

to-night hon. members could read and consider the measure.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN (Central) supported the motion. Ample time to consider the Loan Bill had been given by the notice of motion to suspend the Standing Orders. The object in sitting to-night was to give members more time to discuss the Bill, and it did not follow the measure would be rushed through, for the long discussion in another place would make hon. members here cautious.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (in reply): The Bill should be discussed to-night, so that full consideration might be given to any alterations made by the Assembly. The discussion, if unfinished to-night, could be continued to-morrow.

THE PRESIDENT: If there were reason to believe the Bill would come down to-night, certainly it would be most advantageous for the House to meet again at 8 o'clock. He was willing to take the Chair at any time hon. members might desire. He would put the motion that he leave the Chair until 8 o'clock.

Motion put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	...	10
Noes	...	...	...	5

Majority for ... .. 5

AYES.	NOES.
The Hon. G. Bellingham	The Hon. M. L. Moss
The Hon. H. Briggs	The Hon. G. Randell
The Hon. J. D. Connolly	The Hon. J. E. Richardson
The Hon. J. W. Hackett	The Hon. J. M. Speed
The Hon. R. S. Haynes	The Hon. R. G. Burgess
The Hon. A. Jameson	(Teller).
The Hon. W. Maley	
The Hon. B. C. O'Brien	
The Hon. C. Sommers	
The Hon. A. G. Jenkins	
(Teller).	

Motion thus passed, and the sitting suspended until 8 o'clock.

At 8 o'clock, Chair resumed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS, in moving that the House do now adjourn, thanked members for their courtesy in reassembling. He understood some compromise was being arrived at in another place, but it was impossible for the Loan Bill to reach this Chamber within a reasonable time to-night to be discussed.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at 8:10 o'clock, until the next day.

## Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 17th July, 1901.

Question: Health Board for North Perth—Question: Railway Administration, to inquire—Question: Apples Importation—Question: Railway Accident, to inquire—Question: Royal Visit, Address from Parliament—Message: Assent to Supply Bill—Loan Bill (No. 2), second reading, debate resumed; in Committee, adjourned—Adjournment.

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### QUESTION—HEALTH BOARD FOR NORTH PERTH.

MR. F. C. MONGER (for Mr. Speight) asked the Premier: When it was proposed to carry out the decision of a previous Parliament to grant a Local Board of Health to the North Perth Roads Board District.

THE PREMIER replied: As soon as the Roads Board signified its approval of the exclusion of the Block 884 and the approaches thereto, the Health Board would be gazetted.

#### QUESTION—RAILWAY ADMINISTRATION, TO INQUIRE.

MR. H. DAGLISH asked the Commissioner of Railways: Whether it was the intention of the Government to appoint a Commission, or to move for the appointment of a Select Committee of this House, to investigate the condition of the Railway Department, and submit a report respecting its organisation and management?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS replied: Yes; it is the intention of the Government to at once appoint a Royal Commission.

#### QUESTION—APPLES IMPORTATION.

MR. C. HARPER asked the Premier: 1, Whether any apples were landed at Fremantle shortly before the removal of the prohibition on the landing of the same. 2, If so, why the Shipping Company landing them has not been prosecuted for the breach of the laws. 3, Whether he will cause a report to be procured from the Inspector examining fruit at Fremantle as to the condition of each shipment of apples and pears landed under the amended regulations, describing

what diseases or pests, if any, have been discovered in them, and how treated. 4, Whether each such consignment has been accompanied by a certificate from a Government Inspector at the port of shipment, and, if so, whether the condition justified the certificate.

THE PREMIER replied: 1, Yes, 151 cases, and being unaccompanied by a certificate, extra care was taken with the consignment, and 40 per cent. of same destroyed. 2, The apples were landed by permission of the Minister for Lands, and, after being disinfected and the diseased ones graded out, were placed in quarantine until the Regulations were amended and gazetted. 3, Yes. 4, Only three consignments have so far been accompanied by certificates, but Governments of Eastern States have been notified that certificates will in future be demanded. No.

#### QUESTION—RAILWAY ACCIDENT, TO INQUIRE.

MR. J. M. HOPKINS asked the Commissioner of Railways: Whether it was intended that an independent board of inquiry should investigate the recent railway accident upon the Eastern gold-fields railway, or that an inquiry should be conducted by members of the railway staff?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS replied: A departmental inquiry was now being held.

#### QUESTION — ROYAL VISIT, ADDRESS FROM PARLIAMENT.

MR. J. L. NANSON, without notice, asked the Premier: Whether it was the intention of the Government to move in the matter of the presentation of a loyal address from both Houses of Parliament to their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York?

THE PREMIER replied: The matter will be brought before the House either to-day or to-morrow.

#### MESSAGE—ASSENT TO SUPPLY BILL.

A Message from the Governor was read, assenting to Supply Bill, £1,250,000.

#### LOAN BILL (No. 2), £3,500,000.

##### SECOND READING.

Debate on second reading resumed from the previous evening.

MR. J. J. HIGHAM (Fremantle): It is not my intention to debate this Loan Bill at any great length, and my only reason for moving the adjournment last night was that this important measure was being rushed through the House, and there was a tendency amongst members to let it slide through without the necessary comment. I am afraid that had the Bill reached the Committee stage last night, many of the items would not have received the discussion they merit. The Bill itself is rather a large order, and whilst we may admire the Colonial Treasurer for bringing before us all he wanted, I think the hon. gentleman might have done it in another way, and have asked for an authorisation somewhat less than he has placed before us. I hope we shall get into Committee on the Bill, and that those items from which we dissent will receive the criticism they deserve. There are several items that I do not think ought to be passed.

Question put, and passed on the voices.  
Bill read a second time.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Power to raise money for certain purposes:

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The second clause stated that the Bill was for the purpose of raising the sum of £3,500,000. As however it was his intention to deal with the matter when the schedule came before the Committee, he took it that whatever alterations might be made in the schedule would imply consequential alterations in the second clause.

THE PREMIER: The clause read, "not exceeding."

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 6, inclusive—agreed to.

Schedule (8 divisions, 24 items):

HON. F. H. PIESSE: No objection had been offered by him to the second reading of the Bill, although yesterday he said he would offer objection. His reason for taking the present course was that he had no opportunity of again speaking on the second reading, but would have an opportunity of speaking again now that the schedule was before the Committee, and thus he could farther deal with the Bill. In regard to the schedule generally, he certainly considered it was too large. The Government should not have

come down to the House at this juncture to ask for an authorisation of £3,500,000. It would have been sufficient for the administration of the country and the requirements of the Government, and also for the carrying on of public works, if a sum of, say, about £1,500,000 were raised. That sum would have met our requirements for the next year or year and a half. The Government already had an authorisation permitting them to raise nearly £600,000; and they might have made use of that, as he had pointed out last night. Now, however, the Government asked for £3,500,000, giving as a reason for doing so that the present time was opportune for placing a loan on the London market. No doubt the Treasurer had good reason for putting forward a Bill to provide a certain sum of money, but one did not consider it right that the Government should come at this stage and ask the House to pass a Bill embodying, as this one did, so large a sum as £3,500,000. The Government should not ask for authority to raise such a sum, or ask, as had been done in the first instance, that the Bill should be passed through all its stages in one night. The Committee were now requested to pass the Bill through all its remaining stages in one sitting. It was the duty of the Committee to demand more information in regard to the schedule of works, and more details concerning those works, than could possibly be placed before members during one sitting. Hon. members must have an opportunity of going into the matter in detail, and that he felt certain would take days. Some members would think it necessary to strike out many of the items included in the schedule. Large sums were placed opposite the various works, and he felt confident that those sums would be criticised at some length. Therefore he thought the Committee would be with him in saying that now the Bill had passed its second reading, the schedule should be withdrawn and brought up in amended form, after the conclusion of the royal festivities. If it could be brought forward in an amended form for an amount of about £1,500,000 altogether and giving the details asked for, he would be very desirous to assist the Government in passing the Bill. He considered, however, that the Committee

should not agree to passing such a schedule as this brought down at so late a stage. The Government had already an opportunity of borrowing, having a loan authorisation, as he had pointed out before, of £2,590,000. Of this amount £1,052,000, hon. members knew, the Government had already arranged for by providing the money under the Local Inscribed Stock Act. They had also a million on Treasury bills which were still current and must be taken up in December next. If the present was a good opportunity for the country to place a loan on the London market, why not place the million and a half authorisation which the Government already had? If the country could gain the advantage of 2 per cent. in interest by doing so, it certainly should be done. Then the Government would have the money to pay off the Treasury bills which would fall due in December next. The Government could come down to the House with a revised schedule for £1,500,000 in three weeks' time, and it would probably pass through in a week or ten days. Then the Government would be empowered to raise £1,500,000 later, and they could pay off their Treasury bills. Thus they would be in no worse condition than they were in to-day.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** Raise more Treasury bills?

**HON. F. H. PIESSE:** There would be no difference. The Government already held Treasury bills which they must pay off, and they would have to raise a farther loan in order to provide for Treasury bills to the extent of a million. Of course, there was no renewing Treasury bills. The Government must pay these Treasury bills, and if they required money and were not able to raise it by loan they must get the money by issuing farther Treasury bills or making some other arrangement. If the Government took advantage of their authorisation for £1,500,000, which was the amount the Committee in his opinion should pass, they would be in a good position. There was nothing to prevent them from putting on the market the one and a half millions of authorisation at their disposal if they wanted to take advantage of present conditions. Thus they would provide the million required to pay off the Treasury bills in December next, and

would have £590,000 with which to carry on and meet current obligations. If that were done the Government would be in a good position, and moreover in adopting that course they would not be doing what, in his opinion, they should not do—ask the House at this stage to deal with such a schedule as the one before the House. He would not find fault with the works in the main. Provision would have to be made for all of them, but it was not necessary to make provision for the whole of the money at one time. It had been pointed out the other night by the Colonial Treasurer that many of the works would not be completed for five or six years.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Which works?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The Midland Junction Workshops; the Fremantle Dock and Slip. The latter would take three or four years to complete. Then there was the completion of the Fremantle Harbour Works, which would require two or three years. Consequently a lot of this money could be made available at a later date. No doubt in bringing down their statement the Government were actuated by the desire to place fully before the country the nature of its present obligations. If all those were obligations, of course the country must meet them: there was no getting away from that. But the schedule contained some works which might be stopped or the expenditure in connection with which might be lessened. The requirements of the works which were of immediate and pressing urgency, and had to be provided for at once, could be thought be met by arranging for a loan of one and a half millions.

THE PREMIER: What could be stopped?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The hon. member in dealing with this matter last night had said that the course suggested was one which the old Government had taken, that the old Government had come down with a large Loan Bill. Certainly the hon. member had deprecated that course. He (Hon. F. H. Piesse) remembered the instance.

MR. SAYER: It was in 1896.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: In 1896. He would like to draw the attention of the Committee to a statement made when the Premier had brought down the Loan Bill for £3,500,000.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: For £7,000,000.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: It was urged at the time that there was no necessity for so large an authorisation. The present Colonial Treasurer had then urged that there was no necessity for bringing down a Bill for so large an amount, and had supported his argument by the following words:—

I would not be so anxious to provide the money. I would go on from day to day obtaining the means as I needed them. You want to see all the sovereigns piled up in front of you before you start a public work. You have far more money now than you can expend on public works.

That was a statement made by the hon. member at that time, and yet to-day that hon. member was asking Parliament to grant him this large authorisation, so that he might be able to raise it right away.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: We could not get it.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: When the Loan Bill was before the House last year, the late Premier in dealing with the matter said:—

During recent years we have not followed the procedure of other years by asking for large appropriations. We find it far better in the interests of the colony to ask for appropriations of loan money annually, rather than to ask for large appropriations which are to cover a great number of years. Of course the reason for that is obvious. To ask for large appropriations injures the credit of the colony, and also prevents persons from investing in our stock; because they know there is this large amount standing like a spectre at the gate, which may be raised at any time, and may affect the value of the stock they purchase. [Mr. Illingworth: You did not think so in 1896.] No; we have got wiser since then.

It would be seen that even the Premier of that day had changed his opinion, and decided to come down with Bills for the amounts he required from year to year. The present Treasurer, having got into office, came here with such a staggering amount as £3,500,000, and asked the House to pass it through in one sitting. The Committee should certainly oppose the Bill, and go fairly into the matter. He would press on the Government the necessity for withdrawing the schedule, and bringing it back in an amended form, so that it might be considered when Parliament met again. He would only

repeat what he had stated before, that he would help them as far as lay in his power to pass the Bill then. Many of the works he thoroughly approved of; in fact he approved of most of them. He did not see that anything could be done to stop the majority of them; they must go on. The amounts asked for in the schedule, however, were enormous and unnecessary. In rolling-stock alone the amount was £742,000.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** Why had the late Government ordered the rolling-stock, then?

**HON. F. H. PIESSE:** Admitting the rolling-stock might not all be required now, it certainly would be required as the country advanced. Although he, when a Minister, had put down that item of £742,000, yet he might have put down two and a half millions on the plea that he knew the country was progressing. But as he found that more rolling-stock was wanted from time to time, he had asked for money to purchase more; and that was what the present Government should do. He would advise them to withdraw the schedule and postpone the discussion until Parliament met again, when the Government could bring up a revised schedule. The Colonial Treasurer had said to this (Opposition) side of the House that if we did not agree with the items, we could cut them down. That was not a proper responsibility to be cast on the Opposition side, and he thought the Committee should not permit the adoption of such a course in the circumstances. It was for the Government to say what they required, and not to ask for more than was absolutely necessary. He hoped the Government would withdraw the schedule and bring in a revised one.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. F. Illingworth):** The Government did not propose any new work, but had to meet certain works which the hon. member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) was himself largely responsible for. The Government had to find in London by the 30th June £1,236,267, to complete orders which were sent by the previous Government.

**A MEMBER:** Next year.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The hon. member knew it was utterly impossible for this Government or any other Government to go to the London

market more than once a year, and the largest sum to be obtained was £1,500,000. The hon. member (Mr. Piesse) said the Treasury should raise money upon its present authorisations. We were however pledged for £1,000,000 in December, and if the Treasurer raised the money now, he would simply have to take up the bills not due till December next. How would that help him to pay his indents in London? By raising money now to meet engagements six months hence, we should be closing the door against raising the larger amount now needed. At the present time we wanted £250,000 in London over and above the money we had there, to meet our engagements for the present month.

**HON. F. H. PIESSE:** By that time the Treasurer would have another authorisation.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** That was the financial idea of the hon. member, that we should first of all make 5 per cent. arrangements to raise Treasury bills in London, that six months before they were due we should raise a loan to pay off the Treasury bills, and then immediately on doing that on the new authorisation we were to raise 5 per cent. Treasury bills to reclaim those that would be due.

**MR. QUINLAN:** The Treasurer could get the money for 4 per cent. in Perth.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The hon. member was absolutely incorrect.

**MR. QUINLAN:** The assertion was perfectly correct. He would prove it.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The hon. member might prove what he liked.

**MR. QUINLAN** said he would prove it to the hilt. The money could be raised at 4 per cent. in Perth.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER** said he would take it at that price. Members had urged that the Government should endeavour to raise some of their loans in the State, and the intention of the Government was to try to raise the balance of their authorisations (something less than £500,000) in the State. At present the time was not opportune, because colonial loans had already been raised, but the Government hoped they might be able to do this. What he wanted to impress upon the Committee was that the Government could not meet the engagements and continue the works without

£2,000,000 before June of next year. The present Government were not responsible for the position which existed, and the hon. member (Hon. F. H. Piesse) might not be responsible, but the House was responsible for the conditions and the House had to meet the circumstances. According to the advice laid before him by his officers, the Government would have to provide £2,000,000 between now and the 30th June next. As he had said, we could not place more than one loan in a year, and the amount could not be more than £1,500,000, so that we should have to raise the balance in some other way. At the end of that time we should have exhausted all our resources and have no means of raising money at all. The former Government raised £1,000,000 on Treasury bills which cost them 5 per cent., and these Treasury bills were due in December next; and how were these Treasury bills to be paid? If the hon. member took a seat on the Treasury bench to-morrow, there would be nothing for it but for him to raise £2,000,000 during the next 12 or 15 months and rearrange his Treasury bills as well.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: If 15 months would do it, where did the Treasurer's reference to the 30th June come in?

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: That was speaking of the financial year.

MR. DOHERTY: Two millions and the Treasury bills meant £3,000,000.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: £3,000,000. The country at the last elections gave a mandate that the finances of the country were to be put in order, and the present Government were in office in order to do that, and they were going to do it if they could. We should require most of this money, if not the whole of it, inside of three years; but so long as the Committee took the responsibility of altering the gross amount, there would be no objection. The Committee could alter the schedule amount, but they could not alter it unless they did what had been done in times past, which had been condemned, and that was to indicate that a certain sum of money would do the work, and then come afterwards for additional money.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Had not the Treasurer £1,500,000 now for the year?

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: If the Government got the authority to raise £1,500,000, of course they could finance, but they asked the Committee to give authority to raise sufficient money to complete the works of the former Government. That was all they asked for. They were not asking anything for themselves. The hon. member himself stated that the works could not be stopped.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The Government were going for the whole lot at once.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: It was one thing to come to the House and ask the House to authorise expenditure of £7,200,000. That was published to the world, and came before the notice of financiers. It was another thing to come and say we had undertakings which would require £3,000,000 to complete, and in the interests of our creditors as well as in the interests of the country, we asked for the money to complete them. As a matter of good faith to the people who lent us the money for these works, we should make provision for completing them. Take the Coolgardie Water Scheme: what would be the value of that undertaking if it were not completed? Absolutely none. What would our creditor say? If a wise man, he would say, "You want one and a half millions of money, and what security have we that when you have spent this one and a half millions of money you will have completed your Coolgardie waterworks or anything else? What guarantee have we that you will not reappropriate the money, and so compel us to lend you more money than we originally intended?" That position would interfere very materially with the credit of this country. The Government had put before the Committee, as far as they had been able to ascertain, an honest statement. If the Committee said, "You want three and a half millions of money, we will vote you £1,500,000 now," or a third of the amount the Government required now, the Committee take that responsibility and would have to take it. The Government did not recommend it, and it was not the kind of financing he (Mr. Illingworth) as Treasurer was prepared to recommend or support. We were in duty bound, not only to the country, and not only to those who projected the undertakings, but also to the people who lent the money, to see them

completed and brought to a satisfactory conclusion and made reproductive. The harbour works would be reproductive, and the Government hoped to make the water-works scheme successful and reproductive. The Government had put upon the schedule an amount of money necessary to do the work, and unless the Committee were going to support the Government on financial questions, he was not prepared to take the responsibility of managing the financial affairs of the country. He was prepared to give the Committee his best advice and judgment for what these were worth; but if there were men better able to grapple with the difficulties that surrounded us, he would be glad to give place to those men. The only way in which the finances of the country could be set straight was to vote the money required. There was £300,000 in the schedule of the Bill which might, in a sense, be said to be for new works, such as the continuance of "Development of Goldfields" and "Development of Agriculture." The amount of £3,000,000 was absolutely for old works which had to be completed; and unless the Committee said that some of those works were not required, it was simply beating the air to say the amount in the Bill was too large. It was not for him, as Treasurer, to debate the question with the Engineer-in-Chief as to what should be the cost of the several works set down in the schedule.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: The Engineer-in-Chief was allowed to do the financing for the Treasurer.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: So long as he (the Minister) was in the position of Treasurer, he would not allow anybody else to do the financing for the Treasury. The Commissioner of Railways wanted certain rolling-stock and material, and of course he handed in a certain estimate for so much money required for this purpose. It was not the duty of the Treasurer to test the estimate on which those demands were based. In like manner, the Minister for Works handed in a statement requiring a certain sum of money to carry out works specified, and again the Treasurer could not enter into the question as to whether the estimate for these works was correct or incorrect. If the responsible heads of a department informed the Min-

ister that certain sums were required for certain purposes, and if a request for the money were forwarded to him as Treasurer, it was not for him then to question the correctness of the estimate, his only duty being to find the money. That was the duty before him now. The schedule in the Bill was the result of advice given by the responsible officers of the Government, and was also a consequence of the works in this schedule having been commenced by the previous Government. If those members who were associated with the former Government admitted that they started those works, then those members should assist the present Government in obtaining the money to finish the works. That was a fair proposition. The proposal made by the leader of the Opposition would utterly disorganise the finances of this country; and he (the Treasurer) would not take the responsibility of raising a million and a half at the present time, as suggested, and also pay off the Treasury bills coming due in December next.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Would the Government amend the schedule, and ask for a million and a half?

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: The Committee might vote that the Bill should be for raising one and a half millions on account of works stated in the schedule. The Government could not alter the schedule now.

THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake): Would the leader of the Opposition be satisfied, and would hon. members be satisfied, if a clause were put into the Bill declaring that only a million and a half should be raised during the twelve months? Why should that not be agreed to?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The Treasurer had informed the Committee that one and a half millions would be sufficient for all the requirements for a year; therefore why should the Treasurer ask for more than a million and a half in the present Bill? The Treasurer had said the items were put in the Bill in order to show fairly what was the estimated total cost for completing the several works, and for placing the financial position before the House. But in the schedule were some recurring items, and he hoped it would be necessary to continue many of these items, the necessity for which was a proof

that the country was advancing. For this purpose one million might be required; but in asking for the whole amount, as the Treasurer had done, he might just as well have asked for an authorisation to raise four and a half millions, because we knew that this amount would be required in a few years. The prospects were that in a few years we might require four and a half millions, or much more. He was not at all against granting an authorisation for a loan, but the amount should not be for more than a million and a half. If the Treasurer's contention was right with regard to the sinking fund for the Coolgardie Water Scheme, that from the date of commencing the scheme 3 per cent. sinking fund should be paid on the total amount, then by bringing in this Bill for raising the whole amount the country would, at an earlier date than was necessary, have to commence the payment of that sinking fund on the whole amount. Therefore, why should not the Government make the Bill for one and a half millions, because by raising the three and a half millions proposed in the Bill, we should then have to commence paying the sinking fund on the whole amount. He assured Ministers that he was anxious to assist them in doing what was necessary, but he took it that in the best interests of the country it was undesirable to grant an authorisation for raising more than a million and a half in present circumstances, to carry on affairs for a year or longer. He would be ready to help them in every direction to do that, if they would consent to reduce the amount as he had suggested. Having himself had something to do with the past Government, he took the responsibility for many of the works appearing in this schedule; and members of the late Government did not wish to repudiate their past, and were quite willing to help the present Administration in providing money for completing these works, because these must be completed in the interests of the country. All they did require was that information should be given in regard to the items.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS** (Hon. W. Kingsmill): It was a wonderful thing to observe the attitude which some members took up. The leader of the Opposition had taken a stand on this question which he (the Minister) very

much doubted whether that member would have taken were he now occupying the position which the Premier did at present. If the hon. member now occupied that position, he would have brought down a Loan Bill for £3,500,000.

**HON. F. H. PRESSE:** No; never. Information would have been given to the Committee as to what was required, but he would not have asked for more than a million and a half in present circumstances.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Yes, he would; and this illustrated the change of attitude, because when speaking last night the hon. member said, roughly, the Government should have introduced a Bill for raising only such amount of money as would cover the most urgent requirements; that they should have asked for a million and a half to carry on the works for a couple of years. That statement, "couple of years," was incorrect, because a million and a half would just manage to carry on the works for one year. Another and very different statement was made by the hon. member when addressing his constituents at Katanning on the 24th of March last, at a time when he was not the leader of the Opposition, though there was then a possibility that he might in a short time be the leader of a Government. Let hon. members note what was the opinion of the member for the Williams at that time. He said:

The practice has been to place on the Estimates only a portion of the total required—

**HON. F. H. PRESSE:** The Consolidated Revenue was then referred to.

This was a most dangerous practice, which he had always objected to as one sure to cause trouble in the future.

**HON. F. H. PRESSE:** Misreported in that case.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Another instance of misreporting! Well, he (the Minister) hoped he would not be misreported in this case. This was the same hon. member who now came into the House and argued that the Government should not make an honest statement to the country of the money required to carry out these works.

**SEVERAL OPPOSITION MEMBERS:** That was misrepresentation.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Well, put it another way. The hon. member said the Government should not



take his advice offered three months ago at Katanning, when he was not the leader of the Opposition, to bring down a Bill including enough funds for the completion of all these works; but that the Government should only do what he then deprecated as a dangerous system, namely bringing down a Bill to provide only the money that was required most urgently. A change of attitude of that sort was absolutely past one's comprehension. The hon. member had said he tried not to be factious. He might try, but one must say the hon. member had no luck whatever. If this opposition was not factious, one could not find any word in the English language to describe it more accurately. It was also suggested by the leader of the Opposition that the Government should amend this schedule. One did not see any necessity for that. The Government were prepared to submit to any reduction of items in the schedule which the Committee might wish to reduce; but if an amendment was to be made, it should be done here and now by the Committee, and not by the Government. The Government had considered this schedule fairly well. It contained, apparently to the disgust of the leader of the Opposition, estimates based on information given by the executive officers of the Government; and if the Committee did not want the Government to carry out these works, the Committee could say so.

**MR. F. CONNOR:** What did the Government intend to do with the "light-houses," to start with?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Strike them out. The Government wanted to find out the opinion of the Committee, and in finding out that opinion this schedule could be amended as required. It was not for the Government to alter the schedule when they did not know what the Committee would do with the several items. The House had previously affirmed these works, and he (the Minister) did not say the present Government had taken the recommendations from the leader of the Opposition; but in this case the opinion of that hon. member and the opinion of the leader of the present Government happened, happily, to coincide. It was stated by the leader of the Opposition, and suggested again by an interjection from the member for the Murray

(Mr. W. J. George), that it had been at the instigation of the Engineer-in-Chief that the new item of adding six per cent. for expenses and for raising loans and discounts was first introduced in this Bill. He must give that statement an absolute and unqualified denial. Having heard the statement, he made it his business to inquire of the Engineer-in-Chief, who was an officer under his control, whether it was correct. Had it been so he would certainly have thought that the Engineer-in-Chief was going outside his province. He had, however, the Engineer-in-Chief's distinct assurance that it was not at his instigation or suggestion the practice was adopted. The system had been, as a matter of fact, suggested by a minute which emanated from the Colonial Treasurer. The present requirements, not the past requirements, of the leader of the Opposition might well be met by the insertion of a clause, which the Government were fully prepared to accept, providing that not more than one and a half millions should be borrowed in the current year; or the clause might read that not more than one and a half millions should be borrowed during —

**MR. GEORGE:** The financial year.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** During any financial year.

**MR. GEORGE:** During this financial year.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** During the present financial year. That would meet the requirements of the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse), who appeared rather frightened. That hon. member admitted that a great many of the works in the schedule must be completed, but it looked very much as if he did not want to see them completed by the present Government.

**MR. J. L. NANSON:** In this matter he felt he must support the stand taken by the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse), for the reason that large authorisations of loan funds were not in the interest of the State. In view of the deficit on account of loan funds and general revenue, the most urgent need of the country was an economical administration of the public finances. The Government should be compelled at intervals of not less than 12 months to apply for authorisations. To give authorisation for more money than was required would

be to put a premium on that departmental extravagance which he and other new members had been sent into Parliament to check. The Colonial Treasurer had stated that the Government would require £2,000,000 to meet liabilities between the present time and the end of the financial year; and immediately afterwards the Premier had said the Government were prepared to accept a clause binding them to raise not more than a million and a half. [Several interjections.] He understood from the Colonial Treasurer that the two millions were in addition to the existing authorisation.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** No; apart from it altogether.

**MR. NANSON:** It was pleasant to find that things were not so black as they appeared. The guarantee offered by the Government would not meet the difficulties of the position. In giving such large authorisations, Parliament lost that very valuable check on the Government which small authorisations carried with them.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The Government would submit to a clause as stated.

**MR. NANSON:** If the Government got the authorisation now asked for, it would be unnecessary for them to come to Parliament for farther authorisations. The Government should tell the Committee what amount of money was required out of loan funds to carry on for the next twelve months; and he believed the House would willingly grant them that amount. The Government had admitted that they did not immediately want three and a half millions, and he therefore could not see why so large an authorisation should be given them.

**MR. W. J. GEORGE:** The member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) was to be congratulated on his remarks. The Colonial Treasurer was evidently a little bit mixed. The matter was perfectly clear to this gentleman, but he did not know how to make it clear to brains of ordinary clay. The Treasurer seemed to make much ado about nothing, when he said that unless the Committee passed the Bill, the Government were not prepared to carry on. That was not a proper position for a responsible Minister of the Crown to take. There was some reason to be surprised at it, because the hon. gentleman had fre-

quently been at one with him in curbing, so far as we could, the former Premier in his efforts to bully the House in something after the same style as the present Government were apparently inclined to adopt. The Opposition were not quarrelling with the estimates placed before Ministers by the departmental experts. Members on the Opposition side took it that neither they nor members on the other side were here to educate the Engineer-in-Chief in regard to estimates for public works; but members of the Opposition did expect the Colonial Treasurer to use his judgment in regard to the estimates of the Engineer-in-Chief. The Treasurer should not ask us for an authorisation of three and a half millions, when he knew perfectly well that not more than one and a half millions of this money would be required during the current financial year. Anyway, the Treasurer could not raise that amount. The member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) had pointed out that the House could not accept the clause proposed by the Premier, binding the Government not to raise more than a million and a half in the next twelve months; since if that clause were accepted, the Government after the expiration of twelve months would be in a position to raise the balance of the authorisation without farther consulting the House.

**THE PREMIER:** The Government could not spend that amount.

**MR. GEORGE:** The spending capabilities of the gentlemen on the Treasury bench were as yet unknown. The present Ministry might possibly even excel the example set during the past ten years, and members on the Opposition side were determined that the Government should not have the opportunity to "play ducks and drakes" with the money of the country.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** They did not want to.

**MR. GEORGE:** The House was determined, he thought, that no Government should have an opportunity of obtaining more money than they could reasonably spend in the twelve months before Parliament met again.

**THE PREMIER:** The Government had asked to be so restricted.

**MR. GEORGE:** It was intended to restrict the Government, but instead of

doing so by the clause of which the Premier spoke, it should be done by amendment of the Bill, the amount in the preamble of which should be altered from three and a half millions to one million and a half.

**THE PREMIER:** Yes. The schedule should be left standing.

**MR. DOHERTY:** The House must discuss the schedule.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** What was the House discussing, then?

**MR. GEORGE:** The business of the State. It was the desire of members on his side to pin the Government down, if possible, to one million and a half. When they wanted more money they must ask the House for a farther authorisation.

**THE PREMIER:** The Government were perfectly willing to agree to that.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The Government said so in the opening Speech.

**MR. GEORGE:** No. The Colonial Treasurer suffered from a very long tongue and a very much mixed memory.

**MR. J. GARDINER:** It would be a wise thing perhaps to discuss the items in the schedule, fixing the amounts to be expended on the various works, and to let the total of these amounts be the authorisation in the Bill. Let the Bill also contain the clause the Government asked for, binding them to raise not more than £1,500,000 during the current financial year. A great many members would be willing to pass the schedule on these grounds, and many of them thought it would be a wise thing if the large amounts opposite some of the items were considerably reduced.

**A MEMBER:** Very much better be knocked clean out.

**MR. GARDINER:** The House might arrive at a reasonable amount for each item.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** Did the hon. member propose excision or revision?

**MR. GARDINER:** Revision; though there might be some items which it would be advisable to exclude altogether. Some members were rather mixed as to the balance of the old authorisations. It appeared that the Colonial Treasurer had paid some four or five hundred thousand pounds on account of works included in the schedule of the new Bill. Consequently the £454,000 it was anticipated

the old authorisations would realise was practically already spent. Therefore, no matter how the Government raised it, their doing so would not put them in easier financial circumstances. The hon. member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) knew perfectly well that if a sum of money were raised to take up Treasury bills already due, that would not leave a penny more at the Treasurer's disposal. The Treasurer might issue inscribed stock for the Treasury bills, and thus the loss made by the Forrest Government would be done away with without interfering with the money required to carry on necessary works.

**MR. D. J. DOHERTY:** The Treasurer said last night that he had gone to the local banks for £400,000. Up to what date could the Government carry on with that amount?

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** As a matter of fact that £400,000 was all spent now.

**MR. DOHERTY:** Only £100,000 was understood to have been spent.

**THE PREMIER:** It was all spent. The loan funds account had not been made up, and therefore it was not possible for him to answer some questions which had been asked.

**MR. DOHERTY:** Was £400,000 available?

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** No money at all was available until it was raised, and when it was raised the Government would have to pay the country's debts with it.

**MR. DOHERTY:** Could not the Government raise sufficient locally to carry on for two months?

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** That would be an exceedingly expensive way of financing.

**MR. DOHERTY:** For a few months?

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** If we went in for that kind of financing we would have to pay for it. One matter of importance had been overlooked. The Bill before the House was merely an authorisation for the raising of money. It gave no authority to spend a single shilling.

**THE PREMIER:** The Loan Estimates would be laid on the table of the House as soon as possible, and then the House could take control of the expenditure. It could

stop any works, and control the matter from beginning to end.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** All the Committee would be doing in passing this Loan Bill, whether for £1,500,000 or £3,500,000, would simply be giving authority to raise moneys absolutely necessary, if the works were to be continued.

**MR. HIGHAM:** The works were already authorised.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The former Commissioner of Railways sent indents to London, and those indents were coming in, some being on the way now; and the Agent-General had not the money to pay for them.

**HON. F. H. PIESSE:** There was the £1,500,000.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The £1,500,000 and more would be required by the end of the financial year.

**HON. F. H. PIESSE:** The Committee were willing to give the Government that amount.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The Government were willing to accept it, because they did not want to raise money unless it was absolutely necessary, and it was impossible to raise more than £1,500,000 in one year. Usually Parliament did not meet till about June, and the best time of the year to raise a loan was early in July. Of course the Government could call a special session if necessary, but it would be better if the power to float the loan existed. The Government were entirely in the hands of the Committee. If the Committee thought we should only raise £1,500,000, the Government would be pleased to carry out their injunctions, but he desired to point out that there was no necessity for this, because the Committee had absolute control of the expenditure of every shilling in the Loan Estimates, and that was the time for detailed expenditure to be discussed. If the proposal were one to commence new works, the present discussion would be not only in order but absolutely necessary, and he would expect extended discussion. The proposal, however, was only one to complete the works that this House had discussed for years past; works which had been commenced, and for which large sums of money were to be paid to carry them on. The House passed the works years ago, and he did

not see what the present discussion was about.

**MR. W. J. GEORGE:** The only objection was that the Government should not have £3,500,000 at once.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** If the object of the Opposition was to allow the Government to raise £1,500,000, there was no objection, because the Government had no intention to do anything else.

**MR. D. J. DOHERTY:** The money would be ear-marked; it was ear-marked according to this schedule.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The Government asked the Committee to give them £1,500,000, and to allow them to allocate it themselves. If the Committee were going to be excessively liberal, and to say, "We trust the new Government: we think they are so upright, and all that kind of thing, that we can trust them, and we will not make out any schedule," the Government were prepared to act in accordance with that view; but it would be more satisfactory to have the sums allocated.

**MR. DOHERTY:** What would the liabilities be up to the 30th August.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** It was impossible to get them.

**MR. DOHERTY:** Would there be £200,000 or £400,000?

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The balance of the money the Government had authority to raise, £500,000, was absorbed. We had to pay on the 30th September for rolling-stock £154,000, permanent way material £11,000, general stores £10,000, and water supply £43,000, which made £218,000; in addition to which we had to provide £62,500 for interest, making £280,500. In December we had similar amounts totting up to £342,000, on the 31st March £104,000, and onwards in this way until we got £1,236,267. That was after the 31st August.

**MR. DOHERTY:** We wanted to know the money due in London up to the 31st August.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** That information could not be given, because the Loan Estimates had not been prepared.

**MR. D. J. DOHERTY:** In regard to funds, what he wished the Committee to understand was that there was no

necessity to rush this Bill, for the Government had sufficient money to carry them through to the 31st August. The Colonial Treasurer and the Premier said there was an opportunity to float the loan in the market, but at the same time they had half a million, and he (Mr. Doherty) had no doubt they could obtain money through the associated banks in this State to carry them through to the 31st August. Then the House might meet, and the Bill could be amended according to the feelings of the House.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Then we should not be able to raise the loan.

MR. DOHERTY: That was the only point. It was not that the Government wanted the money, because we had no liabilities to take up before the 31st August.

MR. J. L. NANSON: Were the Government prepared at this stage to remodel the loan schedule on the basis of £1,500,000? If the Government were not prepared to do so at this stage, he would move that progress be reported, and the matter could come up at the next sitting of the House. It was obviously impossible for the Committee to revise the amount unless they received certain information as to the sums which would be sufficient for twelve months upon different items.

THE PREMIER: Let the Committee revise the schedule.

MR. NANSON: It was for the Government to give that information.

THE PREMIER: This schedule was not that of the Government, but the schedule framed by the House last year. The Government were only carrying out the mandate of Parliament. They came down here and said, "You have already told us these works must be completed at the public expense." The Government said, "We cannot construct them unless we have the money. You have told us to do it: give us the money." If the Committee did not give the Government the money, it did not hurt the Government, but it was only revoking the opinion expressed by the House last year. The hon. member for the Murchison (Mr. J. L. Nanson) suggested that progress should be reported, to allow the Bill to be dealt with later on. If that course were adopted, the Government had nothing to do but to close down all the works. They

did not wish to do so, but they could not pay wages unless they had money.

A MEMBER: Let the £1,500,000 be taken.

THE PREMIER: The Government said they only wanted £1,500,000, but the Committee would not give it to them. Let the Committee alter the schedule.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The Committee might alter the schedule, and it might not meet with the approval of the Government.

THE PREMIER: Let the Committee try to amend the schedule, and they would see what objection came from the Government side of the House. The Government did not care as long as they got the £1,500,000. Let the Committee alter the schedule as much as they liked, and state how they were going to spend the money. The Government were the servants of Parliament, and were carrying out the mandate of Parliament. There were no new matters in the schedule.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND: Let the Government take a vote for £1,500,000 on account.

THE PREMIER: The Government were willing to do that. They did not want *carte blanche* to go and spend £1,500,000, and they wanted to know in what direction the money should be spent. If the Committee thought that the Government were wrong, or that the last Parliament was wrong in authorising those works, let them revoke that authority, and the Government would submit to it. The Government would be very glad. They would be very glad to strike out the Coolgardie Water Supply Scheme altogether; at least he would, because he certainly thought that scheme was going to be a curse to the country. So long, however, as the Government had to carry the scheme out, they must do so loyally according to contract, but they could not do it without the money. He did not know what members were thinking of. He would like to reply to a remark by the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Doherty). As he (the Premier) understood the situation, the £500,000 which had yet to be raised under the old authorisation was already practically allotted; that was to say, there were bills in London awaiting payment, and that money was required to meet those bills.

MR. DOHERTY: The Colonial Treasurer said not until after the 31st August. That was the point.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: The money was due now.

MR. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman said not.

THE PREMIER: That, he thought, was not said by the hon. gentleman. At any rate orders had gone forward, orders which were unauthorised by the Committee, and the money for those orders had to be found. The goods were ready to be delivered, and they must be paid for.

MR. DOHERTY: The Colonial Treasurer said £154,000 would be due on the 1st September, and £243,000 on the 1st December.

THE PREMIER: The Government had no money to go on with unless we passed this Bill, and if the Committee said they would rather discuss it next August and let the Government suspend the work, the Government would see what they could do to arrange matters in the meantime, but the task would be a difficult one.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: The Government had not shown how they were going to spend the money on the schedule. Let the Government take their £1,500,000.

THE PREMIER: Let the Committee reduce the amount on the schedule. The House had given directions, but now the Committee were shirking the responsibility. The Committee wanted the Government to take the responsibility which they themselves were afraid of. That was the position.

MR. T. F. QUINLAN: Whatever other members might think, he was not going to be bluffed by any efforts of the Premier in this House. It had been clearly admitted, not only by the Premier but by several members of the Ministry, that the amount they required to carry them through the financial year was one and a half millions. Farther, if this House were to pass an authorisation for raising three and a half millions of money, it would at once appear in the London market, or before the lenders of money, that we in this State were like hawks after chickens; that we wanted to grasp three and a half millions if we could get it, but were only able to place a loan for one and a half millions on the market. In other words, we were discrediting our

own credit. We were to appear before the world as a State wanting to borrow three and a half millions of money, and yet attempting to raise only one and a half millions. Speaking as a private individual, and one who had had some experience in borrowing, he must say emphatically and positively that it was very unwise, not only for a private individual but for this House, to represent to people in the money market that we were going to borrow three and a half millions of money, but would ask for only one and a half millions at present. What would be the natural result? Of course the money-lenders would demand an increased rate of interest. His opinion was that we should pass a Bill for one and a half millions, although he had at first been in accord with the Premier's suggestion that a clause should be inserted in the Bill limiting the amount to be raised this year to one and a half millions and yet pass the whole amount of three and a-half millions. He had since perceived that it would clearly be a false step, and that the proper course would be to authorise the Government to raise the amount which was actually required, one and a half millions, leaving the Government to come forward on a future occasion and seek for authorisation to raise a farther amount for carrying on necessary works. He ventured to say that perhaps the next Government would have better credit in the eyes of money-lenders elsewhere than the present Government appeared to have, because the next Government might consist of persons who had some stake and interest in the country, and they would be committing themselves as well as the country in proposing to borrow. [Several interjections.] Without answering interjections, he wanted to answer the Treasurer, who had doubted his statement when he said earlier in the evening that it was possible to raise money in this State even for a few thousands at four per cent. The municipal council of Perth had raised £25,000 not long ago, and the amount of the loan had been over-subscribed at four per cent. Was not that a proof that if a loan were placed by the Government on the market here, they might get it at three and a half or possibly three per cent.? If it had been possible to raise on municipal credit £25,000 at four per cent.—and there

were other lenders offering money at that time—surely the Committee were justified in asking the Government to endeavour to raise a part of this money in the local market, and not let it go forth to the world that we wanted three and a half millions, and that as soon as the amount was raised it would be necessary to begin paying interest and sinking fund on the whole amount. This State was in good credit to-day in the estimation of financiers; therefore, let an effort be made to raise the amount actually required, namely one and a half millions. He was not opposed to any works of a permanent or payable nature being in the schedule; but he considered that before giving power to borrow the whole of this money, members should bear in mind their past experience, which should have been sufficient to show that if the House gave the Government power to raise the whole of this money, it would be like the case of persons who suddenly acquired wealth, who did not know the value of money, and who probably would end their days in an asylum, in a gaol, or very soon in a cemetery. He had no desire that any of his friends in the present Government—and he believed they were his friends—should follow the example he had cited in regard to the first two places he had mentioned, though of course we might all expect to go to that other place. He hoped the good sense of the Committee would prevail in this matter by limiting the amount of authorisation to one and a half millions. The Government had said they were willing to accept that. They had also said they were willing to insert a clause in the Bill restricting the amount to be raised to a million and a half within 12 months; but that was not the right course to take. He hoped the Committee would agree to limit the authorisation to one and a half millions; and if the Government would consent to that, he would support them at a future time in proposing to go on with any works that might be necessary for the country.

MR. W. F. SAYER: Did the financial advisers of the Government in London know that it was the intention, under this Bill, to seek authorisation for raising three and a half millions.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: The Government had not intimated anything to that effect.

MR. H. J. YELVERTON: The Committee had to decide a very important question, which was also a question of principle. Members had been informed that the Government, acting on the advice of their responsible officers, had put before the Committee the total amounts which would be required for completing these works; and the Committee had to decide now whether they would authorise the borrowing of the whole amount, or grant only sufficient to carry on during the present financial year. That was the question at issue. The first matter for the Committee was to discuss the several items, having the previous knowledge that the Government had been advised by the Engineer-in-Chief as to the amounts required. Having decided what amounts should be expended on the several works in the schedule, the Committee could then authorise the Government to raise what they considered sufficient to spend during the financial year. The Premier's remarks with reference to this matter recently were somewhat uncalled for, because they did in some degree follow the stand-and-deliver policy: they were somewhat similar to the policy laid before us by those railway men the other day. The Premier had said last evening that if the House did not pass this Loan Bill immediately, public works would have to be stopped. The Premier said this, having the knowledge that the Government had authorisation already for raising nearly £600,000, and this House had during the present session granted supply to the amount of one and a quarter millions. It was something like a stand-and-deliver policy to say that public works would have to be stopped unless the Government got authorisation to raise the whole amount stated in this Bill, three and a half millions.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: It would be necessary to raise the money before it could be spent.

MR. YELVERTON: Yes; and he congratulated the Treasurer on the clear and explicit manner in which that Minister had placed before the House the amounts required for carrying out the works stated in the schedule; but in placing a loan on the London market, although we must be straightforward and show the exact position of our financial affairs, yet we

should rather show faith in this country and take a cheerful view of its prospects, having regard to the large revenue that was received.

MR. H. DAGLISH: Not only had there been an extended debate on the second reading of the Bill, but some members were also making, in committee, what might be called second-reading speeches. It appeared to him that the views of hon. members depended very largely on the side of the House on which they happened to sit.

SEVERAL OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No.

MR. DAGLISH: Although this was not strictly a party question, there had been a large amount of captious criticism.

MR. GEORGE: Where did it start from?

MR. DAGLISH: Not exactly from the member for the Murray, but from near him. The course of the present discussion was approaching very closely to stonewalling practices. There had been no opportunity to discuss the schedule. Only two reasons had been brought forward for the position taken up by Opposition members to-night. One was that mentioned by the member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan), that by passing the Bill for three and a half millions we should injure the credit of the country and place ourselves in danger as to getting favourable terms. That argument really amounted to this, that we should try to hoodwink the creditors of the country—[SEVERAL OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no]—by going for a loan that would be actually less than the amount really required for completing the works. If that were not so, he did not understand in what way the passing of the authorisation for raising three and a half millions would affect the raising of the loan when put on the market, if that was not the meaning of the argument of the member for Toodyay. The Premier had expressed his willingness to be bound to one and a half millions for the financial year.

MR. F. CONNOR: But he would not alter the schedule.

A MEMBER: How did members know how much would be wanted for each work for the year?

MR. DAGLISH: Members could not know that until we were dealing with items in detail and could get information

from the Treasury benches. He must congratulate the member for Toodyay in having brought some little reason to the discussion. Another reason was advanced by the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson), when he said the passing of the Bill would encourage departmental extravagance. But the same argument might be used against imposing any taxation; for just as we dealt with items of expenditure from the general revenue, so he assumed the Loan Estimates would receive the same consideration from this House when brought forward. Taking steps for raising money was a different process from giving authority to raise the money. It was ear-marking the money, but the particular amounts could not be devoted to these purposes until the vote had been obtained by the Government for the application of the particular sums. By voting the authorisation for raising the money proposed in this Bill, we were not binding ourselves to spend the full amount of the estimate for each work. That was the whole point hon. members had been labouring. He had been told that we would remove a useful check in agreeing to the authorisation for raising the whole of the money; but this House, on a previous occasion, had removed another check when it agreed to authorise these works to be commenced. He was certainly prepared to vote for the proposals of the Government, subject to revision of the items *seriatim*, and subject to the clause proposed by the Premier, if the Government chose to insert it. He was willing, however, to support the passage of the Bill without any such limitation as suggested.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. Kingsmill): The House appeared now to be somewhat at cross purposes. He hoped he would be able to put the proposal of the Government plainly before hon. members. If the other Ministers disagreed with his remarks they would no doubt express that disagreement. The Government were prepared to accept the authority of the House to borrow one and a half millions for the financial year. At the same time he wished it to be thoroughly understood that the one and a half millions would be borrowed for the purpose of carrying on the works enumerated in the schedule. If the schedule contained any works



distasteful to the Committee, this was the time to strike them out. In leaving the schedule in the Bill the Committee would not run any risk whatever, since the money would have to be spent according to Loan Estimates to be brought before the House. He hoped the Estimates would be brought down sooner than in previous years. He desired to emphasise that the money would not be spent in accordance with the schedule of the Loan Bill. It would be spent in accordance with the Loan Estimates. The Government were in this respect exactly in the same position as they were in regard to the Consolidated Revenue Act.

**MR. JACOBY:** Could the Government say how much was wanted on each item for the 12 months?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Not now. That information would be given in the usual manner and at the usual time, when the Loan Estimates were brought down.

**MR. HOPKINS:** Were the figures in the schedule not binding?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The figures were of course binding for the completion of the works. The Government wished that to be distinctly understood. The Loan Bill, if passed, would represent the Government's programme for the next three years. If the Bill met with the approval of the Committee, the expenditure of the money would be decided on when the Estimates were being discussed; since the Government would, of course, be bound by the decision of the House on those Estimates. The Government were prepared to spend the amounts in the schedule on the works to which they were respectively allocated. The Committee should understand that the actual method of spending the money would be settled in the ordinary course, as had always been done in the Estimates for the year, which, it was hoped, would be placed on the table shortly after the House reassembled. The member for the Murray (Mr. George) asked how the schedule could be altered. He made a great point of that, saying that the schedule was according to the estimates of the expert advisers of the Government. One agreed with the member for the Murray, who was right in that. Certain members had expressed a wish to strike out various works. If works were to be

struck out, this was the time to do it.

**MR. GEORGE:** How could hon. members alter the allocation of the amounts of money to be spent on each item?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** That had never been done before.

**MR. GEORGE:** Members on this (Opposition) side were asked now by the Premier to do it.

**THE PREMIER:** It could be done in the Loan Estimates.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** It had never been done in any Loan Bill before, and he did not think it could be done. The proposal of the Government was really a fair and reasonable one. A remark made by the member for Sussex (Mr. Yelverton), probably as the result of a misunderstanding, was to be regretted. That hon. member had said the attitude of the Premier in stating that certain works must stop if the Government did not get the money they asked for, amounted to a "stand and deliver" policy. Nothing was farther from the Premier's thoughts than to adopt such a policy. The same remark had been made by himself, and he could assure hon. members that nothing was farther from his thoughts. The Government had all sorts of liabilities—liabilities in regard to large indents, liabilities for interest and all sorts of things. These were liabilities which absolutely they could not get away from. On the other hand, liabilities for public works were incurred bit by bit and day by day, and were therefore liabilities which could be stopped. Therefore, if it came to pass that the Government had not sufficient money to meet both sets of liabilities, they must curtail the liability in respect of public works.

**MR. GEORGE:** The Government stated that they would stop public works immediately, if they did not get the Loan Bill passed.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** From the information already supplied by the Treasurer, it was very much to be feared the Government would have no option but to do so. Liabilities of one description could not be stopped. Indents were coming in day after day; not indents of the present Government's making, but indents for goods ordered by the previous Government. These liabilities had to be

met. Therefore the present Government could stop expenditure only in the one direction, that of public works. That was the only direction in which they could save, and would have to save in the absence of farther authorisations.

MR. SPEIGHT: Were those indents specifically sanctioned by Parliament?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: No; those indents were never sanctioned. They were absolutely unauthorised, still the goods could not be sent back. The rolling-stock, for instance, was badly wanted. Whether it was wanted or not, however, it had been ordered, and would have to be paid for. Therefore the only direction in which economy was possible was in the expenditure of money on public works. It was a terrible stand to take, and he recognised that such a step would be bad for the country. Therefore he would entreat the House not to place the Government in such a position as to force them to take that step. If the House did force the Government to it, then the responsibility must rest on the House, and not on the Government. He hoped that the explanation he had made would prove acceptable to hon. members. The Government were quite satisfied to accept the authorisation for one and a half millions, so long as it was made perfectly plain that the authorisation was to go towards completing the works mentioned in the schedule. If any alteration was to be made in the schedule, such as the striking out or cutting down of an item, this was the time to discuss the schedule and make any such alterations. We were supposed to have been discussing the schedule for the last hour or so, but did not seem to have got very far with it. This was the time to make whatever alterations members desired.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Time might be saved with respect to the alteration of the schedule. No one knew better than the hon. member who had just sat down that to alter the schedule in the way proposed by that member was quite out of the province of the Committee.

THE PREMIER: Why?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The proper course was for Ministers to go to their advisers and ask them what amount they required for the works during the period which the £1,500,000 was to cover. He, when Minister, had had experience in

this direction, and therefore knew what he was talking about.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member never did it.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: In regard to the rolling-stock, the House might consider it necessary to cut that item down from £740,000 to £500,000.

THE PREMIER: The rolling-stock was all ordered.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: That would be £240,000 less in the requirements for next year. There was an item, "Fremantle Dock and Slip," standing at £265,000, and work not yet commenced on it. Ten thousand pounds might suffice for that during the financial year. Consequently the item could be cut down by £255,000. Allowing that the whole of the rolling-stock was required, hon. members might vote the full amount of £742,000 which was required by the Government. Hon. members knew that the whole of the money asked for would not be required in the year for the Fremantle Harbour Works; but they did not know how much would be required. Were members to pose as financial advisers of the Government? He considered that the people who should advise the Government were the engineering experts. The Engineer-in-Chief had evidently prepared the schedule, and therefore the schedule should be referred back to him by the Government for his recommendation as to what was necessary. It would not take half an hour to obtain the advice of the Engineer-in-Chief in the direction indicated; and a schedule for the sum named, £1,500,000, could be brought down immediately afterwards, providing for the works of the current year. The Government had already been asked to state how much of these moneys it would be necessary to spend during the year, and the Government were not able to inform the Committee. He quite believed that they were really not able to inform them; he was sure that the information was not lacking because of any desire on the part of Ministers to withhold it. The Government themselves were unable to say, owing to want of knowledge.

THE PREMIER: Loan Estimates would give full information on the point.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The officer who advised the Government in the first instance should be consulted. As to the

additions and improvements to opened railways, hon. members had heard that the work going on might cost £100,000 to complete. The House might well resolve to cut down the expenditure to £50,000 without inconveniencing the Government. He trusted that Ministers were prepared to accept the one and a half millions which they actually required, and then the whole difficulty would be immediately overcome. The Government should revise their schedule.

**THE PREMIER :** It was not the schedule of the present Government.

**HON. F. H. PIESSE :** If he were in the position of the Government to-day, he would not ask the House to cut down the schedule. Immediately he felt that the sense of the House was against the passing of the whole amount of £3,500,000, he would have amended the schedule and obtained the advice of his responsible officers as to the amount they required for the year. This point had been raised by the member for Claremont (Mr. Sayer) the previous night. The Treasurer had given some information in regard to the raising of the prospective loan. This, of course, was information supplied by the Agent General, and probably had been obtained by that gentleman from his advisers in London. The Treasurer had stated that the present time was opportune for raising £1,500,000. That was very likely, and members on this (Opposition) side were anxious to help the Colonial Treasurer to place a loan as speedily as possible. But if those advisers at home had been informed that it was the intention of the House to pass a Loan Bill for three and a half millions, probably their advice would have been very different from what it was now. He considered that it was far better for the Government to accept the authorisation for one and a half millions than to ask for the three and a half millions they proposed, with the intention of putting £1,500,000 on the market, and leaving the balance to be raised afterwards. Such a course was against the interests of the country. The Bill should be altered in accordance with the suggestions made by so many speakers.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake) :** What guarantee had the Government that the Opposition would agree to the schedule when amended? The Gov-

ernment might bring down a schedule and the Committee might be led into the same sort of argument on that. Let the schedule be discussed item by item.

**HON. F. H. PIESSE :** One did not see how it could be discussed.

**THE PREMIER :** The Government would take the advice of their permanent officials when they came down with the Loan Estimates. It was absolutely idle for the member for the Williams to criticise the action of the Government in the matter of this Loan Bill. The difficulty was the hon. member's difficulty, the works were his works, and the present Government were merely endeavouring to carry out his programme.

**MR. GEORGE :** Why should not the Government carry it out after his ideas, then?

**THE PREMIER :** The member for the Williams had blundered into a mess, and wanted the present Government to get him out of it.

At 6-28 o'clock, the **CHAIRMAN** left the Chair.

At 7-30, Chair resumed.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. F. Illingworth) :** The Government desired, if possible, to meet hon. members' wishes. When introducing the Bill, he had said the Government would be prepared to make in the amounts any alterations on which the Committee might decide, so long as the principle was accepted that a certain sum would be required to complete all the works. He had submitted to the leader of the Opposition (Hon. F. H. Piesse) a suggestion which would probably meet with the approval of the Committee: that we at once proceed with the schedule, and decide, without reference to the amounts, whether any of the items should be struck out. The Committee having decided that, the Government would be prepared to bring in to-morrow an amended schedule, showing in a second column the amounts absolutely necessary to be expended on the works during the next fifteen months. He would ask for a vote covering 15 months, because Parliament did not usually sit till June, and it was necessary to have enough to cover two or three months in the beginning of the session, to give the House time to con-

sider preliminaries, and to have the Loan Estimates properly considered. As soon, therefore, as the Committee decided which items should remain in the schedule, and which, if any, should be struck out, the Government would add to the schedule a second column showing, in addition to the total amount required for each work which now appeared in the schedule, the actual amount required for the 15 months; and the gross amount of the Loan Bill would be reduced, accordingly, to the amount required to cover the period of 15 months. That, he understood, was something like what the Committee desired—[SEVERAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear]—and the Government had no objection to this course, for it covered all the Ministry wished, though perhaps not in the form they at the outset anticipated. The Committee might, therefore, proceed with the schedule, and say “yes” or “no” as to whether any item should be struck out. It was not desirable to sit on Friday if that could be avoided, and with hon. members’ assistance the Bill might, with little discussion, be disposed of to-morrow, when the House could adjourn.

MR. DOHERTY: Sit at 2 o’clock to-morrow.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: That might be done, if agreeable to the Premier and the Committee.

MR. F. CONNOR: Before proceeding farther, it would be much better if the Treasurer brought down to-morrow a new schedule containing all the items already enumerated, and a second column showing the necessary expenditure during the next 15 months. The Committee could then discuss the Bill on a fairer basis, because the fact of certain items being struck out to-night might affect those left in. Drop the Bill for the present, and deal with it straight out to-morrow.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: While willing to meet the hon. member, if any alterations were subsequently made, the Bill would have to be reprinted, and that would involve sitting on Friday, which would place the Legislative Council in a difficulty; whereas if the plan he (the Treasurer) suggested were adopted, both Houses could adjourn to-morrow.

MR. F. CONNOR: That the Bill would be passed to-morrow was not absolutely certain.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Another point: The amounts, until the opinion of the Committee were known on the items of the schedule, could not be absolutely fixed.

MR. F. CONNOR: Could they be fixed for to-morrow?

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Yes; if the committee would decide to-night what works should be proceeded with, the Government could say to-morrow afternoon how much would be required to carry on those works for 15 months, and could reduce the gross amount of the Bill accordingly. It would be well to accept this suggestion.

MR. F. CONNOR: The Treasurer would be wise to come here to-morrow with a clean Bill, and ask the Committee to pass it. By the Treasurer’s proposal, the onus of throwing out items would be on private members.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: If the Committee were with the hon. member, that suggestion would be adopted; but the Government proposed to give the Committee an opportunity of objecting to any item on the schedule, and that seemed the fairer proposition, as the House was elected to conduct the financial affairs of the State, and to direct the Government as to what to do. The amounts of the items need not be discussed, but simply the question of policy.

MR. C. H. RASON: That the suggestion just offered was a good one he need hardly say, for it had been first made by him. The discussion had been drifting into lines hard to follow. Now there was a clear and definite proposition, which, if adopted, would soon enable the Committee to get through the schedule. Moreover, in fairness to the Government, whom the Opposition desired to treat fairly, the feeling of the Committee with regard to each item in the schedule should be shown; otherwise it was almost impossible for the Government to bring down a statement showing what they proposed to expend during 15 months on the items, not knowing whether some of these items might be struck out, thus affecting possible expenditure on the remaining items. The Treasurer should know the exact feeling of the Committee on each item, and then bring down to-morrow a statement of proposed expenditure dur-

ing the next 15 months on all items which were to be retained.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND: If it was the suggestion of the Colonial Treasurer that we should have the whole of these items in one column, and in another column the amount required to the 30th September, 1902, one could certainly support that suggestion.

MR. D. J. DOHERTY moved, as an amendment:—

That item No. 3, Geraldton to Murchison Goldfields Railway, Cue-Nannine construction £80,400, be struck out.

MR. A. E. MORGANS: It would clear matters very much if the Colonial Treasurer were able to give some idea of the amounts required during the next 15 months.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: The amounts could not be fixed to-night, but could be to-morrow.

MR. M. H. JACOBY: Would Clause 2 be altered to-morrow, so that the sum of £3,500,000 should be reduced in accordance with the schedule?

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Yes; in accordance with the schedule when amended.

MR. W. OATS protested against the striking out of the item. He understood the money was passed for this railway seven years ago, and the work was now begun. There was no piece of auriferous country in Western Australia that more required money to be spent on it than this. There were lots of things which rendered the line necessary, one being the want of timber.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The question of what the procedure should be was being discussed, when the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans) rose in his place to put a question to the Treasurer as to what portions of the schedule it was proposed to take.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member received a reply to that.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: But the hon. member, he believed, desired to put another question before we dealt with Item 3; and now one would like to have an expression of opinion from the Committee as to what course should be taken.

MR. A. E. MORGANS: The Committee must deal with principles before beginning to deal with items. It was quite impossible to strike out any items

at present; for until we knew the total sum the Government would require in the next 15 months, how could we possibly know what items to strike out? The Colonial Treasurer should give the Committee an estimate of the amount he would require during that period, and then the Committee could deal with the items.

MR. J. M. HOPKINS: How was the Colonial Treasurer to give this estimate? There was an amendment moved by the member for North Fremantle (Mr. D. J. Doherty) to strike out the Nannine railway, and if that were carried, it would immediately upset any estimate which might be given by the Colonial Treasurer.

MR. A. E. MORGANS: That was why one wished a reply given before the items were discussed.

MR. HOPKINS: There was a statement before the Committee, and members had a schedule in the Bill showing a total of £3,500,000. The Committee had been told by the Premier and also the Treasurer that it would probably take two or three years to expend that money, and the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) said it would take six years.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Some of the items; he did not say the whole of them.

MR. HOPKINS: Parliament in authorising these works in the schedule might have blundered, but it devolved upon the Committee on this occasion to rectify those blunders. He was under the impression that this was not the only item the Committee could afford to strike out. The proper course was to deal with the items *seriatim*, and if the Committee could reduce them, as probably they might, to £2,500,000, they might then properly request the Colonial Treasurer to furnish the estimate asked for by the member for Coolgardie (Mr. A. E. Morgans). There were, indeed, numerous items on the schedule which could well be reduced. The Cue-Nannine railway could well be eliminated from the schedule. There was also on the schedule an amount of £488,500 for the Coolgardie Water Scheme, and he took it this was an item the Committee desired to conserve. It had been said the credit of the country had suffered from the undertaking of the great Coolgardie Water Scheme, but, if so,

why was that the case? For the simple reason that the people so far had been led to believe there was a certain amount of mystery in regard to the scheme, and that there was a great possibility that the scheme would never be completed.

MR. GORDON rose to a point of order. He was under the impression the items under discussion were those proposed to be struck out.

THE CHAIRMAN: A member rose and said he was misunderstood; so he (the Chairman) permitted the discussion to go back.

MR. HOPKINS: An amendment had been moved by the member for North Fremantle (Mr. D. J. Doherty).

THE CHAIRMAN: That was the amendment before the Committee. Would the hon. member confine himself to that?

MR. HOPKINS: It seemed that Parliament became responsible for the railway seven years ago.

MR. MONGER: What about the Kalgoorlie railway?

MR. HOPKINS: Let that be struck out. In regard to the railways proposed in the schedule, it would be just as well to first have a Public Works Board appointed, and to have these items submitted to that board for the board to settle which were urgent works and which were not. He had no desire to champion one railway more than another, but he desired to see these things dealt with on a fair and equitable basis, and we had no evidence before us to show which were the pressing railways to open up Western Australia.

MR. MONGER: What about those people who opened up the railways which had made the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins)?

MR. HOPKINS: That was an open expression to come from the member for York this evening. One wondered what railways made the hon. member.

A MEMBER: Greenhills.

MR. HOPKINS: One expected to hear that it was a concession. The East Coolgardie railway was made by the people living on the eastern goldfields, and the profits from that railway had been used to keep going the railways in the agricultural constituencies represented by such people as the member for York (Mr. Monger). He supported the amendment moved by the member for North Fre-

mantle, and he hoped the item would be struck out.

MR. R. D. HUTCHINSON: Some explanation as to the necessity for the items proposed was required. It had been stated during the debate that the whole of these works were set going by a former Government. He believed the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) said the old Government only consented to the Cue-Nannine railway going as far as Tuckanarra. Whether that was the case or not, new members should have every information before voting either one way or the other on Item No. 3 or on any other item in the schedule. It was the duty of the Government to explain why they placed the items on the schedule and how they justified them, and new members should have some explanation from a member of the Government before other members were called upon to discuss the items at all.

MR. W. OATS: Knowing the district referred to from several visits, and knowing what a metalliferous district it was, he was pleased to see this £60,000 placed on the Schedule for the continuance of the line. Everyone said that gold had made Western Australia. It was our duty to support the gold wherever it existed, and the field above Nannine and below Nannine was equal to the average of the fields of this State. He was pleased to see the item in the schedule. The Government had in the past said they could not afford to spend the money for this railway; but when speaking on the question a little while ago he observed that for some parts of the country he would almost deprive himself in order to make railways there. What were the facts affecting that field? Plenty of gold was there, which with careful working would yield good profits to this country and to the investors; but there was no firewood available within miles. These being the facts, he would support the extension of this railway, and he hoped it would go on to Nannine.

MR. A. E. MORGANS: This railway had been promised for years, and money had been voted by a previous Parliament and then reappropriated. Sufficient evidence had been brought before this House in a previous period to show that the railway was justified. If there was any

policy which this or any other Government should keep before them in this country. it was the policy of building railways through the goldfields.

A MEMBER: If we had the money.

MR. MORGANS: It was not want of money. Referring to the mover of this amendment (Mr. D. J. Doherty), that member was never known to vote for the removal of any sum of money which was proposed to be expended in Fremantle, no matter how short of money the Government of the day might be. When any demands affecting Fremantle had to be dealt with, the hon. member would defend them all.

MR. DOHERTY: No; he would not.

MR. MORGANS: Well, the hon. member had followed a bad practice in the past of supporting everything for Fremantle and opposing everything for other parts of the country. If there was any policy that was justified in the present financial position of the country, it was the extension of railways on the goldfields. The production of gold in this State for the next 50 years must be the great element of strength. Our agricultural resources were not yet developed, and it took time to do that; therefore, in the meantime, what was the source of wealth if it was not the production of gold? It was the first and principal duty of this House to see that the resources of those great goldfields were properly developed. Here was an item for the construction of this railway, and information had been placed before this House in times past showing the development of that district. Therefore, the expenditure now proposed should be sanctioned for extending that railway from Cue to Nannine, notwithstanding that it was said the Government were short of funds, though he did not see that it was really so. This important item should not be struck out after it had been passed by a previous Parliament and the money voted, although since reappropriated. It was absolutely unfair to that portion of this important goldfield that this item should be struck out. He hoped members would be just to the people who had invested their money in that part of the country, and he hoped the construction of this line would be continued to Nannine as quickly as was practicable, because that was one of

the most important goldfields in the State. He maintained that to strike out the item was unreasonable and unfair.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): The action of the mover of the amendment could hardly be understood, in view of what took place last session. At that time, members now on the Opposition side pointed out that it was a very bad time to ask for the authorisation, and the hon. member was one of those who then supported the vote for constructing this railway. The present Government had got a certain amount towards the construction, and the work was in progress. The previous Government had been willing to extend the railway into the desert, and the hon. member (Mr. Doherty) now wanted to leave it there. To allow this item to be struck out altogether was a course one could not understand on the part of that hon. member, when members must be aware that there was no mining timber in that district. The district, even under the present disadvantageous conditions, was going ahead; and it was the duty of the Committee to support the action of the previous Parliament; for if we could not afford to leave the whole amount on the schedule for this work, we should at least leave enough to carry it on as quickly as possible.

MR. D. J. DOHERTY (in explanation): The amendment to strike out that item was moved by him in order to take the discussion from general matters and fix it on items; therefore he had taken this item as one which ought to be discussed. Looking at the items in the schedule, he had found that the first item, £15,000 for the Brownhill loop line, was necessary for this year; that the next item, extending the Menzies railway to Leonora, was also necessary; and after that came this item for extending the Murchison railway from Cue to Nannine. He thought this amount would not be required for the present financial year, and therefore he had moved the amendment to strike it out; but he did not want to dictate to the Committee that the whole amount of the item should be struck out, his desire being that the discussion should be brought down to definite items. It was, in fact, a short conversation with the Colonial Treasurer which led him to propose this amendment.

MR. F. W. MOORHEAD: As the member representing the district affected by this proposed railway, he had not heard the remarks of the member who moved to strike out the item, nor had he heard the remarks of the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins); but he could well understand that the member for Boulder would oppose anything which was for the advancement of any part of the country outside a narrow circle around Boulder. If the amendment had been moved only to excite discussion, the time of the Committee had been absolutely wasted; because it was four years since the House passed a Bill authorising the construction of this railway, and the mover of this amendment was then in the House. For two or three years after that vote this work lay dormant, the Government directing their energies to the construction of harbour works at Fremantle, to running railways in the Boulder district and other localities, and they omitted altogether to consider a portion of the State which would be a goldfield when many of the "wild-cats" in the Boulder district would have been exploded. In travelling recently through the Murchison district, he had examined minutely the prospects of that part of the country; and he could assure the Committee that the gold output was increasing, the number of stamps was increasing, and the population was going ahead. When this line was passed by Parliament some four years ago, Nannine was the only mining centre beyond Cue, and there was then only one mine at Nannine. When the question of extending this railway to Cue came before Parliament last session, the hon. member (Mr. Doherty) was silent, or was actively supporting the policy of the Forrest Government. In regard to the condition of the district at the present time, in addition to Nannine there were Tuckanarra, Abbots, Chesterfield, Meekathara, Star of the East, Mt. Yagahong, Gabanintha, Burracurra, and Ravelstone. All these had sprung into existence as mining centres since the extension of this line was originally sanctioned by Parliament; and if there was any reason for proposing the construction of this line in 1896, surely now that we had these additional mining camps, with the increased output of gold, the reasons had been multiplied

tenfold. The population in that district had not sprung into existence by mere speculation, as in some other districts. Take Nannine, for instance: who ever heard of a dishonoured bill in that district? Could this remark apply to the Boulder district? What was the reason generally alleged in this House for the construction of a railway? Was it not to open up country and afford means for the prospector, for cheapening the cost of living and assisting in development? At the present time the cost of firewood in that district was 35s. a load; and how could mines be expected to be carried on with a satisfactory return, when the cost of firewood was so great? Not a stick of mining timber could be obtained in the district, and all such timber required by the mines had to be brought up by railway from the southern districts, then carted to the mines at a large cost. By means of that line, mining timber and firewood would be introduced and the cost of production reduced, and it would be found that the district instead of being compelled to fall back, as at present, on its high-grade mines would be able to work a number of its low-grade ores. That in itself was an advantage. Let members consider what happened during last rainy season in the district. What was its condition then? The people were almost starved by reason of the fact that coaches could not travel the roads. Surely those people must be considered even though they might not be represented by such distinguished gentlemen as the members for Boulder and North Fremantle. The people had claims which should be recognised by Parliament, which were recognised last year by the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Doherty). What, then, was the reason for cutting down the expenditure? There were several items on the list to which attention might be directed more advantageously than to the item under discussion. For four years the railway had been dangled before the eyes of the Nannine people. Last year the House passed a Bill providing the amount for the construction of the line; and, in spite of the statements of the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse), it was not understood that the line was to go only to Tuckanarra. If that were so, if he had thought that,



he certainly should never have supported the line. He would not support that or any other line to run to a banksia bush. But it had been said that Tuckanarra possessed one mine. What did the Premier of that day, the former chief of the member for the Williams, say? He said, "We will go back to the House next session for the balance of the money required." If that was so, and the member for the Williams was willing to vote with the Premier on the want of confidence motion, the hon. member must have indorsed then at any rate the language of his Premier. Therefore on grounds of justice, and on grounds of expediency, members had all the merits on their side in retaining the particular item under discussion. The gold output of the district was increasing; every day fresh mines were being opened. He would ask the House to remember that all the leases were owned by working men. He therefore maintained that although, perhaps, he had intruded at some length on the attention of the House in this matter, he was justified in urging on hon. members the retention of the item.

MR. DOHERTY: Adverting to the remarks of the member for North Murchison (Mr. Moorhead), he desired to say not one word had been uttered by himself against that railway. He moved in the direction he did simply for the purpose of bringing two parties together. He felt himself in the position of one who had interfered between man and wife. The person interfering got the "gruelling," and the other two parties became reconciled. Had the member for North Murchison been in his place when the debate was going on, he would not have cast such reflections. The hon. member should be certain of his facts before he cast reflections. The hon. member's language might be translated to mean that the people at Nannine were to be sacrificed to the people of North Fremantle.

MR. MOORHEAD: A very free translation.

MR. DOHERTY: The wants of North Fremantle had never yet been introduced by him. That constituency was probably worse off than any other constituency in the State.

MR. J. L. NANSON: It would be a pleasure to him to support the item on the grounds so ably put by the member

for North Murchison (Mr. Moorhead). It was unnecessary to rehearse that hon. member's points, but there was one other point which should appeal to members on both sides of the House. The construction of the line represented the carrying out of the policy of giving to every port the trade that geographically belonged to it. The port of Geraldton had been too long denied a great portion of the trade which was its due, the trade with the country north of Coolgardie. The possibilities of a field justifying railway construction also justified the giving of the trade of that field to the port to which it belonged.

MR. F. WALLACE: It had been freely stated by the present Government—and the statement had been accepted by every member of the House—that the items in this schedule represented principally the obligations of the past Government. The member for North Fremantle (Mr. Doherty) said he was acting in a friendly spirit and with a desire to get through the schedule as quickly as possible. That hon. member, with the member for North Murchison (Mr. Moorhead), had supported the Forrest Government, which introduced the Loan Bill for the purpose of constructing those railways—railways which had been opposed by members of the present Government, then in Opposition. Now the members for North Fremantle and North Murchison were found supporting the former Ministers, who, if they had remained in power and carried out their expressed intention, would have come down and asked for the further amount placed on the present Loan Bill. When the Loan Bill in which these lines had originally appeared, was introduced he had opposed it; not because he had been against these particular lines, but because he had been desirous of stopping all railway construction. Those hon. members, however, who had voted for the construction of the railways in question—among the number the line now under consideration—must have recognised what it meant to carry it to Tuckanarra. All members had an idea of the geographical position of the different parts of the State; consequently those who knew Tuckanarra, as the member for North Murchison (Mr. Moorhead) knew it—and in fact every member of the Chamber knew Tuckanarra—must have

been well aware that the line was taken to a place which might safely be called "Nowhere." All members must have known the whole of the country from Cue to Nannine to be one horrible quagmire, positively impassable during wet weather. If the railway had been taken to the centre of the quagmire, surely the loyal supporters of the late Government would not propose to strike out the item for carrying the line to Nannine. He would rather have altogether prevented the line from starting from Cue; but seeing that it had been taken half way to Tuckanarra and that the present Government had shown a desire to carry out the old obligations of the Forrest Government by bringing forward this item of £60,400, he really felt that the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Doherty) had acted as he claimed, merely from a friendly desire to get on with the schedule and dispose of it as quickly as possible. It was to be hoped that the remarks of the member for North Murchison (Mr. Moorhead) as to the supply of fuel and the necessity for mining timber, would have attention; and that the existence of several good mines—two very good ones, the Champion and Champion Extended—would not be overlooked. These were good mines. He was not speaking as an expert, but from information given him by men who had worked on the mines for a number of years. He believed, and if he did not hold such a belief he would not support the item, that with cheaper transport and greater facilities for treatment the mines beyond Nannine and Chesterfield would add largely to the gold output of the State. He would support the item because he recognised that it would be a waste of money to let the line, which had been started, stop at Tuckanarra. He felt especially justified in supporting the item since it was the intention of the previous Government, supported by members on both sides of the Chamber, to carry the line on to Nannine. The present Government, he understood and believed, were only carrying out the obligations of the Forrest Government in putting the item for that line on the schedule.

MR. J. J. HIGHAM: The item should be struck out, and he must support the motion to that effect. No member who had yet spoken had done anything but

mention the number of mines. There was no result as yet to justify the House in incurring the expense of the railway under discussion. The promises of the previous year might be satisfactory enough, but he was not satisfied with the last year's results. He asked hon. members interested in the railway or in the districts which it was intended to serve, to bring forward facts to justify the continuation. The House had voted for its construction as far as Tuckanarra, and presumably it must be built up to that stage; but certainly so far as he could learn outside and could gather from the facts placed before the House, there was no justification for the continuation of the line or for the expenditure of £60,000 on it.

MR. C. H. RASON: It was to be hoped that the Committee would allow the item to stand. When representing a Murchison constituency he had voted for the work, because he thought the circumstances justified it. At that time he sat on the other side of the House. He did not represent a Murchison constituency now, and he had changed his seat in the House; but he saw no reason to change his opinion. He formerly thought the vote was justified, and he thought so still. Great weight attached to the circumstance that Parliament had pledged itself to the work, and he for one thought the pledges of Parliament should be respected.

MR. W. OATS: Everybody knew the great mine at Peak Hill and what it had done. The statistics would show what gold had been produced there. Everybody knew that mine had been a great gold producer for three or four years past. [A MEMBER: "Played out" now.] No; that mine was not "played out." There was also a mine called Abbott's, which certain gentlemen in the Chamber knew something about. That mine was floated in London; the company bought a 10-head battery and a mining plant, and put them on the lease. However, they failed to make the property pay, and abandoned it. The men who first discovered the place were old prospectors, horny-handed toilers; some of them were Fremantle men; and the more credit to them, considering the little knowledge they had of mining, for one did not expect any mining knowledge from Fre-

mantle. He believed the first company sold the plant and everything for £6,000. What became of that mine? In nine months five or six men who took over the property paid off the £6,000, and the mine was a good one to-day. It had paid a lot of money, and it was worth while building a railway for Abbott's mine if for nothing else.

**MR. J. M. HOPKINS:** The railway to Nannine had been opposed by him, he would like to explain, not because he thought the people of Nannine were not entitled to it. He opposed it as a new railway from Tuckanarra to Nannine on the ground on which he had opposed other new lines. He considered that they might just as well be postponed to run the gauntlet of the Public Works Board promised by the Government. That was the reason of his opposition.

**MR. MONGER:** What if the House struck out Item 1, Boulder loop line?

**MR. HOPKINS:** If it were struck out he would not be sorry, though he would not move that it should be struck out. He had opposed the Brownhill loop-line for the simple reason that he did not believe the railway would be of any use. He did not think now it would be. He was in the House to speak his honest opinion. The member representing the district through which the line would run, Hannan's, was present to speak for the item. He (Mr. Hopkins) wanted to say so much in explanation, because, perhaps, his earlier remarks had not been too clear, since he was a little warm. The inferences drawn by the member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan) were unnecessary, and the eloquence of the member for North Murchison (Mr. Moorhead) might have been reserved for a better occasion.

**MR. R. HASTIE:** The passing of the item for the Cue-Nannine line would not prevent its being considered by the Public Works Committee in the future. That could still be done. However, he would like to say that the Labour members were extremely obliged to the member for North Murchison (Mr. Moorhead) and also to the member for Yilgarn (Mr. Oats) for the information they had given. It seemed to have been assumed by the Treasurer and other members who spoke before the members for North Murchison and Yilgarn, that the Labour members

had every information with regard to the line. It seemed to have been assumed that they were in the House last session, and knew exactly the basis on which the line was promised. No information had been supplied as to the population of the district, nor in regard to the length of the line from Tuckanarra to Nannine.

**MR. McDONALD:** Twenty-five miles.

**MR. HASTIE:** The distance from Cue to Tuckanarra was 26 miles, which was half-way then. We had not before us a fair business-like estimate of the probable traffic on that railway, and it was really due to the Committee that the Treasurer should give that information. It had been stated by some members, especially by the member for North Murchison (Mr. Moorhead), that some members wished to oppose anything outside their own districts. That was not fair. Considering the financial position of the State, it was too much to ask the Committee to pass everything that had been agreed to by the last Parliament; for it was quite possible that circumstances had so altered that it would be wise to reconsider the decision of the last Parliament. If the Treasurer would supply the Committee with the number of people and the amount of probable traffic on the line, members would do their best to see if the people of Nannine and the Peak Hill district could be connected with other parts of the State by railway.

**MR. A. J. DIAMOND:** To a considerable extent we were indulging in a "storm in a teacup." We need not waste the time of the Committee in discussing these items. There was not the slightest doubt that this item would be passed. More important matters had to be considered than this item, and the consensus of opinion was that it should be agreed to.

**MR. J. RESIDE:** The member for York (Mr. Monger) made a mistake when he referred to the Brownhill loop line, because it appeared on the schedule as the Boulder-Brownhill loop line, but as a matter of fact it was the Kalgoorlie-Brownhill loop line. As far as the line was concerned, the member for Boulder was not right.

**MR. DOHERTY:** Was this item under consideration?

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The hon. member was out of order.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: Would the Commissioner of Railways supply some information as to what was included in the item "Additions and improvements to opened lines, £318,000"? Was the work so absolutely necessary that we in our present financial position could afford to incur such an expenditure?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The £318,000 was to extend over three years, which would be about £100,000 a year; but as it had been decided to bind the Government to spend a certain amount of money within 15 months, this amount could be reduced *pro rata*.

MR. GEORGE: What was the money for?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: To continue works in hand undertaken by the late Government without authorisation. He would mention one work, the Boulder duplication, for which £40,000 was authorised. The records of the office showed that at the time the authorisation was obtained from Parliament, the estimate for the work was £50,000; yet Parliament was asked to authorise only £40,000. There had been fresh additions and improvements to this line, and the department stood committed to-day to an expenditure of £70,000 for what originally was to cost £40,000. That was for four miles of railway.

MR. CONNOR: Who was in charge of the construction?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The Working Railways branch was in charge of that work; and when the Government took office, they found that one subway, in course of construction, was to cost no less than £12,000. The Government immediately suspended that work. The unsatisfactory condition of affairs existing to-day had a great deal to do with removing the expenditure of loan money from the Railway Department and placing it under the Works Department. To-day the Commissioner of Railways and the General Manager of Railways had to run the traffic, and have only the revenue at their disposal. We could not expend a sixpence of loan money except through the Engineer-in-Chief and the Works Department. That was a principle which would save thousands of pounds to the country.

The Government found the Working Railways branch spending enormous amounts of money in this State; and it was estimated that £70,000 would have to be spent to complete a work which was originally to cost £40,000. The Minister for Works was of opinion that he could save £7,000 on the one subway alone. Farther, whilst the Government asked for £300,000 for three years, the late Commissioner of Railways for five years consecutively had spent £300,000 a year on improvements to opened lines; but when the present Government asked for £300,000 for three years, objection was raised by the Opposition to voting the money.

MR. GEORGE: The Opposition were not objecting; only asking for information.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: To complete the works in hand and liquidate liabilities, to provide stations, station yards and improvements which had cropped up from time to time, the present Government asked for £300,000 to expend in three years. As the Government were to be limited to a 15 months' expenditure, this item would be reduced *pro rata*.

A MEMBER: How much?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The information would be supplied in the margin of the Bill to-morrow.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: In asking the question, he did not wish to embarrass the Minister or his colleagues: he wanted to know what the money was to be spent for. Having seen what had been done on the Boulder line, he had formed his own conclusions, and he was desirous of knowing what the Government intended to do. In the early part of the session he asked the question whether that portion of the Boulder line which was under the system of collecting tickets at the barriers had resulted in financial success. His idea was to see if the result warranted the expenditure incurred.

MR. HOPKINS: The system had not been introduced then.

MR. GEORGE: Tickets were being collected under the barrier system at some of the stations, and the effect of that system should be known to the department. He wanted the results for May and June; and if the returns showed a considerable increase in the receipts,

the expenditure on the line, in a measure, was justified. If not, then the expenditure should be carefully criticised. He desired the information to see how far the idea of carrying out improvements on the railways on a scale, which was almost in front of the railways of the old country, could be stood by this State. It was not a question whether it was the fault of the last Government or not. We desired to know what the work was to cost, whether it was the fault of the last Government or the virtues of the present.

MR. F. CONNOR: This item would come before the Committee to-morrow night; therefore it might be passed without discussion now.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: Some information was required in regard to the item "Rails and fastenings, £265,000." These rails and fastenings were not for the lines enumerated in the schedule, but must be required for certain portions of the existing lines; would the Minister give information as to what the rails and fastenings were for. He would also like to know whether the £742,000 for rolling-stock had actually been indented for and whether a portion was on the way; if so the money would have to be provided.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: At the present time there were 50 miles which it was necessary to relay between Northam and Southern Cross, and there were 114 miles between Southern Cross and Coolgardie to be relaid, the estimated cost of which was £106,600; that was the only line in the service which was paying, and the Railway Department to-day were running heavy engines and trains over the old rails, breaking them up and interfering with the traffic. If the Committee decided to go on with a condition of things such as that, then the old rails would have to be left and the item struck out altogether. Seeing that the line was paying expenses and carrying the burdens of other lines, it was only natural that this line should be put in a satisfactory condition; if so, it would cost £106,600. If the Committee agreed that that should be done, the Department would go on with the construction. Then again to duplicate the line from Bellevue to Northam, a distance of 56 miles, would cost £168,000. Was that work to be gone on with or abandoned?

MR. DIAMOND: Where was Bellevue?  
THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: Just beyond Midland Junction. The officers of the department thought the work necessary. It was for the Committee to say whether the line should be duplicated. The departmental officers thought it necessary; and if it were, £168,000 must be provided.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The Commissioner had not replied to the member for the Murray (Mr. George), who had asked whether this £265,000 for rails and fastenings included the amount to be provided for the rails for the Geraldton-Murchison and the Menzies-Leonora railways. In regard to the item of £60,400 for the Cue-Nannine railway, he might say that in providing by a Loan Bill for the construction of railways, the rails were not reckoned in the amount for construction, the cost of these being included in the item "Rails and fastenings," out of which the cost of rails was taken for any railway in course of construction. Therefore the item of £318,000 could be reduced, and so could the item of £265,000 for rails and fastenings.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. Kingsmill): The idea of the last speaker, while theoretically correct, did not work out in practice.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: It was one of the Engineer-in-Chief's proposals.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Whether that were so or not, the Public Works Department were at present seriously inconvenienced because they could not get back from the Working Railways branch the rails which had been lent. For instance, the Cue-Nannine line was to have been laid with rails made available by the relaying of the line from Perth to Kalgoorlie; but instead of the Working Railways branch handing over to the Works Department those rails as they were lifted, these appeared to have been sold or otherwise disposed of in several ways.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: They were used on the Goomalling line.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The member for North Murchison (Mr. Moorhead) had been much aggrieved that his, the Cue-Nannine railway, did not proceed faster; therefore this explanation was necessary. In the past, there had apparently been an absolute scramble for

such rails, which were neither under the control of the Works nor of the Railway Department; and "the first in" got the rails.

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS:** How much was now owing on this account to the Works Department?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** A large sum.

**MR. DOHERTY:** As much as £100,000?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** And it was not certain whether the Railway Department could repay the amount. The greater part of the rails which were to have been used for the Nannine line had been sold to timber companies.

**HON. F. H. PIESSE:** Nothing of the kind. Thirty miles of them were used for the Goomalling railway.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Some; not all. The Railway Department was, he believed, indebted to the Works Department to the extent of about 50 miles of rails, which debt had not been recovered. Portion of those rails went into the Kurrawang railway.

**HON. F. H. PIESSE:** Not a single rail went into that railway. Those rails were from the line beyond Northam. That could be threshed out by the proposed commission.

**MR. DOHERTY:** The department always charged for carrying such rails.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Without this explanation, some hon. members might have been puzzled as to what became of such rails. For a long time he had been waiting to give this explanation to the member for North Murchison (Mr. Moorhead).

**MR. W. J. GEORGE:** From the Commissioner of Railways he had understood that the item "Rails and Fastenings" included 50 miles of rails to relay the Northam to Southern Cross line, and 114 miles to relay the Southern Cross to Coolgardie line; also from the Minister for Works he understood that certain rails taken up from the Coolgardie line should have gone to Nannine; in other words, that Nannine was to have had a second-hand railway, and apparently to be treated as a second-hand place. There was no necessity to bring down a Loan Bill to purchase rails for the lines mentioned in the schedule, because the rails made available by the relaying of the Northam to Coolgardie and Southern

Cross to Coolgardie line would surely be sufficient to pay back the rails owing to the Works Department, and also to make the Cue-Nannine railway.

**A MEMBER:** Meanwhile the Cue-Nannine railway would be hung up.

**MR. W. J. GEORGE:** It must be hung up for a certain time, for the rails could not immediately be secured, even if ordered from England. What about the item, "Rolling-stock, £742,000"?

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS:** On the 1st June last, there had been available for payment of rolling-stock £112,000. Against this, the indents for rolling-stock which had been executed in London, and were being shipped out here, amounted to £393,275, and orders going forward to £267,670—in all, a total of £660,945. That was the rolling-stock ordered when he took office; and against that there was only £112,000 cash to pay for it, leaving £548,935 to be made good by the present Government. If the Committee decided the rolling-stock not yet built was unnecessary, the Government could cable home to stop any orders not executed.

**MR. W. J. GEORGE:** What did the hon. member mean by "orders going forward"?

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS:** The orders had been issued by the 1st June, and were going forward. One item had been ordered in May by the late Government—45 Class A engines, at a cost of £2,400 each. That was included in the £267,670 mentioned. To pay for these orders, amounting to £660,945, there was available only £112,000.

**MR. F. CONNOR:** Had anything been ordered since?

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS:** No. These were orders to which the State had been committed on the 1st June last. There was no provision here for rolling-stock for the three new lines of railway appearing in the schedule, and now in course of construction; and seeing we had already ordered £660,945 worth of stock, and had only £112,000 cash to pay for it, and had three lines of railway to be equipped with rolling-stock, then surely the item of £742,000 for rolling-stock for the next three years was not unreasonable.

**SEVERAL MEMBERS:** Hear, hear.

## RAILWAY WORKSHOPS, MIDLAND JUNCTION—AMENDMENT, TO STRIKE OUT.

MR. H. DAGLISH, referring to item "Railway Workshops (Midland Junction), £424,000," moved :

That the words "Midland Junction" be struck out.

This would afford an opportunity for inquiry, before Parliament was committed to the large expenditure involved in the item. Though there had been an inquiry made, many years ago, into this subject, that inquiry had been of a thoroughly partial and unsatisfactory nature, because the commission which recommended the Junction site did not go thoroughly into the matter. Farther, the five members of the commission had been utterly divided, three voting one way and two another. The commission sat in 1893, no less than eight years ago; and as they took scarcely any expert evidence, they afforded an instance of the easy-going and light-hearted fashion in which this State had been recommended to incur heavy expenditure, and had been committed to the wasteful expenditure of enormous sums of money on the very shallowest evidence. The subject had since been frequently debated in Parliament, but no new evidence had been adduced. The very partial nature of the commission's inquiry would be realised when he stated that not the slightest consideration had been given to the cost of haulage, one of the most important points in railway management. The nature of the evidence submitted would be seen when he stated that one of the reasons given by the only expert examined by the commission on the subject of the site was that the Midland site was suitable because, amongst other reasons, there was a large area of land available for workmen's dwellings, and a workman could there have a home surrounded by several acres of land, instead of being confined within narrow limits. Though the Commission had been so much divided on the subject, the Midland Junction site was ultimately selected mainly because it was level; and it had since cost about £26,000 to level it, nor was it certain that the levelling was yet complete. From time to time the matter had been brought before the House by members who wanted further information; but at such times

it had always been alleged that the workshops were just about to be proceeded with, that the work had been, comparatively speaking, suspended for some time, but that the present time was very inopportune for inquiry, because the Government had been just about to go on with the work. Still, after the lapse of eight years, practically nothing had been done. Recently, a little spurt had been made, and, significantly enough, made just after the last Parliament, by the slender majority of one, had decided not to inquire into the question of the site. Before Parliament were farther committed to this matter, some inquiry should be made in the public interest, to find out whether we should really be acting wisely in spending a large sum of money at Midland Junction. He knew that members who had referred to the matter in the debate on the Address had assumed that if there were an inquiry, the site would necessarily be shifted; they assumed that if we had an investigation, the present site would not be retained. If the Midland Junction site was a suitable one, there was ample justification for the fullest inquiry. We had not considered at all in this matter the serious displacement of population which must result from shifting the workshops from their present site to Midland Junction. Since the last election he had seen a statement that the Midland Junction people were expecting an accession of 7,000, roughly, in their population. These 7,000 people were to be drawn from the various suburbs of Perth and from Fremantle; and a displacement like this was serious unless there existed the very strongest necessity for it. Before we allowed this change to take place, we should consider those engaged in business and the injury likely to be done to people through a large number of business insolvencies resulting from this shifting of population. We should also consider the question whether it would not be desirable at the present stage of railway development to somewhat decentralise our workshops. Eight years ago, when the commission to which he had referred sat, our total railway system covered 260 miles; whereas at the present time our railway mileage was about 1,400 miles; and yet we were told that an inquiry made when we had simply

a mileage of 260 miles was sufficient evidence that our requirements would be adequately met when our system was five or six times as large. He was not going to appeal to the House either to retain the shops on their present site, or to shift them to any other particular site. [A MEMBER: Subiaco.] Even Subiaco would not be suggested by him, because the common sense of most of the members would suggest that place. Our duty to the State demanded that we should pause very seriously before plunging into a heavy expenditure that might not be warranted. In some of the other States the people had plunged, and had established large workshops, which they afterwards had to remove at enormous expense to the State. He wanted Western Australia to be guarded against that. He also desired that the question of decentralisation of our railway work should be considered. We had in our large mileage two ports, for instance—one being the port of Geraldton, and the other the port of Albany—right away from the metropolis.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: And Bunbury.

MR. DAGLISH: It was open to consideration whether these ports, and the port of Bunbury, might not with advantage to the State have a portion of our railway work done there instead of the work being centralised in any one place. That was a reason why we should consider the matter and have an inquiry before coming to the final decision which this item suggested. The opinion that there was need for inquiry was upheld in the last Parliament by Sir John Forrest, who urged the same thing, and very strongly justified the demand then made for a commission of experts to be appointed to inquire into the whole matter. We should not settle this question on the lines of mere parliamentary debate, but our decision should be on the solid bedrock of expert evidence.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. F. Illingworth) appealed to the Committee not to open up a discussion upon the Midland Railway question. We wanted to get this Bill through, and as far as the Bill itself was concerned, it did not matter to the Government whether the words "Midland Junction" were struck out or not, as long as we retained "Railway Workshops." The House might

consider at some other time whether they would change the site or not.

MR. R. SPEIGHT: Were members to understand that Parliament was committed to an expenditure of £424,000 for Workshops? Never mind whether the site was Midland Junction or anywhere else, were we committed to an expenditure of that kind, and were we going to incur such an expenditure without the House having an opportunity of considering the details of it? It seemed to him a most monstrous expenditure, and he should do all he possibly could to criticise and analyse that expenditure before supporting such an outlay.

MR. C. H. RASON: The amendment before the Committee was to strike out the words "Midland Junction." Although he would be quite willing to fall in with the wishes of the Colonial Treasurer, and not provoke a discussion on this item, still he was bound to show cause, if he could, why the words "Midland Junction" should not be struck out. As to the necessity for the completion and equipment of these shops, we had nothing to do with that at this moment, the amendment we had to deal with being that moved by the member for Subiaco (Mr. H. Daglish), that the words "Midland Junction" be struck out. He (Mr. Rason) had thought the question of the suitability of the site at Midland Junction was one which was settled long ago. There had been motion after motion in the House on the same subject; in fact, he thought that on the question of the Midland Junction workshops we had solved the problem of perpetual motion, for motion after motion had been brought forward on every possible occasion for many years past, and the House had repeatedly confirmed its decision that in the opinion of Parliament—both Houses of Parliament—the site at Midland Junction was pre-eminently suitable. The member for Subiaco, when putting his views before the Committee to-night, had not been as fair as he ought to have been. He said that the commission appointed to consider this question was a partial one, and that the evidence was of an unsatisfactory nature.

MR. DAGLISH: The assertion made by him was that the evidence was partial.

MR. C. H. RASON: The greatest confidence seemed to have been shown in



regard to the opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief. That officer was asked:

We would like your opinion as to which you consider the best site, and the grounds upon which you have formed that opinion?—Answer: I may say that I have confined my researches to the distance between Fremantle and the Midland Junction, because there is a distinct line of demarcation between the grades on this side of the Midland Junction and the grades beyond that point.

Dealing with the claims of Subiaco, the Engineer-in-Chief said:—

Another site which has been mentioned is Subiaco. We have had levels taken of that site, and we find that the levelling and filling up required there would average five or six feet, which would mean an additional expense of £250 to £300 an acre, in preparing the ground. The same objection lies against the Bayswater site. There is also another consideration which weighs against both these sites, and that is the absolute necessity of having these workshops in the vicinity of a staff station. I have not searched for any suitable sites along the Bunbury railway, for the reasons that I cannot see that any site here could be as convenient as that at the Midland Junction, and it could not possibly be cheaper. The evidence of the Engineer-in-Chief went to show that to bring the site at Subiaco up to the same condition as the site of Midland Junction was in when it was purchased by the Government would cost from £120,000 to £150,000. The evidence of Mr. Allison Smith, at all events, should not be partial.

MR. J. J. HIGHAM: It was certainly not impartial.

MR. RASON: Mr. Allison Smith said:

In addition to the advantages which Guildford affords in the matter of a suitable area of cheap and level land, there is also the advantage that the junction of the Midland system and the Canning Timber Company's Railway with the Government lines is made at that place, and also that there occurs there a distinct change in the gradients and character of the traffic of the Eastern Railway, which points to the necessity of having there a large engine depôt, which could be more conveniently maintained in conjunction with workshops than as a separate system.

In fact, Mr. Allison Smith indorsed the opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief. Reference had been made by the member for Subiaco to the vested interest which was supposed to exist at Fremantle.

MR. HIGHAM: No; not Fremantle.

MR. RASON: A vested interest supposed to exist where?

MR. HIGHAM: Between Perth and Fremantle.

MR. RASON: Certainly there was no vested interest at any place between Perth and Fremantle when the subject of the removal of the Workshops was first introduced.

MR. HIGHAM: Certainly there was.

MR. RASON: That was the hon. member's opinion. When the question of the removal of the Workshops was first introduced, there was little, if any, vested interest between Fremantle and Midland Junction. Every available site was on a level footing as far as its claims were concerned. The vested interest existing, if any, was at Fremantle; and the extent of that vested interest was shown by the evidence, or by the reports, of two of the Fremantle gentlemen who were themselves on that very Royal Commission. These gentlemen recognised the vested interest. They stated what it was, and he (Mr. Rason) had extracted their statements from the report of that commission. These gentlemen wished to impress the question of vested interest on the House, and they said:—

We would point out that some twenty men have built houses in and about Fremantle.

MR. HIGHAM: 250 now.

MR. RASON: That might be, but any one who had built houses, anyone who had interests dependent upon the Workshops at Fremantle, since that time, acquired them with his eyes open, and could not claim that the action of the Assembly had in any way prejudiced his position. He trusted members would recognise there was a still greater claim to be made out than he (Mr. Rason) was endeavouring to put forward to-night. Let the Committee look at the position of the Midland Junction site as we found it to-day. We found that in the opinion of experts Midland Junction was an admittedly suitable site in every way. The House had repeatedly confirmed its decision that the shops should be erected there. Already some £43,000 had been spent there. Contracts for some of the buildings had already been entered into, and contracts had been let for the supply of 3,000,000 bricks, which was now being delivered on the ground. There was sufficient concrete on the ground for the whole of the engine-beds, which were now being excavated. The work had at last, after many years' delay, been put well in hand, and was being progressed with

rapidly. Supposing inquiry were now made as to whether the site were suitable or not, there could be no doubt as to what the verdict would be, but still more delay would occur. It might be a question of two or three months', or six months' delay, but undoubtedly the verdict would remain the same. In the meantime this State was losing vast sums of money, and any expert would tell the Committee that already the State had lost more than sufficient to complete and equip these workshops twice over.

MR. HIGHAM: Oh, no.

MR. RASON: It was all very well for the member for Fremantle to say "Oh, no." One did not recognise that hon. member at all events as being a wholly impartial expert. He would like to refer that gentleman to the report of the present Locomotive Engineer, Mr. Rotherham, who at any rate might be recognised as a competent authority to speak on his own particular branch. Mr. Rotherham reported:—

The Workshops accommodation and facilities at Fremantle are inadequate and unsuitable. It is an absolute necessity that immediate action be taken in reference to this most important and urgent matter. Unless reasonable facilities are available, the cost of operating this branch must increase in a most abnormal degree. Departmental reports show that the condition of the locomotives, carriages, wagons, machinery, and general plant is only fair.

It was a nice condition of affairs when the Chief Mechanical Engineer had to report that the condition of the rolling-stock was "only fair." What was the reason of that unsatisfactory condition? Undoubtedly the reason was that there were no facilities provided for the proper treatment of the rolling-stock. He was struck last night by a remark of the Commissioner of Railways to the effect that the total available supply of wagons in this State now numbered 4,000. By turning up the Railway Report it would be seen that on the 30th June of last year the total number of wagons supposed to be available was 4,637. What had become of the 637?

The COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: About 4,000 was the number mentioned.

MR. RASON: He wanted to know what had become of the balance of 637? He presumed they were laid up in the sheds or sidings round about the Fre-

mantle Workshops with no facilities for repairing them. He could only ask hon. members whether they had used their eyes in journeying to and from Fremantle. No one with half an eye but could see the deplorable state of things. The neighbourhood of the Fremantle sheds reminded one of nothing so much as of a gigantic marine store. One saw engines and machinery of all descriptions standing about here, there, and everywhere. One saw a few men tinkering at an engine in one place, and a few more tinkering at another engine somewhere else: all without supervision of any kind. This state of things undoubtedly meant a loss of thousands a year to the State. That had been demonstrated beyond the possibility of denial. It was all very well for the Fremantle members to interject "Oh, no," but let them stand up and prove that the reports of the experts, the report of the State's Engineer-in-Chief, the report of this State's General Manager of Railways, the reports of all the representative railway officials of the State were wrong. Then he would be prepared to believe them. But the reports of all the railway heads in this State went to show conclusively that the delay in the erection of the shops had already cost and was continuing to cost this State thousands a year. Surely it could not be necessary to labour the point at this stage. If any reliance at all was to be placed on the work done in Parliament, then surely the House would refuse to make itself the laughing-stock of the continent. It would make itself the laughing-stock of the continent if it went back on its frequently-repeated verdict on this matter. The subject was superior to parochial interest. "A national undertaking" seemed to be a favourite expression in the House just now. If ever there was a national undertaking, this was one. It was indeed a matter for surprise that the members for Fremantle, when they had been beaten and beaten and beaten hundreds of times he might say, should so persistently return to the attack. It appeared to him that they did so only in a dog-in-the-manger spirit. Those members must be satisfied that the workshops must go from Fremantle, but they said to themselves, "Let us by hook or crook, by some means or other, delay the

removal as long as possible." Those members wished to delay the removal, not because they did not recognise that the workshops must go somewhere else in the interests of the State, but because, he regretted to say, those members thought in delaying the matter they showed that they were protecting the interests of their constituents. Those members should rise superior to that narrow-minded view, and should deal with the matter in a broad-minded, national manner. He still had hopes they might see the error of their ways. At any rate, he felt convinced that the Committee would recognise what was due to decisions of Parliament oft repeated, and that members would not consent, without more consideration than it was possible to give at this juncture, to make the House the laughing-stock of the whole of the States of Australia by attempting to interfere in any way with these works.

MR. W. B. GORDON: If by chance there had been any doubts whatever in his mind with respect to Item 7, they would have been entirely removed by the able arguments of the member for Guildford (Mr. Rason). The member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) had not given any assurance that if the debate on the question continued until next day he would not change his mind with regard to it, as he had so often done already.

MR. DAGLISH: That statement was absolutely untrue.

MR. GORDON: Then the records of *Hansard* must be wrong. He hoped the hon. member had firmly established his mind in this instance. It would be something new, anyhow, if the hon. member did stick to an opinion. The Government were deserving of sympathy, because the members who sat behind them seemed to be splitting up on every possible occasion. They had the assurance of the Premier and nearly every other Minister that the present Administration intended to carry out the policy of the late Government, and they must stand or fall by that. Apart from the discussion, he maintained that if the Government attempted in any way to shelve the matter, they should be put out of office. He might add that as a new member of this House—[A MEMBER: As the new Premier]—he had frequently

heard from the Ministerial benches the interjection that the policy of the present Government was the old Government's policy. Members like himself did not pay any regard to old Governments or new Governments. They reckoned with no Government but the Government of day. The present Ministry had taken those benches, and in doing so they had taken on their shoulders the load that lay there. They had taken up that load willingly, and for his part he refused to admit any plea by the present occupants of those benches that something or other was the fault of the old Government, or the liability of the old Government. The present occupants of the Treasury bench reminded him somewhat of gutta-percha dolls, which squeaked when pinched. The Ministers did that on every possible occasion. If they intended to hold their seats, they should do so in a manly, fair, and square manner, and not on every occasion squeak that something or other was not their fault.

MR. J. GARDINER: Before moving the reduction of the item under discussion, he would like to ask the Minister for Public Works what, roughly, was the amount of money spent up to date on the works, and also the amount which would be sufficient to meet the contract entered into?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. Kingsmill): In replying to the member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner), he could only regret he was not in a position to state accurately the amount of money which had been spent on the proposed site at Midland Junction. He believed it amounted to £50,000 approximately. He could inform the hon. member that the following works had been done. The earthworks for the proposed scheme had been completed. The timber store, 600 feet long by 50 feet wide, was practically completed. The tarpaulin store with a concrete foundation, 140 feet long by 60 feet wide, was completed. About 20,000 bricks had been delivered. Excavation of main drain on the west side, about 980 feet, had been all done; and about 300 feet of concrete work had been completed. The foundations for the iron-rack had been excavated, and the order for timber for the buildings had been placed. The total estimated cost of the proposed workshops was £471,000, which was split

up in detail: earthworks, £20,500 (he believed that estimate had been somewhat exceeded); permanent-way, including labour and material, £42,100; buildings, £277,900; machinery, £130,500. The last item was likely to be exceeded, because the Government had before them another indent for tools for this new workshop. The tools already ordered were considered necessary, but not altogether adequate, inasmuch as the Government were led to believe that further indents would have to go forward. The estimated amount of the indent was £140,000.

MR. WILSON: Was that amount additional?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. The £140,000 was in lieu of the £130,500 which had been placed on the Estimates for machinery.

MR. WILSON: £10,000 more?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, roughly, about £10,000 more. He might say the scheme referred to in the estimate was that proposed as an adequate and necessary scheme by the Chief Mechanical Engineer, Mr. Rotherham. The estimate had been made by the Engineer for Railway Construction, Mr. James Thompson. The estimate was not a new thing. It had been prepared in June, 1900, and came before the late Government. Of course he did not want to hurt the feelings of the member for South Perth (Mr. Gordon) in using that phrase.

MR. GORDON: The member for South Perth had no feelings.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Of course that would be all right then. He trusted the phrase "late Government" had not annoyed the hon. member. His last speech would lead one to infer that he strongly objected to the expression. The late Commissioner of Railways and Director of Public Works, and the late right hon. Premier had seen and noted this estimate in September, 1900.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Was the Minister alluding to him? He had not seen the papers.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Whether the leader of the Opposition saw the details of the scheme or not he did not know, but on calling for the documents that day, he (the Minister) noticed on the papers which contained the detailed estimate the word "noted,"

written by the present leader of the Opposition, also the signature of Sir John Forrest.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Not in September.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The date, he fancied, was September; at any rate the hon. member's well-known signature was on the jacket. Whether the hon. member had looked inside or not when "noted" was written on the outside, he (the Minister) could not say; but the signature of the leader of the Opposition and that of Sir John Forrest were on the outside, which meant that the contents of the file had been noted by them.

HON. F. H. PIESSE said he was not in office at that time.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Possibly the month was wrong, but the file containing the estimate was before the late Government.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: That was right.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: In defence of an officer of the Works Department, he must say something. A statement was made by the leader of the Opposition last night that the estimate for this work had been put down by the Engineer-in-Chief at £180,000.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: By the Commission appointed, he would say.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: If not by the Engineer-in-Chief, then he (the Minister) would say no more on that point.

MR. J. GARDINER: It was his desire to move another amendment on the item. But, before doing so, he wished to assure the member for Guildford (Mr. Rason) that the intention was not to do that hon. member's constituency any injury. We all recognised that we were placed in a rather delicate position in criticising items which belonged to another member's electorate. The member for Guildford had frequently advocated with great force this work, and in the position this country now stood all must agree that the sanction of a work that was practically one of convenience, amounting in cost to £424,000, was something that would disgrace us in the eyes of the community more than going back on anything which had been done by the previous Government. He intended to move that the item be reduced by £150,000. We had a right to consider that there were

other constituencies which had claims of infinitely greater force, so far as the general convenience of the community was concerned, than this one. What was desired was to have sufficient convenience in order that rolling-stock which we now had should be properly treated and looked after, and for that purpose the sum of £424,000 was enormous when we considered that a fair amount of convenience already existed. He believed with the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) that it would be a wise thing as far as possible to decentralise, although he did not wish to be parochial. He was opposing the works from a national standpoint, and he did not think the finances of the country were in a position to allow us to construct this work. It would damage our credit considerably in the eyes of those from whom we had to borrow money if we showed we were willing to put £424,000 in a work which was not revenue producing. Although the amendment might hurt the feelings of the member for Guildford (Mr. Rason), he (Mr. Gardiner) was going to take it to a division.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** This would not be an amendment on the previous amendment. Better deal first with the amendment of the member for Subiaco.

**MR. GARDINER:** The former amendment was not seconded.

**MR. F. WILSON:** It would be well if the member for Subiaco withdrew his amendment; for if the Committee were going to thresh out this extensive question of the Midland Junction site, it would take well into next week to do so; and seeing it was recognised on all sides that the Loan Bill was a question of great urgency the member for Subiaco would be consulting the wishes of members, and would not be doing any harm to the motion he had on the Notice Paper, if he withdrew the amendment. If the hon. member persevered with his amendment, he (Mr. Wilson) could put in an hour discussing the matter, and other members no doubt could do the same. The Loan Bill would not then get through this week.

**MR. H. DAGLISH:** There was no wish on his part to force a discussion on the House, if he understood from the Colonial Treasurer that the passing of this item as it stood would not necessarily determine the matter.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The money was for the purpose of paying for machinery for which orders had been given; but that machinery could be erected on any site Parliament ultimately directed.

**MR. H. DAGLISH:** With the consent of the Committee, he would withdraw his amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

AMENDMENT, TO REDUCE AMOUNT.

**MR. GARDINER** formally moved his amendment as indicated:—

That the item be reduced to £150,000.

**MR. A. E. MORGANS:** If the hon. member would make the amount £100,000 he would support it. If £100,000 were expended on the Workshops next year, that would be more than sufficient. [**A MEMBER:** That was not it.] If members wished to correct him in the position he was going to take, he had misunderstood the nature of the discussion. We began the discussion on the ground that it was the intention of the Government to reduce the whole of the Loan Estimates to £1,500,000.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** No.

**MR. MORGANS:** If it was the intention of the Government to reduce the Loan Estimates to £1,500,000 or any other sum, why not do it?

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** That was not the intention.

**THE PREMIER:** The hon. member was not here this afternoon when the matter was threshed out.

**MR. MORGANS:** If the items were to be discussed to-morrow, then we were going on a wrong line entirely. We wished to facilitate the question and help the Government, who wanted to get a Loan Bill through; and it would be much better to determine to give the Government two millions of money to last for 15 months. It had been suggested that £1,500,000 should be granted, but it would be a mistake to tie up the Government with too small an amount such as £1,500,000. Why should not the Committee agree to the principle that the Loan Bill be reduced to two millions, and then to-morrow the items could be brought before the House, and the way in which it was proposed the money should be spent could be shown?

**THE PREMIER:** That was all threshed out this afternoon.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** It had been decided otherwise.

**MR. MORGANS:** What had been decided?

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The understanding arrived at was that the Committee should discuss the items without the figures, and decide whether any item should be struck out or not. The Government to-morrow night would then bring in an estimate as to what it would cost to continue the works for 15 months, and set the estimate alongside the figures which were now in the Bill, and the Bill would be reduced to the amount whatever is was to be. What we were discussing now was whether any of the items should be struck out.

**A MEMBER:** Or reduced.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** Not reduced. The figures were not to be considered. The amendment was departing from the understanding, but of course it was perfectly in order. If it were decided that the vote should be reduced to £150,000, then the Government would understand that was to be the total amount to be expended during the three years, and only that portion for the 15 months would be provided in the separate schedule.

**MR. A. E. MORGANS:** In the face of that information, he would not proceed with his remarks. The Committee were trying to arrive at the point through the back door, and were not going on business lines. If we were going to assist the Government, let us decide what amount should be placed at the disposal of the Government in the form of a Loan Bill; then let the Government decide what items they would expend the money on within the period mentioned. That would be much the better way. If the Government agreed to that, he thought the Loan Bill could be decided in three minutes.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** It had been decided otherwise.

**MR. MORGANS:** The Committee were discussing the items, and it was quite impossible to arrive at any decision.

**MR. W. J. BUTCHER:** Some members did not grasp the object. The items were to be discussed one by one, and the Committee were to decide absolutely whether any should be struck out or not; but whether the amount was too much or too little was not under consideration. It

was absolutely impossible for the Government to decide what amount of money they required to place in the Bill, until they knew whether certain items were to be struck out or not.

**MR. MORGANS:** The hon. member was putting the cart before the horse.

**MR. BUTCHER:** How were the Government going to arrive at what items they were to expend money on, when it had not been decided whether any items would be struck out? We must discuss the items one by one, and decide whether they should be struck out or it would be impossible for the Government to come to-morrow night with their Bill giving us the amount required. We could discuss the items one by one to-morrow and see if they could be reduced.

**MR. D. J. DOHERTY** desired to move that the item "Midland Railway Workshops, £424,000" be struck out.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** There was an amendment already before the Committee.

**MR. DOHERTY:** Did this amount include a manufacturing workshop? It would be a good thing if the Minister for Works could give that information to the Committee.

**MR. F. CONNOR:** Reverting to the suggestion he made earlier in the evening, would it not be better for the Treasurer to bring down a fresh Bill to-morrow night, put in all the items now in the schedule, with the cost of carrying on the respective works for 15 months, and ask the Committee what items were wanted? To-night, in spite of the arrangement made, the amounts were being discussed; and these amounts must be discussed again to-morrow night.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** That had been settled before.

**MR. CONNOR:** No. The member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans) did not seem to grasp the position; and the whole procedure to-night was unusual in Parliament.

**MR. MORGANS:** It was the "cart before the horse."

**MR. CONNOR:** If this practice continued, new Standing Orders would be required. Surely it was undesirable to discuss something to-night which must again be discussed to-morrow. Why not give us to-morrow night a properly prepared Bill? If the suggestions of the

Opposition were accepted by the Government, and the result embodied in a Bill submitted to-morrow night, the measure could be disposed of in a few minutes.

MR. HOPKINS: Was not the question before the Committee the amendment of the member for Albany?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member speaking (Mr. Connor) was not out of order.

MR. CONNOR: Come down to what was practicable. There was not an item being discussed to-night which would have to be discussed to-morrow night.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. J. J. Holmes): That was not so. To-morrow night the Government would ask for 15 months' requirements, instead of the 3 years' requirements which the Bill now provided.

MR. CONNOR: Then withdraw the Bill, and come to-morrow night with another.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The question was, were the works at Midland Junction to cost £420,000 or £150,000?

MR. CONNOR: Oh! The Treasurer had said this was not a question of amounts, but of items.

THE PREMIER: No; the amendment said that.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: The amendment sought to reduce the amount, and was perfectly in order, though it was not what the Government intended. But the Committee should understand that if the amount were reduced to £150,000, no more than that sum would be expended for three years on the Workshops.

MR. RASON: The agreement arrived at by the Committee was, he understood, to discuss the items to-night, to find out whether any were to be struck out; but not with a view to limiting the total expenditure on the works. To limit the total expenditure on the Midland Junction Workshops to £150,000 would be absurd, because the requisite machinery alone would cost £140,000. It had always been understood it was the determination of the country to erect, somewhere, workshops which would be able to cope with railway requirements. If it were intended to put up workshops the total cost of which, including machinery, would be only £150,000, any machinery expert would say we had better do nothing but go on as now, wearing out engines for

want of repairs, and buying new ones. The Mechanical Engineer now said unhesitatingly that the engines were being ruined for want of that "stitch in time which saved nine," more in machinery than anything else, where every part was dependent on others; for if an engine in want of repair were worked until it could be worked no longer, then a new engine must be bought. This State had already indented many locomotives, while others were lying useless at Fremantle for want of repairs.

MR. HIGHAM: No; not many.

MR. RASON: It was understood the workshops were to be, not only for repairs, but for the manufacture of wagons, at all events. It was absurd to limit the expenditure to £150,000.

MR. McDONALD: For the time being.

MR. RASON: Surely the present object was simply to discuss whether any items in the schedule ought to be wholly struck out, so that the Government might announce to-morrow night what amounts must be spent in the next 15 months to carry on such items as remained. Yet we were now discussing the reduction of items! That was not fair to the Committee; and if the attempt were persevered in, hon. members would sit till to-morrow night.

MR. GEORGE: Regarding this item of £424,000—

MR. EWING: Either pass it or "sling" it.

MR. GEORGE: Either could be done but he would be prepared to take a more common-sense view than to "sling" out an item which was admittedly necessary. As to the expenditure, on which there was a difference of opinion, the amendment was evidently in order. If the Treasurer left the House to-night with the idea that £424,000 was acceptable to the Committee, and came down to-morrow night and stated how much of that sum would be spent in the next 15 months then the Treasurer would be in a fool's paradise; because this item of £424,000 for Railway Workshops would be fought out to the bitter end, no matter whether the Workshops were at Midland Junction, Subiaco, Pinjarra, or Fremantle. The expenditure of £130,000 on machinery and £277,000 on buildings was altogether too ambitious for this State; and it was evident there must be something con-

templated far beyond the repairs proposed for 200 or 300 locomotives and 4,000 coaches and the other rolling-stock, for the next 10 or 15 years. With the building of trucks and passenger coaches he might be inclined to agree; but if it came to building or trying to build locomotives in the State, he maintained such work could not be profitably undertaken. By that means employment might be given to artisans; but it would pay the State far better to pension off those artisans and make them State paupers, than to pauperise the whole of this State by what could be called nothing else than a sort of shoddy manufacture. He had been told by a gentleman who was an authority in South Australia in regard to big engineering works—Mr. Martin, of Gawler—that it had been conclusively proved in the Parliament of that State that it would have paid the Government to have thrown their locomotives into the sea and purchased new ones, rather than to incur the cost of repairs and manufacture that had been incurred in South Australia.

MR. GORDON: That man had been speaking from the manufacturer's point of view.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: No. During the late federal campaign, the argument brought forward by the Premier's partisans was that an article should be made where it could be made most cheaply; and locomotives could not be made anywhere in Australia as cheaply as in America or in England. Moreover, could a small locomotive shop in this State keep pace with the times like big works in America or in Europe, which manufactured for the whole world, and were therefore up to date?

MR. F. CONNOR: What had this to do with the workshops at Midland Junction?

MR. GEORGE: Had the hon. member risen to a point of order? If not, let him sit down. The member for North Perth (Mr. R. Speight), who had had great experience in Victoria, could tell the Committee what the Victorian railway workshops had cost, and how Victoria had lost money by having such enterprises forced upon her. Let us learn from the experience of the other States, and not run mad in this silly fashion by spending nearly half a million in attempting the impossible. He would support the amendment of the member for Albany

(Mr. Gardiner), and would assist him cordially in fighting the battle to the bitter end.

MR. J. M. HOPKINS: The amendment moved by the member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner) would have his support. We were told by the Colonial Treasurer that we had already spent £50,000 upon the railway workshops at Midland Junction, and he (Mr. Hopkins) took the amendment to be that, taking into consideration the financial position of this country at the present time, we did not feel justified in authorising for the next three years a greater expenditure than £150,000 sterling. That would bring us up to a total expenditure of £200,000; and seeing we had provided about £1,000,000 for the purpose of rolling-stock, we should not require to manufacture a great deal in the meantime.

MR. GARDINER said he would alter his amendment so as to reduce item No. 7 by £265,000 [to reduce from £424,000 to £159,000].

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: The Government had no objection to the reduction.

MR. F. WILSON: The Committee were not going the right way about this Loan Bill in discussing the items only and not the amounts, and it would have been much better if the whole Bill had been withdrawn and a fresh one introduced, giving the amounts of the different items, as suggested. Although the items might be passed to-night, he reserved to himself the right to move to-morrow, when the Bill came down, to alter any item.

MR. F. CONNOR: If an alteration were made in an item now, the sum could not be afterwards increased.

MR. F. WILSON: Certainly not; and he did not think we wished to increase any item. The object of ordinary members was always to reduce expenditure as much as possible, and it was for the Government to state the amount of money required to carry on the affairs of the State. Members criticised the items with a view to reducing them, especially when they recognised the present state of the finances. So far as the railway workshops at Midland Junction were concerned, he joined with the member for the Murray (Mr. W. J. George) and the member for North Perth (Mr. R. Speight) in protest.



ing against anything like such a large sum as half a million being expended upon these works. For a State like Western Australia, with its present railway system and its present population, to talk about spending half a million of money for the mere erection of railway repairing workshops was the height of absurdity. We were not putting down workshops to build the whole of the locomotive supply for all the Commonwealth. He would like an opportunity of putting down works at a cost of half a million of money, and he would guarantee to produce out of them the whole of the rolling-stock for Australia and to repair that rolling-stock as well. He thought the member for the Murray mentioned something like £150,000 in addition to what had been spent, that making a total of £200,000, which should be ample for the next ten years. He hoped that if the indents had gone forward —

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The indents had not gone forward, but they were prepared.

**MR. WILSON:** That was a statement he was pleased to hear, and he hoped the Minister would continue to hold those indents until they were cut down by at least one-half.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Those indents were held pending this vote.

**MR. WILSON:** We had not got half through the schedule, and we had arrived at absolutely nothing. He took it the Government would bring their schedule down to something like £1,500,000 or £2,000,000. That was the feeling of the House as to the amount the Government should go to. Out of the million and a half we had £100,000 against this item of workshops; but Ministers would see we were not going to sanction plans which meant the ultimate expenditure of a great deal of money. If next year the item of £200,000 was brought in, on top of what had been already expended and what we were going to pass on this loan schedule, he (Mr. Wilson) would oppose it all he could.

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS** (Hon. J. J. Holmes): It had been explained that the Government only wished to ascertain the view of the Committee with regard to this Bill, and the question seemed now to resolve itself into this: were we going to build work-

shops for the repair of rolling-stock and for the manufacture of rolling-stock at a cost of £424,000, or were we to build workshops for repairing rolling-stock only at a cost of about half that amount? The present Government were not wedded to this scheme in any way.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The scheme was not the Government's at all.

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS:** The Government were simply making an effort to fulfil the promises and meet the obligations of the late Government. A statement had been given to him by an officer of the Railway Department urging the necessity for the erection of these works, and one of the principal recommendations for the works to be gone on with was that it would enable the department to build rolling-stock locally. Two members of the House best capable of giving advice on the subject considered it was not possible to build rolling-stock at anything like a reasonable rate.

**MR. DIAMOND:** Not engines.

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS:** Engines were part of the rolling-stock. In the present state of the finances we might confine ourselves to the minor scheme, namely a scheme for keeping the present rolling-stock in repair, and we might altogether abandon the large scheme of manufacturing. He understood that about £150,000 or £200,000 would meet the cost of the smaller scheme. The member for Guildford (Mr. C. H. Rason) said engines were to be seen about Fremantle in a state of disrepair, and that the department were not capable of handling this rolling-stock. He (the Commissioner of Railways) admitted the workshops at Fremantle were not suitable at the present time, and something in the way of improvement must be done as early as possible. At the present time 45 engines at Fremantle were awaiting construction. Any reasonable man would admit that these could not be constructed satisfactorily at Fremantle.

**MR. DOHERTY:** Erected?

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS:** Erected at Fremantle. All these engines were wanted. Repeatedly, night after night, we had train loads of goods for different places loaded and waiting to be taken to their

destination, and the result was that rolling-stock was tied up and the department could not get on with the traffic, for the sole reason that they had no engines to carry it. The member for Guildford said there were any number of engines at Fremantle which were out of repair, and could not be repaired. It was due to the House to say the state of things was not so bad as the hon. member would have the Committee believe. He (the Commissioner) had before him a statement prepared by the department up to 31st May, 1901. On that date, out of 228 locomotives in the State, 195 were in traffic, 22 under repair, and 7 only were awaiting repair, whilst 4 were hired out. That was not too bad: only 22 under repair and 7 awaiting repair. The total stock of carriages was 258; 226 were in traffic, 27 were under repair, 2 were awaiting repair, and 3 were hired out. The total wagon stock consisted of 4,818, and, as stated the previous night, there were 4,000 in traffic. A lot were tied up at Fremantle wharves, and did not go into traffic on the main lines. Of the total stock of 4,818, 4,412 were in traffic, 177 were under repair, and 164 were awaiting repair, whilst 65 were hired out. In the face of that it would appear the rolling-stock was in very fair order, and we certainly did not want elaborate workshops at a cost of £424,000. He admitted we wanted rolling-stock, and that we wanted workshops better than those at Fremantle, at an early stage; but an expenditure like this was not warranted at the present time, and, as he had said, he thought the House might well adopt the minor scheme, which would cost about £200,000 or £150,000, as the case might be, and for the time being confine ourselves to repairing and not construction.

MR. C. H. RASON: It would be interesting to know what the Commissioner of Railways meant when he spoke of adopting "a minor scheme." Was there a minor scheme prepared?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: A minor scheme could be prepared very easily.

MR. RASON: If the time required for the preparation of a minor scheme was to be judged by the period spent in the preparation of the present scheme, it would probably be ten years before the

new scheme would be ready for submission to the House. The plans for the workshops as now proposed had taken several years to perfect, and those plans met with the approval of the responsible officers of the Railway Department. The position was a peculiar one. Here were the Government introducing a Loan Bill attached to which was a schedule providing, among other things, the amount required to complete the workshops, £424,000. It had been impressed on the Government by their responsible officers that those workshops were necessary. And yet the Minister responsible for the Railway Department was found stating that in his opinion the workshops were not necessary. The Commissioner had hitherto professed to be guided by the advice of his responsible officers.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The figures had been given.

MR. RASON: It would be interesting to know when the Commissioner spoke on the advice of his responsible officers, and when he separated himself from them and gave his opinion merely as a private member. For if he was guided by the advice of his officers on this particular question, it was his duty to support them and to support the item as it stood. Undoubtedly those officers had told the Commissioner that the workshops were necessary. Hon. members generally had travelled altogether outside of what had been intended when we went into committee with the schedule. It was distinctly understood that we were only to discuss whether the various items should be struck out or should remain, and he would appeal to the Committee not to allow any other course to be adopted. He thought the feeling of the Committee, at any rate, was that the item for the Midland Junction railway workshops should remain. The Government should carry out the arrangement which had been made and bring down the schedule to-morrow, leaving the Committee to decide what amount they were prepared to spend on the workshops during the next 15 months. It would be for the Committee to say then whether the amount was unreasonable and should be reduced. The Committee having decided that the item should be allowed to stand, it should be permitted to remain until we saw what amount the Government

proposed to allocate for expenditure on it during the next 15 months. That would be a fair course to pursue. The Treasurer was showing undue haste. The hon. gentleman ought not to tell the Committee that they were responsible for the hurried manner of dealing with the Bill. The Government said they had no objection to the reduction of the amount. This was hardly carrying out in a fair manner the arrangements which they had arrived at. The proper course was to allow the item of railway workshops to stand for the present, and allow the Committee to see to-morrow what amount the Government were prepared to put down for expenditure on that item during the next 15 months. Then let the discussion be on that point. He hoped the member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner) would see the fairness of this and would withdraw his amendment, leaving the matter to be discussed when we saw what the Government were prepared to allocate.

MR. MONGER: An opportunity, such as the present, of congratulating the Government on their climbing-down policy should not be allowed to pass. They were immolated in the first instance by one of their staunchest supporters. The gentlemen occupying seats on the Treasury bench deserved to be congratulated on the noble support they received from those sitting behind them. The first check given to the Government was administered by one of their own supporters, who asked them to reduce one item of their Loan Bill by £265,000—and the great, strong, noble Government assented and said, "The suggestion comes from our side of the House, and we will fall in with it willingly."

THE PREMIER: No.

MR. MONGER: The Government were to be congratulated. He was glad that he had not the honour of occupying a seat on the Government side of the House. When he occupied a seat there, his leader was not in the habit of allowing those behind him to dictate to him in the manner in which, at all events, it appeared the leader of the present Government was dictated to by his supporters.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member used to be afraid to speak.

MR. MONGER: The leader behind whom he had sat on the Government side did not allow anyone to dictate to him as

to the manner in which he should or should not bring down his Loan Bill.

A MEMBER: The supporters of the present Government were possessed of voices.

MR. MONGER: If that was the way the gentlemen who occupied seats on the Treasury bench were going to carry out their duties, it was not a Government that he would care to follow. He wished to put it pointedly to the Premier: was the hon. gentleman going to allow a member sitting on his side of the House to order him to reduce an item by £265,000? The Premier, if he would swallow that, must be congratulated on being led by the gentleman who succeeded him in the representation of Albany. Evidently the member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner) was going to lead the Government. The Government were not going to lead that gentleman.

THE PREMIER: It would be a pleasure to know the views of the hon. gentleman speaking.

MR. MONGER: The views held by him on this question were that the Government should either adhere to the Bill they brought down to the House or else should proclaim that they would adhere to what the member for Albany suggested. As one who had taken a lively part in the debate on the workshops question in the past, he wanted to know whether Ministers proposed to carry out the views expressed by most of them during the last session, or whether they were going to adopt some new-fangled notion, and lay aside the recommendations of those who were recognised as the proper persons to advise the Government. Did the Government propose to be led by their advisers, or did they intend to allow themselves to be led by the staunch supporters behind them? He wanted a definite pronouncement from the Premier on that point. Was this the Bill that the House heard so much about from the Government the other evening? Was this the Bill of which the Colonial Treasurer before introducing it said that it was a sample of his methods of finance? Was this the great Bill we had been led to look for from the present Government? Were the Government always going to climb down in this fashion when a challenge had been thrown out by a member sitting on their side? Did they propose to allow

one member to reduce an item of £424,000 by £260,000 in one act? He would be glad to know whether this was the kind of Government the people of Western Australia should follow. They were quietly and calmly telling the House that they proposed to allow one item to be reduced in that way.

MR. DOHERTY: The hon. member should remember this was not a party question.

MR. MONGER: The question of the removal of the workshops to Midland Junction took up some considerable time last session, and now there were some adverse motions against a decision which had been confirmed by a very large majority of the House. Seeing the attitude now taken by certain members, he thought it was only fair that they should come to a definite conclusion at any rate before the item was passed or reduced. They should arrive at some definite conclusion as to where the works were to be erected.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question of site was not now before the Committee, and therefore need not be discussed.

MR. MONGER: But that it would unduly weary hon. members he would give some extracts from speeches he had made on the question last session. He hoped the Government would be firm in their attitude and not allow the Loan Bill to be overthrown or reduced *ad libitum*, or else that they should say, "We will withdraw the Bill we have brought down, and bring it down in an amended form to-morrow for the sanction of the Committee." Unless the Colonial Treasurer was prepared to adopt one of these two courses, he would have some difficulty in carrying his Loan Bill through.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: A good deal of discussion had taken place on the item, and he considered members were departing from the understanding arrived at. If we were to get through the business to-night to enable the Government to bring down the Bill to-morrow in an amended form as promised, we should not discuss the items in the way that was being done, by moving to reduce certain items. The member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner) no doubt was prompted by a desire to conserve the funds of the country and avoid a large expenditure in a direction which he considered was not

warranted; but some members understood that in bringing down the Bill to-morrow the Committee would have the right to deal with the amounts if necessary. He could not see that members were committing themselves to the total expenditure by agreeing to the schedule being passed as it was to-night, for it would be within the province of members to discuss the items to-morrow. As to the other items on the schedule, he did not intend to offer any objection to them; but as to the amounts, he reserved to himself the right to criticise them, and would take that opportunity to-morrow, if need be. It was a mistake to delay matters at this stage, and he hoped the Committee would come to some conclusion. The various items had appeared from time to time in past Loan Bills, excepting the item for the Albany Harbour Works, which was a small amount and might be cut down: he hoped the Government would reduce this amount in the schedule. In regard to a number of other works, some slight discussion might take place if necessary, but he would offer no objection to the items because he thought they were all necessary works. The only point was whether the amounts provided were necessary, and if not, it was within the province of members to reduce them.

MR. C. H. RASON: If the member for Albany (Mr. Gardiner) persisted in his amendment, although with the utmost desire to forward business, there was not the slightest chance of the debate being brought to a termination to-night. It was only fair that hon. members should carry out the agreement which was come to, and not discuss the amounts, only the desirability of the works. Members would have an opportunity to-morrow when they saw the amounts provided in the schedule to move amendments if it were thought necessary. The understanding arrived at ought to be binding on both sides, and it was agreed to in order to assist the Government in carrying their work through. The hon. member might withdraw his amendment knowing that he would have ample opportunity to-morrow night, when the Government would bring down figures showing the total amount they were prepared to go to. After the Bill was passed and the money raised, not one penny could be spent without a vote on the

Annual Estimates. If the amendment were withdrawn, the remaining items on the schedule would go through with very little delay; but if the amendment were not withdrawn, he was prepared to speak at some length, and other members would do so also.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake):** We found ourselves in this difficulty, that the general expression of opinion of members was in favour of the reduction of the amount; and consequently unless the Committee declared emphatically in the opposite direction, the Government would have to take it for granted that the Committee required the reduction. Perhaps it was going a little bit away from the arrangement suggested, that we should discuss the items one by one and see if any could be thrown out altogether. At the same time it was open to members to move to reduce an item; and if the Government had the direction of the Committee to reduce, the Government would reduce.

**HON. F. H. PIESSE:** The Government had got the feeling of the House.

**THE PREMIER:** The best thing for the member for Guildford to do was to force the matter to a division. The same difficulty would not arise with regard to other items. The Committee desired that the Government should be on the safe side, and go in for repairing workshops rather than for manufacturing; and because we established repairing shops, that would not debar the Government from establishing manufacturing shops later on if Parliament voted the money. The feeling of members seemed to be that the items should be reduced. But the Government had said all along that they wanted the direction of the House. The Government were bound to bring the items down in this Bill, because it was understood to be the wish of the late Government to carry out the bigger scheme of manufacturing. The Government had told the Committee that they were not wedded to that scheme, that they preferred the scheme of repairing shops; but if the Committee thought fit to have the larger scheme, then it was open for them to say so. If the Government based their estimates on the bigger amount and prepared their plans accordingly, it would be difficult to abandon those plans later on. It would be easier

to elaborate the smaller scheme than to reduce the large scheme. Consequently the Government felt that the expression of opinion so far was in favour of the smaller scheme, and unless the Committee were emphatic on the scheme, the Government would base their estimate on the smaller one. It was not fair to hoodwink the Committee. That was an honest expression of opinion.

**MR. W. B. GORDON** said he liked the honest expression of opinion of the Premier. The hon. gentleman gave an honest expression of opinion at the Queen's Hall, and it was, "We intend to follow out the policy of the late Government: we do not intend to disparage their actions." What was the position to-night? We had come to discuss a clear-cut issue, and one of the Government supporters brought in a side issue. The Minister for Works admitted that although this item was put in the Bill, he had held back the indents to know if the item would be passed or not. The member for North Fremantle (Mr. Doherty) advocated the works being at Fremantle, because he represented that place, and there was no doubt about the action of other members. He had heard of men with the backbone of a jellyfish, but he had never seen a row of Ministerial members all with jellyfish backbones.

**MR. TEESDALE SMITH:** The arrangement come to, he understood, was that the Committee were to discuss the desirability of the works, not the amounts. It had been understood this was not a question of amounts, otherwise he might have proposed to strike out or to reduce sundry other railway items. It was unfair of the Government to ask members to take the responsibility of reducing these amounts.

**THE PREMIER:** Would the hon. member be satisfied if the Government brought down alternative schemes in respect of the Midland workshops—an estimate on the lower and one on the higher scale—and left the Committee to decide?

**MR. TEESDALE SMITH:** Yes.

**MR. MONGER:** On what would the lower estimate be based?

**THE PREMIER:** On £150,000.

**MR. MONGER:** Could all the items in the schedule be traversed to-morrow?

**THE PREMIER:** Certainly; and they could be reduced.

**MR. J. GARDINER:** Not having been present when the arrangement between the Government and the leader of the Opposition was made, having no desire to upset that arrangement, and seeing the whole schedule could be discussed to-morrow, he would withdraw the amendment. It was on the broadest principles he had moved to reduce the item. The member for York (Mr. Monger) apparently inferred that he was seeking the emoluments of office; but so long as he had a free hand, no matter on which side of the House he sat, he would exercise his right to do what he thought fair. He was willing to take the opinion of that hon. member, but would not follow his example and be blindly led by any Government. He would exercise the brains his constituents gave him credit for having when they sent him here.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

#### DISCUSSION ON OTHER ITEMS.

**MR. F. CONNOR:** One item that should be struck out was "Lighthouses, £21,000." He moved:

That Item 14, "Lighthouses, £21,000," be struck out.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** The hon. member had not been present when attention had been called to the fact that the lights already ordered must be paid for, though the amount would be recouped from the Federal funds.

**MR. HIGHAM:** True; but they should be paid for out of revenue, not out of loan.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** There was reason for making the payment out of loan. When the amount was refunded by the Federal Government, it could be legitimately reappropriated to some other object to which loan moneys were peculiarly applicable.

**MR. CONNOR:** The Treasurer's explanation being satisfactory, he would withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Development of Goldfields and Mineral Resources, £144,200—Item 16, "Eastern Goldfields, £50,800":

**MR. CONNER** asked for explanation of this item.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The hon. member evidently thought that the

item involved some deep-laid scheme. Hitherto it had been the practice to allocate a separate amount to each goldfield, after which another amount had been set apart for "development generally." It was thought by the Government that this practice, though handy in principle, was not so good as it might be for the administration of affairs; and, thinking the money should be more strictly allocated than in the past, the Government had struck out "development generally," and had distributed the amount over the various goldfields. The importance of the eastern goldfields, it was considered, justified the large amount allotted to them.

**MR. JACOBY:** Was it possible now to discuss previous items?

**THE CHAIRMAN:** No.

**MR. JACOBY:** The deep-laid scheme of the member for North Fremantle (Mr. Doherty) was now evident. Hon. members were blocked from going back to refer to the Fremantle Dock and Slip.

**MR. W. J. GEORGE:** Do that to-morrow.

Item passed.

Item 19, "Other goldfields, £14,800":

**MR. J. EWING** asked whether this included those goldfields already mentioned. Could this money be spent on any of the goldfields to which a specific grant had been allocated? He represented the Donnybrook Goldfield and the Greenbushes Tinfeld. Would any money be available for their development during the next twelve months?

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory):** The votes for specific goldfields would not be under the control of the Mines Department, but were more for the purpose of constructing tanks and other public works generally upon the fields. In the last Loan Bill, some £15,000 had been voted for development, and from £12,000 to £14,000 used in the construction of telegraph lines, and not for the legitimate purpose Parliament had in view.

**HON. F. H. PIESSE:** Nevertheless, it had been used for developing the goldfields.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES:** The work had been of such a nature that the Government of the day had not dared to take Parliament into their confidence, and let them know how they had intended

to expend the money. He said this advisedly, because he knew members of the former Government were fully aware how they intended to expend the money, and they did not dare to take Parliament into their confidence in the matter. On the construction of a telegraph line from Lawlers to Lake Way there was an expenditure of £9,000 for the satisfaction of some 500 or 600 people; altogether contrary to the opinion of the proper officers. Money had been spent in such a way that the removal of dead bodies from one cemetery to another had been charged to the vote for "Development of Goldfields." These three items—"Eastern Goldfields £50,800," "Murchison and Peak Hill Goldfields £23,400," and "Pilbarra Goldfields £12,800"—were for the building of tanks and for continuing other work in the interest of the goldfields. The next item, "Other goldfields (including boring for coal and miscellaneous) £14,600," was to assist in mining development. He hoped Parliament would allow the whole of that amount to be given to the Government. The Government desired to purchase a diamond drill and also several hand drills, and would try to do a good deal of development work, if Parliament would only allow them. That money would be spent not only in the Southern districts, but right throughout the goldfields of the State. That would be the only money the Mines Department would have for the development of mining, for boring and drilling, and in the way of bonuses. The amount would, in his opinion, be sufficient. There was a much larger amount on the original estimates; but by getting the sanction of Parliament to the amount now asked for, the Government would be enabled to give a good deal of assistance to mining in the future.

MR. J. EWING: The explanation of the Minister for Mines was not satisfactory, because the Minister said there was £50,800 for the eastern goldfields, £23,400 for the Murchison and Peak Hill goldfields, £12,800 for the Pilbarra goldfields, and it was also stated that the amount for other goldfields (including boring for coal and miscellaneous) was £14,800. He was told by the Minister for Mines that these "other goldfields" were to include those east of the Murchison and Pilbarra goldfields, as well as any others. He would ask the Minister to give some

assurance that in bringing in the Bill to-morrow he would be prepared to make an allowance for prospecting on the Donnybrook goldfields. It was possible the eastern goldfields would get the major portion of this amount, and he, as member for the South-West Mining District and representative of Donnybrook and Greenbushes, where he hoped there would be an important mining industry in time, was justified in asking the Minister to make provision for these two very important centres. He wished to have some assurance that a part of the money would be set aside for the South-Western portion of the fields, including perhaps Collie coal, to which nothing had been granted, and for which perhaps in the future members might be called upon to grant large sums of money.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): Already a sum had been expended in the South-West Mining District, and £1,500 was to be spent at Greenbushes in the erection of plant to enable the tin-miners to treat their tin. Money was expended at Donnybrook in the erection of a public battery. As far as those two districts were concerned, their interests would always be looked after. If a sum of money were given to him to aid the development of these mines, he would be only too pleased to do what he could for them. He would make a special effort to place with the Mines Department a sum of money by which we could aid the different districts by sending out geologists to get information as to developing reefs, or working levels, or testing for gold. All parts of the State would be properly treated, and everything would depend on the money given to the department.

MR. J. EWING: Had one the assurance of the Minister that a portion of this vote would be given to his (Mr. Ewing's) district?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Certainly. Item passed.

Item, "Development of Agriculture, £42,400":

MR. MONGER moved that after the word "drainage," in the item "Development of Agriculture (including drainage) £42,400," the words "and damming the River Avon" be inserted. Last year the Loan Bill was worded in the same way, when there was an almost unanimous

desire by the House on the subject, and the words he now wished to be added were to have been placed in the Loan Bill. He thought the Minister would admit it was just as well to conserve the waters in the eastern district as to drain the waters of the southern portion of the State. He was certain the Chairman (Mr. C. Harper) as well as other representatives of agricultural portions of the State—especially those in the eastern districts—would agree with him it was very desirable the words proposed to be added should be inserted, or that a promise should be given that words of a similar nature should be inserted in some future Loan Bill.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: There was not the slightest objection to damming the River Avon, but he did object to money required for the drainage of the South-Western district being diverted to any purpose of this sort. An item should be put in the Loan Bill to do that necessary work, the damming of the River Avon; but he would not allow the money required for the South-Western district to be taken away from it.

MR. F. CONNOR moved that progress be reported.

Put and negatived.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: It would be well if the member for York (Mr. Monger) could see his way to withdraw his amendment. The amount of money allocated would not be sufficient either to dam the River Avon or to drain the agricultural areas in the South-West.

Amendment (Mr. Monger's) put, and negatived on the voices.

Item 22, "Immigration, £10,600":

MR. H. DAGLISH moved that the item be struck out. It was very undesirable to encourage immigration unless on some practical principle. If the proposal before the Committee were to lend assistance towards the introduction of families of men already settled here, he might support it, because thus a permanent increase in the population of the State would be secured at a comparatively small cost. The system which had been adopted in the past was, however, utterly unsatisfactory and did not repay the country for the amount of money devoted to it. Apart from that view, he wished to point out that the vote for immigration was one which had

previously been provided out of revenue. It should not be charged to loan funds, and he altogether objected to this course on principle.

Amendment put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	12
Noes	...	...	25

Majority against ... 13

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Connor
Mr. Doherty	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Ewing	Mr. George
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Higham	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Holmes
Mr. Reid	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Reside	Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Wallace (Teller)	Mr. James
	Mr. Kingsmill
	Mr. Leake
	Mr. Monger
	Mr. Moyana
	Mr. McDonald
	Mr. Nanson
	Mr. Oats
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Speight
	Mr. Stone
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Wilson (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

THE PREMIER: The Committee would report progress now, he presumed.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The schedule, as printed, did not meet with his approval, and he would not agree with it. He moved that progress be reported.

Progress reported, and leave granted to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

On motion by the PREMIER, the House adjourned at ten minutes past 11 o'clock until 2:30 the next afternoon.