

purchase, say, eight or nine more at a cost of £1,000, there would be 12 or 13 drills which could be leased or lent out to prospectors under somewhat similar conditions to those on which the Public Works Department are already lending them. That is, the department demands a deposit of £50 as security for the return of the drill in good order and condition whenever the borrower is called upon to do so, and there is also a man placed in charge by the department who is fully competent to look after the property. A dozen of these drills prospecting through this auriferous country would help us considerably in determining which ground should be available for the leaseholder, and which should be retained by the Department of Mines for alluvial workings. The Gold Mines Act, when amended, will probably provide that no ground likely to develop alluvial will be granted as a leasehold. The possession of these drills, and the prospecting done by them, would greatly assist the Minister of Mines in deciding which ground shall be granted as leasehold. A still greater advantage would accrue if, for instance, another Kanowna were discovered; for the small expenditure of £1,000 would then be fully repaid. In many cases where surface alluvial gold has been discovered, great efforts have been made to try to develop the lead. At Goongarie, at Menzies and other places, local syndicates have been formed, and have spent a good deal of money for this purpose; but the difficulty of sinking shafts is so great, that, in almost every instance, those efforts have been abandoned. I do not intend to take up the time of the House longer; but I wish to impress upon the Government the great advantage that would result if a few of these drills were purchased and lent to suitable persons under conditions to be laid down by the Minister of Mines, so that we may be assured that the drills would be kept in active work, and prospecting with them duly carried on. As I say, it would only need one discovery to make the project remunerative; and if we had a dozen drills out on our goldfields, scattered through the auriferous belt, it is impossible to say how many discoveries would result. I know there are people who are

prepared to do the prospecting if they can only get the drills; and if we could only find one other alluvial field, the Government and the country would be amply recompensed. Seeing that the expenditure involved would be so small, I hope the Government will favourably consider the motion.

MR. VOSPER drew attention to the state of the House.

THE SPEAKER, after the bells had been rung and the usual interval had elapsed, finding there was not a quorum of members present, adjourned the sitting.

ADJOURNMENT

The House was thus adjourned at 9.55 p.m. until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 22nd September, 1898.

Motion: Supreme Court, Additional Judge—Reappropriation of Loan Moneys Bill, in Committee, further considered and reported (Divisions) — Paper presented — Criminal Appeal Bill, in Committee, reported—Jury Bill, Assembly's Amendments on the Council's Amendments, considered in Committee—Health Bill, second reading—Adjournment.

The PRESIDENT took the chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

MOTION: SUPREME COURT, ADDITIONAL JUDGE.

HON. H. G. PARSONS moved:

That, in view of the extreme pressure of business now before the Supreme Court, this House is of opinion that the provisions of the Circuit Courts Act, passed last session, should now be enforced by the immediate appointment of a Commissioner or Judge.

POINT OF ORDER.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I am reluctant to rise to a point of order, but this motion involves the expenditure of money, and I think the President ought to decide whether it can be submitted.

THE PRESIDENT: As the question has been raised on a point of order, I may say that the motion infringes on the privileges of another place. The appointment of a third judge means the payment of a third salary, and this House cannot directly or indirectly increase the taxation or burdens on the people. I therefore rule the motion out of order.

REAPPROPRIATION OF LOAN MONEYS BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Consideration in Committee resumed.

Third schedule—Item, Donnybrook to Bridgetown railway—£70,000:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell): Progress had been reported on the previous night, for the purpose of enabling him to obtain further information as to items in the schedule. That information he had received, and he would be pleased to lay it before hon. members as the items were dealt with. In a note to the Under Secretary for Public Works from the Engineer-in-Chief, it was stated that the original estimate for this work was £174,000, so that the work had been carried out under the estimate. Some members appeared to have forgotten that an additional £70,000 was asked for in consequence of an error in the original estimate. The note further read:—

Sufficient money was not provided under the Loan Act, 1894, for the construction of the balance of the line, only £52,000 being allowed for construction and land, while the accepted tender for the work alone was £87,925. The loan schedule was prepared before the survey was made. Extra works have also been ordered, also the cost of supervision, telephone material, turntable, cranes, etc., necessary for the carrying out and equipment of the line, have had to be provided. It is anticipated that the line will be ready to take over for the running of public traffic on 1st prox. A few minor details will, however, yet remain to be completed after that date. Extras on the contract to the amount of £21,300 have been paid to date. These have been occasioned chiefly by the nature of the country traversed, necessitating considerable flattening of the contract slopes to cuttings.

Additional station accommodation has also been provided, and many minor additions and alterations, contingent on a work of this magnitude, have been carried out. The amount of money set down to be reappropriated for this line is for construction works and station equipment only. The amounts provided to cover the cost of the items, "Rails and fastenings" and "Rolling stock," on all lines constructed from loan, have been kept altogether distinct from "construction," and have been lumped together and distinct loan items created under the headings of "Rails and fastenings" and "Rolling stock," and to which material or trucks required in connection with new lines were debited as required.

This was all the information he could lay before hon. members in reference to the Donnybrook-Bridgetown line.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Would the Minister say what was to be the total cost on completion?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: £133,000, to cover everything.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Unless there were some further extras.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: There would be no further extras.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Did that amount cover the rolling stock?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It would cover everything.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The information was just about what he expected. The Premier, in another place, when moving the second reading of the Bill for the construction of the Donnybrook-Bridgetown railway, and the representative of the Government in this House when moving the second reading of the same Bill, pointed out that this line was to cost £100,000.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was for a railway "towards Bridgetown."

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The first Bill, which was thrown out, was for the construction of a railway "towards Bridgetown" and the cost was to be £80,000. When the second Bill was introduced, the Premier stated that the cost would be £100,000. Now we were told it was to cost £133,000. Although the Engineer-in-Chief had pointed out that his estimate was for £174,000, yet why did the Premier and the representative of the Government in this House lead members to expect that the cost would only be £100,000? From the report read today, Mr. O'Connor showed there was an item of £21,000 for extras; also that this

was nothing out of the way, considering the magnitude of the work. If there was an amount of £21,000 for extras in a work of this kind, what would be the amount of extras in a work like the Coolgardie water scheme which was to cost two millions and a half? The colony at the present time was in a bad financial position, and hon. members blamed the Government for the position the colony was in, but he (Mr. Crowder) said the blame was upon hon. members themselves to a certain extent in passing these Bills. The position of the Government was brought about by the Government rushing Bills through the Legislature for certain works which cost double the amount of the estimate. Perhaps the Government was not to blame, but somebody was to blame. The Engineer-in-Chief and his department were to blame in giving estimates that could not be substantiated. This extra cost had not only occurred in regard to the Bridgetown railway. Let us take the building of the Mint. First of all this House was asked to grant £10,000 for the work. Afterwards the amount was increased to £23,000, and the present cost to date was £43,000. The work would not be completed under £50,000. Had a Bill been brought before this House asking us to grant £50,000 for the erection of a Mint, would hon. members have passed the Bill?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That was not the question.

HON. F. T. CROWDER said he was showing the waste of money that had taken place. It was the same thing in regard to the Observatory.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was getting wide of the mark. The item before the Committee was the Donnybrook-Bridgetown Railway, and not the Observatory.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The only alternative hon. members had was to throw out the measure. Probably that was no good, after the money had been spent, and it might mean stopping work in various parts of the country. He was not prepared to do that, but members should deal more carefully with bills of this description in future. It was not a fair thing for the Government to introduce a Bill for the expenditure of £100,000 for the Donnybrook-Bridge-

town railway and then spend an extra £35,000.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The report of the Engineer-in-Chief, which was placed before hon. members at the time the Bill for the construction of the Donnybrook-Bridgetown Railway was before the House, showed that the cost by one route would be £164,000, and by another route £174,000.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE moved, as an amendment, that a suggestion be forwarded to the Legislative Assembly, that the "Donnybrook-Bridgetown Railway £70,000" be reduced by £1,000? He did this to emphasise the opinion of the Council that the expenditure had been unwarranted. The Director of Public Works had gone entirely outside his proper power, in assenting to so great an extra expenditure above the amount previously granted. The Engineer-in-Chief, according to the report, stated that the extra amount of £21,300 had been caused in consequence of the nature of the material through which the line had to pass. If lines were surveyed and passed under estimate, it must speak very loudly indeed for the incompetency of the officers when an addition of 25 per cent. had to be made to the contract price on account of difficult country through which the line had to pass. The engineers must have known of the difficulties, when making the first estimate. If it was only to emphasise our disapproval of the manner in which this contract had been dealt with by the Public Works Department, we should recommend a reduction of the amount asked for, by sending this Bill back to the other House. We should probably be met with the reply that the work had been entered upon or nearly completed, but economy could take place to the extent of £1,000 from now, until such time as the work was handed over.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: Perhaps Mr. Whitcombe had misunderstood how the extras had probably been arrived at in this particular case. Most of the contracts contained schedule prices for extra work, and if it was found that there was much more stone work to be done than was anticipated, because the engineers could not see under the surface of the ground, the contractor would be entitled to charge under the schedule rate for cut-

ting out the stone, and that would be more than for taking out earth.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: It was not stone work at all. The plans which were drawn showed the cuttings to be nearly perpendicular, and with the heavy rain we had experienced the embankments had collapsed. After the experience which the engineers had gained on the Eastern railway, the plan for the embankments of this line ought to have been drawn with a proper slope.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY expressed the hope that the hon. member would not press his amendment, even for the sake of principle. All works of this description had not come up to the expectations of the persons who had estimated the cost. In this case we found that Mr. O'Connor had estimated the cost at £174,000 by one route and £164,000 by another route. The work would be executed and taken over in working order for £30,000 under the estimate. It was true the estimate first made was £86,000 roughly speaking, and only £52,000 was provided in the first instance—he did not know for what reason—but it was stated the line was to be taken “towards Bridgetown,” Mr. Crowder disputed that. One was not able to say whether the Premier or Mr. Crowder was right on the point. If the line was completed for £133,000 for the whole distance, we would be doing very well. That embankments had to be reduced might be expected to occur in many instances. In the case of the cutting through the hills at Greenmount, the engineers could not have anticipated what was met with there. In passing through rocky country it was impossible to tell what was going to happen. It was not worth while for the House to send a suggestion to reduce this vote by £1,000.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: The explanation offered was somewhat faulty or halting, though it had to a certain extent cleared the Engineer-in-Chief from responsibility for the original estimate. He (Mr. Parsons) was inclined not to withdraw his amendment. If it was known to the Government that the line would cost £170,000, why should £100,000 be asked for? Such a course was misleading to the House, and was not constitutional government at all.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was only about £3,000 a mile, after all.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: Hon. members were being misled, and the Cabinet was carrying on an organised conspiracy against the country, and spending money without consulting Parliament. The error was not so much in the estimate of the Engineer-in-Chief as in the estimate formed by the Government of the capacity for forbearance of this House, which capacity the Government evidently took to be unlimited. The Government apparently built lines first, and then asked the sanction of the Legislative Council, that being a sort of thing which should not be encouraged. The amendment ought to be carried, as a broad hint to the contractors and the Government that this sort of thing would not be allowed to pass. The action of the Government was not what should be expected in an advanced and progressive country like this.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Government should be given credit for saving in other directions.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: The Government could not be given credit for saving on the Menzies railway, at any rate. In Greece he had seen embankments built on these lines, and there passengers were always asked to get out and walk while the trains went over. He himself, at one time, had been called upon to give his name and address because he refused to get out and walk. These embankments collapsed simply because, as would probably be the case in this country, they were subject to torrential rains. In the Eastern railway this country had had its lesson, and the people were tired of extravagance, particularly the extravagance of the Works Department, which were raising a growl from even the most patient sections of the community. The policy of the department was an outrage on the public, and it would only be a fair thing to reduce the amount which the House was asked to vote.

HON. W. T. LOTON said he could not support the suggestion made by Mr. Parsons. He was glad that progress was reported on the previous day, because the result had been pretty clear information as to the position in which the country stood in connection with railway construction. The trouble we were involved in

now in regard to this reappropriation of £70,000, arose from the fact that provision was not made under the loan schedule for the full amount required to construct the railway. He was not sure whether Mr. Crowder was right when he said the statement was made that £100,000 would be sufficient to construct the railway.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: It was so announced, anyhow.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Perhaps that was so. He (Mr. Loton) had endeavoured to look up the expenditure under this head, but the accounts went so far back that it was impossible to follow them. The first amount provided was about £40,000 out of the general revenue of the country. Then there was a reappropriation in 1895 of £20,000 for this line, and this was the first loan money he could see appropriated. These two sums made about £60,000, and now hon. members were asked to reappropriate another £70,000. The present position arose from the fact that provision was not made for the payment for the construction of the line before it was commenced.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was in 1897, I think.

HON. W. T. LOTON: In what he had said on the previous night he might have made a mistake, seeing now that the Committee had before them the fact that the line would be completed for £30,000 less than the estimate of the Engineer-in-Chief. Both Houses were, he believed, led to think the line would be constructed for £100,000, and the difficulty was that funds were not provided.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: The estimates made no difference, because £20,000 extras were put on, and that was the particular point on which the department had been at fault. No doubt the Government could be given credit for saving on other lines; but it was the duty of the Government to complete every line as cheaply as possible. The line, he took it, was estimated to cost £174,000, outside of rolling stock and equipment, whereas it was found that the cost would be about £100,000, and the contract was let for £85,000. The Government then authorised a further expenditure of £20,000 on the line, and now they asked the Council to approve of further ex-

penditure without making any remarks at all. If the Legislative Council were not to exercise supervision and not have the right of criticising wasteful extravagance on the part of the Government, there was no reason for the existence of the Chamber.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That position was not taken by the Government.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: But that was the position very nearly taken by the Government, and accordingly, hon. members were asked to allow this proposal to go through without discussion and further, to give the Government credit for saving in directions which the Colonial Secretary had not made clear to the House. It was absurd to place the Legislative Council in such a position, and he hoped hon. members would approve of the amendment. It was only right the Council should take an action which would result in some practical good, if an economy of only £1,000 was insisted upon.

Amendment (to reduce by £1,000) put and negatived.

HON. W. T. LOTON asked whether the amount to be reappropriated was in excess of what was originally voted?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY said he thought he had previously explained the excess, which was in connection with the Brunswick station.

HON. W. T. LOTON: It was an extension of the line.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was an extension of the line, and additional station accommodation had to be put in at Brunswick. This entailed an expenditure of something like £6,000, but he could not give the exact cost. The actual cost, at any rate, was stated by the Director of Public Works to be only a very small sum over the amount allotted for the construction of the line.

Item passed.

Item, Survey of railway from Menzies to Mount Leonora, £4,000:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved that a suggestion be forwarded to the Legislative Assembly, that this item be struck out. The Council was pledged against any further reappropriation of money, for at the commencement of the session a resolution was passed, affirming that no money should be reappropriated for the

purpose of commencing fresh works. That was carried after full discussion, and there was practically no answer to the arguments in favour of it. The colony was not in a position to warrant the expenditure of more money. As to the other works in the schedule, it was idle now to attempt to say that these should not be paid for; but this proposed survey was a new work which the House had definitely said should not be commenced. Surely the Government could not expect the Legislative Council to express one opinion one day and another opinion on the next day. The House would stultify itself if it did not adhere to the resolution it passed at the beginning of the session, in good faith and after full argument. He was opposed to the construction of the line, but, of course, on that point there was room for difference of opinion. No doubt Mr. Matheson would contend that the line was necessary; but when the actual construction of the line was proposed, he (Mr. Haynes) would be prepared to meet that hon. gentleman with facts and figures, to show that the line was being pushed ahead, not for the purpose of conveniencing the people of Leonora, but for the purpose of tapping the trade of Lawlers.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: Question.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Lawlers produced more gold than all the other places it was proposed to serve. If a compromise were suggested, it would of course be discussed, but this was getting the thin end of the wedge in. The House should not be asked to consent to a direct blow being dealt at the trade of a district in which people were settled. It would take away from the Geraldton port and the agricultural districts one of the best markets there were. If this was done by sheer force of numbers, the time might come when other members would want something done for their own districts. He had always endeavoured to see that justice was done to every district, but if he found the interests of his constituents neglected, he must take up the cudgels in their defence, and deal out the same treatment to other hon. members. As he had said, the House at the beginning of the session decided against the reappropriation of money for the construction of new work.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That was not proposed here.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If new work was not proposed, why should money be thrown away on a survey?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The reappropriation was not proposed for the construction of a line, but for a survey.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: But by passing this item hon. members would commit themselves to the construction of the line. The proposed expenditure was not justified in the face of the fact that there was no money for the construction of new lines.

HON. A. P. MATHESON said he was very glad Mr. Haynes had spoken so emphatically, because he had shown the true reason for his opposition to the survey was his opposition to the construction of the line.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The House had decided the matter.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: Quite so. Mr. Haynes truly said that in the early part of the session the House passed a resolution in reference to the reappropriation of money for the construction of this line. That, however, was quite a different question from that now before the House. The question now was as to the voting of a small sum of money for the purpose of the survey, and no suggestion was made that the line was going to be built until funds were available. When the funds were available the Government would have to go to the Assembly and secure the necessary vote, and a survey would enable hon. members to form an accurate opinion as to whether the line was justified, and as to the cost of its construction. The House had, with great justice, found fault with the action of the Government in the past for largely exceeding the original estimates for railway construction. But it had also transpired that these estimates had frequently to be made without any surveys, especially in the case of the railway from York to Greenhills.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: That was built out of revenue.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: In that case it appeared the estimates were made without any surveys having been laid before the House. The House had never previously been put in a proper position to

debate whether expenditure was justified or not. Now for the first time in the experience of the colony the Government approached us with the suggestion that two surveys be made. It would be acting in opposition to everything that had been said in the House to-night if we opposed the Government in their attempt to deal with this matter in a business-like way. We should not go into the subject of whether the railway, as a railway, was justifiable or not, but Mr. Haynes said the reason why the line should not be built was that the gold returns from Lawlers were far better than those from Mount Leonora. He could give an explanation of why that was so. The East Murchison United Battery at Lawlers had been working all the stone in the district continuously and had been enabled by that means to send in good returns, whereas the battery at Mount Leonora was very old and small, and incapable of crushing 50 per cent. of the stone in the district. A new battery was to be erected there, and the gold returns from Mount Leonora would then be far in excess of the gold returns from Lawlers. Mr. Haynes had practically said he did not want the railway to go to Mount Leonora, and therefore he would oppose the survey. It was perfectly clear that surveys should be made before lines should be constructed, and if Mr. Haynes could induce the Government to have a survey made for the lines which he (Mr. Haynes) wanted, he (Mr. Matheson) would be prepared to vote for and support a proposal for having such a survey made. How Mr. Haynes could object to vote for the surveys proposed, which were necessary before hon. members could give an opinion as to the railway, was beyond his comprehension.

HON. H. G. PARSONS said he was in an extremely difficult position as he represented a constituency which included the railway stations on the line projected by the Government, but seeing that the Government did not intend to build the railway he would vote against the unwarrantable expenditure at the present time. It was no doubt unbusinesslike to vote for railways before surveys were made, and in the future he hoped that surveys would be made before lines were settled upon, and particularly

should that be the case in regard to such a line as the Esperance railway, which the Government the other day pledged themselves to half of without a survey. In the case of the Mount Leonora line, and the Coolgardie to Norseman line under consideration in this Bill, it was apparent to most people that these railways were not going to be built. The Government had not the money. It was simply a continuation of the policy of sop, which the House emphatically protested against at the beginning of the session. It was another example of the absolute monumental insincerity of the Government. There was every reason to believe that the grounds for making these surveys were purely political. These lines could not be built out of revenue; there was no prospect of raising a loan for them, and he declined to believe in the good faith of the Government, therefore, he would not vote for the proposed expenditure of £9,000 for the surveys. In doing so he would not delay the construction of the railway lines one day.

HON. F. T. CROWDER supported the motion on the ground that the House at an earlier period of the session decided that the Government should not borrow, direct or indirectly, to increase the indebtedness of the colony. The money the Government were now asking a vote for was to make surveys of two lines, therefore it was the thin end of the wedge. If the Government did not intend to build the railways why make the surveys? Everyone knew that the proper thing was to make a survey before a line was built, but as business men we should not spend money in the survey of a line when that line could not be built within the next three or four years. Look at the present indebtedness of the colony. The money expended was something like nine millions of pounds. There were over two millions to borrow, and there was £1,300,000 to replace Treasury bills, which brought the amount up to three millions and a half which the Government had to borrow, and in the face of the Coolgardie water scheme he did not know how that money was to be borrowed. Then there was to be another sum of one million pounds made up of the £395,000 appropriated last year, and the present reappropriation, making the amount to be raised four millions

and a quarter. It would be three or four years before this amount could be borrowed, therefore, where was the necessity for passing a vote for these surveys, when there was no chance within the next three or four years of the lines being constructed. Was the object to delude unfortunate people, the same as the Government deluded the people of Esperance? Did the Government wish people to believe that the railways would be built and thus increase the price of land and get people to invest? If the Committee passed this schedule it would be stultifying itself after the action which had been taken when the speech from His Excellency the Governor was before the House. The placing of items for two surveys in the Bill was a direct slap in the face to the members of the Council.

HON. D. K. CONGDON: It was desirable that the Government should be in possession of the nature of the country over which the line would go if at any time it was desired to construct these lines. We were not discussing the actual construction of the lines now, but we wanted to know what the country was like if at any time it was decided to construct the lines. He would oppose the motion.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: It seemed to him hon. members in opposing the motion were under the impression that contracts were let before surveys were made. There was no objection to any survey being made before the estimate, or the tenders came in, but that was no reason why we should authorise surveys now. The surveys would not be required for two years, and probably not required at all. It was an absolute waste of money, entirely apart from the fact that the surveys proposed to be made were in the wrong place, on the showing of the Premier himself. The Premier made a statement that it was necessary to take railways where gold was being produced. It seemed that the Premier thought no gold was being produced except on the Coolgardie fields. There was one mining centre in this colony which had not the benefit of a railway, and it produced gold in a far greater proportion to any other field; that was the Peak Hill field. The people there were not crying out for survey; they did not want one; they were content to remain 120 miles from the end of a railway line.

He failed to see why a small mining centre like Mount Leonora, which had not yet turned out gold enough to warrant the suggestion of a survey, let alone a line of railway, should be favoured. He was informed—he would not say how correct the information might be—that the battery at Mount Leonora was not going half its time. There was not sufficient stone there to keep it going.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: It was kept going all the time.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: A spurt had been put on since this suggestion of a survey had been made. He protested against the passing of the item, because we were not justified at the present time in pledging ourselves to an expenditure of £4,000 on an unnecessary work. If it were shown by hon. members who supported the schedule that there was any real necessity, or any outcry among the people, for a work of this kind, then he could understand the survey being proposed. It seemed that the Premier, when he found the suggestion for a railway was objected to in this House, and when he found the finances in such a condition that he could not attempt to force a railway through the House, brought forward this proposal for a survey. The question of particular routes did not enter into the discussion now, although it should not be lost sight of. If a survey was made from Menzies to Mount Leonora, when the time came a railway would follow. The people would be only too glad to get a railway to Fremantle, no matter how circuitous the route might be. It was a curious thing that, although there were only 90 miles between Menzies and Mount Leonora, the rest of the district outside Mount Leonora would not take advantage of the route. It was only an attempt on the part of the Government—possibly pressed forward by some members representing the North Coolgardie district and Perth and Fremantle—to secure the whole of the East Murchison trade. If the argument was admitted now that a survey should be made as far as Mount Leonora, the same argument might be used in favour of a line from Mount Leonora to Lake Way, and then from Lake Way to Peak Hill. It appeared, according to the estimate made by the department, that the expenditure up to the present on works

and railways on the whole of the Murchison field was £36 per head of the population, and for the Coolgardie field £34 per head. At the same time, the gold yield at the Murchison was 97oz. per head of population, as against 32oz. in the Coolgardie district.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What was the population of the Murchison?

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: 6,500 adults. The Eastern goldfields population was 50,000, which was 8 to 1, yet the Coolgardie goldfields only turned out one-third of the gold proportionately to that of the Murchison goldfields. If this railway was not justified, then the survey was not justified.

HON. W. T. LOTON: It was somewhat important that the Government, recognising the unsatisfactory state of the finances, particularly in regard to the construction of public works, were still persisting in endeavouring to pass through the Legislature further votes for the expenditure of public money with the view of pledging the people of the country, through the Legislature, to borrow further money. Unless this were the object, what was the good of surveying a railway line at this particular time? Why did not the Government recognise that it was useless to go into the market to borrow further money for the construction of further works, and that it would be useless for some time to come to do so? The Government would have enough to do within the next two years to raise the money already authorised. To his mind, it would have been more manly and respectful if the Government had withdrawn this temporary procedure as to railways, when they withdrew certain public works. The Government knew perfectly well that it was almost impossible for the Council to reject the Bill; but he (Mr. Loton) was not prepared to say that if it came to the test, and unless the items were withdrawn, he would be unwilling to reject the Bill. He regretted that prominent members who had spoken on the Address-in-Reply strongly on the question of borrowing money for these railways lines, were absenting themselves on this occasion, when they should have made a point of being present and voting. The Government could only have one object in placing these items in the Bill, and that

was a desire to push through the railways and get Parliament to pledge itself to these particular lines. That was the position. It was proposed to entrap this Council, and it was unfair, unjust, unreasonable, unsatisfactory, and unbusinesslike. This procedure would recoil against the Government when they went into the money market again, and it would be a good thing if it did recoil against them. We were not in a position to incur further liabilities now; we were far enough in arrear. We had a continual reappropriation from one loan, to carry out certain works, for which the whole of the money had not yet been obtained. We were pledging ourselves in this Bill to a further half-million loan, unless the works for which the money was being taken could be constructed for less than had been provided. The available funds for the Coolgardie water scheme were two millions. There was one million and a half still to be borrowed. Treasury bills would mature, and would have to be taken up; that would make three millions and a half to be raised. The whole of the public works had been completed, with the exception of the Coolgardie water scheme. With the present re-appropriation there would be a little over four millions to be raised in order to complete the works the country was pledged to. There were many circumstances that we ought not to debate now. It was an important matter for the Central Province whether the extension of the railway to Mount Magnet should not be commenced before any extension was made on the eastern goldfields. The tapping of the goldfields was not the only thing that we had to consider when making railways. We had to consider the population that were settling on the soil, and whether they were likely to remain in the vicinity of the railways. These were points which were hardly worth debating now, but they ought to be fully considered before the Government intended going further with railways. There was another point as to the Mount Leonora railway. The people had not got up any agitation for railway extension beyond Menzies, and no appeal had been made to the Government to go on with the line, yet, in the face of our wretched financial position, which we would be in for some considerable time

—he was glad to say it was not the fault of the colony, it was the fault of the frantic, determined, rash borrowing policy of the Government, which had been going on since the inception of Responsible Government, and would go on until the Government was financially knocked out—the Government proposed to make a survey for the line. If every member were to speak for a fortnight, it would not alter one vote. He did not care about labouring the question, unless there was some possibility of changing members' minds. It was regrettable that this House, composed of 24 members, should be represented on a question of this kind by only half that number. Members, who had apparently taken a deep interest in questions of this kind, were not present. Had those members been bought over by the Government on this question? Had their votes been silenced? Had they been asked to remain away? If that were so, they were not fit to represent any province, and he regretted certain hon. members were not present to hear him say so. If hon. members would not attend Parliament, when questions of this important character were under discussion, they were not fit to occupy seats in this House. He intended to support the motion of Mr. Haynes, that the item be struck out.

HON. E. McLARTY: This was a question of great importance on which every member should express his opinion before recording his vote. His mind had been made up, not since he entered the House that day, but for weeks past: and he would oppose the vote because he did not think the country could afford to go on with more railway construction at the present time. If this item were passed the Committee would be bound to pass the next item, and that, he was sure, hon. members did not desire to do. Seeing that the Government were unable to provide a small sum of £25,000 or £30,000 for the first section of a railway already surveyed, and which was admitted to be urgently required, there was no justification for this proposed expenditure of £9,000 on an additional survey. If that small sum of £25,000 or £30,000 had been forthcoming, it would have given great relief to several hundreds of men who were now starving in the colony. At

the present time there was great distress amongst the labouring classes, and it was a perfect tax on the settlers in the country districts to provide food for these starving men. The Government would be unwise to go on with the proposed surveys. So far as could be judged at the present time, there was no probability of railways being constructed for a considerable time to come. Indeed, he could not see where the money was to come from for the construction of lines, and hence there could be no immediate hurry for the surveys. There might be a difference of opinion as to where this proposed line should start from, and, although his own opinion was that the line should start from Menzies, he did not pretend to know much of the matter, and, at any rate, it would be looked into later on. One railway which had been surveyed was at a standstill for want of funds, and it would be unreasonable to spend another £9,000 on further surveys.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Anything he could say would not, he was aware, influence the votes of hon. members, who had evidently made up their minds on the question, to which, however, there were two sides. He regretted that Mr. Loton should have thought fit to cast reflections on some members of the House. No doubt, there were members absent who would have voted for the proposed survey, and other members who would have opposed it.

HON. W. T. LOTON: It was a general reflection on members who did not attend to their duties.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No pressure, so far as he knew, had been brought to bear on any hon. members on this question; indeed such a step would be unworthy of the Government. He had no knowledge of any influence having been brought to bear on any individual member in order to induce votes in any particular direction. He had made no overtures to hon. members, and did not intend to do so. It was not worth while at this stage to go into the merits of the question before the House, seeing that he had already expressed himself entirely in favour of these surveys and he had no reason to alter his opinion. The districts proposed to be served would

develop into gold-producing centres, and if means were forthcoming the railways would be constructed. It would be useful to have the information which the surveys would furnish, although the Government might not be able to construct the railway for the next two years. The Premier had been quite outspoken on the matter, and had stated it was his intention when opportunity offered to construct the lines. There was no deception at all about the matter. He would not say any more on the question, though he must divide the House upon it. The proposal for the construction of these lines had been withdrawn by the Government, but not, as suggested, in consequence of the adverse vote.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The Government ought to pay some respect to this House.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was quite true, but the House might reverse its decision again, as it had done before. The proposal for the construction of these lines had been withdrawn because of the difficulties in the matter of finance.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That was exactly what hon. members said.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The colony itself was never in a better position than at the present time, and he could not take the gloomy view suggested by some hon. members as to our prospects. There was no doubt a number of people out of employment but, taking the colony as a whole, and remembering its resources, it was never in a better position. It was a pity that some people did not realise better their duty as citizens. If they did there would be less gambling and drinking, on which evil habits money was squandered.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The Government set the example.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was to be regretted that these undesirable habits of the people had received additional assistance from recent legislation. He hoped and believed these railways would be built in the near future, and he trusted the circumstances of the colony would so change as to make its position in the money market firmer. Hon. members would welcome the opportunity of constructing these lines, which had for their object the development and

advancement of the country. No doubt every member was as patriotic as he was himself; and he did not suggest for a moment that any hon. member was not desirous of doing what he could to promote the material interests of the country. Whatever might be the result of the motion, he trusted hon. members would look at the matter from a broad standpoint, and would assist the Government in every way possible in promoting the development and advancement of the country.

Suggestion by motion—that the item be struck out—put, and division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	3
Noes	4

Majority for	4
Ayes.		Noes.	

Hon. H. Briggs	Hon. D. K. Congdon
Hon. F. T. Crowder	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. R. S. Haynes	Hon. G. Randell
Hon. A. B. Kidson	Hon. A. P. Matheson
Hon. W. T. Loton	(Teller)
Hon. H. G. Parsons	
Hon. F. Whitcombe	
Hon. E. McLarty	
(Teller)	

Suggestion thus passed.

Item, Survey of railway from Coolgardie to Norseman, £5,000:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved that a suggestion be forwarded to the Legislative Assembly, that the item be struck out. The arguments he had used in reference to the survey of the Menzies to Mount Leonora line applied also to this survey.

Suggestion by motion put, and division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	3
Noes	4

Majority for	4
Ayes.		Noes.	

Hon. H. Briggs	Hon. D. K. Congdon
Hon. F. T. Crowder	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. R. S. Haynes	Hon. G. Randell
Hon. A. B. Kidson	Hon. A. P. Matheson
Hon. W. T. Loton	(Teller)
Hon. H. G. Parsons	
Hon. F. Whitcombe	
Hon. E. McLarty	
(Teller)	

Suggestion thus passed.

Item, Fremantle harbour works including cable to Rottnest, £128,000:

HON. A. P. MATHESON moved that a suggestion be forwarded to the Legislative Assembly that the sub-item of £4,000 for Rottnest cable be struck out. He submitted this motion to give hon. members an opportunity of being logical. This was an entirely new work, which had not been commenced.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It had been clamoured for.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: There had not been any urgent demand, so far as he could gather, amongst the inhabitants of Rottnest for this cable.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The ships required the cable.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: The inhabitants of Rottenest had not demanded the cable. He had spoken to gentlemen connected with the management of the Fremantle harbour, and others, and from what he could gather this cable was not absolutely needed. It was an expenditure would might properly be left to a later date, when funds might be available. No doubt it would be a gratifying piece of work, but at the moment there was no urgent necessity for it. Hon. members had, in discussing other items, insisted on the necessity for economy, and on that ground he hoped they would support the motion.

Suggestion by motion put and negatived.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: There was an amount of £30,000 for the Bunbury breakwater. Would that complete the work, or would it only complete the first portion; or was this amount simply to fill up the gap which was made recently in the breakwater?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It would complete the work.

Schedule (as amended by suggestions) put and passed.

Second schedule—Item, Norseman tank, £15,000:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The information he had showed that the contract had not been advertised, but the work was necessary to supply the people of the district with water.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: What was the population of Norseman?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Speaking from memory, about 1200.

Schedule put and passed.

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved "that the Committee recommend that the Bill be returned to the Legislative Assembly, with a message conveying the suggestions agreed to, and that the Committee have leave to sit again on receipt of a message in reply from the Legislative Assembly."

Motion put and passed.

Bill reported with suggested amendments, and report adopted.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Goldfields Population and Expenditure, return as ordered.

Ordered to lie on the table.

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

At 7.30 p.m. the PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and report adopted.

JURY BILL.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY'S AMENDMENTS.

The Legislative Assembly's Amendments on the Council's Amendments, as previously made in the Bill, were now considered.

IN COMMITTEE.

Amendment No. 1—Clause 8, line 6, strike out the words "or colonial":

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the Council do not insist on this amendment.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The word "colonial" was struck out after very careful consideration, because, later on, full provision was made for all people concerned; and, unless the amendment were insisted on, this portion of the Bill would be absolutely at variance with other portions.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY asked leave to withdraw his motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved that the Council insist on its amendment.

Put and passed, and the amendment insisted on.

Amendment No. 3—Clause 21, strike out the last three lines:

HON. R. S. HAYNES: This was one of the cardinal features of the Bill, and he moved that the Council insist upon its amendment. At present each person who entered the dock was entitled to challenge up to the number of six, and, if the panel were exhausted, then the representative of the Crown could pray a *talis*, and the sheriff could go into the body of the court and empanel persons who happened to be there. In England, under the common law, each person had the right to challenge up to the number of eight, but, in the case of misdemeanour, there was no such right. But, as soon as the death sentence was removed from felonies, felonies and misdemeanours were punishable alike, and the right was extended. Challenge with reason was unlimited, but without reason a person here could challenge to the number of six. In a case of murder, there was right to 20 challenges, but it was sought in this Bill to limit the number to six. The law at present was that each prisoner had the right to exhaust his challenge; but it was sought to be shown by the Assembly that there was a danger of the whole panel being exhausted. After 13 years' experience in this colony and five years' experience before, he had never known a panel exhausted, except it might be in consequence of juries having retired to consider their verdict. It was a fundamental principle of our constitutional law that each prisoner should have a right to challenge. It might be that the challenge was not always used, but it was a right that might be very necessary in times of excitement. The Crown could keep on challenging as long as they liked and exhaust a panel, but the prisoners could amongst them only challenge six. Why should a person alone have a right to challenge six jurymen, and if tried with, say, two others, only have a right to challenge two? The amendment on which he asked the House to insist was according to the law of England, and also of New South Wales. There was no reason for the alteration of this principle

of common law which had been handed down from time immemorial.

Put and passed, and the amendment insisted on.

Amendment No. 5—not insisted on.

Resolutions reported, and report adopted.

Message accordingly transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

HEALTH BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell) in moving the second reading, said: I mentioned the other night that I understood I was not expected to make a long speech on this Bill, but simply to move the second reading, in order to put the Bill on a stage. I propose to take the second reading now, with a suggestion that the other stages of the Bill be dealt with on a date to be fixed. It is preeminently a Bill to be discussed in Committee clause by clause. It is a long Bill consisting of 243 clauses, and it deals with a very important subject, or subjects. The Bill, which will, therefore, require careful consideration at the hands of hon. members, creates a Central Board of Health. We have a Central Board of Health under the Act of 1886, with the passing of which Act I was considerably concerned. I was on the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the measure and make certain recommendations. That Act, as I have said, created a Central Board, but I always maintained that the Board created was without authority and without power; and I think I am not wrong in saying the board has not worked satisfactorily since its inception. I pointed out at the time, that a Central Board was necessary with ample powers. A board should be constituted in such a way as to exercise authority over local boards, and deal with matters generally. This Bill creates a Central Board, to which the Government appoint three persons. Unlike the members of the present board, the members of the board under the Bill are to be paid, and a doctor is to be the president, with a civil engineer and a builder as colleagues. I think it is a wise provision that a doctor should be the president of the board, and being a doctor he will be a

useful member of it. The president of the board will have to do a lot of work, and he should be a man fitted for the position, with a knowledge of sanitary matters and other matters affecting the health and food of the people, also their drinks. For that reason I am glad to see that the Bill creates such a board. This board is to the Bill what the main spring is to the watch. The Governor may remove or reappoint the members of the board. I think that is a useful provision. Clause 7 defines the powers of the central board. The board may recommend officers to be appointed, and those officers are to be paid, according to clause 7, by moneys voted by Parliament for the purpose. Further on members will find a provision which to a certain extent seems to be in opposition to this clause, but it is not in opposition to it. It provides that officers appointed by the local boards are to be paid out of the rates which the local boards make. According to clauses 8 and 9 the Governor or the Minister or the central board may make inquiries wherever necessary, and the board is invested with full powers to that end. There can be no doubt as to these powers. Mr. R. S. Haynes has read the Bill through, and knows the powers which are conferred on the officers of administrative boards generally. Clause 10 deals with the powers of the board to act in emergencies or where no local board exists. The central board is to be the final judge in cases of emergency, and it is invested with power to compel the local boards to do their duty. I am pleased to see that such a power is given. The local boards of health are to be of three kinds: the municipal councils, where such exist, are to be local boards of health, and these local boards are given power outside municipalities over adjoining country where it is necessary, and the Governor may extend the area outside municipalities or retract any area. The Governor may, however, create local boards outside and not adjoining municipal districts. That is provided for in clause 15. Sub-clauses 2, 3, and 4 provide the mode for conducting such districts. According to clause 18, officers of health are appointed, and these officers must be medical men. Where two districts are adjoining, one

health officer can be appointed for the two districts adjoining. The Governor may also remove these officers or reappoint them. Clause 21 refers to the instructions and powers of inspectors. The officers of health have power over inspectors, and this clause forbids all servants of the central board or boards of health from receiving fees or having any interest in contracts. Part 4 of the Bill deals with the adulteration of foods, and directs and provides penalties. Clause 45 deals with the adulteration of spirits, and clauses 46 to 48 deal with the sale of compounded articles of food and compounded drugs. That is where there is more than one ingredient in an article of food. There are exceptions in certain cases. Clauses 49 to 51 deal with the sale of milk. The provisions are very minute and drastic. Clause 52 deals with the sale of butter, and clause 53 with diseased animals and unwholesome food or drugs. Clause 54 provides a penalty on the importation of diseased animals or unwholesome food. Clauses 56 and 57 give power to appoint analysts, and the analysts must furnish to the local boards or the central board quarterly reports. Clauses 68 to 74 contain directions for the various proceedings to be taken against offenders, and the penalties which attach, and the remedies in certain cases. Part 5 deals with common lodging houses. These have to be registered, and the persons who keep them have to produce a certificate of character. Local boards have to keep a register of the lodging houses, make by-laws, and impose penalties. Lodging house keepers must report deaths and cases of fever and infectious disease in their houses, and forward returns of lodgers when required. Part 6 of the Bill deals with dwelling houses. These may be declared by the board unfit for occupation, and the local boards may prevent overcrowding, even in a private house. Cellars are prohibited as dwelling places, and the definition in the Bill is, "any cellar in which any person passes the night shall be deemed to be occupied as a dwelling." That is a clause which may require some consideration. This part of the Bill also prevents, as the present Act does—and I may here state that this Bill is largely taken from the present Act and Victorian legislation—stables

and such like places being converted into dwelling houses without the authority of the central body. That is a very useful provision after what we saw in this city a year or two ago. I believe an attempt was made even before that time to turn a stable into a dwelling house. Part 7 deals with infant life protection. Registers are to be kept by the local boards, and a register is to be kept by the person registered, and notice of the death of an infant has to be given by the occupier of the house. Severe penalties are attached to this provision. There are some exceptions in clause 106. Part 8 deals with infectious diseases. Clauses 107 to 111 are provided for the prevention of infection and the enforcement of regulations. These provisions affect private dwelling houses, schools, churches, places of assembly or entertainment, hospitals, and other places. This part of the Bill also gives the definition of the different diseases. Clause 112 deals with the treatment and custody of lepers. In this connection I may observe that the Bill does not provide for the arrest of a man on suspicion of being a leper, nor for his being submitted to examination. I do not know if this House will think it worth while, in view of what has been said recently, that some such power as that should be placed in the Health Bill. When a man is certified to by two or three doctors—I think it is three—to be a leper, he is to be isolated and kept in custody. There are certain powers, if he escapes, to return him and treat him, so that no infection can possibly arise from the disease he is suffering from. According to clause 113, certain persons have to report the outbreak of infectious disease in certain districts, and amongst the persons named are doctors. Separate nightsoil services must be maintained in the case of typhoid fever and other diseases. That is the practice at the present time, and I think it has been very well carried out in Perth.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: In typhoid fever cases only?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; this clause applies to other infectious disease I think. Clauses 115 to 128 are wholesome provisions for the prevention and spreading of contagion. Clauses 129 and 130 relate to the letting of houses

in which infected persons have been lodging. Clauses 131 to 134 deal with hospitals generally. They give power to the local authorities to provide places for the reception of sick persons, and the clauses give useful power to the chairman of the central board, which, as I have said before, is the main-spring of the Bill. Clauses 135 to 137 enable local boards to regulate and control private hospitals. This is a useful provision. Clauses 138 and 139 deal with nuisances and offensive trades, impose penalties and provide methods of procedure, and also deal with filthy premises. Clauses 152 to 187 are wholesome sanitary provisions. There are 6 divisions dealing with public buildings, streets, yards, sewers and drains, offensive matters, etc. Power is given to make sanitary arrangements for abattoirs, slaughter-houses, the pollution of water, and private and public morgues. Part 11 deals with the infringement of the provisions of the Bill, and proceedings on complaint being made to the Central Board of the default of the local board. Clauses 196 and 197 provide for the inquiry by local boards into complaints. An owner or occupier may be ordered to do certain work, and in the event of his not doing so, the board can carry out the work themselves, and the cost will be charged on the land or the property as the case may be. The local boards also have to provide for the abatement of nuisances in certain cases. Clauses 204 to 211 deal with property, rents, etc. Crown lands may, in certain cases, be put into a sanitary condition by the local board. Part 12 is devoted almost entirely to the legal proceedings to be taken by the authorities. Clauses 218 to 242 deal with how the proceedings are to be conducted, and provide penalties and appeals, also deal with application of penalties. These are the main features of the Bill, and I think it deals with a large number of subjects which are most important to the public weal. The measure should receive the careful consideration of hon. members. I should like to go so far as to say—not that members should agree to everything—but that every clause should have consideration except those which are of a formal nature, and those intended to carry out the provisions of the

Bill. We shall have to watch that the powers of the boards are not made unduly stringent, but that the object which is intended to be secured—a high state of public health—is brought about. One hon. member mentioned that municipal councils as boards of health did not carry out their duties. There is power for the Government, Minister, or central board to carry out the provisions of the measure, so that there will be no excuse whatever for local boards to neglect their duties. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I have very little to say on this Bill, but I wish to congratulate the Government on having undertaken a work which was much needed. I do not know any Act which required simplifying more than the Health Act. It was introduced at a time when it was much wanted, and its initiation was the signal for an outcry on the part of a great number of persons in Perth and Fremantle. Unfortunately the Act only dealt with Perth and Fremantle, and the Central Board fell into conflict with the board at Fremantle. By-laws were made, and I say if those by-laws had been carried out the health of the city would not have been so bad as it was. The by-laws were very stringent, and people outside Perth did not like to submit to laws which they said at that time were made by foreigners. They were made by members of the Perth City Council. The colony has grown since that time and the present law is not sufficient to deal with the city as it now stands. I am sure the House will give the closest attention to the Bill because if we are going to make Perth a healthy city, and the home of a healthy people, we must have a board properly constituted, and we must have an Act thoroughly and effectively carried out. We must have a Bill in the first place effectually drawn so as to give proper powers to the Central Board, and to the local boards. I hope hon. members will take an interest in this Bill, and read it carefully through so that when we come to the committee stage we may be able to discuss clauses which may require amendment. I say this because I do not think there is any city in Australia which so much requires a Public Health Act as Perth; therefore

I think hon. members who desire to see Perth a healthy city should do what they can to make this Bill a good one. I shall do what I can to make the measure effective, and I hope every hon. member will do the same.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 8.15 p.m. until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 22nd September, 1898.

Personal Explanation—Motion: Select Committee, Additional Power—Papers presented—Question: Inspection of Patent Slip—Land Bill, Select Committee: Report presented—Agricultural Lands Purchase Act Amendment Bill, first reading—Mining on Private Property Act Amendment Bill, first reading—Goldfields Act Amendment Bill, first reading—Motion: Leave of Absence—Motion: Coolgardie Goldfields Water Scheme, Acceptance of Tenders; Amendment, passed on Division; Further Amendment, negatived on Division—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. GEORGE (Murray): I move the adjournment of the House, for the purpose of making a personal explanation. I suppose there is no member who regrets more than myself what took place yesterday evening, with regard to the difference of opinion between the Director of Public Works and myself. To men of my stamp,