

were only twenty-seven members who voted in favour of the principle of payment, but in 1893 there was an absolute majority of members in the House of Commons who favoured the system. In a House consisting of 505 members a majority was found voting for the principle. The Premier can want no greater precedent than that. It has been stated that I am advocating class legislation. When I advocate legislation in the interest of the majority, the idea of class legislation is exploded. When hon. members refuse to vote for payment of members, they vote in favour of the wealthy classes.

HON. H. W. VENN (Wellington): I do not wish to give a silent vote on this occasion. When a motion in reference to payment of members was submitted on a former occasion, I said, as I say now, that I believe in the principle: it is a difficult matter to argue against the principle of payment of members. On the previous occasion, when this subject was discussed, I did not support the motion; but, as the hon. member now submitting the motion only asks the House to affirm the principle, I take it that the mere affirmation of the principle will not lead the Government to be in any hurry, therefore I shall vote for the motion. Unless there is a decided expression of opinion given that the Government should immediately take action, I assume that the Government can suit their own convenience in considering the question. At the next general election this question might be very well placed before the country. As the hon. member who moves the motion does not desire the Government to take immediate action, I shall be very glad to support the principle. I do not see how it is possible to advance any argument against the principle. A man should be paid for services rendered to the State, and that being so, I shall support the motion now before the House affirming the principle of payment of members.

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

Ayes ...	20
Noes ...	11
Majority for ...	9

AYES.  
Mr. Conolly  
Mr. Doherty  
Mr. Ewing  
Mr. Gregory  
Mr. Hall  
Mr. Higham  
Mr. Holmes  
Mr. Illingworth  
Mr. Kenny  
Mr. Kingsmill  
Mr. Leake  
Mr. Moran  
Mr. Oldham  
Mr. Rason  
Mr. Simpson  
Mr. Venn  
Mr. Vosper  
Mr. Wallace  
Mr. Wilson  
Mr. James (Teller).

NOES.  
Sir John Forrest  
Mr. A. Forrest  
Mr. Harper  
Mr. Hooley  
Mr. Hubble  
Mr. Lefroy  
Mr. Monger  
Mr. Pennefather  
Mr. Phillips  
Mr. Piesse  
Mr. Burt (Teller).

Motion, as amended, thus passed.

#### REGISTRATION OF FIRMS BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council, and, on the motion of Mr. JAMES, read a first time.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10:50 p.m., until the next day.

### Legislative Council,

Thursday, 25th November, 1897.

Papers presented—Questions: (1) Petitions of Right; (2) Police Protection in South Perth—Question: Legislation re Timber Leases—Question: Compensation re Hainault Leases—Question: Mr. G. D. Simpson and Peak Hill Mining Properties—Question: Site of W.A. Smelting Company's Works—Question: Fremantle Water Supply—Question: Subiaco Roads Board District—Steam Boilers Bill: select committee's report—Underground Surveyors Bill: further consideration in committee; division on amendment to Clause 5—Employment Brokers Bill: first reading—Sale of Liquors Amendment Bill: first reading—Industrial Statistics Bill: first reading—Immigration Restriction Bill: first reading—Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill: in committee; division on amendment to Clause 4—Local Courts Evidence Bill: in committee—Loans Reappropriation Bill: in committee—Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill: second reading—Motion: Leave of Absence—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

## PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER OF MINES—(1.) Returns of Land Selection, Department of Lands and Survey for the nine months ended 30th September, 1897. (2.) Comparative Returns of Imports and Exports into and from Western Australia during the years 1892 to 1896.

Ordered to lie on the table.

## QUESTIONS—(1) PETITIONS OF RIGHT; (2) POLICE PROTECTION IN SOUTH PERTH.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I beg to ask the Minister of Mines, without notice, when he intends to bring down the correspondence relative to the Petitions of Right for which I asked some time ago; and also the information concerning the police protection in South Perth, for which I also asked.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): The hon. member was out of the House when I answered his question with regard to police protection in South Perth, and promised that, if any further information were required, I would be glad to give it. I also stated, in answer to the other question, that some point had arisen with reference to petitions of right which would rather prejudice the interests of the Government. If this has been settled since, I will be very glad to carry out my promise and supply the information desired. I will look into the matter.

## QUESTION—LEGISLATION RE TIMBER LEASES.

HON. J. H. TAYLOR, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister of Mines if it was the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill during the present session of Parliament to amend the timber regulations now in force; and, if so, would such Bill be brought forward in sufficient time to ensure its passage through both Houses before the prorogation?

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) replied:—Yes. The Government hope to introduce the Bill next week.

## QUESTION—COMPENSATION RE HAINAULT LEASES.

HON. R. S. HAYNES, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister of Mines

—1. What arrangement, if any, was made by the hon. the Premier, and with whom, as to payment of compensation to the owners of the Hainault leases? 2. What was the consideration for such agreement, if any? 3. What amounts, if any, have been paid away thereunder? 4. By what authority have such payments been made, and out of what vote has the money been taken?

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) replied:—1. The Government promised to pay the plaintiffs £500, to reimburse them for any expense and trouble they had incurred. 2. No consideration. 3. The sum of £500 has been paid, and the costs, as far as they have been taxed, have also been paid. 4. There is no vote of Parliament, and the money has been paid on the authority of his Excellency the Governor-in-Council.

## QUESTION—MR. G. D. SIMPSON AND PEAK HILL MINING PROPERTIES.

HON. R. S. HAYNES, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister of Mines: 1. Is the Hon. the Minister of Mines aware that Mr. Reed, Departmental Engineer of the Department of Mines, in a letter upon official paper dated from the Department on the 27th May, 1897, addressed to Mr. Darlington Simpson, stated as follows:—"Having received instructions from the hon. the Minister of Mines to revisit and report on the Peak Hill Goldfield for you, I have the honour to submit a copy of my official report to the Department of Mines, with further information collected during my visit?" 2. Is the hon. the Minister of Mines aware that Mr. Reed, in his official capacity, in that letter advised upon the manner in which the property known as the Peak Hill Patch should be worked, and expressed the opinion that "the success of the mines referred to is quite assured?" 3. Is it a fact that the hon. the Minister of Mines gave Mr. Reed instructions to revisit the goldfield and report for Mr. Simpson, as set forth? 4. If not, did the hon. the Minister give Mr. Reed any, and if so what, instructions in that respect? 5. If any instructions were so given, for what reason were they given? 6. Were the reports given to Mr. Simpson for the purpose of assisting him in floating a company in Eng-

land or elsewhere to acquire and work the mines? If not, for what other purpose?

7. Has the Minister of Mines seen the prospectus of the Peak Hill Goldfield, Limited, and the annexures thereto? 8. Is the Minister aware that a *fac simile* of Mr. Reed's letter of 27th May, 1897, bearing the royal arms, and a *fac simile* of a *Government Gazette* is annexed thereto?

9. Is the Minister aware that the prospectus is headed as follows:—"A new goldfield of phenomenal richness, proved by Government reports, statistics, and returns to be one of the richest gold-fields yet discovered?" 10. Is the Minister aware that, in support of such statement, it is stated in the prospectus, amongst other things, that "The Directors take it as collateral evidence of the soundness of the business that two gentlemen—one the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the other the brother of the Premier of Western Australia—have, after investigating the business with the Chief Engineer of the Government, identified themselves with the company?"

11. Who is the Chief Engineer referred to? Has the gentleman investigated the matter with the other gentlemen mentioned? 12. If it be the fact that the matter has been so investigated, was it with the sanction of the hon. the Minister of Mines? 13. Mr. Simpson having stated in a report annexed to the prospectus that he waited on the hon. the Minister of Mines and obtained his consent to Mr. Reed revisiting the mines for the purpose of reporting thereon, as before mentioned, and the practical working thereof, will the hon. gentleman state whether such consent was given, and for what purpose was the report to be used? 14. Is the Minister aware that, relying on the truth and accuracy of the statements and reports, the company has been floated on the London market for £250,000? 15. If, on perusal of the prospectus, the hon. the Minister is of opinion that, from the frequent reference to official reports and Government documents, and the Government officials' connection with the mine, the British public were, or might be, induced to believe that the stability, richness, or permanence of the mines in question had in any way been vouched for by the Government, will the hon. the Minister take any, and if so what, steps to remove such an

erroneous impression? 16. If the allegations and statements in the prospectus or any of the documents annexed thereto are untrue, open to qualification, or published without authority, what steps, if any, does the Minister intend to take in the matter? 17. How long has Mr. Reed been in the Government service, and what appointments has he held, and by whom was he appointed? 18. Is Mr. Reed still in the Government service, either actively or on leave of absence? If not, on what date did he resign, and who has been appointed in his place? 19. Is Mr. Reed in any manner connected with the company in question as manager, engineer, or otherwise; and, if so, for what length of time?

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) replied:—1. Yes. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4, 5. Because it was represented that English capitalists would not accept the report of any gold-mining authority, unless he were a Government official, and as the small leaseholders at Peak Hill were asking for money to be spent in procuring water and erecting a crushing battery, etc., the Government thought it would be more in the interests of the colony to assist the introduction of capital, and so have the mines developed, and machinery erected by private enterprise, in such a remote locality. The Government allowed Mr. Reed to go for twelve days to report, for which the Government received £75; but they take no responsibility for his report, which was to Mr. Simpson, and not the Government. 6. No reports were given to Mr. Simpson by the Government, as far as I know. 7. Yes. 8. Yes. 9. Yes. 10. Yes. 11. I presume the Departmental Engineer, as that term is used on the first page of Mr. Reed's report; I am unable to say. 12. No. 13. Answered by No. 5. 14. I understand the company has been floated, but cannot say on what grounds, beyond those given in the prospectus. 15. If I considered any erroneous impression had been created, I should certainly take steps to contradict, but I am of opinion the merits of this field have been rather understated than overstated. 16. At present I don't see the necessity for any. 17. Mr. Reed entered the Government service on 30th December, 1891, as draftsman. He has since held the positions of Assistant

Engineer, Engineering Surveyor, Inspector of Mines, and is at present the Departmental Engineer and Statist, as also Inspector of Mines for the Collie Coal Field. 18. Mr. Reed is on four months' leave of absence, without pay. 19. I understand he is at present employed by the company, in some capacity, but cannot say what, precisely.

**QUESTION—SITE OF W.A. SMELTING COMPANY'S WORKS.**

HON. A. P. MATHESON, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister of Mines:—1. Whether the site to be acquired from the Government by the Western Australian Smelting Company is above or below the two bridges over the Swan River at Fremantle? 2. Is it possible for large vessels to deliver cargoes on any frontage above the two Fremantle bridges before those bridges have been removed? 3. Have any arrangements been made to remove these bridges to enable large vessels to discharge in Rocky Bay?

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. WITTENOOM) replied:—1. The site acquired is above the bridges. 2. Large vessels cannot pass under the bridges, but large barges, without masts, can do so. 3. No.

**QUESTION—FREMANTLE WATER SUPPLY.**

HON. A. B. KIDSON, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister of Mines, Whether the Government have any reason to believe that the water supply of Fremantle is not absolutely permanent and sufficient.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. WITTENOOM) replied:—The Government have no reason to believe that the present water supply for Fremantle is not absolutely permanent and sufficient.

**QUESTION—SUBIACO ROADS BOARD DISTRICT.**

HON. R. S. HAYNES, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister of Mines:—1. Was the whole of the land comprised in the limits of the Subiaco Roads Board district by proclamation defined to be within the municipal district of Subiaco? 2. Before such proclamation

was any provision made for payment of claims against the Roads Board? 3. Was any, and if so what, sum voted for the formation of Rokeby Road, in the said district? 4. To whom has the same been paid, whether to the Roads Board or the Municipal Council? 5. How has the money been expended?

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. WITTENOOM) replied:—1, 2, 3. The sums voted for the formation of Rokeby Road amounted to £1,860. 4. £910 was paid over to the late Roads Board, and £950 to the municipality. 5. The Town Clerk states that the money has been expended in clearing and macadamising the road.

**STEAM BOILERS BILL.**

**SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.**

Report brought up by Hon. G. RANDALL, and ordered to be printed without the evidence.

**UNDERGROUND SURVEYORS BILL.**

**IN COMMITTEE.**

Consideration in committee resumed.

Clause 5.—Duties and powers of Board:

HON. G. RANDALL moved as an amendment that the following paragraph be added to sub-clause 4:—

(d) Provided that all licensed surveyors who shall have actually carried on or practised the business or profession of an underground mining surveyor in the Colony of Western Australia for the term of 12 months immediately prior to the coming into operation of this Act, and who passes an examination in the subject of mining surveying as follows:—Connection and reduction of bearings to datum of surface survey; survey of vertical and inclined shafts, drives and workings; survey of mineral veins, lodes, seams and leads; the practice of underground levelling and plotting sections.

There was a general feeling in the committee on the previous day in favour of some such amendment as this. The object sought by the Hon. R. S. Haynes would be attained by this amendment. The Minister of Mines had signified his assent to some such amendment.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The amendment, as it stood, was meaningless. Some such words as "shall be entitled to a certificate under this Act, and registered accordingly," should be added at the end of the amendment.

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved that the amendment be amended by striking out the words "provided that."

Put and passed.

HON. A. H. HENNING moved, as a further amendment, that in line 3 the words "for the term of 12 months immediately" be struck out.

THE MINISTER OF MINES had no objection to the amendment. All he wished was to provide that underground surveyors should pass an examination.

Put and passed.

HON. A. H. HENNING moved, as a further amendment, That in line 4 the words "and who passes an examination in the subject of mining surveying as follows" be struck out. This would entitle those licensed surveyors who, prior to the coming into operation of the Bill, were actively carrying on or practising the business or profession of surveying, to register, provided the other conditions of the Bill were complied with. This Bill should be read to a certain extent with the Mining Regulations Act of 1895, which provided that a mine owner was subject to a penalty if he did not provide the mining inspector and Mines Department with an accurate and full detailed plan of the underground workings. If that and the necessary plan for the blocking of it was done by any individual whom the owner thought desirable to employ, or by any individual authorised by the Minister of Mines, he (Mr. Henning) saw at once that there would be a deadlock to a certain extent. The former were consulting engineers to a certain extent. The companies had their regular staff, and employed officers who devoted their whole time and attention to this particular work, or any other work which they were ordered to do. These men could not be taken to be included within the purview of this Bill, because they neither pretended that they were surveyors, nor did they make use of the name, and they did not practise underground mining surveying in the way intended to be covered by this Bill. In order to meet the difficulty, he suggested that any one employed at the present time in underground surveying, or who was carrying on underground surveying on his own account, should be entitled to be licensed under this Bill. If the Government were to step in and say to

those men already in practice as underground surveyors, "You must, before you can be allowed to carry on in the future, pass an examination," the next thing we would hear would be that no one would be allowed to select any Crown lands until he had first passed an examination to show that he was a competent farmer. This might be applied to all other businesses. The underground surveyors at present practising came here when there was no necessity for registration, and had fulfilled their duties without any adverse comment on their work. Why then should they be prevented from carrying on their business?

THE MINISTER OF MINES said it was idle to talk any longer on this subject. With regard to the references that had been made to the Mines Regulation Act, hon. members had in their hands an amending Bill, the second reading of which he would shortly move, dealing with some of the points to which reference had been made, and which the Bill now being discussed would also in some way affect. He hoped the committee would assist the Government in trying to render the department as effective as possible. As to the men already practising here, no harm could accrue to them, since they would only be asked to pass a small examination.

HON. R. S. HAYNES supported the amendment. The persons who would be affected by the Bill were living on the goldfields.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: The Government would also be affected by it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The Government would not be in any way affected by it. The hon. members who asked the committee to pass this amendment were Messrs. Henning and Matheson, who represented the Coolgardie goldfields, and himself, who represented Central Murchison. They represented the people who were to be affected by the Bill. The hon. Minister told them that the surveyors would only be asked to pass an easy examination, but it appeared to him to be a very difficult examination. If it was such an easy examination as the hon. Minister represented, it was only a farce asking these men to pass it. The reason why he took up his present position was that justice might be done to his constituents. He asked the agricultural

members to accord him the same support which he would be willing to give them if an agricultural question were in dispute.

HON. J. H. TAYLOR quite agreed with the Minister of Mines. Although he had not the honour to represent a gold-mining constituency, his constituency having been cut in half, yet he had lived on the goldfields more than any other member of the House, and he was quite convinced that the body of men who would profit most by the Bill were those who were now practising as underground mining surveyors. All those who were competent in that profession would have no difficulty whatever in passing the examination in underground mining surveying to which it was proposed to subject them, and when they had that certificate they would form a guild, a charter, which would be more difficult to enter by people coming in at the end of twelve months.

HON. G. RANDELL: The Minister had given a reasonable concession, and he (Mr. Randell) would oppose the amendment proposed by Mr. Henning.

HON. A. P. MATHESON would give his heartiest support to Mr. Henning's amendment. No one could have better expressed his objections to the course proposed by the Minister than the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) had done; for he had said the result would be that a close guild would be created which any person coming here afterwards would find very difficult to enter.

HON. J. H. TAYLOR: The words used were "a guild," not a "close guild."

HON. A. P. MATHESON: The Minister of Mines had referred to the Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill, which provided that the whole of those surveys which had been hitherto made by private individuals must in future be made by licensed surveyors.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: For certain purposes.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: The result would be that the cost of underground surveying would be as heavy as the cost of ordinary land surveying now was, owing to the difficulty of obtaining licenses. He had been informed that the reason why ordinary survey fees were so expensive was the extreme difficulty of any ordinary land surveyor in this colony

passing the necessary examinations. He intended most heartily to support the amendment moved by the Hon. A. H. Henning.

HON. D. K. CONGDON would vote against the amendment, believing this Bill had been introduced in consequence of the Mines Department finding that the work of the surveyors on the goldfields was being carried out in an inefficient way. If those unlicensed surveyors were compelled to undergo an examination, as proposed by the Minister of Mines, that difficulty would be got over.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: There should be men on whose competency full reliance could be placed, and he would therefore support the Minister of Mines.

Further amendment (by Mr. Henning) put, and division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	...	9
Noes	...	...	...	6

Majority against	...	...	3
------------------	-----	-----	---

AYES.	NOES.
The Hon. D. K. Congdon	The Hon. H. Briggs
The Hon. C. E. Dempster	The Hon. F. T. Crowder
The Hon. J. W. Hackett	The Hon. R. S. Haynes
The Hon. D. McKay	The Hon. A. B. Kidson
The Hon. E. McLarty	The Hon. A. P. Matheson
The Hon. J. E. Richardson	The Hon. A. H. Henning
The Hon. J. H. Taylor	(Teller).
The Hon. E. H. Wittenoom	
The Hon. G. Randell	
(Teller).	

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

Bill reported, with amendments.

#### SALE OF LIQUORS AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on the motion of the MINISTER OF MINES, read a first time.

#### INDUSTRIAL STATISTICS BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on the motion of the MINISTER OF MINES, read a first time.

#### IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on the motion of the MINISTER OF MINES, read a first time.

#### BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation:

HON. A. B. KIDSON moved that the following new sub-clause be added:—  
 "‘Court’ means the Bankruptcy Court established by the principal Act."

Put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

#### Clause 4—Meeting of creditors:

HON. A. B. KIDSON moved, as an amendment, in line 3, that the word "three" be struck out and "seven" inserted in lieu thereof; also that in line 4 the word "ten" be struck out and "fourteen" inserted in lieu thereof.

Put and passed.

HON. A. H. HENNING moved, as a further amendment, that in line 5 all the words after "time" be struck out and the following words inserted in lieu thereof: "and place convenient to a majority in value of the creditors." According to the clause, no matter whether the debtor resided away in the far North, or whether close handy, he would have to come to Perth to call his meeting if a majority of the creditors lived in Perth. The creditors could be represented at a meeting by proxy, but the debtor was bound to attend the meeting. In clause 6, paragraph 7, there was a provision that the chairman of the meeting—who, of course, was chosen by the creditors, and no doubt the majority would choose their own man—had to decide whether or not the time and place were convenient to a majority of the creditors. These two clauses could not stand as they were printed in the Bill. Either the amendment he (Mr. Henning) proposed must be passed, or paragraph 7 of clause 6 must be altered. The Hon. A. B. Kidson had stated that the South Australian Act, of which this Bill was practically a copy, was perfect. The words he (Mr. Henning) proposed to insert were in the South Australian Act, and it had been found to work well in South Australia.

HON. A. B. KIDSON would accept the amendment, provided the mover pointed out how a certain fraud, which might be perpetrated, could be guarded against. Firstly, a meeting of creditors had to be held; and it had to be convened by the debtor at a time convenient to, and at a place where, a majority of the creditors conducted their business. At the meeting, resolutions might be passed, and the chairman had the right to decide whether

the meeting was being held at a time and a place which were convenient to a majority of the creditors. What was there to prevent a debtor calling a hole-and-corner meeting at a place which was not convenient to a majority of the creditors, and at that meeting a chairman being appointed—who, of course, would be in the swim—and deciding that the meeting was held at a place convenient, whereas it was not convenient to a majority of the creditors.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	6
Noes	...	...	...	6
<hr/>				
A tie	...	...	...	0

AYES.		NOES.	
The Hon. D. K. Congdon		The Hon. H. Briggs	
The Hon. R. S. Haynes		The Hon. C. E. Dempster	
The Hon. A. B. Kidson		The Hon. A. H. Henning	
The Hon. D. McKay		The Hon. A. P. Matheson	
The Hon. G. Raudell		The Hon. E. McLarty	
The Hon. J. E. Richardson		The Hon. J. W. Hackett	
(Teller).		(Teller).	

The CHAIRMAN gave his casting vote against the amendment.

Amendment thus negatived.

HON. A. B. KIDSON moved, as a further amendment, that all the words after "creditors," in the last line, be struck out and the following words inserted in lieu thereof: "have their principal places of business."

Put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

#### LOCAL COURTS EVIDENCE BILL.

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

#### LOANS REAPPROPRIATION BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): In introducing the second reading of this Bill, I feel sure that hon. members will not desire me to make a very exhaustive speech, because most of you have probably already perused the remarks made by the Premier and Treasurer, who is in possession of all the details in connection with it. This Bill is for the reappropriation of certain moneys, and in

a schedule to the Bill hon. members will find the amounts voted for the different works from which it is proposed to abstract certain sums. In the first schedule these amounts are set forth, and the purposes for which they were originally voted under the Loan Act are there stated, and opposite to them is set the amount that is proposed to be reappropriated. In the second schedule will be found the purposes for which the reappropriations are to be made. I do not propose to say very much on the question. It is a matter in connection with finance. It has had the careful consideration of hon. members in the Assembly, and it has been passed after a very long discussion. The works enumerated in the second schedule have been to a certain extent under-estimated, and it is necessary, in order to carry them out to a finish, that some further funds should be available. For some of the works no provision has been made hitherto. It has been found that they are urgently required, and that they must be carried out in the interests of the colony. Some, indeed, have already been started. There are three ways of obtaining money for carrying out these works. In the first place a new loan might be raised for the £395,000 required, or the money might be provided for out of revenue; or a third way is by reappropriation from funds already in hand. I think all will agree that it would not be wise, at the present moment, that a new loan should be placed on the market—in fact, if we were to attempt to do so I do not think it would be successful. On the other hand, it is impossible to get this sum from revenue, because every penny has been allocated for various pressing and urgent requirements of the colony; and therefore the Government consider that for the purpose of carrying out these necessary works they should avail themselves of certain moneys that have been voted, and will not be wanted at the present time. I feel sure that hon. members will place no obstacle in the way of the Government endeavouring to carry on the development of the country to the best advantage, and it is for this reason that this Bill is being brought before you. I do not think that I need say any more. The Bill speaks for itself, and with these remarks I

now move that it be read a second time.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I regret to say that this Bill will not have my support. I feel it is my duty, even though I stand alone in this House, to oppose this Bill to the very utmost. I do not think a Bill upon a more vicious principle has ever been presented to this House. It affects, specially, the interests of Perth and Fremantle, the object being to take away money which has been voted for a Fremantle dock and slip, and money which has been voted for the sewerage of Perth and Fremantle, as also for rolling stock. What are the Government going to do with it? To fritter it away on the Collie coalfields, to throw it away on the Donnybrook towards Bridgetown railway, and to waste it on a number of other objects. Is it of such pressing importance that this Donnybrook railway should be completed? I had an opportunity of seeing a photograph of some of this work, and I have very grave doubts as to whether the money is being wisely spent. However, the House voted it, and it is not for me to question it; but the House also voted in favour of the Fremantle dock and slip and the Perth and Fremantle sewerage, and now it is proposed to spend the money thus voted on the Donnybrook towards Bridgetown Railway, the Kalgoorlie-Boulder Railway, the Kanowna Railway, the Menzies Railway, the Southern Cross-Kalgoorlie Railway, etc. All the money seems to be going down South. Perth this year will be worse than it was last year, and yet the Government propose to take the money away from where it ought to be legitimately spent and to spend it on the goldfields. This is a matter of grave importance, and every hon. member should be present in his seat to oppose the Bill. It is a wretchedly bad principle which the Government are initiating. The Government are introducing precedent after precedent. Both in dealing with money already granted and in raising and expending money, they are introducing precedents which are the curse of this country. It is all very well to say that we can trust the Government who are at present administering the affairs of this colony. If we want to know whether we can do a certain thing, we look to the House of Commons, then to



the Legislatures of the other colonies, and finally to the Parliament in our own colony. Of course if we can find a precedent in our own colony, it is worth a dozen precedents in any of the other colonies, and fifty precedents in England; therefore I ask hon. members to be very cautious in dealing with this matter, and to prevent the Government from setting a precedent of this character. The Minister of Mines said he supposed that all members had read the speech of the Premier and Treasurer. I have something else to do besides listening to the trash which the right hon. gentleman sometimes speaks.

**THE MINISTER OF MINES:** I ask if the hon. member is in order in making these remarks?

**HON. R. S. HAYNES:** I will correct myself by saying that I have something else to do besides listening to the eloquence of the right hon. gentleman who leads the other House. We should not be compelled to read speeches made in the other place for the purpose of passing Bills in this House. If a sufficient reason exists for taking money from Perth and Fremantle, and showering it broadcast over the southern districts, then the Minister of Mines is quite capable of putting that reason very forcibly before the House. I regard this Bill as monstrous. I value my life more than the immediate prosperity of the Bridgetown district. On the principle that those people who contribute the most money to the Treasury should receive the greatest consideration, Perth and Fremantle are certainly entitled to the greatest consideration at our hands. They have received it so far from this House, but now the Minister asks us to leave out Perth and Fremantle, and fritter away on the Bridgetown Railway and other works the money which was originally voted for providing proper sewerage for Perth and Fremantle. How can the Minister ask any constituency to give up its rights?

**THE MINISTER OF MINES:** We only ask hon. members to approve of the Bill. If they do not, they can show their disapproval by rejecting it.

**HON. R. S. HAYNES:** The light and airy way in which the hon. the Minister introduced this Bill—

**THE MINISTER OF MINES:** I will ask the ruling of the Chairman if the remarks of the hon. member are not out of order?

**HON. R. S. HAYNES:** I say that the Bill was introduced airily and without argument by the hon. gentleman, who considered it sufficient to tell this House that the right hon. the Premier said it was necessary, and that, consequently, we must say so too. The death rate in Perth—I speak subject to correction—is higher than in any other city in Australia. This House has affirmed the principle of the proposal that there shall be a system of sewerage in Perth and Fremantle. At the present moment the death rate may be below, but it will be alarmingly higher before the end of the summer. Fevers and similar scourges may start here with which we shall be unable to cope. Have the people of Perth and Fremantle said they do not want deep drainage? Is the shipping at Fremantle falling off, that the dock is not required? If not, why are we asked to return the money that has been voted for these works? The works which I have mentioned will be reproductive works, whereas those on which it is proposed to fritter away the money will not be reproductive. I protest against the proposed reappropriation, and I shall oppose it in every possible way.

**HON. A. P. MATHESON:** I think that Mr. Haynes has rather overlooked the fact that, while the Fremantle dock and slip have been deprived of £70,000, the Fremantle harbour works have received £160,000. Fremantle and the coastal railways, and the Collie coalfields have benefited by £132,000, and I take it that the £200,000 which has not been spent on rolling stock is practically the money which has to be used for the purpose of the Fremantle harbour works. In any case I do not think it is much good discussing the question at any great length, because the money seems in nearly every case to have been already spent.

**HON. R. S. HAYNES:** Our duty is to show our approval or disapproval of the principle.

**HON. A. P. MATHESON:** That may be, but you cannot get out of the fact that the money has gone. I think it is little short of a disgrace that the Government should have allowed the work of providing for the sewerage of Perth and Fremantle to slide, in the way they have done.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Let the people tax themselves for this work.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: That is a very plausible argument, but it is the invariable practice in this as well as in other colonies to expect the Government to do everything in the shape of a public work. I agree that the practice is a most absurd one, and that the sooner it is done away with the better; but the practice does prevail, and the Government are terribly to blame for the fact that they have not commenced a proper system of sewerage for Perth and Fremantle. There is no doubt whatever that a certain amount of progress might have been made in the direction of draining Perth, at any rate. I do not know so much about Fremantle, but in Perth a system of drainage might have been commenced long since, if only the Government had been prepared to take up some line of action. They have had reports and papers prepared by their own engineers, and the only reason why they have not commenced the work seems to be that they have not placed the fullest reliance on the advice which they have received.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Do you refer to the sewerage or drainage?

HON. A. P. MATHESON: I am not aware of what is the distinction between the two, but I am referring specially to deep drainage.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I cannot see my way to follow Mr. Haynes altogether in his ferocious attack on the Bill, because I can quite see that, under the circumstances, some such course as the Government have taken may have been necessary. Mr. Matheson has drawn attention to the fact that £160,000 have been allocated towards the Fremantle Harbour Works. I can hardly feel justified, under the circumstances, in opposing the Bill, more especially as I am convinced that the Fremantle Harbour Works are an absolute necessity. As Mr. Haynes said, they do not belong to Fremantle only, but are a national work. It is absolutely necessary that the work should be gone on with as expeditiously as possible, and if anything were to occur which would render it necessary to stop that work, it would be next door to a national calamity. There is one point, however, on which I agree with Mr. Haynes, and that is with regard to the Government's

intention not to proceed with the sewerage scheme for Perth and Fremantle. I think that the Government are absolutely wrong in this matter, and I think they are making a rod for their own backs in not carrying out the scheme that they originally decided that they would—the scheme which Parliament supported by voting sufficient money to carry out the work.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Why should the Government do it?

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Because it is an absolute necessity, in the first place. The people here have been dying like flies from typhoid fever.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: No.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: They have been dying in hundreds. The percentage last year or two has increased at an alarming rate, and yet the Government sit down and do nothing. We know perfectly well that Perth is the most unhealthy city in the Australian colonies, and therefore the Government, knowing that the city cannot afford to carry out the work, should undertake to do it. There is not a single work that would have redounded to the credit of the Government more than the carrying out of a sewerage scheme for Perth and Fremantle. They would have had the approval of the whole colony if they had done it. What their reason for not doing it is I do not know.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: It is not the Government's place to do it.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: But the Government have pledged themselves to it, and they cannot turn round now and say it is not their place to do the work. The Government do not intend to proceed with the work, and it does not matter whether the £40,000 is reappropriated or not.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: The Government cannot proceed with the work.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I extremely regret that the Government have decided not to commence the deep drainage, and I do hope they will reconsider their position, and before very long start the work, and proceed with it as rapidly as possible.

At 6:40 p.m. the PRESIDENT left the chair.

At 7:45 p.m. the PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

HON. G. RANDELL: I think it is the duty of hon. members, as far as they possibly can, to assist the Government in the readjustment of the finances of the country in this direction, so long as we are satisfied on the face of it that good reasons can be alleged for what has been done. All of us know the peculiar circumstances in which the colony is placed at the present time, and none of us are disposed to believe that the Government, for the mere fun of the thing, are going to alter the appropriations already made, and reappropriate the funds so appropriated. No doubt the Government had to reconsider their position in many respects, in order to provide for many works in various parts of the country; and so long as the works are for the advancement and interest of the country, there is no very serious reason why we should object. There may be, as the Hon. R. S. Haynes stated, a principle behind, which it is not desirable should often be acted upon.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It is constantly being acted upon.

HON. G. RANDELL: Even the hon. member will not dispute that the altered circumstances of the colony involve the reconsideration of the position we occupy, and an endeavour on our part to meet those altered circumstances. I am not here to defend the actions of the Government in this matter; but looking down the schedules and the sums of money taken from the various appropriations made, I must say that the money that has been spent on the works named in the second schedule is for useful works. We have commenced, rightly or wrongly—I gave my vote in favour of it—a line to the Collie coalfields, in the hope that a useful and beneficial industry will be developed. All must admit, if we have the coal there of a valuable quality, it will be of great benefit to this country. As to the Donnybrook line, it runs into a good district, which is languishing for the want of communication. There is an abundant sphere there for the cultivation of fruits and other things; and, given easy access to the centres of population, these lands will be occupied and industriously cultivated. Almost all the other reappropriations are devoted to the development of our gold-fields, and I believe every hon. mem-

ber has the full intention to do all he possibly can to develop that important industry, knowing full well the influence it has on our progress and advancement in numbers and wealth. I would like to say, and it is partly for that reason I rose to speak on the subject, that I do not share the alarmist views expressed in this House and other places in regard to the health of Perth, or that Perth will suffer very materially in the immediate future by not undertaking the deep drainage. I quite think the Government are justified in giving this subject—it is a very important one—their fullest and fairest consideration, gaining all the information they can on the subject. The report given by Mr. Napier Bell, as is well known, has been challenged, and, I believe, by a professional engineer—a gentleman who has a very high standing in his profession—and we have it from other sources that there is no absolute necessity for immediately embarking on this scheme, if we do not see, from want of funds, our way clear to do so. I think it would be a mistake to adopt the plan proposed by Mr. Bell. That plan would involve the taking of the sewage across the River Swan into the Canning district, and I think that course ought not to be adopted unless we are absolutely compelled to do so. There are other schemes suggested, which do not involve the same consequences, and which might be undertaken. I do not think the Government should let this matter quietly rest, but they should arrive at some decision in the matter on the best data they can obtain. As the Hon. F. T. Crowder intimated, it is first of all the duty of the City Council to attend to sewerage matters, but the City Council have considered themselves debarred from carrying out a scheme of sewerage by their inability to obtain funds, and the Government have stepped into the breach, and are willing to do what they can in this direction. The majority of citizens of Perth desire that something should be done for dealing with the refuse and sewage of the city. From scientific sources several plans have been mentioned, with every hope of complete success. I refer to an opinion expressed—I believe openly in the newspapers—by Dr. Jameson, who has given the subject great consideration, and I believe he is an authority on the subject.

This matter should be dealt with, if possible, at an early date. I fail to see why the thing should be hung up because a reappropriation is to take place. There will be a considerable sum of money left to devote to the undertaking, but I hope the Government will not undertake the deep drainage scheme until they are satisfied, and the citizens are satisfied, that the plan to be followed is likely to accomplish the object in view. I said I do not share in the alarmist views that have been expressed in the House and outside with regard to the health of Perth. It is well known that in other parts of the world typhoid fever is again and again prevalent. Large numbers of deaths have taken place here from fever, but there is no satisfactory reason given by the medical profession for the outbreak of fever here. I believe in the old country typhoid fever used to be reckoned as a rich man's disease, due to defective drainage in houses and hotels. Here, I take it, the disease, as far as a layman can judge from observations, arises from many causes. One of the most potent is the abnormal conditions in which numbers of the population are living. They are crowded into lodginghouses with a small amount of air space in the rooms. Many people perhaps are not careful enough in their own personal cleanliness. I believe if people, generally speaking, were careful in the washing of their hands on every occasion, especially before taking meals, that would to a large extent—and I have that opinion from medical men—protect them from the inroads of typhoid fever. People live, as I have said, in abnormal conditions, and, as regards food, they are not careful. I come back to what I said, that we have no direct statement from the medical profession how typhoid fever is disseminated in our midst. [A MEMBER: By filth.] Some of the people who live in the most filthy places in Perth have escaped contamination, and some who live in the best conditions have been affected by typhoid fever. In many cases it may be that the system has run down, and it may be that some persons are inured against the disease. With regard to what the Hon. R. S. Haynes said as to the increase in the outbreak of typhoid fever in the current year, I do not share in that opinion. I have some grounds for thinking that probably we shall not

have so severe an attack of typhoid fever as we had last year. At the present moment the hospitals have very few typhoid patients in them.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: They are nearly all dead.

HON. G. RANDELL: I go further, and say that the whole of these cases are not traceable to the city of Perth itself. The Perth hospital receives patients from the suburbs and outlying districts. It is said that the death rate of Perth is larger than that of any other Australian city; but congregated in the hospital here are many patients who come from outside places. People are brought in from, say, Cottesloe, Claremont, Highgate Hill, Victoria Park, and even from the Canning and other places. These cannot be put down to the defective sanitary arrangements of Perth. I do not say that the sanitary arrangements are as complete and good as they should be. I believe every effort should be made to cleanse the city as far as possible. I am hoping that the City Council will awaken to a sense of their duty. They have certainly taken steps to cleanse the back yards in the more congested parts of the city, and in that way they are helping to defeat the common foe. I thought it right to say these few words in reference to the question, but I do not think any good will come from debating at length the Reappropriation Bill. We can only accept or reject it. I do not think it is one of those Bills we can send back with suggested amendments. At any rate, I do not think the House would do that, even if we had the power. I am quite willing to believe that the Government have given their best consideration to the Bill, and that they have brought it in reluctantly, because they had no alternative, and it is my duty as a legislator to assist them to the best of my ability.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I fully coincide with the remarks which have fallen from the Hon. G. Randell. My only objection to this Reappropriation Bill is, as far as I can gather, that the moneys which are to be reappropriated have been spent.

HON. G. RANDELL: I think that was denied in the other House.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I do not know whether it was denied or not, but my objection is that, as far as I can gather, the moneys to be reappropriated

have been spent. I raise my voice as one member of this House against the system of the Government spending money without first of all bringing the matters before Parliament. At the same time, I fully agree with the remarks which have fallen from the Hon. G. Randell that, so far as the Government are concerned, they are placed in a position of great trust, and I give them every credit for endeavouring, as far as lies in their power, to do the best they can for the colony; and, believing as I do that those who form the Government are doing the best they can, this time I will look over the spending of the money before it has been asked for. In the future I hope moneys will not be spent before Parliament has been asked for it. On that point I will say nothing further. I should not have risen to say anything only for the remarks made by the Hon. R. S. Haynes and the Hon. A. B. Kidson in regard to the sewerage of Perth. In this Reappropriation Bill £40,000 is reappropriated from the £142,000 for the sewerage of Perth and Fremantle, first instalment. If my memory serves me aright, and if not hon members will correct me, the £142,000 was the first moiety passed by Parliament of the £300,000 for the sewerage scheme. The Government have found that it is utterly impossible to complete the sewerage system of Perth, and Fremantle for that sum. The members of the Government, like hon. members, are only human, and they may be of one opinion at one time, but other opinions having been brought to bear upon them they may alter that opinion; and I believe the Government would not alter their opinion without they have just cause for doing so. In offering to set apart £300,000 for the drainage of Fremantle and Perth they thought they were doing what was the correct thing, but now they find they cannot carry out the sewerage for that amount. Apart from whether the Government carry out the work or not, I maintain it is not part and parcel of the Government policy to spend £300,000 for the sewerage of Perth and Fremantle.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Then why did you vote for it?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I have altered my opinion. The Lord helps those who help themselves, and it should be for either Perth or Fremantle to come

forward and show that they are in a position to pay the interest on a sum such as will complete the work, before the Government have any right whatever to tax the whole of the colony for the benefit of Fremantle or Perth. The Hon. G. Randell mentioned Dr. Jameson's scheme. During the time I was a member of the City Council, Dr. Jameson brought forward some very good ideas as to the cleansing of Perth, and I am confident, after years of watching, that had Dr. Jameson's views been carried out at the time he submitted them, we should not be in the position Perth occupies to-day. Dr. Jameson, after years of watching, cites Berlin with a population of eight or nine millions, and the only cleansing for that city is the dry earth system.

A MEMBER: You mean a population of eight hundred or nine hundred thousand.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I may be wrong.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: He means the population of the whole of Germany.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The pan system of Perth is condemned because it is not properly carried out. Hon. members may instance Adelaide, which is properly drained by a sewerage system, but we must remember, at the same time, that Adelaide is naturally laid out for a drainage system, and I may say that Perth is not blessed in the same way. Our sewage would first have to be drained into a certain spot, then pumped over the mountains or go into the sea, and if it goes into the sea it will destroy the town of Fremantle. In Sydney they have a sewerage system, and the sewage is emptied into the sea at Botany, where the water is 60 feet deep. Perth has none of these conveniences.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: What about Brisbane?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Well, you have been there since I was there, and I will not express an opinion. All I say is this, that the Government have a perfect right, as a body of sensible men, to say whether they are going to find the money for a deep drainage scheme for Perth. So far as I am concerned, and I say it openly, although I am not an out-and-out supporter of the measures brought forward by the Government, when I find the Government doing their

best I support them. I do not believe the Government of the colony at the present day would ever bring in an Reappropriation Bill, if they did not do it in the best interests of the colony.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (in reply): I must congratulate hon. members on the careful attention they have given to this Bill, as well as to other Bills brought before this House. I think it is a matter of congratulation to the colony that there are in the Upper House members who give such careful attention to the details of the Bills brought forward. I have been accused this evening, I believe, of opposing amendments that are brought before the House by the Hon. R. S. Haynes, but I really think I may fairly return the compliment, and say he not only opposes amendments brought forward by me, but he opposes all the Bills brought before the House. I know the hon. gentleman has more than the average amount of ability, and can grasp matters better than most people, therefore I cannot understand his motive of opposition. At the present moment the Government have brought down a number of Bills that seem, according to the hon. member, to be all wrong. I hope this Bill will receive the very careful consideration which it should do, and which apparently, to some extent, it has. I have also been accused of bringing forward no arguments in support of the Bill. I referred to the speech of the right hon. the Premier, which I said no doubt had been read, but which some hon. members said they had not read, and yet in the most extraordinary manner several members—I will mention two, the Hon. A. P. Matheson and the Hon. A. B. Kidson—seem to know a great deal about it.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: I have not seen the Premier's speech.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I have not read the Premier's speech.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: That only shows how great thoughts strike minds at the same time. I take it that these simultaneous ideas show how great minds run in the same groove. I was accused of introducing the Bill in such a brief way that it was impossible for anybody to know anything about it; yet I find that two members get up and know all about it, and these members appeared to have a thorough grasp of the

Bill. I made a short speech, because I thought hon. members on reading the Bill would know what was intended, and it was no use inflicting a long speech on the House. If I used no arguments in favour of the Bill, let us look at some of the arguments brought against it. First of all the Government are accused of taking money away from important works at Fremantle, which is singled out on this occasion, when upon other occasions the same town is selected for other objects. We are accused of doing great harm to the dock—[HON. R. S. HAYNES: And the sewerage]—to the sewerage and other things, to spend the money at Collie or Blackwood. What are the facts of the case? An amount of £142,000 was voted for the dock and slip, and all the Government are reappropriating is £70,000. It is admitted by those most interested that it is impossible to spend that amount of money this year, so that no harm can follow on that account. With regard to the Fremantle sewerage, it is more than compensated for by the Fremantle Harbour Works, £160,000, which evidently escaped my lynx-eyed friend. All the money voted by the Bill, it is said, is to be spent on some rubbishing railways, which go to nowhere. This is the argument which has been used. When we find the hon. gentleman moving his ground on every occasion when he wants to bring forward some argument, it is unnecessary for me to take up the time of the House to reply to him. I will let the hon. gentleman's arguments look after themselves. As has been said, a great deal of this money has already been spent, and the Government have spent it with considerable reluctance. The position was forced upon them. Had they not spent the money upon the works that have been mentioned, these works would have had to stop. Take this despised railway, the Collie coalfield line, or the Donnybrook railway, would it have been wise for the Government to stop at the stump of a tree, when all the money voted had been expended? If it was good enough to vote the money in the first instance, it was good enough for the Government to go on spending money upon the line. Take the gold-fields works: it has been said that there was no hurry for the Boulder railway. The Government had not a moment's

peace until they started this line, and it is now making the best of returns. Will hon. members say that, when it is necessary to make an expenditure to develop the best interests of the country, the Government ought to stand still because Parliament has not voted the money?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Yes.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: There are occasions when, if a Government is any good at all, it must take the bull by the horns and do the necessary work. I have only to refer to the different railways to show their usefulness. Who would say, stop the railway from Kalgoorlie to Menzies, which will open up miles and miles of country, and those mines which have been found by prospectors after hard work—prospectors who have gone through the burden and heat of the day? These mines could not get along without machinery being taken there. Are we to stop a work like that because Parliament is not sitting, when we want a few pounds to carry on the work? It is better to take advantage of the position, and to carry on the works. Any man who takes the view that we should not carry on these works is not worthy of a seat in this House. Then there is the question of water: what greater question can there be than the supply of water on the goldfields?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: But the tanks will not hold water.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: A sensible interjection, of course, is worthy of some consideration. The tanks cannot hold water at the present time, because the Almighty has not favoured us with the water. This is the hon. gentleman who advocates the interests of the goldfields.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That portion which I represent.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: I am not a selfish man, and I do not think only of one part of the country. Now we come to the question of the sewerage scheme. There is not the slightest doubt that during the sitting of Parliament last year, the Government committed themselves to a system of sewerage to cost £300,000, and placed in the schedule an amount of £142,000 as the first instalment. Since then we have had reports on this matter, and the Government are told by their

advisers, by scientific men, that no scheme could be carried forward under a cost of £400,000. Would it be wise, in the face of the reports of competent men, to start in our present financial position, when we have not the bulk of our loan borrowed yet for the works? Would it be wise to undertake a large work like that, without being sure of the money to carry it out? Any careful businesslike man would not start the work under these circumstances. The Government did not think it wise to do such a thing, and I go further and say that the people of Perth and Fremantle, if canvassed to-morrow, would not be prepared to indorse the expenditure of such a sum of money which would place on them a large amount of rates. It is a very large amount indeed, and we must always remember that for the systems adopted in a good many places, the people have found their own money, but the Government of this colony have come forward in a liberal manner to the tune of £300,000. I say this question has come round to one of surface drainage, and this is the scheme I believe the City Council of Perth, who represent the ratepayers, are inclined to favour.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: They are men of wisdom.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Whether they are men of wisdom or not, I cannot say, but they are elected by the men of Perth, who pay the rates and are responsible for the expenditure. This sum of £40,000 is voted for the surface drainage, and the Government are prepared to give further assistance if it is necessary. At all events, the Government will give way to no one in their desire to promote the health, not only of Perth and Fremantle, but of every part of the colony. They have proved their desire in this regard, for if you go to any part of the goldfields you will find the Government have been very liberal in establishing hospitals and granting sums of money for other purposes. What would have been more popular than for the Government to have come down and said, "Go on with the Perth and Fremantle sewerage scheme?" Any Government that wanted to make itself popular would have done so; but we have been misrepresented, and our actions have been misstated, when we try to do the best we can. I feel confident that every hon. member who gives this Bill

careful consideration, and fairly analyses the motives which induced the Government to bring in the Bill, will give it his support. It is a matter of regret to us that the Government are obliged to come down with a Bill of this description, and we look to hon. members to support us in our efforts to do the best we can for the country. I hope hon. members will support the Government in the action now taken, and show by their vote that they have confidence in the Government, and recognise that their efforts are in the best interests of the colony as a whole.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

First Schedule—agreed to.

Second Schedule—Works for which the amount of £395,000 reappropriated is to be applied:

HON. R. S. HAYNES: In the second schedule there was an amount set down for a tank at Widgeemooltha, and another at Bardoc. He wished to know if these tanks had been completed, or whether the work was proceeding, or was partly completed and the works stopped.

THE MINISTER OF MINES said he was given to understand that the money in connection with some of the tanks—he could not say which—was expended, but to what extent he could not say.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Could the Minister say what tanks had been completed.

THE MINISTER OF MINES could not say. The Government were pledged to the expenditure of this money on these tanks, but as to the exact position the work was in he was not in a position to say.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: In regard to what was said about the deep drainage, he would like to explain, as it might be inferred from what he had said on the second reading, that he was wedded to this deep drainage scheme.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not go back and discuss that now, as the Hon. R. S. Haynes had spoken to the second schedule of the bill.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Perhaps he would be permitted to speak by way of explanation, without referring to the items.

THE CHAIRMAN: If it was the pleasure of the House he could do so.

Permission given.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: said his desire was to explain that he was not wedded to the deep drainage scheme. He thought the Government should, at the earliest possible opportunity, ascertain what was the best scheme, and then carry out that scheme as expeditiously as possible.

Schedule put and passed.

Preamble and title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and report adopted.

#### MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): Hon. members are, no doubt, familiar with the Mines Regulation Act, which was passed some time ago. It is now proposed to amend that Act in two principal directions. One is in connection with the return of underground plans from the mines, and the other is in connection with the formation of a board for the examination of engine-drivers, and for giving first and second class certificates instead of only one. The present Act states that every mine owner or mine manager shall keep plans of the mine or mines under his charge, which shall be prepared either by the mine manager or by a surveyor who has the approval of the Mines Department. These plans are kept upon the mine, and any inspector has power to have access to them, and may make a copy of them for any purposes that may be required. By this Bill it is proposed that the mine managers shall still keep a plan of their mines, to be made by a licensed surveyor, but that they shall forward to the Mines Department a plan of the underground workings of their mines, and every subsequent six months shall forward a further plan showing what work has taken place since. The object of the change is to ensure that mine owners and managers shall send these plans to the Mines Department, so that the department may have an accurate record of all underground workings in connection with mines. In 1896 a Mines Record Branch was established in connection with the Mines Department, for



the purpose of registering and putting on record everything that was possible in connection with mines, such as their underground workings, the returns of crushings and other particulars which might be of interest. This branch was established some six months ago, but there was no power to compel mine managers to send down a copy of their plans, and there was no time for the inspectors to copy them. This Bill provides that the managers shall forward plans to this Record Branch. It is proposed to have all these particulars, so that any person coming to the colony and wishing to purchase any property will be in a position to go to this Record Branch and to see exactly what sort of a mine it is that he proposes to purchase. The establishment of a Record Branch of this description will do away to a very large extent with the sale of worthless mines. The Department of Mines has had a good deal of advice in connection with this matter, particularly from Mr. Cosmo Newbery, a scientific gentleman well-known in Victoria, who strongly approved of the institution of this branch, and in a report that I have here he states that "Departmental methods having become, to a certain extent, traditional, it would be difficult to establish a new office in any of the older colonies." But no such difficulty exists in this colony, where mining is a recent development and the officials have no traditions on the subject. The object the Government have in view in creating this branch is to assist and promote the development of our mining resources, by supplying those engaged in mining with information likely to be of value in their ventures. In Victoria they were very late in starting a branch of this kind, and I believe that they have regretted it to a large extent since. The real object of a Mines Record Branch is—first, the collection of statistics as to the yields of all mines, so that there will be a complete and continuous history of each mine and the date of its commencing operations; secondly, the filing of copies of all the underground workings. These are the two great points of the Bill. Section 3 provides that this Bill and the principal Act shall apply to all mines and mining areas in such goldfields, districts, and mineral districts or portions thereof, respectively, as the Governor

may, by order in Council, from time to time direct. The provisions of the original Act do not extend to any mines in which less than five people are employed underground, so that it is impossible to know what is going on in a mine of that description. A provision is made in this Bill that returns showing the underground workings of all mines up to date shall be sent in, and that every subsequent six months an additional return shall be sent in showing the progress made. These returns are to be sent in to be recorded in the Mines Department. The Bill also states that all plans that are sent forward and all tracings shall be considered confidential, and none of the information shall be divulged. There is a penalty for managers who do not comply with the provisions of this Bill. There is a further provision that when a mine is abandoned a plan of its workings shall be forwarded to the Mines Department. This is a most important matter, because in time to come, when abandoned leases are again taken up by prospectors or leaseholders, they will know exactly what has been done, where the drives are, what the workings were, what the timberings were, and all particulars in connection with it. I am informed that information of this kind will be most valuable. That is the part which deals with the underground workings and returns. We next come to clause 11, by which the Governor-in-Council is empowered to appoint a board to examine engine-drivers. The original Act only provided for one certificate, whereas this Bill provides for two certificates. Under the existing Act, examiners were at one time in the habit in some cases of giving a conditional certificate, which almost amounted to a second-class certificate; but it was afterwards found that this was not quite in accordance with the Act, and accordingly the practice was abandoned. There is a very great difference between the man accustomed to work winding machinery, who has the lives of a great many people in his hands, and the man who is in the habit of working only ordinary machinery; and therefore it is proposed that any man who has worked winding machinery for twelve months prior to this Bill coming into force, and can satisfy the board of his competency, shall get a first-class cer-

tificate, while any man who has been in the habit of working only ordinary machinery will get a second-class certificate. I propose to introduce an amendment providing that engine-drivers who do not happen to arrive here just at the time that there is a meeting of the board to enable them to pass these examinations, may obtain a provisional certificate from any member of the board, to allow them to obtain employment till an opportunity occurs for them to undergo an examination. Several cases of hardship have come to my knowledge of men arriving here with first-class certificates and being compelled to wait, perhaps three weeks or a month, or even more, before they have an opportunity of undergoing the necessary examination, and being unable in the meantime to obtain employment, as by so doing they would render their employers liable to a fine under the existing Act. A penalty is provided for driving without a certificate. Power is also given to the Governor to appoint inspectors of machinery. These men are empowered to inspect any kind of machinery. The Bill also provides that an inspector of mines may obtain the services of one of the inspectors of boilers, when he inspects a mine, for the purpose of satisfying him that the boilers are in good order. There is also a clause dealing with inquests on people who have been killed by accidents in mines, which provides that no person who is interested in the particular mine where the accident has happened shall be one of the jury. The Bill also provides that, so far as is practicable, a majority of the jurors shall be composed of working miners. This is a matter to which considerable attention has been given, and I am very pleased to be able to introduce this amendment in accordance with the advice of so many people on the goldfields. I hope hon. members will pass the Bill as it is, and enable us to start this record branch in connection with the Mines Department, as it will be of the greatest value not only to the department but to the colony; and I think it will be recognised by all who have had any long experience on the goldfields, that it is one of the best institutions that could be started.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: There is no doubt that such a record branch as the hon. member proposes to establish is a very desirable thing, but the amount of

responsibility and expense that has been thrown on mine owners by the preparation of the different returns that the Government want is becoming a very serious question. I notice from a Bill before me that similar statistics are to be required from the agricultural, pastoral, and other industries. These inquiries are of a most inquisitorial character, and I should have been inclined later on to move that this special clause requiring the management of mines to supply these particulars should be struck out; but, seeing that all the industries of the colony apparently are about to be taxed to the same extent, it is hardly reasonable to expect the mining industry to escape. I think the general principles of the Bill, apart from the broad principle involved in the preparation of these returns, are very desirable.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: This is one of the Bills which will always have to be brought in by reason of the slipshod manner in which Acts are passed. I have grave doubts whether the hon. the Minister of Mines has made out any case calling for the establishment of a record branch, or showing that we ought to saddle mine owners with any more burdens than those with which they are already saddled. We shall want an army of inspectors to see that the provisions of the Bill are carried out.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: The mining managers, and not the inspectors, are to be called upon to supply these returns.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: But inspectors will be required next, and after that will come an amending Bill requiring that the inspectors shall be qualified. I doubt the propriety of compelling mining managers to supply the Mines Department with plans of their underground workings. I have not the slightest objection to compelling them to make plans of their underground workings to be kept in their own offices, but I object to compelling them to make tracings of their underground workings to send down to Perth.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: They are to forward their crushing returns also.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That is a different matter; but to compel them to forward to Perth tracings of their underground workings is, in my opinion, an infringement of the rights of the subject. What benefit or advantage will accrue

from compelling them to do that? The Minister has not given us any reason to warrant us in doing this. The hon. gentleman no doubt thinks it will be a good thing to have these plans. The Minister has seen maps of various places hanging in offices; he has seen, no doubt, plans of the Zoo, and he wishes to have some plans of the mines to hang about his offices. The Minister seems to have a disease; he has an idea that for every Act that is passed there should be an amending Act. How inconsistent has the hon. gentleman been in regard to the registration of engineers! and if the House wished to be consistent it would have to strike out the clause in reference to granting certificates to engineers. The Minister said it was necessary that the men appointed as underground surveyors should pass a thorough examination; but what do we find? When the Underground Surveyors Bill was before the House, I argued that the men who were carrying on business should not be interfered with, and I see that clause 12 of the Bill before the House introduces this very principle that I strove to have incorporated in the Underground Surveyors Bill. Clause 12 says:—

The said Board shall grant a first-class certificate of competency to every person who satisfies the Board that he has been in charge of and has efficiently managed, upon a mine, winding machinery worked by steam, by which men were raised and lowered in cages, for a period of 12 months prior to the application for such certificate, and shall grant a second-class certificate to every person who satisfies the Board that he has been in charge of and has efficiently managed upon a mine machinery worked by steam for a period of twelve months prior to the application for such certificate, and such certificate shall confer the same privileges as a certificate of competency of the same class.

Was that not all I asked for the surveyors? The House, to be consistent, should strike out the clause, but I shall support it. The hon. gentleman has given no reason why the Bill is necessary, and in the absence of any reason I cannot support the measure.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### MOTION—LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

HON. H. BRIGGS, without notice, moved that 14 days' leave of absence be granted to the Hon. H. G. Parsons.

MR. PRESIDENT: Before I put this motion, I must again draw the attention of hon. members to this question of leave of absence being given. I think the rule for leave of absence has been strained to its utmost degree, this session. Those hon. members who are away from the colony, of course, cannot help it, but members residing in the colony I think should certainly make some effort to attend. Suppose a case of emergency arose, and it was desired to suspend the Standing Orders, the work of the Council might be stopped. I think it my duty, as President, to call attention to this matter.

Motion put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9 o'clock p.m. until the next Tuesday.

## Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 25th November, 1897.

Message (appropriation) re Supply Bill—Papers Presented—Question: Post and Telegraph Offices for Northampton—Question: Inspector of Mines for Knowna and Bulong—Stock Diseases Act Amendment Bill: first reading—Return: Perth Public Hospital—Sale of Liquors Act Amendment Bill: third reading—Employment Brokers Bill: third reading—Industrial Statistics Bill: third reading—Immigration Restriction Bill: third reading—High School Act Amendment Bill: second reading—Dog Act Amendment Bill: Legislative Council's Amendments; in committee—Local Inscribed Stock Bill: Legislative Council's Amendments; Speaker's Ruling; in committee—Annual Estimates: Debate on Financial Policy; in Committee of Supply—Adjournment.

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### MESSAGE (APPROPRIATION) RE SUPPLY BILL.

A Message from the Governor was received and read, recommending an appro-