

THE PREMIER: There would be just the same necessity. If we had a population of a million, he would vote for it.

MR. OLDHAM: If the hon. member would prove that to him, he would be prepared to fall in with that view.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	9

Majority for ... 8

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Burt	Mr. George
Mr. Conolly	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Doherty	Mr. Illingworth
Sir John Forrest	Mr. Kenay
Mr. A. Forrest	Mr. Oldham
Mr. Hall	Mr. Simpson
Mr. Hassell	Mr. Vosper
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Menger	Mr. James (Toller).
Mr. Morgans	
Mr. Pennefather	
Mr. Phillips	
Mr. Quinlan	
Sir J. G. Lee Steere	
Mr. Venn	
Mr. Wood	
Mr. Hubble (Teller).	

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 56—agreed to.

On the motion of the PREMIER, progress was then reported.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 12.21 (midnight) till Wednesday afternoon.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 25th August, 1897.

Hainault Gold Mine, Limited, Bill: Report of Select Committee—Returns: Swan River Shipping Company's Lease—Motions: Leave of Absence—Commonwealth Bill: Presentation at Sydney Convention—Motion: Standing Orders Suspension (Supply only)—Temporary Supply: Message from the Governor: Supply Bill, £350,000; all stages—Police Act, 1892, Amendment Bill: Discharge of Order—Standing Orders Suspension (all Bills)—Treasury Bills Act Amendment Bill: all stages—Hainault Gold Mine, Limited, Bill: Debate on Motion to go into Committee; in Committee; third reading—Vacancy in Federal Convention Bill: all stages—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

HAINAULT GOLD MINE, LIMITED, BILL.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

HON. H. G. PARSONS brought up the report of the select committee on the Hainault Gold Mine Limited Bill, and moved that it be received.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Is this the final report of the committee appointed to inquire into this Bill? This is one of the most important subjects it is possible for any House of legislature to deal with—to decide upon the rights of litigants in the Supreme Court.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Will you not hear the report read first?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The motion is that the report be received. If the hon. member will withdraw that motion, and move that the report be read, perhaps it would be in proper form. If it is the final report of the committee, the objection I have to it will not be removed by hearing it read. The matter is one of the most vital importance affecting the interests of persons—

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I submit, sir, that there can be no discussion at this stage.

THE PRESIDENT: I was going to point out to the hon. member that the report cannot be read until it is in the possession of the House; in other words, until it has been received.

Put and passed.

HON. H. G. PARSONS moved, That the report be read.

Put and passed.

Report read by the Clerk.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: There are only four signatures to the report, and five members were appointed.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: The Hon. G. Randell was at the meeting, but was not present to sign the report after a clean copy had been made of it. He would have signed it at once had he been there. The committee was entirely unanimous.

RETURN—SWAN RIVER SHIPPING COMPANY'S LEASE.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) laid on the table of the House a return to the order of the House, in reference to the leased land (jetty, &c.) in Perth held from the Crown by the Swan River Shipping Company.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I would like to ask the Minister whether the information given here is to be the final information in compliance with the motion? If that is so, when a return is asked for, it would be better to say, "I will not give the information at all," than to give information like this. I asked the nature of the tenancy of the Swan River Shipping Company in respect of the wharf and premises in Bazaar Terrace, Perth, and the answer is "A lease for 7 years from the 1st July, 1897." Paragraph 2 asked, "The amount of rent, and how payable;" and the answer is, "£50 per annum, payable half yearly in advance." No. 3: "The cost of dredging the channel for the purpose of launching one of the company's boats;" to which the reply is given that there was no dredging beyond that contemplated in the original scheme, and therefore no additional expenditure was incurred. I would like to ask, is that the only information I am to get?

THE MINISTER OF MINES: That return comes from the department.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I ask whether the hon. gentleman is prepared to give any further information?

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member will have to give notice.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I only ask if the Minister will give any further information.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: I will try and do it.

MOTIONS—LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On the motion of the Hon. H. J. SAUNDERS, leave of absence for the remainder of the session was granted to the Hon. F. M. Stone.

On the motion of the Hon. F. T. CROWDER, leave of absence for the remainder of the session was granted to the Hon. D. K. Congdon.

On the motion of the MINISTER OF MINES, leave of absence for the remainder of the session was granted to the Hon. W. Alexander.

COMMONWEALTH BILL.

PRESENTATION AT SYDNEY CONVENTION.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) moved, "That the draft of the Federal Constitution, as received from the Federal Convention, together with the amendments made by the Legislative Council, be remitted to the Convention at Sydney by the Hon. J. W. Hackett." Last night we passed a resolution that a message be forwarded to the Legislative Assembly, transmitting the amendments suggested by the Council, and desiring their concurrence therein. I find, on looking at the Act, that their concurrence is not required. The Act distinctly says that the amendments made by either House are to be transmitted to the Convention by one of its members.

THE PRESIDENT: There was an error made last night. We adopted the same procedure as in the case of an ordinary bill; but, as the Minister states, this House can suggest its own amendments to the Bill, and send them on by one of its members.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I beg to move that the Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the session.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member is quite in order. The Standing Orders may be suspended at any time in case of pressing necessity. It may be necessary at the end of a session to pass any Bill through its several stages at one sitting.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I oppose this, unless the Minister excludes from the operation of the motion the Bill in reference to the Hainault Company.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: I can be guided only by the wishes of the House.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I would point out that it is only in cases of urgent necessity that the Standing Orders can be suspended; and the question is, whether it is a case of urgent necessity to deal with this Hainault Company's Bill. I submit it is not. Certain Bills—for example, the Supply Bill, or a Bill with reference to appointing a gentleman to represent the colony at the Federal Council—are matters of urgent necessity, and everyone, in the interests of the colony, would be bound to support them; but when we have to deal with the rights of private persons, then it looks like rushing an Act through Parliament. This very chamber is created for the purpose of preventing hasty legislation; yet now we are to have hasty legislation of the most abominable sort. I do not know what Bills are going to be produced yet; but, I ask, is this the way we are going to deal with the affairs of the colony, and with the rights of individuals, which are more important than all? I protest against it. I hope every hon. member will vote against the motion. I should be prepared to support the Minister on Bills of urgent necessity; but it seems to me that it is not right to ask for *carte blanche* in this manner. If he has any reason for any one Bill to be passed through, I would agree to suspend the Standing Orders in regard to that one Bill; but I cannot call to mind any time when the Standing Orders have been suspended for the remainder of a session.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It is done almost every session.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It is done; but not to pass Bills dealing with the private interests of people. It is not done to pass a Bill like the one before the House. It is most improper, and is opposed to every principle for which this House is brought into existence.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: I regret the position taken by the hon. member. It is not in connection with the Bill referred to by the hon. member at all that I have introduced the motion. This Hainault Bill would come on to-day

for its second reading, and we should go into committee, and the third reading would take place to-morrow.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If the Standing Orders are suspended here and in another place, the Bill can go right through to-night.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: We should ordinarily come to the second reading to-day.

THE PRESIDENT: The Bill has already been read a second time. It is in the committee stage now.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: My motion does not apply to this Bill at all.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If the Minister says the third reading will not come on till to-morrow, I will withdraw my objection.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: I am in the hands of the House.

THE PRESIDENT: It is common to suspend the Standing Orders on each Bill as it comes on.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The Minister is quite right in asking for the suspension of Standing Orders in regard to certain Bills; but when he wishes to do so in regard to the Hainault Bill, it is well for the House to consider whether that is a measure of pressing necessity. Arguments that would apply in regard to the Appropriation Bill will not apply to the Hainault Bill.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Then you can vote against the third reading.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I would rather it would not go so far as that.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: I will withdraw the motion that I have moved, and will move it only in connection with the Supply Bill. I move that so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as will enable the Supply Bill to pass through all its stages at one sitting.

Motion (altered by leave) put and passed.

SUPPLY BILL, £850,000.

A Message from the Assembly having been received, requesting concurrence in the granting of temporary supply for the services and works of the year 1897-8;

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

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (HON. E. H. WITTENOOM), in moving the second reading, said: The measure is one with which members of this House have very little to do, according to the Constitution of the country. It simply provides for two months' supplies for the colony out of the revenue; and, according to section 1, the amount is £500,000 out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and £350,000 from moneys to the credit of the General Loan Fund. The object in passing this Bill is to allow the ordinary business of the State to be carried on until the return of the delegates from the Sydney Convention. The Government will want supplies to carry on.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Bill passed through committee without debate.

Read a third time and *passed*.

POLICE ACT, 1892, AMENDMENT BILL.

DISCHARGE OF ORDER.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: In view of the fact that Parliament proposes to prorogue to-morrow—I take it that is the intention of the Government—there will be no opportunity or chance of this Bill going through the Legislative Assembly this session; and I do not think it would be wise to take up the time of the House in going on with the Bill when I know it could not go through the other chamber. In addition to that, I wish to introduce the Bill in another form next session. I move that the Bill be discharged.

Order discharged.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Before proceeding with the next business of the House, I find on looking into the matter, that we shall have to take into consideration the Hainault Bill this evening, and to do that it will be necessary to suspend the Standing Orders; and, as the Hon. R. S. Haynes intends to oppose that motion, I will test the feeling of the House on the matter. I will move, "That the Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the session." Unless the Bill is taken in hand, we shall not be

able to do what we require in time for consideration of the Bill in the Assembly.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I understood from the President that the Standing Orders could not be suspended unless on a matter of urgent necessity. I do not know whether I am right in saying that the matter is entirely in the hands of the President.

THE PRESIDENT: That question is solely in the hands of the House to decide itself. The President does not decide whether it is a matter of urgent necessity.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Then I must oppose the motion of the hon. gentleman; and I do so because I feel that it is my duty here to see that the rights of other persons shall not be sacrificed without due consideration. The Bill, as you stated, sir, is a hybrid one, which is treated in the same way as private bills; and I object to the Bill being rushed through the House in the way proposed. I know of no precedent; and I challenge the Minister of Mines, or any member of the House, to produce a precedent from any legislature of the world, where they have passed a measure such as this by suspending Standing Orders. The Minister wishes to suspend the Standing Orders so as to deal with this measure and then send it to another place. I hope the House will not lead the way, and show the other House of the Legislature that we are disposed to suspend Standing Orders in order to deprive people of their rights, and not give them an opportunity of being heard. It seems the very object for which this House was created—to prevent hasty legislation—is being defeated. I am speaking irrespective of the Hainault Gold Mining Company's Bill; and therefore I appeal to hon. members not to make this a party subject. The very ruling which you, sir, gave here shows that certain steps had to be taken before this Bill could be dealt with. What for? Was the reference to the committee a farce? Because that is what it seems to me to have been reduced to. Leave to bring up a report next day was given; and when that report was brought up I objected to it. Then the Minister says: "I will suspend the Standing Orders and proceed with it. We will have a little Star Chamber of our own." I intend to denounce such

action as this. I regret the Minister has attempted to suspend the Standing Orders, and thus deprive us of the privileges we have. How can we decide in this matter until we have heard both sides? I am not asking that the House should hear only one side, but that it should hear all the parties concerned. It is the Hainault Gold Mining Bill to-day. What Bill will it be to-morrow? This is the third time retrospective legislation has been proposed in this House. The Government seem to be getting bolder as they grow in strength. They say: "We will not only pass retrospective legislation, but we will suspend the Standing Orders to do it." The object of the Upper Chamber is at once gone. To speak of the effect on the credit of the colony is only what I call drawing a red herring across the trail. By fixing your eyes on it you fall into the pit prepared for you. The next session a Bill will be brought in, and this very case will be cited as a precedent. I feel the good sense of the House will prevent such a course of action. In what way is this Bill of pressing necessity? I will put it before the House clearly. A forfeiture takes place in November. The reinstatement takes place in December. There is a session of Parliament in which no attempt is made to introduce a Bill. They allow one whole session to go by. Therefore, how can it be a matter of pressing necessity? But nine months afterwards they find that it is a matter of pressing necessity. Where is the ground on which the Minister brings forward his motion? The hon. gentleman has not made out a case, even if the Bill did not deal with the interests of private persons. But how much more careful ought we to be when it takes away the rights of private parties! The hon. gentleman says they are legal rights; and if they are, we are taking them away; and we are asked to suspend the Standing Orders to deprive persons of these legal rights. The Bill is brought forward at the fag end of a session, and this motion is made irrespective of the merits or demerits of the case. How can we get at the bottom of it here? If you have the evidence before you and decide, I am with you; but do not burk inquiry and send the legislation through. I hope hon. gentlemen of the House will not vote for the Bill. I intend to divide the House on this motion; and if I am

by myself, I think I am doing my duty in calling for a division.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I also desire to protest, and pretty strongly, against this Bill being rushed through the House. I fail to see the necessity for it. The Hon. R. S. Haynes has made out a very strong case why the Bill should not be rushed through; and the Minister has given no reason for being in any hurry. There is no pressing necessity for the Bill; and, as the Hon. R. S. Haynes stated, if we run this Bill through—which is referred to as a hybrid Bill—in the future this action will be referred to as a precedent. I object to this being done, because it would be a most dangerous precedent. If the facts, as stated by the Minister of Mines, are true, really there is no necessity for the Bill at all. The fact of an error creeping into the *Government Gazette* by negligence cannot in any way affect the leaseholders who have complied with the Act. Take the case of a Minister of Mines who, by some act of weakness or wickedness or madness, advertises the cancellation of half-a-dozen leases of the leading mines in the colony, and the lessees of these mines have paid up their rents and have complied with the whole of the conditions. Yet we are told by the Minister that the publication in the *Gazette* would mean an absolute forfeiture! On the facts as submitted by the Minister, there is no necessity for the Bill. Even if the necessity for the Bill can be shown, we ought to deal with it in a calm and reasonable manner. Is there any necessity for its being rushed through? I have heard no reason given yet. Hon. members, I am sure, do not wish to do anything to embarrass the Government in any action. There has been too much of the invertebrate order, in giving way in this House; but I do not think we should give way on this occasion. If the Bill is a good one it can be discussed in the session that follows. We have every reason on this occasion to speak in the strongest terms possible against the rushing of a Bill through the House—a Bill that interferes with individual rights; and it seems this Bill certainly affects to a large extent private rights. Every man in the colony might have an action against the Government. It might be pending; and there would be nothing to prevent a Bill being put before the

House and rushed through in a similar hasty manner to this. If the Government have done wrong, they should meet that wrong as a private individual has to meet any mistake. I do say I certainly take the statement of the Minister of Mines as correct. He has put a true statement before the House. Therefore there is no necessity for haste, because the original lessees have a position which cannot be assailed by jumpers. The Hon. R. S. Haynes has drawn attention to the fact that this House is practically brought into existence to prevent hasty legislation; but this is hasty legislation in the extreme. Bills granting supply, or bills in connection with the federation movement, might be bills of urgency; but bills of a hybrid nature like this Hainault Bill should be dealt with in the usual course. The report of the select committee has only just come up, and has been read. There is one thing I notice in the report. I do not wish to cast any reflection on the committee. No doubt they worked industriously for the short time at their disposal; but it was too short to deal with it. The evidence did not disclose that the company had paid the money. In the report, nothing is said about it. Was the money paid under a wrong number? And is there a receipt? Nothing is said in the petition. If the company has a good case it has nothing to fear.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I hope hon. gentlemen will consider carefully before they vote against the motion. The hon. R. S. Haynes has stated there is no reason for urgency. Nothing could possibly be more urgent. It is such things as these that have an ill effect in London.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It has existed for nine months.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: That makes my argument all the more strong. Two wrongs do not make one right; and the sooner the error is rectified, the sooner it will make people in England feel more secure. I understand from the gentlemen who composed the select committee that the most careful consideration was given to this matter; and they came to the conclusion that the Bill should be passed through the House. I am told that the rent has been paid.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The report of the select committee says nothing about it.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I did not say that it was in the report of the select committee. I said I had been informed by members of the committee that undoubtedly the rent had been paid. Knowing the bad effect this will have in London, for we know to a certain extent there has been a slump in London caused by insecurity of tenure, and we know that if we do not remedy this error it will make matters a hundred times worse. The Hon. S. J. Haynes said he accepted the statement of the Minister as being correct. That being the case, every other hon. member except the Hon. R. S. Haynes accepts the statement; and if a wrong has been done, let it be righted as soon as possible. Any mistake made by the department should be rectified without delay. We know what the effect in London has been; and if the Government rectifies the mistake, a different feeling will exist. I hope hon. members will consider the matter in the light I have put it—that it is a matter of urgency, and that the sooner the Bill is passed the better for the colony.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: I regret very much the attitude taken up both by the Hon. R. S. Haynes and the Hon. S. J. Haynes. [Hon. R. S. HAYNES: Both legal gentlemen.] That makes me all the more surprised; because they, as a rule, grasp the facts of a case quickly. The Hon. S. J. Haynes says there is no urgency. If that is so, there never was urgency in any case before. We know that to-morrow the Legislative Assembly will have risen; and unless they have time to look into the matter, the Bill will not be passed. It is the object of the gentlemen opposing this motion to prevent the Bill being passed; but we are suspending the Standing Orders to enable it to be passed. Let the Bill come on for discussion: then they can oppose it and try to defeat it. I hope hon. members will be reasonable, and allow the wishes of the majority to be carried out. I do not understand in what way the Bill is being rushed through the House. Notice was given of the first reading and of the second reading. The second reading has come off; the Bill will be taken into committee; hon. members may then say what they wish to say, and the Bill will be reported to the House. That is not rushing it. I want to give

the House an opportunity of dealing with it.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It has had an additional stage imported into it.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): If it had not been for the action of the two hon. members, we should have got along much more rapidly, and the Bill would have been before the Legislative Assembly ere this, and that larger consideration which they desire should take place would be over. It is said the money has not been paid. As a matter of fact, it has been paid. Here is a letter from the man who paid the money himself.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It is not likely he would admit that he did not pay it.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: But he admits that he did pay it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The hon. gentleman is very simple. Because a man says he paid it, the Minister accepts that as a fact.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: But if this man holds the receipt, what would the hon. member say?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I would like to see the man produce the receipt, and submit himself to my cross-examination.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: This is not a court of justice.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Let us go into committee, and give the Bill that consideration which the hon. member desires. Let us bring the matter before the House, and have it discussed; and if the House does not wish to carry the Bill, they know how to say so. It has nothing to do with the Government particularly, except this, that the Government wish to take care of the interests of the people they represent. A mistake has been made, and it is a mistake which may cost the Government a serious amount of money unless it is repaired. These people were in possession of this lease, and were deprived of the title without any fault of their own; and it is only an act of justice on the part of the Government to re-instate them in their title. I ask hon. members to give this matter their gravest consideration, and help the Government in a matter in which they are trying to do their duty to the people.

Question put, and division taken, with the following result:—

Ayes	12
Noes	2

Majority for ... 10

AYES.				NOES.	
The Hon. F. T. Crowder				The Hon. S. J. Haynes	
The Hon. C. E. Dempster				The Hon. R. S. Haynes	
The Hon. J. W. Hackett				(Teller).	
The Hon. A. H. Henning					
The Hon. A. B. Kidson					
The Hon. A. P. Matheson					
The Hon. D. McKay					
The Hon. H. G. Parsons					
The Hon. G. Randell					
The Hon. H. J. Saunders					
The Hon. W. Spencer					
The Hon. E. H. Wittenoom					
			(Teller).		

THE PRESIDENT: That gives the ayes twelve votes; and, as I am in favour of the motion of the Minister, that will make up the required number present for enabling Standing Orders to be suspended.

Standing Orders suspended accordingly.

TREASURY BILLS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on the motion of the Minister of Mines, read a first time.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom), in moving the second reading, said: This Bill, I wish to explain to hon. members, is an amendment of Act 57 Vict., No. 2; and in that Bill authority is given to the Government to issue Treasury bills for a certain purpose, which is set forth. The Act was carried out and the Treasury bills were transacted, and the expenditure was incurred. It was found, owing to some difficulty in connection with the loan market not being favourable and other circumstances, that it would facilitate the action of the Government to introduce a Bill giving power to float Treasury bills from time to time. I want to point out unmistakably that this power will continue for years to come. It is not confined to any particular Ministry; but the power will exist for all time, to enable the Government at certain times when the market is not favourable to float a loan, for temporary purposes to float Treasury bills. This Bill limits the amount to three millions, so that the Government at any time, by Treasury bills, can raise three

million pounds; but they must not exceed that amount. The Bill is introduced owing to the present condition of the money market; and, I understand, a good amount of money is available for Treasury bills, although people will not take up inscribed stock at a low rate of interest. It would not be well to go to the market and pay a high rate of interest. There is an amendment in section 3 which enables the Government to give one large bill to any one firm taking a large amount. That is to obviate the necessity for giving a number of small bills.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: I would like to say a few words on the subject of this Bill; because I think Bills of this character are likely to be rushed through without the mature consideration which they require. A sum of three millions is an enormous sum to authorise the Government to raise on Treasury bills, off-hand; but I fully recognise the necessity of the existing circumstances, and the desirability of the House agreeing to the amendment necessary. Only there are one or two suggestions I would like to make. I understand that the London and Westminster Bank have agreed to take these Treasury bills; and I would like to suggest that possibly a much better price would be obtained by offering these bills for tender, and not making a fixed agreement with the London and Westminster Bank. There is nothing said about interest in the Bill; but, as the Minister of Mines suggested, it will have to be in excess of a loan interest; and I think these bills would appear in London as an extremely good security. The methods adopted by the colony of securing funds in London are not carried on in the business way that operations like this deserve. I think the suggestion of selling the bills by tender is one that should have very careful consideration at the hands of the Government. I should also like to get a little light on the exact nature of a Treasury bill, and of the advances which are made on Treasury bills. My reason for desiring that information is that not so long ago we were informed—I know in absolute good faith—by the Minister of Mines, that he was prepared to vouch for the absolute accuracy of the statement in the Governor's Speech, to the effect that we did not owe a penny to

any of the financial institutions of the colony. It will be within the recollection of hon. members that, in dealing with the question, I suggested—knowing that large sums had been advanced—that we were indebted to financial institutions outside the colony. But the Minister assured the House that that was not a fact. I do not wish to convey that the Minister was in any way misleading the House, but, as a matter of fact, I had always been under the impression that loans made by a bank on Treasury bills for a short time—say a year—were loans pure and simple. They would by any ordinary individual be treated as indebtedness. I gather from the paper that at that moment £480,000 of Treasury bills were lodged with the associated banks of the colony. I must say, to the ordinary mind that it certainly seemed, under the circumstances, that we were indebted to the financial institutions for that sum.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: So you were for a million loan too.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: The million loan was placed amongst the financial people of the other hemisphere.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: So are Treasury bills.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: While we have it stated that the financial institutions of the colony had not lent us sixpence, I do consider we were indebted at that time—and I think I ought to be thanked for giving the Minister an opportunity of correcting the impression which does prevail in the country, if I am wrong, or on the contrary give him the opportunity of saying how he misunderstood my question, if I am right.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I have listened very carefully to what the Minister has said in favour of the Bill; and I take it that when introducing a measure he places before the House the reason why the Bill should be passed. But I listened with great attention to what the hon. gentleman said; and I do not know whether I am more thick-headed or block-headed this afternoon than on other occasions; but I did not hear one reason advanced in favour of the Bill. Some hon. members may know the reason, but I do not; and I am not going to vote in favour of a Bill allowing the Government to raise three millions, or to allow it to pass without any dis-

cussion. A few minutes ago we passed a Bill through the House allowing the Government £850,000, and not one word was said about it. We granted £750,000 two months ago. The Government have spent two millions this year without any legislative sanction; and we are now asked to amend a Bill, which was passed only in 1893, when the Government had not such a hold on the country or on hon. members as they seem to have now, and when they could get power only to raise £500,000; and now they want three millions! (HON. A. B. KIDSON: Certainly.) The hon. gentleman is accustomed, no doubt, to deal with large amounts in the flourishing district he is in. Three millions would be nothing to him. But we are asked to pass a Bill about which the Minister has given us no explanation why the Act should be altered or amended, or why this huge power should be vested in the Government.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: What is your opinion about the Government?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Much the same as the hon. gentleman's opinion was until he was put up as a delegate for the Federal Convention. Now he has undergone a remarkable change, since he expects to be elected. It is only a slight aberration, and he will return to his former views when he comes back. The Minister has not given any reason for this Bill. It is the custom of the hon. gentleman, in introducing Bills to this House, to fully explain them, but he has given no reason for the passing of this measure, and I object to the way in which the hon. the Minister has moved the suspension of the Standing Orders. He has given us no reasons; but when one or two hon. members have got up and have raised two or three objections, the hon. member in his reply will knock these reasons down, and give others why the Act should be passed. In the course of debate it is scarcely fair to do this. We have no opportunity to answer him. The hon. gentleman has given no reason in favour of the Bill—not the slightest. Perhaps hon. members do not know how the Act is going to be amended. The Bill is for the purpose of amending Act 57 Vict., No. 2; and by that Act the Colonial Treasurer has authority to raise £500,000—that is, half-a-million. That is how the Act has stood from 1893 to 1897.

Various sessions of Parliament have been held since; but the Government were satisfied with the power to raise half-a-million; and now, at the fag end of the session, with the Standing Orders suspended, the Government ask the House to multiply their powers by six. If the House has an opportunity of discussing this Bill, perhaps there will be no objection to it.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Discuss it now. You have a chance.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: How is it possible to discuss the Bill fully when the orders have been suspended? I suppose the next thing will be that the Government will put the closure on.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: You put the closure on first.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I am glad I put it on. It gave hon. members a taste of what it is like. This Bill will pave the way to the chief measure, the Hainault Gold Mining Company's Bill; and I have not the slightest intention of seeing that Bill go through. It can go through only in one way. Hon. members can guess what I mean. Clause 1 is as follows:—

The Colonial Treasurer for the time being of the said colony may issue, from time to time, bills, to be called Treasury bills, for the purpose of raising any sum of money, not exceeding three millions, authorised to be raised by any Loan Act, whether passed before or after this Act, and not already raised at the time of the issue of the said bills; and on paying off and discharging any such bills, may issue other bills in lieu thereof to the extent of any such moneys for the time being remaining unpaid.

That gives the Treasurer for the time being enormous powers. It is all very well to say we have complete faith in the integrity of the Colonial Treasurer. We all have absolute faith, not only in the Treasurer, but in each individual member of the Ministry. But I contend this: If we grant powers like this to the present Ministry, who are not always going to remain in power, another Ministry may come into office, and we have no guarantee that each member of a new Ministry will be filled with the same rectitude of purpose. What is the money for? For the purpose of carrying through such schemes as the Coolgardie Water Supply? When the Government cannot raise money elsewhere, this Bill gives them power to raise it without defining

the rate of interest. We might have a Colonial Treasurer closely allied to the banking institutions, and he might make arrangements by which Government funds would be brought into the coffers of the banks. What could be easier for a Treasurer hereafter, who had authority to borrow money, if one of the banks had a large sum of money deposited with it, than for him to raise Treasury bills for a large amount, and give them to the bank at two or three per cent. for twelve months? The Treasurer would say—"I have power to do it; and if you did not want me to do it, why did you not repeal the Act?" I do not think we should vest such large powers in any Treasurer. We have passed a sum of £850,000 in a few minutes, and not a single soul asked a question about it; and now the Minister is asking leave to raise three millions, and not a word is asked about it. Hon. gentlemen seem to think that they should let the delegates get away to the Federal Convention, and that therefore they should ask the Government nothing. Is it right to enlarge the powers of the Treasurer from £500,000 to three millions? We are told it is necessary in the present state of the money market; but we are not passing it for the present state of the money market only, but for all time; not for the present Ministry, but for every future Ministry; and this important Bill is being passed at the fag end of a session, with the Standing Orders suspended, and with the House not disposed to do much business, because at the end of a session members are not disposed to go into any fresh matter. In the last House some hon. members said: "We are going to form a party." Where is that party now?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: You were on the Government side then.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I am on the Government side now; but I will never give the Ministry authority to increase their power to borrow from five hundred thousand pounds to three millions. In the present state of the House, and seeing the present hold the Government have on the House, the Ministry can snap their fingers. There are few members who would say a word against them; and those who would say a word against them stop away. Why should not this Bill have some limitation as to the rate of

interest, and some limitation as to the time of its existence? It is quite possible to say that it shall be in force for one, two, or three years, and that the interest should not be above a certain sum. Then we would safeguard ourselves; but we are handing over the finances to the Government without any control. They have spent two millions without our knowing what they have done; and they are growing stronger and bolder every day. The revenue of the colony on the introduction of responsible government was £400,000. Two years afterwards the Government asked permission to issue Treasury bills for one-and-a-half millions. At that time they dared not spend Treasury bills for more than four hundred thousand pounds at a time; but now they dare to ask the House for authority to borrow three millions. The expenditure this year, without legislative sanction, stands without parallel. It is not to be equalled anywhere in the world. We are creating a very bad precedent. A future House will be bound to follow the precedent this House is now establishing. It will be bound in honour to do it. A House always approves of an act when there is a precedent to go upon—in fact Parliament lives by precedents. The rules of the House are made up of unwritten precedents, subsequently reduced to writing. Therefore, we should not establish a dangerous precedent like this. I want to show how completely we are going to hand over the control of the finances without asking for the slightest check. Clause 4 of the proposed Bill is as dangerous as any of the other clauses—in fact it is the most dangerous of them all. It says:—

Treasury bills intended to be issued for the amounts named therein, and to be sold beyond the limits of the colony, may be signed by the Colonial Treasurer and the Under Treasurer, and registered in the Treasury and by the Auditor General without the dates of issue or the times of currency being inserted, and such dates shall be inserted by the agent appointed to negotiate such sale on behalf of the Government, when issuing such bills, and immediately after such issue, such agent shall, by writing under his hand, notify such dates and times to the Colonial Treasurer and to the Auditor General for registration.

Under the old Act the dates of issue were bound to be put in; but the person who issues them is now going to allow the agent to do that. Is he anything of the

stamp of the man who was postmaster at Coolgardie? If the Government will trust one they will trust another, and if they are disappointed by one they may be disappointed by another. I do not know whether any hon. member has taken the trouble to read this clause of the Bill; but I ask them whether the Minister has told them what effect it would have on the rights and privileges of the House. The Minister simply brings the Bill to the House and says—"Here is the Bill: I say you must pass it."

HON. G. RANDELL: Do you propose that we reject it?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: We might amend it by inserting the amount of interest these Treasury bills should bear.

HON. G. RANDELL: But we cannot amend it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Then we will send it back with a suggestion. That is practically an amendment, because the other chamber is bound to make our amendments if we insist on them. If not, what is the use of this House? We may as well be at home by the fireside as wasting our time here. Time should be given to the House for the consideration of this measure.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: You can have as much time as you like.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You would have given us about five minutes, if you had had your way, and if no one had risen to oppose the Bill.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: What is the use, so long as there is no opposition?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: But hon. members did not know what the Bill was to repeal. The Minister simply asked the House to repeal an Act. He never read a section. I was waiting to hear what it was; but the Minister simply said it was in consequence of the depressed state of the market that we were asked to pass this Bill. Because the money market is depressed, we are to give the Government authority to raise three millions!

A MEMBER: They must have the money, and how are they to get it if not by these means?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: How did they get it before? It is not right to come here at the fag end of a session to rush a Bill through. The Minister has told us before that this House was appointed to revise legislation and to check hasty

legislation; but a Bill is introduced at 5.30, and if there had been no objection to it it would have been law at 6 o'clock. And that Bill gives the Treasurer the power to raise £3,000,000 without limitation of time or interest! I know no hon. member who is more capable of introducing a bill and placing it more properly before the House than the Minister of Mines—to wit, the Federation Bill; but I never heard the hon. gentleman get up and move a bill with less explanation than the Minister offered on this Bill to-night. Did he express any opinion as to Clause 4? Why, these Treasury bills are to be sent out *en bloc* to the agent in London. Well, I do not know whether he is in London: he may be at Coolgardie.

HON. G. RANDELL: That case is pending yet. You may render yourself liable for damages.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I do not know anything about it; but it was only a matter of £7,000 or £8,000. That is not large. We are dealing with millions. The old principle that the bills be registered and that they all pass out from the Treasury here is done away with in this case. Under the old Act, when we gave the Colonial Treasurer power to issue bills, the Auditor General reported to Parliament, and Parliament knew what amount of bills had been issued. The object is manifest. It was some check on the Colonial Treasurer. If he said "I have issued only £50,000 or £100,000 worth of Treasury bills," that statement could be borne out by the Auditor General's report. But that is going to be done away with now. They are going to have agents selling these bills all over the colonies. The Bill does not state how many agents; but I suppose they will be all over the colonies and in England. It does not say what commission is to be allowed for the sale of these Treasury bills. The Treasurer will simply give the blank bills to these people, and let them fill them in. It does not matter much about the interest or the date of issue. These officers, away from the colony, would not be subject to the criminal law of this colony, and they would not be subject to the legislature in any way. Perhaps bills would be given to some bank in England—perhaps to the Federal Bank of Victoria or the Commercial Bank of South Australia; and if

either of those banks got some of the Treasury bills undated, and the currency left blank, they would do very well, and I do not think they would shut their doors. Has the hon. gentleman given any reason for this violent departure from the safeguards in the Act 57 Vict., No. 2? I ask the House to reject this measure until some reasons are given for increasing the borrowing power of the Colonial Treasurer from half a million to three millions, and for giving him power to issue Treasury bills with a blank date. The hon. gentleman cannot give any reasons. I say he cannot give a valid reason why this Bill should be passed. And in the absence of any reasons, this House, I submit, has a duty to perform, which is to reject it. In committee I shall move certain amendments.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 5, inclusive—agreed to.

New clause:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved to add a new clause, to read as follows:—"That the operation of this Act shall not extend beyond the term of three years from the passing of it."

THE MINISTER OF MINES regretted that he was unable to accept the new clause.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Make it five years or any time.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: That would do away with the object of the Bill altogether. When introducing the measure, he had pointed out that it was intended to be an enduring Act; and the object was to raise money by bills when they could not raise it satisfactorily by inscribed bonds. It was necessary for the Government occasionally to resort to Treasury bills for temporary relief, until they could float a loan on advantageous terms.

HON. R. S. HAYNES asked if the Minister was prepared to accept any time.

THE MINISTER OF MINES said he was not; but there was no objection to the hon. member moving his suggestion.

Amendment put and negatived.

Preamble and title—agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment, and report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 6:30 p.m. the PRESIDENT left the Chair.

At 7:30 p.m. the PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

HAINAULT GOLD MINE, LIMITED, BILL.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) moved that the President do now leave the Chair for the purpose of considering the Bill in committee of the whole Council.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I am anxious that this matter should be discussed irrespective of the claims of the different parties. It must not be thought that I have come here to advocate the claims of either party. Perhaps hon. members may think that I am interested in the matter, and if so, that may account for the opposition which my remarks have received in the chamber. I have been asked if I had any interest in the matter. I have not a scintilla of interest in one side or the other. I am moving in the matter because I feel it is my duty to do so, and because, if this Bill is passed, it will create a precedent which will have a deleterious effect on all concerned. The respect which has been entertained for this House has been almost unlimited in the country, because in the past it has safeguarded the interests of all parties. It was called into existence as a check, and it has always been held in the highest respect, because it has fulfilled its obligations in the past. I hope, therefore, that we are not going to throw away that prestige. The report of the committee is, I am afraid, most unsatisfactory. The President ruled that the matter had to go before the committee in the same way as a private Bill. What is the object of sending a private Bill before a committee, if not that the committee may hear both sides, because it deals with the interests of private individuals? That was the sole object of referring this matter to a committee, in order that the whole facts could be threshed out. The hon. member (Hon. A. B. Kidson) said the committee were not a court of justice, but Sir Thomas Erskine May said that they were a court of justice when they were dealing with a private Bill, and were bound to proceed according to the strict rules of law. The object was to investigate and hear both sides. The Bill before the House proposed

to re-establish the title of the Hainault Company to the lease. The necessity of the Bill arose because the hon. gentleman who introduced it said certain other persons had a legal title to the land in dispute. Therefore the object of the Bill was to deprive those persons of their legal title. It was said that these persons were jumpers. Now a jumper is a person who has not a miner's right.

HON. MEMBER: How can you prove that?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I cite in support of my statement the finding of the Supreme Court of this colony on jumping. They decided that a person who held a lease did not want a miner's right. In this case the people are holders of a miner's right. The miner's right must be supreme, and they have a right to go on all lands which the Crown has decided to be forfeited. They went there after notice. It is said that there was some fault in the forfeiture. It is also said that the rent has been paid. Is not that the very crux of the whole question? Has it been paid or not?

THE MINISTER OF MINES: It has been paid.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The committee do not say that the rent has been paid. They have expressly excluded finding that the rent has been paid. That is a nice judicial body to decide a question of this sort. It was the only question they had absolutely to find, whether the rent had been paid or not. [*Several extracts from report of committee read.*] What was the official error of the Government? I contend that the report of the committee does not justify the Bill at all. The committee did not have time to properly investigate the matter. If they had had time, all these facts would have been proved in the proper course. They would have had a receipt for the rent. If there is a receipt, I would like to see the counterfoil for it. Nothing would be easier than for the agent of the company—I am not suggesting that it took place—if through forgetfulness the rent had not been paid, to pay the rent afterwards, and to get a receipt, and then say he had the receipt all the time. The committee should have inquired into the circumstances of the case. What evidence have they had before them? They asked for power to send for persons and papers. Did they

let the other side know they were sitting in committee. They were acting as a judicial body, and there were some lawyers among them. Every lawyer knows that both sides should be heard. It is opposed to the very first principles of natural justice to allow a person's interests to be taken away in the absence of any evidence on behalf of the person interested. There is nothing in the report to allow you to take away these people's interests. It is alleged, in justification of the proposed annulling of the lease, that the motives of the parties were of a speculative character. Is the House going to pass legislation to restrain speculative actions in the colony, and are they going to decide that an action is speculative without even inquiring into the matter? It seems to me that the House are interfering with the administration of justice. They have appointed Judges, and yet will not trust them with the case. No wonder that the Government lose nearly every case they bring into Court, chiefly from the way in which their cases are handled.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: I think their merits are all right.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: They are brought in such a disgraceful way before the Court, that the Government always lose. I do not think I ever brought a case against the Government in which I did not succeed beyond hope and anticipation. My contention is that, with this report before it, the House ought not to proceed any further with the Bill. Let us get the whole facts before us; let us do exactly the same as the Supreme Court. Why does the Court ask for all the facts. Lawyers know you cannot decide conflicting issues unless you hear both sides. The Minister of Mines, in a very glowing and able speech, has pointed out that the company lost their lease through the error of some Government clerk, and he contended that the company ought not to be thus deprived of their interest. I quite agree with the hon. member, but the real person who is interested in this is the Government. The company will not lose a fraction. If the company's lease has been illegally forfeited, they can make the Government pay for their loss. But the Government would lose; hence this action. It is an act of indemnity to the Government.

Why do not the Government put it in their Excess Bill?

THE MINISTER OF MINES: We have not got it yet.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You have a Bill here for £850,000; you might just as well have made it for £875,000. Let the persons in dispute fight it out. How would hon. members like to have their rights taken away without having their case brought before the Court? The hon. gentleman says that the fair fame of the colony would be ruined, if this Act were not passed and the company re-established. I contend that, if this Bill be passed, and the circumstances were made known in England, it would blast the reputation of this colony. I ask the House to pause before passing this Bill. Hear the evidence on both sides, and I, for one, if the hon. gentleman be correct in what he has stated, will be the first to support him through thick and thin. But I do ask the hon. gentleman not to press this on at the fag end of the session. Bring it before the committee—I do not want to be on the committee—have the matter threshed out to the very bottom, and, if what the hon. gentleman says is true, I will as warmly support the passing of the Bill as I now oppose it.

HON. A. H. HENNING: I heartily congratulate the hon. member who has just sat down for the forensic address with which he has favoured us, but I venture to think that the only comment that requires answer is the statement that both sides require to be heard. As one of the committee who brought in this report, I can tell the hon. member that we had before us, as stated in that report, the sworn testimony of those people to whom he has referred. We had their sworn testimony, and on the facts disclosed by them and by their witnesses, we based our report. The whole argument of the hon. gentleman is for delay, that this Bill should not be gone on with. It has been said that there has been undue haste in rushing the report through.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: There has been, and you cannot deny it.

HON. A. H. HENNING: The House stamped the matter as one of urgency, and I submit that it should have been dealt with as a matter of urgency. In private life, when one admits that he has done

wrong to another party, he cannot be too hasty in making restitution.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Why did you not make your report, then, last session?

HON. A. H. HENNING: My hon. friend shows how little he knows of the circumstances of the case. The forfeiture happened by a *Gazette* notice dated November 20. Within fourteen days of that time, namely on December 4, a publication of the cancellation of that forfeiture was made. The idea was to rectify the error as speedily as possible. It was found by the committee that not only was this error caused by the Government, and that they attempted to rectify it, but that before the 7th of April these people knew of the error, and of its intended rectification, before they took any steps to acquire an interest in the mine.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Has the hon. member any right to say what the committee found, when the report does not say so? I submit he is out of order in saying that the committee found something which is not in writing.

HON. A. H. HENNING: The report distinctly says that the *Gazette* of the 20th of November was produced. It also states that the *Gazette* was produced showing the forfeiture, and it also says that Antill, one of the parties, stated that on the 7th of April, 1897, by virtue of a miner's right, he entered on the land. These are the facts I stated.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You said he had knowledge of the error, and I stated that you had not shown it in your report.

HON. A. H. HENNING: He admitted knowledge of the notice in the *Gazette* cancelling the forfeiture.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: But not knowledge of the error.

HON. A. H. HENNING: I take it that the publication of the cancellation was an admission of error, and this man, knowing that the cancellation had happened within a fortnight of the publication of the forfeiture, must have known there was an error, otherwise the cancellation would not have taken place. The hon. member asks why, if the matter was so urgent, no legislation was brought in last session. The facts noted happened after the conclusion of the sitting. The sitting concluded in March, and the men attempted to take possession on April 7. There was no knowledge that the cancella-

tion of the forfeiture was ineffectual till after April 7, when the parties attempted to take advantage of the error of the Government. The hon. member asks why we did not take the evidence of these men, but, having the sworn testimony of the men before us, there was no necessity to ask them to repeat it. The hon. member says that these men were not jumpers because they had miners' rights. In support of that he said that the Supreme Court had decided that it was unnecessary for the holder of a lease to have a miner's right. I do not know that the holder of a lease is in the position of these people. They are applying for claims, and the hon. member says that they are not jumpers because they are the holders of a miner's right.

Question—That the President do now leave the Chair—put and passed.

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill passed through committee without amendment or debate.

Bill reported.

MOTION FOR RE-COMMITTAL.

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, That the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of amending Clause 3. He drew attention to the fact that Clause 3 provided that all litigation between any of the parties founded upon the avoidance of the lease should cease, and that the Court might order costs in favour of any party to such litigation, and might order one party to pay the costs of another, as between solicitor and client. He thought it was only fair if we allowed costs to one side, that compensation should be awarded to the other side. We had admitted that the Court might order either party to pay costs, either that the company should pay the costs of the men, or the men the costs of the company: then why not pay compensation? If it was correct that the company had not broken the lease, and that the miners went on the land wrongfully, it should be open for the Court to award compensation. If not, we would not be giving them any show at all. He asked the House to give the Court power to award compensation.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. WITTENOOM) congratulated the hon. member on the tenacity with which he had fought the Bill. He deeply re-

gretted that he could not see his way to accept the suggestion of the hon. member. He felt if once the door was opened to compensation in this way, the object of the Bill would be defeated.

Motion put and negatived.

On the motion of the MINISTER OF MINES, the report was adopted.

THIRD READING.

Bill then read a third time.

On the motion of the MINISTER OF MINES, it was resolved that the title of the Bill be "An Act to re-establish the title of the Hainault Gold Mine, Limited, to the Gold-mining Lease No. 81E."

Bill transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

VACANCY IN FEDERAL CONVENTION BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on the motion of the Minister of Mines, read a first time.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER OF MINES, in moving that the Bill be read a second time, said: It is unnecessary for me to say much in explanation of this measure. Hon. members are all aware that tomorrow an election takes place for three members of the Federal Convention, to fill the places of members who have resigned. That election takes place between ten and twelve o'clock. At a very late hour indeed—in fact, within the last day—the resignation was sent in of Mr. Loton, who, from illness, has been obliged to resign his seat. In these circumstances, the Government are obliged by statute to proceed to the election of a member to fill the vacancy. It was necessary that immediate steps should be taken in such an urgent matter; because it is unwise that we should have one delegate short at the Convention in Sydney. As it was impossible to follow the usual practice provided by the Federal Enabling Act, the difficulty is being got over by the introduction of this short measure; and I feel confident it will commend itself to hon. members. The Bill is altered in some respects to suit the present occasion. The chief alteration is comprised in Clause 3, which reads:—"The returning officer shall, in such way as he may think fit, invite the members

"of the Council and of the Assembly to meet for the purpose of the said election in the Assembly's room at noon of the twenty-sixth day of August, 1897, and shall himself then and there attend, and till fifty minutes after noon receive nomination papers nominating candidates for the vacant seat." The ordinary procedure has been gone on with, and the election will proceed as usual; but instead of fifteen days between the issue of the writ and the day of nomination, and two days between the date of nomination and election, there is only one hour.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Bill passed through committee without amendment, reported to the House, and report adopted.

THIRD READING.

Bill read a third time, and *passed*.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE MINISTER OF MINES moved "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until eleven o'clock to-morrow morning."

Put and passed.

The House adjourned at 9:15 p.m. until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 25th August, 1897.

Papers Presented—Question: Rebate of Duties on Supplies for Foreign Ships—(Question: Fisheries Licenses—Question: Kalgoolie-Menzies Railway Contract—Question: Proposed Claremont Municipality—Question: Duty on Imported Pumps and Pipes—Motion: Rebate of Duties on Supplies for Foreign Ships—Treasury Bills Act Amendment Bill, third reading—Commonwealth Bill, in Committee; Re-Committee; Presenting Amendments to the Convention—Vacancy in Federal Convention Bill; all stages—Hainault Gold Mine Bill; Debate on Motion to suspend Standing Orders—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

THE MINISTER OF LANDS (Hon. George Throssell) laid upon the Table the following papers: (1.) Regulations for the Control and Management of the Pearl Shell Fishery at Sharks Bay. (2.) Regulations under "The Fishery Act, 1889." (3.) Regulations under "The Stock Diseases Act." (4.) Regulations under "The Homesteads Act, 1893."

QUESTION—REBATE OF DUTIES ON SUPPLIES FOR FOREIGN SHIPS.

MR. HIGHAM, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier:—(1.) Whether it was his intention to formulate regulations which would facilitate the rebate of duties paid on goods supplied to foreign shipping, or re-exported from the colony? (2.) Whether he was aware that the Frozen Meat Company had been debarred from supplying meat in bond to foreign shipping. If so, why?

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied:—(1.) The question is being considered. (2.) The Frozen Meat Company have been debarred from supplying meat to other ships in harbour without paying duty, as such a proceeding is contrary to law (*vide* Sections 255, 257, and 268 of the "Customs Consolidated Act, 1892").

QUESTION—FISHERIES LICENSES.

MR. SOLOMON, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier:—(1.): Whether the Government would, at an early date, take into consideration the necessity of