dock.

MR. MORGANS: The harbour at Albany has existed for forty years, and has done very well. The steamers of these important lines have been coming in and going out of Albany for years past, and, as I say, they have done very well without a dry dock. I want to call attention to another matter in connection with this. When that question of the Nannine Railway was proposed the other day, I heard the leader of the Opposition say he intended to oppose that railway.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I never said anything of the kind.

THE PREMIER: You did at the beginning of the session.

MR. MORGANS: I do not quite remember his words, but at any rate that was the impression they conveyed to me, that he intended to oppose the making of that railway. The money for that railway has been voted just as much as has the money for this dry dock, and if that does not apply in the case of the Nannine railway, why should it apply to the dry dock at Fremantle? The position the Opposition have taken up in this matter is absolutely inconsistent, and the position taken up by the leader of the Opposition is glaringly so. In view of the arguments used by the leader of the Opposition and other members on the Opposition side of the House, that this country cannot afford to spend any sum of money at the present time, that this is a moribund Parliament, and that we are absolutely

unjustified in incurring any expenditure of any kind, I think the only thing the hon. member for South Fremantle can do, in order to be consistent in his position, is to withdraw the motion.

At 6:30, the SPEAKER left the Chair.

At 7:30, Chair resumed.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I hardly know the object the mover had in view in moving this motion, unless it is that he thinks the Government require stimulating in regard to this matter.

MR. HIGHAM: No question about it.

THE PREMIER: I do not know why the hon. member should say that, because in the Administrator's opening Speech, delivered on the 15th August, he said: "It is hoped that the dock at Fremantle will soon be commenced." There we have an indication of the intention of the Government. Hon. members of course are aware that, owing to the reappropriation of money originally voted for this dock, there is not much of the amount now available for the construction of the dock. On the 30th June last, as will be seen by the published accounts, the sum of over £14,000 remained to the credit of this vote; but that circumstance would not prevent the Government from going on with the work, because we have the opportunity now of asking the House to supplement the amount. The reason why the Government have not made a commencement with this dock has been that the position assigned to it in the scheme of the Engineer-in-Chief cannot yet be reached by the dredgers. In a minute made by the Engineer-in-Chief a few days ago he says:

The construction of the dock cannot be commenced until the dredging to full depth is completed up to the site which will be occupied by the dock, which will take some months to accomplish.

That is the position the Government are in at present in regard to this matter, that according to the Engineer-in-Chief's minute the site of the dock cannot be reached until the dredging to full depth is completed some months hence. I can assure hon. members the intention of the Government is to carry out this work, which is part of our programme and part

of the policy which has received the approval of this House; and the fact that we have reappropriated some of the money which was not required for the dock at the time, because the site could not then be reached, has not in any way changed the views of the Government in regard to this matter.

MR. HIGHAM: Have you finally decided on the site, then?

THE PREMIER: I cannot say we have finally decided on any site, for we are really in the hands of our professional advisers in regard to a site. I have not heard from the Engineer-in-Chief that he has changed his opinion in regard to the site, and by the minute I have read, made by him a few days ago, it would seem he has not changed his opinion. Other sites have been suggested, and I may say I have my own view in regard to a site; but I could not think of placing my view as to the site for this dock against the view of an experienced professional man like Mr. O'Connor; therefore I am prepared to follow his advice in regard to a site for this dock. My friend the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans) made some observations this afternoon in regard to the action of the member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth); and although I do not want to be unduly hard on the leader of the Opposition or on those who sit on that side of the House—in fact, I never am hard on them—yet when I get an opportunity, and such a good one as I have to-night, I must take advantage of it. That is fair warfare of a friendly description. The hon. member (Mr. Illingworth) has told us that the action of members on the Opposition side in opposing all new works at the beginning of this session did not refer to the dock at Fremantle, as that was not a new work, but was a work which had been approved by Parliament, and for which a vote of money had been passed; and he said the reappropriation was only a temporary expedient for a time. Now the hon. member was wrong: his memory played him false in regard to that statement, because the Nannine railway is in the same position, and in fact in a better position in regard to the approval of this House having been given than is the Fremantle dock, because although the

Legislature has approved of the Nannine railway, and the money for it was voted and a special Act passed authorising the construction of the railway along a particular route —

[MR. ILLINGWORTH made a communication to the Speaker.]

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member (the Premier) must not quote from the *Hansard* report of this session.

THE PREMIER: I should advise the hon. member (Mr. Illingworth), when he wishes to communicate with the Speaker, to get some friend to do it, and not to do it himself so openly as he has done on this occasion. I can quote what the hon. member said without looking at the report. He said he was in favour of building a railway to Tuckanarra, one to Bonnievale, also one from Port Hedland to Marble Bar, and was in favour of building railways everywhere. I asked if the hon. member was prepared to build a railway to Tuckanarra. He said he was in favour of building a railway to that place, and was prepared to approve of the building of many other railways, but that he was not in favour of this moribund Parliament building any of these railways; that he would oppose the building of a line to Tuckanarra by this Parliament, even if he lost his seat through it, because he had his duty to the country to consider, and would vote against a railway to Tuckanarra.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That is the part you are incorrect in.

THE PREMIER: I said: "Would you not vote for a railway to Tuckanarra?" He said, "Not to Tuckanarra."

MR. ILLINGWORTH: "Or any other place," I said.

THE PREMIER: "Or a yard beyond it," he said. That is what the hon. member said. Now I think the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans) was perfectly right when he charged the hon. member with inconsistency. The hon. member is willing to build this dock, which will cost £200,000 or more.

MR. MONGER: A quarter of a million.

THE PREMIER: I believe it will cost a quarter of a million, or nearly as much—he was quite willing this work should be done immediately, because this House had approved of it; but he was not willing to build the railway to Nannine a little while ago, although this House had

approved of that, and he was not willing the other night to build a railway to Norseman, although that line had also been approved by this House. I say the hon. member has been thoroughly inconsistent, and as regards some other members opposite, even my friends the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Solomon) and the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes), though not quite as inconsistent, are almost as inconsistent as he, because they said, "We must not undertake any new works." Now, carrying out that principle, I do not know whether they will vote against the Nannine railway, which has not yet come up for consideration, but they have certainly voted against the Norseman railway, a work approved by this House last session. Therefore I think hon. members opposite are, in regard to this matter, thoroughly inconsistent—those of them who wish the Government to spend money on works not yet commenced. What was the motion moved by the member for East Coolgardie (Mr. Moran) and supported by hon. members opposite? No new works were to be commenced: it did not matter whether they had been authorised or not. Here we find the very same members who were willing then to drive the Government out so as to stop their doing any new works, even if such works had been authorised by Parliament; here we see those very members to-night urging the Government to enter at once upon the construction of new work—a work not commenced, and to cost a quarter of a million. Well, I do not mind that. I am very glad to see that there is a change come o'er the spirit of the dream.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You have converted us, you know.

THE PREMIER: If the hon. member will admit that he is converted, I will say no more. I do not take it he is converted. If the hon. member, however, will allow me to sit down with the feeling that he has been converted, and that he no longer feels in regard to the condition of this colony and its financial position as he felt at the beginning of the session, I need not say one single word. I have no objection to this motion: it is only carrying out what the Government always intended to do. It will be of some little assistance to us, for it shows this House

is in thorough accord with the action the Government intend to take.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I will tell you about the finances to-morrow night.

MR. WILSON (Canning): If I may be pardoned for using a vulgarism—

THE PREMIER: Do not do that!

MR. WILSON: I should say the Forrest "chickens have come to home to roost." We have been pointing out from the Opposition benches for years past the bad policy of this reappropriation business, which has for so long been a plank in the Premier's platform; the reappropriation of moneys from works authorised by this House, and the spending of such moneys on other works. From time to time we have pointed out the danger of this policy.

THE PREMIER: There is no danger at all.

MR. WILSON: To my own knowledge, we must have pointed out the dangers of the system at least a dozen times, and debated the subject in this House. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: Hear hear.] What do we find to-night? We find the Ministry are in the position that an urgent work which was sanctioned four years ago by Parliament is not yet ready to be undertaken.

THE PREMIER: There is the Engineer-in-Chief's reason.

MR. WILSON: The reason—yes; I will deal with the reason presently. And we find the right hon. gentleman would wish to carry on the old system of projecting fresh works in this House, such as the Coolgardie-Norseman railway, not, in my opinion, with the intention during this year or ery possibly during next year of spending a five-pound note upon that work, but in order that he may get a new authorisation, and thus be able to raise fresh money. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: Hear, hear.] That is the position as it appears to us; and I say that members on this (Opposition) and indeed on the other (Government) side of the House were perfectly consistent in opposing new authorisations. They pointed out that the works which Parliament had authorised the Government to carry out were sufficient for the next twelve months or two years, and what we wanted to see was a proper start made with the works which had been authorised before we granted any fresh authorisations for

further borrowings. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: Hear, hear.] That is the position; yet we have the Premier accusing us to-night of being inconsistent. It does not matter what words we used on the occasion, or whether the leader of the Opposition made a slip. If he did—I do not know that he did—but if he did make a slip in expressing his opinions, that has nothing to do with the principle. The principle remains that we wish the Government to stop this procrastinating policy of getting works approved in the House and never carrying them out, or of waiting for years until the opportunity is gone, until the country at large has suffered for the want of those works. The same arguments which were adduced in connection with the Junction Workshops apply in this case, that the decisions of Parliament have been flouted, that urgent works have been passed here, and yet we have the Government holding back and practically refusing to carry out the instructions of Parliament. For members of the Opposition I must say that whenever we have opposed the policy of the Government, and especially when we were speaking and debating the no-confidence motion moved in this House a short time ago, we pointed out that in our opinion the financial position of the country did not warrant the construction of fresh public works out of loan funds. And at the same time we pointed out most emphatically that there were works like the Fremantle Harbour Works, including this dry dock, which must of necessity be completed by any Government that might be in power. And where does the inconsistency come in? We have to spend close on a million of money, I believe, for those harbour works. Every practical man in the House knows full well that the harbour works will not be complete without a dry dock; and yet, although the work has been authorised and the money voted, not one thing has been done to carry out the vote of this House. I made a mistake: I think something has been done, and done some three years ago. I believe the pumping machinery has been ordered. The last thing that ought to have been done by the engineering staff was done some three years ago, despite the fact that the Engineer-in-Chief says that he knew all along that he

could not commence this work until he had a certain amount of dredging done. But I would point out in regard to this dredging that if the Premier be correct in his statement that the site has not yet been definitely arranged or fixed upon—

THE PREMIER: I did not say so.

MR. WILSON: I understood you to say so.

THE PREMIER: I said I had never heard that the Engineer-in-Chief had changed his mind as to the site.

MR. WILSON: I was about to point out that if the site has not been definitely fixed upon—but I presume now it has been fixed—if it were not fixed upon then, where did the argument about the dredging come in? Because it is just possible that the dock might be constructed in some portion of the harbour which has already been dredged. The Administrator's Speech certainly mentioned this dry dock with fresh hope—a hope that it would be commenced shortly. But was not the dry dock mentioned in the Governor's Speech of 1896, some four years ago? I presume it found a place there, and perhaps it was mentioned subsequently. Therefore what was mentioned in the Governor's Speech, and indeed what is voted by the House, apparently goes for nothing. It appears to me that the Government feel that they have the right and the power to ignore everything, no matter whether mentioned in the Governor's Speech as their policy or not, or whether voted and carried in this House: they are going to bide their own time, and not seek to suit the convenience of the public or the country. It is merely a question of whether it suits the policy of the Ministry. Now I for one protest strongly against this policy. I do object to the decisions of the House being flouted in this manner. I spoke strongly the other evening as to the workshops, and I speak strongly again now. I say that when Parliament decides that a work is urgent and necessary in the interest of the whole country, then it is the duty of the Government to carry out that work as quickly as possible, or at all events to give sound reasons why it should be delayed. That argument, I take it, is unanswerable, and I for one will not be a party to aiding and abetting the Premier and his Ministers in delaying

any longer the works which have been sanctioned by this House.

THE PREMIER: Then you will help us with the Nannine Railway?

MR. WILSON: I am not at the present time considering the question of the Nannine Railway.

THE PREMIER: I know you are not.

MR. WILSON: When the Nannine Railway comes before the House, I will be quite prepared to give my opinions with regard to it and to vote according to my convictions. I was about to say that I am not pleading for this dry dock on behalf of Fremantle, and I do not think it right for any member to cast in the teeth of the members for Fremantle that they are seeking for something for their own district specially and alone, because I take it that this is a work which affects the whole colony of Western Australia. If we are going to make a success of the Fremantle Harbour Works, if it is our wish, as it is our duty, to cheapen the oversea freights between foreign ports and Western Australia, then we must give facilities to the shipping which use our harbour; and I say it is a crying shame that this great, this necessary work, has not been put in hand at least two years ago. There is another aspect to the question. As we go on in the federal movement, having decided to throw in our lot with the other colonies in federation, we hope and it is our intention to make Fremantle the terminal port in Western Australia. We hope to have steamers trading backward and forward between Fremantle and the other ports of our country; and we trust those steamers will be like the Singapore boats, like the one boat—I think the “Bullarra”—which trades between Fremantle and the North-West ports: we hope to have scores of steamers making Fremantle their terminal port; and of necessity they must have facilities for repairs and overhaul at that port. Then we shall, possibly, have Fremantle made, to some extent, a naval station. We shall have the gunboats coming there, and, in addition, we of course already have the leading mail boats; and taking into consideration that possibly two years will be required to build this work, surely it is our duty to at once undertake it: in fact, as hon. members have pointed out, the work ought to have been pretty well

out of hand at the present time. And although I advocate this dry dock being constructed immediately in the interests of the whole colony, yet it is going to bring a great amount of prosperity to Fremantle itself, and to North Fremantle especially. The locomotive shops, we will admit, must be removed; but if we construct this dry dock, we are going to build up ship-repairing yards, engineering works and foundries which will be established in our midst; and so we shall have much larger and more profitable industries than the Fremantle locomotive shops have ever proved to that town. Another advantage of course, and one which we cannot overlook, is the fact that the dock will assist to make this harbour a reproductive work. No doubt the harbour dues gathered from the shipping will go a long way towards paying the interest on the cost of construction, and possibly the sinking fund; but I would point out that a dry dock there, capable of taking steamers of large dimensions such as visit our port to-day, will benefit our revenue enormously, and will ensure the financial success of our harbour works.

THE PREMIER: You do not say the dock itself will be a financial success?

MR. WILSON: I do.

THE PREMIER: Such docks are not generally financially successful.

MR. WILSON: I do say so. If the Government would sanction the construction of the work by private enterprise, I should be very glad to raise the capital.

THE PREMIER: I suppose you would go to London to float a company?

MR. WILSON: Certainly. Why, you would go to London in the same way. What does the Premier do but go to London to float his loans? I consider that if private enterprise constructed that dry dock, we should just follow out the course the right hon. gentleman follows. He says it is not I who would do it, if I went on the London market to raise the capital; therefore, if that be so, it is not he who carries out the great works of this country.

MR. DOHERTY: “Sharks” do not get anything out of it.

MR. WILSON: The “sharks” do get something out of it.

MR. VOSPER: They will take good care of that.

MR. WILSON: People do not raise loans out of love for the country or out of respect for the right hon. gentleman. They raise a loan to make a profit, the same as anyone else would do. If the right hon. gentleman is not prepared to carry out this work, it is a good and justifiable work to place in the hands of private enterprise. The dock could have been constructed long ago by private enterprise.

THE PREMIER: Advocates of private enterprise always say that.

MR. WILSON: With a dog-in-the-manger policy, the Premier cannot do this himself and he will not allow anyone else to do it, the consequence being that the colony is suffering. Instead of going ahead and providing facilities for a greater amount of shipping and for a larger population, we must abide the time when it will be convenient for the Government to carry out the work. I want, in conclusion, to point out that there are very few harbours, indeed I think there are none, in the whole of the Australasian group, of the size and importance of Fremantle, without the facility of a graving dock.

THE PREMIER: There is Port Adelaide, anyway.

A MEMBER: She is building one.

MR. WILSON: I do not think Adelaide is to be compared to Fremantle. She has not the same position; she has no roadstead for ships; and if the ships went there, they could not get to the harbour.

THE PREMIER: They go up the river.

MR. WILSON: You cannot get them up the river.

THE PREMIER: Most of them go up the river.

MR. WILSON: The fact remains that at Fremantle a ship has to be patched up as best it may in our harbour, and sent round to other colonies, at serious risk and enormous cost, before it can be properly overhauled and repaired. What is stopping us? We are stopped because the Engineer-in-Chief has reported that he cannot start the work until some dredging is done. Dredging was done quickly enough some time ago on the north side of the harbour. I believe it was done in six or seven months. Do you mean to say that the dredging at the site of a graving dock could not be done in the same time? There is nothing to prevent

the work from being taken in hand forthwith. Let them dredge the channel, and make use of the machinery which is lying idle at Fremantle.

THE PREMIER: You will have to get the money.

MR. DOHERTY (North Fremantle): On this subject I represent one of the Fremantle constituencies. I really let the thing "go," because I am certain that the House in its wisdom will carry the motion of the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Solomon). It is folly to point out to us that we threw out the Norseman Railway Bill, which has no analogy to the port of Fremantle. That railway would have been to an inland town, and it would not have paid for the grease on the axle wheels. The harbour works at Fremantle relate to all the shipping in Australia, and if we had a graving dock it would bring labour to our market, and give employment to a large number of people. Our firm had experience on two occasions last year in relation to a steamer. That steamer had to go into the port at Melbourne, and it cost us a great deal of expense and a great loss of time. I think we spent £6,000 in Melbourne, and it might as well have been spent in Fremantle. The spending of that money would have been of great benefit to Fremantle and North Fremantle, and it would have assisted the labour market here. Many aspects of the question have been pointed out by the member for the Canning (Mr. Wilson), and I am pleased to see that for once he supports the members for Fremantle.

MR. WILSON: Every time.

MR. DOHERTY: I say he does so in this instance because I am certain about it. He ably supports the members for Fremantle on this occasion. I need not labour the question. There will never be a great port until a graving dock is established, and I ask the House to carry without any further delay the motion of my friend the member for South Fremantle.

MR. GREGORY (North Coolgardie): I intend to give the motion my support, and I wish to say a few words on this occasion. There are many works the Government have been proposing of late which I should have been pleased to support, but owing to the large amount of work which has been previously

authorised by Parliament, I thought it necessary that we should curtail any new expense until some of those works which had been passed by Parliament have been proceeded with.

THE PREMIER: Which do you refer to?

MR. GREGORY: I am referring to the dry dock and the Norseman Railway.

THE PREMIER: Which do you want us to go on with particularly?

MR. GREGORY: I think this should be proceeded with. In 1895 Parliament agreed to the construction of this work, and a large sum of money was voted to the Government for this purpose. It is time some commencement was made with the work. The whole of the money has not been reappropriated. I believe this work would be fairly remunerative, and it would find employment for a large number of people. It would tend to make Fremantle a much better port than at present, therefore I intend to give the motion my support.

MR. CONNOR: Shall I be in order in asking to withdraw my amendment?

THE SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. MONGER: If the hon. member intends to withdraw his amendment, I wish to speak to it.

MR. MORAN: The proper thing to do is to have the words "as soon as possible."

THE PREMIER: You cannot do it quicker than that.

MR. CONNOR: I will let my amendment stand.

MR. MORAN (East Coolgardie): In offering a few remarks, I think the party from which this motion comes are amongst those who say the finances of the colony will not stand any fresh work this session.

MR. WILSON: This is not a fresh work.

MR. MORAN: I maintain that it is a fresh work. Consistency is a jewel, seldom found in a woman but never in a politician. However, we will endeavour to be consistent on this point. What is the use of authorising or asking the Government to start this work immediately? What does "immediately" mean? They have to get the money somewhere. We say they cannot get the money, and that if they do get it there are other things

more urgent than the dock at Fremantle to be done at the present time.

THE PREMIER: If you say we cannot do it, of course it must be so.

MR. MORAN: If you can get it, by all means go ahead with this work. Are the Government opposing this?

THE PREMIER: The responsibility of getting the money is not in any way with you.

MR. MORAN: Just as much with me as with the Premier. The Premier has had the responsibility for ten years, and he apparently fancies that no one else has any responsibility for anything.

THE PREMIER: You know a lot about raising money, no doubt.

MR. MORAN: The Premier is too fond of what we call "throwing off" about people who have the temerity to say anything concerning the finances of the colony. I object to that. I think it is not a proper thing.

THE PREMIER: What do you know about raising money in London?

MR. MORAN: If I did not know a little better than the Premier knew when he placed his last loan, I think I would not have dealt with the matter. I cannot say what he knows about raising money in London. He knows what he is told by his responsible advisers. I do not suppose he knows the position of the London market better than anyone else, nor do I suppose that he has any intuition more than any other mortal. I venture to say the present is not the time to bandy words over this matter, because evidently the Premier is not going to trouble the London money market very much longer; therefore whoever will have to do it, he will not be the one. Seeing that the finances of the country are in an unsatisfactory state, according to a majority of the House, who said we should not start the Norseman railway principally because of that reason—

THE PREMIER: I deny that. You have no justification for saying that.

MR. MORAN: I think I have justification for saying it, in this way, that a majority of that particular section of the House which enabled an adverse motion to be carried against the Norseman railway, view these public works from the standpoint that at the present moment it is inopportune to increase the probable burden on the people of the colony.

THE PREMIER: Do you think that was the reason?

MR. MORAN: I think so.

THE PREMIER: Is that the reason why the Fremantle members voted?

MR. MORAN: I think I gave the Fremantle members credit for voting conscientiously in this matter. There was no reason for their doing otherwise. I know the seven members responsible for carrying that motion against the Norseman railway did it wholly and solely with the view that at the present moment it would be unsatisfactory to enter upon such an undertaking, seeing the general election is so close and that the money market is not in a satisfactory condition. I do not refer to Western Australia's position particularly; but I say the money market of the world has been in a very unsatisfactory position. The discount has been very high at home, and we know that trouble in the political world has made the money market very mixed up. To instruct the Government to commence this work immediately would be out of keeping with the policy we have taken up. I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment of the member for East Kimberley (Mr. Connor), which says it is desirable that this should be done "as soon as possible." I would not like to say how soon that will be.

MR. SOLOMON: I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

Amendment put and passed, and the motion as amended agreed to.

MOTION—PROSPECTING, VOTE TO ENCOURAGE.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that provision be made in the Estimates for a vote for the encouragement of prospecting,

He said: I do not consider in moving a motion of this nature it is necessary to speak at any length. All members will be agreed that the prosperity and progress of the colony depend on the rapid development of our gold industry more particularly, and our mineral industries generally. It is pretty obvious that we cannot continue to derive the benefits which we have been obtaining from the mining industry unless the borders of that industry are expanded; and it is

well known that there remains a very large area of unprospected country which is worthy of attention, and which we may reasonably assume to be auriferous or metalliferous. We all know also the difficulties under which prospectors are placed in all parts of this colony—the difficulty of obtaining water and food and beasts of burden, in addition to which there are other troubles. We have seen recently how the loan of a few camels from the Government to a prospecting party led to the discovery of a large and wealthy mine, and an equally large and wealthy law-suit. That is a reason why we should encourage prospecting. Perhaps no better argument could be adduced for encouragement to be given, to the utmost power of the Government. It is worthy of note that in every colony except this there is a sum annually placed on the Estimates for the encouragement of prospecting for gold and other minerals; and I do think that this colony, occupying as it does the premier position as a gold-producer and being more dependent on the gold-mining industry than any of the other colonies, should follow that example and should do it as quickly as possible. I may add that if, as the Estimates stand at present, the Premier does not find it convenient to provide a sum for this purpose, he may consider what he can do in that way when he brings in the Supplementary Estimates,

MR. MORGANS (Coolgardie): I have pleasure in supporting the motion, and I agree in what has been said in regard to the importance of a vote for this purpose.

THE PREMIER: How do you propose spending the money?

MR. MORAN: Leave it to Mr. Mulachi Dwyer: he will spend it.

MR. MORGANS: There will be no difficulty in spending it, though the manner of doing it will need some consideration. This colony has not been much prospected yet. It is true there are a few centres—Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, Norseman, and some others—but by far the largest area of the country is still unprospected; and no doubt there are many other parts of the colony which will prove some day, when properly prospected, to be as rich and valuable as is Kalgoorlie itself. There are various places within the colony where the foot of man has not yet trod; there are districts

in this colony within easy reach or in the track of the well-known gold-belt which stretches from Kimberley to Esperance; there are hundreds of thousands of acres that have not had the foot of a prospector on them yet. There is one thing to be said in regard to the prospector. I draw a strong distinction between the prospector and the alluvial miner. I say the alluvial miner has been credited with the opening up of this country; but with that opinion I do not agree, for I know that the men who have actually opened up the country are the prospectors—those who go out into the desert and find gold, and then seek the aid of capitalists. Through that channel it is that we have the country opened up by the prospectors; for, having made a find and got the aid of capitalists, these prospectors are not satisfied to sit down, but they start again into the desert to prospect still farther. The prospector is well worthy of any help the Government can give him, and there is no better class of men in this country than the prospectors. Some of them go into the most difficult places and discover splendid deposits, and as soon as they have disposed of them they have gone still farther out and done splendid work for this country. In regard to the means of spending the money which is asked for in this motion, I admit there would be some difficulty; but that difficulty might be removed with the aid of wardens and registrars on the various goldfields, and there is no reason why some system could not be devised whereby an effective and proper control could be exercised over the prospecting vote.

MR. VOSPER: We have the example of Victoria.

MR. MORGANS: Yes; as the hon. member says, there is the example of other colonies, though I do not know what their experience has been; but it should not be impossible to devise some plan for the distribution of this money, and, as practical men, we in this House and others in the country could surely find some effective means of controlling the expenditure. The class of men who do deserve liberal encouragement at the hands of this country and this House are the prospectors.

MR. GREGORY (North Coolgardie): I rise to ask that the debate be adjourned.

The matter is an important one, and I do not like the idea of the Government putting money on the Estimates for this purpose, because there are other means which can be adopted for assisting prospectors. I move that the debate be adjourned till this day week.

Motion put and passed, and the debate adjourned accordingly.

MOTION—FEDERATION REFERENDUM, IMPROPER ISSUE OF CERTIFICATES.

MR. MONGER (York) moved:

That, in view of the unsatisfactory replies to inquiries made by the Government in connection with the improper issue of voters' certificates at the recent referendum, farther steps be taken.

Earlier in the session I put several questions to the Premier on this matter. I asked him whether his attention had been called to the way in which voters' certificates had been issued by certain persons on the goldfields, at the recent referendum. In replying to this question, the right hon. gentleman gave certain replies, and subsequently he placed on the table certain communications, the result of the questions which I had submitted to him. After these papers had been put on the table of this House, I asked the Premier farther whether it was not the intention of the Government to take any notice of the replies which had been given to the various questions submitted to the gentlemen to whom my original question referred, through the Warden or Resident Magistrate of the particular district. The Premier said, in response to that farther question (which I had asked without notice), that until some motion was tabled in this House the Government did not desire to proceed farther in the matter. In consequence of that statement, I have submitted this motion to the House; and I now desire to call the attention of hon. members, and particularly the Premier and the Attorney General, firstly to the notice which appeared in the *Morning Herald* of the 2nd August, in regard to the improper issue of certificates for voting, and secondly in regard to the letter which was submitted to the returning officer in the referendum, through the Chief Under Secretary, Mr. Oct. Burt, in which he submitted certain questions. I desire the attention of those Ministers particularly to the reply which was sent

by one of those gentlemen to Mr. Warden Finnerty at Coolgardie, as follows:

Semaphore Chambers, Kalgoorlie,
August 14, 1900.

SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of 13th inst., from which it appears the Government are dissatisfied with the method adopted by me in issuing certificates, to which I can only reply that in similar circumstances I would act in a similar way. I do not feel called upon to offer any explanation, nor have I the time or inclination to submit a report.

I have, etc.,

W. R. BURTON.

I say that in the face of this reply which was sent to Mr. Warden Finnerty, and has been placed on the table of this House among the papers presented, it is the duty of the Government to call on Mr. W. R. Burton for some further explanation. I want to go one point farther, and say that as far as the referendum was concerned, and as to the way in which it was carried out in connection with the voting at Kalgoorlie, it was wrong from start to finish. I am desirous that this gentleman whose letter I have read to the House should be called on by the Government to give some farther explanation than that which he has thought fit to give in response to the letter sent to him through Mr. Warden Finnerty. As far as the other persons mentioned are concerned, they had the politeness, at all events, to give or try to give satisfactory explanations for the line of action they took. This gentleman (Mr. Burton), a justice of the peace for the magisterial district of Coolgardie, has tendered, in response to a most polite and delicately-worded letter from the Warden, a reply which I consider most unpolite. I desire to bring these matters under the notice of hon. members, and ask them to join with me in requesting the Government to call on the gentleman to whom I have particularly referred for some farther explanation.

MR. LOCKE (Sussex): I second the motion.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie): I have had the doubtful privilege of having been the first person to call attention to this matter on the goldfields. In Kalgoorlie, I was accused at the time in the local Press, and by persons outside, of having called attention to this matter from a feeling of disappointment or

spleen at the result of the referendum on the question of Federation. Hon. members who have known me in this House for some years will, doubtless, believe that my action in the matter was not prompted by any such mean motive; and, even if I had been so actuated at the time, it must be obvious that this feeling of disappointment at the result of the referendum would have worn off by this time. We all recognise the result of the referendum, that it was a fair one, and I am quite prepared to accept the result, and even to rejoice with the victors. I may say that any person who would do what I was accused of doing at Kalgoorlie, simply because he happened to belong to the defeated party, would be unworthy of the name of a man; and I distinctly disclaim any such design on my part in first bringing the matter under the notice of the authorities. If there be any guarantee of the liberties we enjoy under the constitution, it consists in the purity of the ballot-box being maintained; and any person who endeavours to interfere with it in the slightest degree, for the purpose of gaining some electioneering advantage, is taking a course highly dangerous to the constitution; and no matter who he may be, or how high his position, or whatever his political views may be, I should use the same language to one in political sympathy with myself as I would use to an opponent, on this question. What occurred at Kalgoorlie was this. During the conduct of the referendum, for some reason or other the Enabling Act passed by this Parliament was set at defiance and treated with contempt by certain persons on the goldfields who were entrusted by the Government with the task of supplying voting papers to the electors; and those papers were supplied without any proper care or check for preventing improper use of them, and they were allowed to get into the hands of unauthorised persons, who hawked them about in a most indiscriminate and unblushing manner.

MR. MORGANS: Who are the offenders?

MR. VOSPER: The principal offender was Mr. W. R. Burton, whose letter has been read to this House. The papers have been on the table of the House for the last month. Two of these people were written to—Mr. Hugh Mahon, a

justice of the peace, and Mr. W. B. Burton, also a justice. Mr. Mahon has furnished the Government with a reply, in which he sets forth that his action was owing to his interpretation of the Act and his interpretation of the instructions forwarded to him by the returning officer. And I can quite understand, reading the Act and the instructions, that a mistaken interpretation might possibly arise, and I therefore believe that Mr. Mahon was acting in good faith; and especially as he has taken the trouble to defend himself, we may drop his case. With regard to Mr. Burton, the matter is otherwise. I had the privilege of personally seeing how some of this work was carried out. I believe the greatest fault committed by Mr. Mahon was that he allowed people in his office and others immediately under his control to fill up forms and accept the signatures of applicants for voters' certificates; but Mr. Burton was a prominent member of the Federal League, and the books of certificates which were given to Mr. Burton to get filled up were handed over by him—so I am informed—to the paid canvassers of the Federal League, and were by them hawked about from door to door, and the signatures taken anyhow by any person, and without any attesting witness or other safeguard.

MR. MONGER: That is more than confirmed by Warden Finnerty's evidence.

MR. VOSPER: That is more than confirmed by the evidence which has been laid upon the table. This man is asked for an explanation by Warden Finnerty in a very courteous and polite manner, acting under instructions from his superior officer; and the only reply from Mr. Burton is an absolutely insolent refusal to afford any explanation. Now, my opinion of such a person—and I do not say this with any degree of political rancour, but I say it fearlessly—is that he is absolutely unfit to be entrusted with the work of an assistant returning officer, and I doubt very much his fitness for administering justice. [MR. MONGER: Hear, hear.] I hold also the view that we must above all things maintain the purity of the ballot-box, and I say that this is a matter which calls for rigid inquiry. I do not know what steps can be taken to force this person to explain his action; but if there be any coercion possible, I think it should most certainly

be exercised; because I think even the most ardent federalist in this House will agree with me that whether the result of this interference with the ballot-box be for or against his cause, he cannot allow the machinery of the constitution to be tampered with; because, if we do so, we corrupt the very foundations of political life; we strike a blow at the very foundations of our liberties; and a person who would so tamper with the ballot-box for any political purpose whatsoever ought to be treated as a man utterly unworthy of public trust. This man has been asked to defend himself on certain definite charges, and has refused in a manner absolutely insulting to the Government, to this House, and to the officer charged with the prosecution of these inquiries; and I contend that this House and the Government cannot allow the matter to rest where it is, and we should pursue the inquiry to its utmost limits, and discover fully how far we can go in making these persons responsible for their action, in any way that justice demands. I shall certainly support the motion.

MR. A. FORREST (West Kimberley): It is due to this House and the country that the Government should take some action on this matter. Here is one of Her Majesty's justices of the peace who flouts the warden and flouts the Government, and who will give no reasons for his action. It practically comes to this, that unless we take some action, there is no doubt this person will carry on the same game next time. I cannot understand why the Government have not long ago removed the names of those three justices of the peace, for any one of them is as bad as the others. If the Government are frightened to take off these names, let us have a vote in this House, and have them off. [A MEMBER: Hear, hear.] I may say this House will vote almost unanimously on that point, because those persons are not fit and proper men to hold the commission of Her Majesty. Their whole conduct recently is such that decent people can hardly realise the fact that these men, the proprietors and the editor of a goldfields newspaper, are belittling the whole of the people of the colony. They have held up my friend, the Attorney General, to public ridicule in the Press, and when they are brought

face to face with a Select Committee of this House, they admit they had no ground whatever to go on: they own up to that. Are these proper persons to be on the commission of the peace? I say it behoves this House to deal with men of this stamp. If they were appointed justices some years ago and have abused their positions, then it is time, if the Government will not take action, that we should move to have something done. We must pass a motion calling upon the Government to ask these gentlemen to resign, and if they do not resign, the Government should issue a new *Gazette*, leaving out their names. A question is raised by the member for North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper) and the member for York (Mr. Monger) with reference to the action of Mr. Burton. I have never met that gentleman, and I am not prejudiced against him in any way at all.

MR. MONGER: Neither have I met him.

MR. A. FORREST: But I do not know what to make of him. Charges are brought against him by the Government; the warden writes to him politely; and, in reply, Mr. Burton says he will do it again. Well, there is only one way to deal with such a man, namely the way in which I should deal with him if he had anything to do with me. I should get rid of him quickly. I support this motion, and hope the feeling of this House will justify the Government in coming to some conclusion. I hope hon. members will not be afraid to get up in their places: I hope they will not be frightened of this newspaper, but will give their opinions freely on the case now before this honourable House.

MR. MORAN (East Coolgardie): The trouble in this case is certainly the want of sorrow, or want of an expression of regret, at having done an injury, rather than the enormity of the wrong committed. I took some little trouble, during the referendum in Kalgoorlie, to find out how things were being conducted, and I went to one of the registrars and asked him if he would kindly inform me whether he was sending out blank books of forms of electors' rights broadcast throughout the town. He said that was quite true; that he had been instructed by the Reform League, and could not find he was doing

wrong. I said, "It is a remarkable thing that you should do this, because, in my judgment, 'personal application' means a personal application to you by the person who wishes to get the vote." He said, "I do not read it that way"; and we went through the Act carefully, and there was some little doubt as to whether he was doing wrong. I believe one of those assistant registrars, when written to by Warden Finnerty, offered what I considered a fairly satisfactory explanation: at any rate, he did not reply in insolence, or exhibit any high-handed refusal to explain. He did not flout the authority of the warden or of the Government, but endeavoured to point out where a man might make a mistake; and there is therefore something to say on his behalf. But I take it the mistake in Mr. Burton's case is that, being written to on a grave matter like this, he should have replied in that most extraordinary manner which he adopted. But I warn this Parliament to be very careful. This House does not know what it is tackling if it tackles Mr. Burton, and I warn the House to beware.

MR. MONGER: I am not afraid.

MR. MORAN: Mr. Burton is a man of very large influence and great determination of character, and the House should be careful of what it is doing. Mr. Burton is well known in public life, and I warn the House not to do anything rash. It might be like the British troops trying to catch De Wet.

MR. VOSPER: Let us keep out of the "wet."

MR. MORAN: But if the House only knew what is commonly known on the goldfields in reference to certain justices of the peace, it would not waste time over a trifle like this. I may tell the House that things in connection with certain goldfields justices are not at all satisfactory.

MR. VOSPER: Absolutely rotten.

MR. MORAN: I assure the House there are firms of solicitors on the goldfields and business people who could tell a very peculiar tale, or several tales.

MR. MONGER: Let us have the information.

MR. MORAN: Well, I do not want to say much; only that a little purification is at the present moment urgently required; and Baxter and Rappiport, up

to the present, may have held the belt; but who can say as to the future?

MR. VOSPER: Do people pay a retaining fee to the magistrate as well as to the lawyer?

MR. MORAN: I say that if the Government were to be a little more careful in the appointment of justices, it would be well. Of course the Government are not to blame, because a man is never known until he is tried, and the Government generally appoint justices at the request of the warden for the district or of other influential people in the neighbourhood; but it is certainly time that certain little things were looked into in this country, because I can assure the Government that the administration of justice, not generally but in a few limited and well known cases, by justices of the peace, wants looking into closely. If the Attorney General likes to lend his ears to what he will commonly hear reported, if he ever goes up to that neighbourhood, he will not be long in arriving at the conclusion that a little purification will not do the country any harm.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I am sorry to hear what the last speaker has said with regard to the administration of the law on the gold-fields. I can say that very few instances have come under my notice in which charges have been made against justices of the peace. One or two cases have come to my knowledge, and we have tried to get rid of the justices when we could. But if hon. members or the people in the district will not bring such cases under the notice of the Government, it is not very easy for the Government to take action. In any case, it is a difficult matter and requires a great deal of care, because of the enormity of the offence. To charge a justice with acting improperly is a very serious matter, and the charge is not easy to prove. In regard to the matter under consideration, I must say that I cannot make any excuse for the action of the assistant registrars, who happen to be also justices of the peace, in issuing those voters' certificates or sending them away by other persons to be signed by the voters. The instructions are as clear as they can be; and I cannot understand the member for East Coolgardie (Mr. Moran) in thinking there is any doubt about the matter; nor can

I understand, if he read this statute over with the person who was administering it, how any other conclusion could have been arrived at than that the assistant registrar was doing wrong.

MR. MORAN: That was my opinion, and is still.

THE PREMIER: What does the statute say? It says that any adult person of either sex may obtain a voter's certificate—how?—"on making application therefor in the form of the second schedule hereto, to the registrar or an assistant registrar of the electoral district in which such person resides."

MR. MORAN: It does not say "personal application," after all.

THE PREMIER: But he must make the application personally.

MR. MORAN: Yes; or in writing. They filled up the forms.

THE PREMIER: How is it to be made?—"on any week day except Saturdays, between the hours of 9 and 11, and on Saturday between 9 and 9, up to and including the 28th day of July, 1900." And the next sub-section says, "the counterfoil shall be in the form of the third schedule, and shall be signed by the electoral registrar or the assistant registrar issuing the same." Surely that infers that the two of them had to sign. The Act said voters' certificates issued should be numbered consecutively. Some may have been handed about to third parties, and may not have been distributed at all. Perhaps a dozen or twenty or even a hundred or a thousand may have been taken out by a paid canvasser, and failing to get anyone to fill them up, that canvasser may have said "I could not get any; I exhausted the district." In that case, where are the consecutive numbers? The whole thing is absurd. Then again if a voter obtained his certificate, he had to produce it to the assistant returning officer or the presiding officer, as Section 4 provides:—

Any person to whom a voter's certificate is issued may, on producing and delivering up the same to the assistant returning officer or other presiding officer, vote at the polling place therein named within the electoral district for which such certificate was issued, but not elsewhere.

Then the assistant returning officer could insist on each voter signing.

MR. MORAN: That is all right.

THE PREMIER: The whole thing is as plain as a pikestaff to anyone desiring to read it and wanting to understand it; and I think it is a gross scandal that this plan was adopted by those who were entrusted with the duty in Kalgoorlie. Surely there was no occasion for this.

MR. MORAN: They all did it.

THE PREMIER: The population was circumscribed in a small area, where there were numerous polling places, registrars, and assistant registrars, and where there was supposed to be more interest in this question than in any other part of the colony. There was no reason for this course. It is, I say, a scandal and disgrace to those who took part in it. The reason why the Government have not taken any action in regard to these justices of the peace is this. I think Mr. Burton's conduct more reprehensible than that of others; but you must remember these are two justices of the peace, with intelligence; they are not persons who do not know and do not understand, but they are very intelligent persons; and it is mere subterfuge to tell me they did not know they were doing wrong. One seems to make some excuse, but the other is insolent. I have met Mr. Burton, who was a justice of the peace at Esperance. When he came to Kalgoorlie he was anxious to be made a justice of the peace for Kalgoorlie, and he was really appointed there by the Government.

MR. MORAN: Nobody asked you.

THE PREMIER: I think he is unworthy of being a justice of the peace, and I believe that is the view of this House. I shall have much pleasure in asking His Excellency the Administrator to remove him from the magisterial bench.

MR. MONGER: The other man ought to resign.

Motion put and passed.

PAPERS—WYNDHAM ABORIGINE CHILD, AND MRS. DURACK.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie) moved:

That all papers, including copies of depositions in connection with the case against a Mrs. Durack, of Wyndham, for the alleged illtreatment of an aboriginal child, be laid upon the table of the House.

This was a case that came before the police court. He had written to two

persons, including the clerk of the court, in order to get hold of the depositions, but had not been able to obtain them.

The motion being seconded,

MR. CONNOR asked the hon. member to give some reason.

MR. VOSPER replied that he had done so. He wanted to get the depositions, and to find out what the matter was. There might be nothing in it.

Motion put and passed.

MOTION—PAYMENT OF MEMBERS, TO LEGISLATE.

Debate resumed from 20th September, on the motion by Mr. Gregory in favour of payment of members and immediate legislation.

MR. MITCHELL (Murchison): This debate was adjourned on the motion of the member for York (Mr. Monger), but by way of saving the time of the House I have an amendment to submit, if I am in order:

To strike out the words "future Parliaments," in the last line, and insert "Parliament" in lieu.

MR. J. F. T. HASSELL (Albany): I beg to second the amendment. My reason for doing so is that I was returned to this House on the express understanding that I should support payment of members during the present session of Parliament. There are several gentlemen who are likely to become candidates at the next general election, and if the question of payment of members be not settled now, those candidates may not be in a position to offer to represent constituencies in different parts of the country, because they will not know whether there is to be payment of members or not. As this is a matter I was requested by my electors to bring forward during the present meeting of Parliament, I have great pleasure in seconding the amendment.

MR. GREGORY: I accept the amendment.

MR. HUTCHINSON (Geraldton): I rise to support the amendment, and do so not only as one who supports the principle of payment of members, but as one who, like the member for Albany, has been sent here to support it not only for the future but for the present Parliament. It would be unfair for us to do anything in the way of providing for payment of a future Parliament and not do so for

members who are here now. According to the showing of the Premier last night, members who are in the House now have for a number of years—some of them for ten years—carried on the business of the colony.

THE PREMIER: They are not the ones who want payment of members.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Some of them want it as badly as I do.

THE PREMIER: I do not mean it personally, but they are not in favour of the principle.

MR. HUTCHINSON: It is not so much a question of whether we want it or not, as whether the country wants it, and whether we should provide what the country is asking for. To my mind, there is no doubt that the vast majority of the people of this country are in favour of the system.

THE PREMIER: Why not refer it to them?

MR. HUTCHINSON: The right hon. gentleman asks why not refer it to them? I do not believe in adopting the referendum for any question that may come along. If it be right for us to refer the question of payment of members to the country, it is right to refer to the country every railway and every work that requires to be built.

THE PREMIER: That is a very different matter.

MR. HUTCHINSON: If we were to refer every little question like this of payment of members—

THE PREMIER: A little question—£16,000 a year!

MR. HUTCHINSON: If we were to refer every little question to the country, the life of this Parliament would be taken away to a great extent. It would mean that members would not dare to say what they considered best and necessary for the country, without referring to the people every week or every month during the time they were assembled. It is not necessary for me to go over the arguments in favour of the principle of payment of members—they have been dealt with many times in the House; and it is only necessary for us to recollect that in every colony in Australasia this principle of payment of members has been adopted for years, and that the objections which can be raised against it now have been raised in every one of the other colonies,

and very few of the objections—indeed I do not think any of them—have ever been proved to be true. I recollect well that years ago when the question was being agitated in New South Wales, people said “You will get the House full of agitators”; but there are no more agitators in the House now in New South Wales or Victoria than there were before that principle was introduced. I believe the majority of the electors in this colony and in every other colony have sufficient good sense to know what sort of man they want to send into Parliament; and if the man they elect does not represent their views, they will have sufficient sense to get rid of him. If he goes into the House and does not represent their views, they will make known their opinions in such a manner that he will have no weight in the House, and the country will take very little interest in him. I cannot understand how anyone can argue that members who come here and devote six or eight months of the year, should not be paid for it. Are we expected to assist to the best of our ability in making the laws of the country, to do it for nothing, and at the same time to pay all who carry out the law? If so, we are expected to deprive ourselves of rights which are those of every man in private business, and do the country's work for nothing, a state of things which the country does not ask for, or look for, because the people are prepared to pay us, and we have no right to allow a feeling of false modesty to interfere with the bringing in of this Bill. It has been said outside the House, and probably it will be said inside, that it is not right for us to vote this money at the present stage, and for the Parliament now sitting. But it is quite probable that when a system of payment of members is put into law, the Legislative Council will also have to be included; and if that be the case, it is impossible for members of Parliament not to vote for payment to themselves, because the members of the Legislative Council do not go for election as members of the Assembly do, so that the former, at any rate, will have to vote themselves this salary, remuneration, or whatever it may be termed. I do not see any reason why we should not vote this salary for ourselves; because the majority of members know very well their constituents are in

favour of the principle, and it is our duty to ourselves and to them to vote for it now. I have no feeling of false modesty about the matter, because I consider every member who comes here should do what he considers right in the interests of the country, and ought not to be allowed to suffer financially. I intend to vote for the amendment, and I hope the majority of members will do likewise; because that would, at any rate, make it clear that those who will come in at the next general election will know their position, and the country will be able to send men knowing there is payment of members, and that there will be no excuse for any man who is returned, and does not attend to the business of the country.

MR. SOLOMON (South Fremantle) : It is my intention to support the amendment. I was sent here not with a pledge, but on the understanding that I should vote for payment of members, and for many years I have always done so, when the question has come before the House. I have always thought that payment of members would give a larger scope and choice to the electors, because there is many a man who possibly is not able to leave his business for a time without having somebody to attend to it while he is away on his parliamentary duties, and I consider that such a man should have some allowance, so that he can provide a substitute. I do not think the electors would require a man to neglect his business for the purpose of serving his country, because every man is worthy of his hire. Not only that, but in very many instances men have to neglect their business to such an extent that without their foreseeing the consequence they are led almost to their ruin. This question has been raised time after time, and on the last occasion it was decided to adopt the principle of the referendum. From what I understand however, the people do not require a referendum, but want the question settled before the next election, and desire to know whether future members are to be paid or not. No doubt if the question did go to a referendum the majority of the people would vote in favour of payment of members, and, at any rate, they desire the question settled once and for all.

MR. MONGER (York) : On all occasions when I have had the pleasure of speaking on this subject I have expressed myself opposed to the system of payment of members, and I have no occasion now, practically on the eve of the dissolution of Parliament, to differ from the ideas I expressed eight years ago. When I meet my constituents in a few months' time, I intend to express the same opinions on this question as when I first sought their suffrages, and if this big question is to be considered at all, there is but one way to decide it, and that is by means of a referendum to the whole of the people. Let everybody who desires to hold a position in Parliament appear before those whose suffrages he seeks, and express his opinions one way or the other; and I would hail with pleasure a referendum, hoping that the intelligence of the people would be such as to decide that, at all events for years to come, there shall be no payment of members. So long as I have an opportunity of expressing myself, it must be in that direction; and I am surprised to think that only the other day there should have emanated from the Legislative Council a motion carried, I believe unanimously, having the same object in view as the motion we are now considering.

THE PREMIER : Do you propose to give the Legislative Council payment, too?

MR. MONGER : I am sorry to think that members of the Legislative Council should have taken on themselves to bring forward such a proposal. I would like to see that body constructed on the same basis and with the same privileges as the Legislative Council in Victoria. Members of the Legislative Council are supposed to represent the wealth and intellect of Western Australia, and if they were on the same basis as the Chamber in Victoria, they would not for one moment think of making such a suggestion. I hope it will be a long time before Western Australia ever carries out such a motion as that of the member for North Coolgardie (Mr. Gregory), and that at the next general election, if the matter be referred to a referendum, the people will show sufficient intelligence to declare they will have independent men who do not seek election on chance of a paltry salary.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie) : I do not think this a question which requires much in the nature of argument. The referendum was a compromise suggested by the Premier two years ago.

THE PREMIER : It was one year ago, and it was accepted by everyone.

MR. VOSPER : That compromise was accepted, because it was impossible to get more, and for some reason or other the opinion of the House has changed, I am glad to say, because the compromise was one which did not meet with my favour. I was returned pledged to the principle of payment of members, and immediate payment at that.

THE PREMIER : The hon. member agreed to the compromise.

MR. VOSPER : It will be found in the pages of *Hansard* that I expressed regret at the arrangement. Speaking for myself, the only argument that need be adduced in favour of payment of members is that the labourer is worthy of his hire. So far as my constituency is concerned, I am pledged to the principle, and I take it the intention was that I should vote for payment, not for a future Parliament, but for myself and my colleagues in this Parliament.

MR. MORAN : What is a future Parliament?

MR. VOSPER : I do not know, and I will leave the question to some person more skilled in constitutional law than myself. I do not see why we should provide for future Parliaments, because, as has been said : "What has posterity done for us that we should do this for posterity?" The majority of members came pledged to the principle of payment of members in this Parliament and other Parliaments, and, consequently, we would have been justified in passing the motion in the first session. It is a matter of regret that the motion was not passed then, and we would do well to make up for lost time by passing the amendment, and thus declaring that not only should members of Parliament be paid, but that members of this Parliament are at least entitled to payment for the remaining period of their term.

MR. HIGHAM (Fremantle) : On the ground that the labourer is worthy of his hire, I certainly would be justified in accepting the amendment of the member

for the Murchison (Mr. Mitchell) ; but I fail to see why that hon. member should receive the support of members opposite to the amendment he has proposed. We have accepted the position we now hold without any recompense, and I think it is most discreditable to this Parliament—

MR. MORAN : Why?

MR. HIGHAM : I think it is most discreditable to this Parliament—

MR. MORAN : You need not take the money.

MR. HIGHAM : I am not going to take it so far as that goes, but I think it is most discreditable on the part of other members to accept payment voted by themselves when they came into this Parliament without payment of members. I may say what I have said before on the floor of this House, that personally I am not in favour of payment of members. I have not been returned pledged to support payment, still I do hold that to some extent there should be a reimbursement for expenses to members who travel from long distances to this House. However, I have never been able, after consulting a great many members in this House and visiting members on this question, to arrive at any basis on which a reimbursement for expenses should be made. On these grounds and on the understanding that was arrived at I assented to the vote taken last year. So far as the referendum is concerned, I will admit that I have changed my opinion. I say that this House is practically justified in passing legislation in favour of payment of members for the next Parliament.

MR. MORAN : Will it bind the next Parliament?

MR. HIGHAM : If we pass the legislation this session, certainly the next Parliament may throw it out. We may pass the legislation in this session for payment to members of the ensuing Parliament, and I think in doing that we are doing all that we are justified in doing. I certainly hope that this House will not pass the amendment.

MR. A. FORREST (West Kimberley) : In regard to the motion before the House and the amendment, I may say that I intend to vote for the amendment for the reason that it has been passed in this House now for many years that it is desirable to pay members. I suppose it will make very little difference to myself,

because I am not particularly anxious about the small amount of money that may be decided on. I have always been against payment of members, and I did not come here pledged one way or another. Up to the present I have always voted against payment, because I thought the honour of being a member of Parliament should be sufficient. But we find that from one end of the country to the other it is the express wish of the electors that payment should take place at as early a date as possible. Members in this House have worked 14 or 15 years, and in a great many cases 10 years, and have not received a sixpence for the whole of their services excepting a free pass on the railways. If the amendment is not carried, I certainly will vote against the Bill which will come before the House, because the least we can do is to let those who intend to enjoy the privilege of payment of members pass their own Bill. If we do pass the motion, the present Parliament should be paid the same as every other Parliament in the world. I express this opinion because wherever you go, on the goldfields especially and in nearly every other district in the colony, the question has been asked of those who aspire to parliamentary honours whether they favour payment of members, and the candidate has always said, "yes," which reply has given satisfaction. We shall not be doing anything very wrong if we carry out the express wish of the electors. A resolution was passed in 1897, in 1898, and in 1899 that payment of members is desirable; therefore I see no reason why the payment should not date from the financial year 1899, if it is agreed to. I assure members it is a very expensive thing to be a member of this House, because you have to keep up your own home whether you live in the city or in a country district, and your business to a certain extent is neglected. It is a source of great expense also, and I would like to ask the Premier what it costs him in the refreshment room per month for being a member of Parliament. I would like to ask other members here, who perhaps are fairly well to do, how much it costs them per annum. I am sure it is more than the small amount which it will be proposed to pay members. If it was not the express wish of the electors I should be the last member in the House to agree to

payment. I have no particular wish to see the payment carried out. I have been opposed to it before, but when the Government bring down a Bill and ask us to support it and grant payment of members—

THE PREMIER: We have not done that.

MR. A. FORREST: I think there is a Bill before the House.

THE PREMIER: That Bill is simply to ask the electors to say whether there should be payment or not.

MR. A. FORREST: I see no reason for a referendum. Every district in the colony is in favour of payment of members, and even the district of Bunbury I believe would favour payment of members; therefore it is not possible for us to stop it any longer. As far as I am concerned I intend to vote for payment of members on the ground that if we pass the necessary legislation, we have as much right to receive the salary appertaining to the office as the next Parliament which will be elected in May next.

MR. CONNOR (East Kimberley): I find there is something wanting in this debate, and which we feel lonely without. A question such as this has actually cropped up without there being a no-confidence debate. That being so, I think it wise that some time should be given for members to move a no-confidence motion. I am opposed to payment of members myself, but we have not had sufficient time to debate this matter; therefore I move that the debate be adjourned.

THE SPEAKER: Is there any seconder?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I second the motion.

Motion for adjournment put, and declared negative on the voices.

MR. GREGORY (North Coolgardie): I hardly think it is worth going into details—

THE PREMIER: A division was called for, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: I did not hear any-one call for a division.

MR. CONNOR: I called "divide."

THE SPEAKER: I did not hear it. The House will divide.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	14
Noes	14

A tie 0

AYES.

Mr. Connor
Mr. Darlôt
Sir John Forrest
Mr. D. Forrest
Mr. Higham
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Pennefather
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Rason
Mr. Sholl
Mr. Throssell
Mr. Wood
Mr. Monger (Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Ewing
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Hall
Mr. J. F. T. Hassell
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Moran
Mr. Oats
Mr. Solomon
Mr. Vosper
Mr. Wilson
Mr. Gregory (Teller).

THE SPEAKER: I give my vote for the "ayes."

Motion thus passed on the casting vote, and the debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9:30 o'clock until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 11th October, 1900.

Paper Presented—Motion: Railway Station Removal, Kalgoorlie—Kalgoorlie Municipal Loans Reappropriation Bill, third reading—Municipal Institutions Bill, amendments adopted *pro formâ*—Distillation Bill, second reading—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Annual Report by the Commandant of the Local Forces.

Ordered to lie on the table.

MOTION—RAILWAY STATION REMOVAL, KALGOORLIE.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS (North-East) moved:

That the departmental reports and plans relating to the proposed new station, situate near Hannan street, Kalgoorlie, be laid on the table of the House.

For some time past a station had been situate near to Hannan street, in Kalgoorlie, and some persons, encouraged in a belief that the station would remain there, had erected large and commodious buildings, and trade had been diverted to that locality. For some reason or other, the station for that end of the town was now to be fixed about 200 yards from the old station; and unless some good reasons for this removal were given, it should not take place. If the departmental report showed that the alteration of the site was necessary, then there would be no objection; but he wanted these reports to be open to inspection, so that any unpleasant rumours or suspicions aroused by the removal of the station should be done away with.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE (South) seconded the motion. Some time ago the Government put up land for sale by auction, and advertised that the land was in the vicinity of Hannan street railway station; the station was now to be removed, which was very inconvenient, and damaging to property in the main street of the town. It was proposed that there should be a sub-way at that station, which did not go into the middle of the next street, but went to the furthest end of the next street from Hannan street. He did not wish to impute motives to Government officials, but he had strong reasons to believe that the station could have been conveniently nearer to Hannan street than the site it was proposed to remove it to.

Question put and passed.

KALGOORLIE MUNICIPAL LOANS REAPPROPRIATION BILL.

Read a third time, on motion by Hon. A. G. JENKINS, and *passed*.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS BILL.

COMMITTEE, *pro formâ*.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the House went into Committee for the purpose of adopting, *pro formâ*, certain amendments recommended by a Select Committee, and for having the amendments printed in the body of the Bill prior to discussion.

Bill reported formally with the amendments, and ordered to be reprinted.